



Autogynephilia and inverted sex-partner roles in heterosexual men

Pilot survey report

July 2022

Jerzy Adam Kowalski, PhD
Institute of Sex Research, Warsaw

ABSTRACT. In the research on autogynephilia—the tendency of some men to respond with sexual arousal to the thought of being a woman—is an aspect that has been poorly studied; it is the role autogynephiles play in sexual acts (sex-partner roles; SPR). The pilot survey, using a specially designed SPR scale, shows a very strong correlation between the occurrence of autogynephilia and the tendency to fulfill passive SPR and the propensity to submissiveness in sexual relations, suggesting that these are elements (aspects) of a shared phenomenon. The passivism-submissiveness complex seems to be a wider entity because while almost all cases of autogynephilia entail passivism-submissiveness, the latter property can also occur in non-autogynephiles (also exclusively heterosexual); thus creating a category of persons that has not been described in the literature so far. Research results also suggest that the tendency to fulfill certain SPR is a quality independent of the sexual orientation of the individual.

KEYWORDS autogynephilia, transgenderism, sexual orientation, sex-partner roles, passivity-submissiveness complex

INTRODUCTION

In the end of 1980's, Blanchard (1989a, 1989b) introduced the concept of autogynephilia that he defined as the tendency of some men to respond with erotic arousal to the thought of themselves as women. According to the author, this property underlies all non-homosexual varieties of gender disorders, in particular non-homosexual transvestism and transsexualism, while very rarely, if ever, it occurs in homosexual men. The author hypothesized this disorder is in fact the result of the interaction of autogynephilia as such with additional, constitutional, or experiential factors. However, Blanchard (2005, 445) writes that his theory is still at a preliminary stage of development; its explanatory power needs to be confirmed and some explanatory hypotheses could be replaced by others.

According to one of the newest hypothesis (Lawrence, 2009; Blanchard, 2015; Hsu & Bailey, 2017; Seto, 2017; Hsu & Bailey, 2019), in the course of autogynephilia, the shift emerges in the

identification of the target erotic object. This is called an erotic target identity inversion (ETII), i.e., the external erotic target, which is usually a woman for a man and is located within the body of a given man (becomes internal towards the self). However, such men can yet retain varying degrees of sexual attraction to an external erotic target (a woman). It depends on whether such men are able to feel sexual attraction to whichever people at all. If they are, then the external and internal target erotic object are similar to each other (i.e., a real woman and the picture of himself as a woman). In other words, the individual feels sexual attraction to real women and at the same time, are sexually aroused by the thought of being a woman themselves. The two kinds of sexual attraction occur in various proportions, producing sui generis continuum—from the feeling of attraction exclusively to an external erotic object to the feeling of attraction exclusively to the internal erotic object (the vision of himself as a woman). At the same time, the line of the continuum marks a trajectory of deflection of the standard model that is called erotic target location errors (ETLE).

This paper is aimed to investigate some issues that arise from the theory of autogynephilia. In the reports of the phenomenon, a peculiar feature is striking. E.g., Blanchard (1989b, 323) thus characterized one of the characteristics of autogynephilia (emphasis added):

Heterosexual gender dysphorics represent those cases in which the autogynephilic disorder interferes the least with normal erotic attraction to other persons. However, some heterosexual gender dysphorics are able to maintain potency with their wives only by means of cross-gender fantasy during intercourse (...). In many cases, the individual prefers to have intercourse with his wife in the female superior position. He then fantasizes that his wife—imagined as a man—is penetrating him—a woman (...). Others fantasize during heterosexual intercourse that they and their wives are two women having lesbian relations.

Interestingly, quite similar phenomenon was observed in the case of men having sex with transgender women (MSTW). Mauk, Perry, and Munoz-Laboy (2013, 800) noted (accent added):

Men exhibiting this pattern of desire for TW described a common affective element resulting from being the receptive partner during anal sex—what one of our participants referred to as “role reversal”. In contrast to their TW partners’ masculine role of “aggressive” and “dominant” penetrators during anal sex, these men were able to enjoy being penetrated—experiences they interpreted as a form of feminine behavior. Freddy noted that he found it “fun trying something that [he] thought was prohibited for straight guys”.

In turn, Weinberg & Williams (2010) write that “MSTW cases deconstruct the relationship between gender and sexual arousal through gender transgression”.

What is conspicuous in the above cases is the reversal of typical roles assigned to the female and male sex in sexual intercourses. In common notion, the sole sex of an individual unambiguously determines the function the individual fulfills during the sexual intercourse: i.e., the male or female function, performing or receiving the coital penetration. Meanwhile, in the discussed cases, biological men show proclivity to perform the role that is usually attributed to a woman. However, besides sporadic instances described in the literature, there is little known on this question.

