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ABSTRACT Sexual fantasy can be a part of sexual behaviour. Understanding sexual fantasies enables clinicians to understand the needs and barriers in individuals’ sexual functioning. Sexual functioning in marriage and relationships is in turn influenced by sexual fantasies. In this first ever study of sexual fantasy from India, we report on 30 homosexual men and 30 heterosexual men who were given Wilson’s Sexual Fantasy Questionnaire (SFQ). Homosexual men in this sample scored high on exploratory (trying out new techniques), intimate and interpersonal (fantasies about places, objects and times) as well as for overall libido. Heterosexual men acknowledged levels of external sexual restrictiveness, which were associated with sexual inhibition in real life. These findings from an urban sample reflect cultural and social factors, which can influence sexual fantasy and sexual functioning.
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Introduction

Almost everyone has fantasies, be they sexual or romantic. Most common fantasies are romantic, but understanding the nature of sexual fantasies is central in making sense of human sexuality and sexual behaviour. Sexual fantasies have erotic functions but are also likely to play a significant role in the commission of sexual offences (Abel & Blanchard, 1974). They are also robust indicators of underlying conventional sexual orientation (heterosexuality and homosexuality) and paraphilic preferences in comparison to measures of sexual behaviour or sexual self-identification alone (Gosselin & Wilson, 1980; Gosselin et al., 1991; Rahman & Wilson, 2003). A lack of sexual fantasies and/or perverse fantasies and resulting guilt due to these fantasies,
may further contribute to personal sexual dysfunction as well as within couple relationships. Leitenberg and Henning (1995), in a review of the literature, raised several questions about sexual fantasy including the underlying purpose of sexual fantasy, the directional nature of fantasies in relation to arousal (whether arousal increases fantasies or vice versa), the exact nature of the fantasies, and their relationship with sexual dissatisfaction. They raise questions about methodology of measuring sexual fantasies – whether these are done with checklists, open-ended questionnaires, or actual recording of the fantasies. Apart from the actual methodological problems, another key problem is that of accuracy and reliability of the fantasy reports on part of the respondents. In studies 47–92% men had reported sexual fantasies while having sexual intercourse whereas, among women, the reported prevalence was between 37% and 94% (Leitenberg & Henning, 1995). It would appear that there might be gender differences on type of fantasy not only in the prevalence of sexual fantasies during different parts of the sexual act but also on gender socialization. These need to be studied further.

Male fantasies are said to contain more visual imagery and explicit anatomic detail compared with women who had more affection-laden, emotion-laden and story line-type of fantasies (Barclay, 1973). This was confirmed by Kelley (1984).

Elucidating possible sexual-orientation-related variation in sexual fantasies is important for two primary reasons. Firstly, imagery-based techniques are widely used within the context of sex therapy. If there are important individual differences between client groups (such as heterosexuals compared to homosexuals) these need to be studied clearly. A therapist would need to identify individual client’s fantasies in order to facilitate response to training in techniques such as sensate focus or conditioning protocols. Such therapy may have to be tailored to the expressed fantasies rather than those of the group and be successful in enhancing arousability within one sexual orientation but not another as a function of the type of fantasies employed. Secondly, further information on sexual fantasy may aid our general understanding of psychological sex differences in several domains of sexual pathology. For example, heterosexual men are consistently found to be more interested in casual sexual encounters and visual sexual stimuli (such as pornography) than heterosexual women (Bailey et al., 1994). Importantly, homosexual men are as interested as heterosexual men in these domains (whilst lesbians are no different to heterosexual women), thus limiting the putative developmental explanations for the sex difference (Bailey et al., 1994). In this case, it would be difficult to see how the male preference for visual sexual stimuli is a consequence of a desire to subjugate women (often argued by sociologists) given that gay men also show this preference.

This might suggest that there is a common pathway to certain aspects of psychology in men, irrespective of their sexual orientation (Bailey et al., 1994). Could sexual fantasies also follow a similar pattern of consistency (although obviously being different in the content toward male versus female targets)? More importantly, does any consistency (or lack thereof) in sexual psychology vary as a function of culture?

