

**Psychology 436**  
**∞ Sexuality and Gender ∞**  
**Queen's University**  
**Winter 2013**

**Wednesdays 1-2:30 pm**  
**Fridays 11:30-1 pm**  
**Watson 122**

**Meredith Chivers, PhD, CPsych**  
**[Meredith.Chivers@queensu.ca](mailto:Meredith.Chivers@queensu.ca)**  
**354 Humphrey Hall**  
**533-2889**  
**Office hours: Fridays 3-4pm**

*Course Description*

Gender differences in sexuality are consistently observed in sex research. The intersection of gender and sexuality, however, is a controversial place. Some theorists argue that gender differences in sexuality are a social construction, that is they reflect our culture more so than constitutional differences; others look to our evolutionary roots and biology as sources of the many differences observed between women's and men's sexuality. In this course, we will explore the foundations of gender differences and similarities in sexuality and examine how these factors manifest in important aspects of women's and men's sexual lives. The course will begin with an overview of the major theoretical positions on gender differences and similarities and, in the weeks that follow, we will examine the evidence for gender differences in several aspects of sexual psychology from these positions.

*Course Format*

This course is designed to resemble a master's level seminar course in that participation in presentations and discussions is mandatory. The balance between lecture/presentations and discussion will be about 30/70. Students are expected to come to every class and to actively participate. This course is also designed so that the concepts introduced earlier in the course will be revisited as new concepts and empirical results are presented in subsequent classes. In this way, we can build an understanding of the complex issues surrounding sexuality and gender.

*Course Website*

Course materials, including syllabi, reference list of course readings, assignment information, and grades will be provided via Moodle for Psyc436.

To log in, go to: <https://moodle.queensu.ca/>

### Course Requirements

1. *Readings.* All readings for the course will consist of journal articles, review articles or book chapters, with an emphasis on the most comprehensive and up-to-date knowledge available. Please see the course Reference List (below) for a complete list of references for the readings.

Because of changes to Queen's Access copyright license (regarding distribution of electronic or paper copies of published works in educational settings), students cannot be provided with pdf copies of articles by the professor. Citations of all articles are provided in the Reference List and can be downloaded from the internet via [www.scholar.google.ca](http://www.scholar.google.ca). A demonstration of this will be provided in the first day of class. Some works not easily available via the internet, such as book chapters, will be placed on reserve in the Library.

All students are required to thoroughly read all the research articles/review chapters assigned for each class to facilitate the discussions that follow the presentations.

2. *Attendance and participation.* The success of this class rests on the active participation of all the students. Attendance will be taken and students are required to notify Dr. Chivers, in advance, if they will be absent. Students who are absent without notification or reason will receive a grade of 0 for discussion that day. Students who provide notification will not be graded for that class. During class, each student is expected to contribute to the discussion and participation will be graded.
3. *Discussion questions.* For every topic, students will submit a discussion question on the week's readings to me by no later than 7pm on the day before class. Discussion questions will be compiled and distributed to the class via Moodle. Students will be graded on the quality of their questions (see the document Grading Details for grading scheme & below for deadlines). Late submissions will receive a 0. Dates for which discussion questions are required are indicated with an asterisk in the course schedule (see below).
4. *Oral presentation & discussion.* Starting in the third week, a group of three students will give a presentation on the week's theme, covering three research articles and integrating these findings with the weekly readings. The presenters will then moderate a discussion on the topic. Students will be randomly assigned to a paper and the schedule will be finalized in the second class. Groups are encouraged to submit a presentation outline to Dr. Chivers for feedback at least one week prior to the date of their presentation. The presenters are required to integrate their articles with the week's readings and stimulate discussion on the topic, so think of ending your presentation with big picture questions. (See Oral Presentation Grading Details below for grading scheme).
5. *Final Project.* Students will choose to either:

- 1) Submit an original proposal for research on any aspect of gender differences in sexuality (see Research Proposal Guidelines). Students must submit a proposal outline by Feb 15th. This will not be graded, but feedback will be provided to students to guide them in developing their research question and focusing on methods to test their hypotheses.

OR

- 2) Participate in the Association for Psychological Science's Wikipedia Initiative by working together to create, compile and edit Wikipedia pages dedicated to understanding gender differences and similarities in sexuality. Students will work together in groups of 2-3 to address each of the main topics (and their subtopics) covered in the course. Students must submit a proposal outline by Feb 15th. This will not be graded, but feedback will be provided to students to guide them in developing their Wikipedia page(s). Students are encouraged to develop their own topic, and this topic must be distinct from the topic covered in the oral presentation. See Grading Details for more information.

*Evaluation*

Oral presentation	30%
Participation in discussion	20%
Discussion questions	20%
Final Project	30%

*Deadlines*

Discussion questions: By 7pm the evening before class.

