

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Personality of Polish gay men and women

Marcin Kwiatkowski^{1:A,B,C,D,F}, Iwona Lidia Janicka^{2:A,C,D,E,F}

1: Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, Liverpool, UK

2: Institute of Psychology, University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland

BACKGROUND

Sexuality is a part of one's identity and personality that is shaped under the influence of biological and environmental factors and interactions with society. The results of research conducted so far and concerning the personality traits of gay men and women are not consistent, and only a small number of them concern the Polish population. Hence the objective of the present research was to provide personality profiles of men and women with different sexual orientations.

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

The participants ($N = 346$) included 84 gay women, 82 gay men, 95 heterosexual women and 85 heterosexual men. The following measures were used: a survey developed by the author, the Kinsey Scale, the EPQ-R (Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised) adapted by Brzozowski and Drwal (1995), and the Sixteen-factor Personality Questionnaire of Cattell adapted by Nowakowska (1970).

RESULTS

The results support the hypothesis that gay women and heterosexual men share similar personality traits, while gay men have more diverse traits, similar to the traits typical for heterosexual women and men. In particular, personalities of gay men are described by such traits as progressive attitude, independence, or willingness to take risks, which means traits linked to factor Q1. The highest values of that factor are observable in the case of gay men, as compared to gay women, and also in comparison with heterosexual men and women.

CONCLUSIONS

Sexual orientation is responsible for differences in personality traits of the studied group to a greater extent than their biological sex.

KEY WORDS

gays; lesbian; personality traits

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR – Prof. Iwona Lidia Janicka, Institute of Psychology, University of Lodz, 10/12 Smugowa Str., 91-433 Lodz, Poland, e-mail: i.janicka@wp.pl

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION – A: Study design · B: Data collection · C: Statistical analysis · D: Data interpretation · E: Manuscript preparation · F: Literature search · G: Funds collection

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE – Kwiatkowski, M., & Janicka, I. L. (2015). Personality of Polish gay men and women. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 3(4), 242–253.

RECEIVED 22.06.2015 · REVIEWED 30.07.2015 · ACCEPTED 03.10.2015 · PUBLISHED 25.11.2015

BACKGROUND

The attitudes towards same-sex oriented people in Poland are quite different than in countries such as the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Spain or the Netherlands. In those countries, gay men and women are not excluded in any way, but rather treated as equal to heterosexual people. In Poland, the topic of same-sex oriented people is undertaken reluctantly, shrouded in mystery, and anxiety, which contributes to the stigmatization of this social group. This is why Bojarska and Kowalczyk (2010) suggest that when researching non-heterosexual people, it is necessary to take into consideration the socio-cultural context, which allows for a fuller characterization of the problem.

A gap on this subject that started over the years is visible when analyzing the Polish and international psychological literature. It is very likely that the lack of modern psychological research on behaviors of people with same-sex desires is linked to a lack of convincing and conclusive results from previous studies and a strong domination of biological and medical sciences in this field (Sandfort, 2000). More and more Polish scientists (for example, Izdebski, 2012; Slany, Kowalska, & Smietana, 2005; Szukalski, 2005; Brzask, 2008; Majka-Rostek, 2008; Iniewicz, Mijas, & Grabski, 2012; Mizielinska, Abramowicz, & Stasinska, 2014) have started to study lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB)-identified people. The ongoing research concentrates on the issues related to the quality of life of gay men and women and on same-sex couples and same-sex families. There are just a few studies in the Polish literature that concentrate on the individual characteristics of gay men and women. Due to the small number of participants, the studies concerning personality traits and the studies presented below should be treated as initial pilot studies.

Personality is shaped by biological and environmental factors and by interactions with society, whereas sexuality is an inseparable part of one's identity and personality (Nay, McAuliffe, & Bauer, 2007; Rosenfels, 1971). It is widely accepted that the personality traits typical for gay men and women are noticeable even during their childhood. The boys show signs of mental feminization, whereas the girls show signs of masculinization (Lew-Starowicz & Lew-Starowicz, 1999; Lippa, 2000; Lippa & Arad, 1997). Moreover, research on personality during adulthood shows different traits responsible for the differences between gay and heterosexual people.

In comparison to heterosexual women, the typical features of gay women include: higher level of emotional coldness, self-confidence, non-conventionality, self-sufficiency, and a low level of emotional tension (Hopkins, 1969). Similarly, research conducted by Duckitt and Du Toit (2001) shows that non-conformism is a typical feature of gay women. Gay women

can also be described as more distrustful, eccentric, socially skillful, and self-sufficient, in comparison to heterosexual women. In the categories concerning gender, they show a lower level of traits traditionally perceived as feminine. This is also why they have, as compared to heterosexual women, lower values of the gentleness index, being less delicate, sensitive and prosocial, and higher values of the domination index, being stiff, difficult in interpersonal relationships, and introverted. In addition, typical features of gay women include a higher level of emotional stability, lower level of propensity for becoming excessively troubled, and emotional tensions.

