

## Specific Sexual Fantasy Themes: A Multidimensional Study

William B. Arndt, Jr., John C. Foehl, and F. Elaine Good  
University of Missouri—Kansas City

The study questioned the implicit assumption that sexual fantasies are unidimensional. Using factor analysis, four sets of fantasy themes were identified for males and females. These specific fantasy themes and total fantasy scores were submitted to discriminant analysis using the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and several sexual behaviors as independent variables. In none of these analyses were the discriminating variables for the high versus low total fantasy scores the same as those for the specific fantasy theme scores. Results were interpreted with reference to previous studies of sexual fantasies. It was concluded that sexual fantasies can be meaningfully treated as multidimensional.

Freud provided the starting point for much of the research on sexual fantasy with his statement that "A happy person never phantasies, only an unsatisfied one" (1908/1962, p. 146). Recent researchers have questioned this deficiency explanation of fantasy. Hariton and Singer (1974), for example, found that fantasies during sexual relations were common and not related to neuroticism nor to sexual satisfaction. Fisher (1973) reported that the sexually responsive female spends much time thinking about sex and that general psychological disturbance was unrelated to orgasmic consistency. Also contrary to a deficiency model was Epstein and Smith's (1957) finding that male orgasm rate was positively correlated to sexual themes in projective tests. Likewise, Wilson (1978) found positive relations between sexual fantasy frequency and orgasm frequency for both sexes. It appears, then, that for many people sexual fantasies are not responses to lack of satisfaction, but are a part of an active sex life, often used to enhance these experiences (Sue, 1979; Sullivan, 1976).

In studies that went beyond an inquiry into the *function* of sexual fantasy, several researchers examined the relation between fantasy and personality characteristics of sexual fantasizers. In the Hariton and Singer (1974) study, 15 sexual fantasy items were included as variables in an extended ques-

tionnaire examining the function of coital fantasy. Although the fantasy themes differed somewhat in content (i.e., imaginary lover, helplessness, and exhibitionism), when factor analyzed along with other variables, all fantasy items loaded on one factor, with only two loading on another factor. This, unfortunately, precluded any correlations of types of fantasy with other variables. Hariton and Singer were able to identify personality traits with women who are high coital fantasizers. Although the relationships were rather weak, such women displayed the creative personality qualities of aggression, exhibition, impulsivity, autonomy, and dominance. Similarly, Brown and Hart (1977) found that quantity of female sexual fantasy was related to independence, nontraditional feminine attitudes, and anxiety. Moreault and Follingstad (1978) reported that for females, sex guilt was negatively correlated with total fantasy production and that those with low sex guilt produced longer, more explicit, and varied fantasies than did those with high sex guilt. Similar results were reported by Leiman and Epstein (1961). Wagman's (1968) study of daydream types and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scales indicated that sexual daydreams of men and women were correlated with anxiety and negatively related to the tendency to repress.

It is noteworthy that only a very few researchers have examined the relation between specific content of sexual fantasy and personality characteristics of the fantasizers. This situation reveals a lack of congruence between researchers' interest in and practitio-

---

Requests for reprints should be sent to William B. Arndt, Jr., Department of Psychology, University of Missouri—Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri 64110

ners' use of sexual fantasies. Although the total amount of sexual fantasy produced by a client may be of some interest to the therapist, it is the specific theme of those fantasies that is explored and/or modified.

In his pioneering study of sexuality in women, Maslow (1942) related the personality variables of self-esteem (a dominance feeling) and security-insecurity to sexual fantasies. He found that high self-esteem women sought to be dominated in sexual relations, whereas middle self-esteem women preferred to be seduced. And, for high self-esteem, insecure women, power was expressed in sadomasochistic fantasies.

The work most pertinent to the present study was that of Wilson (1978) and Gosselin and Wilson (1980). From the responses of 45 men and 45 women, Wilson (1978) derived four correlated factors: exploratory, intimate, impersonal, and sadomasochistic. Gosselin and Wilson (1980) studied fetishists, sadomasochistics, and transvestites obtained from patrons of special interest boutiques and members of specialized clubs. They compared the three sexually differentiated groups and a control group on the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) and on the four factors of the Wilson Sex Fantasy Questionnaire. They found, for example, that transvestites showed a surprisingly low incidence of intimate fantasies, and that sadomasochists had extremely high total fantasy compared to the other groups. Gosselin and Wilson did *not*, however, specifically relate the subjects' Eysenck scores with the four fantasy factors.

