This study sought to describe and compare commitment structures among lesbian and gay male living-together relationships, and to develop an instrument which would measure different dimensions of commitment among gay dyads without some heterosexual biases inherent in traditional measures of interpersonal commitment. Questionnaire data collected from 32 lesbians and 50 gay males who had lived together for at least six months were factor analyzed, yielding three factors: (1) intradyadic commitment, (2) extradyadic commitment, and (3) commitment-as-trust. On all three of these indices the lesbians scored somewhat higher than did the gay males, but in fact there were surprisingly few significant differences between the gay men and the lesbians. Suggestions in the data that lesbians report somewhat less social supports and are more concerned with couple boundary maintenance, whereas gay males report somewhat more jealousy and dependency, are discussed in terms of their implications for such relationships.
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Recently, commitment within love relationships has become a topic of great interest among social scientists. The term "commitment," however, has been applied to a variety of settings in scholarly literatures. For example,
commitment has been discussed in reference to one's occupation or career (Becker & Carper, 1956), to religion (Payne & Elifson, 1976) to communes (Kanter, 1968), and to more general cultural values (Kornhauser, 1962). The sociological and psychological literatures concerning commitment in love relationships, however, have remained scant and theoretically confusing (Huston & Levinger, 1978; Rosenblatt, 1977). For example, commitment in relationships has been defined as (1) "a desire to maintain a love relationship" (Leik et al., 1978; Lewis et al., 1977); (2) "a balancing mechanism in social exchange" (Leik and Leik, 1972:1); (3) "a dedication to... continuation [of a relationship] over an extended period of time" (Lewis, 1973), and (4) "events or conditions which constrain the individual to continue" a relationship (Johnson, 1978: 2-3).

The last definition is rather broad and may be applied to a variety of activities, including attitudes, goals, behaviors, material objects, and relationships. Furthermore, Johnson (1978) suggests that there are components of commitment including characteristics of the individual's evaluation and dedication to a line of action (personal commitment) as well as characteristics of the social and environmental setting in which the individual is embedded (structural commitment). Johnson's conceptualization is thus preferred, because of its breadth of potential application and theoretical clarity. Moreover, the application of Johnson's model provides a systematic method by which we may compare commitment within various types of relationships, perhaps avoiding some of the biases and theoretical confusion present in some previous investigations.

This conceptual confusion in regard to relationship commitment is particularly evident when the empirical
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