Any considerations in this regard are difficult since an additional general issue of the roles played by people in the sexual act is also rarely raised in the science. It is also probably due to the yet mentioned common opinion on attributing specific roles in sexual intercourses to the biological sexes.

The only perceived exception of this principle refers to homosexual relations. Once there was in this regard strong tendency to consider the roles in sexual intercourses—yet even all homosexuality—as a kind of inversion (Sandford, 2005). More recently, Kowalski (2016) offered a literature review in the area. He proposed also to harmonize the divergent terminology used in this field, i.e., the term sex-partner role (SPR), which shall be adopted in this paper. As to now, we do not have any review or systematization of the issue in regard to heterosexual relations. This paper stands as an attempt to decrease that gap.

The thinness of the data and the lack of the methodological arrangements result imply that any research in this area must necessarily be provisional and shall require replications and confirmations. It seems reasonable to start detailed research from an empirical reconnaissance that would allow to make a preliminary diagnosis of the phenomenon; particularly to determine how much the SPR adopted by heterosexual men are diverse, what is the link between the types of performed SPR, and autogynephilia or the other personal traits.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

The process of recruiting respondents took place on few social networking sites for people with non-typical sexual preferences. It was assumed that there could be a sizable group of autogynephilic people in such communities. Two recruitment methods were used: (i) posting an advertisement on a web portal calling for the completion of an online survey, to which a relevant link was also given; (ii) sending mail to randomly selected persons having a profile on the portal with the same text of the invitation to participate in the survey. According to autogynephilia theory, the phenomenon is limited to biological men, so the e-mail invitations were addressed only to men in order to ensure a sufficient number of them. The survey was completed by 147 persons.

Research tools

People who accepted the survey invitation and went to the survey questionnaire website (on the Google Drive server) via the corresponding link were informed about the purpose of the survey, the fact that the questionnaire is completely anonymous, and that passing to the questions is tantamount to consent to participate in the study. A 5-grade Kinsey-type scale was used to diagnose

the sexual orientation of the subjects. Diagnosing the occurrence of autogynephilia was done by two joint scales built by Blanchard (1989b): the Core Autogynephilia Scale and Autogynephilic Interpersonal Fantasy Scale. The identification of atypical preferences as to SPR in heteroerotic relations was much more challenging. Since we do not have scales to measure these preferences, it was necessary to construct them for this study.

The review of the literature showed that the observed cases of atypical heterosexual SPR are to some extent analogous to fulfilling the passive SPR's in homoerotic relations. Therefore, the typical scale of homoerotic SPR was adopted as the starting point for constructing a new scale. Since the consummative is most essential stage of sexual activity, the appetitive stage was not taken into account. Within this framework, the genital-genital sexual intercourses or their analogue—the genital-anal ones—resulted in omitting other types of consummative activity, e.g., genital-oral ones, masturbation, etc., as being accidental to the primary sexual act.

It was difficult to combine the relevant survey questions, so two separate measures were created—one to estimate the tendency to activism in fulfilling SPR, and the other to measure passivity in this respect. Next, the results obtained with both measures for each respondent was combined (but not adding up), so we obtained the joint measure that determines the respondent's preferences in terms of SPR. The first of the measures so developed is the Universal Indicator of Coital Activism (UICA); it refers to both sexes and is included in Appendix A. The second measure is the Male Anogenital Passivism Scale (MAPS). With the lack of assumed terminology in this regard, the survey questions placed emphasis on the behavioral aspect rather than labeling. Besides actions during the same coital intercourse, the demand for the other forms of stimulation at the anal zone was also taken into account (Appendix B). Both the scales apply as well to heteroerotic as to homoerotic relations in men because the premise was adopted that, in both cases, the matter is an analogous pattern of receiving sexual stimulation—either from phallus area or from anal zone.

A set of questions on attitudes towards BDSM practices was also included in the questionnaire but this report refers to only those that relate to the basic issues of the work, leaving the remaining material to be used in another publication. Statistical calculations were made in PSPP 1.2.

RESULTS

General features of the sample

Of the 147 people who completed the questionnaire, 66% were male (98 persons) and 33% female (48 persons); 1 person did not disclose his/her sex. Further analysis included only men ($n = 98$), because only Blanchard's autogynephilia theory applies. Transgender people (5 MtF) were also included to the male group due to the similarity of the autogynephilia process for both groups. The highest number of men were between 30 and 44 (67 people; 46%), 57 people (39%) were in the age 18 – 29, and 22 people (15%).

