

Exploring the Production of Marginalizing Behaviours in Women who have Sex with Women

by
Jenn Clark

B.A., Kwantlen College, 2013

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

The Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
(Gender, Race, Sexuality and Social Justice)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

April 2021

©Jenn Clark, 2021

The following individuals certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled:

Exploring the Production of Marginalizing Behaviours in Women who have sex with Women

Submitted by Jenn Clark in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master's of Arts

In Gender, Race, Sexuality and Social Justice

Examining Committee:

Janice Stewart, Professor of Teaching, Associate Dean Innovation and Strategy, Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality and Social Justice, UBC

Supervisor

Jennifer Jenson, Professor, Language and Literacy Education, UBC

Supervisory Committee Member

Abstract

Our sexual self is learned across our lifespan. We learn what behaviour is acceptable and what behaviour is not. The things that we learn about our sexual self are steeped in hegemonic ideologies. Without conscious awareness, we then act out our sexual interactions with scripted behaviour which allows for mutual understanding between two parties but also women.

Specifically, I examine the intragroup violence that is perpetrated through relational aggression using a sample of women who have sex with women (WSW).

Interviewing WSW recounting interactions with potential paramours, participants were asked to discuss whether objectification was present in their experiences.

A qualitative thematic analysis was performed on the interview scripts. The analysis identified several nodes of objectification. Using a combination of sexual script theory and film analysis, this research identifies the enactment of intragroup relational aggression tactics through the objectification of WSW by WSW.

Objectification is one method of dehumanizing individuals. Objectifying paramours in the WSW communities' acts as enforcement to conform others to the hegemonic ideologies of the groups. Further interrogation of the hegemonic ideologies of WSW communities brings forth an understanding of how these interactions are learned.

This thesis explores the construction and enactment of ideologies that occur in interactions between women who have sex with women.

Lay Summary

We learn the rules of gender and sexuality. There are cultural norms that we must follow in order to fit in. If we don't follow them, other folks in society will gossip, make fun of, or bully us back into abiding by the rules. This study looked at stories told by WSW showing interest in other WSW. It was found that one form of making others follow the rules of sexuality in non-heterosexual women is to objectify them. What this means is that if a woman has the appearance of a butch person then others will interact with that person in a masculinized fashion. This interaction happens outside of trying to understand who the person is for their uniqueness.

Preface

This thesis is an original, unpublished work by the author Jenn Clark. The field work reported in Chapters 3 and 4 was covered by UBC ethics certificate number H17-00265.

The groundwork in Chapters 1 to 3 was presented as part of a conference submission made by Kwantlen College Human Sexuality Psychology Lab under the direction of Dr. Cory Pedersen. A poster entitled “Butches on Top; Femmes on the Bottom: Intragroup Relational Aggression Produced through the Lesbian Gaze “was shown at the Association for Psychological Science, in November 2017 in Atlanta, Georgia.

All investigations including literature reviews, data collection and analysis were the sole responsibility of the author.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Lay Summary	iv
Preface	v
Table of Contents	vi
Terminology.....	viii
Acknowledgements	ix
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Prelude to a Thesis	1
1.2 Research Purpose	2
1.3 WSW Defined.....	2
1.4 Lack of Literature on WSW and Dating	3
1.5 Insider Information from WSW	4
1.6 Research Approach.....	6
2 Literature Review	7
2.1 Learning.....	7
2.2 Learning Gender.....	10
2.3 Sexual Script Theory	14
2.3.1 Myth of naturalness.....	15
2.3.2 Sexual organs as the primary sources of meaning	16
2.3.3 Etiquette	17
2.4 Learning Sexuality	18
2.5 Male Gaze Theory	21
2.6 Relational Aggression.....	27
3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS	30
3.1 Purpose of Study.....	30
3.2 Guiding Principles	30
3.2.1 Paradigmatic Stance	30
3.2.2 Researcher Positionality	32
3.2.3 Phenomenological Methodology	34
3.3 Study Population	35
3.4 Recruitment.....	37

3.5 Data Collection	37
3.6 Data Analysis	39
3.7 Ethical Considerations	40
3.7.1 Marginalized Populations	41
3.7.2 Sensitive Topic	41
3.7.3 Prejudicial Comments	42
3.7.4 Informed consent	43
3.7.5 Maintaining Confidentiality	44
3.8 Risks and Benefits of Participating	45
3.9 Limitations	45
3.9.1 Intersectionality of Presentation	46
3.9.2 Intersectionality of Race	46
3.9.3 Intersectionality of Location	46
4 Findings	48
4.1 Instances of Objectification found in this data set	48
4.1.1 Objectification: Denial of Subjectivity	49
4.1.2 Objectification: Reduction to Appearance	51
4.1.3 Objectification: Reduction to the Body	55
4.1.2 Ownership/Commodity	56
5 Discussion	60
5.1 Did I really objectify those women?	60
5.2 How have women made objectifying language part of their conversation?	61
5.2 Why would women objectify each other?	62
5.3 What are the long-term negative impacts on members of the LGBTQ+ communities?	63
6 Conclusion	66
References	67
Appendix A: Interview Script	87
Appendix B: Consent Form	89

Terminology

Asexual	Not having sexual feelings toward others: not experiencing sexual desire.
Bisexual (Bi's)	Sexually or romantically attracted to people of same sex and the opposite sex.
Dateability	How suitable or how worthy a person is to date.
Gender fluids	Someone who does not identify with a fixed gender.
Gold Stars	Lesbians who have never had sex with men.
Hegemony	The social, cultural, ideological, or economic influence exerted by a dominant group.
Marginalized	Relegated to a lesser position within a society or group
Pansexual	A person who is attracted to someone not based on their gender but on their personality
Polyamory	The state or practice of having more than one romantic relationship at a time.
Queer	Sexual or romantic attraction that is not limited to people of a particular gender identity or sexual orientation; not the norm.
Scarlet A	Someone who is labelled by society as bad
Zeitgeist	The general intellectual, moral, and cultural climate of an era.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my graduate advisor, Dr. Janice Stewart, Senior Instructor, Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Social Justice for her guidance through the course of my graduate work.

The enthusiasm from friends belonging to the Kwantlen College Human Sexuality Lab and their director, Dr. Cory Pedersen, was also much appreciated.

A special thanks goes to friends Kaye, Kate, Ine, and Shruti who helped keep me motivated and talked me through my writer's blocks.

Huong, there are no words to describe our relationship or your support, but I am eternally grateful to you.

Finally, my parents whose patience, love and financial assistance were needed to accomplish this task.

1 Introduction

1.1 Prelude to a Thesis

I was out for dinner one night at the restaurant chain where my brother is the corporate chef. The establishment comes with prestige, great service, and a lot of attention. After finishing dinner, the food and beverage manager, my brother and myself went to the lounge to visit and have some drinks. The lounge is laid back with T.V.s on the wall and predominately female servers dressed in black. Customers show up in casual dress. The servers know the two men that I am sitting with. They are 'big-wigs' in the company, so we are attracting lots of attention at the table. Later that night, after the men with me had begun drinking starts what can best be described as locker room talk. Boasting about their conquests and commenting on the appearance of the serving staff. This is disturbing because one of the two men is married, and the other is my brother. Even more disturbing, I joined in. In that moment, I had no outside thought or critique of how I was behaving in this environment, or how absolutely outside my character and moralities I was performing. I left the lounge. Not a minute outside the door I stopped in my tracks – WHAT JUST HAPPENED??? I felt confused, odd, uneasy, disturbed. I had just joined in on behaviour that I know is destructive to women. I walked out of the lounge and reflected on what had just happened. I felt gross, unstable, outside myself. My behaviour reflected none of my moralities or who I see myself to be. Who was that? It threw me off for the rest of the day. Two years later and I was still replaying that evening in my head and trying to figure out:

- Did I really objectify those women?

- As a WSW would I exhibit the same behaviour towards women I was attracted to?
- How have women made that type of language a part of their conversation?
- Why would I objectify other women?
- What are the long-term negative impacts on members of the LGBTQ+ community downgrading each other?

