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Traditionally, men are expected to arrange their lifestyle in a way that allows them to obtain the “package deal” of a career, becoming a husband, and fatherhood. This study quantitatively studies the effects of partnering on gay and straight men as mediated through the bar scene, aiming to explore how bar participation alters their social networks and their perceptions of social expectations. The ultimate goal is to determine if gay and straight men report differing social expectations such as becoming a husband and father. This investigation explores their beliefs on commitment, monogamy, and parenthood and seeks to determine whether these beliefs differ due to sexuality. Collecting data about how the men participate in the bar scene and if their participation differs after partnering will help reveal differences in social network composition, social expectations, and commitment. The data were collected from people 18 and older through a web-based survey linked directly to particular bars and other community sites within one urban region of Kentucky. Bar participation between gay men and straight men, particularly when partnered, did not differ significantly, suggesting similarities in social network composition. Social expectations did not vary much between gay and single men, but the commitment each group reported was conceptually different. Ultimately, the study both supported and opposed previous literature concerning traditional gendered social expectation.
CHAPTER I

Introduction

Bar participation can reveal useful information about an individual such as their social network composition. Understanding gay men’s social network composition compared with straight men’s social network composition will provide insight on whether gay men and straight men have differing perceived social expectations; and thus, held to different standards of life, especially after cohabitation and marriage. Sociologically considering the implication of gender on both straight and gay men within our society and how society constructs expectations through gender, specifically roles through marriage and family, understanding if gay men can obtain these goals to the same degree as straight men is important.

The predominant concepts outlined within existing literature that creates space for further research include 1) actual behavior, 2) the purpose of bar attendance, 3) and social role expectations of partnered and single gay and straight men. This study examines four potential purposes of bar attendance: finding a sexual partner, friendships, social networks and community, and building identity. These purposes will emphasize commonalities and differences between gay and straight men. Structural-strain theory is used to understand the importance of the bar or club scene, especially for partnered gay men. Differential association theory is used when considering how men participate within the bar scene. Socioemotional selectivity theory along with dyadic withdrawal theory will be used specifically to examine men’s social networks after marriage.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Drawing from previous bar research, understanding frequency and purpose of attending bars allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the sample population. Social networks, such as family and friends, which are evident in why a person decides to frequent a bar is then explored. The literature highlights finding a partner as a reason behind bar attendance and what partnership for both gay and straight men looks like not only for how they participate in the bar, but also on different social expectations they are met with after partnering. Coupledom is then explored through the lens of commitment and monogamy, marriage, and parenting.

*Frequency of going to bars*

Frequency of going to bars is the best indicator of which groups of men utilize the bar the most both before and after partnering. Analyzing which group spends the most time in the bar allows for social networks and social expectations to be more evident. The bar scene is used as an indicator of social networks. This indicator helps reveal the differences between gay and straight men to better understand social expectations. Prior research is more illustrative when divulging the gay bar scene than within the research available on the straight bar scene. For example, the bar is viewed as an important social institution for gay men starting with the Stonewall Riots of 1969 that helped to launch the gay rights movement in the United States. The bar was considered an important place for gay men to socialize with one another during a time when laws prohibited homosexuality in public spaces (Stonewall Riots, 2009).
Purposes of Bar Attendance

The existing literature identifies finding a sexual partner, friendships, social networks, sense of community and building identity as purposes of bar attendance.

Finding a sexual partner

The bar is often thought of as a convenient sexual marketplace used for entertainment (Cavan, 1966; Lindsay, 2006). Both men and women participate in the bar scene, at times, for sexual fulfillment. This general understanding is a reason behind why after marriage, straight men are less likely to participate in the bar scene. The wife may especially discourage participation. Therefore the social networks no longer focus around friendships and going out to bars, but are dominated by family and couple home entertainment (Cavan, 1960; Lindsay, 2006). This is a type of social control that occurs when “…a person internalizes a sense of obligation to one or more significant others and, as a result, avoid high risk behaviors so as not to jeopardize performance of these role obligations” (Lewis & Rook, 1999, p.63; Homish & Leonard, 2007).

Friendships

Using the bar to find a sexual partner is only one purpose behind bar attendance. The bar can act as an institution where friendships and social networks are created and sustained. Friendship is a voluntary relationship (Friedman, 1993; Wilkinson, Bittman, Holt, Rawstorne, Kippax, & Worth, 2012). The role of friendship is to allow the individual to create and recreate themselves (Wilkinson et al., 2012). When considering gay and straight men’s friendships, gender and sexuality constrains how friendship is performed. Friendship is not perceived as intimate between straight men because they interact with friends in a way that conforms to gendered expectations. Men tend to avoid
expressive behavior and self-disclosure (Migliaccio, 2009). For men to present masculinity while maintaining friends, men illustrate closeness through shared activity, such as watching a game together, which is known as “closeness in doing” (Swain, 1989; Migliaccio, 2009, p. 229). An importance of friendship among straight men is the ability to express masculinity in a way that teaches and reiterates masculinity. The role of the friendship among men becomes centralized around the importance of portraying gender (Migliaccio, 2009). Understanding friendships in individual social networks is important as a way to reveal different reasons men go to bars and behavior in the bar.

Friendships among gay men are often more intimate in that there are elements of self-disclosure such as centralizing gay identity. Gay men’s friendships are not only for companionship, but the relationship itself influences gay identity and the expansion of the self (Nardi, 1999; Raymond, 2000). Friendship helps mold the self especially when building a gay identity. Friendships are also essential for networking within gay communities. In acknowledging how gender affects gay men and friendships, Nardi (1999) states that “Gay men’s friendships have the potential for challenging the dominant structures of masculinity while providing important sites for gay men’s development, for maintenance of personal identity, and for the reproduction of gay community and political identity” (Nardi, 1999, p.9; Raymond, 2000, p.275). Gay men’s friendships are essential in gay men’s psychological and social development (Nardi, 1999; Carpiano, Kelly, Easterbrooks, & Parsons, 2011).

While the general concept of friendship for both groups is similar, the way gay men and straight men participate and construct friendship varies substantially. Both types of friendships allow for the development of self either through building masculinity or in
building a gay identity. Friendship appears to consist of more intimacy within gay men’s friendships than straight men’s friendships, though they are both essential in building self. Friendships among gay men offer a different type of support and self-acceptance unique to gay identity that is not available in straight men’s friendships; therefore, gay identity based on sexuality is essential (Nardi, 1992; Nardi & Sherrod, 1994; Wilkinson et al., 2012). Understanding the differences in friendships is necessary in considering if gay and straight men utilize the bar after partnering. For instance, the literature demonstrates that gay men often have more intimate friendships than straight men. Intimate friendships between gay men will likely remain important after partnering, indicating why gay men (partnered and single) still frequent the bar. Since friendship among straight men is said to be less intimate, they may be less important once the straight man has partnered.

Friendships among men do not strictly happen in bars, nor do they have to focus around building a “masculine” or “gay” identity as indicated above. However, the context of friendships created and managed through the bar is the focal point. This is not to indicate that straight and gay men do not have intimate and supportive friendships. However, focusing on bar participation will allow the role of these friendships within the bar scene to be analyzed. The differences in the type of friendship support these men receive may be evident through the analysis of the participation within the bar scene. Studying bar participation can provide a different level of insight into the varying friendships of gay and straight men ultimately highlighting differences and commonalities that may indicate social expectations.
Social networks and community

Emotional support and social companionship are two important contributors that bind an individual to social networks (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Hlebec & Kogovšek, 2013). These aspects of social networks are considered when differentiating between gay and straight men and their perception of community. When considering differentiations of social networks, those emphasizing the role of friendship predominately make up the entirety of social networks for gay men whereas social support from family prevails for straight men, especially after cohabitation or marriage (Shippy, Cantor, & Brennan, 2004). In comparing the social networks of gay and straight older adults, levels of social support turned out to be the same, but where the support came from was different; straight individuals’ support came from family members and gay individuals’ support came from friends (Dorfman, Walters, Burke, Hardin, & Karanik, 1995; Shippy, Cantor, & Brennan, 2004). Research supports the notion that gay men often rely mainly on friends to incorporate their social network whereas straight men often rely on family. The varying dimensions of social networks among the two types of men indicate that the bar scene may be utilized differently in meaningful and insightful ways. Networks made up of friendships would pertain more to a social night life that would therefore use the bar more; whereas, networks that pertain to family or coworkers would be central to different types of gatherings such as going to dinner as a family.

Straight men’s social networks that are based on friends center on specific activities meaning that the shared activity between the men is the main context of their friendship (Wright, 2006; Watson, 2012). For example, if two men became friends at the bar then their friendship will likely to continue in the context of the bar. However, the
same man may have other friendships that only pertain to other activities such as church. Men’s networks are based within specific organizations (Wright, 2006; Watson, 2012). Performing masculinity within friendships is important, but the way in which men perform masculinity may differ when considering the context in which they interact with their friends.

Another aspect of the social network of straight men is the presence of coworkers. Men report more coworkers within their social network than women due to having more social connections in the workplace that is relative to keeping friends positioned within organizations (Mardsen, 1987; Moore, 1990; Ajrouch, Blandon, & Antonucci, 2005). Family, however, is often the key component to straight men’s social network especially after marriage. The family is where the straight man forms the intimate relationships that he shies away from with friends.

Gay social networks are much more tied to friendship than straight social networks, so much that the term friendship and network go hand in hand. “The diversity and intensity of a person’s social ties pose important implications for socialization, access to resources, and personal actions due to the patterning of the network and obligations build into the network” (Degenne & Forse, 1999 as quoted by Carpiano et al., 2011, p. 77). Gay men often have several gay friends within their social network that function as a “chosen family” (Weston, 1991; Shippy, Cantor, & Brennan, 2004). Respondents within a particular study of 129 bisexual and gay men suggested that most of their social network was actively involved in the gay community and to cease participation would mean isolating them from their entire social network (LeBeau & Jellison, 2009). This shows that friendship is an important aspect of gay social networks because they make up
a community, and without actively being involved within the social networks, the gay man would be isolated from friends and the rest of the community. Partnered gay men still rely heavily on their social network of friends due to this “connectedness” of community, whereas straight partnered men can rely more heavily on family because they do not need this sense of community through friends. Straight partnered men’s social networks consist of family, both his and hers.

When considering social networks for gay men after cohabiting with a partner, friendship remains an essential part of the social network. Cohabiting gay couples report less social support from family and more social support from friends compared with straight married couples (Kurdek, 2005; Houts & Horne, 2008). Also, relatives are less likely to be asked for support from gay cohabiting men and instead rely on each other or friends (Shippy, Cantor, & Brennan, 2004). When gay men were surveyed about the relationship with in-laws, findings showed that family support for gay couples was less frequent and less important in gay relationship satisfaction than for straight couples (Kurdek, 2000, 2004; Pope & Cashwell, 2013). When solely considering straight married couples, research suggests that social network satisfaction was not as important as psychological well-being when determining marital quality (Walker, Isherwood, Burton, Kitwe-Magambo, & Luszcz, 2013). Socioemotional selectivity theory explains that as people age, social relationships with people outside the marriage becomes less important (Carstensen, Isaacowitz, & Charles, 1999; Walker et al., 2013). Relationships with friends are generally more important to the wife than to the husband, which again deploys gender as a centralized concept (Proulx, Helms, & Payne, 2004; Walker et al., 2013).
Overall, after marriage or cohabitation begins, the gay man will still rely on a social network of friends and the straight man will rely more on the social network of family.

**Building identity**

Building identity through bar participation is done by both straight and gay men. Bar participation and consumption of alcohol in bars is a way in which men construct masculinity (Roberts, Bond, Korcha, & Greenfield, 2007). Straight men use the bar to build a “masculine” identity whereas gay men use the bar to build a “gay” identity. Building identity is more intricately woven into bar participation for gay men because building identity in some sense binds individuals to gay social network/community. Social networks and community play a vital role in how men build a gay identity. The gay bar scene is said to “operate as launch pads for gay life and to serve as places to meet other gay men and disseminate information as well as places to encounter aspects of gay socialization” (Carpiano et al., 2011, p.76). When considering social networks and drug use, the more an individual associated with other gay men, the higher their association to drugs (Carpiano et al., 2011). Research shows that rates of drug usage are higher for gay men than for straight men (Skinner & Otis, 1996; Carpiano et al., 2011). This may be due to gay men’s social networks centering on friendships and at places like a bar where drinking and drug use are more prominent. Drinking and drug use within the bar then may become part of the identity.

Gay men who are involved within a gay community form a more positive gay identity through their participation although this may vary (Lebeau & Jellison, 2009). Being a part of a larger gay community for socialization allows for higher self-esteem, greater social support, and less depression (Zea Reisen & Poppen, 1999; LeBeau &
Building a social network of gay men allows the gay man to experience gay community (Woolwine, 2000; Carpiano et al., 2011). Community for gay men is molded through social networks where mutual recognition, obligation, and interaction are important. Friendship is intricately woven into gay men’s social networks. In a study that measured sexual, social, and community as three types of social engagement, the most common engagement was visiting bars, cafes, and restaurants where gay men frequented. The study also reported 34.4% of gay men visited bars most months or more frequently (Wilkinson, Bittman, & Hold, 2012). In gay men’s communities, the bar or night life scene has played a more prominent role in the lives of current generations of middle-aged and older gay and bisexual men (Hostetler, 2012). Research has also shown that the participation in the bar scene is less important in lesbian social networks (D’Augelli & Garnets, 1995; Hostetler, 2012). With advances in achieving gay rights, the gay community itself is no longer primarily made up of bars due to communities expanding to address different social, recreational, and political needs of gay individuals (Hostetler, 2012). However, the gay neighborhood institutions, including bars, allowed for community cohesion and solidarity that was important in generating the gay rights movement (Kelly, Carpiano, Easterbrook, & Parsons, 2013). While some research has noted a decline in gay neighborhoods due to assimilation (Rosser, West, Weinmeyer, 2008), the decline in existing gay enclaves may be a sign that attitudes toward sexual minorities are becoming more liberalized in the United States (Loftus, 2001). Despite the decline, current research has demonstrated that urban gay men still report their gay community as vibrant and as an important aspect of their lives (Kelly, et al. 2013). Although there are more outlets for gay social life nowadays, understanding who
participates in the bar and understanding the social networking for gay men that still exists within the bar is even more interesting because it has been a celebrated social institution throughout the gay rights movement and at times the only space in which LGBT could be open about their sexuality. Analysis on bar participation allows us to better understand the role of the bar in how gay men construct their social networks and adhere to social expectations.