In terms of sexual fantasy work in heterosexuals and homosexuals, among the first studies was by Masters and Johnson (1979). They reported on a small sample of
30 gay men and lesbians along with a heterosexual control group. The five most common fantasies for gay men were imagery of sexual anatomy (primarily penis and buttocks), forced sexual encounters, idyllic setting for sex, group sex and sex with women. It was not clear how the data were collected. Their heterosexual male sample showed forced sexual encounter, observing sexual activity, group sexual experiences and replacing established sexual partner as predominant fantasies. They concluded that there were more similarities between homosexual and heterosexual male fantasies. Price et al. (1985) reported that among homosexual males “unspecified sexual activity with other men”, “oral sex” and “sex with another man not previously involved with” were common fantasies. Interestingly, heterosexual males also demonstrated similar fantasies, e.g. oral sex, sex with strangers and group sex. In another study, Keating and Over (1990) recruited a sample of 42 heterosexual men and 40 homosexual men from a genito-urinary clinic. The participants were asked to rate 53 sexual fantasies in terms of how arousing these were for them. Both heterosexual and homosexual men were much more aroused by, and made much more use of, same-orientation than opposite-orientation fantasies.

Bearing in mind the possible bias in recruiting from a sexual health clinic, the authors emphasise that the therapist needs to be able to identify the patients’ current fantasies. As can be seen most of these studies come from developed countries.

Wilson (1978, 1988) developed, and Wilson and Lang (1981) described, further development and validation of, the “Sex Fantasy Questionnaire” (SFQ). The SFQ is a 40-item self-report measure that assesses four types of sexual fantasies: Exploratory, Intimate, Impersonal and Sadomasochistic. The SFQ is an unusual development in self-report measures in that it begins with a wide variety of detailed items and has established the four types by factor analysis rather in the tradition of personality testing. It is well validated and has been used in normal samples (in Western and Japanese samples), non-clinical paraphilic samples and sexual offenders (Gosselin & Wilson, 1980; Iwawaki & Wilson, 1983; Wilson, 1997; Baumgartner et al., 2002; Plaud & Bigwood, 2002). For example, Gosselin and Wilson (1980) used the questionnaire with men belonging to various fetishistic clubs (to tap unconventional interests) and found that controls and individuals with unusual sexual interests had similar levels of intimate and exploratory fantasies.

In view of these findings, and the dearth of work on sexual fantasy among homosexuals in developing countries, we decided to extend the use of the SFQ in a community sample of gay men and an equal number of heterosexual men in Mumbai, India. This is the first ever study of sexual fantasy among gay men in India.

Method

Participants

These were 30 heterosexual and 30 homosexual men of Indian ethnic origin recruited from Mumbai, one of the largest metropolitan cities in India, situated in the state of Maharashtra. The homosexual sample was approached using a purposive
snowball method. An equal number of heterosexual men were approached through direct contact. Both groups were recruited largely from educational institutions through direct personal contact initially by R.B. and a snowball approach. There were no refusals. Participants were not remunerated for taking part and were fully aware that they would be taking part in a study about sexual attitudes and behaviour.

Ethical approval was obtained by R.B. from the local Ethics Committee. All the participants were approached using personal contacts and one of the implicit inclusion criteria was their knowledge of English so that they could answer the questionnaire and return it to R.B.

**Measures**

A general demographic details questionnaire asked subjects their age, marital status (single or married), occupation (most were students, see Results section), and whether or not they had a steady sexual partner at the moment regardless of their sexual orientation. Additional questions with Likert-type response formats (these were coded categorically) were:

(i) sexual satisfaction if they had a steady partner, ranging from “Not at all satisfied” (0) to “Totally satisfied” (5);
(ii) overall rating of sex life, ranging from “Not at all satisfactory” (0) to “Totally satisfactory” (5);
(iii) number of weekly orgasms (categories “0–1”, “2–3”, “4–5”, “6–7”, and “8 +” to be checked);
(iv) overall rating of sex drive, ranging from “Very low” (0) to “Very high” (5);
(v) number of lifetime sexual partners (defined as intercourse) with response to checked from “None”, “1–2”, “3–10”, “11–50” or “50 +”;
(vi) rating of upbringing as regards matters of sex, ranging from “Very restrictive” (0) to “Very permissive” (5); and
(vii) level of self-perceived sexual inhibition, ranging from “Very inhibited” (0) to “Very uninhibited” (5).