Presentation outline: One week before presentation (optional but recommended).

Wikipedia contribution outline/research proposal outline: Feb 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

Final research proposal/Wikipedia entry: April 5, 2013, 4pm.

**Late submissions lose 10% per day late, except for emergencies with documentation.**

**Presenters and those providing critiques MUST be in class on the scheduled date.**

**PLEASE SUBMIT ONLY ELECTRONIC COPIES OF ALL ASSIGNMENTS. When you email your discussion question or assignment to me, be sure to request a delivery and read receipt. You will receive notification when I open the email.**

*Class structure:*

Lecture classes:

Orientation to topic: 45 min

General discussion or guest speaker: 30 min

Presentations:

Student presentation & discussion: 45 min

General discussion or guest speaker: 30 min

*Copyright information:*

All course materials including the material posted to the course website is copyrighted and is for the sole use of students registered in Sexuality & Gender, Psyc436. The material on this website may be downloaded for a registered student's personal use, but shall not be distributed or disseminated to anyone other than students registered in Sexuality & Gender, Psyc436. Failure to abide by these conditions is a breach of copyright, and may also constitute a breach of academic integrity under the University Senate's Academic Integrity Policy Statement.

*Academic integrity:*

Academic integrity is constituted by the five core fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility (see [www.academicintegrity.org](http://www.academicintegrity.org)). These values are central to the building, nurturing and sustaining of an academic community in which all members of the community will thrive. Adherence to the values expressed through academic integrity forms a foundation for the "freedom of inquiry and exchange of ideas" essential to the intellectual life of the University (see the Senate Report on Principles and Priorities <http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/policies/senateandtrustees/principlespriorities.html>).

Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the regulations concerning academic integrity and for ensuring that their assignments conform to the principles of academic integrity. Information on academic integrity is available in the Arts and Science Calendar (see Academic Regulation 1 <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academic-calendars/2011-2012-calendar/academic-regulations/regulation-1>), on the Arts and Science website (see <http://www.queensu.ca/artsci/academics/undergraduate/academic-integrity>), and from the instructor of this course.

Departures from academic integrity include plagiarism, use of unauthorized materials, facilitation, forgery and falsification, and are antithetical to the development of an academic community at Queen's. Given the seriousness of these matters, actions which contravene the regulation on academic integrity carry sanctions that can range from a warning or the loss of grades on an assignment to the failure of a course to a requirement to withdraw from the university.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topics</b>	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Presentations/Syllabus</b>
9/01	Introduction	<i>Syllabus review</i>	
*11/01	Theoretical perspectives	Lippa (2005); Gangestad & Simpson (2000)	<i>Gender: Biology &amp; Evolution</i>
*16/01		Vanweesenbeck (2009); Hyde (2005) and commentaries	<i>Gender: Society &amp; Culture</i>
18/01	How we study gender differences	Petersen & Hyde (2011); Conley et al (2011)	<i>Gender difference or similarities?</i>
*23/01	Sexual desire	Baumeister (2004) or (2000); Baumeister, Catanese, & Vohs (2001); Tolman & Diamond (2001)	Lecture
25/01			1. Presentation; Lippa (2009); Conaglen & Evans (2006); Fisher et al (2012)
*30/02	Sexual arousal	Chivers (2005 & 2010); Rupp & Wallen (2008); Janssen (2011)	Lecture
1/02			2. Presentation: Suschinsky & Lalumière (2011); Kukkonen et al (2010); Both et al (2011)
*6/02	Hormones & sexuality	Wallen (2001); Pfaus (2008); Gangestad et al (2005); Bancroft & Graham (2011)	<b><i>Guest Lecture: Sari Van Anders, PhD</i></b>
8/02			3. Presentation: Goldey & Van Anders (2011); Gangestad & Thornhill (1998); Miller & Maner (2009)
*13/02	Mating strategies I: Sociosexuality & mate preferences	Schmitt (2005) & commentaries	Lecture
15/02			4. Presentation: Conley et al (2012); Boothroyd et al (2008); Timmers & Chivers (2012)
20&22/02	<b><i>READING WEEK -- NO CLASSES</i></b>		
*27/02	Mating strategies II: Infidelity & sexual coercion	Harris (2003); Shackelford & Goetz (2007); McKibbin et al (2008); Vandermassen (2011)	Lecture
01/03			5. Presentation: Hines (2007); Levy & Kelly (2010); Kilgallon & Simmons (2005)
*6/03	Sexual orientation	Rahman & Wilson (2003); Diamond (2003)	Lecture
8/03			6. Presentation: Lippa (2006); Diamond (2008); Vranglova & Savin-Williams (2010) <b><i>Guest Lecture: Lisa Diamond, PhD</i></b>
*13/03	Transgender sexuality	Veale et al (2010); Lawrence (2007); Vasey & Bartlett (2007)	Lecture
15/03			7. Presentation: Chivers & Bailey (2000); Lawrence (2005); Kuper et al (2012) <b><i>Guest Lecture: Paul Vasey, PhD</i></b>
*20/03	Sexual variations	Lawrence (2009); Seto (2012);	<b><i>Guest Lecture: Michael Seto, PhD,</i></b>
22/03			8. Presentation: Seto et al (2012); Terry & Vasey (2011); Langström & Seto (2006)
*27/03	Sexual functioning	Barlow (1986); Basson (2008); Brotto & Heiman (2007)	<b><i>Guest Lecture: Lori Brotto, PhD,</i></b>
29/03	<b><i>Good Friday: No Class</i></b>		
3/04	Sexual functioning		9. Presentation: Purdon & Watson (2011); Brauer et al (2011); Brotto et al (2012)
5/04	<b><i>Final class: Wrap up</i></b>		