*Social role expectations of men after partnering*

When considering social gendered role expectations for adult men, the main focus is on partnering, having kids, and providing for a family. Dominant cultural values in which men measure success in terms of a “package deal” include having a steady job, getting married, having children, and owning a home (Townsend, 2002). While understanding the package deal is essential when illustrating social expectations, the role of monogamy and commitment in how men define their relationships needs more attention to better understand the social expectations of marriage and family.

*Defining Commitment for Cohabiting and Married Couples*

To elaborate on partnering expectations, romantic relationships that become serious and lasting usually implicitly or explicitly expect monogamy that entails an even deeper level of commitment. Monogamy can be viewed as an aspect of commitment.

In order for people to meet the social expectation of partnering, people begin dating. “Through social interaction, dating and casual conversation, individuals who are following cultural scripts become sorted into couples who “just know” that they want to get married and have children” (Townsend, 2002, p. 43) This illustrates that people follow and reinforce a script that highlights these lifetime events as expected. While
seeing that taking on the role of boyfriend or husband is important, understanding how relationship attributions determine relationship quality and how they compare and contrast for gay and straight men is also important. Understanding the dimensions of relationships allows for better determining if the relationship fits into existing social networks, or if the social network changes due to the new relationship. How men define commitment once dating becomes a permanent lasting relationship and whether or not monogamy is expected within those relationships could also differ.

Defining commitment has been a popular research topic over the past half century, but the conceptualization varies among researchers (Pope & Cashwell, 2013). Though previous research has not come to a consensus about how to define commitment, much work has developed specific aspects of how people view commitment. One widely accepted view of commitment comes from Johnson’s Tripartite Model of marriage commitment in which the core principle of commitment consists of three different experiences (Johnson, Caughlin, & Huston, 1999). These experiences include wanting to stay married, feeling obligated in a moral sense to stay married, and feeling constrained to stay married (Johnson, Caughlin, & Huston, 1999). Within his work, commitment is experienced in three distinct ways: personal, moral, and structural (Johnson, Caughlin, & Huston, 1999). Personal commitment is viewed as the “want to” aspect in which a person is in a relationship because they want to be; moral commitment is viewed as the “ought to” aspect in which a person stays in a relationship because they feel morally obligated; structural commitment is viewed as the “have to” aspect in which a person feels constrained to stay no matter how they feel personally or morally (Johnson et al 1999; Tang & Curran, 2013).
To better understand these aspects of commitment, Johnson breaks them down into even smaller components. Personal commitment consists of individuals wanting to continue a relationship due to attraction both to the person, to the concept of the relationship, and to developing an identity as a couple (Aron, Aron, & Smollen, 1992). Moral commitment components consist of relationship-type obligations. These obligations reveal what ways the person feels obligated to their partner, whether it is because they made a promise, because of religion, or because of their general moral values. Structural commitment views relationships on a more dependent level in which leaving a relationship would cause constraints on the individual economically and through social pressure to not give up on a relationship or marriage when things get tough. Other widely used concepts of commitment center on the following relationship variables: conflict, willingness to sacrifice, and persistence in the relationship (Etcheverry & Le, 2005). This type of definition encompasses the personal dedication aspect, but goes further to also embrace the constraints as part of commitment. Personal dedication is an element of commitment in which the person is willing to maintain and improve the quality of the relationship (Stanley & Markman, 1992). Constraint commitment is similar to Johnson’s (1999) view of structural commitment in which people maintain the relationship despite their personal dedication. People will maintain a relationship due to internal pressures that view leaving a relationship as economically, socially, personally, and psychologically costly (Stanley & Markman, 1992). These different aspects of commitment become even more complex when situating how commitment is measured for married and cohabiting couples.
Cohabitation and marriage usually mark a transition from dating into a permanent relationship. However, previous research has not been consistent with findings on whether cohabiting couples are as committed as those married. “Cohabitees have been shown to invest less in their relationship than married couples” (Poortman & Mills, 2012). The increase in couples living together without being married is often interpreted as an unwillingness to be fully committed and create lifelong partnerships (Jamieson, Anderson, McCrone, Bechhofer, Stewart, & Li, 2002). To challenge this conception, a 2002 study of married and cohabiting couples ages 20-29 years found that respondents chose “entering a permanent arrangement” for when they began to live together and “I want to commit myself to our relationship,” illustrating that married and cohabiting couples have similar levels of commitment (Jamieson, et al. 2002). However, a 2012 study has also found that to better understand views of commitment, we must first understand that levels vary between cohabiting couples and married couples, but also within these groups as well (Poortman & Mills, 2012). The belief that cohabiting couples do not commit needs to be interpreted differently to illustrate that there are varying ways to commit. Overall, cohabiting is becoming a mainstream way of coupling. “Cohabitation started as an alternative way of living, developed into a temporary phase before marriage, and finally became a strategy for moving into a union gradually” (Manting, 1996, p.53). Cohabiting is becoming more acceptable and soon may be viewed as an alternative to marriage instead of a period before marriage (Haskey, 2001).

While comparing cohabiting couples with married couples on their level of commitment seems fair, this becomes challenging when comparing same-sex couples with heterosexual couples. This is problematic because same-sex couples are not always...
legally able to marry and therefore commitment is viewed and transitioned into differently. Marriage is often viewed as a commitment making ceremony for heterosexual couples, but same-sex couples create committed relationships outside the normative marriage-based model (Reczek, Elliot, & Umberson, 2009). While the ceremonial aspect of marriage cannot always legally bind same-sex couples, many couples hold commitment ceremonies as a symbolic celebration of their partnership in place of a legal marriage. “Although many commitment making factors such as moving in together and joining finances are similar to heterosexual couples commitment making, these events may have alternative meaning and importance” (Rostosky, Riggle, Dudley, & Wright, 2006; Reczek, et al, p.741). Marriages and commitment ceremonies stand as a public symbol for couples to represent their dedication to one another, but is not the only way in which same-sex couples define commitment due to not legally being able to marry. As mentioned above, taking steps like living together as a couple may show the same level of commitment as a marriage would for heterosexual couples. Many same-sex couples view ceremonies as a celebration of their committed relationship instead of a marital view of a transformative moment in which the couple becomes united and committed (Reczek, Elliot, & Umberson, 2009). A more current study published in 2013 that focused on cohabiting couples found that same-sex and heterosexual couples engage in and maintain their relationships due to feelings of attraction and commitment to their partners and relationship to the same degree (Pope & Cashwell, 2013). The research findings demonstrate that same-sex couples and heterosexual couples that cohabited view commitment similarly.
The main difference in considering the social expectation of finding a partner and getting married is the fact that gay couples cannot marry in most states, and that gay marriage has not been federally recognized until very recently. However, cohabiting gay relationships are quite similar to straight married relationships (Houts & Horne, 2008). Longitudinal studies of straight couples and gay cohabiting couples indicate that social support predicts relationship quality (Pasch & Bradburry, 1998, Kurdek, 1989, Smith & Brown, 1997; Elizur & Mintzer, 2003). Gay cohabiting relationships are similar to straight marriages when considering relationship quality, but are different in the way that relationship attributes determine satisfaction (Houts & Horne, 2008). This could possibly be due to the expectation of different societal roles. Both gay men and straight men regarded “long-term effort” and “commitment” as important component of relationships (Pope & Cashwell, 2013). It is also important to note that while marriage is used as a step to validate commitment, the eight same-sex couples that held commitment ceremonies in the 2009 study consisted of only three gay male couples and the men were legally married (Reczek, Elliot, & Umberson, 2009). This shows that there is a gender difference in how lesbians and gay men view commitment ceremonies that may be an effect of how their perceived social expectations.

**Monogamy**

In conceptualizing how couples define relationship commitment, monogamy plays an important role. Often when people think of relationship commitment, they also think of monogamy in that couples often expect their partner to be exclusive. Within monogamy a couple is socially expected to be exclusive within their romantic relationship, meaning they are expected to only interact sexually with one another.
There are four dimensions of monogamy that include emotional, sexual, viewing monogamy as relationship-enhancing, and viewing monogamy as a sacrifice (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007). Another important part of monogamy is social which shows how the individual within a relationship wants to be thought of as monogamous by society (Anderson, 2010). When an individual views monogamy as relationship enhancing they are associating monogamy as a way to build intimacy and strengthen the bond within their relationship whereas an individual viewing monogamy as a sacrifice is more aligned with beliefs that being exclusive blocks natural drives and needs (Hosking, 2014). There are conflicting perspectives on monogamy that show monogamy as important to healthy emotional development (Erikson, 1964) or as imposing natural human needs and desires and making relationship satisfaction under monogamy impossible to reach (Charles, 2002).

There are definite gender differences on the topic of monogamy. Traditional gender roles create societal expectations that back the perception of men being sexually active and women being more emotionally invested (Hill & Preston, 1996). Previous research has illustrated that men in heterosexual relationships are more likely than women to view monogamy as a sacrifice (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007). These findings back the views of monogamy restraining natural sexual drives. In a 1984 study of married and cohabiting couples, Thompson found that men were more likely to have sexual affairs whereas women were more likely to have emotional affairs outside their partnership (Thompson, 1984). Thompsons’ 1984 finding on gender differences matched Schmookler and Bursiks’ 2007 finding, which explained that women valued sexual monogamy more than their male partners and valued emotional monogamy more than
their male partners (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007). Thompsons’ 1984 research was also supported by Dreznicks’ findings that showed men are more likely to approve of sexual infidelity and women are more likely to engage in emotional infidelity (Dreznick, 2003). Similar findings on gender differences were also found in Hosking’s 2013 research, which explained that men report being more able than women to view sexual activities and emotional attachment as separate (Hosking, 2013; Banfield & McCabe, 2001). Though there are obvious gender differences when it comes to who is more likely to remain monogamous with their partners, other research has shown that both genders view monogamy as important even if they are not exclusive. A study on undergraduate heterosexual men and their views of monogamy found that men value and support the idea regardless if they live up to monogamous expectations (Anderson, 2010). Both men and women also have the same conception of what constitutes as cheating behavior (Yarab, Sensibaugh, & Allgeier, 1998). Anderson noted that even when the men admitted to sexually cheating on their partners that they still viewed themselves as monogamous and that this may be due to a strong cultural stigma for individuals who violate the monogamy script (2010). In this view, monogamy is working as a social system to perpetuate romantic relationships in a way that adheres to societal expectations of marriage and is embedded in social institutions of religion and the nuclear family (Willey, 2006; Foucault, 1990; Anderson, 2010).

There are also differences between same-sex and opposite sex couples on the topic of monogamy. Not all couples are monogamous. Some couples have open relationships in which they are committed to each other, but allow sexual interactions with people outside their romantic relationship. These open relationships or agreements
vary from couple to couple with different rules for their extra dyadic sexual encounters. However, most heterosexual couples expect their relationships to be exclusive or monogamous to develop a successful, satisfying, and committed relationship to the point that most of the time this expectation is implicit (Atkins, Baucom, and Jacobson, 2001). Heterosexual couples do not necessarily need to have this conversation because monogamy is so embedded in how society views romantic couples. When some heterosexual couples do openly partake in sex outside their relationship, they often still identify as monogamous to escape stigma and still conform to social expectations (Anderson, 2010; Coleman, 1988). Due to the gender differences in how monogamy is viewed with the understanding that men are more likely than women to participate in extra dyadic sexual encounters, gay men are more able to participate in open relationships than women and straight men. Hosking noted that non-monogamy or open relationships are more common among coupling gay men than among lesbians or straight couples (Hosking, 2013; Solomon, Rothblum & Balsam, 2005; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Bryant & Demian, 1994).

Due to men being more open to sexual encounters outside their relationships, some gay male couples enter open relationship agreements. This aligns with Schmookler and Bursiks’ study that demonstrates how men are more likely to view monogamy as a sacrifice that blocks their natural sexual drives (2007). By viewing this need as natural, gay couples can allow their partners to express themselves sexually outside their relationship without fear of this behavior equating to the lack of relationship commitment. Men are documented to be able to have sex without getting involved emotionally (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Townsend, 1995). This is important to note when
considering how gay couples can enter agreements where they trust their partners to stay emotionally committed to one another despite not being sexually exclusive. Other than viewing monogamy as blocking natural sexual drives, having sexual relationships outside the couple is a way in which couples can prevent their relationships from becoming boring (Hoff & Beougher, 2010). While not all gay male couples view monogamy as a sacrifice and some expect monogamy within their relationships (Adam, 2006), most of the non-monogamous relationships particularly within the U.S. are made up of gay couples (Bettinger, 2005). This may be due to society not expecting gay men to partner and marry and therefore do not have to face stigma for not following a monogamous script.

