

- ity and friends in members of gay, lesbian, married, and heterosexual cohabiting couples. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 14(3/4), 57-68.
- Lesnick-Oberstein, M., & Cohen, L. (1984). Cognitive style, sensation seeking, and assortative mating. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 112-117.
- Lewis, R. A., & Spanier, G. B. (1979). Theorizing about the quality and stability of marriage. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Family relationships* (pp. 49-65). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lynch, J. M., & Reilly, M. E. (1985/86). Role relationships: Lesbian perspectives. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 12(2), 53-69.
- McWhirter, D. P., & Mattison, A. M. (1984). *The male couple: How relationships develop*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- O'Brien, R. G., & Kaiser, M. K. (1985). MANOVA method for analyzing repeated measures designs: An extensive primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 316-333.
- Peplau, L. A. (1983). Roles and gender. In E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. H. Harvey, T. L. Huston, H. H. Kelley, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L. A. Peplau, & D. R. Peterson (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 220-264). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Peplau, L. A., & Amaro, H. (1982). Understanding lesbian relationships. In W. Paul, J. D. Weinrich, J. C. Gonsiorek, & M. E. Horvath (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Social, psychological, and biological issues* (pp. 233-247). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peplau, L. A., & Cochran, S. D. (1981). Value orientations in the intimate relationships of gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 6(3), 1-19.
- Peterson, D. R. (1983). Conflict. In E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J. H. Harvey, T. L. Huston, H. H. Kelley, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L. A. Peplau, & D. R. Peterson (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 360-396). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 95-112.
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 265-273.
- Sarason, I. G., Levine, H. M., Basham, R. B., & Sarason, B. R. (1983). Assessing social support: The Social Support Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 127-139.
- Schulz, S. A., & Alperson, B. L. (1984). Interpersonal phenomenology as a function of sexual orientation, sex, sentiment, and trait categories in long-term dyadic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 983-1002.
- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 15-28.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93, 119-135.

On "Being a Prostitute"

Paul W. Mathews, BA Hons

ABSTRACT. The book "On Being a Prostitute" (Perkins & Bennett, 1985) is a valuable contribution to the sociology of deviance and sexual ideologies. However, comprehensive as it is, the book presents certain omissions and flaws, with implications for both its empirical data and theoretical underpinnings. In focusing on male (homoerotic) prostitution, and drawing upon Bennett's (1983) "Twenty-Ten" survey (which forms the main empirical base of that aspect of the book), I argue that certain categories of male prostitutes have been excluded. These omissions, I suggest, were necessary to allow Bennett's hypothesis that *most* male prostitution derives from economic necessity—a recurrent economic determinism reminiscent of Havelock Ellis (1906/1936), and somewhat contrary to a broader structural approach (see Mathews, 1983).

In an attempt both to categorize male prostitution and so explain the causes thereof, Perkins and Bennett (1985) and Bennett (1982, 1983, and 1982-1984 personal communications) have, in a contemporary analysis of Australian data, proposed that almost all male prostitutes encountered in their studies identified themselves as either bisexual or gay. This assumption permeates the whole (1985) book, clearly indicated by Bennett's consistent reference to prostitution by males as "male gay or homosexual prostitution." Implicit here is that male prostitution is conducted only, or primarily, by gays. Such terminology is not necessary to distinguish male prosti-

Paul W. Mathews resides in Sydney, Australia. Mr. Mathews is a PhD candidate in anthropology at the University of New South Wales. He is an instructor at Macquarie University and the University of New South Wales. Correspondence may be addressed to the author at the School of Sociology, University of New South Wales, P.O. Box 1, Kensington, 2033, Sydney, NSW, Australia.

Journal of Homosexuality, Vol. 15(3/4) 1988

© 1988 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

tution from male heterosexual prostitution, for the term *gigolo* already provides that distinction.

To this Bennett adds the imputation that those who claimed to be heterosexual, or were unable to identify sexually either way, were confused about their identity. By selective sampling, Bennett (1985) tends to portray heterosexually identified prostitutes un sympathetically as angry young men, as confused, as the progeny of poor backgrounds or of traumatic experiences.¹

Following from this, Bennett infers that the prime and virtually only cause of male prostitution is one of economic pragmatics. For example: "Prostitution among young gay males appears to be quite common, at least on a casual basis, as an occasional source of additional income" (Bennett, 1982; p. 1).