**Reference List for Psyc436 Readings**

**Dates: Jan 11, 16 & 18**

**Topics:** Theories of gender; how we study gender differences/similarities in sexuality

**Readings:**

- Lippa, R. A. (2005). Theories of gender. In D. Riegert (Eds.), *Gender, nature, and nurture* (pp. 81-118). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. (available on reserve at the Stauffer Library)
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 23(4), 573-644, doi: [10.1017/S0140525X0000337X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0000337X).
- Vanweesenbeck, I. (2009). Doing gender in sex and sex research. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour* 38(6), 883-898, doi: 10.1007/s10508-009-9565-8.
- Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities. *American Psychologist*, 60(6), 581-592, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.60.6.581.
- Commentaries:
- Archer, J. (2006). The importance of theory for evaluating evidence on sex differences. [Peer commentary on the paper “*The gender similarities*” by J. S. Hyde]. *American Psychologist*, 61(6), 638-639.
- Davies, A. P. C., & Shackelford, T. K. (2006). An evolutionary psychological perspective on gender similarities and differences. [Peer commentary on the paper “*The gender similarities*” by J. S. Hyde]. *American Psychologist*, 61(6), 640-641.
- Lippa, R. A. (2006). The gender reality hypothesis. [Peer commentary on the paper “*The gender similarities*” by J. S. Hyde]. *American Psychologist*, 61(6), 639-640.
- Zuriff, G. E. (2006). Judgments of similarity are psychological: The importance of importance [Peer commentary on the paper “*The gender similarities*” by J. S. Hyde]. *American Psychologist*, 61(6), 641, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.6.641a.
- Hyde, J. S. (2006). Gender similarities still rule. [Commentary on the paper “*The gender similarities*” by J. S. Hyde]. *American Psychologist*, 61(6), 641-642, doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.6.641b.
- Petersen, J. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2011). Gender differences in sexual attitudes and behaviors: A review of meta-analytic results and large datasets. *Journal of Sex Research*, 48(2), 149-165.
- Conley, T. D., Moors, A. C., Matsick, J. L., Ziegler, A., & Valentine, B. A. (2011). Women, men, and the bedroom: methodological and conceptual insights that narrow, reframe, and eliminate gender differences in sexuality. *Psychological Science*, 20, 296 – 300. DOI: 10.1177/0963721411418467
- 

**Dates: Jan 23 & 25**

**Topic:** Sexual desire and plasticity

**Readings:**

- Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Gender differences in erotic plasticity: The female sex drive as socially flexible and responsive. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(3), 347-374, doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.126.3.347. **OR**
- Baumeister, R. F. (2004). Gender and erotic plasticity: Sociocultural influences on the sex drive.

- Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 19(2), 133-139, doi: 10.1080/14681990410001691343.
- Baumeister, R. F., Catanese, K. R., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Is there a gender difference in strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a review of relevant evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 242-273, doi: [10.1207/S15327957PSPR0503\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0503_5)
- Tolman, D. L., & Diamond, L. M. (2001). Desegregating sexuality research: Cultural and biological perspectives on gender and desire. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 12, 33-74.

**Presentation (Jan 25):**

- Lippa, R. A. (2009). Sex differences in sex drive, sociosexuality, and height across 53 nations: Testing evolutionary and social structural theories. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 38(5), 631-651, doi: 10.1007/s10508-007-9242-8.
- Conaglen, H. M., & Evans, I. M. (2006). Pictorial cues and sexual desire: An experimental approach. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 35(2), 201-216, doi: 10.1007/s10508-005-9000-8.
- Fisher, T. D., Moore, Z. T., & Pittenger, M. (2012). Sex on the brain? An examination of frequency of sexual cognitions as a function of gender, erotophilia, and social desirability. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49, 69-77.