There are obvious differences between how couples view commitment. Social science research painted open relationships positively since the early 1970s, but this view has not been as supported by relationship therapists that help re-create stigma surrounding non-monogamy (Finn, Tunariu, & Lee, 2012). Despite the stigma, current research has illustrated that intimacy and commitment did not vary between the agreement types of monogamy, monogamish (a term used to shows that sex is only allowed with others outside the relationship when both partners are present), and open relationships (Hosking, 2012). Another quantitative study of 566 gay male couples found that monogamous relationship and open relationships were equally satisfying, however monogamous relationships reported more trust (Hoff, Beougher, Chakravarty, Darbes & Neilands, 2010). This also backs past research that illustrated that open relationships are as satisfying, loving, and well-adjusted as monogamous relationships (Kurdek, 1988; LaSala, 2004). Thus, gay couples and straight couples are comparable in commitment
whatever their stance on monogamy and is important to investigate when gaining a better understanding of bar behavior.

The way in which gay and straight men define commitment is important to take into consideration when deciphering bar behavior. This will reveal the relationship between commitment levels and bar participation, and reveal whether commitment plays a role in how men utilize the bar scene. This will also illustrate if social expectations differ between the two types of men, especially when taking into consideration whether or not they follow a monogamous script or participate within an open relationship. Through the lens of the bar, comparing the two types of men on their commitment levels, views on monogamy, and their bar behavior will show what societal expectations they may be following. Gaining a better understanding on how each type of couple views commitment, monogamy, and marriage will also give more insight on the social expectation of parenting and family life.

*Social Expectation of Parenting*

When gay coupled men and straight coupled men were questioned about wanting children and being a relationship model for their social networks, gay coupled men considered it unimportant and straight coupled men considered it expected and important (Pope & Cashwell, 2013) suggesting that social expectations play a role in personal relationships. This again highlights the “package deal” expectation in that straight men are expected to have children, whereas gay men are not. Having children is regarded as a social expectation. “Becoming a father was a moral transformation in that it shifted men’s priorities and sense of responsibility. Marriage marked the end of a period of fun and responsibility to oneself; having children marked the shift from couple time to family
time” (Townsend, 2002, p. 77). This directly shows the expectation of disassociation with social networks of friends to incorporate a more family oriented social network. However, many gay partnered men report envisioning family life in a ‘traditional’ way to include two committed parents (Rubun & Faith-Oswald, 2009). Fatherhood for gay men often changes social relationships from gay friends without children to straight friends with children (Power, Perlesz, McNair, Schofield, Pitts, Brown, & Bickerdike, 2012). In the United States, parenting is denoted as the natural domain of women that places fatherhood as secondary to motherhood (Berkowitz & Marsiglio; 2007). Due to this, gay fathers realize that they will be challenging societal notions of parenthood, and often question their ability to be a father due to opposing traditional views on gender roles and families (Berkowitz & Marsiglio; 2007, p.367). Overall, fatherhood has evolved to include an increasing amount of men fathering children outside marriage, living apart from their children, and taking on fatherhood roles to children that are not biologically related to (Flood, 2003).

**Social Expectations Specific to Gay Men**

Social expectations within the context of the gay man suggested that partnering was positively reinforced and in coupling, these relationships would function as a center for extended friendship structures or “kinship structures” (Carrington, 1999). The partnered gay men would be the planners, organizers, and facilitators of social occasions that the social network of friends would gravitate around (Carrington, 1999). This suggests that the gay couple becomes the center of the “chosen family” made up of friends and that they are expected to take on the leadership role of networking between friends. Though this social expectation is a bit different from the more intrinsic roles of
fatherhood and husband, this expectation puts further emphasis on the importance of friendship in gay social networks. This also shows that the social network of friends available within the lives of gay men reflects the love and affection sustained through creating a “chosen family” (Carrington, 1999).

Applied Sociological Theories

The current study is viewed through the lens of four theories that include: structural strain theory, theory of differential association, theory of socioemotional selectivity and dyadic withdrawal on social regression hypothesis.

Structural Strain Theory

Previous literature has outlined two different social worlds of gay men and straight men, especially when considering their utilization of the bar scene. To better understand if there is a relationship between social expectations for gay men and straight men and how they participate within the social network of the bar after cohabitation or marriage, structural-strain theory is applied. Anomie is a concept of structural-strain theory. The concept of anomie is “regarded as a distinction between universal American goals and the lack of access to these goals” (Finestone, 1976; Featherstone & Deflum, 2003, p.478). This concept can answer research questions considering the differing social expectations and how individuals are linked to goals or blocked from goals, such as the role of husband and father. In linking structural-strain theory to this specific research question, one can view the structural conditions of how the bar scene is utilized differently between the two groups, and therefore consider prescribed patterns of behavior or conduct (Featherstone & Deflum, 2003). To elaborate on anomie more, the concept involves an imbalance between cultural goals and ways that individuals can go
about achieving said goals (Deflum, 1989; Featherstone & Deflum, 2003). Again, this allows the opportunity to evaluate the differences of the utilization of the bar scene as well as the differences in social expectations between gay and straight men. This theory helps consider gay men’s anomie compared with straight men, meaning how “there is an acute disjunction between the cultural norms and goals and the socially structured capacities of members of the group to act in accord with them” (Merton, 1968 as cited in Ritzer, 2011, p.258).

Theory of Differential Association

The theory of differential association suggests that behaviors such as drug use or drinking are “learned in interactions within intimate personal groups and in contexts where the behavior is defined more favorably than unfavorably” (Sutherland & Cressey, 1994; Carpiano et al., 2011, p.77). In considering the bar scene itself, outside how social expectations may relate to participation in the bar scene, the theory of differential association is used to better understand why gay men or straight men may have higher participation within the bar scene (Sutherland & Cressey, 1994; Carpiano et al., 2011, p.77). This allows the research to delve deeper into observing the differences in gay and straight men’s networks and how they relate to participation within the bar scene, specifically for the group that has a higher rate of participation. The theory is used to see whether gay men or straight men are participating in the bar scene specifically to drink and not for socializing with friends and family or finding a sexual partner. The theory of differential association is used when investigating deviance, but in this aspect will explore whether the drinking is just an aspect of the bar scene where intimate social groups are formed, or if it is the sole reason people are going to the bars. Comparing
straight men and gay men and their reported frequency and purpose of bar attendance allows this theory to be utilized.

Theory of Socioemotional Selectivity

When considering whether straight men’s social networks change from friend-based to family-based after marriage, the theory of socioemotional selectivity is used to highlight if and how straight men narrow their network following coupling. Socioemotional selectivity suggests that as people age, they focus more on their marriage and less on the social relationships outside the marriage (Walker et al., 2013). Hence, this work explores if that is true for both gay and straight men.

Dyadic Withdrawal Hypothesis on Social Regression

Based on Philip Slater (1963), dyadic withdrawal on social regression states that couples often withdraw from their relationships with other people in their social network as they become more involved with their romantic partner. Slater also argues that engagement and marriage strengthen the relationship between the couple and the larger kin network or family (Slater, 1963). Johnson and Leslie (1982) tested this hypothesis with 419 college students and found that as couples become more involved with each other, their social network of friends shrinks and are less involved with the friends that do remain in their social network. Another finding suggested that the family network did not shrink, but that family was more prevalent during rituals of engagement and marriage (Johnson & Leslie, 1982). Dyadic withdrawal of social regression is used as well as the theory of socioemotional selectivity when determining the social network make-up of both gay and straight men, and how it alters after partnering.
These four theories allow the study to (1) measure how varying goals and norms of the different groups correlate with social expectations and the utilization of the bar scene (social network), and (2) a deeper understanding of the interactions within the different networks. Social expectations are therefore going to be considered as the roles that society expects the gendered man to incorporate into their everyday lives, such as the expectation of the man to become a husband and father. Straight men will be considered partnered if they are married or cohabiting whereas gay men will be considered partnered if they are cohabiting. As dating unions that are non-cohabiting vary considerably in their level of commitment, those who are dating will not be considered partnered in this study. The utilization of the bar scene consists of several different aspects such as whether the individual is using the bar scene to meet someone for sexual purposes as described above or to socialize with friends. Ultimately, the research explores which group uses the bar scene the most and in what ways, but mainly focusing on the participation after partnering.
Chapter III

Research Methods

Now that gay and straight social networks have been examined separately with their relation to cohabitation and marriage, their participation with the bar scene can be explored by considering how social expectations contribute to different social networks. Overall, discovering the importance behind why and how social expectations between gay and straight men differ is very important. Even with advances in gay rights, the bar scene is still prevalent in gay culture, especially in forming gay identity.

Hypotheses

H1: Social expectations of gay men and straight men will be different. The independent variable is sexuality and the dependent variable is social expectations, which include expectation to marry and have children.

H2: Social expectations of cohabiting gay men will still allow and encourage participation within the bar scene whereas social expectations of married straight men will discourage participation. The theory of socioemotional selectivity and dyadic withdrawal will be used to explain how after marriage, straight men deemphasize friendship and primarily focus on family (Walker et al., 2013; Slater, 1963). The independent variable is social expectations and the dependent variable is bar participation. Strain theory will again be used to consider the changing goals and expectations of straight men and why they can no longer build their goals around friendship.
H3: Respondents that report friends as their main social network will have higher bar participation than respondents that report family as their main social network. The independent variable is social networks and the dependent variable is bar participation.

H4: Straight men that report high levels of commitment to their partner will participate in the bar scene less than straight men that report less commitment.

H5: Gay men that report high levels of commitment to their partners will participate in the bar scene the same amount as gay men that do not.

H6: Gay men and straight men will not differ on how much commitment they report, but will differ in the amount they participate in the bar scene when partnered. Commitment is the independent variable and bar participation is the dependent variable. Although commitment differs between cohabiting couples and married couples, couples that combine their income are viewed as more committed to one-another than those that do not combine their incomes.

H7: Men that report having a combined income with their partner will also report higher levels of commitment. The independent variable is income and the dependent variable is relationship commitment.

H8: Monogamy will be less important in defining commitment in gay relationships than in straight relationships. The independent variable is monogamy and the dependent variable is relationship commitment.

Testing these hypotheses will add to previous literature and fill gaps in the literature by answering how and why social expectations differ for gay and straight men. The results will also uncover whether the bar scene remains prevalent in building gay
culture and gay identity even with equality advances such as more state recognition of same-sex marriage.

Sample

Data were collected from gay and straight men at least 18 years of age through a web-based survey. Cohabitating and married respondents make up the analytic sample to investigate social expectations of gay and straight men who are partnered. The online survey was directly linked to multiple social media websites such as Facebook or Twitter that belong to bars or clubs in a particular urban region within Kentucky. To capture both a straight and gay bar population, a list of bars within a specific region was established as a pool for random sampling. The few gay bars located within this region were specifically selected as well to ensure we have a comparable amount of gay participants through convenience sampling. The goal was to identify at least six gay bars within this area. Five of the six identified gay bars participated in the study. Random sampling was used to select five comparable straight bars that were willing to participate. The bars were asked to share the survey on their social media site. The selected bars were also asked to display flyers and handbills about this survey within their business. The flyers and handbills contained a scan-able QR code that linked directly to the survey. Additionally, the written link was printed onto the flyers for those unable to scan the QR code. An incentive was also offered for participation in the survey in which respondents had the opportunity to win one of three $50 visa gift cards.

Initially, attaching the survey link to several social media sites belonging to bars was expected to draw the biggest pool for participants. However, many bars were unable to post the link to their social media sites for business reasons, but allowed the link to be
shared onto their page. The survey link on social media sites that belonged to bars was not generating enough participants because many bars were unable to post the survey themselves, which would have directly sent out notifications to people who liked their page. The survey was still attached to the bar pages, but was only accessible through their actual page. To combat this issue, the survey link was also shared to other social media sites that did not directly belong to any particular bar. The social media sites selected were community and public groups that pertained to the particular region and population suitable for the sample.

Out of the ten participating bars, eight of the bars displayed handbills for customers to take. Flyers were presented at six of the locations. Three bars posted the survey onto their social media site multiple times. Eight of the bars allowed the survey to be posted onto their page multiple times. The survey was posted to nine social media sites that did not belong to any particular bar, but were community groups that pertained to the sample.

While most studies that have sampled from LGBT populations often do so qualitatively, quantitative methods were used for this project to begin to capture a comparable sample of gay and straight men through their participation at bars. Several existing studies that have targeted gay populations for research have done so not only qualitatively through in depth interviews and snowball sampling, but also through utilizing existing social structures for that population. For instance, LGBT population has been accessed through institutions such as AIDS coalitions and human equality or fairness groups. Using these resources is a convenient way to access a larger population of LGBT people, but is often oversampled from and could yield a biased sample due to
being individuals that participate in activism. This population therefore would not capture a general gay population that this study needs. To compare gay men and straight men, an existing social structure that both men partake in was needed, which is what led to the utilization of the bar scene. While qualitative measures could still be used to capture data from both gay and straight men that go to the bar, this exploratory quantitative approach was used to capture a larger sample of both men to have a more in-depth analysis. A weakness in this method is trying to capture married and cohabiting straight-oriented couples that go to bars, while hypothesizing that this population reduces their participation at bars when partnered. However, the questions are formatted to allow participants to report their use of the bar before and after partnering. Posting the survey to community social media sites allowed greater chances of capturing married and cohabiting straight-oriented couples as well. The survey yielded 132 men and women. The analytic sample for this study is limited to men (n = 68). Categorically, 32 of the men reported being gay and 32 reported being straight as their sexual orientation. Breaking the sample down further, 18 of the gay respondents were partnered and 19 of the straight respondents were partnered. There are limitations with smaller sample sizes such as this (discussed in more detail in the discussion section), but analyzing the sample is still beneficial in exploratory research.