Sexual fantasy was assessed by the Wilson Sex Fantasy Questionnaire (SFQ) (Wilson, 1997). With this instrument, participants estimate the frequency with which they favour each of 40 themes, ranging from normal to variant sexual interests, under headings of “Daytime fantasies”, “Fantasies during intercourse or masturbation”, “Dreams whilst asleep”, “Would like to do in reality”, and “Have done in reality”. For each of these categories, there is a 6-point response scale, ranging from never (0) to regularly (5). Respondents also list the number of themes they find most exciting in fantasy and in reality.

Interest in each theme is calculated as the sum of responses over all five contexts. The summed “interest” scores are averaged to give scores representing four content categories (each encompassing 10 items) established by factor analysis (Wilson, 1997): Intimate (e.g. “Having intercourse with a loved partner”), Exploratory (e.g.
“Participating in an orgy”), Impersonal (e.g. “Using objects for stimulation”), and Sadomasochistic (e.g. “Being whipped or spanked”). Libido is calculated as the total fantasy output, i.e. the mean of all of the above “interest” variables. Those who are on the high side of all or most of the fantasy subtypes are also high on the general factor of libido which is linked to orgasm frequency, number of partners and rated sex drive (Wilson, 1978).

Analysis

Finally, following Waisman et al. (2003) we also computed a variance-quotient (VQ) score. This was calculated for each subject by adding together their scores on the Impersonal (fetishistic) and Sadomasochistic categories and expressing them as a ratio of the sum of their Intimate and Exploratory fantasies, thus VQ = (Imp + SM)/(Int + Expl). The VQ provides an index of variant sexual preferences based on the relative frequency of “variant/paraphilic” versus “conventional” sexual interests (higher scores representing “variant/paraphilic” interests).

Results

Participant characteristics

Independent samples t-test showed a significant age difference between the groups, t(58) = -2.39, p = 0.020, with gay men being older (mean = 23.66, SD = 2.84) than heterosexual men (mean = 21.86, SD = 2.96). Given the high preponderance of students in both the groups, occupational status was dichotomised into “student” and “other” (made up of professional and service occupations) to maximise the number of cases for \( \chi^2 \) analysis. Significantly more heterosexuals were students (N = 28) than were homosexuals (N = 16), \( \chi^2 = 12.27, p < 0.001 \). In the current study the mean scores of presumed heterosexuals and homosexuals are presented in Table II and not surprisingly show greater homosexual interest in the homosexual group. Chi-square analysis also revealed that there were no significant group differences in whether respondents had a steady partner or not, \( \chi^2(1) = 1.11, p = 0.292 \) (10 heterosexuals having a steady partner compared with 14 homosexuals) and the assumptions for chi-square were violated for analysis of marital status so are not presented, although all of the heterosexuals, and 25 homosexuals, reported being single.

Variables regarding sexual history and satisfaction were initially categorised (see Method) but did not fulfil the requirements for \( \chi^2 \) analysis and were converted to continuous variables and analysed using independent samples t-tests (see Table I for man scores).

For respondents that had a steady partner, there were no significant group differences in overall sexual satisfaction with these partners: t(22) = 0.382, p = 0.706. There were no significant group differences in overall rating of sex drive: t(57) = -0.07, p = 0.287, level of restrictiveness about sex drive: t(57) = -1.07, p = 0.287, level of restrictiveness about sex during upbringing: t(55) = -0.98, p = 0.328, or overall rating of self-perceived sexual inhibition: t(54) = -1.95, p = 0.056.
However, there was a significant group difference in overall rating of sex life: $t(45.70) = -3.09, p = 0.003$ (unequal variances assumed), with gay men reporting being more satisfied than heterosexual men, a significant group difference in number of self-reported weekly orgasms: $t(43.37) = -2.19, p = 0.033$ (unequal variances assumed), with gay men reporting more than heterosexual men, and a significant group difference in number of lifetime sexual partners: $t(57) = -6.70, p < 0.001$, with gay men reporting more than heterosexual men.

