

**Sexual Diversity**  
**Psychology 4000A**  
**Spring 2009**

**Instructor:** Dr. Paul L. Vasey  
**E-mail:** [paul.vasey@uleth.ca](mailto:paul.vasey@uleth.ca)  
**Office:** D 852  
**Office Hours:** after class or by appointment

**Teaching Assistant:** Doug VanderLaan  
E-mail: [doug.vanderlaan@uleth.ca](mailto:doug.vanderlaan@uleth.ca)

**Class Time:** Tuesday 3:05-5:45pm  
**Classroom:** W866

**Seminar Description:**

Sexual orientation is the subject of much emotional public debate. Rarely is this debate grounded by any of the scholarly research that has been conducted on the topic. In this seminar, we will explore the question: “*What is sexual orientation?*” As such, we will not be primarily concerned with the proximate or ultimate *causes* of sexual orientation. Rather, what concerns us here is to more accurately identify what the term “sexual orientation” encompasses so that we can then characterize the component parts of this phenomenon in as accurate a manner as possible. Some of the questions we will be addressing include: How can we measure sexual orientation? Can sexual orientation change or *be* changed? What is the relationship between love and sexual desire? What is love? Does attraction and arousal to particular sexed bodies encompass the totality of one’s sexual orientation? How do sexual orientation identities develop and why?

As you can see from the seminar schedule (below), the class is set up in terms of particular themes (i.e., sexual orientation can be directed towards unusual locations). Each class we will read material pertaining to the designated theme (typically an academic article and a popular essay on the same topic). Each of us will likely pick up and focus on some particular aspect of the reading. Consequently, together, we will discuss these reading materials with each other, helping each other achieve a clearer total understanding of what the author intended to communicate. We will work to think critically with respect to each of the readings, asking questions about flaws in logic, gaps in reasoning and where to go next in terms of testing the ideas presented. I recognize that everyone is busy, but sometimes students might want to pursue further reading(s) on an assigned theme and I can certainly suggest further readings. Individuals that do decide to read more on a particular assigned theme could share what they learned using the seminar’s Courseware (WebCT) discussions that will continue through the week (this will greatly impress me and the grade you receive for your Courseware (WebCT) participation will reflect this). Importantly, we will attempt to draw links between the various readings covered in the seminar (and students might want to form links with additional readings I have not assigned, but which they have taken upon themselves to read). By the end of each seminar, we will come to realize that we can only begin to understand each of the assigned themes and we will realize how much more there is to

learn. Along the way, we will start to develop an integrated framework that will permit us to think about how the component parts of sexual orientation interact and align. By the end of the seminar, I suspect you will think about sexual orientation quite differently from the way you did at the start of the semester.

### **My Teaching Style:**

Because this is a seminar class, the emphasis is on discussions, not lectures. I will not stand up at the front of the class and lecture with a power-point presentation that focuses your attention on all the “right” answers and information. This means that students will have to be *a lot* more actively engaged than they typically are in most classrooms. To be sure, I guide seminar discussion in my role as The Professor, but I also treat each seminar as a potential learning experience for myself because I firmly believe that good academics never stop being students. The general seminar model I follow could be summarized as “fumbling my way to some sort of (partial) knowledge.” Students who want black and white “right” answers about the world laid out pronto by the instructor like the recipe for a cake, will probably not like this way of learning. Equally, students who want answers to “everything” will be frustrated. A lot of research remains to be done and we simply don’t know “everything” about many of the topics we will cover in this seminar. Maybe this will prompt some of you to become sex researchers.

I also have a sense of humour about sexuality, as well as, academia. This occasionally comes though in the classroom. If I was “up tight” and ridged during classroom discussions of sexuality, you would be too. That sort of teaching style would simply suggest that the topics under discussion are very *very* bad and should only be mentioned in reverent and hush tones. That type of mindset would impede us from undertaking an objective and scientific investigation of sexuality. If you are someone that thinks that humour has no place in the classroom or in discussions of sexuality you will not like my style of instruction and should not take this seminar.

I am not an instructor that dwells on “factoids.” As such, I’m not interested in cramming into your heads sundry factoids about sexual orientation (e.g., In study Z by Dr. Y, she showed that X% of homosexual men listen to Judy Garland on a weekly basis). I’d rather create a seminar environment in which we think in broad conceptual terms about the assigned themes. My feeling is that without the right conceptual framework in place, there is no way of structuring and making sense of all the factoids. Factoids might make you a Trivial Pursuit champion, but they don’t make you a critical and insightful thinker.