**Dependent Variable**

*Bar participation.* Frequency of bar participation is measured with a single question that asks the respondents to report how often they attended a bar or club within a month with response categories ranging from 1 (a few times a year) to 7 (nine or more times) where higher scores indicate higher bar participation. The variable was recoded to the midpoint
of each frequency category. A measure for *frequency of bar attendance after partnered* will be measured with a single question that asks: “Now that you are ‘in a relationship’ (married or cohabiting), which of the following statements best describes you?” with the following possible response choices: I go to the bar the same amount as I did when I was single; I go to the bar less often now than I did when I was single; I go to the bar more often now than I did when I was single. A set of dummies will be created. The main dependent variable is frequency of bar participation, however, some independent variables being used to explain frequency of bar participation will also be used dependently to compare straight and gay men holistically. Social expectations are used as a dependent variable as well, which includes social network measures and role expectation variables.

**Independent Variables**

*Social expectations* are measured by two indicators: *social networks and role expectations*.

**Social Networks.** A measure of *social network* make-up is based on six questions: (a) My social network is mainly made up of friends, (b) My social network is mainly made up of family, (reverse coded), (c) My social network is mainly made up of coworkers/colleagues (reverse coded), (d) I rely on my friends more than anyone else, and (e) I rely on my family more than anyone else (reverse coded), (f) I rely on my coworkers/colleagues more than anyone else (reverse coded), with responses ranging from 4 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. The variables could not be placed into an index because the items did not meet the required reliability score and therefore were collapsed to yes (1) or no (0) categories.
Five additional indicators of social networks rely on the measures to several questions, with response options ranging from 1= friend(s), 2= family, 3= romantic partner, 4= other with text box. If they indicated friend(s), they are coded as having social networks made up of friends (1; 0 otherwise). If they indicated family, they are coded as having social networks made up of family (1; 0 otherwise). Respondents will be asked:
(a) “During your free time, who do you associate most with”; (b) “Who do you rely most on for emotional support”; (c) “If you needed financial help, who would you turn to”; (d) “Who do you trust the most”; (e) “If a traumatic event occurred, who would you call first?” The five indicators were then summed together based on category choice. The variables therefore ranged from 0-5. Reliability scales were checked and scored close to or above 0.70 for Cronbach’s Alpha.

Role expectations. Multiple questions are asked to measure respondents’ roles in which the respondents’ answers ranged from 5= strongly agree to 1= strongly disagree. A measure of romantic relationship roles is based on the following questions: (a) I am considered an important part of my significant other’s family; (b) I am expected to attend all of my significant others’ family functions; (c) I am welcome to attend my significant others’ gatherings with friends; (d) I am considered important to my significant other’s friends. The items are summed to create an index of attitudes of partnered social network inclusion that ranges form 4-20 with higher scores indicating more social network inclusion. Reliability analysis was checked before creating the index. Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.68, allowing for the four variables to be scaled.

A measure of traditional gendered expectations is based on the following questions in which respondents answers range from 5= strongly agree to 1= strongly
disagree: (a) “I should be the main provider for myself and my family”; (b) “Being married or in a committed relationship is important to me”; (c) “I want to have child(ren) or I already have child(ren)”; (d) “I am expected to have children”; (e) “Being a parent is not important to me” (reverse coded); (f) “I do not need to be the sole provider in my family” (reverse coded). The items are summed to create an index of attitudes of “the package deal” which ranges from 6-30 with higher scores indicating more traditional gendered expectations. Again, reliability analysis was run to ensure the items could be scaled (α = .67).

Further questions measure the expectation to parent in which respondents answers ranged from 5= strongly agree to 1= strongly disagree: (a) “My parents expect me to have a child(ren),” (b) “My partner expects us to have a child(ren) together,” (c) “My friends keep asking me when I will have a child(ren),” (d) “My coworkers/colleagues keep asking me when I will have a child(ren),” and (e) “I feel pressured to become a parent.” Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.88, allowing the items to be summed to create an index of expectation to parent which ranges from 5-25 with higher scores indicating higher societal expectations to become a parent.

A measure of relationship commitment (adopted from the commitment and personal relationship questions used by Stanley & Markman, 1992) is based on the following questions in which respondents’ answers ranged from 5= strongly agree to 1= strongly disagree: (a) “I want this relationship to stay strong no matter what rough times we encounter in the future”; (b) “I do not have any lifelong plans for this relationship” (reverse coded); (c) “I want to grow old with my partner”; (d) “I may decide that I do not want to be with my partner at some point in the future” (reverse coded); (e) “I tend to
think about how things affect “us” as a couple more than how things affect “me” as an individual; (f) “I want to keep the plans for my life somewhat separate from my partner’s plans for life (reverse coded); (g) “My relationship with my partner is more important to me than almost anything else in my life”; (h) “My relationship with my partner comes before my relationships with my friends”; (i) “My career (or job, studies, homemaking, child-rearing, etc.) is more important to me than my relationship with my partner (reverse-coded). The items are summed to create an index of relationship commitment that ranges from 9-45 with higher scores indicated more relationship commitment. Again, Cronbach’s Alpha was 0.92 indicating that the nine variables could be scaled. The respondents were also asked to define what relationship commitment means to them.

A measure of relationship monogamy is based on four questions. The respondents were asked if they thought romantic relationships should be monogamous in which they responded with (a) yes, (b) no, or (c) indifferent, where yes (1) and no (0). The respondents were asked to report if their current relationship or marriage is (a) monogamous, (b) open relationship (allowed to see other people), or (c) neither with text box. The variables were dummied to determine if the respondents are monogamous (1) or open (0). The respondents were asked if they would still consider themselves monogamous if they were to cheat on their partner with response categories as (a) yes, (b) no, or (c) indifferent with text box, where yes (1) and no (0). Attitudes on relationship monogamy (adopted from Schmookler & Bursik’s Monogamy Attitude Scale, 2007) is measured through the following questions in which the respondents’ answers range from 5 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree: (a) “Being monogamous means you are emotionally exclusive with your partner,” (b) “Being monogamous means you are
sexually exclusive with your partner,” (c) “I view monogamy as a way to enhance my relationship”, (d) “I view monogamy as a sacrifice” (reverse coded), (e) “Being monogamous with my partner means sacrificing my sexual drive” (reverse coded), and (f) “Being in a monogamous relationship is a way for society to know that I am committed to my partner.” The items were initially going to be scaled, but when running Cronbach’s Alpha to test for reliability, the score was too low to do so. Therefore, the responses were collapsed to agree (1) and disagree (0).

Additional bar measures are used to understand frequency of bar participation. Three questions measured the reasons for behavior in attending bars. Respondents were asked to check all that apply as reasons for attending a bar or club (a) socialize with friends, (b) socialize with family, (c) socialize with partner, (d) to find a sexual partner, (e) for social networking, (f) to drink, (g) to feel like I’m part of a community. Respondents were then asked to report the main reason for bar attendance. Respondents were asked to check all that apply when asked who they attended the bar with (a) friend(s), (b) partner, (c) family, (d) co-worker(s), (e) alone, which will indicate purpose of behavior through indicating social networks. Each reason is coded as 1 if selected or 0 if not.

Two questions measured purpose of bar attendance. The following nine items measured specific purpose of bar attendance: (a) I go to the bar to relax; (b) I go to the bar to be social; (c) I go to the bar to have fun; (d) I go to the bar to meet new people; (e) I go to the bar to be surrounded by other people; (f) I go to the bar to relieve stress; (g) I go to the bar to get away from my responsibilities; (h) I go to the bar to be alone; (i) I go
the bar to celebrate. Responses ranged from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). The respondents were asked to share other reasons they have for going to a bar.

The following six items measured attitudes of bar attendance: (a) It is perfectly fine for people who are in a serious relationship to go to the bar frequently; (b) It is acceptable for someone in a relationship to go to the bar without their significant other; (c) I assume that people I encounter in bars are single; (d) It is fine for couples to attend the bar together; (e) I assume that people at bars are looking to hookup. Responses ranged from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).

The following six items measured personal standards of bar attendance: (a) It is perfectly fine for me to go to the bar frequently, even if I am in a relationship; (b) It is acceptable for me to go to the bar without my significant other; (c) It is perfectly fine for my significant other to go to the bar without me; (d) It is fine for me and my significant other to go to the bar together; (e) It is unacceptable for my significant other to attend the bar without me (reverse coded); (f) It is acceptable for me to attend the bar without my significant other if I am going with family; (g) It is unacceptable for me to attend the bar without my significant other if I am going with friends, coworkers, or colleagues (reverse coded); (h) It is acceptable for my significant other to go to a bar with friends, coworkers, or colleagues without me; (i) It is unacceptable for me to attend the bar without my significant other (reverse coded). Responses ranged from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).

An aspect of commitment as indicated through income is measured through two questions. Respondents were asked, “Do you and your partner combine your income?”
with responses being (1) yes or (0) no. If the respondent indicated that they do combine their income, the respondent was asked to report household income.

Focal Variables

Sexuality is measured with a single question asking the respondent to report their sexual orientation as gay, straight, or bisexual. Sexuality is coded as gay (1) and straight (0). Respondents reporting bisexual will not be used in analysis.

Relationship status is measured with two questions: “What is your relationship status” in which they selected (a) single, never married (b) dating but not living together, (c) dating and living together, (d) married, (e) separated/divorced, or (f) widowed/widower. Using the sexuality and relationship status questions, a set of dummies was created to determine whether the respondent is straight and partnered, gay and partnered, straight and single, or gay and single.

More specifically, dummies were also created to determine if the respondent is straight and single, straight and dating, straight and cohabiting, straight and married or gay and single, gay and dating, gay and cohabiting, or gay and married. However, breaking the variables down was for frequency purposes only. Computing the partnered variables into straight and partnered and gay and partnered variables was necessary to have a larger group.

Descriptive Variables

Age is measured with one question that asks respondents to report their current age bracket: (a) 18-24 years, (b) 25-34 years, (c) 35-44 years, (d) 45-54 years, (e) 55-64 years, (f) 65 and older. Age was recoded to the midpoint of the categories. Race or Ethnicity is measured with one question that asks respondents to report their race or
ethnicity from the following selections with a text box option for specifics: (a) White with text box, (b) Black or African American with text box, (c) Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin with text box, (d) American Indian or Alaskan Native with text box, (e) Asian with text box, (f) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander with text box, or (g) Some other race or origin with text box. While race and ethnicity was recorded, the variable was not used as a control because the sample was predominately white.

Fatherhood is measured with one question that asks the respondent to report if they have a child or children. Fatherhood will be coded as yes (1) and no (0).

Education is measured with one question that asks respondents to report the highest level of school they have completed with the following selections: (a) Less than High School, (b) High School Diploma or GED, (c) Some college, no degree, (d) Associates Degree (For example: AA, AS), (e) Bachelor’s Degree (For example: BA, BS), (f) Master’s Degree (For example: MA, MS, MEng, Med, MSW, MBA), or (g) Professional or Graduate Degree (For example: PhD, EdD). The categories were collapsed and dummy variables high school or less (reference), some college, and college degree were created.

Income is measured with two questions that ask the respondent to report their approximate personal annual income before taxes. Respondents that are single or do not combine their income with their partner will answer this question. If the respondents were partnered and did combine their income, the respondents were asked to report their approximate annual household income before taxes. The responses range from (a) less than $10,000 to (k) $100,000 or more for both questions. The variable was recoded to the midpoint of the category for the analysis. Locale is measured with two questions that ask respondents to report the region in which they were raised and currently residing with the
responses being (a) Rural, (b) Urban, (c) Suburban, (d) Neither with text box. Urban will be coded as 1 and rural as 0.

Analytic Procedures

One-way ANOVA and independent-sample t-tests are used to compare means across sexuality by relationship status categories. The one-way ANOVA showed the difference in means by category (straight and partnered, straight and single, gay and partnered, gay and single) for the following variables: frequency of bar participation, reasons for bar attendance, purpose of attendance, social network measures, and demographics. The independent sample t-tests tested the difference in means for partnered men (gay and straight) for the following variables: bar participation after partnered, partnered standards of bar attendance, role expectations, commitment measures, and monogamy measures. Due to the categorical sizes being smaller in nature, comparing difference in means allowed for significance to be revealed. Analyzing mean differences through ANOVA and independent sample t-tests is important in exploratory research. These tests allow for the comparisons of means across groups, but also reveal significant differences. ANOVA is an exploratory tool used to compare groups and can provide reasoning for further exploration. ANOVA is an adequate and necessary robust tool that allows researchers to work with small sample sizes. Comparing the partnered groups through the use of independent sample-tests reveals if the difference is real and meaningful. Difference in mean testing is very important in exploratory research because it not only allows for a better understanding of groups despite the sample size captured. Discovering significant differences in means when comparing groups is a first step that other researchers can build from.
Chapter IV

Data Analysis

Sample Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the analytic sample are illustrated in Table 1. Descriptive statistics for partnered men only are found in Table 2. Looking at frequency of bar participation for the sample, about 24% of the whole sample of men reported that they only went out a few times a year. This could reflect the period in which the bars were surveyed, which was in the weeks leading up to Christmas and the New Year. This percentage could also be higher because the survey was posted to other social media sites that did not belong to specific bars. Approximately 6% went to the bar once a month, about 15% went twice a month, 13% reported going about 3.5 times per month, about 15% reported 5.5 times per month, 6% reported 7.5 times per month, and 22% reported going 10 times per month.