The premise of the present study is that total sexual fantasy frequency is not unidimensional, but rather is a composite of relatively independent fantasy themes. Therefore, an examination of specific fantasy content areas may provide a more refined analysis of personality differences among subjects than would the use of total fantasy frequency only. This premise was examined in two steps. First, as in Wilson's (1978) work, sexual fantasy categories were identified by means of factor analysis. Second, the study examined the relation of personality traits and types of sexual outlet and satisfaction to total fantasy and to the several fantasy content areas. Data for males and females were analyzed sepa-

rately because Mednick (1977) found that the sexes differed in their fantasy productions on his rationally derived categories.

This approach has several advantages over previous research. An increase in the number and diversity of items provides a pool from which distinct groupings may be obtained, whereas for Hariton and Singer (1974) the small number of fantasy items prevented an analysis of types of fantasy. Also, the use of college students as subjects reduces the possibility of sampling bias, and more important, allows for the determination of relationships among fantasy types and personality traits, rather than the comparison of fantasy types across selected groups as done by Gosselin and Wilson (1980).

## Method

### *Subjects*

Participants were 138 female and 125 male students recruited from psychology classes. Before they volunteered, students had been informed that the study involved questions about sexual fantasies and behaviors, and that their answers would be anonymous.

### *Procedures and Instruments*

On arrival at the psychology office, participants were given an envelope containing the following materials: the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Guilford, Guilford, & Zimmerman, 1978), the Sibling Incest Aversion Scale (Arndt & Ladd, 1981), and sexual fantasy and behavior questionnaires.

*Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.* This factor analyzed scale, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, was chosen because of the relatively low trait intercorrelation. The traits assessed are general activity, restraint, ascendance, sociability, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness, thoughtfulness, personal relations, and masculinity.

*Sibling Incest Aversion.* The Sibling Incest Aversion scale purports to measure the severity of the Oedipus conflict. It has a high internal consistency as shown by a Hoyt index of .98. Results showed, for example, that scores were related to sex guilt and number of opposite-sex siblings. Middle-scoring women rated themselves as more introverted and sensitizing than did high or low scorers. The data on females yielded more significant results than did the male data.

*Sexual fantasy questionnaires.* Each item of the sexual fantasy questionnaires presented a single sexual act with the sex of the participant(s) identified. Participants indicated the frequency with which they had each fantasy during the past year on a 7-point scale from *never* (1) to *once a day or more* (7). Male and female forms were similarly constructed. Fantasy themes were derived from

Friday (1974, 1975) and Shanor (1977) for women and from Friday (1980) and Slattery (1975) for men. Provisional forms were factor analyzed and revised for use in this study.

*Sexual behaviors.* Sexual behavior questions asked for the frequency, during the past year, of orgasms with partners, orgasms with masturbation, and degree of sexual satisfaction.

## Results

### *Generality of Fantasy Popularity*

To assess the correspondence in popularity of fantasies between participants in the present study and those in the Gosselin and Wilson (1980) sample of British subjects, the Spearman correlation was calculated between those fantasies that were similar in content in both studies. Similarity was determined by three judges, and fantasies were paired if at least two of the judges agreed on the match. There were 18 paired male and 16 paired female fantasies. Using the mean ratings as indexes of popularity, a correlation of .98 was obtained for males, and a correlation of .88 was obtained for females.

### *Data Analysis*

First, fantasy themes were factored using the principle components method with oblique rotations. Then, to obtain a more general picture of factor patterns, second-order factors were derived, again using oblique rotations. Third, total fantasy scores and second-order factor scores were calculated. The total fantasy score was the sum of scores across all items and served as an index of amount of fantasizing, regardless of fantasy themes. These score distributions were divided at the median; the high and the low groups constituted the dependent variables in several discriminant function analyses.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, along with orgasms with partner and with masturbation, sexual satisfaction, and incest aversion constituted the independent variables. For a variable to qualify as a descriptor, its standardized discriminant function coefficient had to be at least one half of the value of the largest coefficient, and the probability of its univariate *F* ratio had to be .20 or less.