**Date: Jan 30 & Feb 1**

**Topic:** Sexual arousal

**Readings:**

- Chivers, M. L. (2005). Leading comment: A brief review and discussion of sex differences in the specificity of sexual arousal. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 4, 377-390.
- Chivers, M. L. (2010). A brief update on the specificity of sexual arousal. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 25, 407-414.
- Rupp, H. A., & Wallen, K. (2008). Sex differences in response to visual sexual stimuli: A review. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(2), 206-218, doi: 10.1007/s10508-007-9217-9.
- Janssen, E. (2011). Sexual arousal in men: A review and conceptual analysis. *Hormones & Behavior*, 59, 708-716.

**Presentation (Feb 1):**

- Suschinsky, K. D., & Lalumière, M. L. (2011). Category-specificity and sexual concordance: The stability of sex differences in sexual arousal patterns. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 20, 93-108.
- Kukkonen, T. M., Binik, Y. M., Amsel, R., & Carrier, S. (2010). An evaluation of the validity of thermography as a physiological measure of sexual arousal in a non-university adult sample. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 861-873. doi: 10.1007/s10508-009-9496-4
- Both, S., Laan, E., & Everaerd, W. (2011). Focusing on “hot” or focusing “cool”: Attentional mechanisms in sexual arousal in men and women. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 8, 167-179. DOI: 10.1111/j.1743-6109.2010.02051.x

**Dates: Feb 6 & Feb 8**

**Topic:** Hormones & sexuality

**Readings:**

- Wallen, K. (2001). Sex and context: Hormones and primate sexual motivation. *Hormones and Behavior*, 40, 330-357, doi: 10.1006/hbeh.2001.1696.
- Pfaus, J. G. (2008). What's behind her smile? *Hormones and Behavior*, 55, 265-266, doi: 10.1016/j.yhbeh.2008.09.004.
- Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Apgar, C. E. (2005). Adaptations to ovulation implications for sexual and social behaviour. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(6), 312-316, doi: 10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00388.x.
- Bancroft, J. & Graham, C. A. (2011). The varied nature of women's sexuality: Unresolved issues and a theoretical approach. *Hormones & Behavior*, 59, 717 – 729.

**Presentation (Feb 8):**

- Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (1998). Menstrual cycle variation in women's preferences for the scent of symmetrical men. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 265(1399), 927-933, doi: 10.1098/rspb.1998.0380.
- Miller, S. L., & Maner, J. K. (2009). Scent of a woman: Men's testosterone responses to olfactory ovulation cues. *Psychological Science*, 21(2), 276-283, doi: 10.1177/0956797609357733.
- Goldey, K. L., van Anders, S. M. (2011). Sexy thoughts: Effects of sexual cognitions on testosterone, cortisol, and arousal in women. *Hormones & Behavior*, 59, 754-764.

**Dates: Feb 13 & 15**

**Topic:** Mating strategies I – Sociosexuality & mate preferences

**Readings:**

- Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28, 247-311, doi: 10.1017/S0140525X05000051.

**Presentation (Feb 15):**

- Boothroyd, L. G., Jones, B. C., Burt, D. M., DeBruine, L. M., & Perrett, D. I. (2008). Facial correlates of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 211-218, doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.12.009
- Conley, T. D., Ziegler, A., & Moors, A. C. (2012). Backlash from the bedroom: Stigma mediates gender differences in acceptance of casual sex offers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. DOI: 10.1177/0361684312467169 (only available online).
- Timmers, A., & Chivers, M. L. (in press). Sociosexuality and sexual arousal. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*. (available from Dr. Chivers).

**Dates: Feb 27 & 29**

**Topic:** Mating strategies II: Infidelity & sexual coercion

**Readings:**

- Harris, C. R. (2003). A review of sex differences in sexual jealousy, including self-report data, psychophysiological responses, interpersonal violence, and morbid jealousy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 103-128.



- Social Psychology Review*, 7(2), 102-128, doi: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0702\_102-128.
- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T. (2005). Adaptation to sperm competition in humans. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(1), 47-50.
- McKibbin, W. F., Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., & Starratt, V. G. (2008). Why do men rape? An evolutionary psychological perspective. *Review of General Psychology*, 12(1), 86-97, doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.12.1.86.
- Vandermassen, G. (2011). Evolution and rape: A feminist Darwinian perspective. *Sex Roles*, 64, 732-747.