When looking at gay men by relationship status, 8 men reported being gay and single and 18 men reported being gay and partnered. The gay and partnered category was created by collapsing respondents that reported dating (6 respondents), cohabiting (9 respondents), or married (3 respondents) as their relationship status. When considering straight men by relationship status, 9 men reported being straight and single and 19 men reported being straight and partnered. The straight and partnered category was created by collapsing respondents that reported dating (1 respondent), cohabiting (7 respondents), and married (11 respondents). Focusing on the demographics to paint a vivid picture of the sample, reported age is as follows: 10% were 18-24 years of age, 47% reported being 25-34, 21% of the respondents were 35-44, 16% specified 45-54, 4% fell into the age range of 55-64, and only 1% was 65 or older. Therefore, the sample captured the
necessary age range of both early adulthood and middle-age. As these categories were recoded to their midpoint, the approximate average age of the sample is 36 years. When looking at annual personal income earned before taxes, about 50% made $39,000 or less. The other 50% made at least $40,000 or more. However, about 40% of the sample made between $30,000 and $49,000 annually. On average, the men earned about $42,000 a year. Overall, about 60% of the partnered men combined their income. Separately, 74% of straight partners combined their income while only 44% of gay partners reported combining their income. The respondents were asked to report their highest level of education. From the sample, only about 16% reported having a high school diploma or less, about 36% reported having some college education, while about 50% have earned a college degree. When asked whether they had a child or children, 74% answered they did not, therefore, only 26% of the sample reported having a child or children. When reporting the region in which they had been raised, 40% of the sample indicated being raised in a rural area, 24% in an urban area, 29% suburban, and 6% indicated neither. When asked about current residency, 43% reported living in an urban area while 54% indicated living in a non-urban area. The respondents were asked to report their race or ethnicity, resulting in 96% classifying as White. The other race and ethnicities reported include Black, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Entire Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Bar Participation</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation by Relationship Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Partnered</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Single</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Partnered</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Single</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Network Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network of friends</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network of family</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network of Coworkers/colleagues</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my friends more</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my family more</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my coworkers/colleagues more</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Network Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network made up of Friends</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gendered Expectations</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monogamy and Commitment Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally exclusive with partner</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Relationships</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrificing Sexual Drive</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Commitment to Society</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for Bar Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Friends</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Family</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Partner</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a Sexual Partner</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Social Networking</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To drink</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a part of the community</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet new people</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume people are looking to hook-up</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Personal Income</td>
<td>41955</td>
<td>19170</td>
<td>14500</td>
<td>94500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma or less</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatherhood</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Partnered Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Bar Participation</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality (Gay=1, Straight=0)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Network Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network of friends</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network of family</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network of Coworkers/colleagues</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my friends more</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my family more</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my coworkers/colleagues more</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Network Measure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network made up of Friends</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to have children</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents expect to be a grandparent</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Partner</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monogamy and Commitment Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider self as monogamous even if not sexually</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Scale</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine Income</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar Participation after Partnered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go less often now that I am partnered</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go more often now that I am partnered</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnered Standards of Bar Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine to frequent the bar while partnered</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable to go to bar without partner</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine for partner to attend bar without me</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine for me and partner to go to a bar together</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable for partner to attend bar without me</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable for me to attend bar without partner</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable to attend bar without partner</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if attending the bar with family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable to go to bar without partner</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if going with friends/ coworkers/colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable for partner to go to bar with</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends/ coworkers/ colleagues without me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Personal Income</td>
<td>42076</td>
<td>18880</td>
<td>14500</td>
<td>9450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma or less</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatherhood</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analytic sample consists of 68 male respondents, of which 32 identified their sexual orientation as straight and 32 indicated gay (47.1% each). While straight and gay orientations are the only orientations being used for analysis, three respondents denoted bisexuality (4.4%) and 1 male chose other (1.15%), but specified pansexuality. Of the men taking the survey, 28% were single, 10% were dating, 24% reported cohabiting, 21% said they were married, and 17% failed to answer. Table 3 is provided below to illustrate the breakdown of each category of relationship status by sexual orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation/ Relationship Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Dating</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Cohabiting</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Single</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Dating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Cohabiting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Married</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to some categories being too small, gay and dating, gay and cohabiting, and gay and married were collapsed into one group of gay and partnered. Dating, cohabiting, and married categories were collapsed into a single partnered category for straight men as well. With the new variables being created, 18 (26%) respondents were coded as gay and partnered while 19 (28%) respondents were coded as straight and partnered.
Bivariate Analysis

Frequency of bar participation is the dependent variable. Table 4 shows frequency of bar participation for each sexuality by relationship status group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation/Relationship Status</th>
<th>Frequency of Bar Participation per month</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than a few times a Month</td>
<td>Once a Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Partnered</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 33.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Partnered</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 21.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay and Single</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 25%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight and Single</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count 13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent 24.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $x^2=25.89$, df=18, p=0.10

Chi-square was used to test for significant relationships between sexuality by relationship status and frequency of bar participation. The Chi-square results showed no association between sexuality by relationship status variables and frequency of bar participation, however, the table is described here nonetheless given the exploratory nature of this study. Table 4 shows that 33% of gay partnered respondents reported going to the bar only a few times a year compared with 21% of straight partnered respondents. About 6% of gay partners frequented the bar once a month whereas about 11% if straight
partners go to the bar once a month. The respondents who went to the bars twice per month are as follows: 5.6% of gay partners and 10.5% of straight partners; the respondents who went to the bars 3.5 times per month: 17% of gay partners and 15.75% of straight partners; of those who went 5.5 times: 28% of gay partners and 15.8% of straight partners; respondents who went 7.5 times: 5.6% of gay partners and 0% of straight partners; and lastly the respondents who frequented the bar 10 times per month included 5.6% of gay partners and 21% of straight partners.

Crosstabs were used to compare gay and straight men in how they reported their reasons for going to the bar, their main reason for going to the bar, monogamy and commitment measures, as well whether or not they reported combining their income with their partner. Table 5 below reveals the degree to which men reported their reasons for bar attendance. The question instructed the men to check all reasons that apply for going to the bar. The percentages shown are in relation to the total N of each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for going to a bar</th>
<th>Sexuality by Relationship Status Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Friends</td>
<td>Count 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Family</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Partner</td>
<td>Count 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a sexual partner</td>
<td>Count 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For social networking</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To drink</td>
<td>Count 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To feel like I’m part of a community</td>
<td>Count 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note=Chi-square was run for sexuality by relationship status categories and each reason for going to a bar and no significance was found.
Table 5 presents the degree to which each category reported reasons for going to the bar. A Chi-square test was used to check for significant association between sexuality by relationship status variable and the different reasons for going to a bar. The sexuality by relationship status variable is statistically independent from reasons of going to a bar. Respondents indicate socializing with friends and to drink are the primary reasons for bar attendance across all categories based solely on frequency, which is further explored in the tests of significant difference with ANOVA.

To examine reasons for bar participation more thoroughly, the results of how men reported their main reason for going to the bar are provided in Table 6. Chi-square test were used to check for significant relationships between the variables in Table 6 and no significance was found between sexuality by relationship status categories and the main reason for bar participation. Socializing with friends still remains the main reason that the men across the sexuality by relationship status categories are going to bars. Analyzing the main reasons for bar participation helped partially support hypothesis 3 that questioned if respondents who reported friends as their main social network would have higher bar participation that those who reported family. Approximately 60% of gay partnered men and 37% of straight partnered men indicated that socializing with friends was their main reason for going to the bar. However, none of the sexuality by relationship status groups indicated going to socialize with family. Additionally, 50% of single gay men and 44% of straight partnered men selected friends as their main reason for going to the bar. This reveals that gay partnered men indicate going to bars to socialize with friends to a higher degree than straight partnered men that supports the literature on building gay identity and a gay community (hypothesis 3).
Table 6: Main Reason for Bar Participation by Sexuality and Relationship Status Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Reason for going to a bar</th>
<th>Sexuality and Relationship Status Categories</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straight and Partnered</td>
<td>Straight and Single</td>
<td>Gay and Partnered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Friends</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For social networking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To drink</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To feel like I’m part of a community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $x^2=8.46, df=12, p=0.75$

To explore frequency of bar participation further, crosstabs were also used to compare commitment levels with participation for each partnered category. Chi-square test were used to check for significant relationships between the variables in Table 7 and there was no significant association between frequency of bar participation and commitment for partnered straight men. Table 7 illustrates frequency of bar participation by commitment level for partnered straight men to explore whether the levels of participation per month increases or decreases based upon reported commitment level, specifically testing hypothesis 4. Overall, straight men indicated high levels of commitment with the lowest recorded score being 31 when 9 was the lowest score possible. With that in mind, the crosstab only shows straight men who report higher
levels of commitment to their partner. Looking at the column that represents going to the bar less than once per month (0.5) in comparison to the other frequencies has the highest number of cases (4). At first glance, it appears that straight men with higher commitment levels attend the bar less, but when looking at the cases that fall into the other frequencies, there is not a pattern. Therefore, hypothesis four is not supported based on the crosstab because partnered men seem to have varying amounts of participation despite scoring high on commitment.

Table 8 investigates the relationship between frequency of bar participation per month and commitment level for partnered gay men to see if frequency decreases as commitment increases. Chi-square test were used to check for significant relationships between frequency of bar participation and commitment for partnered gay men and no significance was found. Specifically, the analysis was used to test if gay men who report high levels of commitment will participate in the bar the same amount as gay men who reported low levels of commitment. On average, gay men reported a high level of commitment, ranking at 34.65 on the commitment scale out of 45. However, straight partnered men did report a higher level of commitment on average. Regardless, 71% of gay partnered men indicated that they go to the bar less often now that they are partnered. Therefore, hypothesis five was not met.
Table 7: Frequency of Bar Participation by Commitment Level for Straight and Partnered Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnered Straight Men</th>
<th>Less than a few times a Month (0.5)</th>
<th>Once a Month (1)</th>
<th>Twice a Month (2)</th>
<th>Three or Four times a Month (3.5)</th>
<th>Five or Six times a Month (5.5)</th>
<th>Seven or Eight times a Month (7.5)</th>
<th>Nine or more times a Month (10)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Scale</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $x^2=35.41$, df=40, p=0.68

Table 8: Frequency of Bar Participation by Commitment Level for Partnered Gay Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnered Gay Men</th>
<th>Less than a few times a Month (0.5)</th>
<th>Once a Month (1)</th>
<th>Twice a Month (2)</th>
<th>Three or Four times a month (3.5)</th>
<th>Five or Six times a Month (5.5)</th>
<th>Seven or Eight times a Month (7.5)</th>
<th>Ten or more times a Month (10)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Scale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $x^2=62.09$, df=60, p=0.40
Previous literature on commitment suggested that partners who combine their income were more committed to one another than partners who did not. A crosstab analysis reveals how many partnered men reported combining their income. Table 9 shows that overall, about 60% of partnered men combined their income. However, straight and partnered men reported combining their income to a higher degree than gay and partnered men. This crosstab tested hypothesis 7: men who report having a combined income with their partner will also report higher levels of commitment. In order to test this hypothesis, a correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between commitment and partners combining their income. Commitment and combined income were positive in direction and highly correlated. The Pearson’s Correlation was also significant (0.42, p<.01). This indicates that the higher the commitment level, the higher chance of combining income with a partner that supports the hypothesis. This relationship was expected based on previous literature on commitment where combining income was viewed as showing more commitment. Combined income was not significantly associated with bar frequency per month throughout the analysis, however, there was a noticeable difference in straight and gay partners. Descriptively, a statistical difference was originally expected due to frequencies reported in the crosstab (Table 9). Only 44% of gay partners reported that they combined their income compared with 73% of straight partners. Chi-square tests were used to check for significant relationships between combining income and straight and partnered as well as with being gay and partnered. The results revealed no significant association between combining money and sexuality by relationship status categories, meaning that the variables are statistically independent from each other.
Table 9: Combining Income by Partnered Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you combine your income?</th>
<th>Straight and Partnered</th>
<th>Gay and Partnered</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $x^2=2.68$, df=1, p=0.10

Monogamy is often viewed as a predictor of commitment. Table 10 shows frequencies of three different monogamy variables and how the partnered men reported their views and was used to test if monogamy is less important in defining commitment in gay relationships than in straight relationships (hypothesis 8). The hypothesis was not supported because there was no significant difference between gay partnered men and straight partnered men in their response to whether they thought romantic relationships should be monogamous. Most men, straight or gay, reported that relationships should be monogamous. Only 2 out of 16 straight partnered men indicated that relationships should not be monogamous, both of which fell on a lower end of the commitment scale. When asked if their current relationship was monogamous, only two gay partnered men indicated that they were not, both were lower on levels of commitment they reported. When asked if they would consider themselves monogamous if they were to have sex with someone other than their partner, 2 out of 19 straight men reported that they would still consider themselves monogamous. The two men also scored very high on the commitment scale. Only 1 gay partnered man out of 17 reported that they would still consider themselves as monogamous, again this respondent had scored lower on the commitment scale. Therefore, monogamy was viewed about the same for both gay partnered men and straight partnered men, indicating no difference. The percentages
shown are in reference to the column categories, meaning the percentages represent either straight and partnered or gay and partnered. While the frequencies show an association between two variables, Chi-square allowed for significance testing. The results revealed no statistically significant association between the sexuality by relationship status categories and the monogamy predictors. The frequencies reveal how similar the partnered men are despite sexuality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monogamy Predictors</th>
<th>Straight and Partnered (N=19)</th>
<th>Gay and Partnered (N=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should romantic relationships be monogamous?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 (74%)</td>
<td>12 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your current relationship considered monogamous?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 (89%)</td>
<td>14 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to have sex with someone other than your partner, would you still consider yourself to be monogamous?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 (74%)</td>
<td>16 (89%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-Square was run for the partnered categories and each monogamy measure and no significance was found.

Open-Ended Responses

Respondents were also asked a series of open-ended questions. One question prompted the men to share other reasons they had for attending the bar. Partnered straight men indicated the following reasons: karaoke, music, sports coverage, trivia nights, and work. Straight single men did not write in any response to the prompt. Gay partnered men reported: eye candy, only go if there is a concert being held, really do not go to bars or
clubs often, meet someone for the first time, people watch, to drink, to listen to live music, and working. Gay single men reported: entertainment, finding someone special, fundraising events, to get out of the house, and to support business and workers if local.