Drawing upon survey data presented in *Young and Gay* (Bennett, 1983),² Bennett asserts that 34.3% of the gay males in his sample engaged in male prostitution; 38.6% of the bisexual males did so; and only 6.5% of the heterosexual males did so. The reasons for engaging in such prostitution are enumerated in Table 1.

From this information Bennett asserts that a total of 18 prostitutes derived the bulk of their weekly income from prostitution, and did so for reasons of economic survival. However, many more than this number indicated that prostitution may have been one way of sup-

Table 1

Percentage of Gay and Non-gay Males Who Derive Income from Prostitution According to Three Motives

Subject	Economic Survival	Good Money	Other
Gay Males	73.2	4.2	22.5
Bisexual Males	68.2	13.6	18.2
Heterosexual Males and Others	84.6	15.4	0.0

plementing an inadequate income. These conclusions were reached by means of asserting that young gays seek refuge in the gay scene from the ostracism and hostility of the wider society. Because of the cost of refuge and possible unemployment and poverty, prostitution becomes a necessary means of survival (Bennett, 1983).

Such conclusions amount to a denial of the possibility of male prostitution being "work," as it may be for many female prostitutes. Yet the economic situations and needs of both male and female prostitutes are very similar. Bennett (1985) bases his assertion of a difference on "commitment," which he defines as "length of service" or "goal oriented" (p. 21). Yet he admits that prostitution can be work, but for gays only, and only for a limited time.³ Bennett goes on to assert that there is a tendency for young people who might be homosexual to recognize and accept this at earlier ages. One likely consequence of this is an increasing tendency of young gays to leave home or to be evicted from it, necessitating independent survival.

The thrust of Bennett's (1983) argument may be summarily quoted:

Larger numbers of young gays on the streets of the inner city, coinciding as it does with a crisis in youth employment and lack of cheap rental accommodation, means the increased likelihood of young gays turning to prostitution. In relation to male prostitution this probably explains the apparent change in the type of young men engaging in prostitution. In the past it has been presumed that most of these young men were either heterosexual and just trying to obtain an income to survive, or else confused about their sexual identity and using prostitution as a means of concealing their possible homosexuality. However, most observers now report that most young male hustlers are either homosexual or bisexual. This was confirmed in the survey by the fact that only one case out of 100 young men who had engaged in prostitution identified himself as heterosexual, while only six were unable to identify themselves sexually. This was in spite of the fact that the sample was obtained in those places where only young male hustlers would have been likely to have been found. Clearly the large number

of young gays and the earlier acceptance by them of their sexual identity has significantly reduced the proportion of heterosexual males or those uncertain of their sexuality amongst young male hustlers.

Prostitution, then, could be seen as the forced decision by many young gays . . . in order to survive in the face of poverty. Criminal activities, such as theft or drug dealing, appear from the survey to be the more common option of non-homosexual young people. Presumably this is a consequence of the domination of the male hustling scene by young gays. In fact a few heterosexual males suggest that they would sometimes engage in hustling not for prostitution purposes but in order to "roll" (i.e., assault and rob) their clients.

. . . hustling is no more than a means of survival when no others appear available or sufficient . . .

The reasons for the high incidence of prostitution amongst young gays might therefore be summarized as follows:

1. The impact of youth unemployment, inadequate social security, and the lack of appropriate low cost accommodation;
2. The earlier acceptance by young gays of their homosexuality and the failure of their families to understand this or to be able to cope with it; and,
3. The lack of appropriate alternatives open to younger gays. (pp. 54-55)

Although Bennett focuses on young gay prostitutes, he also indicates (ALP, 1983) that prostitution among *young* people, perhaps not necessarily gay, is also increasing (cf. Mathews, 1983). For them, as for young gay prostitutes, prostitution reflects the rise in youth unemployment and the lack of other means of survival. URSA (1982) concurred with this increase in numbers (in the United States) and the declining age of prostitutes, and the reasons of pragmatics, but adds that prostitution also appears "to be related to the growth of the gay subculture and the liberation of gay attitudes" (p. 4). However, this apparent increase in the number of young prostitutes, gay prostitutes, and young gay prostitutes may also result from the methodological factor of current research only now beginning to focus on these categories, or that because of ne-

cessity or changing social attitudes, such prostitutes are becoming more visible.