### *Female Fantasy Factors and Discriminating Variables*

The largest intercorrelations among the female second-order factors were .41 between Factor 1 with 4, and .47 between Factor 2 with 4. All other intercorrelations were less than .25. Table 1 presents the five most salient fantasies for each second-order factor, their second-order factor loading, incidence (% of subjects having the fantasy once a year or more), and mean fantasy score. All five discriminant analyses were significant at the .01 level. See Table 2 for Wilks's lambda and associated chi-square, probability, and omega-square. Table 3 gives the discriminant function coefficients and univariate *F* significance levels for the five analyses.

The most salient themes in Factor 1 presented the woman as attractive ("I'm a very glamorous woman and an extremely handsome man is having sex with me"), and the males as admiring ("I'm wearing skin-tight clothes. Men are staring at me") and gentle ("A man is kissing my breasts"). This factor was named *Romantic*. The discriminant analysis was significant well beyond the .01 level with 20% of the variance accounted for. The qualifying variables indicate that women high in this factor had a high frequency of orgasms with masturbation and high satisfaction with their sexual lives. They were also impulsive (low restraint) and meditative (thoughtfulness).

Factor 2 was labeled *Variety* because the themes involved both watching and being watched in sexual activities ("A man is watching me masturbate" and "A man and I are having sex while others are watching"), risk ("A man and I are having sex in a place where there is danger of being caught"), and finally a tentative homosexual theme ("A woman is holding my hand while I masturbate"). The significance of the discriminant analysis was well beyond the .01 level, and 29% of the variance was captured. Women scoring high on this factor reported high frequency of orgasm with partners and in masturbation. They scored low on incest aversion and low on restraint.

Factor 3 was labeled *Suffering*. The predominant elements in the most salient themes were bondage ("Several boys are tied in a

row. I bring each of them to erection"), suffering ("I'm made to suffer before a man will satisfy me sexually"), pain ("A man is holding me down and tells me there is pleasure in pain"), and punishment ("Several boys are in need of punishment. I order them to strip and I spank them"). The discriminant analysis on this factor was significant at the .01 level, and 18% of the variance was accounted for. The discriminating variables were low scores on incest aversion, submissiveness (low ascendance), and moodiness and anxiety (low emotion stability).

Factor 4 was labeled *Dominance* because every theme involved a dominant-submissive

relation ("An older man is seducing me," "I capture a man and force him to have sex with me," and "I'm a slave who must obey a man's every wish"). The discriminant analysis was significant well beyond the .01 level, with 29% of the variance accounted for. Those scoring high on the *Dominance* factor reported a high incidence of orgasms with masturbation and high sexual satisfaction. Their pace of activity was slow and deliberate (low general activity); they were anxious and moody (low emotional stability) and reflective (thoughtfulness).

The discriminant analysis on the total fantasy score was significant well beyond the .01

Table 1  
*Second-Order Factor Loadings, Incidences, and Means of Female Fantasy Themes*

Fantasy	Second-order factor loading	Incidence (%)	<i>M</i> rating
Factor 1: Romance			
I'm a very glamorous woman and an extremely handsome man is having sex with me.	.54	71	2.03
A man is kissing my breasts.	.52	92	3.03
I'm wearing skin-tight clothes. Men are staring at me.	.48	51	1.13
I'm in a secluded place. A man gently removes my clothes and has sex with me.	.45	90	2.68
I'm at a party where famous men admire my charms.	.40	64	1.28
Factor 2: Variety			
A man is watching me masturbate.	.77	30	0.63
A man and I are having sex while others are watching.	.69	28	0.44
A man and I are having sex in a place where there is danger of being caught.	.53	65	1.50
Two men are having sex with me.	.52	41	0.88
A woman is holding my hand while I masturbate.	.44	8	0.12
Factor 3: Suffer			
Several boys are tied in a row. I bring each of them to erection.	.47	10	0.14
I'm made to suffer before a man will satisfy me sexually.	.38	22	0.51
A male relative of mine is having sex with me.	.27	14	0.21
A man is holding me down and tells me there is pleasure in pain.	.20	27	0.49
Several boys are in need of punishment. I order them to strip and I spank them.	.19	4	0.04
Factor 4: Dominance			
An older man is seducing me.	.46	46	0.86
I capture a man and force him to have sex with me.	.43	25	0.47
I'm seducing a boy who is a virgin.	.43	33	0.70
I'm at a party where I summon each man I desire to have sex with me.	.36	33	0.56
I'm a slave who must obey a man's every wish.	.33	30	0.63