Regarding actual orientation as noted above, analysis of the responses to Theme 9 on the SFQ ("Homosexual activity") confirmed that the gay men recruited for the present study had greater (homosexual) responses on all five response categories (comprising sexual feelings, motivation and behavioural indices – see Table II, no statistical analyses of these are presented as they are covered by the summed interest score). Homosexual men scored significantly higher than heterosexual men in the overall summed “interest” compared for homosexual activity $t(34.37) = 26.19, p < 0.001$ (unequal variances assumed). Interestingly, among heterosexual men there was a significant difference between responses to conducting homosexual activity in reality versus fantasy “would like to do in reality,” paired $t(29) = 2.40, p = 0.023$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I. Mean (SD) responses for sexual demographic variables.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterosexual men</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual satisfaction with steady partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of weekly orgasms$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of sex drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of sexual partners$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upbringing regarding sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of self-perceived sexual inhibition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$The modal response category for number of weekly orgasms was 1 (meaning 0 – 1 orgasms) for heterosexual men and 3 (meaning 4 – 5 orgasms) for gay men.

$^b$The modal response category for number of sexual partners was 1 (meaning “None”) for heterosexual men and 4 (meaning 11 – 50) for gay men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II. Mean (SD) scores across response category for “Homosexual activity” theme (number 9) of the SFQ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterosexual men</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytime fantasies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasies during intercourse/masturbation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasies during sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have done in reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to do in reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall summed interest score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sexual fantasy**

For sexual fantasy measures (see Table III), there were significant group differences for exploratory, \( t(41.141) = -4.525, \ p < 0.0001 \) (unequal variances assumed), intimate, \( t(58) = -9.092, \ p < 0.001 \), and impersonal, \( t(52.569) = -4.611, \ p < 0.0001 \) (unequal variances assumed) categories, and for libido scores, \( t(51.507) = -6.551, \ p < 0.001 \) (unequal variances assumed), with gay men scoring higher than heterosexual men. There were no significant group differences for sadomasochistic category: \( t(39.590) = -1.992, \ p = 0.062 \) (unequal variances assumed) or for VQ scores, \( t(58) = -0.245, \ p = 0.807 \), indicating both groups of men had relatively “non-paraphilic” sexual interests.

The modal theme (most frequently occurring) that heterosexual respondents found most exciting in fantasy was 2 (“Having intercourse with a loved partner”) and most exciting in reality was 40 (“Kissing passionately”) and most exciting in reality was 36 (“Having sex with someone of a difference race”).

**Associations between fantasy measures, age and sexual variables**

For heterosexual men, there were no significant associations between age and any sexual fantasy measure (all alpha values for Person’s \( r \) were > 0.05). In gay men, there were significant positive associations between age and the exploratory category scores: \( r = 0.382, \ N = 30, \ p = 0.037 \), and libido scores: \( r = 0.367, \ N = 30, \ p = 0.046 \), and no other significant associations (all \( p > 0.05 \)).

Spearman’s correlations were computed between the sexual fantasy and additional sexual variables. In heterosexual men, there were significant positive associations between number of weekly orgasms and number of lifetime sexual partners: \( r = 0.533, \ N = 28, \ p = 0.004 \), level of sexual restrictiveness during upbringing: \( r = 0.566, \ N = 27, \ p = 0.002 \), exploratory category scores: \( r = 0.504, \ N = 28, \ p = 0.006 \), intimate category scores: \( r = 0.514, \ N = 29, \ p = 0.005 \), impersonal category scores: \( r = 0.503, \ N = 28, \ p = 0.006 \), sadomasochistic category scores: \( r = 0.456, \ N = 28, \ p = 0.015 \), libido: \( r = 0.667, \ N = 28, \ p < 0.001 \), and VQ scores: \( r = 0.427, \ N = 28, \ p = 0.023 \). There were significant positive correlations between overall rating of sex drive and level of sexual restrictiveness during upbringing: \( r = 0.593, \ N = 27, \)