The suggestion that almost all prostitutes are gay fits neatly into current theories of gender and sex identity in regard to deviance. The lack of a clear distinction between male prostitution and male homosexuality reflects the stigmatization of homosexuality and its highly deviant status in our society due to the medicalization and criminalization of homoeroticism. Such ambiguity allows gay males to utilize prostitution in a way that does not impinge upon their self-image. For them, prostitution can be seen as just another aspect of being gay; it need not hold any particular significance of its own. Consequently, gay males involved in prostitution may need never conceive of themselves as prostitutes separate from or in addition to being gay. This contrasts with the prostitution practiced by delinquents or working-class heterosexual boys as described by Reiss (1967a, 1967b) and Harris (1973), for example, whom Bennett (1982) claims, "comprise only a relatively minor proportion of the total amount of male prostitution which occurs" (p. 5).

Bennett asserts that previous studies are distorted by the fact that they include a large proportion of young males who are in fact homosexual themselves as well as having been identified as delinquent by the authorities. He suggests that the focus on these particular groups is due in part to the fact that their sexual exploits were perceived and labeled as "delinquent":

Many of those who are labeled as "delinquent" by society are so labeled because their sexuality does not promote or allow them to conform to socially acceptable behavior and young men who would eventually identify as homosexual would have been amongst these very often in the recent past. (p. 5)

Additionally, homosexual identification in the past by young prostitutes was relatively difficult, and their behavior not an obvious part of the male hustling scene. Because gay males generally operated in relative secrecy, it was difficult for observers to be aware of activities and interactions. In contrast, young so-called delinquents tended to belong to a visible subculture easily recognized in other contexts while they still managed to interact with the

male homosexual hustling scene, as Reiss's (1967a, 1967b) data exemplifies. Investigators wishing to talk to young male hustlers would have found it much easier to make contact with generally delinquent young men. Also, there is a greater concern politically with the idea of young males who are apparently heterosexual being "forced" into having sex with older men as a consequence of their being in some kind of trouble and needing money; positing male prostitution within the legal and medical themes of adult-child "sexploitation."

The works of, for example, Reiss (1967a, 1967b) and Harris (1973), then, described how delinquent subcultures of young males can incorporate a tradition of male prostitution into their activities in such a way that it does not impinge upon their self-identity. Socially, these young men are labeled as objects of exploitation who bear no particular responsibility for their situation beyond that of their lack of options. Personally, they tend to see themselves as exploiting "queers" for their own needs; consequently, they have no particular reason to identify as prostitutes. Their prostitution is just an aspect of the preexisting status of "deviant," and can be interpreted by them and by observers as a behavior that arises from their general delinquency.

Due to the essential lack of conflict between male prostitution and the predominant stereotype of masculinity, there is no particular reason why involvement in male prostitution should represent any problems to the gender identity of these types of prostitutes. In western society, masculinity is held to be an analogous to sexual activity and assertiveness. In a man, promiscuity is held to be relatively natural. Sexuality is seen as instrumental to furthering one's own position. Thus, prostitution as promiscuous and instrumental accords with a broad notion of masculinity. The fact that prostitutes must be seen as sexually desirable, as well as able to fulfill the desires of others, conforms with the concept of virility: The virile male must be one who is sought after by many and is able to give pleasure. Therefore, it seems unlikely that any male involved in prostitution will have problems with his self-image as masculine, for young men are able to affirm their masculinity by virtue of their ability to attract and exploit clients.

Based on the above reasoning, it is possible to view boys in-

involved in prostitution as having resolved any conflict with their assigned gender role, and possibly even affirming that role. However, society views their behavior as in conflict with both age and gender role. For those who self-identify as gay or bisexual, male prostitution does not challenge their sexuality. As Reiss (1967a, 1967b) explains, so long as the sexual acts are confined to a specifically limited range of possibilities that, according to the prevailing subcultural definition, do not have to imply a homosexual commitment, then those young men involved who identify as heterosexual can retain such a self-identification.