Polish research conducted by Kulpa (2001) on a small group of gay women failed to confirm the previously obtained results. The following traits were found in the studied sample: submissiveness, subordination, strong sense of danger and insecurity, bashfulness, and timidity, as well as depressiveness, pessimism and inhibition, and, additionally, a strong sense of duty and a high level of conscientiousness, resulting from approaching life in a serious manner. Typical features of the studied sample of women also included a higher than average level of tenderness, delicacy, politeness, sensitivity, and concern with supposed and expected difficulties, which are interpreted as symptoms of emotional weakness. In the case of gay women, the following traits could be observed: high level of personality disharmony, internal discord, high level of emotional tension, being upset and insecure, low level of resilience to stress, need of compassion and acceptance of their social environment, and a propensity for negative self-evaluation. Immature personality, manifesting itself through a lack of emotional balance, irritability, impulsiveness, and impatience, is regarded as a symptomatic feature of the studied sample. Moreover, they were found to experience shifting moods from joyfulness to dissatisfaction, as well as deep sorrow. Kulpa (2001) also refers to the research conducted by Rosenhan and Seligman (1989), according to which gay women who reject their sexual orientation experience anxiety, depression, shame, and feelings of guilt and loneliness. Similar results among gay women who keep their sexual orientation concealed were obtained by Ghorayeb and Dalgarrondo (2010), and Meyer (2003).

Studies indicate that gay women who accept their sexual orientation do not manifest psychopathological symptoms, and are happy with their sexual orientation (Rosenhan & Seligman, 1989).

To sum up, it is possible to say that the research results concerning personality traits of gay women are not consistent. What should be noted is the difference concerning Polish and international research. Most Polish studies mention traits associated with disturbed personality, which is not the case in international studies. Thus, it is indicated that the accept-

ance of one's sexual orientation is significant for the correct development of one's personality.

In spite of the fact that the literature mentions male homosexuality more often than the female one, so far most of the research has been conducted outside of Poland, and only a small part of it concerns the personality traits of gay men. To the best of our knowledge the first researchers to become interested in the personality of gay men were Cattell and Morony (1962). They observed a high level of extraversion and feelings of guilt, as well as a weak superego among gay men. Further research showed that gay men, as compared to heterosexual men, are characterized by: a lower level of domination and a propensity for achieving success, a lower level of expansiveness, and a higher level of sensitivity, and confidence, accompanied by a lower level of resilience to stress, and also by a higher level of distrustfulness. Moreover, gay men were regarded as more neurotic, infantile, less emotionally stable and non-conventional; they manifested a tendency to be excessively troubled, to experience self-recrimination and emotional tensions, to have a low self-esteem, to be self-sufficient, and to experience a high level of emotional tension. It is simultaneously reported that gay men were more gentle and helpful towards other people than heterosexual men (Evans, 1970; Duckitt & Du Toit, 2001; Lippa, 2005). Gay men, compared to heterosexual men, scored higher on a non-conventionality scale, and lower on a submissiveness scale, which may suggest a general attitude of non-conformism or autonomy, likely shaped as a response to the social situation of stigmatization and discrimination of both male and female sexual minorities (Stringer & Grygier, 1976; Mondimore, 1996).

Research conducted with the Neo-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), as developed by Costa and McCrae, showed that the typical features of gay men, compared to heterosexual men, include a higher level of readiness to seek compromise, and openness to experiences (Lippa, 2005, 2008). In spite of the fact that people with same sex desires are sometimes identified as having a narcissistic personality (Rubinstein, 2010), studies showed that an equally high variance of that trait can be found in other populations (Moskowitz, Rieger, & Seal, 2009).

The self-perception of gay men is quite interesting. They selected negative adjectives to describe themselves, which may suggest difficulties with accepting their own personalities and a propensity for evaluation of oneself less favorably (in Pilecka, 1999). They perceived themselves as individuals who cannot persistently perform difficult tasks, and who get distracted easily. In addition, they accepted the fact that they tend to avoid integration with a group and to stay away from situations in which they have to compete against other people, or to act aggressively. They also experienced fear of becoming emotional-

ly committed. Gay men manifested difficulties with struggling to achieve distant objectives, and they avoided tasks requiring reliable effort and self-discipline. Simultaneously, they were aware of their own awkwardness in terms of struggling with the difficulties that are a part of real life, and of a tendency to seek refuge in the world of dreams.

In their case, bashfulness, and a propensity for low self-evaluation, result in difficulties with interpersonal relationships. Moreover, they score low on traits traditionally considered to be masculine, such as ambition, assertiveness, the ability to achieve objectives by resorting to violent means, and the ability to make decisions quickly. As for the results concerning their ideal personality, the highest level was found for the need to persevere, paying attention to order, organizing and planning one's activities (Pilecka, 1999).

The topic of personality of gay men did not attract the interest of Polish researchers. This is why one ought to be very cautious when generalizing the results. It was said that "in the case of individuals with homosexual orientation, and that concerns men in particular, it is very frequent that the development of [their] personality is extended in time, full of conflicts, difficult, or even disturbed" (Lew-Starowicz & Lew-Starowicz, 1999, p. 45).