The respondents rated their sexual orientation on a 5-step Kinsey-like scale as follow: heterosexual only – 61 people (62%), mostly heterosexual – 22 people (23%), evenly bisexual – 5 people (5%), predominantly homosexual – 0 people (0%), homosexual only – 10 people (10%). Thus, heterosexual men predominate since those at least partially heterosexual stand for 90% of the sample. In turn, men at least partially homosexual made up 38% of the sample. It is also worth noting that in total bisexuals account for 28% of the sample, while 72% were people with unidirectional sexual orientation.

The social networking sites from which the research sample originates primarily groups people with a tendency to dominate or succumb in sexual life; their practices are called in brief as BDSM (from bondage, domination, sadism, masochism). The respondents rated their attitudes towards sexual submission as follows: propensity to submission – 46 people (47%), attitude to partnership – 17 people (17%), propensity to domination – 35 people (36%). In turn, the subjects assessed the strength of their tendency to submission as follows: none – 21 people (21%), weak – 10 people (10%), large – 18 people (18%), very large – 49 people (50%). And they described the strength of their propensity to dominate as follows: none – 15 people (15%), weak – 27 people (28%), large – 17 people (17%), very large – 39 people (40%). The subjects therefore have a rather clear attitude towards BDSM practices. On the one hand, 68% of them have a high or very high tendency to submission, on the other hand 57% are prone to high or very high dominance. Only 21% show no inclination to submission, and 15% do not show any tendency to dominate. The respondents were also asked about the degree of fulfillment of their fantasies in the regard to BDSM practices. It proved that 9 persons (11%) had not had any practical experience in this field; 26 persons (30%) had small experience, and 51 persons (59%) had large experience.

Preferences towards sex-partner roles

The Universal Indicator of Coital Activism (UICA) and the Male Anogenital Passivism Scale (MAPS) were used to identify the preferred SPR. The subjects declared the following level of propensity for activism within SPR: none – 24 people (25%), moderate – 19 people (19%), large – 55 people (56%). In turn, the tendency to passivism was manifested by the subjects as follows: none – 24 people (25%), weak – 14 (14%), moderate – 18 (18%), large – 42 people (43%). Thus, a total of 74 men (75%) exhibit moderate and high activism, of which 19% includes moderate activism and 56% high activism, while 25% of men do not show any inclination to activism in this regard. On the other hand, 74 men (75%) are willing to take some kind of passive SPR, while 24% do not show any propensity for passivism.

In order to assess a person's joint SPR preferences, results the respondent obtained on both scales was combined (but not summarized). For greater transparency, both variables were first dichotomized, grouping the data obtained into two categories: lack of activism – activism; lack of passivism – passivism. The newly obtained variable will therefore take four values: (i) no passivism, no activism; (ii) pasivism, lack of activism; (iii) lack of passivism, activism; (iv) passivism and activism. Persons who admit neither to passivism nor to activism (12 persons; 12% of all men) are either indifferent towards the performance of the SPR or have refused to disclose their preferences in this

regard; they will be excluded from further analysis. The other three categories create the positions of a new simple three-grade SPR scale, i.e.: (1) exclusive passivism; (2) exclusive activism; (3) universal attitude (both activism and passivism). After combining the results obtained by the respondents under the new scale, the preferences of the subjects for SPR was as follows: only passive – 12 people (14%), universal – 62 people (72%), only active – 12 people (14%). However, it seems that such a perfect symmetric distribution of numbers, which is the same as the two earlier, is rather random and specific only for this particular sample.

The above data set covers all men surveyed, therefore, it may be interesting with such distribution for men of various sexual orientations. As it shows in table 1, there is a slightly different variation in preferences for SPR within each type of sexual orientation. The vast majority of men in each group tend to perform universal SPR, with such universality being relatively highest among bisexual men (89%) and the smallest among exclusively homosexual men (60%). Men who are only passive in SPR are the most numerous in the homosexual group (30%), and the least numerous among bisexuals (11%). Men evince only active SPR appear more frequently in the heterosexual group (23%), and least frequently in the bisexual group, where not a single such case was reported.

Table 1. Preferences in SPR and sexual orientation types

Sexual orientation	Sex-partner roles (UICA+MAPS)						Total	
	only passive		universal		only active			
	frequency	%	frequency	%	frequency	%		
heterosexual	6	12	32	65	11	23	49	100%
homosexual	3	30	6	60	1	10	10	100%
any bisexual	3	11	24	89	0	0	27	100%
whole sample	12	14	62	72	12	14	86	100%

The results are very significant. Obviously the presence of passive, universal, and active SPR in exclusively homosexual men (exHoM) is not special, as these are standard SPR in this case.

Likewise, the same set of SPR is also understandable in the case of bisexual men. What is of particular interest; however, is what types of SPR undertake exclusively heterosexual men (exHeM) and also bisexual men in his heteroerotic relationships, as these properties can be compared with the default, standard SPR for heteroerotic relations.