1.2 Research Purpose

This inquiry examined intragroup violence that is perpetrated through relational aggression as a tool of conformity. To explore such a broad concept, the proposed research will sample women who have sex with women (WSW) as a case study group. This research hopes to uncover the complex intragroup relational aggression that is produced by (and against) women who have sex with women and their reasons for engaging in such tactics that upholds their own subjugation. If this behaviour ultimately results in their own marginalization, what are the underlying reasons for using these measures of conformity. Specifically, this research seeks to examine: the relational aggression as enacted by the WSW communities.

1.3 WSW Defined

Women who have sex with women (WSW) is a term that has been adopted by research communities in order to encompass the breadth of identities and orientations that comprise non-heterosexual women (Cast, 2003; Gergen, 2001; Young & Meyer, 2005).

WSW groups are based on behaviour instead of identity (Cast, 2003). There is great importance in being able to have one's identity recognized (Dworkin, 2013; Stets, 2003). Grouping identities into an overarching label eases the discussion of similarities over one of differences (Diamond, 2013; Dworkin, 2013; Young & Meyer, 2005). All these factors acknowledged; WSW is the term that is used throughout this thesis to avoid listing all identities of non-heterosexual women at every juncture.

1.4 Lack of Literature on WSW and Dating

While using the term WSW to discuss matters of this thesis succinctly, the review of relevant literature was done with all non-heterosexual women's orientations and identities considered. Finding literature that describes the rules of dating is difficult. Couple that search with trying to find literature on non-heterosexual women increases the difficulty. Research on courtship, sex, and pairing is most often looked at from a reproductive lens (Kiesling, 2013; Moore, 2010). In other words, the heterosexual is superimposed as the framework as to how we should discuss WSW dating (Crawley & Willman, 2018; Taylor, 2018). What this means is that the research on WSW is primarily examined from a butch/femme perspective as though no other form of couple exists (Crawley & Willman, 2018; Levitt et. al., 2003; Taylor 2018). The research on bisexuals focusses on biphobia (Diamond, 2013; Dworkin, 2013; Obradors-Campos, 2011; Stulberg, 2018; Wu et. al., 2019). This is rampant in both hetero and non-hetero communities (Dworkin, 2013; Salim et. al., 2020; Wu et. al., 2019) and results in the devaluation of bisexuals as potential paramours (Gurevich et. al., 2007; Wu et. al., 2019). For trans* individuals research tends to focus on clinical angles (i.e., therapy)

(Lyons et. al., 2017; Nemoto et. al., 2011; Samons, 2009; Sanchez & Vilain, 2012) and discrimination in heterosexual communities (Clifford & Orford, 2007; Pearce et. al., 2020). Literature on the history of the gay and lesbian civil rights movements tell us of the violence endured, the gaining of rights, and the continued struggles (Cartier, 2014; Hegarty, 2018; Rothblum, 2012; Rose & Hospital, 2018; Skidmore, 2011). The histories are told from one perspective and biased by the privilege of those who tell it (Bass, 2018; Berlant, 2012; Griffin, 2018; Halberstam, 2018; Law & Urry, 2004; McRobbie, 2013; Skidmore, 2011; Singer, 1993). Historical accounts can teach us about the past and the contexts in which WSW found themselves; however, they don't teach WSW how to comport themselves in dating.

Dating in general is rule bound. Don't kiss on the first date. Don't message for 3 days. Don't talk about religion, politics, or exes. These are some of the spoken rules of dating. There are also unspoken rules of dating and these are learned through experience and socialization. Don't date fat folk (Conte, 2017; Felkins, 2019; Taylor, 2018). Don't date outside your race (Hall & Greene, 2002; hooks, 2015; McIntosh et. al., 2011; Lane, 2015; Liu et al., 1995; Phua & Kaufman, 2003). These rules are prejudiced. Much of the unspoken rules are followed without understanding where they come from or what purpose they serve. We can be challenged to question our choices in who we date, however, this requires work that most of us are not willing to do.

1.5 Insider Information from WSW

In order to understand the unspoken rules and roles of WSW dating, looking outside academia proved more fruitful. Online magazines, blogs, vlogs, online forums, and online groups function to inform from a subversive place (Zgoda & Shane, 2018). As stated above, the unspoken rules of dating are often based in prejudice and privilege which are hard to admit to. So, the unspoken rules are relegated to editorials – people demanding them to stop or making them fodder for humor – the man hating lesbian portrayal in sitcoms. The following will discuss some examples of one of the unspoken rules of dating in the WSW communities, what I call the propinquity to the penis rules. The most common example that is heard around town is the “Gold Star.” This term refers to a lesbian that has never slept with a man. In the WSW world, this sexual history comes with an arbitrary elevation (Manzella, 2018). The top spots in the WSW communities belong to those that are furthest away from sex with men. As Sam Manzella (2018) points out in their article, the gold star is regarded as ‘gayer’ than other orientations. Furthering this line of propinquity to the penis, bisexual women are seen as untrustworthy and on a temporary stay when sleeping with women (Dworkin, 2013). Bisexual women are seen as wanting to explore sex with women but ultimately returning to men for long-term relationships (Borver et al., 2008; Gurevich et. al., 2007; Salim et.al., 2020; Wu et. al., 2019); therefore bisexual women are seen as closer in proximity, time, and orientation toward the penis. The unspoken rules are part of what maintains the hierarchy in WSW communities.

When we are with a particular person, in a particular time – we conform to the standards that are prescribed for that situation, even if we don’t agree with them. When we do not

endorse a rule, we are devalued by the group. When we see someone else acting outside the bounds of the scripts, we are expected to devalue them.

1.6 Research Approach

This study employs a qualitative approach using in-depth, fluid interviews guided by conversations with WSW participants. A qualitative thematic analysis was then performed on the interview scripts.

2 Literature Review

Socio-cultural theorists are driven by the learned nature of the socialization of behaviours and identities (Andersen & Chen, 2002; Chen et al., 2006; Gedeon, 2015; John-Steiner, 1999; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014; Tarver, 2011). In order to discuss how individuals and societies inform each other, I open with the assumptions that I make when referring to learning.

2.1 Learning

Learning occurs throughout our day and across our entire life. I make several assumptions about learning:

- *One, learning impacts every environment that we interact with, including our prenatal environment.*

Barnes (2015), performed a study looking at interactions with prenatal environment. In their study, they examined the language that women used to address their fetus. After an ultrasound revealing that their future child was a girl, mothers used typical gendered scripts to talk to their baby. For example, referring to them as a 'little princess'. This anticipatory socialization has not been shown to change the prenatal environment itself. However, it has set in motion the traditional scripting of gender prior to the birth of the child (Barnes, 2015). This gendered scripting then impacts the environment that the little princess is born into - the pink bedroom with floral motif.

- *Two, learning occurs outside the bounds of consciousness (i.e., is implicit)*

In terms of teaching, we don't always use our critical thinking in the messages that we impart to others. The hidden curriculum is learning that occurs outside the formal syllabus (Cassese & Bos, 2013; Lee, 2014; De Lissovoy, 2012; Picower, 2012) and includes things like: textbooks focus on male scientists while female scientists are left out (Lee, 2014); textbooks are limited to heterosexist language in their examples (Lee, 2014); and, textbooks are told through the biased lens of colonialism (De Lissovoy, 2012). Educators do not set out to enforce these hegemonic ideologies of race, gender, and sexualities (Picower, 2012); however, students internalize and reproduce what they see (Lee, 2014; De Lissovoy, 2012; Picower, 2012). In the same fashion, our daily lives contain a hidden curriculum that sends messages about gender and sexuality to those around us.

- *Three, learning prunes the connections in the brain, fine tuning them so that they operate faster but also narrowing their range.*

Learning occurs as a result of activity in the brain. The colloquial phrase in neuroscience is 'fire together, wire together.' This Hebbian theory says that co-activated brain synapses will create faster action (Guzman-Karlsson et. al., 2014; Verguts & Notebaert, 2008; Whitaker et al., 2016). In opposition, synapses that are not activated are released or pruned from the brain (Gibon et al., 2016; Guzman-Karlsson et. al.,

2014). This means that when rules of behaviour are learned together, they are then wired together so that they can be activated rapidly. The diversity of playing behaviours that children exhibit in early childhood, aka imagination, begin to narrow as they age (Beghetto & Plucker, 2006; Gelman & Gottfried, 2016). They learn the appropriate rules of play from their environment (Leaper & Bigler, 2018; Peplak et al., 2017; Weisgram, 2018). Neuroscientists have linked issues in synaptic pruning to Autism Spectrum Disorders which can be characterized by impaired social skills (Ebrahimi-Fakharia & Sahina, 2015; Kim, 2016; Lia et. al., 2015). Synaptic development in the brain could account for a portion of this socialized learning.