**Presentation (Feb 29):**

- Levy, K. N., & Kelly, K. M. (2010). Sex Differences in Jealousy: A Contribution From Attachment Theory. *Psychological Science*, 21(2), 168-173, doi:10.1177/0956797609357708.
- Kilgallon, S. J., & Simmons, L. W. (2005). Image content influences men's semen quality. *Biology Letters*, 1(3), 253-255, doi:10.1098/rsbl.2005.0324.
- Hines, D. A. (2007). Predictors of sexual coercion against women and men: A multilevel, multinational study of university students. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 36(3), 403-422, doi: 10.1007/s10508-006-9141-4.
- 

**Date: March 6 & 8**

**Topic:** Sexual orientation

**Readings:**

- Diamond, L. M. (2003). What does sexual orientation orient? A biobehavioral model distinguishing romantic love and sexual desire. *Psychological Review*, 110, 173-192. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.110.1.173.
- Rahman, Q., & Wilson, G. D. (2003). Born gay? The psychobiology of human sexual orientation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(8), 1337-1382, doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00140-X.

**Presentation (March 8):**

- Lippa, R. A. (2006). Is high sex drive associated with increased sexual attraction to both sexes? *Psychological Science*, 17(1), 46-52, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01663.x.
- Diamond, L. M. (2008). Female bisexuality from adolescence to adulthood: Results from a 10-year longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(1), 5-14, doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.5.
- Vrangalova, Z., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (2010). Correlates of same-sex sexuality in heterosexually identified young adults. *Journal of Sex Research*, 47, 92 – 102. DOI: 10.1080/00224490902954307
- 

**Date: March 13 & 15**

**Topic:** Transgender sexuality

**Readings:**

- Veale, J. F., Clarke, D. E., & Lomax, T. C. (2010). Biological and psychosocial correlates of adult gender-variant identities: A review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(4), 357-366, doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.09.018.
- Lawrence, A. A. (2007). Becoming what we love: Autogynephilic transsexualism conceptualized as an expression of romantic love. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 50(4), 506-520, doi:

10.1353/pbm.2007.0050.

Vasey, P.L. & Bartlett, N.H. (2007). What can the Samoan *fa'afafine* teach us about the Western concept of "Gender Identity Disorder in Childhood"? *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, 50: 481-490.

**Presentation (March 15):**

Chivers, M. L., & Bailey, J. M. (2000). Sexual orientation of female-to-male transsexuals: A comparison of homosexual and nonhomosexual types. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 29(3), 259-278, doi: 10.1023/A:1001915530479

Lawrence, A. A. (2005). Sexuality before and after male-to-female sex reassignment surgery - *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 34, 147-166. DOI: 10.1007/s10508-005-1793-y

Kuper, L. E., Nussbaum, R., & Mustanski, B. (2012). Exploring the diversity of gender and sexual orientation identities in an online sample of transgender individuals. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49, 244-254. DOI: 10.1080/00224499.2011.596954

---

**Date: March 20 & 22**

**Topic:** Sexual variations

**Readings:**

Lawrence, A.A. (2009). Erotic Target Location Errors: An underappreciated paraphilic dimension. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46: 194-215.

Seto, M. (2012). Is pedophilia a sexual orientation? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41: 231-236.

**Presentation (March 22)**

Terry, L.L. & Vasey, P.L. (2011). A case report of feederism in a woman. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40: 639-645.

Seto, M.C., Lalumière, M.L., Harris, G.T., Chivers, M.L. The sexual responses of sexual sadists. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 121(3): 739-75.

Langström, N., & Seto, M. C. (2006). Exhibitionistic and voyeuristic behavior in a Swedish National Population Survey. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 35, 427 – 435. DOI 10.1007/s10508-006-9042-6.

---

**Date: March 27 & April 3**

**Topic:** Sexual functioning

**Readings:**

Barlow, D. H. (1986). Causes of sexual dysfunction: The role of anxiety and cognitive interference. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 54(2), 140-148, doi: [10.1037/0022-006X.54.2.140](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.54.2.140)

Basson, R. (2008). Women's sexual function and dysfunction: current uncertainties, future directions. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 20, 466-478, doi: 10.1038/ijir.2008.23.

Brotto, L., & Heiman, J. (2007). Mindfulness in sex therapy: Applications for women with sexual difficulties following gynecologic cancer. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 22, 3-11. DOI: 10.1080/14681990601153298.

**Presentation (April 3):**

Brauer, M., van Leeuwen, M., Janssen, E., Newhouse, S. K., Heiman, J. R., & Laan, E. (2011).

Attentional and affective processing of sexual stimuli in women with hypoactive sexual desire disorder. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, DOI: 10.1007/s10508-011-9820-7 (only available online)

Purdon, C., & Watson, C. (2011). Non-erotic thoughts and sexual functioning. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40, 891-902. DOI 10.1007/s10508-011-9755-z

Brotto, L. A., Seal, B. N., & Rellini, A. (2012). Pilot study of a brief cognitive behavioral versus mindfulness-based intervention for women with sexual distress and a history of childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 38, 1-27. DOI 10.1080/0092623X.2011.569636

---

*Grading scheme:*

All components of this course will receive numerical percentage marks. The final grade you receive for the course will be derived by converting your numerical course average to a letter grade according to Queen’s Official Grade Conversion Scale:

***Queen’s Official Grade Conversion Scale***

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Course Average (Range)</b>
A+	90-100
A	85-89
A-	80-84
B+	77-79
B	73-76
B-	70-72
C+	67-69
C	63-66
C-	60-62
D+	57-59
D	53-56
D-	50-52
F	49 and below

## **Grading Details**

**Discussion Questions:** 20% of final grade. Questions must be 100 words or less. Questions over 100 words will not be graded and will receive a grade of 0.