Personality is shaped under the influence of the opinions of society and interactions with society. This is why the attitudes of heterosexual people towards those attracted to the same sex are important. In Polish society, gay women are perceived in a less judgmental manner, and perceived with more tolerance than gay men (Kocaj, 2000). According to an assessment of the majority of heterosexual men, major features of a typical gay woman include independence, a high level of intelligence and being non-conventional (Pilecka, 1999). In addition, gay women excite heterosexual men (Kocaj, 2000). In turn, the image of an average gay man is ambivalent. A gay man is perceived as submissive, characterized by a lack of self-confidence, but simultaneously capable of acting regardless of the views and opinions of other people. According to heterosexual women, the typical features of a gay man include a high level of intelligence, being original and non-conventional. Moreover, gay men are seen as people who avoid the feelings and wishes of other people. According to men, a typical gay man does not have sufficient self-confidence, does not trust himself and his own abilities, yet, nevertheless, manifests a high level of intelligence and is non-conventional (Pilecka, 1999).

The persisting negative perception of gay men is linked to the ingrained conviction that they have actual or presumed female traits. Research also shows that men with female traits are less liked, and more avoided as co-workers, that they are considered to be boring and not very intelligent (Stotzer & Shih, 2012),

but to be also inferior, maladjusted and immature (Blashhil & Powlishta, 2009). Noticing female traits results in feeling of a threat to masculinity in the case of heterosexual men, which may result in aggressive behavior towards gay men (Stotzer & Shih, 2012). However, it needs to be pointed out that the negative assessment concerned not only the perceived female traits, but also the simple fact that a gay person is gay. Just for that reason, gay men were assessed negatively (Blashhil & Powlishta, 2009).

A critical or hostile attitude of society towards people with same-sex desires makes it difficult for personality to develop, which, ultimately, may result in its disintegration. It is only in a place "where homosexual people can enjoy a social environment which is encouraging or tolerant, and where they live in a world of their own institutions, organizations and forms of staying together, that their personality attains a higher level of harmony, integration and self-acceptance" (Lew-Starowicz & Lew-Starowicz, 1999, p. 45).

Previous studies, the majority of which were conducted outside of Poland, do not provide conclusive answers to the questions concerning differences and similarities of personality traits between people attracted to the same or opposite sex, and sometimes they even contradict each other (Cattell & Morony, 1962; Duckitt & Du Toit, 2001; Evans, 1970; Hopkins, 1969; Kulpa, 2001; Lippa, 2005, 2008; Lippa & Arad, 1997; Rosenhan & Seligman in Zimbardo, 2002; Rubinstein, 2010; Stringer & Grygier, 1976).

The inconsistent results of the abovementioned studies may be due to the differences in living conditions of gay men and women, as well as social and cultural factors that influence the attitudes towards LGB-identified people, thus influencing the development of a person with same sex desires. Due to social changes and more favorable attitudes towards same-sex oriented people in Polish society, we attempted to reassess the existing research on the personality of gay men and women. Hence the objective of this research was to assess the personality of Polish gay men and gay women.

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

Information about the study was posted on public Internet forums as well as on websites dedicated to Polish sexual minorities.

All those interested could participate through the website (a demographic survey and the personality questionnaire were posted online), or after having contacted the author, have the material e-mailed, and then return it to the provided e-mail address. Participation in the research was anonymous and voluntary. Of the received 478 sets of questionnaires, 132 were rejected due to the insufficient quantity of data required to conduct further analysis, or because they were only par-

tially filled out. Participants who identified as bisexual, and those under 18 years of age, were not included.

The data from 346 participants (179 women and 167 men) were used for the analyses.

The assignment to groups was based on the answer to the question concerning sexual orientation. The Heterosexual-Homosexual Kinsey Scale was used (in Mondimore, 1996; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953) to analyze the degree of compatibility of the declared sexual orientation and the way of defining one's sexual orientation by the participants. Using the Kinsey Scale 166 participants (82 men and 84 women) were selected who rated themselves as exclusively homosexual and 180 participants (85 men and 95 women) who rated themselves as exclusively heterosexual. A high degree of compatibility was found between the declared sexual orientation and the type of sexual behaviors (as indicated by the Heterosexual-Homosexual Kinsey Scale) among both men and women.

The correlation between the declared sexual orientation and the way of defining one's orientation on the Kinsey Scale was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 377.38$, $p = .001$). The age of the groups was compared with a single-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA). The analysis showed no differences between the groups ($F = 2.01$, $df = 3$, $p = .113$), which shows their homogeneity in terms of age. A similar number of participants (a large majority) in both the studied group and in the control group had a high school education or higher education.

No correlations were found between participants' education and their sexual orientation ($\chi^2 = 10.23$, $p > .05$).

MEASURES

The participants were asked about their demographic variables (sex, age and education), declaration concerning their sexual orientation, and its assessment with the Kinsey Scale (Mondimore, 1996). Personality was studied with the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised (EPQ-R) in the adaptation of Brzozowski and Drwal (1995), and also with the Sixteen-factor Personality Questionnaire of Cattell in the adaptation of Nowakowska (1970).