In making his assertions, Bennett (1985) suggests that there are few such heterosexual male prostitutes at any one time. According to his sample, only 4% to 5% of all those involved in hustling probably fall into this category, and it would appear that they are becoming fewer in number as an increasing number of young gay males become aware of their sexuality at an earlier age and so displace the non-gays. Bennett (1982) suggested that those who are not gay simply cannot compete with gays, for the latter are able to offer more in terms of actual sexual practices and affectional response.

This in brief, then, is the more contemporaneous argument expounded by Bennett and others (e.g., Urban & Rural Systems Associates, 1982). Initially, it appears to conflict with my assertion (Mathews, 1983) that 50% or more of male prostitutes identify as heterosexual. But upon further analysis, it can be seen that Bennett's data and subsequent assertions at least complement my own, despite Bennett's significant methodological flaws and unfounded assumptions.

Bennett's (1982) survey was conducted in most of the gay venues of Sydney. Four-hundred forty-one young patrons were interviewed in areas where male hustlers of various ages usually congregate. "As such it probably includes a fair [sic] representation of the bulk [sic] of male homosexual prostitution in Sydney" (p. 2). Bennett fell into much the same trap as Reiss (1967a, 1967b) did: obtaining a selective sample. Bennett's sample is not a "fair" representation of the "bulk" of male prostitution in Sydney, but one of male prostitution in King's Cross.

My own data takes into account different types of prostitution — gay, bisexual, heterosexual, redlight, and suburban, of both the

working and middle classes — and my theoretical contention generalizes to all such prostitutes. Thus, it is representative of a substantial segment of male prostitution. Bennett's data, on the other hand, comes from research conducted from within the gay community, and as a result shows evidence of bias, selective sampling, and ulterior motives. Bennett fails to take into account any class distinction in prostitution or the prostitution that occurs in suburban areas among both gay and nongay boys. I readily concede that some in my sample were gay, bisexual, or confused about their emerging (heterosexual or homosexual) identity, and perhaps had turned to prostitution as a means of externalizing that identity in order to rationalize their behavior. Bennett only condescendingly concedes that perhaps at some time in the past a great deal of prostitution was in the form of subcultural, heterosexual gangs.

As I indicated (Mathews, 1983), my sample is somewhat dated (i.e., late 1970s), but it is not significantly different from my current, ongoing observations. Certainly, since the time of my original study, social tolerance has increased and allowed young boys to identify more easily as homosexual. This may well account for Bennett's more recent data that most prostitutes in Australia's red-light districts are in fact gay.

However, Bennett's assertion that the prostitutes in his sample were gay is only an assumption. By the sociological method he uses in the interviews, Bennett assigns a gay identity to the prostitutes on the basis of their activities, period of involvement in prostitution, and their association with the gay subculture. He claims that as a result of these very same factors, they also identify themselves as gay. This identity may be part of a rationalizing process: To be gay, to have "gay" friends, and to mix in the gay subculture (i.e., to identify with the gay subculture), then they must be gay. This identity is subculturally and socially induced, particularly as a hostile heterosexual society forces the prostitute-deviant to seek validation and moral support in a group who shares the social values associated with his behavior — that is, his homosexual activity.

In the same vein, Bennett relates homosexuality as a stigmatized category to acts of prostitution because the proscriptions against both demand strategies of adaptation and techniques of avoidance. The boy who prostitutes himself has a choice of either retaining a

conventional self-concept of being heterosexual by means of adopting neutralizing techniques to explain his behavior to himself and others, or of accepting a homosexual identity, which in the current cultural milieu of "tolerance" is perhaps easier.

Those acclaimed gay prostitutes of Bennett's sample, who for various reasons take up some form of permanent association with the gay community or redlight area, may through rationalization come to accept the values of that subculture and identify themselves as primarily homosexual. The important factor is not an inherent propensity, but the degree to which the boys' activities and self-concepts are supported by the subculture (Weeks, 1980/81).

In short, the greater social tolerance of the 1980s has not necessarily made it easier for a young person to identify as gay, but merely easier to accept his homosexual-prostitutional behavior for what it is — and then only in terms of the alternative subculture of homosexuality or gay milieu.