Table 2  
*Discriminate Analyses on Female Second-Order Factors and Total Fantasy Scores*

Discriminate analyses	Wilks's lambda	Chi-square (df = 13)	p	Omega-square
Factor 1: Romance	.79	30.16	.00	20
Factor 2: Variety	.70	45.46	.00	29
Factor 3: Suffer	.81	26.60	.01	18
Factor 4: Dominance	.71	44.99	.00	29
Total fantasy	.70	45.51	.00	29

level, and 29% of the variance was accounted for. The high fantasizers were characterized by active sexuality with partners, using masturbation, and satisfaction with their sexual activities. These high fantasizers were meditative (thoughtfulness) and self-centered (low objectivity).

#### *Male Fantasy Factors and Discriminating Variables*

Of the four male second-order factors, the correlation between Factors 1 and 4 was .42, and between Factors 1 and 2 it was .28. The other intercorrelations were less than .20. Table 4 presents themes of the four second-order factors and associated statistics.

Of the five discriminant analyses, one was significant at the .02 level, two at less than the .10 level, one approached the .10 level, and one was far from even approaching significance. The percentage of variance of fantasy scores explained ranged from 14 to 20. See Tables 5 and 6 for the results of the discriminant function analyses.

Factor 1 was labeled *Force* because the salient themes involved spanking ("I'm spanking a woman because she's been naughty") and binding ("A woman ties me up and has sex with me"). The discriminant analysis of the Force scores failed to reach significance.

Factor 2 was labeled *Same Sex* because in each of the five most salient themes another male was present ("Another man and I are having sex with a woman" and "I'm watching a man and woman having sex"). The discriminant analysis was significant at the .02 level, and 20% of the variance was accounted for. Men who scored high on Same Sex were given to masturbation. Their low incest aversion is coupled with impulsiveness (low restraint) and reflectiveness (thoughtfulness).

Factor 3 is bipolar involving themes of urination at one end of the pole and the popular themes of women's legs and breasts at the other. Unfortunately, urination is confounded with low popularity, so this factor was named *Unpopular*. The discriminant analysis approached significance at the .10

Table 3  
*Female Second-Order Fantasy Factor Scores and Total Fantasy on Variables Meeting Criteria of Inclusion*

Variable	Factor 1: Romantic		Factor 2: Variety		Factor 3: Suffer		Factor 4: Dominance		Total fantasy	
	D	p	D	p	D	p	D	p	D	p
Orgasm										
Partner	—	—	.60	.00	—	—	—	—	.34	.05
Masturbation	.43	.05	.49	.00	—	—	.49	.00	.55	.00
Incest aversion	—	—	-.32	.00	-.45	.05	—	—	—	—
Satisfaction	.43	.09	—	—	—	—	.36	.02	.47	.00
General activity	—	—	—	—	—	—	-.31	.13	—	—
Restraint	-.40	.11	-.50	.12	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ascendance	—	—	—	—	-.38	.14	—	—	—	—
Emotional stability	—	—	—	—	-.79	.00	-.48	.01	—	—
Objectivity	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-.39	.10
Thoughtfulness	.58	.04	—	—	—	—	.64	.00	.64	.00

Note. D = discriminant function coefficients.

level, and 14% of the variance was accounted for. Those who scored high in unpopular fantasies and who did not subscribe to fantasies of women's legs and breasts reported a low frequency of orgasms with partner. They had low incest aversion scores and a slow and deliberate pace of activities (low general activity).

The themes salient in Factor 4, called *Macho*, depicted the man as sexually stimulating to women ("A woman tells me she wants my body" and "I get a woman so sexually excited that she screams with pleasure"). The discriminant analysis was significant at the .10 level, and 15% of the variance was accounted for. Men who engaged in *Macho* fantasies were characterized by a high frequency of orgasms, both with partner and in masturbation. They were impulsive (low restraint) and had a high level of general activity.