I am not interested in maximizing your suffering. I think the seminar will be challenging, but every class is designed to maximize learning and stimulate interest. As such, I have invested a lot of time and energy into choosing the “right” readings. I assume that your time is as precious as mine. As such, you can see I have made every effort to keep the required reading workload manageable and even fun. My feeling is that, by doing so, you will really read the assigned readings and not feel so overwhelmed that you just throw up your hands and give up.

I was recently asked, if you had to pick a handful of goals you have for your seminar what would they be? Here is what I said:

- I hope the students learn to think critically using an evidence-based approach to analyzing issues and not an approach based on their personal value systems.

- I hope students realize that sex is something that can be studied scientifically and systematically using an evidence-based approach.
- I hope students learn that political correctness has no place in the scientific study of sexuality. At the same time, I really hope students come to realize a subtle, but important distinction; namely, researchers can personally and privately hold “politically correct” values about various moral, legal and social policies that affect their communities, irrespective of any “politically incorrect” results that arise from their scientific research.
- I hope students understand that sexually speaking, the world is *very* diverse, and their little corner of the sexual universe is just one hue of the rainbow.
- I hope students get comfortable talking and thinking about sexuality.

**Required Readings:**

Required readings (see the seminar schedule below) have been chosen for each week of the seminar. They must be read **before** the seminar in order for discussions to function properly. Required readings include carefully chosen (see above) peer-reviewed academic articles, scholarly book chapters and more popular essays on a related topic. Most are conceptual in scope, not empirical. Required readings that are available from the university’s online library system are identified in the course schedule with an asterisk (\*). All other required readings will be made available to students on the university Coureware (WebCT) seminar page, which can be accessed by logging in with your uleth webmail username and password here:

<https://courseware.uleth.ca/webct/logonDisplay.dowebct>

**Grading:**

The following ranges will be employed in assigning grades in this course:

A+	≥ 89.5	C+	66.5-69.4
A	84.5-89.4	C	63.5-66.4
A-	79.5-84.4	C-	59.5-63.4
B+	76.5-79.4	D+	56.5-59.4
B	73.5-76.4	D	50-56.4
B-	69.5-73.4	F	≤49.9

In accordance with the University of Lethbridge Calendar,

- A = Excellent
- B = Good
- C = Satisfactory
- D = Poor
- F = Fail

**SEMINAR ASSESSMENT:**

**Quizzes (50%):** Quizzes will take place each week at the beginning of class to assess comprehension of the reading material. The format of the quizzes will be multiple choice and/or short answer. Each quiz is worth 5%. This is the carrot I use to get you to read the required reading material before class.

### **Participation:**

If you do not participate in discussions inside and outside of the seminar via the University Courseware (WebCT) system, your final grade will suffer. Students who do not participate in the seminar discussions should not be surprised to get zero for that portion of their grade.

### **Participation in classroom discussions (10%):**

Students can earn 10% of their grade simply by participating in classroom discussions. So if you say something intelligent in each class (even raising an insightful question counts, regardless of whether you know the answer), you'll get a maximum of 1% per class. Questions or comments that contribute a novel, insightful and well-reasoned perspective to class discussion are considered quality contributions. The most impressive questions or comments are those that draw together information from two (or more) seminars, relate the pieces of information to each other and, in doing so, illuminating some insight. No grades will be assigned for attendance (it's not enough to simply be a warm body).

**Extra-seminar Courseware/WebCT participation: (10%):** Participation in Courseware (WebCT) directed discussions will be assessed on a weekly basis. If you contribute one insightful written item to the week's Courseware (WebCT) directed discussion you will get a maximum of 1% per class. Discussions will be "directed" in the sense that the instructor will pose questions related to the assigned readings, the films, and class discussion. The questions posed by the instructor will serve as a launching pad for discussion, but I encourage students to think (and discuss) broadly about the issues under investigation. I will rein in the discussion if it runs too far a field. Students that relate seminar material to other readings that they have made the effort to search out will be viewed very favorably.