Respondents were also asked to define what commitment meant to them. Straight Partnered responses are as follows: “being there for my wife when she needs me”; “being there for one another through everything, whether that is one partner or many (polyamory)”; “consistent sex”; “honesty and commitment”; “love and respect”; “participating in something with your all and no reservations”; and “until death do us part”. Gay partnered men reported: “Being honest and on the same page with each other including life goals and keeping each other in mind on a daily basis”; “Commitment with time, emotional support, and life goals”; “it means to me that my partner is there for me no matter what”. Also, that “we encourage each other to grow together”; “No matter what, at the end of the night, we are home together”; “Relationship commitment means enjoying and loving every second that you spend with your partner; and we are both over 50 and retired. We are both happy to be in a relationship that gives both of us companionship, security, sex, etc. We are honest and open with each other and we support each other. We have enough trust that it allows both of us the space to do things the other has no interest in but enjoy the other’s company and share each other’s interests.”

Tests of Significant Difference

Difference in means testing was necessary to explore differences between each group (straight and partnered, straight and single, gay and partnered, gay and single). ANOVA was used to analyze all independent variables as well as frequency of bar
attendance. The results are shown in Table 11 below. ANOVA is used to tell if there were any statistically significant differences between the means across multiple categories. There is a statistically significant difference in means between single gay men and partnered straight men in terms of going to the bar to socialize with a partner. Single gay men are less likely than partnered straight men to go to the bar to socialize with a partner, which makes sense because gay single men do not have a partner. While the previous revelation was not shocking, there was also a statistically significant difference in means between gay single men and straight single men on assuming that people are in the bar looking to hookup. Gay single men are less likely than straight men to assume others are looking to hookup while at the bar. Gay single men are also more likely to go to bars to meet new people than straight partnered men because there is a significant difference between means. There is a statistically significant mean difference between straight single men and straight partnered men when indicating that their social network was consisted of friends. Straight single men indicate a social network of friends more so than straight partnered men.
Table 11: Differences in Means by Sexual Orientation/Relationship Status Categories using ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Straight and Partnered</th>
<th>Straight and Single</th>
<th>Gay and Partnered</th>
<th>Gay and Single</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Bar Participation</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Friends</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Family</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialize with Partner</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a Sexual Partner</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Social Networking</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Drink</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a part of the Community</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet new people</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume people are looking to hook-up</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Network Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Social Network is mainly made up of friends</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Social network is mainly made up of family</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My social network is mainly made up of coworkers/colleagues</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 Continued: Differences in Means by Sexual Orientation/Relationship Status Categories using ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Network</th>
<th>Straight and Partnered</th>
<th>Straight and Single</th>
<th>Gay and Partnered</th>
<th>Gay and Single</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I rely on my family more than anyone else</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Network Measures</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network made up of friends</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.33&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network made up of family</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network/Romantic Partner</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Gender Expectations</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age as Midpoint</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>40.83</td>
<td>16.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Personal Income</td>
<td>47441</td>
<td>20846</td>
<td>51167</td>
<td>25820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma or Less</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatherhood</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Locale</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> indicates significant difference from Straight and Partnered at the p< .05 level; <sup>b</sup> indicates significant difference from Straight and Single at the p< .05 level.
Table 12: Differences in Means by Partnered Men using Independent Sample t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Straight and Partnered (n=19)</th>
<th>Gay and Partnered (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar Participation after partnered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to the bar less often now that I am partnered</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to the bar more often now that I am partnered</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnered Standards of Bar Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine to frequent the bar while in a relationship</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable to go to bar without partner</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine for Partner to attend bar without me</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine for me and partner to go to a bar together</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable for partner to attend bar without me</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable for me to attend bar without partner</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable to attend bar without partner if attending the bar with family</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable to go to bar without partner if going with friends/coworkers/colleagues</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable for partner to go to bar with friends/coworkers/colleagues without me</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Network Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network made-up of coworkers/coworkers</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role Expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered role expectation index</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation to Parent index</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents expect grandchild(ren)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Commitment index</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine Income</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income</td>
<td>66500</td>
<td>18974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income- combined income</td>
<td>63590</td>
<td>19725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monogamy Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monogamy means partners are emotionally exclusive</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monogamy means partners are sexually exclusive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monogamy is a way to enhance my relationship</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monogamy is a sacrifice</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monogamy means sacrificing my sexual drive</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monogamy shows society I am committed</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significant difference from Straight and Partnered at the p< .05 level
Independent sample t-tests were used to examine the differences in means between partnered gay men and partnered straight men on all of the independent variables specific to partnered men as well as frequency of bar attendance. Specifically, t-tests (Table 12) were used in support of hypothesis 1, testing if social expectations differed. The t-test revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the means of straight partnered men and gay partnered men in terms of going to the bar less after becoming partnered. Gay partnered men were more likely than straight partnered men to report going to the bar less often after entering into a relationship. Focusing on whether men report going to the bar less often per month now that they are partnered, 37% of straight partners agreed that they do indeed go to the bar less. Additionally, straight partnered men were more likely to view attending the bar without partner if going with family as acceptable. The difference in means test also shows that straight partnered men were more likely to view attending the bar without their partner as acceptable if they were going with coworkers, colleagues, or friends. Not surprisingly, there was a significant difference in means between partnered straight men and partnered gay men based on reporting a social network consisting of coworkers or colleagues. Partnered straight men were more likely to report a social network of coworkers and colleagues compared with partnered gay men. While a difference in means was not found when testing for expectation to parent, straight partnered men were more likely to report that their parents expected grandchildren. There is a statistically significant difference in the means between partnered straight and partnered gay men in terms of household income. Straight partnered men reported making a higher annual income compared with gay partners. However, the combined household income did not reveal a significant
difference in means. The partnered groups have a difference in means when considering the commitment index, testing hypothesis 6. Straight partnered men report an average of 39 on a scale 9-45 where higher scores indicate higher levels of commitment. On average, straight partnered men are reporting high levels of commitment to their partner. Lastly, there was no meaningful difference in means when testing the monogamy measures.
Chapter V

Discussion and Conclusion

Do gay men continue to frequent the bar even when they are in a relationship? Do straight partnered men go to the bar less and if so, do they rely on family more than friends? This project was formed from a few simple questions that called into question sexuality, social expectations, and social networks. The ultimate goal of this research was to determine if gay and straight men would report having similar perceptions of social expectations. The approach was to better understand bar participation for men to uncover social network differences to see in what ways those networks, consisting of friends or family, contributed to perceived social expectations. Ultimately, the research sought to uncover how different gay and straight men were on several platforms: bar participation, social networks, social expectations of becoming a husband or father, views of commitment and monogamy all as mediated through the bar participation. To capture the required sample, the bar scene was used as a common ground. The bar was viewed as a public space that gay and straight men both had access to, making the men more comparable by sampling from a specific urban area in Kentucky. Networking with straight and gay bars in this region allowed for both gay and straight men to be captured in the sample. The use of online surveying and community social media pages was meant to help capture partnered respondents. While the analyses pointed to a few differences in social expectations, particularly feeling pressure from parents to have children, many results pointed to the similarities among the groups of men. Does this mean that society is becoming more open to seeing gay men settle down, partner up, and have children? Have the past 15 years of gay men being represented more through television shows altered
what society expects from gay men? This project cannot answer those questions, but what it does reveal is that gay men are reporting positive perceptions of being able to achieve the package deal.

The first hypothesis stated that social expectations of gay men and straight men would be different. Social networks between the two groups differed on reporting a social network compiled of coworkers or colleagues. This supports the literature found on how straight men build friendships, which focused on having shared activities through work or through recreation. Coworkers were mentioned often within the literature on social networks of straight men. Straight partnered men indicating coworkers as their social network is not surprising due to building social connections and friendships through shared activities that is relative again to keeping friends positioned within organizations. However, what does this suggest for gay men that are not reporting a social network compiled of coworkers and colleagues to the same degree as straight men? This could suggest that gay men are not reporting coworkers and colleagues possibly because of keeping their sexual identity concealed in the work place. While the urban area that the sample was developed from has a fairness ordinance that protects gay individuals from being openly discriminated against due to their sexual orientation or gender identity based on employment and housing, it is important to note that only 10 (56%) of the gay partnered men and 7 (87%) of the single gay men reported residing in non-urban areas, meaning they were commuting to the urban area for bar participation. Therefore, gay men could not be reporting coworkers or colleagues to the same degree as straight men because of their sexuality, or because of the region they are living.
The second half of hypothesis 1 focuses on role expectations. The analysis (Table 12) reveals that there is a statistically significant difference in means between straight partnered men and gay partnered men on reporting that they feel pressured by their parents to have children. The partnered men held the same views and reported the same personal expectations for themselves when viewing partnered role expectations and expectation to parent. Meaning, both gay and straight partnered men felt the same amount of pressure to become a parent from other aspects of society, like friends, coworkers, and colleagues and even from their partner, but differed in the pressure to become a father that they felt to from their immediate family. Gay partnered men reported less pressure from parents about having children than straight partnered men. This illustrates that there is a difference between gay partnered and straight partnered men in social expectations, at least from what their immediate family may expect from them. Gay partners are reporting less pressure to have children than straight partners, implying that parents hold gay men and straight men to two different standards on becoming a father. Just acknowledging that the social expectations differ for gay and straight men opens a new arena for future research that could focus more directly on social expectations, identity, and roles of gay men. Particularly, if gay men feel less pressured to have children, what ways do gay men differ from straight men when transitioning into fatherhood?

Age was initially expected to be significantly associated with frequency of bar participation due to gay men being spending time in bars even as they age to socialize with friends. However, age was not a factor. Partnered straight men, partnered gay men, single straight men, and single gay men were all relatively around 34-40 years of age (Table 11). There was not much variability in age. Assumptions cannot be made on
whether or not older people were participating in the bar scene or not. The sample did not capture an older age, but this could have been due to the survey being online instead of concluding that older people were simply not attending the bar.

Due to the categorical frequencies of cohabiting gay men and married straight men being too small for any meaningful analysis, hypothesis two could not be tested.

In relation to hypothesis three (Table 6), gay partnered men go to bars to socialize with friends to a higher degree than straight partnered men, supporting the prediction that gay partners would rely on friendships more so than straight partners. Going to the bars was expected to remain important to gay partnered men because of the network of friendships that are cohesive with building a gay identity and gay community. Withdrawing from the institution of the bar after partnered may mean withdrawing from their network of friends to a degree that could be detrimental to feeling like part of a community. The role of gay friendships was said to be more intimate than straight friendships because of the idea of self-disclosure, feeling accepted, and creating a sense of community. The fact that gay partnered men indicated going to the bars specifically to socialize with their friends to a higher degree than straight partners is not surprising because of the need of belonging to the gay community. Straight partners were expected to partially withdraw from their friendship networks to shift their focus to family. The argument here is that gay partnered men continue to go to the bar to socialize with their friends because their friends are considered “chosen family.”

While there was a difference in the amount reported by gay partnered and straight partnered men about attending the bar to socialize with friends, there was no overall difference in the frequency of bar participation. The ANOVA results reveal no significant
difference between straight partnered or gay partnered men in relation to frequency of bar participation, but did indicate a significant difference in frequency of bar participation between partnered gay men and single straight men. This finding supports the literature in that bars are a prevalent social institution for single straight men.Interestingly, there was no significant difference in means between gay partnered and gay single men which indicates the men continue to go to the bar about the same amount despite relationship status. While the analysis allows for pieces of the story, the hypothesis only partially supported due to there being no significant difference in the social network composition to compare with frequency of bar participation that also did not vary much across the sexuality by relationship status groups. Based on the literature, the general concept of friendship for both gay and straight men is expected to be similar, however the way gay men and straight men participate and construct friendship varies. The open-ended responses reveal other reasons for going to the bar. The other reasons straight men reported were focused primarily on shared activities. For example, straight men reported going to the bar for karaoke, for live music, and play trivia. This is supportive of the literature in how straight men build friendships through doing specific activities together. The other reasons for bar attendance that gay men reported were as follows: fundraising events, meeting new people, support local business. The reasons are in support of the literature as well, which suggested that gay men build friendships in way that creates gay community and identity.

Particularly, based on the theory of dyadic withdrawal, straight men were expected to withdrawal from their friendships, de-emphasize the importance of friendships, and focus more on family once they partnered. However, the research
concludes that gay and straight men despite relationship status rely on family, friends, and coworkers to the same degree (Table 11). Meaning, if there was any withdrawal occurring after partnering, straight men and gay men are withdrawing from social networks at the same degree. Table 11 also illustrates that straight, single men report a social network of friends to a higher degree than straight partnered men, so while there may be some withdrawing occurring for straight men, there is still no significant difference between being straight partnered or gay partnered. This indicates that in order for men to achieve the package deal of having a career, becoming a husband, and becoming a father, they may not have to completely withdraw from their other social networks to focus more intimately on family. Men are reporting high levels of commitment while partnered and also reporting a strong connection with their network of friends. This suggests that complete withdrawal is not necessary; men can have the ultimate package by meeting all of the social expectations of starting a family as well as having a strong tie to their friendships.

Theoretically speaking, the analysis revealed the opposite of what the literature suggested and what both the theory of socioemotional selectivity and dyadic withdrawal proposed for partnered men. The expectation was that straight men who report high levels of commitment will go to the bar less, but that was not found. Why could this be? Socioemotional selectivity explained that straight men often narrows down their social network from friend-based to family-based after partnering. However, in the analysis we see that straight men report their main reason for going to the bar is to socialize with friends even when partnered, suggesting that they did not narrow down their social network to primarily family after becoming partnered. Differently said, this indicates that
straight partnered men value their friendships to a much higher degree than originally predicted. While friendships may be created differently for gay and straight men, the analysis goes to show that friendships for straight men become important after starting a family. To clarify this assumption, asking about relationship longevity to better understand if the relationship were new or old would have allowed for a better evaluation of social networks. However, reviewing the original relationship status variables is important (Table 3). A total of 11 of the 19 straight and partnered men reported that they were married, which translates to about 58%. Marriage does not reveal how long the couple has been together, but does indicate more permanency than couple that only reported dating.