- *Four, we apply what we have learned about our self to learn about others again, outside our conscious awareness.*

There is a theory in research about envy called two-ness: it describes the brain's binary nature (Ninivaggi, 2015). If we had to process each piece of information that we come into contact with, we would be in constant cognitive overload (Rutkowski & Saunders, 2019). The binary nature of the brain means that when we learn about one aspect of something, we simultaneously learn the opposite (Ninivaggi, 2015). To illustrate, when we learn that boys are aggressive, we ascribe passiveness to girls. As we learn aspects of our self, we learn to distinguish our self from other people in all matters of identity, including gender and sexual orientation.

2.2 Learning Gender

The construction of gender and sexuality are linked – it is hard to discuss one without the other (Bancroft, 2002; Hines, 2004; King et. al., 2019; Lips, 2019). Gender has been studied from many different perspectives (biological, evolutionary, cultural, psychological, etc.). Each discipline has a guiding paradigm for their inquiries. For the purposes of this thesis, I will concentrate on the social construction of gender from two aspects: one, our internal sense of gender; and, two, the way we perform our gender. Socio-cultural theorists articulate that gender is built on a system of culturally informed social roles (Braun & Davidson, 2017; Gedeon, 2015; Glaveanu & Tanggaard, 2014; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014; Roof, 2016; Westwood, 2016). The socialized gender rules then dictate how someone should behave and what role they should take when in social situations (Braun & Davidson, 2017; Johansson, 2007; Liben & Bigler, 2017; Roof, 2016; Westwood, 2016).

Social Roles Theory examines roles that different genders enact in society that maintain societal expectations (Robinson, 2005; Roof, 2016; West & Zimmerman, 2002). Social roles are formed from hegemonic ideologies (Diamond & Butterworth, 2008; Robinson, 2005; Roof, 2016; West & Fenstermaker, 2002). The roles are hierarchical with some roles seen as more valuable than others (Clarke & Arnold, 2017; Endendijk et al., 2016; Lips, 2019; Roof, 2016; Westwood, 2016). For example, fathers are seen as hardworking outside the home while mothers are seen as caregivers and stay at home (Scicluna, 2017; Smith, 2017).

Social Dominance Theory looks more broadly at how groups function to maintain hierarchy enhancing ideologies (Ho et. al., 2012; Sidanius & Pratto, 2004; Vargas-Salfate et. al., 2018). For example, individuals who exist on the periphery of a group will work to conform toward the norm. These changes allow the individual to feel more secure in their place within the group (De Dreu, 2007; Haaker et. al., 2016; Steinel et. al., 2010; Wilson, 2017). Some research has looked at the influence of anonymity on the performance and enforcement of group norms. While there is some research to support that anonymity within a group lessens the need to perform and enforce group rules, there is a divergent line of thought that no matter the presence of others in a group there is a pressure to conform to group norms (Fiske, 2011; Lea et al., 2006; Pinsonneault & Heppel, 1997).

Panopticism is a theory based on a prison design that had no blind spots where prisoners could not be seen (Brivot & Gendron, 2011; Foucault, 2008; Gane, 2012; Manokha, 2018). Extrapolating from this, Foucault took the premise of nowhere to hide in society (Foucault, 2008; Manokha, 2018). We have internalized the group norms and we carry them with us whether or not we are present in the group in that moment (Fiske, 2011; Krakauer & Rose, 2002; Manokha, 2018; Postmes et. al., 2001; Prasad, 2013). In addition, this overseeing eye functions to make individuals enforce (police) the ideologies when others step out of line (Fiske, 2011; Glasford et. al., 2009; Steinel et. al., 2010). The group hierarchy is therefore maintained.

Children do not exhibit adherence to normalized gender roles until they have appropriately learned them (around age 4) (Martin & Ruble, 2010). We understand our gender as early as 24 months (Martin & Ruble, 2010) but its reinforcement continues indefinitely (Spears Brown & Stone, 2018; Weisgram, 2018). At 24 months of age, we understand rudimentary stereotypes that pertain to gender – boys play with trucks, girls with dolls (Cherney, 2018; Martin & Cook, 2018; Martin & Ruble, 2010; Weisgram, 2018). As we age, these stereotypes grow in range and sophistication (Spears Brown & Stone, 2018; Martin & Ruble, 2010), but the imaginative play or transgressive play narrows (Bruan & Davidson, 2016; Spears Brown & Stone, 2018). For example, boys stop playing with dolls.

Socialization theorist, Albert Bandura studied how gender performance was learned through imitation (1995). His Bobo doll study has children watch as an adult aggressively acts toward a blow-up doll. The results found that the children imitated the adult behaviour. The results were almost identical when the adult was the same gender as the child watching the video.

Sandra Bem, another socialization of gender theorist, hypothesized that gender learning and portrayal is not static, but changes over time with new information (Bem, 1981; Bem, 1983; Bem, 1993; Bem, 1995; Bem, 1998). For example, Bem found that children have a mental representation of how a policeman looks and acts. Bem uncovered that children can take in new information and apply it to this representation (Liben & Bigler,

2017). Bem found that using minor changes to language such as police *officer* allows the mental representation to expand beyond just a man (Bem & Bem, 1973).

Researchers, including Bandura have now expanded the social learning theory to include cognitive processes in its underpinnings (Bandura, 1995; Thompson & Dahling, 2012; Pasterski et.al., 2010). The social-cognitive learning theory incorporates the intrapsychic understanding of gender and its roles in recognizing and performing gender in different contexts (Pasterski et.al., 2010; Prati, 2012). The social-cognitive learning theorists look at the interaction between the learning of gender (as discussed above) and incorporating the social into their sense of self (Martin, 2004). Their sense of self then becomes an evaluation of their gender based on the social norms learned as well as their experiences with punishments/rewards of the norms (Pasterski et.al., 2010; Prati, 2012). The self and the social then interact in a reciprocal fashion. The self plays out in the social, the social enforces, the self learns.

The process of reciprocal determinism highlights the interaction between the intrapsychic and the interpersonal to inform the use and creation of gender scripts (Bandura, 1995). We continue to learn gender roles as we understand more human dynamics and presentations of gender outside its current binary nomenclature (Lazar, 2014; Stokoe & Attenborough, 2014). The rules change with the zeitgeist. There is more knowledge around different presentations of gender currently; however, there are still many constrictions on expressing gender in any form that feels comfortable for that individual (Lazar, 2014; Stokoe & Attenborough, 2014; Queen, 2014). In a discussion of

sex and sexuality, we cannot exclude our sense of gender and society's expectations around gender as they influence one another. It is my belief that they should not influence each other, but as we exist in this moment, they are heavily reliant on each other. Gender and sexuality are so intertwined that as we learn about one, we often learn about the other within the same message.

2.3 Sexual Script Theory

Sexual Script Theory postulates that our sexuality is formed through our social interactions with people and our environment (Gagon & Simon, 2017). Sex and its surrounding acts (flirting, cruising, courtship, etc.) have been largely driven by the idea that humans engage in these behaviours in order to procreate (Edelman, 2004; Hines & Davis, 2018; Jackson, 2005). Our sex and sexuality are not as narrow as reproduction (Browne, 2002; Jackson, 2005; Rohy, 2014); however, the norms that we learn about sex and sexuality are still informed by the reproductive paradigm (Jackson, 2005; Rohy, 2014). When we start to think about our sexual self, we have already had our internal beliefs shaped (Gagon & Simon, 2017). In the same fashion as gender, the reciprocal social/ self interaction has framed our sexual self. The biologically based social norms narrow our understanding of the sexual self to biology (Edelman, 2004; Gagnon & Simon, 2017; Jackson, 2005). The reproductive paradigm thus masks the social nature of the construction of the sexual self (Gagon & Simon, 2017).