For the prostitute to identify himself as gay also identifies him as one of a group, even if only loosely. Such an identification may then provide ready-made justifications or rationalizations for his behavior. The non-gay identified (heterosexual) prostitute has already justified his actions to himself; otherwise, it is unlikely that he would have become or continue as a prostitute. He thus has no need to identify as "gay." In fact, such identification may disturb him (see Jackson, 1978).

One must therefore question if Bennett's sample subjects admitted to being bisexual or gay because they had internalized the belief that they must be because they are prostitutes, for it is possible for a prostitute to take on a homosexual role without a homosexual identity. That their activities constitute homosexual behavior (i.e., homoeroticism) is beyond question, but motivations assigned for such behavior do not necessarily follow.⁴ Justifying being a prostitute by claiming to be gay may not accurately explain one's motivations, but could suggest (apart from the need for behavioral and psychological consonance) the motives and behaviors that are regarded as socially acceptable in an interview situation in the King's Cross subculture, and suggest the degree of tolerance of "deviant" sexuality in the wider society (see Merton, 1968).

Bennett proposes that because male prostitution could not be, or

was inconsistently, explained in the past, assigning a gay identity to almost all prostitutes overcame the problem of finding a common denominator in the character of prostitutes, when in fact there may be no subjective common denominator as "gay self-identity." His proposal rests on the assumption that because boys engage in homosexual behavior, whether for money or not, they must be gay—a rationalization the boys themselves may wrongly adopt, assimilate, and at times express, perhaps even to an interviewer.

An interviewer, particularly one who is gay and self-confident,⁵ may also tend to impute a sympathetic gay identity onto those boys who cautiously admit such an identity or those who label themselves as bisexual or nonidentified. This may be particularly so if a question about one's gender identity is closed. For example, "Are you gay, bi, or heterosexual?" With only three options and no opportunity for explication,⁶ the subject may choose the one answer nearest to his concept of the answer. Whereas the interviewer may be confident in his or her own identity and knows exactly what that identity means to him or her, the prostitute-interviewee may place different conceptual connotations or exigencies upon the same word. This becomes most apparent in researching prostitution in other cultures. For example, in the Philippines, boy prostitutes (and other citizens) do not recognize a gay person as a homosexual in the western sense, but merely as fun-loving and homoerotic. Similarly, these boys in Manila see themselves as gay, but not homosexual.

Recent inquiries in Sydney among adolescent boys of my acquaintance also revealed anomalies in our taken-for-granted definitions and concepts. Some boys made a distinction between "gays" and homosexuals ("poofers"). The former almost exclusively reside in and frequent redlight areas or gay communities, associate with their "own kind," and often have permanent adult sex partners. Homosexuals are often the unseen or "unknown" men who constantly solicit males, particularly boys. The attitude toward the latter was hostile, while condescendingly tolerant of "real" gays and bisexuals. Some boys also labeled various men as "plastic poofs"—males, usually heterosexual, or assumed to be heterosexual, who frequent gay venues and dress in "appropriately gay" attire, but who do not indulge in any form of homosexual sex. They are looked upon by heterosexual boys with contempt (for being

"plastic"), but are considered (sexually) "safe." If these distinctions can be made by an outsider, what variations are possible in subjective self-identification?

Like some of the boy prostitutes, Bennett may feel the need to justify their prostitution in terms of their gender identity; that is, they can only be prostitutes for an extended period if they are gay. While this may be true, the converse, that only gays can be prostitutes, does not hold true. Rather, the hesitancy or confusion about gay identity by these acclaimed young gays may result from their not being gay, as well as their possibly being gay. On this basis, the prostitutes' inconsistency or confusion, Bennett has no valid reason to assume an emerging gay identity for them.

Bennett also totally ignores the substantial number of boys who engage in prostitution in working or middle-class suburbia, of which I have ample evidence (Mathews, 1983), particularly in the form of diachronic and synchronic case histories.⁷ Bennett does not question why, if young gays in need of money prostitute themselves, then what is to prevent young heterosexuals in need of money from being prostitutes. For them, as with young gays, occasions arise when, for the sake of survival or acquiring luxuries, prostitution is justified. (See Reiss's [1967a, 1967b] explanation-description, in terms of gang fun, an adolescent homosexual phase, whether in the redlight areas or in the suburbs, and perhaps with a qualitative and correlative difference in need, commitment, and associated ostracism.)