Students will submit 11 questions over course; see Deadlines for details. Questions are marked out of a possible 10 marks. Total marks possible are 100. The highest 10/11 discussion question grades will be averaged.

*Grading scheme:*

0 = no question submitted

2 = Question demonstrates poor understanding of the article(s).

4 = Question demonstrates limited understanding of the article(s) and reacts to the material; does not attempt critical thinking, integration with course material and/or to examine material from different theoretical viewpoints.

6 = Question demonstrates good grasp of the article(s) and reflects issues/topics limited to the paper in question without an attempt at critical thinking, integration with course material and/or to examine material from different theoretical viewpoints.

8 = Question demonstrates good grasp of the reading and shows a good attempt at a “big picture” perspective, critical thinking, integration with previous course material and/or to examine material from different theoretical viewpoints.

10 = Question demonstrates excellent grasp of the reading and excellent evidence of critical thinking, attempts to link current to past readings, constructive criticism of research design with evidence of considering how different theoretical perspectives would inform a different/better research design, etc.

**Participation in Discussion:** 20% of final grade

Students are expected to come to class prepared to engage in discussion. During discussions, I will make note of who is speaking and the quality of their contributions. Students who find it difficult to engage with class discussion are welcome to prepare comments in advance, or to make a point of raising and elaborating upon their submitted discussion question.

Students are strongly discouraged from drawing from personal experience or providing anecdotal evidence when discussing research topics. Grades for participation are arrived at through relative scores.

**Oral Presentation:** 30% of final grade

**A. Clarity/organization of power point presentation (out of 4)**

1. Not clear at all; very poor organization
2. Inadequate clarity (dense slides, bad links, missing or too much info, distracting graphics/animation)
3. Clear enough; reflected the organization of the original article
4. Excellent use of power point; professional quality of presentation.

**B. Clarity of oral presentation (out of 4)**

1. Not clear at all; very poor oration
2. Inadequate clarity (speaking too fast, lack of balance with slides)
3. Clear enough; audience understood
4. Excellent oration (dynamic, well timed, engaging)

**C. Presentation of data and results (out of 4)**

1. Data and results not comprehensible as presented
2. Poor presentation (not explaining axes, rushed, unclear, overly complicated)
3. Adequate presentation: results clear to audience.
4. Excellent depiction/presentation of data and results, improvement over article format.

**D. Accuracy (out of 4)**

***NOTE: A half mark will be deducted for every typo.***

1. Misrepresentation of an important point; several inaccuracies
2. A few (minor) content inaccuracies; Sloppiness (undefined terms)
3. Accurate and clean, up to 2 minor presentation inaccuracies (typos).
4. Accurate, clean and no typos.

**E. Comprehension of material (out of 4)**

1. Did not seem to understand the material.
2. Clearly understood article.
3. Clearly understood article and integrated content with weekly readings.
4. Clearly understood article, integrated content with weekly readings and other course material.

**F. Time: Minus 1 points for every minute over 30 minutes Start: \_\_\_\_\_ Stop: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Final Project:** 30% of final grade

**A) Sexuality & Gender Wikipedia Initiative:**

Participate in the Association for Psychological Science’s Wikipedia Initiative by working together to create, compile and edit a Wikipedia page dedicated to understanding gender differences and similarities in sexuality. Students will work together in groups of 2-3 to address each of the main topics (and their subtopics) covered in the course.

Together, we will create a Wikipedia page entitled, “Sexuality & Gender” or “Gender Differences and Similarities in Sexuality” (or something to that effect – input welcome!). The page content will essentially be a layperson-accessible summary of the course content, linked to other Wikipedia pages, online sources, multimedia, etc.

Goals: To ensure the content about sexuality and gender on Wikipedia...

- a) Is correct
- b) Is current
- c) Is comprehensive
- d) Is inclusive of gender and sexual variations (where possible)
- e) Discusses gender differences and similarities
- f) Discusses multiple theoretical viewpoints

All contributions will be evaluated for their capacity to meet each of these goals.

Timeline:

Week 1 – Orientation to Wikipedia Initiative; participants create a Wikipedia Account & sign up with the Wikipedia Initiative.