“As a result of our commitment to nature and to the sexual organs as the primary sources of meaning we fail to observe that the doing of sex (even when alone) requires

elaborate and sequential learning that is largely taken from other domains of life and a resultant etiquette that allows for the coordination of bodies and meanings in a wide variety of circumstances... it is only our insistence of the myth of naturalness that hides these social components for us.” (Gagon & Simon, 2017; p.6).

The above passage has several key pieces. *Myth of naturalness*, says that the sexual self is guided by biological desires. *Sexual organs as the primary sources of meaning*, form the ideologies that we are grounded in our genitalia and that our sexual responses must be guided by the *etiquette* that then corresponds with those organs.

2.3.1 Myth of naturalness

Illustrating the myth of naturalness, the scientific community interchanges the term sexual differentiation with gender differentiation (Fausto-Sterling, 2012; Fine, 2014; Fine et al., 2013; Hines & Davis, 2018; Rahman et. al., 2017; Rippon et al., 2014). The term refers to the way the brain is developing as a result of chromosomal difference between XX and XY embryos (Hines & Davis, 2018; Rahman et. al., 2017). An embryo is created by two sex chromosomes (X chromosome or Y chromosome) (Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). The possible combinations of sex chromosomes are XX or XY (Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). Of note – there are other combinations that appear in humans but are proportionately rare (Feder, 2014). For ease of discussion, I will concentrate on the XX and XY pairings. Regardless of the XX or XY nature of the embryo, the first 6-7 weeks follow the same path (Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). Around the 7-week mark, the influx of hormones differentiates the embryo (Hines &

Davis, 2018; Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). The XY embryo under the influence of testosterone (and Mullerian Inhibiting Factor) causes the Wolfian ducts to grow and suppresses the growth of the Mullerian ducts (Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). This is the point at which scientist term the sexual/gender differentiation of a human (Hines & Davis, 2018; Rahman et. al., 2017). It is argued that the testosterone that is responsible for the Wolfian duct growth (which ultimately forms the male genitals), is also responsible for sexual/gender differentiation in the brain (Hines & Davis, 2018; Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). Testosterone is seen as the agonist in many male behaviours (Fausto-Sterling, 2012; Hines & Davis, 2018; Voyer & Voyer, 2000). For example, multiple studies have deemed male participants better at spatial relations than women (Rahman et. al., 2017; Voyer & Voyer, 2000). They tie this difference to brain differentiation as a result of testosterone (Voyer & Voyer, 2000). The brain differentiation occurs prenatally but it is tied to a behaviour that occurs much later in life. With all that information in mind, we are taking a very complicated behaviour such as playing with trucks and linking it to our biology. We are naturalizing boys as playing with trucks. If the behaviour is tied to conditions before birth, we have no control over it. As illustrated in the learning of gender, there are powerful mechanisms at work shaping play behaviour in children. There is also an increasing number of researchers in social sciences that are debunking brain differentiation studies (e.g., Cordelia Fine, Gina Rippon).

2.3.2 Sexual organs as the primary sources of meaning

Sexual arousal is thought to be shown by a change in the genitals (aka sexual organs) (Bancroft, 2005; Bossio et. al., 2018; Chivers et. al., 2004; Reyes et. al., 2017). In studies on the arousal of men, an instrument known as the penile strain gauge is used to measure how aroused the participant is. The strain gauge is placed around the penis to measure turgidity. The more aroused, the higher the strain gauge reading (Bossio et. al., 2018). This signifies that there is more blood in the penis which is attributed to an increased arousal of the participant (Bancroft, 2005; Bossio et. al., 2018; Chivers et. al., 2004; Reyes et. al., 2017). The arousal is concentrated on the genital (Bancroft, 2005; Bossio et. al., 2018; Chivers et. al., 2004; Reyes et. al., 2017) and not on the stimuli that the study is using to elicit the arousal. The androcentric nature of science limits the research on female sexual arousal (Fausto-Sterling, 2012; Law & Urry, 2004; Woodard & Diamond, 2009) however, arousal in women is commonly attributed to increased blood flow to the vaginal canal resulting in lubrication (Chivers et. al., 2004; Chivers et. al., 2010). There are multiple tools that measure other areas of the female genitals (clitoral tumescence, temperature of the labia, etc.) (Woodward & Diamond, 2009). The lesson to be learned here is that female sexual arousal has historically been seen as occurring within the vaginal canal and research is now expanding its inquiries to other facets of arousal (neural substrates) (Mitricheva et. al., 2019). The lesson behind the lesson is that the organs are still the site of meaning.

2.3.3 Etiquette

Taking the reproductive paradigm and pairing with the meanings of sex attributed to the organs, the etiquette centers around how to have sex to procreate. It is between a man

and a woman, an egg and a sperm, a penis, and a vagina (Barker, 2018; Martin, 1991; Martin & Luke, 2010; Jackson, 2005; Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). Side note, the correct terminology for female genitalia would be vulva because it encompasses the full structure (Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015); however, the term used most often in everyday language is vagina (Braun & Kitzinger, 2001). This is evidence of sex being placed in the organs but also in reproduction – the part of the woman's body that is involved in reproduction is the vagina (Martin, 1991; Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). The structures around the vaginal canal are primarily sources of pleasure (Boisvert, 2019; Goldey et. al., 2016; Nobre & Pinto-Gouveia, 2006) but they are increasingly becoming the subject of research (Woodard & Diamond, 2008). The vaginal canal is the opposing structure to the penis, the cylindrical nature of the penis fits into the canal shape of the vagina. Not only does the etiquette refer to sex acts themselves, but it also refers to the behaviours leading up to sex (Barker, 2018; Gagnon & Simon, 2017). We have metaphors for the progression of sex. We round first base and head to second – meaning we start at kissing and then move to fondling. We all end up at home plate which signifies sexual intercourse (Vernacchio, 2013). Intercourse, in its current definition, involves the sex organs (Barker, 2018). The involvement of the sex organs is what moves us from foreplay to sex. Sex occurs at the site of the organs and we get there in a prescribed manner.

2.4 Learning Sexuality

Sexual scripts are learned long before we see humans as sexual beings. We learn the norms of sexuality starting in childhood. We are punished for inappropriate sexual

interactions (Angelides, 2019; Gagnon & Simon, 2017; Martin, 1991). For example, children of different genders play doctor together. This involves one child, the doctor, examining another child, the patient. The punishment here comes from the patient usually being in some form of undress (Angelides, 2019). If interrupted in this interaction by an older person, the children are scolded and told not to do so again (Angelides, 2019; Gagnon & Simon, 2017). Punishment here would take form around the 'opposite' genders interacting together with the presence of nudity. Being nude with children of the same gender occurs in showers at pools without a sense of wrong. Being nude with adults of the same gender, for example bathing with a parent, is not wrong either (up to a certain age) (Allen et. al., 2018). The nudity does not impact the punishment of the behaviour, but the opposite genders coupled with nudity is deemed wrong. The person punishing the doctor play has relegated the interaction to being sexual (Allen et. al., 2018; Angelides, 2019; Gagnon & Simon, 2017; Leander et. al., 2018; Martin, 1991). Gagnon and Simon (2017) posit that playing doctor in the child's mind is them acting out an occupation and not sexually exploring. The child has now learned about appropriate sites of nudity and appropriate persons to be nude with. Another example is when children explore their genitals at a young age. There is no sexual arousal (as deemed by the review of literature above) but there is a reaction from others to this act (Angelides, 2019; Cacciatore et. al., 2020; Davies & Robinson, 2010; Johansson, 2007). The older person will punish the behaviour (Cacciatore et. al., 2020; Davies & Robinson, 2010). The older person may also inform the child that they should only touch their genitals in private (Allen et. al., 2018; Davies & Robinson, 2010). The child has learned that touching their genitalia is a behaviour that should be hidden from others.

The child with no sexual arousal is merely exploring their body and the reaction of the older person gives meaning to it. Despite sexual learning taking place, there is no clearly defined timeline in terms of the emergence of sexual acts in humans (Cacciatore et. al., 2020; Davies & Robinson, 2010; Leander, 2018). It is usually marked by puberty or the onset of the secondary sex characteristics and hormone increase (Martin, 1996; Pinto & Macleod, 2019; Sadler, 2015; Schoenwolf, 2015). The definition of puberty and the timeline associated with it is in flux depending on the zeitgeist as ‘puberty’ or the onset of sexual behaviour is occurring at an earlier age than previously thought (Pinto & Macleod, 2019).