### **Instructor's Questions (10%):**

Participation will be evaluated based on your verbal response to questions I ask in class about various aspects of the readings. I will pose questions directly to individual students of my choice and everyone can expect that they will be asked two such questions over the course of the seminar. Responses that contribute a novel, insightful and well-reasoned perspective to class discussion are considered quality responses. 0 = didn't understand the question. 2.5 = Sort of understood the question. 5 = Understood the question.

### **End-of-Term Test (20%)**

An end-of-term test is worth 20% of your grade. The format for this test will be essay-style, long answers. One or two readings will be assigned prior to the test and there will be questions on the test pertaining to these reading(s).

### **Bonuses**

**Participation in Department of Psychology projects (maximum 2%):** After your final grade has been calculated (not including possible bonuses you might accrue from the two-minute presentations [see below]), you can have an additional 2% added onto your final grade if you have participated in some research in the Department of Psychology

that pertains to sexuality or gender. This will give you an opportunity to experience how psychological research is conducted. A list of potential projects in which you can participate will be listed on the seminar's Courseware (WebCT) page approximately two weeks after the start of the course. Because research projects start up throughout the semester, additional projects may be listed during the course of the seminar.

**Two-minute presentations:** Every week students (up to a maximum of 2 students/week) who choose to do so will each give a two-minute presentation on a topic of their choice selected from one of the entries in:

Love, B. (1994). *Encyclopedia of Unusual Sexual Practices*. NY: Barricade Books.

The basic goal of this exercise is to: (1) give you some practice talking in front of a group of people, (2) help you get comfortable talking about sex. The instructor has a copy of the book and it will get passed around to whomever is presenting. A list of the topics previous presenters have chosen will be recorded so that the same topic is not chosen twice.

*What's in it for you?* If your final mark is 1% below the next letter grade, I'll bump your grade up. So, if you do a 2-minute presentation and your final grade is: 78.5 (B+), I'll bump your grade to 79.5% (A-).

Those students that wish to do two-minute presentations should identify themselves during the first class and a schedule will be drawn up. In giving a two-minute presentation please, put together an overhead slide (acetate) in which you *define* the phenomenon you are discussing and include one or two additional points (maximum) which you feel are the most important "take-home" messages about the phenomenon. If there is a graphic that accompanies the particular phenomenon you have chosen to present on (some of the entries in the book are accompanied by line drawings), please show the graphic on an overhead slide (acetate) because pictures are always good!

**Other information about the seminar:**

(1) In addition to the readings, documentary films on sexuality will sometimes be screened during some seminar classes. If you miss the films, they cannot be borrowed from the instructor and there will not be a second screening. **No exceptions.** The TA and I lead very busy academic lives outside of this seminar and we simply do not have the human resources necessary to accommodate individually scheduled screenings of missed films. Do not ask us to do so unless you want a very chilly response. Questions pertaining to material presented in the documentary films may be on the midterm and end-of-term tests.

- (2) The seminar will deal frankly with controversial issues pertaining to sexuality. This content may make some people uncomfortable. Some of the course material will be very sexually explicit. Such individuals should seriously consider this possibility before they commit to taking this seminar.
- (3) Given the controversial nature of the course material, a diversity of viewpoints will inevitably exist in the classroom. Voicing well-reasoned disagreement with others' viewpoints is perfectly fine (even encouraged!); being disrespectful towards others is not.
- (4) Additional work will not be assigned for those who wish to improve their grades.
- (5) Please turn off your cell phones during the seminar.
- (6) Students can write missed tests if they provide documentation from a doctor stating that they were ill and that their test performance would have been seriously affected on the day of their illness. The documentation must have the doctor's name, address and phone number. Non-medical reasons for missed exams (i.e., a death in the family) must also be supported with appropriate documentation.
- (7) If students need to talk about some sexual or gender related issues that are troubling them, I strongly recommend they make an appointment with the counsellors at the student-counselling center. The Student Counselling Office can be found in TH 218. The number at the counselling center is 317-2845. The website is:  
<<http://www.uleth.ca/ross/counselling/index.html>>.