The Eysenck Questionnaire includes four scales: Neuroticism (N), Extraversion-Introversion (E), Psychoticism (P), and Lie (L). The internal compatibility (Cronbach's α) as well as absolute stability (r) in the case of the Neuroticism, Extroversion-Introversion, and Lie scales was between .72 and .84, whereas for the Psychoticism scale the coefficients were between .58 and .75 (Brzozowski & Drwal, 1995).

The Sixteen-factor Personality Questionnaire of Cattell was used as a multi-factor method, making it possible to verify the results of previous studies.

The Polish adaptation of this questionnaire consists of 305 questions, and additionally 3 buffer questions. The questionnaire is composed of 16 two-dimensional (positive and negative) personality factors (Nowakowska, 1970). As the adaptation conducted by Nowakowska originates from the 1970s, reliability analysis of the separate factors of the questionnaire was conducted (Cronbach α). The analysis was conducted on 284 individuals (72 heterosexual men, 87 gay men, 53 gay women, and 72 heterosexual women). The results indicate that the following factors had a satisfactory reliability: B: Reasoning ($\alpha = .74$), factor C: Emotional Stability ($\alpha = .73$), factor F: Liveliness ($\alpha = .74$), factor H: Social Boldness ($\alpha = .84$), O: Apprehension ($\alpha = .86$), Q1: Openness to Change ($\alpha = .71$), and Q4: Tension ($\alpha = .81$). The reliability of factor A: Warmth was also relatively satisfactory ($\alpha = .69$ for the entire group, .69 for heterosexual men, .73 for gay men, .66 for gay women, and .65 for heterosexual women). For the purpose of further statistical analysis, only those factors were used. The remaining factors were not subjected to further analysis because of the low reliability: E: Dominance ($\alpha = .52$), G: Rule-Consciousness ($\alpha = .56$), I: Sensitivity ($\alpha = .64$), L: Vigilance (Cronbach $\alpha = .48$), M: Abstractedness ($\alpha = .51$), N: Privatness ($\alpha = .20$), Q2: Self-Reliance ($\alpha = .58$), and Q3: Perfectionism ($\alpha = .38$).

RESULTS

In order to analyze the differences concerning personality traits between gay and heterosexual participants, a single-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

The analysis revealed that the differences between the groups concern only two variables from the Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R) – the Psychoticism scale ($F = 3.73, p = .012$) and the Lie scale ($F = 4.84, p = .003$), and five factors from the Sixteen-factor Questionnaire of Cattell: factor A: Warmth ($F = 3.75, p = .011$), factor F: Liveliness ($F = 3.17, p = .024$), factor O: Apprehension ($F = 3.34, p = .019$), factor Q1: Openness to Change ($F = 22.22, p = .001$), and factor Q4: Tension ($F = 3.41, p = .018$).

In order to conduct a more detailed comparison between the groups for those variables, *post hoc* analyses with Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test were conducted. The results are presented in the consecutive Tables. Personality traits of gay and heterosexual women (Table 3) and gay and heterosexual men (Table 4) were compared.

Significantly higher results on the Lie scale among gay women than among heterosexual men and women can be linked to the fact that gay women, due to their feelings of exclusion and lack of social acceptance, experience the need for social approval much more than heterosexual individuals do, and that they may manifest a tendency to present themselves in a more positive light more frequently.

Gay women, in comparison with heterosexual women, had lower results on the factor A: Warmth, which means that their traits may include emotional coldness and stiffness in contact with other people. They also obtained higher results in the case of factor Q1: Openness to Change ($p = .007$), which shows a higher level of progressive attitude, their independence in terms of thinking and actions, and also inclinations to take risks.

Table 1
Personality traits measured with EPQ-R

EPQ-R	Group	N	M	SD	df	F	p
Neuroticism	GM	82	12.57	5.61	3	1.78	.319
	HM	85	11.91	6.54			
	GW	84	13.04	5.98			
	HW	95	13.61	5.83			
Extraversion	GM	82	13.74	5.95	3	0.76	.518
	HM	85	14.64	5.22			
	GW	84	14.63	5.21			
	HW	95	13.61	6.42			
Psychoticism	GM	82	8.51	4.11	3	3.74	.012
	HM	85	10.38	4.72			
	GW	84	9.39	3.81			
	HW	95	8.39	4.51			
Lie	GM	82	8.08	4.14	3	4.48	.003
	HM	85	7.26	3.69			
	GW	84	9.20	4.26			
	HW	95	7.06	3.75			

Note. GM – gay men; HM – heterosexual men; GW – gay women; HW – heterosexual women.