The discriminant analysis of total fantasy frequency was significant at the .07 level, and 16% of the variance was captured. High fantasizers reported a high frequency of masturbation. They described themselves as having a fast activity pace (general activity), as impulsive (low restraint), and as prone to moodiness and anxiety (low emotional stability).

### Discussion

With the exception of Wilson (1978), those who have studied the relation of sexual fantasies to personality and sexual variables have used total fantasy frequency as their dependent variable. Thus, they have assumed that sexual fantasies are homogeneous. The results of the present study cast doubt on this assumption. The existence of four relatively independent male and female fantasy factors,

Table 4  
*Second-Order Factor Loadings, Incidences, and Means of Male Fantasy Themes*

Fantasy	Second-order factor loading	Incidence (%)	M Rating
Factor 1: Force			
I'm spanking a woman because she's been naughty.	.57	22	0.53
A woman ties me up and then has sex with me.	.56	42	1.05
I require a woman to say, "I've been bad, please punish me."	.55	14	0.31
I'm forcing a woman to have sex with me.	.55	39	0.95
I'm kidnapped by a woman and must do as she orders.	.53	46	1.10
Factor 2: Same Sex			
Another man and I are having sex with a woman.	.57	44	0.90
I'm watching a man and woman having sex.	.49	60	1.32
Two men are having sex while I watch.	.36	11	0.30
I'm at a party where everybody is having sex with everyone else.	.32	62	1.31
Another man and I are fondling one another.	.29	22	0.63
Factor 3: Unpopular			
A woman is watching me urinate.	.44	18	0.27
I'm watching a woman urinate.	.45	17	0.29
A woman asks me to urinate on her.	.33	11	0.17
I'm kissing a woman's large breasts.	-.43	91	3.44
I'm excited by a woman's shapely legs.	-.31	96	4.06
Factor 4: Macho			
A woman tells me that she wants my body.	.47	86	2.71
I get a woman so excited that she screams with pleasure.	.44	87	2.78
Two women are exciting me sexually.	.43	84	3.06
A woman is forcing her intentions on me.	.41	87	2.81
Several women are admiring my nude body.	.36	65	1.78

Table 5  
Discriminate Analyses on Male Second-Order  
Factors and Total Fantasy Scores

Discriminate analyses	Wilks's Lambda	Chi-square (df = 13)	p	Omega-square
Factor 1: Force	.92	9.97	.70	8
Factor 2: Same sex	.80	26.03	.02	20
Factor 3: Unpopular	.85	19.37	.11	14
Factor 4: Macho	.84	19.97	.10	15
Total fantasy	.83	21.06	.07	16

each associated with differing personality and sexual patterns, support the contention that sexual fantasies are multidimensional.

Even though an effort was made to include a wide variety of fantasy themes from published sources, no claim of representative sampling can be made. Although there was remarkable agreement in popularity between participants of the present study and Gosselin and Wilson's (1980) British subjects, inspection of correspondence of item placement in the several sets of factors was minimal. This lack of correspondence was not surprising because item wording and sampling differed between the two studies. Also, Wilson (1978) seems to have factored male and female data together, whereas in this study they were analyzed separately.

### Females

The relation between total fantasy, sexual behavior, and sexual satisfaction for females shows that high fantasizers were orgasmic both with partners and in masturbation. They also expressed satisfaction with their sexuality. These findings are supportive of those of Wilson (1978), Epstein and Smith (1957), and Fisher (1973). They constitute a more powerful refutation of the Freudian deprivation model than do the Hariton and Singer (1974) results, in which total fantasy was simply not related to sexual satisfaction.

The present results lend credence to Fisher's (1973) postulated special link between intercourse frequency and self-centeredness. The present study adds another element to this linkage because self-centeredness was related not only to frequency of orgasm with intercourse, but also to total fantasy output. Perhaps a certain amount of centering on self facilitates both sexual fantasizing and orgasmic consistency with partners.