COURSE CODE: QuePsyc436147-000-Mer

Week 2 – Begin reading articles relevant to topics covered in Sexuality & Gender course.

Week 3 – Select the topic you wish to cover. A maximum of three students can work on one topic. Students can select their own topics, and topics are first come, first served. If you feel passionately about a topic, be sure to register with that topic with ASAP. Otherwise, submit this information to Dr. Chivers to by Feb 1 by email.

Week 4 – Complete Wikipedia tutorials on APS portal

I strongly recommend that students opting to work on this group project begin familiarizing themselves with the Wikipedia editing language using the tutorials available through the APS portal.

**BY FEB 15** – Submit a one-page, point form summary version of your article (with citations) as a word document. If you are improving an existing article, copy the existing article and write a summary reflecting your planned structure and changes for the article using “track changes”. I will provide feedback after reading week.

I will be able to see what articles you are working on through the APS portal. Similarly, other students participating in the initiative can do the same. Students are encouraged to comment on other students' work, particularly those that they might have some expertise with, such as the content they covered in their presentation.

**Final submissions are due April 5<sup>th</sup>.**

Length:

There is no minimum nor maximum length for entries. Brief is better; more people are likely to read an entry that is succinct and informative. Instead of achieving comprehension through length, you will achieve it by linking to other Wikipedia articles, citing research articles or other online sources, using images/figures/etc., providing external links to other articles, multimedia etc. Contributions will be graded on their capacity to meet the goals listed above.

**B) Research Proposal Guidelines:**

Many scientific papers, and most in the discipline of psychology, have a highly specific and stylized structure. This structure is so common and “routine” that it might seem boring and restrictive. The structure of the form provides easy access for your audience. They know what to expect: they understand the vehicle in which you present your ideas. For the scientific article or thesis, the form has 4 major sections that proceed from a broad focus, to a narrow set of details specific to the study, back out to the broad implications of the results: an hourglass format.

The form:

Introduction

Method

Results

Discussion



In a thesis, each of these sections may be treated as a chapter. In an article, each is a “section” of several pages. In a conference presentation, each section requires several minutes and several slides.

A proposal usually consists of the first 2-3 sections – Introduction and Method and Analyses (how results will be assessed). Of course, you have no results to report yet, because the research is not yet done. Theses and articles are always written in past tense. **Proposals are written in future tense.**

Each section can contain subsections, and these are also quite routine, though there are also several common variants.

Here are some *models* (suggestions) for formatting the first two major sections (or chapters) of a thesis, as in a research proposal. This information is presented as an aid for writing a proposal.

## **Introduction**

### Overview or Objectives (sometimes called “Introduction”):

One or two paragraphs that introduce the problem in very abstract terms, conceptualizing it within the subfield. This is often done by outlining a question that has not been asked or has not been properly resolved. The last several sentences must point in the direction that the rest of the section or chapter will take, though you need not outline the specific steps.

### Background or literature review:

This section takes up the bulk of your proposal. It should consist of several subsections, each one focusing on a different topical area or research tradition. Here are several *possible* designs.

Design A: Some problems are best dealt with by a nested review. So the first subsection provides a general overview of the area, or the general consensus in the field, or a summary of the accumulation of knowledge in an area. Following this subsection, there will be several additional subsections that focus on more specific issues. These will be the issues that you will draw from to formulate the approach to your question. Or, you might want to do further nesting, such that subsection 2 outlines a specific approach or area of knowledge and subsection 3 (or 3-5, or whatever) focuses on very specific research paradigms within this approach.

Design B: It is also possible for each subsection to review topics or areas that are not nested but parallel. For example, the first section could be on evolutionary theory approaches to x, the second on social-learning theory approaches to x, and the third on feminist theory approaches to x, where each is an approach of equal weight or relevance to your question. You should then end your review with an integrative section in which you describe the relative benefits and/or disadvantages of these approaches, or select some features from each, or state why you are basing your thesis on the last approach, not the others.

Design C: This third possibility is a variant of the last approach under B, and it can be particularly powerful. Here you present a series of approaches, as in B, but you criticize each approach as you go along, rather than at the end. That is, you end your discussion of each approach by saying what it is missing (at least in relation to the problem you are pursuing). That identified gap then sets up your introduction of the next approach, in the next subsection, which you treat similarly. By this sequence of introducing and



critiquing several approaches, you end up with the approach that is most suitable for your own study.

These three designs are not carved in stone. Rather, they are models, and many hybrid approaches are also possible.

The most important thing about the background/literature review section is this: Each subsection (each segment of review) *must be framed in relation to your question*. There should be no ambiguity about how each reviewed approach would, or might, or could be applied to your question, or at least to a research paradigm that can address your question. In other words, each subsection is not just a review of studies; it is an argument in which you make claims about a figure-ground relation – a general approach in relation to a specific issue. There are many ways to do this and there is no specific recipe. One way is to make sure that each section ends with reference to the question you are pursuing (if this is not evident throughout). It is also helpful to make explicit bridges between sections (e.g., “Before describing these methodological issues in more detail, I will first review recent research on X.”).