As we can see, among ExHeM there is a deviation from the default model, which covers as much as 77% of this group. This is a very large deviation. Unfortunately, at this stage of the research, we were unable to perform such an analysis with regard to the heteroerotic component in bisexual men because it was not sufficiently clear to what extent the SPR of given bisexual man are identical in both homoerotic and heteroerotic relationships. It is possible that these individuals are ready to

play different roles in hetero- and homoerotic relationships. In other words, they actually have a set of two different roles. The SPR scale used in these studies does not make such a subtle distinction (it initially assumed the identity of both SPR); therefore, the analysis in this regard will be limited here only to exHeM. We will be particularly interested in to which extent the inversion of SPR can be explained by the presence of the phenomenon of autogynephilia.

The occurrence of autogynephilia

The results obtained by respondents on the combined two scales of autogynephilia were grouped into four degrees of severity and was as follows: no autogynephilia – 38 people (44%), small – 9 people (11%), moderate – 20 people (23%), large – 19 people (22%). As it was earlier predicted, the survey included a relatively large number of autogynephilic men – they accounted for 56% of the sample (48 people); in contrast, 44% of the sample were non-autogynephiles (38 people). These results confirm the earlier prediction that organizing communities of people with atypical sexual preferences may contain a significant number of autogynephiles. It is likely that these people have difficulties finding suitable partners in ordinary social contacts and look for them in different niche communities. Using additional coding of the responses, it was also found that 6 men (7%) reported various forms of imagining that they had female features, but without gaining erotic arousal, which does not qualify them as autogynephiles according to Blanchard's definition.

Additionally there was checked the sexual orientation of autogynephilic men and following data was received: exclusively heterosexual - 22 people (46%), rather heterosexual - 17 people (35%), evenly bisexual - 5 people (10%), exclusively homosexual - 4 people (8%). By the way, it is worth noticing that when it comes to the homosexual group, 60% (6 persons) of this group are non-autogynephiles, and 40% (4 people) are autogynephiles. These results are partially inconsistent with the claims of the autogynephilia theory by Blanchard (1989a, 1989b, 1991), but they are consistent with the results obtained by Nuttbrock *et al.* (2011), who studied 571 transgender Male to Female subjects and noted that 23% of homosexual respondents reported experiencing autogynephilic experiences; similarly writes Vealle (2015).

Autogynephilia and the inversion of SPR

Table 2 shows the relationship between the occurrence of autogynephilia and a person's SPR. As it can be seen, the dominant group in both categories are men with universal SPR (63% and 79% respectively). This strictly corresponds to the results shown in table 1. Such a large predominance of universal attitudes make it difficult to notice the trends that appear here. Therefore, it is important to realize that the universal attitude basically consists of two elements—both the active as well as passive one. Taking this into account, we can see that in the group without autogynephilia, about a quarter of men (10 people; 26%) are only active in SPR, while near 3/4 (28 people; 73%) are men with at least a slight passivism (universal and only passive ones). However, in the autogynephilic group, only 4% (2 people) are only active, while 96% (46 people) are at least slightly passive.

Table 2. Autogynephilia occurrence and preferences in SPR

Autogynephilia occurrence	Sex-partner roles (UIAC+MAPS)			Total
	only passive	universal	only active	
	4	24	10	38
non-autogynephiles	10%	63%	26%	100%
	33%	39%	83%	44%
	8	32	2	48
autogynephiles	17%	79%	4%	100%
	67%	61%	17%	56%
	12	62	12	86
sum	14%	72%	14%	100%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

The above data applies to all men in the sample. They also include men at least partially homosexual. In order to assess the extent we are dealing with the inversion of the default model of (heterosexual) SPR, and how much we are attending to the performance of the homosexual type of SPR by men at least partially homosexual, we must eliminate the possible influence of that in the analysis, as it was mentioned earlier. Therefore, the analysis shall be limited just to exHeM. Such distribution of SPR (broken down into autogynephiles and non-autogynephiles) is presented in table 3.

As table 3 shows, in the case of exHeM, 91% of autogynephiles manifest deviation from the default model. This is slightly less than for all autogynephiles in the sample, and seems to indicate that SPR inversion is a nearly common feature in autogynephiles. It should be noted that there is a large percentage of universal roles (68%) and a noticeable percentage of purely passive roles (23%). This suggests that the SPR inversion is relatively rarely a complete inversion, and rather the partial deviation from the standard model prevails. This leads to the conclusion that we can distinguish at least two degrees of inversion: partial inversion (universal roles) and total inversion (only passive role). On the other hand, it should be noted that exclusively passive exHeM are mostly autogynephiles (83%; 5 people), and only a small part of them (17%; 1 person) are not autogynephilic. Conversely, universal exHeM are more or less in a similar proportion of both in autogynephiles and non-autogynephiles (63% and 68% respectively). In contrast, it can be seen in completely opposite proportions than in the category 'passive only' in regard to the category 'active only'. Here, 82% are non-autogynephiles and only 18% are autogynephiles. This data suggests that autogynephilia is associated with a greater degree of SPR inversion, while inversion without autogynephilia appears to be more moderate.