Table 2
 Personality traits measured with Cattell's 16 Personality Factors Test

16 PF	Group	N	M	SD	df	F	p
A: Warmth	GM	82	20.11	7.04	3	3.75	.011
	HM	85	18.81	6.54			
	GW	84	17.66	6.16			
	HW	95	20.35	6.17			
B: Reasoning	GM	82	16.11	3.51	3	1.93	.123
	HM	85	15.73	3.90			
	GW	84	14.95	3.70			
	HW	95	16.06	3.01			
C: Emotional Stability	GM	82	22.04	6.73	3	2.09	.101
	HM	85	20.59	7.65			
	GW	84	19.66	7.01			
	HW	95	19.80	6.20			
F: Liveliness	GM	82	19.00	7.51	3	3.17	.024
	HM	85	21.99	6.43			
	GW	84	21.18	6.39			
	HW	95	19.87	6.92			
H: Social boldness	GM	82	23.20	10.09	3	0.07	.972
	HM	85	22.77	9.79			
	GW	84	22.46	10.29			
	HW	95	22.67	10.16			
O: Apprehension	GM	82	19.26	9.65	3	3.34	.019
	HM	85	17.73	10.53			
	GW	84	20.67	9.84			
	HW	95	22.21	9.29			
Q1: Openness to Change	GM	82	30.23	5.40	3	22.22	.001
	HM	85	24.13	6.77			
	GW	84	25.98	5.27			
	HW	95	22.93	7.23			
Q4: Tension	GM	82	17.70	7.78	3	3.41	.018
	HM	85	17.84	8.92			
	GW	84	18.76	8.87			
	HW	95	21.23	8.04			

Note. GM – gay men; HM – heterosexual men; GW – gay women; HW – heterosexual women.

Moreover, the personality traits of gay men, and heterosexual men (Table 5) and gay women (Table 6), were compared.

It was revealed that gay men in comparison with heterosexual men have lower results on the scale of Psychoticism ($p = .033$), which can cause them to be perceived as more warm and friendly, and which may determine their stronger propensities for becoming emotionally agitated, and also for compassion and perceiving them as more cordial and friendly. The major traits of gay men also include lower (than those of heterosexual men) results concerning factor F: Liveliness ($p = .027$), which indicates a lower level of their expansiveness and enthusiasm in social situations, and the results concerning factor Q1: Openness to Change makes it possible to assess them as individ-

uals with a higher, as compared to heterosexual men and women, creativity, dynamism and risk-taking scores ($p < .001$), with a more progressive attitude, independent in terms of thinking and actions, and also manifesting inclinations to take risks, in comparison with heterosexual men, as well as with heterosexual women ($p = .001$). Another difference between heterosexual women and gay men was factor Q4 ($p = .029$). The lower results among gay men shows their smaller difficulties with becoming adjusted, and lower level of emotional tension and excitability, in comparison with heterosexual women.

A comparison between the personality traits of gay men and women is presented in Table 7.

The results show a statistically significant difference between the studied groups concerning factor

Table 3
Personality of gay women and heterosexual women

Trait	Group	N	M	SD	p
Psychoticism	GW	84	9.39	3.81	.447
	HW	95	8.39	4.51	
Lie	GW	84	9.20	4.26	.004
	HW	95	7.06	3.75	
A: Warmth	GW	84	17.66	6.16	.031
	HW	95	20.35	6.17	
F: Liveliness	GW	84	21.18	6.39	.581
	HW	95	19.87	6.92	
O: Apprehension	GW	84	20.67	9.84	.726
	HW	95	22.21	9.29	
Q1: Openness to change	GW	84	25.98	5.27	.007
	HW	95	22.93	7.23	
Q4: Tension	GW	84	18.76	8.87	.208
	HW	95	21.23	8.04	

Note. GW – gay women; HW – heterosexual women.

Table 4
Personality of gay women and heterosexual men

Trait	Group	N	M	SD	p
Psychoticism	GW	84	9.39	3.81	.467
	HM	85	10.38	4.72	
Lie	GW	84	9.20	4.26	.011
	HM	85	7.26	3.69	
A: Warmth	GW	84	17.66	6.16	.955
	HM	85	18.18	6.54	
F: Liveliness	GW	84	21.18	6.39	.872
	HM	85	21.99	6.43	
O: Apprehension	GW	84	20.67	9.84	.218
	HM	85	17.73	10.53	
Q1: Openness to change	GW	84	25.98	5.27	.232
	HM	85	24.13	6.77	
Q4: Tension	GW	84	18.76	8.87	.896
	HM	85	17.84	8.92	

Note. GW – gay women; HW – heterosexual men; p – p-value – Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test.

Q1: Openness to Change ($p = .001$). Gay men had higher scores in the case of factor Q1: Openness to Change, which shows higher levels of their progressive attitude, independence in terms of thinking and actions, and also inclinations to take risks, in comparison with gay women.

A comparison between personality traits in the groups of heterosexual women and men is presented in Table 8.

Heterosexual men obtained higher scores on the scale of Psychoticism in comparison with heterosex-

ual women ($p = .017$). Their typical features included a lower ability to become emotionally agitated, show compassion and distrust. They also could be perceived as emotionally colder, impersonal and unfriendly. In addition, men with a lower level of factor O: Apprehension ($p = .014$) may be seen as more self-confident and determined in comparison with females, who had a higher level of concern, loneliness and propensity for self-recrimination. The difference in the case of factor Q4, indicating lower results among heterosexual women, shows their greater difficulties with

Table 5
Personality of gay and heterosexual men

Trait	Group	N	M	SD	p
Psychoticism	GM	82	8.51	4.11	.033
	HM	85	10.38	4.72	
Lie	GM	82	8.08	4.14	.565
	HM	85	7.26	3.69	
A: Warmth	GM	82	20.11	7.04	.225
	HM	85	18.18	6.54	
F: Liveliness	GM	82	19.00	7.51	.027
	HM	85	21.99	6.43	
O: Apprehension	GM	82	19.26	9.65	.753
	HM	85	17.73	10.53	
Q1: Openness to change	GM	82	30.23	5.40	.001
	HM	85	24.13	6.77	
Q4: Tension	GM	82	17.70	7.78	.999
	HM	85	17.84	8.92	

Note. GM – gay men; HM – heterosexual men; p – p-value – Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test.