Commitment and being in a relationship for gay partners was not expected to interfere with bar participation, but the analyses reveal that there is definitely a difference in frequency of participation per month between partnered gay men and single straight men. Concluding that gay men who report higher levels of commitment go to the bar fewer times than gay men who report lower commitment. The theory of dyadic withdrawal suggested that as men become more involved in their romantic relationship, they tend to withdrawal from their other social networks. The analysis for gay partnered men shows support for this, but was not predicted to do so for gay men. Bar participation was expected to remain the same for gay men despite being single or partnered. The literature suggested that gay friendships and networks would allow for gay partnered men to still participate within the bar scene to the same degree as single men to still have a sense of gay community. This may suggest that the social institution of the bar is not nearly as important as it had been during the start of the United States gay rights
movement. There are more opportunities, particularly in an urban area, to freely express sexuality without fear of repercussions. Overall, this could indicate a few different things. One, gay partnered men may view commitment in a much different way that what was tested. Looking back at the open-ended responses, there was not much difference between gay and straight men in how commitment was being defined. However, that does not mean that there are not differences in how the men represent commitment, particularly to society. Two, the bar scene is not as important in developing gay identity or community as it had been in the past. Three, the urban area is much more diverse and accepting, especially when having laws protecting against discrimination over sexual orientation or gender identity, in ways in which people can come together to develop a sense of community. Linking to previous literature, Oldenburg (1989) suggests that urban nightlife including bars, restaurants, cafés, and other establishments serve as “third places” where strangers come together to experience a degree of inclusiveness that often wipes away inequalities that people experience within other spaces, creating a diverse and accepting environment (Oldenburg, 1989; Grazian, 2009). There could be several reasons why commitment could be viewed differently based on sexuality and access to resources. For example, many straight couples show their level of commitment to one other in public ways through getting married. Marriage between gay individuals is not legally an option in the urban area from which the sample was pulled. Many couples may still have a ceremony, or wear rings, or do a million other things to show their commitment. Unfortunately, those questions were not asked within this study.

The analysis revealed that gay and straight men did differ based on the level of commitment they reported (Table 12), showing that straight men reported a higher level
of commitment to their partners than gay partnered men. For discussion purposes, the six variables were looked at separately to try to figure out how gay and straight men differed on commitment. The only indicators that gay men did not seem to differ from straight men were whether they wanted to keep their lifelong plans somewhat separate from their partners and disagreeing based on whether they may decide that they do not want to be with their partner at some point in the future. On all other variables testing for agreement in levels of commitment, gay men indicated commitment only about half the amount that straight partners indicated. Gay partnered men were less likely than straight partnered men to indicate that they wanted their romantic relationships to stay strong no matter what, to have made lifelong plans with their partner, wanting to grow old with their partner, thinking about “us” instead of “me,” and considering the relationship more important than their career. When comparing how gay men and straight men reported perceptions of social expectations through role expectations of becoming a husband and father, gay men did not seem to fall short in reporting less social expectations particularly within their relationship. In other terms, gay men still reported social expectations to the same degree that straight men did. Becoming a husband and father and having a package deal and achieving these traditional gender roles seemed just as important to gay men as to straight men. Being raised with these traditional views of what men should do may be why the men are reporting the same amount of pressure. Why then did gay men fall short in their level of commitment? The answer may lie in access. In terms of structural strain theory, particularly the concept of anomie, there is a distinction between universal American goals and lack of access to these goals. For instance, gay men are reporting traditional role expectations to the same degree, but since they do not have access to the
same rights that straight partners have through legalized marriage (such as health benefits, tax breaks, life insurance), they are ultimately blocked from fully achieving the complete package deal of career, husband, and father. Lack of access to achieving the same goals as straight partners is reflected here in commitment.

The groups of men differed on commitment, but did not differ on bar participation, which is completely opposite of hypothesis 6. Based on the literature, gay men both single and partnered were predicted to have higher frequency of bar attendance per month, especially in comparison to straight partnered men due to the theory of socioemotional selectivity, but that prediction was not confirmed. Gay men were predicted to also have higher attendance because of having a social network consisting of friends. However, based on the analyses gay partnered men were more likely to pull away from social networks of friends. Why could this be? Perhaps the men were simply pulling away from the bar scene, but not necessarily their friends. Living in a more diverse urban area, there are more options than the bar for which gay men can build an identity and community around.

Although combined income was not found as significantly associated with frequency of bar participation, the percent difference is intriguing. If combining income is an important predictor in level of commitment between partners, it is interesting that only half of gay partners are willing to combine their income. Only about 1/3 of straight partners reported that they did not combine their income. Again, this suggests that either gay partners view commitment drastically different that straight partners or that there is an inherent difference between couples that are opposite gender and couples that are same gender. Not combining an income could have more to do with masculinity, where
both men are seeking to be the earner and provider, than actual sexuality. Keeping money separate might be reflecting masculinity and pride. More questions need to be posed that focus more directly on income and expenses to really delve into this phenomenon.

The analysis showed that there was no difference in the importance of monogamy in defining commitment between gay and straight men. Gay men are perceived by the public to be more promiscuous and less committed, but that is not what the analysis shows. Monogamy was viewed the same despite sexuality. While gay men did report less commitment, the results do not point to gay men being more promiscuous. Mostly, partnered men of both sexualities believed that relationships should be monogamous. These results could counteract the promiscuity stereotype that many gay men face. The literature did suggest that men more-so than women cheat on their partners through sexual encounters. The promiscuity stereotype that gay men face seems to not have anything to do with sexuality but with gender.

**Summary of Findings**

What does all of this mean? There are some differences in perceived social expectations between gay and straight men, but not as much as was expected. Both gay and straight men reported about the same expectations from their partners in relation to traditional gender roles, role expectation of partnered roles, and expectation to have children. The men reported the same degree in the pressure they felt to become a parent from friends, coworkers, colleagues, and from their partner. Initially, gay partnered men were expected to report different social expectations. Gay partnered men were expected to report less pressure from their social networks to adhere to traditional gender roles and social expectations of becoming a husband or father. This was not found. The only
predictor that was different between gay partnered men and straight partnered men is the pressure they felt from their parents to have children. Gay men reported feeling less pressure from their parents based on adhering to social expectations of having a child than straight partnered men. When thinking about social networks, the literature demonstrated that gay men both single and partnered relied on friends to a different degree than straight men, particularly emphasizing a “family of friends.” Due to this perception, family was expected to be less important in the lives of gay men. Having a lack of familial interaction may be a reason for why gay men did not feel as much pressure from their parents to have children.

There also was not much difference found between gay and straight men based on social network composition. Surprisingly, straight men indicate having a social network consisted of friends even after partnering. Straight men and gay men value friendships even after partnering, meaning that straight men did not withdrawal from their friendships the way that the theory of dyadic withdrawal had suggested. Can this be found across the board for straight men, or does the fact that these men utilize the bar scene transition into the way in which their social networks are comprised and upheld? The fact that the analysis resulted in opposing the literature on men’s friendships and how straight men navigate through life to have the “package deal” is an interesting finding. Bar participation may be the key factor into why the straight men within the sample did not withdrawal from their social networks to focus primarily on their romantic relationship and family. The bar scene is often thought of as a “sexual marketplace” and because of that conception, straight partnered men that continued to go to the bar were expected to report lower levels of commitment. However, straight partnered men reported
high levels of commitment that did not transition into going to the bar less. More surprising, gay partnered men that reported high commitment levels did often go to the bar less. Though bar participation did not alter between gay and straight men despite relationship status, except the difference between gay and partnered and straight and single, gay and straight men did differ on the commitment that they reported. Straight partnered men reported higher levels of relationship commitment than gay partnered men, calling into question if there are differences in the way the men experience or view commitment that the survey did not test.

Predicting that gay men would continue to use the bar scene just as much despite relationship status was wrong. This prediction was made because the social network of friends was expected to be so centered on “friends as family” that even when partnered, gay men would continue to go to the bar to emphasize their involvement in gay community. As previously suggested, interacting in an urban area that has laws protecting against discrimination based on sexuality or gender identity may have allowed for the bar to be less important in emphasizing gay community because other institutions like local businesses, cafes, or coffee shops are open and available.

Limitations of the Study

Comparing gay and straight men’s social network composition and utilization of the bar scene to divulge whether social expectations differ among them is exploratory research due to the lack of previous research conducted. There are several limitations to this study. The most problematic limitation is that the results are not generalizable to the whole population. The bar was used as an institution to capture gay and straight men that were comparable, instead of capturing a biased sample by specifically targeting a gay
population available through social activist groups. However, having the survey posted to several types of sites that allowed the work to capture a less “activist-biased” sample. The survey was readily available to a wide range of gay and straight men through different websites that focus on activism, community involvement, social night life, and the bar. The study would have been less generalizable and more bias had the sample only been captured from strictly community and activist type websites or from social night life and bar websites. Another limitation lies in capturing a large enough sampling size. Securing enough dating, married, and cohabiting men that are both gay and straight did not happen. Being able to analyze the men by smaller categories could have revealed many unanswered questions about how the men reported commitment. Therefore, analysis on each particular category was not possible and a few hypotheses could not be tested. Collapsing dating, married, and cohabiting into a partnered category was possible and allowed for some tests of hypotheses. While some interpretation and comparison was lost because of the sample size, collapsing the categories allowed for an adequate comparison between gay and straight men in this exploratory study.

Collecting online survey data is another limitation of the study. Online surveys were the easiest and most convenient way to collect survey data; however, more people were expected to be reached through social media sites of bars. However, many bars were unable to post the survey onto their social media page in a way that would be directly linked to followers, limiting the number of people that had quick and easy access to the survey. This limitation was partially counteracted by posting flyers and handbills with a direct link to the survey by using a QR code, giving more people the chance to take the survey. In order for even more people to see the survey, the link and description was also
posted to online community sites. While some of these limitations were unforeseen prior to the start of the project, every effort was made to overcome them.

Suggestions for Future Research

While a few of the hypotheses were supported, many hypotheses were not, creating several avenues for future research. First, research needs to focus on a deeper investigation of commitment in gay relationships. This would add to the existing body of literature in a meaningful way. Gaining a more in depth understanding of commitment and how that translates into relationship quality and how gay men transition from a social network of friends to that of family would explain many hypotheses not supported in this analysis. Second, existing literature describes straight men’s friendships as less intimate than gay friendships. However, this analysis revealed that though straight men may build their friendships through shared activities, they were fully committed to their friendships. Exploring more on how men’s friendships may be changing would be an interesting avenue for future research. Third, respondents in this sample did not have children. Exploring how much social networks, bar participation, and role expectations alter for both gay and straight men as they transition into fatherhood is a comparison that would be an interesting follow-up study. This could yield very different results in expectations and network composition as well as bar participation if the sample focused strictly on rural gay men. Fourth, choosing an urban area that is not protected from discrimination by law may yield very different findings and very different comparisons to rural straight men.

Lastly, while having a small sample size is a limitation to the study, not analyzing the data due to size issues would leave many populations uninvestigated in terms of
research. Instead, this exploratory research that happened to have a small sample size was able to find a common location to capture a comparable sample of gay and straight men. Using the bar as the common ground to collect data allowed the research to compare gay and straight men without having to rely on secondary data collected from resources such as LGBT community organizations that could have held bias. The process of analyzing small sample sizes helps to identify the issues of data collection. The issues that were discovered during data collection can inform future research.

Conclusion

Even with some limitations, the study makes several contributions and opened the door for future research. One major contribution is that social network compositions and social expectations for gay and straight men and their utilization of the bar scene, specifically after partnering, had never been researched before. This exploratory study has pulled from an existing literature that is mostly theoretical to begin testing hypotheses. This comparison study generates new ideas not only to LGBT studies, but to gender studies. Finding that gay partnered men reported less commitment than straight partnered men opens areas in LGBT research to further investigate the structure of gay relationships. The study revealed that straight men are not withdrawing from their friendships to the same degree that the theories and previous research suggested. More investigation on how gender impacts male friendships to understand present social networks after partnering is needed. Sociologically, the study shows how gendered social expectations affect both straight and gay men. This research also adds more knowledge to what people think about relationships, networks, and the bar. A common assumption is that people utilize the bar as a “sexual marketplace” to meet new people (Cavan, 1966;
Lindsay, 2006). This study revealed that while the bar can be used in that way, it is also used to maintain remain connected with friends after partnered. Several couples reported that they still frequented the bar, indicating that the bar is not simply used by single people to hookup. This study has generated new ideas about social expectations of men in today’s society, specifically concerning social network composition and relationship commitment.
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WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Institutional Review Board
Continuing Review Report

Name of Project: Meet me at the Bar?
Name of Researcher: Jasmine Routon
Department: Sociology

How many total subjects have participated in the study since its inception? #0

How many subjects have participated in the project since the last review? #0

Is your data collection with human subjects complete? ☐ Yes ☒ No

1. Has there been any change in the level of risks to human subjects? (If “Yes”, please explain changes on a separate sheet) ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Have informed consent procedures changed so as to put subjects above minimal risk? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet) ☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Have any subjects withdrawn from the research due to adverse events or any unanticipated risks/problems? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet) ☐ Yes ☒ No
4. Have there been any changes to the source(s) of subjects and the Selection criteria? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet) ☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Have there been any changes to your research design that were not specified in your application, including the frequency, duration and location of each procedure? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet) ☐ Yes ☒ No
6. Has there been any change to the way in which confidentiality of the Data is maintained? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet) ☒ Yes ☐ No
7. Is there desire to extend the time line of the project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
On what date do you anticipate data collection with human subjects to be completed? First half of 2015

2. Informed consent is collected the same way, but if the respondent wished to be entered into winning 1 of 3 $50.00 gift cards, then they will have to provide their contact information. However, their contact information will be collected completely separate from their survey responses and therefore their identity will still be confidential.