Whereas Havelock Ellis (1936) perceived the causes of prostitution as related to poverty (i.e., the economic conditions of women, children, and prostitutes), and the behaviorists in Albert Cohen's (1955) style perceived prostitution in terms of familial-environmental factors, today, explanations focus upon sexuality, given impetus by the gay and feminist movements. In this latest explanation, in terms of conflict between society and sex/gender identity, the underlying assumption is that prostitution is not inherently deviant, but merely an expression of one's sex/gender identity, an expression bounded and channeled by the current cultural milieu. In Ellis' time, it was poverty. In the 1950s, deviance was thought to be caused by a breakdown in social ties and discipline consequential to post-war prosperity, rapid development, and absent fathers. In

more recent times, deviance has been seen in terms of the polemical oppression/emancipation of sexuality (see Merton, 1968, p. 540, fn. 87).

Although deviant behavior was previously seen as being caused primarily by external factors, it was still unacceptable and indicative of flaws inherent in the individual. Today, it is argued that deviance is an expression of individual personality or collective behavior molded by the society, a viable part of the whole society and therefore not external to it. This being so, Bennett's assertions throw prostitution back to the "poverty explanation" of Ellis' time. The only thing that perhaps has changed is the noninherent nature of deviance, but only in terms of an inherent character trait not being normal per se. Bennett's assertion that only gays can be male prostitutes conjures up images that only inherent character traits can be deviant or made to be deviant, and only under economic conditions of poverty.

My own explanation (Mathews, 1983) of male prostitution-delinquency, in terms of a "Capitalist Success Ethic," makes no temporal distinction for western culture. I explain prostitution by heterosexuals (and if necessary by gays) more adequately than it has been before. My explanation refers to the present, even if, as Bennett claims, heterosexual prostitution is less extensive, and of course my explanation may refer to future or other cultural situations.

I propose that the cause of prostitution is wealth and social mobility, aspirations that have dogged civilization throughout history (see Weber, 1930). The "Capitalist Success Ethic," to which I specifically refer as commencing from about the 16th century, provides only a historically relevant framework of technological, moral, and social culture in which to focus on the numerous aspects of sexuality, including prostitution. From this has evolved our present socio-sexual and economic-cultural condition, of which the age differential in our society and correlative expected roles, aspirations, economic means, and contemporary gender identities are prime factors. It is, in fact, because of these factors, which in part constitute the social structure of western culture, that the need arises for young gays, either self-identified or emerging in their identity, to prostitute themselves for pragmatic reasons. In this sense, Bennett's data does not conflict with my own hypothesis. Bennett's primary flaw

is to fail to concede that these factors equally apply to heterosexuals who, due to the inculcation of the "Capitalist Success Ethic," and due to their conflicting economic dependence and age roles, also find it necessary to be delinquents and prostitutes.

As the first comprehensive treatment of one aspect of the empirical reality of prostitution in King's Cross, Perkins and Bennett's book, *Being a Prostitute*, does offer a resounding critique of double-standard social structure and western morality. However, the book ultimately fails when the theories expounded by the authors are critically examined.

NOTES

1. Ironically, such a description has been used in previous times for people who "became" homosexuals. Bennett's reversal of this psychosocial descriptive "cause" to apply to heterosexuals may well be poetic justice, but nevertheless may be just as inaccurate.
2. Overall, the book (Perkins & Bennett, 1985) qualifies the "20-10" survey (as presented in Bennett, 1983) to some extent, but this tends at times to create issues of degree rather than kind. However, the book still lacks a comprehensive structural approach.
3. There are further statistical and interpretative problems with the presented survey results, most too tedious to elaborate on here. One example lies with the comparative statistics quoted: "Two-tenths percent of women generally are currently working as prostitutes," while some 33% of young gay males "had worked at some time or other" (1985, p. 22). First, and statistically, the two figures refer, respectively, to *current* workers (for females), and *all* workers, past and present, for gay males.