Table 6
Personality of gay men and heterosexual women

Trait	Group	N	M	SD	p
Psychoticism	GM	82	8.51	4.11	.998
	HW	95	8.39	4.51	
Lie	GM	82	8.08	4.14	.367
	HW	95	7.06	3.75	
A: Warmth	GM	82	20.11	7.04	.995
	HW	95	20.35	6.17	
F: Liveliness	GM	82	19.00	7.51	.833
	HW	95	19.87	6.92	
O: Apprehension	GM	82	19.26	9.65	.193
	HW	95	22.21	9.29	
Q1: Openness to Change	GM	82	30.23	5.40	.001
	HW	95	22.93	7.23	
Q4: Tension	GM	82	17.70	7.78	.029
	HW	95	21.23	8.04	

Note. GM – gay men; HW – heterosexual women; p – p-value – Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test.

becoming adjusted, and also high levels of emotional tension, excitability and impatience in comparison with men ($p = .039$).

SUMMARY

The objective of the study was to assess personality profiles of individuals with different sexual orientations. Due to the applied psychometric methods, the analysis included 12 personality traits, 4 from the

EPQ-R, and 8 from the Sixteen-factor Personality Questionnaire of Cattell.

The results comparing the groups of gay women and men and heterosexual women and men indicate that the largest number of similar personality traits is found among gay women and heterosexual men. It is possible to claim that a major characteristic of gay women is having personality traits similar to those observable among heterosexual men. In turn, gay men manifest more polarized traits, and those traits are similar to those of heterosexual women and men.

Table 7
Personality of gay women and gay men

Trait	Group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
Psychoticism	GW	84	9.39	3.81	.574
	GM	82	8.51	4.11	
Lie	GW	84	9.20	4.26	.289
	GM	82	8.08	4.14	
A: Warmth	GW	84	17.66	6.16	.074
	GM	82	20.11	7.04	
F: Liveliness	GW	84	21.18	6.39	.172
	GM	82	19.00	7.51	
O: Apprehension	GW	84	20.67	9.84	.790
	GM	82	19.26	9.65	
Q1: Openness to Change	GW	84	25.98	5.27	.001
	GM	82	30.23	5.40	
Q4: Tension	GW	84	18.76	8.87	.849
	GM	82	17.70	7.78	

Note. GW – gay women; GM – gay men; *p* – *p*-value – Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test.

Table 8
Personality of heterosexual women and men

Trait	Group	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>p</i>
Psychoticism	HW	95	8.39	4.51	.017
	HM	85	10.38	4.72	
Lie	HW	95	7.06	3.75	.988
	HM	85	7.26	3.69	
A: Warmth	HW	95	20.35	6.17	.119
	HM	85	18.18	6.54	
F: Liveliness	HW	95	19.87	6.92	.170
	HM	85	21.99	6.43	
O: Apprehension	HW	95	22.21	9.29	.014
	HM	85	17.73	10.53	
Q1: Openness to Change	HW	95	22.93	7.23	.577
	HM	85	24.13	6.77	
Q4: Tension	HW	95	21.23	8.04	.039
	HM	85	17.84	8.92	

Note. HW – heterosexual women; HM – heterosexual men; *p* – *p*-value – Tukey’s honestly significant difference (HSD) test.

Gay men are more cordial, and more friendly, than heterosexual men, which makes them more woman-like, but they also differ from heterosexual women, as the former manifest smaller difficulties with becoming adjusted, and a lower level of emotional tension and excitability, which makes them more similar to heterosexual men.

The largest number of differences, even though they concern solely the three dimensions of personality, could be observed between gay and heterosexual women, and also gay and heterosexual men.

In that case, the common polarizing factor was Q1: Openness to Change, which was higher among gay men and women.

The following traits ought to be regarded as typical for gay men and women (in particular for gay men): dynamism, creativity, independence or risk-taking, which are the traits connected to factor Q1. It has the highest values among gay men in comparison with gay women, and also in comparison with heterosexual women and men (*p* = .001). That factor may be regarded as typical of gay women, because it has

significantly higher values than among heterosexual women ($p < .05$).

DISCUSSION

The analysis of personality traits showed that gay women as compared to heterosexual women and to men in general manifest a stronger propensity to present themselves in a more positive light and care more for society's approval. Moreover, gay women may have a higher level of emotional coldness, and also of stiffness in contacts with other people. These results support the previous research according to which gay women experience a strong need to be accepted and recognized by their social environment (Kulpa, 2001); their typical features also include a higher level of emotional coldness (Hopkins, 1969).