4. The sources of subjects has changed in that access to the survey will be on several social media sites owned by bars but respondents will also be able to access the survey through a QR code that will be placed on a flyer. The flyer will be placed at the participating bars, either in the bathroom, at the counter itself, or both.

5. The changes to the design just consist of how I am reaching respondents. The only change is that I want respondents to also access the survey through being provided information about the survey at the actual location of the bar instead of strictly online. The design changed to include this aspect with the use of a QR code that links the respondent directly to the survey and through offering incentives for people to take the survey.

6. The changes to confidentiality is that before I didn’t place to collect their contact information at all and therefore the respondent was not providing their name whatsoever. Now, if they want to have a chance of winning an incentive, they must give me their contact information. However, their contact information is collected separately from their survey responses and therefore their responses will still be confidential.

In addition to the changes above, a few changes have been made to the actual survey. The new questionnaire has also been uploaded.
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Continuing Review Report

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

Institutional Review Board
Continuing Review Report

Name of Project: Meet me at the Bar?
Name of Researcher: Routon, Jasmine
Department: Department of Sociology

How many total subjects have participated in the study since its inception? 32
How many subjects have participated in the project since the last review? 32

Is your data collection with human subjects complete? ☑ Yes ☐ No

1. Has there been any change in the level of risks to human subjects? (If “Yes”, please explain changes on a separate sheet).
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

2. Have informed consent procedures changed so as to put subjects above minimal risk? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet).
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

3. Have any subjects withdrawn from the research due to adverse events or any unanticipated risks/problems? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet).
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

4. Have there been any changes to the source(s) of subjects and the Selection criteria? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet).
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

5. Have there been any changes to your research design that were not specified in your application, including the frequency, duration and location of each procedure. (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet).
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

6. Has there been any change to the way in which confidentiality of the Data is maintained? (If “Yes”, please describe on a separate sheet).
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

7. Is there desire to extend the timeline of the project? ☑ Yes ☐ No
   On what date do you anticipate data collection with human subjects to be completed? March 2015

The sources of the subjects was mutually through social media sites of bars that decided to host the survey or agreed for the survey to be posted to their social media site. I am wanting to expand the data collection to other social media sites, not strictly bar owned sites. This means that people will have access to the survey through social media sites that are bar owned and affiliated and other social media sites set up as a public domain. Therefore, I am wanting to expand the location of the data collection from being accessed strictly through bar participating social media sites to other social media sites that are not necessarily strictly tied to bars, but are a public domain to that same general region.
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Below you will find the details of the project, the procedures to be used, and the potential benefits and possible risks of participation. You may ask any questions you have to help you understand the project by calling or emailing the contact information above. You should keep a copy of this consent form for your records.

1. Nature and Purpose of the Project: The project is meant to measure behavior in the bar scene in order to explore social networks, social expectations, and bar utilization amongst men and women.

2. Explanation of Procedures: You will be asked to complete an online survey. The online survey will measure behavior in the bar, as well as relationships, networks, and expectations. The surveys should take no more than 10 minutes.

3. Discomfort and Risks: You will be questioned about your behavior and your relationships, which may lead to emotional discomfort.

4. Benefits: Uncovering social expectations, social networks, and use of the bar scene through the online survey will allow for community development that can lead to a more culturally diverse community. However, there are no direct benefits to you.

5. Confidentiality: After the survey is completed, the answers will be automatically sent to the researcher and therefore there will be no way of telling who exactly took the survey. Also, your name or other identifying information is not collected which will heighten anonymity.

   If you wish to be entered into the chance to win 1 of 3 $50.00 VISA gift cards, you will have to submit your contact information. Your contact information will be collected separately from your responses and therefore your anonymity will still be protected.

6. Refusal/Withdrawal: Refusal to participate in this study will have no effect on any future services you may be entitled to from the University. Anyone who agrees to participate in this study is free to withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty.

You understand also that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, and you believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and potential but unknown risks.

Your continued cooperation with the survey implies your consent.

THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY
THE WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Paul Mooney, Human Protections Administrator
TELEPHONE: (270) 745-2129
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Bar Participation: Measuring Social Expectations and Networks

For the purpose of this study, a bar is viewed as a public space earning profits primarily from the sale of alcoholic beverages. This definition does not include establishments associated with or a part of hotels or restaurants with full food menus. A bar, therefore, is defined as a place where drinking is the primary focus, but can include secondary activities such as dancing, live music, and pool.

1. What is your age?
   - 18-24 years
   - 25-34 years
   - 35-44 years
   - 45-54 years
   - 55-64 years
   - 65 and older

2. What race or ethnicity do you identify as? Check one or more boxes and fill in the text box with specific race or origin.
   - White with text box
   - Black or African American with text box
   - Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin with text box
   - American Indian or Alaskan Native with text box
   - Asian with text box
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander with text box
   - Some other race or origin with text box

3. Do you have a child or children?
   - Yes
   - No

4. How would you describe the region in which you were raised?
   - Rural
   - Urban
   - Suburban
   - Neither with textbox

5. How would you describe the region in which you are currently living?
   - Rural
   - Urban
   - Suburban
   - Neither with text box
6. Please report the highest level of school or highest degree that you have completed.
   - Less than High School
   - High School Diploma or GED
   - Some College, no degree
   - Associates Degree (For example: AA, AS)
   - Bachelor’s Degree (For example: BA, BS)
   - Master’s Degree (For Example: MA, MS, MEng, Med, MSW, MBA)
   - Professional or Graduate Degree (For Example: PhD, EdD)

7. Please report your approximate annual PERSONAL income (before taxes).
   - Less than $10,000
   - $10,000 - $19,000
   - $20,000- $29,000
   - $30,000 - $39,000
   - $40,000 - $49,000
   - $50,000 - $59,000
   - $60,000 - $69,000
   - $70,000 - $79,000
   - $80,000- $89,000
   - $90,000- $99,000
   - $100,000 or more

8. What gender were you identified as at birth?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other with text box

9. What gender do you identify as now?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other with text box

10. What is your sexual orientation?
    - straight
    - gay
    - bisexual
    - other with textbox
For the purpose of this study, family is defined as parents, grandparents, siblings, cousins, aunts/uncles, and in-laws.

11. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
   - My social network is mainly made up of friends
   - My social network is mainly made up of family
   - My social network is mainly made up of coworkers/colleagues
   - I rely on my friends more than anyone else
   - I rely on my family more than anyone else
   - I rely on my coworkers/colleagues more than anyone else

12. During your free time who do you associate most with?
   - Friend(s)
   - Family
   - Romantic Partner
   - Other with text box

13. Who do you rely on most for emotional support?
   - Friend(s)
   - Family
   - Romantic Partner
   - Other with text box

14. If you needed financial help, who would you turn to?
   - family
   - friend(s)
   - romantic partner
   - other with text box

15. Who do you trust the most?
   - family
   - friend(s)
   - romantic partner
   - other with text box

16. If a traumatic event occurred, who would you call first?
   - family
   - friend(s)
   - Your romantic partner
   - Other with text box
17. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements. Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:
   o I should be the main provider for myself and my family
   o Being married or in a committed relationship is important to me
   o I want to have child(ren) or I already have child(ren)
   o I am expected to have children
   o Being a parent is not important to me
   o I do not need to be the sole provider in my family

Monogamy means that each partner within a relationship is exclusive to one another. This means that they are only have sexual intercourse with each other and only having a romantic emotional connection with each other.

18. Do you think that romantic relationships should be monogamous?
   o Yes
   o No
   o Indifferent

19. If you are not currently in a relationship, think back to your attitudes on monogamy during previous relationships. If you have not been in a relationship, answer based on your general attitudes on monogamy. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements. Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:
   o Being monogamous means you are emotionally exclusive with your partner
   o Being monogamous means you are sexually exclusive with your partner
   o I view monogamy as a way to enhance my relationship
   o I view monogamy as a sacrifice
   o Being monogamous with my partner means sacrificing my sexual drive
   o Being in a monogamous relationship is a way for society to know that I am committed to my partner

For the purpose of this study, a bar is viewed as a public space earning profits primarily from the sale of alcoholic beverages. This definition does not include establishments associated with or a part of hotels or restaurants with full food menus. A bar, therefore, is defined as a place where drinking is the primary focus, but can include secondary activities such as dancing, live music, and pool.
20. How often do you go to bars/clubs per month?
- A few times a year
- Once a month
- A couple of times a month
- 3 or 4 times a month
- 5 or 6 times a month
- 7 or 8 times a month
- 9 or more times per month

21. Who do you go to the bar/club with? Check all that apply.
- friend(s)
- partner
- family
- co-worker(s)
- alone

22. Check all reasons that apply for going to a bar/club.
- socialize with friends
- socialize with family
- socialize with romantic partner
- to find a sexual partner
- for social networking
- to drink
- to feel like I’m part of a community

23. Select your MAIN reason for going to a bar/club.
- socialize with friends
- socialize with family
- socialize with romantic partner
- to find a sexual partner
- for social networking
- to drink
- to feel like I’m part of a community

24. Below, please share other reasons you have for going to a bar:

25. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
- I go to the bar to relax
- I go to the bar to be social
- I go to the bar to have fun
- I go to the bar to meet new people
- I go to the bar to be surrounded by other people
- I go to the bar to relieve stress
I go to the bar to get away from my responsibilities
I go to the bar to be alone
I go to the bar to celebrate

26. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements. Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:
- It is perfectly fine for people who are in a serious relationship to go to the bar frequently
- It is acceptable for someone in a relationship to go to the bar without their significant other
- I assume that people I encounter in bars are single
- It is fine for couples to attend the bar together
- I assume that people at bars are looking to hook up

Skip Pattern: Selecting Single, never married, Separated/Divorced, or Widowed/Widower will skip the respondent to the end of the survey.

27. What is your relationship status?
- Single, never married
- Dating but not living together
- Dating and living together
- Married
- Separated/Divorced
- Widowed/Widower

28. What gender is the person you are in a relationship with or married to?
- Male
- Female
- Other with textbox

29. What do you refer to your significant other as?
- Girlfriend
- Boyfriend
- Husband
- Wife
- Partner
- Fiancé
- Other with textbox

30. Since you are in a relationship (married or cohabiting), which of the following statements best describes you?
- I go to the bar more often now than I did when I was single
- I go the bar less often now than I did when I was single
31. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements. Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:
   - It is perfectly fine for me to go to the bar frequently, even if I am in a relationship
   - It is acceptable for me to go to the bar without my significant other
   - It is perfectly fine for my significant other to go to the bar without me
   - It is fine for me and my significant other to go to the bar together
   - It is unacceptable for my significant other to attend the bar without me
   - It is unacceptable for me to attend the bar without my significant other
   - It is acceptable for me to attend the bar without my significant other if I am going with family
   - It is unacceptable for me to attend the bar without my significant other if I am going with friends, coworkers, or colleagues
   - It is acceptable for my significant other to go to a bar with friends, coworkers, or colleagues without me

32. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements. Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:
   - I am considered an important part of my significant other’s family
   - I am expected to attend all of my significant others’ family functions
   - I am welcome to attend my significant others’ gatherings with friends
   - I am considered important to my significant other’s friends

33. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
   - My parents expect me to have a child(ren)
   - My partner expects us to have a child(ren) together
   - My friends keep asking me when I will have a child(ren)
   - My coworkers/colleagues keep asking me when I will have a child(ren)
   - I feel pressured to become a parent

34. Reflecting on your current relationship, how much would you agree or disagree with the following statements:
   - I want this relationship to stay strong no matter what rough times we may encounter in the future
   - I do not have any lifelong plans for this relationship
   - I want to grow old with my partner
   - I may decide that I do not want to be with my partner at some point in the future
   - I tend to think about how things affect "us" as a couple more than how things affect "me" as an individual.
I want to keep the plans for my life somewhat separate from my partner's plans for life.
My relationship with my partner is more important to me than almost anything else in my life.
My relationship with my partner comes before my relationships with my friends.
My career (or job, studies, homemaking, child-rearing, etc.) is more important to me than my relationship with my partner.

35. Below, please define what relationship commitment means to you.
36. How would you define your current relationship/marriage?
   o Monogamous (Only dating each other)
   o Open Relationship (Allowed to see other people)
   o Neither with text box

37. If you were to cheat on your partner, would you still consider yourself to be in a monogamous relationship?
   o Yes
   o No
   o Indifferent with textbox

38. Do you and your partner combine your income?
   o Yes
   o No

Skip Pattern: If respondent selected Yes for previous question, the respondent will be asked to report Household Income.

39. Please report your approximate annual HOUSEHOLD income (before taxes)
   o Less than $10,000
   o $10,000 - $19,000
   o $20,000- $29,000
   o $30,000 - $39,000
   o $40,000 - $49,000
   o $50,000 - $59,000
   o $60,000 - $69,000
   o $70,000 - $79,000
   o $80,000- $89,000
   o $90,000- $99,000
   o $100,000 or more


doi:10.1300/J041v01n02_06

doi:10.1037//0033-295X.100.2.204


Journal of Homosexuality, 38(4), 5-37. doi:10.1300/J082v38n04_02

Wright, P. H. (2006). Towards an expanded orientation to the comparative study of
women’s and men’s same-sex friendships. In K, Dindia & D. J. Canary (Eds.),
Sex differences and similarities in communication. Mahwah: Lawrence Erbaum
Associates Inc.

differences in the incidence of self-denied unfaithful behavior in heterosexual

Latino Lesbians and Gay Men. Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology,
5(4), 371-379. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.5.4.371