#### Design:

This section could be called “Design,” or “The present study” or something like that. Here you say what you are planning to do, and why. In other words, here is where you show that a particular research design is/was custom-made for answering the question you have posed, given the research you have now reviewed. It is very important that each of the features of your design – *what* you are looking for and *how* you are going to find it – is justified in terms of the literature you have reviewed. The reader should react to this section by saying: “Of course, this would be the most obvious approach to take. I wish I’d thought of that.” This is the crux of a proposal.

#### Additional review:

Sometimes, it is necessary to review additional literature at this point with respect to methods and measurement. For example, there may be methodological issues called for in your design that would not have fit nicely into the lit review that unfolded previously. It is very important to justify your choice of methods and instruments, and while this may fit smoothly into your “Design” section, it may be more graceful to use a separate section or two to provide details about your choices.

#### Hypotheses or research questions:

The introduction should end with clearly stated hypotheses that flow naturally from your design. In other words, such a design is suited to find out several things, and you have

several predictions as to what you will find (or what you expected to find) once you analyze your data.

If your study is quite exploratory in nature, you may not have real hypotheses. In these cases, set out a number of “research questions” that could produce various outcomes, and provide details as to the potential outcomes, and what each would mean in the context of your research question.

**Overall, I strongly recommend using subheading titles. It helps to guide the reader and keep her informed. It also gives structure to the argument you are making. I also strongly recommend that you make links between paragraphs. Often for a proposal it is also helpful to explicitly state where you are going (e.g., “ In section one I will provide the literature background, in section two I will review why traditional perspectives fall short, and I will conclude with the research design that will test my hypotheses.”**

## Method

### Overview:

Some people like to start the method section with an overview, though this isn’t strictly necessary. This should be a one-paragraph description of what you did: primarily your procedure but with brief mention of the measures you used. If you are tight on space, you can easily drop this.

### Participants:

For a research proposal, describe the characteristics of your sample population, briefly state how they might be recruited, and provide an estimate of the number of participants you will need to test your hypothesis.

### Procedure:

The purpose of the study procedure is to provide all the details necessary for another researcher to replicate your study/experiment. Outline all the proposed procedures in your study. From the first phone call to prospective participants, to their arrival at the lab, to the explanation of what was required, to the experimental manipulations or tests themselves. Make sure you include all relevant details about the set-up of the lab or interview room, the recording equipment used, etc. Go through the steps of the procedure meticulously enough so that people understand exactly what you did. However, it isn’t necessary to use so much detail that someone else could replicate your study precisely without contacting you. That kind of detail is only possible through direct communication between investigators. Here, as in all other parts of the thesis, it is necessary to justify the choices you made, unless these are already obvious from your previous discussion (e.g., from Chapter 1).

Measures or tasks:

List each of your measures or tasks under a separate subheading. Include important data about each measure, such as reliability and validity data available from published articles. If you are not using any standard measures, but rather tasks of your own design, you should describe these here. Include information about why each task was structured as it was, unless this is already obvious from Chapter 1. Also make reference to other studies from which you borrowed ideas to make up your tasks.

Scoring procedures and/or derivation of variables:

Whether you used observational or other methods, you can also use this section to describe how you derived variables for your data analysis. Often investigators will merge raw data codes into more convenient variables. Or, the many available scores from standard measures can often be aggregated in various ways (e.g., subscales). Particularly if you are using observational/laboratory methods, you need to detail the methods by which you scored behaviour. This is where you describe the coding system you used, the training of the coders, the means by which you achieved reliability and the reliability levels you attained, and so forth. This can be a very long section, because coding or scoring is usually an involved process. Here is where you describe what you did to derive your variables and why. Note that some of these procedures involve statistical analysis (e.g., factor analysis). It is OK to describe these analyses here, along with tables and so forth. But it is sometimes hard to figure out where the Method chapter ends and the Results chapter begins. As a rule of thumb, put the boring stuff in this section of the Method chapter and the interesting stuff – what you found out in relation to the questions you asked – in the Results chapter.

Analysis Plan

In this section you describe the statistical methods that you will use to analyze the variables in your study. You must relate these analyses to your hypotheses directly (e.g., “Differences between the X and Y groups will be tested using an independent samples t-test on the ABCD test scores.”). The purpose of this section is to explain how you will evaluate the hypotheses you proposed.

Expected Results

In many cases, it will be useful to depict what the results would look like if the null hypothesis was rejected. Graphs are useful. This should not be a long section as the information in the previous sections makes it perfectly clear to the reader what you expect.