### **CLASS SCHEDULE**

Class Date	Lecture and Class Discussion Topics	Required Reading
Sept. 15	Introduction to the course	
Sept. 22	<p><b>What is sexual orientation?</b></p> <p>How can sexual orientation be measured? Do all various measures of sexual orientation align with each other?</p> <p>What is sexual behavior? What is sexual attraction? What is sexual arousal? In what way are these phenomena distinct?</p> <p>Why do we have <i>sexual</i> identities at all? Why do some sexual identities exist and not others?</p>	<p>*Bailey, J. M. (2008). What is Sexual orientation and do women have one? In: <i>Contemporary Perspectives on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identities (Nebraska Symposium on Motivation)</i>, Hope, D.A. (ed.), pp. 43-64. New York: Springer. <a href="http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/JMihael-Bailey/BaileyNebraska.pdf">http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/JMihael-Bailey/BaileyNebraska.pdf</a></p> <p>Christina, G. (1992). "Are we having sex now or what?" In: <i>The Erotic Impulse: Honoring the Sensual Self</i>, Steinberg, D. (ed.). pp. 24-29. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons. <a href="http://www.gretachristina.com/arewe.html">http://www.gretachristina.com/arewe.html</a></p>

	<p>What do sex differences in genital and subjective arousal tell us about male and female sexual orientation?</p> <p>Is sexual orientation just about attraction, or can it also be about aversion?</p> <p>Is all sexual arousal pleasurable?</p> <p>Is sexual orientation manifested differently according to one's (sub)culture and the historical period into which one is born?</p> <p>What is Bailey's (2008) basis for arguing that women do not have a sexual orientation? Is this conclusion plausible?</p>	
<p>Sept. 29</p>	<p><b>Stability and fluidity in sexual orientation</b></p> <p>Is sexual orientation stable or does it change over time?</p> <p>What, if anything, changes? Behavior? Fantasy? Identity?</p> <p>Are there sex differences in sexual fluidity and if so, why might this be?</p> <p>Can sexual orientation <i>be</i> changed through some form of intervention?</p> <p>Even though Beckstead (2001) argues that reparative therapy does not work, why does he conclude that for some people, it may be helpful?</p> <p>Beckstead (2001) outlines some ways that reparative therapy might benefit certain individuals. Is there any evidence that reparative therapy benefited Harryman? Is there any evidence that Harryman's (1991) reparative therapy did not work because he was not sufficiently motivated? In other words, did he simply not try hard enough?</p>	<p>Beckstead, A.L. (2001). Cures versus choices: Agendas in sexual reorientation therapy. <i>Journal of Gay &amp; Lesbian Psychotherapy</i>, 5: 87-115.</p> <p>Harryman, D.D. (1991). With all thy getting, get understanding. In: <i>Peculiar People: Mormons and Same-sex Orientation</i>, R. Schow, W. Schow &amp; M. Raynes (eds.) pp. 23-35. Salt Lake City: Signature Books.</p> <p>Film: <i>One Nation Under God</i></p>

<p>Oct. 6</p>	<p><b>Distinguishing lust from love</b></p> <p>Should we distinguish sexual orientations from romantic orientations?</p> <p>If so, do they always mirror each other or can one's sexual orientation differ from one's romantic orientation?</p> <p>Should one's romantic orientation be considered part of one's sexual orientation?</p> <p>Can someone's sexual orientation be person-centered? In other words, can someone be "attracted to the person and not the gender"?</p> <p>Using the ideas outlined in Diamond (2003) can we characterize Matteson (1991) as having a sexual orientation and a romantic orientation? What does Matteson's sexual and romantic orientations tell us about how these two dimensions of sexuality are organized?</p>	<p>*Diamond, L.M. (2003). What does sexual orientation orient? A biobehavioral model distinguishing romantic love and sexual desire. <i>Psychological Review</i>, 110: 173-192.</p> <p>Matteson, D. (1991). Bisexual feminist man. In: <i>Bi Any Other Name: Bisexual People Speak Out</i>, L. Hutchin &amp; L. Kaahumanu (eds.), pp. 43-50 . NY: Alyson Publications.</p>
<p>Oct. 13</p>	<p><b>What is Love?</b></p> <p>How many different types of love are there?</p> <p>Can the existence of different types of love help answer the question as to whether we should distinguish sexual orientations from romantic orientations?</p> <p>Can it help explain why an individual might have a sexual and a romantic orientation that might be different?</p> <p>Can it help explain why individuals might be "in love" with different people at the same time?</p> <p>Is it possible to experience passionate love for someone in the absence of lust?</p>	<p>*Sternburg, R.J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. <i>Psychological Review</i>, 93: 119-135.</p> <p>Film: <i>When Two Won't Do?</i></p>