Second, and more significantly, Perkins and Bennett are comparing two different types of samples, arbitrarily reducing the male sample to include only gays (and perhaps a few straights). The implication is clearly that all females are capable of prostitution, but only 0.2% do so, while all males are not potentially prostitutes. Only gay males are so capable, of which 33% have been or are. Although the statistics are distorted and incomparable, the more important point is the theoretical assumption — what could in fact be called the "double standard" operating within sexual deviance.

Another example is the average age of male prostitutes, claimed by Perkins and Bennett (1985) to be 20.6 years. But averages can be misleading, even to the extent of obtaining the same average with very dissimilar samples, as Table 2 shows. Note that in column 2, all but one of the sample are under 16, while in column 3, all but one are over 16 years old. Although the same average is calculated in these three samples, that figure does not truly reflect the range or constitu-

Table 2

Example of Same Age Averages Obtained through Different Constituents

Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3
14 yrs.	13 yrs.	17 yrs.
15	25	17
16	13	17
17	14	17
18	15	12
16 yrs.	16 yrs.	16 yrs.

(Averages = 16 yrs.) (N = 5.)

ents of each sample. Although Perkins and Bennett do give a breakdown of ages in one (male) sample, they tend to focus on the average.

4. Similarly, Wooden and Parker (1982) noted that most of the self-defined heterosexual inmates of a prison, who reported male sexual activity in prison, did not believe they were engaging in homosexuality. Some 10% of these heterosexuals did identify as bisexual because they were having male sex; 55% of the heterosexuals who were sexually active did not consider themselves as either bisexual or homosexual. It is clear, then, that Bennett may have been somewhat simplistic in getting his respondents to label themselves, failing to explain the self-labels or expand upon the theoretical implications of this factor.

In this book, Bennett (1985) seems for the most part to ignore the question others have often raised: What defines sexual orientation?—the sexual act itself, self-image, and gender behavior, or the nature of one's exotic fantasies? The sex act itself, of course, does not necessarily define the orientation. Likewise, motivations are situational and need to be explored. But none of these variables were raised by Bennett, and thus the data for me to explore in this instance are absent.

5. Neither Perkins nor Bennett states his own sexual orientation, or that of other interviewers. Equally significant is that any pragmatic interest, no matter how benign, the authors may have had in the selection of data is not mentioned, but Bennett's previous (1982, 1983) writings, and that of the Australian Labor Party (1983), which Bennett cites for his support, clearly indicate to readers (particularly the Select Committee of the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly Upon Prosti-

tution) the need for recognition of prostitution, its causes, conditions, characteristics, and the funding of welfare services for such people.

6. At no point do Perkins and Bennett (1985) publish the actual questionnaires or interview schedules used. Also notable here is the authors' admission (pp. xviii-xix) that the interviews and questionnaires were brief and conditions difficult, limiting the amount of information that could be collected, and I might add, explicated by subjects.

7. Case studies in my own thesis (Mathews, 1983) consisted of boys 12 to 20 years of age, with a number of boys similar in age and similar or different in class position, thus enabling some comparisons. I was also able to keep in contact with some of the boys as they grew up, thereby observing changes in their sexual orientation. Accordingly, some boys were assigned at various times to more than one category in a theoretical typology (perhaps applicable only to Australia). Those categories are as follows.

Type 1: The Professional Prostitute. The boy who engages in prostitution on a professional basis, and as a primary means of deriving an income. He takes an active role in solicitation, and mainly operates in the "redlight" areas. Prostitution is a major and integral part of his lifestyle, economic activity, and behavior.

Type 2: The Regular Prostitute. The boy who engages in prostitution on a regular, but not full-time, basis as a means of deriving some income, or to supplement his income from other kinds of work. He takes an active role in solicitation and mainly operates in the "redlight" areas. Prostitution is a major part of his lifestyle, often integrated with overall economic activities and behavior. (None of my sample were categorized as being currently of this type.)

Type 3: The Part-time Prostitute. The boy who engages in prostitution on a casual, part-time, or irregular basis, operating in both "redlight" areas and his own home area about equally. He takes an active role in solicitation, and the income is additional to any other source. Prostitution is a major part of his behavioral pattern.