Table 3. Autogynephilia and preferred SPR in exclusively heterosexual men

Autogynephilia	Sex-partner roles (UIAC+MAPS)			Total
	only passive	universal	only active	
non-autogynephiles	1 4% 17%	17 63% 53%	9 33% 82%	27 100% 55%
autogynephiles	5 23% 83%	15 68% 47%	2 9% 18%	22 100% 45%
sum	6 12% 100%	32 65% 100%	11 23% 100%	49 100% 100%

However, it should be noted that the discussed relationship is not symmetrical or two-sided. While autogynephilia almost always seems to involve SPR inversion, there are many instances of such an inversion without autogynephilia. As much as 67% of non-autogynephilic exHeM (4% + 63%) also deviate from the default SPR pattern. In this case, the percentage of universal roles remains at a similar level to that of autogynephiles (63%), and the percentage of purely passive roles is much smaller (4%). SPR inversion is therefore slightly weaker but still significant. These results suggest that SPR inversion is a compound phenomenon broader than autogynephilia, with some part of the phenomenon (a certain range) closely related to autogynephilia with the remainder occurring independently of autogynephilia. Therefore, it would be interesting to see how the autogynephilic type of SPR inversion differs from the non-autogynephilic one.

First, the characteristics of autogynephilic inversion were searched for. It was examined whether there was a link between the severity of inversion and the severity of autogynephilia. Since the used SPR scale is not an accurate measure of inversion (it contains only two degrees of deviation: universal and ordinary SPR), the subscale of this scale (i.e., MAPS) was used to estimate the inversion. Table 4 collates the severity of autogynephilia and the severity of coital passivism. Since there are small numbers in several cells of the table, we can additionally dichotomize both variables, i.e. combine the 'medium' and 'large' categories into one category 'significant', and the 'none' and 'small' categories into the category 'insignificant'. As a result, for these frequencies we will obtain the following 2x2 table:

1	3
2	16

As can be seen, 73% of all cases (16 people) are persons with a significant degree of autogynephilia as well as significant degree of passivism, while the rest cases (27%) are divided into all other categories. The computed Q-Yule contingency coefficient (Adeyemi, 2011) for the data amounts to 0.86 and indicates the existence of a very strong relationship between both variables.

Table 4. Autogynephilia intensity and the grade of coital passivism in exclusively heterosexual men

Autogynephilia intensity	Grade of coital pasivism (MAPS)				Total
	none	slight	mean	large	
	1	0	2	1	4
slight	25%	0%	50%	25%	100%
	50%	0%	25%	9%	8%
	1	1	4	4	10
moderate	10%	10%	40%	40%	100%
	50%	100%	50%	36%	20%
	0	0	2	6	8
large	0%	0%	25%	75%	100%
	0%	0%	25%	55%	16%
	2	1	8	11	49
sum	22%	21%	27%	30%	100%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Non-autogynephilic inversion of SPR

Subsequently, factors related to non-autogynephilic SPR inversion were searched for. Among the parameters included in the questionnaire, the propensity to submissiveness in sexual relations turned out to be the most significant factor. Table 5 shows the degree of coital passivity of non-autogynephilic exHeM and their submissiveness in sexual relations. The calculated γ coefficient of Goodman and Kruskal (Adeyemi, 2011) is 0.96 and indicates an extremely close relationship between both variables. The direction of the dependence will be more clearly visible when we again make a dichotomization of both variables, similar to the previous one. Thus we are obtaining such a 2x2 table:

1	17
7	2

The upper right corner shows a slight passivism (lack as well as little) and a slight tendency to submissiveness (no and little), while the lower left corner shows a significant passivism (medium and large) and a significant tendency to submission (medium as well as high). If in other studies a similarly high degree of correlation is confirmed, it will mean that the correlation between both variables is almost complete and they actually constitute one common complex of phenomena that could be described as 'passivity-submissiveness'. This would be an empirical confirmation of usual opinions about a close relationship between both features.