The relation between fantasy and sexuality did not carry over to all of the specific factor themes. None of the three sexual variables differentiated high from low Suffer women. High Variety women were characterized by high masturbatory and partner orgasms, but not by satisfaction. High and low Romantic women were separated by satisfaction only. Similar to Hariton and Singer's (1974) submissive fantasizers, high Dominance women reported sexual satisfaction. Note that there

Table 6  
Male Second-Order Fantasy Factor Scores and Total Fantasy on Variables  
Meeting Criteria of Inclusion

Variable	Factor 1: Force		Factor 2: Same Sex		Factor 3: Unpopular		Factor 4: Macho		Total fantasy	
	D	p	D	p	D	p	D	p	D	p
Orgasm										
Partner	—	—	—	—	-.46	.19	.40	.06	—	—
Masturbation	—	—	.40	.02	—	—	.40	.18	.52	.03
Incest aversion	—	—	-.39	.01	-.58	.11	—	—	—	—
General activity	—	—	—	—	-.80	.01	.28	.06	.40	.15
Restraint	—	—	-.61	.01	—	—	-.55	.00	-.77	.00
Emotional stability	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-.53	.11
Thoughtfulness	—	—	.38	.10	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. D = discriminant function coefficient.

is an important difference between the present Dominance factor and Hariton and Singer's submissive factor. Dominance contains both dominant and submissive themes, whereas Hariton and Singer's submissive contains only submissive themes. It is surprising that no female dominant fantasies were represented in their erotic fantasy scale.

Hariton and Singer (1974) concluded that sexual fantasizing is a reflection of a general tendency to daydream. If we take the thoughtfulness score as an index of daydreaming (Wagman, 1968), the present results are consistent with their conclusion, but only for Total, Romantic, and Dominance fantasies. No such relation was found for Variety and Suffer fantasies.

Wagman (1968) and Brown and Hart (1977) found sexual fantasy frequency correlated with anxiety. On the other hand, in the Hariton and Singer (1974) study, fantasy was unrelated to neuroticism. Assuming some correspondence between anxiety and neuroticism, the present data are consistent with the Hariton and Singer results. Emotional stability, which taps anxiety, moodiness, and other neurotic complaints, did not differentiate between high and low total fantasy women. However, emotional stability did discriminate high from low women on the Suffer and Dominance factors.

Both the Suffer and Dominance factors contained subject-active and subject-passive themes, so that women having active fantasies were also likely to have passive fantasies. Similarly, Maslow (1942) concluded that for insecure women, sex is a weapon of power and that masochistic women also display sadistic fantasies. Wilson (1978), too, found that sadistic and masochistic fantasies factored together. A discriminating variable of the Suffer factor was low ascendance and with the Dominant factor was low general activity. Some of the high Suffer scorers' fantasies may be compensatory for their lack of ascendance, as in ordering boys to strip and then spanking them; and some of the Dominance women's fantasies may also be compensatory for their low activity level, as in capturing a man and forcing him to have sex. This compensatory fantasizing may well be involved in the high Suffer and high Dominance women's low emotional stability. But, at least,

dominance fantasies were related to sexual satisfaction; suffer fantasies were not.

### *Males*

It is interesting that there are fewer studies of male sexual fantasies than of female fantasies. This difference probably reflects the increasing emphasis on female sexuality in general, rather than a lack of interest in male sexuality.

Although the present study analyzed the male and female data separately, specific cross-sex comparisons were not made because of the possibility of differential volunteer bias. However, one notable overall difference was that the male results were much less powerful than were the results for females. Satisfaction, for example, failed to qualify as a discriminating variable on any of the male analyses. This lack of discrimination was not due to restriction of range in male satisfaction scores, because the male standard deviation (1.94) was larger than that for the female scores (1.34). The only factor in which thoughtfulness discriminated was Same Sex. And, one factor, Force, failed to yield a significant discriminant function. This relative lack of statistical significance was encountered in the Arndt and Ladd (1981) study. Wilson (1978) also found consistently lower correlations among males between orgasm frequency and fantasy scores, than among females. Overall, there appears to be less dependence among male sexual activity, fantasy, and personality traits than there is for the female. This finding fits with the assertion that male sexuality is somewhat peripheral to male personality and emotionality, whereas female sexuality is imbedded in the totality of female being.