### Table III. Mean (SD) sexual fantasy scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Heterosexual men</th>
<th>Gay men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimate category</td>
<td>2.80 (2.11)</td>
<td>6.91 (4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory category</td>
<td>8.03 (3.14)</td>
<td>14.84 (2.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal category</td>
<td>3.17 (2.29)</td>
<td>6.48 (3.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadomasochistic category</td>
<td>0.38 (0.64)</td>
<td>0.95 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libido score</td>
<td>3.59 (1.73)</td>
<td>7.30 (2.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ score</td>
<td>0.31 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level of self-perceived sexual inhibition: $r = 0.691$, $N = 26$, $p < 0.001$, exploratory category scores: $r = 0.444$, $N = 29$, $p = 0.016$, and sadomasochistic category scores: $r = 0.395$, $N = 29$, $p = 0.034$. Significant positive associations were also found between number of lifetime sexual partners and impersonal category scores: $r = 0.399$, $N = 29$, $p = 0.032$, and VQ scores: $r = 0.517$, $N = 29$, $p = 0.004$.

Finally, in heterosexual men there were significant positive associations between level of sexual restrictiveness during upbringing and level of self-perceived sexual inhibition: $r = 0.651$, $N = 26$, $p < 0.001$, sadomasochistic category scores: $r = 0.396$, $N = 27$, $p = 0.041$, and libido: $r = 0.385$, $N = 27$, $p = 0.047$. No other associations were significant (all $p > 0.05$).

In gay men, Spearman’s correlations revealed significant negative associations between level of sexual satisfaction with steady partners (for those respondents that had them) and impersonal category scores: $r = -0.584$, $N = 14$, $p = 0.028$, and VQ scores: $r = -0.540$, $N = 14$, $p = 0.046$. There were also significant positive associations between overall rating of sex life and exploratory category scores: $r = 0.412$, $N = 30$, $p = 0.024$, intimate category scores: $r = 0.456$, $N = 30$, $p = 0.011$, and libido: $r = 0.386$, $N = 30$, $p = 0.035$. Number of weekly orgasms was significantly positively correlated with overall rating of sex drive: $r = 0.761$, $N = 30$, $p < 0.001$. Finally, significant positive correlations were observed between number of lifetime sexual partners and level of self-perceived sexual inhibition: $r = 0.782$, $N = 30$, $p < 0.001$, and exploratory category scores: $r = 0.366$, $N = 30$, $p = 0.047$. There were no other significant associations (all $p > 0.05$).

**Discussion**

Before we discuss the findings some limitations of the study need to be considered. Naturally, these opportunistic sampling methods introduce the possibility of self-selection biases in the study. The homosexual men participating in this study may be open and comfortable with their sexualities and thus willing to provide more detailed information of their sexual fantasies, as may heterosexual volunteers. Nonetheless, previous research in Western samples indicates that although there are some quantitative differences between individuals who volunteer for sex research studies and those who do not (in personality and sexual history variable) the overall effect sizes are small and do not constitute major confounders (Dunne et al., 1997).

However, as there is no such data for participation in sex research studies in the Indian sub-continent, and the real possibility of self-selection biases operating in sexual orientation studies, we cannot exclude that these may have had some influence on the results presented here. In no way can the sample be seen as truly representative of homosexuals in India. The heterosexual sample was selected using a different approach although through direct contact. This again mars the generalisability of findings. Secondly, the questionnaire was in English as were all the responses, again pointing toward difficulties in generalising the findings. However, these findings can be taken as representative of an English speaking, metropolitan group of homosexual and heterosexual men. Thirdly, the numbers are small therefore again there are problems in generalising these findings or applying these to other gay samples in
India. In addition it must be emphasised that the SFQ is being used for the first time in this setting and the findings need to be replicated before any further assumptions are made. Overall, this study should be viewed as an important yet a preliminary one.