Table 5. Autogynephiles although partially homosexual and types of SPR

Sexual orientation	SPR (UIAC+MAPS)			Total
	exclusively passive	versatile	exclusively active	
exclusively heterosexual	2 12% 67%	15 88% 65%	0 0% 0%	17 100% 65%
steadily bisexual	0 0% 0%	5 10% 22%	0 0% 0%	5 100% 19%
exclusively homosexual	1 25% 33%	3 75% 13%	0 0% 0%	4 100% 15%
sum	3 11% 100%	23 89% 100%	0 0% 0%	26 100% 100%

For comparison purposes, it is worth checking how the above relationship looks in the case of autogynephilic men. As shown in table 6 and also in this case, there is a strong relationship between the two qualities, but it looks a bit different. We see only one dominant relationship here: significant passivism (medium as well as high) is associated with significant submissiveness (medium as well as high), and this relationship applies to as much as 82% of all autogynephiles. If we also combine low values for both variables (none as well as small), we get the dichotomized data:

2	1
18	1

In this case $Q\text{-Yule}'a = 0.8$ and indicates a strong correlation between the two variables. These results are consistent with the data on the relationship between the severity of autogynephilia and the severity of passivism (see table 4), which becomes understandable if we take into account the finding that submissiveness and passivism constitute a common complex of phenomena.

To highlight the relationship between coital passivism, sexual submission and autogynephilia, the dichotomized data for the two previous tables can be also combine:

3	18
25	3

In this case, $Q\text{-Yule}'s = 0.96$, so it is as high as in the case of the non-autogynephiles subgroup. As it can be seen, for each of the reference groups there is a very strong relationship between passivism and submissiveness, although there are also some differences between the two.

Table 6. Autogynephiles at least partly homosexual and types of homosexual SPR

Sexual orientation	Homosexual SPR					Total
	only passive	mostly passive	versatile	mostly active	only active	
exclusively heterosexual	2	2	4	8	1	17
	12%	12%	24%	47%	6%	100%
	100%	100%	50%	62%	100%	65%
steadily bisexual	0	0	2	3	0	5
	0%	0%	40%	60%	0%	100%
	0%	0%	25%	23%	0%	19%
exclusively homosexual	0	0	2	2	0	4
	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
	0%	0%	25%	15%	0%	15%
Sum	2	2	8	13	1	26
	8%	8%	31%	50%	4%	100%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

DISCUSSION

It should be emphasized that the group of autogynephilic men was studied in the terms of their everyday life, and not in clinical circumstances. Additionally, the online nature of the study and full anonymity of the survey were conducive to showing a high degree of honesty when answering the survey questions. Although some of the peculiarities of the presented SPR distribution seem to be specific to this particular research sample, clear trends are revealed here, which may constitute a starting point for further research.

The presented results show that autogynephilia is closely related to the inversion of SPR, those typical for heterosexuality (i.e., coitally active male roles and coitally passive female roles). When assessing the extent of this inversion, it was necessary to analyze separately exclusively heterosexual men and bisexual men, because it is not clear whether SPR in bisexual men are identical or separate in their heterosexual and homoerotic relationships; this issue requires further research. It turned out that autogynephiles predominantly tends to deviate from the standard model and are almost universally ready to perform at least partially passive SPR (91-96%). At the same time, most of them retain a tendency to perform also active SPR (77-83%), thus showing universal preferences in this regard. Such a wide spread of the universal attitude is somewhat reminiscent of the situation in homosexual relationships in this respect. Further analysis showed that one of the dimensions of SPR, coital passivism, exhibits varying degrees of severity depending on the severity of autogynephilia (Q -Yule = 0.86). However, a reflection arises that the applied SPR scale (coital passivism and activism) was not very accurate. In future research in this field, it is worth considering the use of other or additional items of this scale.

The research has revealed a completely unexpected phenomenon. It turned out that in exclusively heterosexual men who are not autogynephiles, there may also be an inversion of default SPR—in the sample, more than 3/4 of them showed a tendency to perform at least partially passive SPR. Looking for factors related to this passivism other than autogynephilia, it was found that it is very closely related to submissiveness in sexual relations (γ Goodman and Kruskal = 0.96; a power of relation that is observed in social science very rarely), which suggests the existence of a kind of homogeneous passivity-submissiveness complex. Since the research sample came from a community with specific sexual preferences, further research should check how widespread such attitudes are in the general population. This finding suggests that quite independently from whether the theory mentioned in the introduction pertaining the ETII and ETLE shall be confirmed, we deal with the inversion of SPR in heterosexual men and respectively with various extents of errors in fulfilling these roles.