Reinforcing appropriate and inappropriate behaviours of sexuality and gender shapes a person’s internal dialogue around their sexual self. This process begins at an age where people are not able to cognitively understand the construction of this internal dialogue nor the ability to understand what drives the evaluation of the appropriate or inappropriate (Angelides, 2019; Cacciatore et. al., 2020; Davies & Robinson, 2010; Johansson, 2007). In the same fashion, those that are imparting this knowledge – our parents, our teachers, etc. – may be in the same state of unawareness of the ideological formation of the rules and regulations of gender and sexuality (Barnes, 2015; Berlant, 2012).

“Previously learned moral categories and oppositions (good and evil, purity and degradation, modesty) and gender role activities (aggression and submission, control and freedom, needs for achievement and affiliation) are integrated into new sexual

scripts, at first private and then collective, which contain new meanings to be applied to organs, orifices, activities, and people that make up the conventional sociosexual drama.” (Gagnon & Simon, 2017 p. 38)

The examples above function in two ways: one - it shapes our internal understanding of sex and sexuality; and two - it shapes our interpersonal understanding of sex and sexuality.

In early childhood, our primary influences of learning are our nuclear family (parents, siblings, people who live in the home) and media (television, movies, YouTube) (Shelton, 2019). These are some of the institutions that shape our learning.

2.5 Male Gaze Theory

The male gaze is a term that was coined by Laura Mulvey in 1975 to describe the way in which a spectator engages with the female form in film (Mulvey, 1975; Sassatelli, 2011). Mulvey used the gaze to examine the eroticism of looking at another as an object formed through the interplay of the lens, the audience and the characters on the screen (Mulvey, 1975; Sassatelli, 2011). The interplay of these three perspectives determines how we look at women's bodies (Mulvey, 1975; Sassatelli, 2011). The lens focuses on her body in portions, obscuring any human element and paralyzing her as an object (Kilbourne, 1999). The dark cinema allows the audience member a sense of anonymity for their gaze and psychologically removes them from the consequences of that gaze (Mulvey, 1975). Mulvey reasons that “[t]raditionally, the woman displayed has

functioned on two levels: as erotic object for the characters within the screen story, and as erotic object for the spectator within the auditorium, with a shifting tension between the looks on either side of the screen.”(Mulvey, 1975 p. 11-12) Mulvey argued that, based on sociological ideologies, the passive role is occupied by women and the active role is occupied by men. The inferences made by Mulvey (1975) is that society’s hegemonic ideologies (patriarchy in this case) influence the way that the three perspectives of film interact thus creating a narrative around how we look at the characters in film (specifically female characters).

In critique of Mulvey’s original formulation of the male gaze, Gaylyn Studlar, frustrated by the narrow view that the spectator is male, suggested a reading from the perspective of a female spectator (Studlar, 1989). In addition to looking through the eyes of the female spectator, Studlar (1989) critiques the psychoanalytic perspective that occludes the historical influences on looking and seeing. Studlar says that the spectator can take multiple identifications viewing several films, but also multiple identifications in one film. According to Studlar, the identification occurs with the character in the film but also relates to the context in which the film occurs. The properties of the identification with characters, storylines, and cinematic environment are driven by multiple aspects of the self and must also be located within the context of history. The intersectionality of the viewer must also be seen in understanding how the spectator identifies and absorbs the film (Longfellow, 1991; Studlar, 1989).

In 2004 Mulvey reflected on her original essay on the male gaze. This reflection involved an acknowledgement that the way that people engaged with films had changed- now being more controlled by the viewer. The cinematic experience brought into the home, with a pause button at hand, allows the spectator to access more control in their interaction with the film (Mulvey, 2004). This technological advancement also meant that spectators could access films outside of the time in which the film was made. So, the advancement allows the context in which we view a film to change.

The viewing of films does not only teach us how to evaluate the character based on the camera angles and the darkness of the theatre, but we learn power relations outside those of gender.

The imperial gaze speaks of how film constructs the way that whites look at people of colour (Kaplan,1997). The imperial gaze discusses the construction of knowledge from the perspective of hegemonic western ideologies (Allen,1998; Kaplan,1997). bell hooks (1992) advances the gaze to one of opposition. The oppositional gaze reflects how the way that we see film can construct the way we look at others, but we can also defy the gaze and recognize the white supremacy found in the construction of films (hooks, 1992; Jacobs, 2016). Films have ideological messages that we internalize. For the scope of this thesis the male gaze is the focus.

Film is not the only place where we learn the rules of gender. Jean Kilbourne, a prominent feminist critic of advertising, discusses the narrative that is caused by

advertisers' objectification of women. In a similar vein to Mulvey, Kilbourne describes the portioned way that women are seen in ads. Women are often portrayed in pieces. Kilbourne also examines the stories being told in the language and surrounding images in advertisements. All these pieces, the woman, the story, and the background, work together to script the way we view women and the way women view themselves. In a series of 4 documentaries called *Killing Us Softly* Kilbourne begins her examination with the partitioning of women in ads. Her astute theory is that this focus on portions of women's bodies causes their dehumanization. They are objects of desire. the key here being objects. Women are often shown in pieces in advertising. They are legs, a neck, a mouth but not a whole body (Kilbourne, 1999). In addition to being seen in parts, advertising imparts ideologies around the nuclear family, heteronormativity, heterosexism, gender roles, capitalism etc. (Kilbourne, 1999; Kilbourne, 2020). So, while we are learning and seeking out role models for the scripting of our sexual self, we are bombarded by the ideologies that are used to sell products, including women as products. Interestingly, Kilbourne has re-released documentaries in the *Killing Us Softly* series and despite the advancement in our understanding of their harm, the messages and images remain. In fact, Kilbourne uses similar jokes in each video. This tells me that there is not a great deal of change in the ideologies that advertising is advancing but just a change in the pictures. Kilbourne illuminates that we passively absorb advertisements, much like we engage in the voyeuristic looking that Mulvey described. "[T]he extreme contrast of the auditorium (which isolates the spectators from one another) and the brilliance of the shifting patterns of light and shade on the screen helps to promote the illusion of voyeuristic separation..." (Mulvey, 1975 p. 9)

“Advertising is our environment...we don't pay direct attention to the very nature of these ads, but we are powerfully influenced, mostly on an unconscious level by the experiences of being immersed in an advertising culture....” (Kilbourne, 1999 p.27)

The removal of the conscious in both the theatre and in advertising allows people to exist in a hegemonic ideology driven world. We are absorbing the rules of all aspects of society. As broached earlier, panopticism, or the boundless surveillance of individuals, also functions to obfuscate the influences of our learned behaviour.

“[the panopticon] makes it possible to perfect the exercise of power. It does this in several ways: because it can reduce the number of those who exercise it, while increasing the number of those on whom it is exercised. Because to intervene at any moment and because the constant pressure acts even before the offences, mistakes or crimes have been committed. Because, in these conditions, its strength is that never intervenes, it is exercised spontaneously and without noise, it constitutes a mechanism whose effects follow from another. Because, without any physical instrument other than architecture and geometry, it acts directly on individuals; gives 'power of mind over mind'.” (Foucault, 2008 p. 9-10)

The panopticon because of its boundless surveillance also functions to internalize the ideological messages of power. The panopticon functions to make every site in which an individual exists to be one of surveillance. When we are surveyed, we obey. The feeling of surveillance in every location has brought the enforcement of ideologies into

an internal surveillance of our self (Foucault, 2008; Gane, 2012; Gray, 2002; Manokha, 2018; Prasad, 2013).