Satisfaction with sex life

Those who had steady sex partners were sexually satisfied. This may reflect cultural expectations. This was true for both homosexual and heterosexual men indicating that a regular source and availability of sex made them feel better. There remains a problem in that we did not explore the quality of the couple relationship so it is difficult to be certain about the quality of sexual relationship within this context of overall relationship. All this measure does, is to tell us that they were satisfied and this is how this must be read. Whilst there appeared to be no differences in self-reported sexual drive across the two groups, gay men reported a higher frequency of weekly orgasms and a higher number of lifetime partners. This may partly reflect the young age of the sample, but is consistent with previous work showing higher sexual partner rates among gay men (Craib et al., 2000). Interestingly, work from a “mating psychology” perspective shows that whilst gay men have a greater number of sexual partners than heterosexual men, this is not due to an underlying psychological difference in the preference for casual sex and sexual novelty (or “sociosexuality”) between these groups of men (Bailey et al., 1994). Rather, it may reflect opportunistic and structural differences, such as the willingness of other gay men to engage in non-committal sex, and the constraining influences of women’s sexual preferences (for, on average, longer-term and committed sexual relationships) on heterosexual men (Craib et al., 2000).

Again, young age could explain equal levels of restrictiveness across the two groups. Bullough (1976) had suggested that in sex-negative cultures (which see sex as a negative activity) the function of sexual activity is procreation and not pleasure. Traditionally it had been thought that Hindu women enjoyed sex much more than men (Bullough, 1976) but social, political and cultural changes led to the establishment of patriarchy which changed the way sex was seen. It will be of interest to link the levels of patriarchy with acceptance of homosexuality (Bullough, 1979).

Upbringing and sexual pleasure

Heterosexual men reported a significant positive association between number of weekly orgasms and number of lifetime sexual partners, indicating that regular availability of partners increases the number of orgasms. These were also associated with sexual restrictiveness in upbringing confirming the culture as relatively sex-negative where restriction does not reduce sex drive. Obviously levels of restrictive upbringing were likely to be linked with levels of self-perceived inhibition, which indeed was the case. In a culture where homosexual behaviour is still illegal homosexual men were reporting more satisfaction in the overall rating of sexual life. However, both groups reported homosexual fantasies “during daytime” and “during sex”, and more heterosexuals had “done it in reality” than those “wanting to do it”,
indicating that some same-sex acts remain a common activity even among heterosexual men in spite of its illegal status. This needs to be explored further to determine perceptions and behaviour, which could be constructed as bisexual. We did not ask the duration or degree of same sex activity in heterosexuals.

**Sexual fantasy**

Gay men scored higher than heterosexual men on areas of exploratory, intimate and impersonal sexual fantasies, which could be seen as a reflection of their life style. These are the first to examine the gender-irrelevant content of sexual fantasies among gay men compared to previous work which has focused more on the level of male versus female content in the fantasies of these groups (Masters & Johnson, 1979; Bailey et al., 1994).

A previous study on coming out in south Asian gay men by Bhugra (1997) had found that fear of being found out was reported by nearly three-quarters, thus the true level of acknowledgement of fantasies, which may well be seen as odd or abnormal, may further complicate their responses.

Interestingly, there were no differences across the two groups in fantasy of the sadomasochistic variety. The patterns of sexual activity also varied among gay men. Those who were sexually satisfied with their partners were less likely to have impersonal fantasies, which again is self-evident. However, our findings also support the observations by Masters and Johnson (1979) and Price et al. (1985) that the top fantasy categories for gay men were not dissimilar from those of heterosexual men. It would be useful to explore the role of culture in formulating fantasies in future studies.

In summary, the present investigation needs to be taken as a pilot study and as forming the basis for a larger study to explore bisexual behaviour and fantasies using qualitative as well as quantitative methods. Overall, gay men score higher on certain types of conventional sexual fantasies compared to heterosexual men, although some of these might be related to other sexual demographic variables. Further work must also examine the sexual fantasies of Indian women – both heterosexual and homosexual.
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