The discussed results show the great flexibility and plasticity of attitudes that men show in terms of choosing a sexual partner. The presented relationships, however, are statistical in nature and do not replace theoretical explanations, in particular causal explanations. Various explanatory hypotheses are possible. One such possibility is the evolutionary-ethological hypothesis. It has been noticed, e.g., that in animals one of the forms of conciliatory behavior (avoiding a fight) and determining the status of an individual in a group are, i.a., folding a hand in a begging gesture, curling up or adopting a female copulatory position (buttocks raised); the latter gestures can be made by both female and male individuals. These are gestures that can be easily understood within a given genre, symbolizing a lower rank, subordination (Eibl-Elbesfeldt, 2017). In the course of phylogenetic development, such behaviors could eventually create the personality component of passivity-submissiveness in humans. However, this hypothesis requires verification.

The obtained results should be interpreted very cautiously. It should be taken into account that the sample of respondents was not too large and the fact that this sample was created on the basis of communities with unusual sexual preferences (BDSM). In some categories (ranges of variables), the number of cases was very small, which required an increase in the degree of data aggregation to the point of dichotomization, which reduced the degree of accuracy of the calculations. Small numbers and generally ordinal nature of the measurement scales allowed for the use of only non-parametric, less precise measures of the strength of the relationship between the variables. It is necessary to repeat the studies on a larger sample and to compare the results with analogous data for the general population to be able to make more reasonable generalizations. It should also be noted that though we rather referred to the behavioral aspect than to terminological labeling, the emphasis was on attitudes rather than completed actions in constructing the SPR. The question remains to what extent these inclinations remain in the sphere of fantasy and to what extent they are realized in action. The respondents' declarations show that nearly 89% of them have some experience in fulfilling their fantasies, but this is a general assessment relating to all their preferred BDSM practices. It should also be emphasized that questions about coital passivism-activism were asked alongside questions about various BDSM-type practices. It is possible that similar questions asked in a different, more neutral context could result in a slightly different proportion of the answers given.

CONCLUSIONS

The results obtained suggest that the inversion of default SPR can be viewed as the degree of deviation from the standard pattern on something like a trajectory between the propensity to perform exclusively active SPR and the tendency to perform exclusively passive SPR. Deviation from the pattern is associated with a gradual decrease in the tendency to coital activism and an increase in passivism. The latter property is also accompanied by a gradually increasing tendency to submissiveness, creating a passivity-submissiveness complex. At higher levels of passivity-submissiveness, autogynephilia very often joins this complex.

The results shows that similar variation in SPR preferences occurs within both basic sexual orientations, which suggests that this property is shaped by a mechanism separate from the mechanism shaping one's sexual attraction to a person's sex. It shows how unjustified is the stigmatization of homosexual people manifesting passivity; that is a feature which transcends far away from homosexuality. This finding is also partly linked with the finding of some researchers that autogynephilia—contrary to Blanchard's original theory—can occur in men not just heterosexual, but also homosexual (cf. Nuttbrock *at all.*, 2011; Veale, 2015), so it is independent from sexual orientation.

The SPR category, which has so far been used only for the description and analysis of homoerotic relationships, turns out to be an analytical category useful also in the study of heteroerotic relationships. Its use is particularly desirable in the case of gender disorders, but it can also be helpful in more general research on sexual orientation, especially in the matter of understanding the mechanisms shaping human sexual orientation.

The results suggest also that the inversion of default heteroerotic SPR shows varying degrees of severity. More detailed research in this field should look for possible connections between this issue and the issue of inversion in the field of socially understood sexual and gender roles already discussed in the literature (see Sandfort, 2005). The serious flaw of these latter studies is that they omit the sexual aspect of social roles, as if these roles were completely barren of a sexual dimension (or that dimension was taboo of some sort). Our study shows also how unjustified is the stigmatization of homosexual persons showing passivity—it turns out that this trait goes far beyond same homosexuality.

The SPR category, which has so far been used only for the description and analysis of homoerotic relationships, turns out to be an analytical category useful also in the study of heteroerotic relationships. Its use is particularly desirable in the case of gender disorders, but it can also be helpful in more general research on sexual orientation, especially in the matter of understanding the mechanisms shaping human sexual orientation.

The results on bisexual men are also interesting. Almost 90% of them show a universal attitude towards SPR, only about 10% lean towards exclusively passive SPR (the least among all sexual orientations), and none of them declared their will to perform exclusively active SPR. Although the size of this subgroup (27 people) is too small to draw definitive conclusions from the fact that there are no exclusively active men in this subgroup, it can be assumed that bisexuality clearly foster universalism in the field of SPR. One could say that universality in regard of sexual attraction often entails universality in the roles played in the sexual act.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Universal Indicator of Coital Activism (UICA)

How much do you prefer the following practice in sexual relations?

	none	a little	much
penetrating the crotch of a partner (that is, vagina or anus) with penis or its prosthesis (e.g., strap-on, dildo, vibrator)	[0]	[1]	[2]
<i>(in parentheses, the response score is given)</i>			

Appendix B

Male Anogenital Passivism Scale (MAPS)