We learn the hegemonic ideals of gender and sexuality and enforce them on our self. Self-objectification is looking at our self through the enforcer lens (Fredrickson et. al., 1997; Haines et. al., 2008; Quinn et. al., 2011; Sanchez & Broccoli, 2008). The literature on self-objectification has primarily focused on women but is now expanded to men's self-objectification. For the purpose of this study, research on self-objectification in women was the focus. In a well-known study, Fredrickson and colleagues (1997) split women into two conditions. In one condition the women were asked to try on a sweater in front of a mirror. In the second condition the women were asked to try on a bikini. In order to align the variance between the groups to objectification, the women were asked if they felt objectified. The female participants indicated that they did feel objectified. The following task was for the women to answer some math questions. The women who were in the bikini condition performed worse on the cognitive test than the women who wore the sweater (Fredrickson et. al., 1997; Haines et. al., 2008; Quinn et. al., 2011). The internalized body surveillance has diverted cognitive function away from the task at hand (Quinn et. al., 2011). Research in self-objectification has also tied the sexualization of women to increased self-objectification (Karsay et. al., 2018; Smolak & Murnen, 2011). The voyeurism discussed by Mulvey and Studlar and the sexualization of women in the media are interacting and influencing how women evaluate their self. The panopticon means that our environment, no matter where we are, is imparting hegemonic ideologies on us. In addition to evaluating our self and others, panopticism

creates enforcers. So, we enforce the social norms on our self and on others. The panopticon creates a complicated chasm of ideological control of the intrapsychic and the interpersonal.

2.6 Relational Aggression

Psychology began with the premise of understanding the individual mind and branched to include the study of the collective mind (Le Bon, 2017; McDougal, 2012). Examining the intrapsychic and the interpersonal aspects of sexual script theory overlays the movement from individual think to the collective think. Group dynamics posit that we cannot understand the mind of one individual when we are in a social situation (Brown & Harris, 2014; Forsyth, 2000; Le Bon, 2017; McDougal, 2012; Szanto, 2013; Wildschut et. al., 2003). The mind of the individual is now the mind of a group of individuals. The minds of the group do not resemble the individual minds of the group members (Forsyth, 2000; Le Bon, 2017; Szanto, 2013). This performative thinking does not always occur in the presence of other individuals. As with self-objectification, the ideologies found in the group follow the members outside of the physical space of being in a group (Forsyth, 2000; Szanto, 2013; Turner et. al., 2007). The individual finds a connection to a group (I am a girl). The individual then seeks out to learn the mores of the group (girls play with Barbie). As a result of the identification with this group, the individual then takes on the rules of the group to guarantee their continued affiliation. Group think plays a large role in shaping how we act in social situations (Forsyth, 2000; Steinel et. al., 2010). Affiliation creates dynamics both within the group(s) with which you identify (intragroup) and interactions with others outside of the group(s) with which

you identify (intergroup) (Fiske, 2011; Hipp et. al., 2009; Hogg, 2000; Wildschut et. al., 2003). For example, a girl playing with a Barbie will invite a girl to join but if a boy wants to join, he will be rebuffed (intergroup dynamic). If the girl who joined the Barbie party has Ken hook up with Ken, that girl will be corrected – “Ken doesn’t do that” – or will be punished for their transgression – “go away,” (intragroup dynamic).

For the purposes of this inquiry, the focus of group dynamics will be centered on intragroup agonist behaviours. In other words, how we punish those we affiliate with when they do not follow the group rules.

Agonism is behavior that is associated with conflict and can range from physical aggression to passive aggression. It is commonly related to resource allocation, social organization (i.e., power), and kinship (Chun & Choi, 2014; Fiske, 2011; Glasford et. al., 2009; Hipp et. al., 2009; Ma et. al., 2016; McDonald et. al., 2012; Steinel et. al., 2010). Agonism in groups occurs for many reasons, most of which relate to the power structure of the group (Chun & Choi, 2014; Glasford et. al., 2009; Steinel et. al., 2010). According to structural models of conflict, conflict occurs when the task trying to be accomplished meets the social context of the group (de Wit et. al., 2012; Korsgaard et. al., 2008). Deutsch sees group conflict as arising from interdependence (Korsgaard et. al., 2008). In this situation, agonism is higher when interdependence means that your goals are better met if another person’s goals are not met (de Wit et. al., 2012; Korsgaard et. al., 2008). Emerson views conflict as arising from the value of the goal and the availability of alternate resources to meet that goal (Chun & Choi, 2014; Korsgaard et. al., 2008;

Ma et. al., 2016). Process models of conflict see conflict as a series of events. Conflict occurs, the conflict is internally assessed, the person assessing searches for a transgression at the fault of the person with whom they are in conflict (Korsgaard et. al., 2008).

Maintenance of group dynamics are done through relational aggression, a non-violent, form of aggression that harm an individual's position in a group. Relational aggression is used as an enforcer of power structures (aka hegemonic ideologies) (Coyne & Ostrov, 2018; DiFonzo & Bordia, 2007; Goldstein & Cialdini, 2007; Hanish et. al., 2012; Mason, 2002). The group with which one affiliates also influences the type of relational aggression used (Hanish et. al., 2012; Werner & Hill, 2010). Affiliation with a group creates an adoption of the group ideologies (Fiske, 2011; Glasford et. al., 2009; Steinel et. al., 2010). Agonism within the group is assessed against the rules of the group and the transgressor is punished through relational aggression.

We learn gender. We learn sexuality. We join a group of similar individuals. We adopt the group norms. We enforce the group norms. If we do not conform, we suffer sexually and socially.

3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

3.1 Purpose of Study

In an attempt to understand our behaviour, I look to the social. The purpose of this study was to listen to the stories of Women who have sex with Women (WSW) in order to understand how interactions between WSW are learned, scripted, and enacted.

Of particular interest the research uncovers the complex intragroup relational aggression that is found in the WSW communities. The beginning of this chapter focuses on the guiding principles that help me in my inquiry: my paradigmatic stance and my researcher positionality. Secondly, I discuss the practical aspects of the study, the methodology employed. And thirdly, I outline the ethical considerations that are due discussion in any research endeavor.

3.2 Guiding Principles

3.2.1 Paradigmatic Stance

My paradigmatic stance informs how I view and interact with knowledge (Hopp, 2020; Zahavi, 2018). I see this as the lens that guides me in understanding how our experiences (aka knowledge) are shaped and maintained throughout lifespans. My understanding of knowledge is that it is socially constructed (i.e. learned) and maintained through group dynamics (i.e. scripted and enacted).

Critical paradigm proffers that knowledge is socially created and influenced by society's ideologies (Buniss & Kelly, 2010; Scotland, 2012; Wolgemuth, 2016). Knowledge then operates in a reciprocal deterministic fashion – the person is internally influenced and externally reinforced to act within the bounds of their learned knowledge.

The diversity of humans in a variety of places, histories, and generations means that one single truth cannot exist, as indicated by constructivist theorists (Bridges, 2017). We can see how knowledge has changed over time if we look at some historical junctures regarding homosexuality and mental health in North America. In 1973, homosexuality was removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) of psychiatric disorders (Hegarty, 2018), it had been a category of disorders in every edition of the DSM since its inception in 1952 (Kawa & Giordano, 2012). Despite the removal of homosexuality from the DSM in 1973, the 'treatment' of homosexuality was reviewed and denounced in 2009 (Resolution on Appropriate Affirmative Responses to Sexual Orientation Distress and Change Efforts, 2009). The governing institution, the American Psychological Association (APA), removed homosexuality as a category of disorder in 1973 (Hegarty, 2018), reviewed therapeutic responses to sexual orientation and denounced methods of reparative therapy as ineffective and likely to harm in 2009 (Resolution on Appropriate Affirmative Responses to Sexual Orientation Distress and Change Efforts, 2009). Knowledge is shared within groups by the individuals that belong to that group. For example, homosexuality is punishable by death or imprisonment in some countries (Christie, 2016) whereas in Canada being gay is not criminalized and same-sex marriage is legal. Despite the social tolerance of homosexuality in Canada, LGBTQ+

individuals are still at higher risk for mental illness, homelessness, etc. (Taylor et al., 2011). Knowledge is created. Knowledge carries its history forward (Hopp, 2020; Zahavi, 2018). Knowledge differs between groups and zeitgeists (Hopp, 2020; Zahavi, 2018).

My paradigmatic stance is that knowledge is learned through the sociality of humans. It is based in a set of principles that were institutionalized a long time ago. They still serve enforcers of knowledge and influence how we interact with it. Knowledge is a complicated and always changing entity.