Despite the dearth of pertinent studies to relate to the present findings and the relative lack of significant relationships found, a few interesting results concerning male sexual fantasies emerged. The pattern of discriminating variables for total and Macho males were similar, with high orgasm in masturbation, general activity, and impulsiveness. They differed in that Macho males were characterized by orgasms with partner, although total males were not. It is interesting that the only other variable on which they differed was low



emotional stability in the total fantasy male, with no such relation for the Macho male. The total male, to some extent, then fits the deprivation model, with high fantasy frequency, high orgasms in masturbation, and low emotional stability. The Macho male acts out his fantasies in orgasms with partners and does not complain of anxiety and moodiness.

Males scoring high on the Unpopular fantasies reported low rates of orgasm with partner, yet did not have high frequencies of masturbation to orgasm. They were simply low total-orgasm-outlet men. In keeping with this low sexual activity was their low general activity level. It would be difficult to ascribe their low sexual activity to repression or puritanical attitudes because of their low aversion to sibling incest. Perhaps their low frequency of orgasm is a manifestation of low sex drive and this less-than-adult-strength drive is responsible for the immature sexual fantasies.

### Summary

This study demonstrated that it is more meaningful to consider the content of sexual fantasies than it is to treat them as a homogeneous dimension. The present results strongly suggest that the seemingly conflicting results of previous studies are a function, in part, of the use of different samples of fantasy themes. Variables pertinent to one set of themes simply do not necessarily carry over to other themes.

Considering the psychoanalysts' interest in the interpretation of specific manifest fantasies and the behavior modifiers' attempts to manipulate specific deviant sexual fantasies, further research should focus on the development and meaning of homogeneous fantasy themes. Future research could explore the attribution of traits of those who subscribe to the several fantasy themes. It might be expected, for example, that Dominance fantasizers rely heavily on power, or dominance-submission constructs. Another interesting line of inquiry would be to investigate differences in biographical variables among the four theme fantasizers. Also, this study points to the need of exploring what differing roles sexual fantasy plays in the lives of males and of females.

### References

- Arndt, W. B., & Ladd, B. (1981). Sibling incest aversion as an index of oedipal conflict. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 45, 52-58.
- Brown, J. B., & Hart, D. H. (1977). Correlates of females' sexual fantasies. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 45, 819-824.
- Epstein, S., & Smith, R. (1957). Thematic apperception, Rorschach content, and ratings of attractiveness of women as measures of sex drive. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 473-478.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. San Diego, CA: Educational & Industrial Testing Service.
- Fisher, S. (1973). *The female orgasm*. New York: Basic Books.
- Freud, S. (1962). Creative writers and daydreaming. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 9, pp. 142-152). London: Hogarth. (Originally published 1908)
- Friday, N. (1974). *My secret garden*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Friday, N. (1975). *Forbidden flowers*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Friday, N. (1980). *Men in love*. New York: Dell.
- Guilford, J. P., Guilford, J. S., & Zimmerman, W. S. (1978). The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Beverly Hills, CA: Sheridan Psychological Services.
- Gosselin, C., & Wilson, G. (1980). *Sexual variations*. New York: Simon & Shuster.
- Hariton, E. B., & Singer, J. L. (1974). Women's fantasies during sexual intercourse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 313-322.
- Leiman, A., & Epstein, S. (1961). Thematic sexual responses as related to sexual drive and guilt. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 169-175.
- Maslow, A. H. (1942). Self-esteem (dominance-feeling) and sexuality in women. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 16, 259-294.
- Mednick, R. A. (1977). Gender-specific variances in sexual fantasy. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 41, 248-254.
- Moreault, D., & Follingstad, D. R. (1978). Sexual fantasies of females as a function of sex guilt and experimental response cues. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 1385-1393.
- Shanon, K. (1977). *The fantasy files*. New York: Dial Press.
- Slattery, W. J. (1975). *The erotic imagination*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Sue, D. (1979). Erotic fantasies of college students during coitus. *Journal of Sex Research*, 15, 299-305.
- Sullivan, P. R. (1976). Masturbation fantasies as indicators of deepest sexual longings. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality*, 10, 154-159.
- Wagman, M. (1968). The relationship of types of day-dream behavior to selected MMPI scales. *Psychiatry*, 31, 84-89.
- Wilson, G. D. (1978). *Secrets of sexual fantasy*. London: J. M. Dent.

Received January 10, 1983

Revision received September 19, 1983 ■