The differences between gay men and heterosexual men showed that gay men are more cordial and more friendly, that they manifest a stronger propensity for becoming emotionally agitated, and also to show compassion. In addition, gay men may manifest a lower level of expansiveness, and enthusiasm in social situations. The results of studies conducted before have also shown a greater level of sensitivity in gay men (Duckitt & Du Toit, 2001; Evans, 1970), lower expansiveness (Evans, 1970), and higher confidence (Duckitt & Du Toit, 2001; Evans, 1970).

Gay men may be described as more creative, independent, progressive, dynamic and not afraid to take risks, which makes them different from heterosexual men and women. Gay men show smaller difficulties with becoming adjusted, and also a lower level of emotional tension and excitability, which additionally makes them different from heterosexual women, but similar to heterosexual men.

We can see that gay and heterosexual men and women differ from each other concerning the degree of progressive attitude and independence in terms of actions and thoughts. Differences regarding those traits could also be observed between gay men and women. Gay men, in comparison with gay women, have a higher level of the abovementioned traits. Stringer and Grygier (1976) explain that it is connected to the general non-conformism and autonomy, typical of sexual minorities, which develops as a response to stigmatization and discrimination. The transparency of one's sexual orientation frequently requires surpassing the generally accepted patterns and behaviors, usually forcing men to be independent, and changed by non-conformism, whereas among women hiding their sexual orientation and adaptation to the officially prevailing rules is much easier. Jannin, Blanchard, Camperio-Ciani and Bancroft (2010) report that the idea of men's interest in same-sex partners generates more fears of moral and religious nature than that of women. Stigmatization

and discrimination are both connected with general stress, referred to as *minority stress*. This is a particular and additional stressor of a chronic character, and also one that is caused by social processes. Negative opinions from a part of the social environment result in psychological consequences. Concealing one's actual ego, monitoring one's behavior, clothes, manner of speaking, etc., which usually concerns gay men, results in a lack of self-acceptance and in low self-esteem (Meyer, 2003). These fears, and the lack of support from society and family, may result in abnormalities in the development of personality, and even in mental disorders. This is why mental health disorders occur more frequently among gay men and women than among heterosexual men and women (Ghorayeb & Dalgarrondo, 2010; Meyer, 2003).

It should be emphasized that there are qualitative differences between gay and heterosexual men, between gay and heterosexual women, but also similarities of their personality traits.

The present results indicate that gay men have fewer personality traits usually ascribed to men, and more of those ascribed to women, while it is the opposite for gay women – they have fewer female personality traits and more masculine ones. According to the commonly accepted patterns, women are perceived as more prosocial, more likeable and warm, whereas men are perceived as instrumental and concentrated on achievement (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Earlier research (Stringer & Grygier, 1976; Duckitt & Du Toit, 2001) showed that there are certain similarities in personality traits of gay men and heterosexual women, and also between gay women and heterosexual women on the scales of the Dynamic Personality Inventory.

Based on the obtained results, it is also possible to presume that similarities in personality traits between gay women and heterosexual men, between gay men and heterosexual women, as well as between gay women and gay men, are connected with the contemporary tendencies concerning the socio-cultural understanding of genders. Men and women function in a modern culture which is a mixture of traditional tasks and roles, and thus the new quality of masculinity and femininity develops in the direction of androgyny and gender egalitarianism.

The idea of gender egalitarianism is not supported in the present study by the results concerning heterosexual women and men, which show a polarization of traits into male and female ones. This may be linked to social and cultural convictions concerning men and women, the visible division of roles and expected behaviors in the group of heterosexual participants. That may also suggest that gender egalitarianism is more typical among gay people than among heterosexuals. These differences may also be the result of other determinants, perhaps resulting from biological conditions. Finally, it can be concluded that

sexual orientation determines personality traits of the studied sample more than sex does.