3.2.2 Researcher Positionality

I am a 38-year-old Caucasian female and I consider myself to be a visible minority (I look gay). I grew up in a middle-class family in a middle-class neighborhood and school. I came out when I was 19. Before 19, my family, my neighborhood, and my school had no one that was out as gay. My population of study is women who self-identify as women who have sex with women (WSW). I have social capital in this group as a result of looking gay. This could have impacted interactions with my participants in several ways. As an insider, I have knowledge of the colloquialisms and therefore less must be explained to me. Also, I am someone who has a better understanding of the participant's story which can result in a more comfortable atmosphere to share. When dealing with highly charged stories (i.e., dating, sex, and love), having someone with whom you are comfortable can increase the likelihood of honesty and elaboration (Sherlock, 2016; Wiederman, 1999). Thirdly, as an insider, my familiarity with the stories

of WSW meant that I might not probe a participant to elaborate where I should. As someone who has a 'butch' appearance, an interview with someone who identifies as butch can elicit a, for lack of better words, bro-interaction (a shared masculine communication pattern). When interviewing someone who identifies as femme, the dynamic is performed differently. The role ideologies change based on the different appearances. I have been an active member of the WSW communities, specifically the dating community. I help organize and run speed dating events for WSW. I not only participate in many of the events as a dater, but I also observe and talk with the participants during the events. Given my familiarity with the common happenings across events, I wanted to understand the motivations behind the interactions. My familiarity means that I see things that others may not see across situations, but it also biases me to look for the interactions that I have seen before.

I used a fluid script with my participants to allow them to share their experiences with minor guidance. I did my very best to maintain a neutral stance and agree with participants in order to keep the conversation flowing. I identify as an intersectional feminist and many of the comments were not aligned with my beliefs. I also identify as interdisciplinary researcher with a BA in psychology - I look at the way the participants answer questions as well as their body language, and the intonation in their voice. My background in psychology could also mean that I am attempting to explain behaviour attributing it to unconscious thoughts when they may be consciously directed. The unconscious thoughts, in this instance, refer to knowledge, beliefs, etc. that guide our behaviour but occur without our awareness (Barg & Morsella, 2008).

3.2.3 Phenomenological Methodology

To understand the complicated intrapsychic and interpersonal aspects of WSW, I used a methodology that would allow a deep dive into the stories of my participants.

Phenomenological methodology deems that 'things' have relational value (Zahavi, 2018). This means that we have ascribed meaning to objects based on our previous knowledge with that 'thing,' where that 'thing' is located, and the common/shared understanding of what that 'thing' is. To illustrate, a necktie is a piece of fabric that is often made of silk and can have plain, pattern, or comical prints. Ties by themselves seem to remind many of Father's Day as they are often the present of choice. A tie hung on a doorknob has a much different meaning ascribed to it that is shared by most. A tie on a woman can bring forward the image of the Catholic school girl fantasy if she possesses long hair. And a tie on a woman with short hair is seen as the lesbian prototype. Each of these interpretations of a tie are based in who is observing the tie, where the tie is, and the meaning the tie carries. A play is not complete without a character, a storyline, a set, and an audience.

I sought out to examine the stories that my participants told me with three goals. Firstly, to look at the stories that WSW tell about interacting with other WSW. How they come to understand that a WSW is interested in them and how they demonstrate to another WSW that they are sexually interested in them (i.e., flirting). Secondly, I wanted to look at the shared understanding of these behaviours. Are the stories they tell like others' accounts? Are the interactions toward them easily understood? And thirdly, I wanted to

look at the evaluation of these actions. Do they see anything wrong with these behaviours? Do they enjoy them?

Examining the interrelatedness of stories could only be done with a phenomenological methodology that allows me to examine the conscious aspects of the participants' stories alongside the unconscious aspects. When I discuss the unconscious aspects of my participants' interviews, it is based on my assumptions of what is driving their behaviour/thoughts. My assumptions are made with research to support them. I would never assume that I can accurately describe the unconscious as it is still debated as to whether the unconscious exists (Barg & Morsella, 2008). Law and Urry (2004) argue that researchers are meaning makers. Meaning makers in this context implies that the scientific process is not devoid of bias. Our ideologies influence how we conduct, interpret, and discuss research. These biases are hidden because scientists see the scientific method as empirical. Law and Urry are referring to the overall methodological processes. I kept this in mind when discussing the unconscious in someone else's story. I also see great importance in examining and discussing the asynchronicities between the story that we tell of ourselves and the behaviours we enact. Thankfully, the phenomenological lens that I employed allows these complex relations to be deconstructed.

3.3 Study Population

Participants were chosen based on two criteria: individuals who self-identify as women and who also identify as sexually attracted to women. The inclusion/exclusion criteria

were kept broad in order to allow all orientations of WSW to participate in the study. Prior research on WSW are segmented by orientation which allows a closer examination of certain types (i.e., bisexual women, lesbians); however separate inquiries doesn't allow for a comparison of the interactions that are shared across WSW of all orientations. Self-identity was a very important distinction for me in recruiting participants. It is not up to me to decide how someone should identify. In addition, research indicates that self-identification as a particular gender is correlated to gender differentiation in brain matter (Kranz et al., 2014). For example, if someone self-identifies as a woman but may not have been 'born' a woman, their brain could more closely resemble that of a 'born' woman. feminine traits and characteristics than their 'birth' gender. Of note, studies such as Kranz et al. are in their infancy and more exploration is needed. The criteria did not include specific location, race, ability, etc. in order to garner an intersectional sample. That being said, the participants who ended up part of the study were between the ages of 32-54, predominantly Caucasian, and University educated. Literature on lesbians, bisexual women, and queer women is still sparse in comparison to studies on male orientations and literature that does exist is contradictory. In one study WSW will be understood as having a butch vs femme dynamic (Diamond, 2017) and in another study there will be a rich dynamic of personalities found in the WSW population (Diamond, 2013; Diamond, 2017). In order to see some of the similarities across various orientations in the WSW communities, this study was designed to avoid classifying WSW and instead allowing the participant to identify in whatever way felt most true to themselves.

3.4 Recruitment

Participants were sought who were part of the WSW dating world. Being a person who is actively involved in the WSW communities in Vancouver, I sought out participants that would not know me personally. I posted in several Facebook groups that were geared toward a variety of sexual orientations and were predominantly occupied by individuals who identify as women. The groups that I contacted were called Butch-Femme, A Little Lez Conversation, and Girls that_♥_Girls. I contacted the moderators to obtain permission and reassured them that my intentions for the research were genuine and that I respected their space. I found these groups because I already belonged to them, however I am a social media lurker not a poster and therefore I felt like my being a part of the group would not influence my interaction with the participant. Once a potential participant contacted me, we would decide how best to conduct the interview. Interviews were conducted on Facebook messenger, Skype, and over the phone.

3.5 Data Collection

I conducted a total of 6 interviews with WSW. I used a fluid script for the interviews, which meant open ended questions asking them to describe their interactions with women that they were interested in (for list of questions, see Appendix A). The open-ended questions were used to start the conversation. I then allowed the participant to talk as much as they wanted about their experiences. I had prepped several probing questions to draw the stories forward and to allow the participant to reflect further on

their past. I used them minimally as I did not want to influence their story. I engaged with the participants as an active listener. I am a loud and gregarious person, so I held my personality at a minimum to show engagement while not taking over the story telling. I also maintained a neutral reaction to the stories that participants were recounting. One of the reasons for this thesis is to explore the denigration that occurs in WSW communities. There were many examples within the interviews. Participants would look to me when saying something that they knew was prejudicial. I did my best to hold my reaction so the participant would not feel judged, but I also tried not to agree with their statement.

The interviews were conducted over the phone, on Facebook messenger (chat not phone or video), and Skype. The choice of how the interview was conducted was decided by the participant. Interviews were not conducted in person because recordings would have been too hard to hear. Also, participants discussing topics of a sensitive nature, such as dating, would be more likely to open up and share if they were in a place where they felt more comfortable.

Once an interview was completed, it was transcribed into word documents for ease of review. Identifying information was removed. Research ethics were maintained in the care and consideration of the participants and the data (see below for a more detailed discussion of ethics).