Which of the following practices do you prefer in sexual relations?
(mark only one answer in each row)

	Type of practices	none	a little	much
a	penetrating my crotch (that is vagina or anus) by a partner with penis or its prosthesis (e.g., strap-on, dildo, vibrator)	[0]	[1]	[2]
b	licking my anus and its vicinity by a partner (rimming)	[0]	[0.1]	[0.2]
c	stimulating my anus with a partner's fingers or hands (fisting)	[0]	[0.1]	[0.2]
d	stimulating my anus by a partner with various utensils (e.g., balls, plugs, vibrator)	[0]	[0.1]	[0.2]
E	having been made enema by a partner	[0]	[0.1]	[0.2]

The scale refers to male passivism; merely point (a) refers to passivism in women. The response score is given in parentheses; total possible score is 0 - 2.8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adeyemi, O. (2011). Measures of association for research in educational planning and administration. *Research Journal of Mathematics and Statistics*, 3(3), 82-90.
- Blanchard, R. (1989a). The classification and labeling of non-homosexual gender dysphorias. *Arch Sex*

- Behav*, 18(4), 315-334. doi:10.1007/BF01541951
- Blanchard, R. (1989b). The concept of autogynephilia and the typology of male gender dysphoria. *J Nerv Ment Dis*, 177(10), 616-623. doi:10.1097/00005053-198910000-00004
- Blanchard, R. (1991). Clinical observations and systematic studies of autogynephilia. *J Sex Marital Ther*, 17(4), 235-251. doi:10.1080/00926239108404348
- Blanchard, R. (2005). Early history of the concept of autogynephilia. *Arch Sex Behav*, 34(4), 439-446. doi:10.1007/s10508-005-4343-8
- Blanchard, R. (2015). Departures from alloerotic heterosexual teleiophilia: Research on the less examined types. In M. Bailey (Ed.), *Erotic target identity inversions*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the International Academy of Sex Research, Toronto, ON.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1972). *Love and hate: The natural history of behavior patterns*. Trans. G. Strachan. Routledge.
- Freund, K., & Blanchard, R. (1993). Erotic target location errors in male gender dysphorics, paedophiles, and fetishists. *Br J Psychiatry*, 162, 558-563. doi:10.1192/bjp.162.4.558
- Freund, K., Steiner, B.W., & Chan, S. (1982). Two types of cross-gender identity. *Arch Sex Behav*, 11(1), 49-63. doi:10.1007/BF01541365
- Hsu, K. J., & Bailey, J. M. (2017). Autopedophilia: Erotic-target identity inversion in men sexually attracted to children. *Psychol Sci*, 28(1), 115-123. doi:10.1177/0956797616677082
- Hsu, K. J., & Bailey, J. M. (2019). The "Furry" Phenomenon: Characterizing Sexual Orientation, Sexual Motivation, and Erotic Target Identity Inversions in Male Furies. *Arch Sex Behav*, 48(5), 1349-1369. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1303-7
- Kowalski, J. A. (2016). Sex-Partner Roles in Homoerotic Relations: An Attempt of Classification. *J Homosex*, 63(1), 87-102. doi:10.1080/00918369.2015.1078639
- Lawrence, A.A. (2009). Erotic target location errors: an underappreciated paraphilic dimension. *J Sex Res*, 46(2-3), 194-215. doi:10.1080/00224490902747727
- Mauk, D., Perry, A., & Munoz-Laboy, M. (2013). Exploring the desires and sexual culture of men who have sex with male-to-female transgender women. *Arch Sex Behav*, 42(5), 793-803. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0079-z
- Nuttbrock, L., Bockting, W., Mason, M., Hwahng, S., Rosenblum, A., Macri, M., Becker, J. (2011). A further assessment of Blanchard's typology of homosexual versus non-homosexual or autogynephilic gender dysphoria. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40, 247-257, doi:
- Sandfort, T. G. (2005). Sexual orientation and gender: Stereotypes and beyond. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34(6), 595-611. doi:10.1007/s10508-005-7907-8
- Seto, M. C. (2017). The Puzzle of Male Chronophilias. *Arch Sex Behav*, 46(1), 3-22. doi:10.1007/s10508-016-0799-y
- Veale, J. F. (2015). Comments on ethical reporting and interpretations of findings in Hsu, Rosenthal, and Bailey's (2014) "the psychometric structure of items assessing autogynephilia". *Arch Sex Behav*, 44(7), 1743-1746. doi:10.1007/s10508-015-0552-y
- Weinberg, M. S., & Williams, C. J. (2010). Men sexually interested in transwomen (MSTW): gendered embodiment and the construction of sexual desire. *J Sex Res*, 47(4), 374-383. doi:10.1080/00224490903050568