Type 4: The Casual Prostitute. The boy who engages in prostitution on a repetitive basis (perhaps with intervening lengthy periods between encounters) through circumstances associated with homosexuals or other males. His area of operation in his own home district. He does not take an active role in solicitation, although he may make it known that he is available. He may accept rewards other than money for his involvement. Any money acquired this way is supplemental to his other sources of income. His involvement in prostitution is incidental to his primary lifestyle.

Type 5: The Contingent Prostitute. The boy who engages in prostitution as a result of inducement by various forms of reward and verbalizations. He neither actively seeks clients, nor makes it known that he is available. He must be involved on more than two occasions, although not necessarily with the same partner. Like Type 4 prostitutes, his area of operation in his own home district. Though he will accept money, he mainly seeks rewards that are nonfinancial in nature. His involvement, termed "contingent" because of the chance circumstances in which he may find himself, is only remotely connected to his main

behavioral pattern. But because his involvement is (and must be) repetitive, he may become fully acquainted with prostitution and graduate to another type.

These categories broadly correspond with, or can be related to, much of Reiss's (1967a, 1967b) explanation-description of prostitution.

Finally, for the purposes of my thesis and typology, I define a male prostitute as a male who is available for sexual relations with another male for reward (excluding sexual satisfaction per se) on a regular or repetitive basis. Notable in the case studies and typologies of both myself and Reiss are the circumstances of prostitution—motivation, self-identity, place of operation, and so on—factors which Bennett does not address.

REFERENCES

- Australian Labor Party (A.L.P.) (East Sydney Branch). (1983). *Submission to the Select Committee of the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly Upon Prostitution*.
- Bennett, G. (1982). *Gay youth, deviant subculture or misrecognized category?* Unpublished sociology honors thesis. University of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Bennett, G. (1983). *Young and gay: A study of gay youth in Sydney*. "Twenty-Ten" (Youth Group) Survey. University of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Cohen, A. (1955). *Delinquent boys*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Ellis, H. (1936). *Studies in the psychology of sex* (Vol. 4). New York: Random House. (Original work published 1906.)
- Harris, M. (1973). *The dilly boys: Male prostitution in Piccadilly*. London: Croom Helm.
- Jackson, B. (1978). Deviance as success: The double inversion of stigmatized roles. In B. A. Babcock (Ed.), *The reversible world* (pp. 258-75). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Mathews, P. W. (1983). *Male homosexual prostitution*. Unpublished sociology honors thesis. University of New South Wales, Sydney.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. (Enlarged ed.). New York: The Free Press.
- Perkins, R., & Bennett, G. (1985). *Being a prostitute. Prostitute women and prostitute men*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Reiss, A. J., Jr. (1967a). The social integration of queers and peers. In J. Gagnon & W. Simon (Eds.), *Sexual deviance* (pp. 198-227). New York: Harper & Row.
- Reiss, A. J., Jr. (1967b). Sex offenses: The marginal status of the adolescent. In J. Gagnon & W. Simon (Eds.), *Sexual deviance* (pp. 43-77). New York: Harper & Row.
- Urban & Rural Systems Associates. (1982). *A study of juvenile prostitution: Executive summary. (Adolescent male prostitution: A study of sexual exploitation, etiological factors, and runaway behavior.)* San Francisco: United States Department of Health and Human Services.

Weber, M. (1930). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner & Sons.

Weeks, J. (1980/81). Inverts, perverts and Mary-Annes: Male prostitution and the regulation of homosexuality in England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 6(1/2), 113-134.

Wooden, W. S., & Parker, J. (1982). *Men behind bars: Sexual exploitation in prison*. New York: Plenum Press.

for faculty/professionals with journal subscription recommendation authority for their institutional library . . .

if you have read a reprint or photocopy of this article, would you like to make sure that your library also subscribes to this journal? if you have the authority to recommend subscriptions to your library, we will send you a free sample copy for review with your librarian. Just fill out the form below—and make sure that you type or write out clearly both the name of the journal and your own name and address.



() Yes, please send me a complimentary sample copy of this journal:

(please write in complete journal title here — do not leave blank)

I will show this journal to our institutional or agency library for a possible subscription.

The name of my institutional/agency library is:

NAME: _____

INSTITUTION: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY: _____ STATE: _____ ZIP: _____

Return to: Sample Copy Department, The Haworth Press, Inc.,
12 West 32 Street, New York, NY 10001