	<p>In the film, <i>When Two Won't Do</i>, does Morine exhibit different types of love towards her various male partners?</p> <p>Can Sternburg's "Triangular Theory of Love" help us understand why some people identify as polyamorous? Does Matteson love his female partner the same way he loves his male partners?</p> <p><b>Peak Erotic Experiences</b> Should an individual's "core erotic theme" be considered part of their sexual orientation?</p> <p>If so, what are some potential examples of "core erotic themes" that might count as part of someone's sexual orientation?</p> <p>Would be easier to experience passionate love for someone if their peak erotic interest closely matched your own?</p>	<p>Morin, J. (1992). Peak erotic experiences. In: <i>The Erotic Impulse: Honoring the Sensual Self</i>, Steinberg, D. (ed.). pp. 9-20. NY: G.P. Putnam's Sons.</p>
<p>Oct. 20</p>	<p><b>Sexual Orientation has an age-related dimension</b></p> <p>What is the difference between child molestation and pedophilia?</p> <p>Can pedophilia be considered a sexual orientation?</p> <p>Can pedophilic sexual interests be changed through interventions?</p> <p>What are some other examples of age-related dimensions of sexual orientation?</p> <p>Do pedophiles exhibit romantic orientations? If so, how are these expressed?</p> <p>Same-sex sexual partners are unusual sexual targets, so why isn't homosexuality considered a paraphilia or a mental disorder?</p>	<p>Seto, M. C. (2008). Introduction: Defining pedophilia. In: <i>Pedophilia and Sexual Offending Against Children: Theory, Assessment and Intervention</i>. (pp. 3-22). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.</p> <p>Silva, D. C. (1990). Pedophilia: An autobiography. In J. R. Feierman (Ed.), <i>Pedophilia: Biosocial dimensions</i> (pp. 464-487). New York: Springer-Verlag.</p> <p>Film: <i>Capturing the Friedman's</i></p>

<p>Oct. 27</p>	<p><b>Sexual orientation can be oriented toward unusual targets</b></p> <p>Is zoophilia a sexual orientation?</p> <p>Do individuals with sexual orientations towards unusual targets express love? How is it expressed?</p> <p>Do zoophiles “love” their animal sexual partners?</p> <p>Do foot fetishists love their partners or do they love their partner’s feet?</p> <p>Is there any evidence that foot fetishism can be eliminated via clinical interventions?</p> <p>Why do fetishes towards specific classes of objects (e.g., leather, rubber) exist? Why not fetishes for bednobs or broomsticks?</p>	<p>Miletski, H. (2005). Is zoophilia a sexual orientation? A study. In: <i>Bestiality and zoophilia: Sexual relations with animals</i>, A.M. Beetz &amp; A.L. Podbersck (eds.), pp. 82-97. Ashland: Purdue University Press.</p> <p>*Earls, C.M. &amp; Lalumière, M.L. (2008). A case study of preferential bestiality. <i>Archives of Sexual Behavior</i>, 38: 605-609.</p> <p>Bergner, D. (2009). The Phantom of the Opera. In: <i>Other Side of Desire</i>, pp. 3-45. New York: HaperCollins.</p>
<p>Nov. 3</p>	<p><b>Sexual orientation can be directed toward unusual locations</b></p> <p>What are Erotic Target Location Errors?</p> <p>What are some of the various ways in which ETLE can manifest?</p> <p>What is autogynephilia and what are some of the ways it can be manifested?</p> <p>What evidence is there that fetishes, transvestitism and anatomical autogynephia constitute a single paraphiic dimension?</p> <p>How are autogynephilic and homosexual male-to-female transsexuals different?</p> <p>In what ways do men with ETLE express love?</p> <p>What is the relationship between sexuality and identity?</p>	<p>*Lawrence, A.A. (2007). Becoming what we love: Autogynephilic transsexualism conceptualized as an expression of romantic love. <i>Perspectives in Biology &amp; Medicine</i> 50: 506-520.</p> <p>Bloom, A. (2002). Conservative men in conservative dresses. In: <i>Normal</i> (pp. 49–98). New York: Random House.</p> <p>Bailey, J.M. (2003). Terese and Cher. In: <i>The Man Who Would Be Queen</i>, pp. 145-156. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press.</p> <p>Film: <i>All Dressed Up &amp; No Place to Go</i></p>