REFERENCES

- Blashhil, A. J., & Powlishta, K. K. (2009). The impact of sexual orientation and gender role on evaluations of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*, 160-173.
- Bojarska, K., & Kowalczyk, R. (2010). Homoseksualność i społeczeństwo [Homosexuality and society]. In: Z. Lew-Starowicz, & V. Skrzypulec (eds.), *Podstawy seksuologii* [The basics of sexology] (pp. 34-61). Warszawa: PZWL.
- Brzask, A. (2008). *Homoseksualizm u mężczyzn. Aspekty psychologiczne, psychiatryczne i ewolucyjne* [Men's homosexuality. Psychological, psychiatric and evolutionary aspects]. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Continuo.
- Brzozowski, P., & Drwal, R. L. (1995). *Kwestionariusz osobowości Eysencka. Polska adaptacja EPQ-R. Podręcznik* [Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. Polish Adaptation of the EPQ-R. Manual]. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP.
- Cattell, R. B., & Morony, J. H. (1962). The use of the 16PF in distinguishing homosexuals, normals, and general criminals. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26*, 531-540.
- Duckitt, J. H., & Du Toit, L. (2001). Personality profiles of homosexual men and women. *The Journal of Psychology, 123*, 497-505.
- Evans, R. B. (1970). Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire scores of homosexual men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34*, 212-215.
- Ghorayeb, D. B., & Dalgarrondo, P. (2010). Homosexuality: mental health and quality of life in a Brazilian socio-cultural context. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 57*, 496-500.
- Hopkins, J. H. (1969). The Lesbian Personality. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 115*, 1433-1436.
- Iniewicz, G., Mijas, M., & Grabski, B. (2012). *Wprowadzenie do psychologii LGB* [Introduction to LGB psychology]. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Continuo.
- Izdebski, Z. (2012). *Seksualność Polaków na początku XXI wieku. Studium badawcze* [Sexuality of the Poles at the beginning of the 21st century. Research study]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.
- Jannin, E. A., Blanchard, R., Camperio-Ciani, A., & Bancroft, J. (2010). Male homosexuality: Nature or Culture? *International Society for Sexual Medicine, 7*, 3245-3253.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders; Bloomington: Indiana University Press [First publication of Kinsey's Heterosexual-Homosexual Rating Scale. Discusses Kinsey Scale (pp. 636-659)].
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders; Bloomington: Indiana University Press [Discusses the Kinsey Scale and presents comparisons of male and female data (pp. 468-475)].
- Kocaj, P. (2000). Studenci wobec homoseksualizmu mężczyzn i kobiet [Students' attitudes towards male and female homosexuality]. *Problemy Rodziny, 2-3*, 73-76.
- Kulpa, A. (2001). Niektóre cechy osobowości homoseksualistek [Chosen personality traits of homosexual women]. *Problemy Rodziny, 4-6*, 99-103.
- Lew-Starowicz, Z., & Lew-Starowicz, M. (1999). *Homoseksualizm* [Homosexuality]. Warszawa: PZWL.
- Lippa, R. A. (2000). Gender related traits in gay men, lesbian women, and heterosexual men and women: the virtual identity of homosexual-heterosexual diagnosticity and gender diagnosticity. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 899-926.
- Lippa, R. A. (2005). Sexual orientation and personality. *Annual Review of Sex Research, 16*, 119-153.
- Lippa, R. A. (2008). Sex differences and sexual orientation differences in personality: Findings from the BBC Internet survey. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 37*, 173-187.
- Lippa, R. A., & Arad, S. (1997). The structure of sexual orientation and its relation to masculinity, femininity and gender diagnosticity: different for men and women. *Sex Roles, 37*, 187-208.
- Majka-Rostek, D. (2008). *Związki homoseksualne. Studium socjologiczne* [Same-sex relationships. Sociological study]. Warszawa: Difin.
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 674-697.
- Mizielinska, J., Abramowicz, M., & Stasinska, A. (2014). *Rodziny z wyboru w Polsce. Życie rodzinne osób nieheteroseksualnych* [Families of choice. The family lives of non-heterosexual people]. Warszawa: PAN.
- Mondimore, F. M. (1996). *A natural history of homosexuality*. London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Moskowitz, D. A., Rieger, G., & Seal, D. W. (2009). Narcissism, self-evaluations, and partner preferences among men who have sex with men. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 725-728.
- Nay, R., McAuliffe, L., & Bauer, M. (2007). Sexuality: from stigma, stereotypes and secrecy to coming out, communication and choice. *International Journal of Older People Nursing, 2*, 76-80.
- Nowakowska, M. (1970). Polska adaptacja 16-czynnikowego Kwestionariusza Osobowości R. B. Cattella [The Polish Adaptation of the Cattell's 16 Personality Factors Test]. *Psychologia Wychowawcza, 3*, 478-500.

- Pilecka, B. (1999). *Psychospołeczny kontekst homoseksualizmu* [The psychosocial context of homosexuality]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Radamsa.
- Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: a theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender and Society, 18*, 510-531.
- Rosenfels, P. (1971). *Homosexuality: the psychology of the creative process*. New York: Ninth Street Center.
- Rosenhan, D. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1989). *Abnormal Psychology* (2nd ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Rubinstein, G. (2010). Narcissism and self-esteem among homosexual and heterosexual male students. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 36*, 24-34.
- Sandfort, T. (2000). Homosexuality, psychology, and gay and lesbian studies. In: T. Sandford, J. Schuyf, J. W. Duyvendak, & J. Weeks (eds.), *Lesbian and gay studies. An introductory, interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 14-45). London: Sage Publications.
- Slany, K., Kowalska, B., & Smietana, M. (2005). *Homoseksualizm – perspektywa interdyscyplinarna* [Homosexuality – an interdisciplinary perspective]. Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.
- Stringer, P., & Grygier, T. (1976). Male homosexuality, psychiatric patient status, and psychological masculinity and femininity. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 5*, 15-27.
- Stotzer, R. L., & Shih, M. (2012). The relationship between masculinity and sexual prejudice in factors associated with violence against gay men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*, 136-142.
- Szukalski, P. (2005). Zachowania homoseksualne i postawy wobec homoseksualizmu. Analiza porównawcza Polski i krajów wysoko rozwiniętych [Homosexual behaviors and attitudes towards homosexuality. A comparative analysis of Poland and the highly developed countries]. In: K. Slany, B. Kowalska, & M. Smietana (eds.), *Homoseksualizm – perspektywa interdyscyplinarna* [Homosexuality – an interdisciplinary perspective] (pp. 74-103). Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.
- Zimbardo, P. G. (2002). *Psychologia i życie* [Psychology and life]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.