<p><b>Nov. 10</b></p>	<p><b>Sexual Orientation Identities</b></p> <p>Why do people adopt, or ascribe to others, sexual orientation identities at all?</p> <p>Why do some sexual minority identities arise and not others? Why don't people identify as bednob-o-philes and broomstick-o-philes?</p> <p>Is it necessary to even have a sexual orientation identity?</p> <p>Are our sexual orientation identities "real" or are they just stories we tell ourselves about ourselves?</p> <p>What does it mean if someone self-identifies as "unlabelled"?</p> <p>What does Diamond (2005) think we got wrong about sexual orientation identity development? Why did we get it wrong?</p> <p>Is Katz (1990) really suggesting in the past heterosexuals (and homosexuals?) did not exist? Do you think Bailey would agree with Katz that heterosexuality (and homosexuality) were "invented"?</p> <p>Elliot (2000) states that "When I asked one prominent wannabe who also happens to be a psychologist if he experiences the wish to lose a limb as a matter of sex or a matter of identity, he disputed the very premise of the question." Why did he dispute the premise of the question?</p> <p>Elliot feels that medical diagnoses generate identities, but is this really the case for something like apotemnophilia?</p>	<p>Katz, J.N. (1990). The invention of heterosexuality. <i>Socialist Review</i>, 20, 7-34.</p> <p>Diamond, L. M. (2005). What we got wrong about sexual identity development. In A. Omoto &amp; H. Kurtzman (Eds.), <i>Sexual orientation and mental health</i> (pp. 73-94). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association Press.</p> <p>Elliot, C. (2000). A new way to be mad? <i>The Atlantic</i>, 286: 72-84. <a href="http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200012/madness">http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200012/madness</a></p> <p>Film: <i>WHOLE</i></p>
<p>Nov. 17</p>	<p><b>Sexual orientation can be oriented toward unusual activities (I)</b></p> <p>In Baumeister's (1988) view, how does sexual masochism facilitate escape</p>	<p>*Baumeister, R. (1988). Masochism as escape from self. <i>The Journal of Sex Research</i>, 25(1), 28-59.</p> <p>Gates, K. (2000). Pony play comes out of</p>

	<p>from self? What evidence is there that he is correct?</p> <p>Can Baumeister's (1998) Escape from Self Theory help to explain the apparent absence of sexual masochism in many non-Western cultures?</p> <p>In Baumeister's view, what makes <i>sexual</i> masochism a particularly effective facilitator of Escape from Self?</p> <p>How does "pony play" exemplify Baumeister's theory?</p>	<p>the stables. In: <i>Deviant desired: Incredibly strange sex</i>, pp. 12-71. New York: Juno Books.</p> <p>Film: <i>Born in a Barn</i></p>
<p>Nov. 24</p>	<p><b>Sexual orientation can be oriented toward unusual activities (II)</b></p> <p>What is courtship disorder theory?</p> <p>Why are some unusual sexual activities paraphilic (e.g., triolism), but not others (e.g., a preference for threesomes or group sex) orientation?</p> <p>Individuals with courtship disorders experience lust in relation to particular unusual activities. Is it conceivable that they experience love in relation to these unusual activities? If not, why? If yes, how would this love manifest itself?</p> <p>Shealy's essay is tongue-in-cheek. Nevertheless, how does it highlight how sexuality, even atypical sexuality, provides a grand organizing force in people's lives?</p> <p><b>Does everyone have a sexual orientation?</b></p> <p>Do some individuals have no sexual desire whatsoever?</p> <p>Are some individuals that are described as asexual really analloerotic?</p>	<p>Freud, K. (1990). Courtship disorder. In: <i>Handbook of Sexual Assault: Issues, Theories and Treatment of the Offender</i>, Marshall, W.L., Laws, D.R., &amp; Barbaree, H.E. (eds.), pp. 195-207. NY: Plenum Press.</p> <p>*Shealy, B. (2007). It's not easy being a frotteur. <i>The Onion</i>, Oct. 24.  <a href="http://www.theonion.com/content/opinion/its_not_easy_being_a_frotteur">http://www.theonion.com/content/opinion/its_not_easy_being_a_frotteur</a></p> <p>Bogaert, A. (2006). Toward a conceptual understanding of asexuality. <i>Review of General Psychology</i>, 3: 241-250.</p>

	Do some individuals that are described as asexual really just have Hypoactive Sexual Desire Disorder?	
Dec. 1	TBA	TBA
Dec. 8	Final test (20%)	