3.6 Data Analysis

When looking at data from a phenomenological perspective, it can be done in different ways. One is to look at the words and their meaning (hermeneutical phenomenology), the other to look at the “essence” (Zahavi, 2018) found within the interviews (descriptive phenomenology). For the purposes of my thesis, I took the descriptive approach to the data analysis. The essence of the story is found in the tale itself but also the surrounding senses felt by the storyteller in recounting their experiences. Not only does descriptive phenomenology allow me to look at the sense felt by the participants but also the underlying motives behind the experiences. While descriptive phenomenology dictates that the researcher, aka me, must take an unbiased stance in interpreting the data, it is impossible for any researcher to be completely devoid of their own perspective. I kept my privileges in my awareness (e.g., white cis-gendered middle-class woman privilege) to confront them when examining the data. The most important aspect of research for me is to bring forward new perspectives of participants’ stories and making the voices of individuals heard, I am not concerned with being right but am concerned with being just.

The first step was to transcribe the interviews. This is an arduous task and does not particularly allow for an interpretation of the stories. It is simply pragmatic to have a written copy. Once the interviews were transcribed, I began to read them. I read them multiple times with space and time between readings. Their words never really left my head but stayed in a constant state of analysis as I continued my day to day activities.

Once I felt as though I had a grasp on some essential elements, I began to make point form notes of key words or phrases that were similar across interviews as well as a list of elements that were incongruous across their stories. It is the directive of descriptive phenomenological analysis that the researcher not only examine the similarities of experiences but also the differences between experiences to have an overall understanding of the data (Kuckartz, 2013; Ponterotto, 2006; Sandelowski, 2010). I looked at the story of each of the participants as an entity unto itself. Learned behaviour is often automatically performed without conscious effort (Semenza, 2017; Solms, 2017). When a behaviour becomes automatic, it can become less recognized by our self as characteristic of who we are (Barg & Morsella, 2008; Semenza, 2017; Solms, 2017). For example, I can call myself a feminist and believe in equality between genders from a moral stance but my actions toward women can often be interpreted as being driven by internalized misogyny. The identified behaviour as told through the participants' story provides the essence of the context, their experience, and their interactions. The incongruities are a part of the essence of the experience whether they occur with conscious direction from the individual or not.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethics in simple terms is a set of rules that researchers must follow. In conducting this study, I kept several considerations in mind. Firstly, I considered the implications of researching a marginalized population. Secondly, content that concerns relationship dynamics and sexual attraction requires a respectful and safe space to discuss

(Hunting, 2014; O'Donoghue, 2019; Ponterotto, 2010; Sherriff et al., 2014). Thirdly, and possibly the most difficult consideration, was how to deal with any prejudicial comments

3.7.1 Marginalized Populations

Marginalized populations face prejudice, increased scrutiny, isolation, and decreased social power (Browne, 2005; Hill et al., 2016). I actively work to confront my own privileges as to increase my competencies regarding cultures, genders, orientations, and abilities. Research ethics functions to design studies that are sensitive to marginalized populations and to lessen harm that could occur (Browne, 2005; Sherriff et al., 2014). Researchers can also supplement institutional regulations with the ethical treatment of research participants (Sherlock, 2016; Sherriff et al., 2014; Wiederman, 1999). For example, I have read and continue to read grass roots publications that have broadened my knowledge of the historical treatment of marginalized populations, specifically but not limited to the LGBTQ+ communities. I have also changed and continue to change my language to be more inclusive and less ignorant of prejudice.

3.7.2 Sensitive Topic

Upon a participant indicating interest in this study they were sent the informed consent (discussed in further detail below and provided in Appendix C). Participants were informed of the purpose of the research as well as the kinds of information that would be discussed. Once the volunteer read and was still interested in participating, I

presented several options for communicating with me (Skype, Facebook messenger, call or video, or telephone). The participant was free to choose whatever method felt most comfortable to them. All participants chose to not meet in person – perhaps due to comfort of discussing matters of a sensitive nature.

3.7.3 Prejudicial Comments

The purpose of this study was to understand the interactions that WSW experience interacting with women where there was sexual attraction. In conducting research while also being committed to social justice, I had to decide on what I would do when faced with a comment that was harmful to others. Literature on making these decisions is of varied opinions depending on the context of the comment. In therapy, there are regulatory bodies that have delineated that the therapist must assess the comment in the context of harm to the patient (being confronted with being prejudiced) versus the harm to others (Romani, 2018). Researchers are not bound by the same regulatory bodies; however, they are guided by the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS 2, 2010). Literature indicates that the researcher must balance the need to maintain the story of the participant and the research dynamic versus the social justice of allowing a prejudicial comment to stand (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, 2018). I chose to allow the story of the participant to be the predominant factor in dealing with prejudicial comments and thus I maintained my researcher role of allowing the story to be told without interrupting the process with an attempt to inform around prejudicial attitudes. Of note –

two of the participants were quick to identify their own prejudicial comments while continuing to hold the beliefs in their actions. For example, they admitted, “The only sexual orientation that I will not date (I’m sorry that community is going to hate me, but you want me to be honest): trans male to female preop is a no to me.” If I were to have intervened in this situation, it may have compromised the comfort of the participant in openly sharing.

3.7.4 Informed consent

Informed consent has 3 principles that must be followed when conducting research. One, consent must be freely given. This means that the individual wants to participate in the study as a result of their own decision. There must be no undue influence driving them to do so. Two, consent must be informed. Informed indicates that the participant understands the various aspects of the study (the time it takes to participate, where the interview will take place, what kind of questions will be asked). Thirdly, consent is ongoing. Ongoing consent means that the participant may choose to withdraw from the study at any point in time without reprisal. This includes but is not limited to, ending the interview, and withdrawing data after the interview is conducted (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, 2018). When an individual indicated an interest in participating in this study, they were sent the informed consent document as an attachment to an email. The following instructions were contained in the body of the email: “Please carefully read the informed consent document attached to this email. You have 24 hours to read over the form. Please reach out to me if you have any

questions or concerns and I will be happy to answer them. Thank you for considering participating in this study.... After having read the consent document if you would like to participate, please return the signed consent form and I will contact you to set up the interview.”

The informed consent document for this study can be found in Appendix C.

Once a participant emailed with their signed consent form, they were asked where they would like to be interviewed. Once the interview began, I introduced myself and asked them if it would be ok to record our session so that I could review the materials later. All participants verbally consented to being recorded (video and/or audio). Participants were also informed of the procedures used to maintain their confidentiality during and after data collection. After the interview, the recordings were transferred to an encrypted thumb drive

3.7.5 Maintaining Confidentiality

Confidentiality must be considered not only in terms of data but also in terms of participants. Interviews were transcribed into word documents for ease of review. The transcripts were cleaned of identifying information and the original and a cleaned version were both saved. For the purposes of this study identifying information includes any pertinent details found in the stories that could help someone outside the study decipher who the participant is. The data cleaned from the transcripts can include: names, dates, popular locations, and identifying features (tattoos, hair colour, etc.) The transcripts, the audio/video files, and the signed consent forms were transferred to an

encrypted thumb drive. The thumb drive was copied to another encrypted drive as a precaution. These procedures conform with the regulations of data and participant encryption as indicated by UBC's research ethics board.

3.8 Risks and Benefits of Participating

Individuals who want to participate in a research study must be informed of any potential risks and benefits of doing so. This study is of minimal risk. Sharing personal stories around relationships can elicit emotional reactions. To support my volunteers, I provided them with a list of LGBTQ+ allied counselling services that they could access. Participants were also informed that there were no concrete benefits for participating in this study (i.e, gratuities). The only tangible benefit would be feeling good about helping expand research in communities of which they are a part.

3.9 Limitations

The purpose of this study was to explore how WSW learn how to interact with other WSW. Best practices in feminist research is to collect stories from an intersectional sample of participants. In this regard, intersectional refers to diversity in the lived experiences of the participants (Collins et al., 2016; Hunting, 2014; Nagel, 2000; Sherlock, 2016). Having a sample of heterogenous participants means that the stories that we hear are complicated by the participants' gender identity, race, socio-economic status, location, etc. (Collins et al., 2016; Hunting, 2014; Nagel, 2000). Intersectionality

in participants provides richer data (Hunting, 2014) and therefore better results. The biggest limitation of my thesis is intersectionality.

3.9.1 Intersectionality of Presentation

My inclusion criteria indicated that participants would self-identify as WSW. This criterion allowed a broad definition that would fit a lot of people. This allowed participants to readily come forward and volunteer. My entire sample of participants identified as either 'butch', 'femme', or 'butch presenting but femme identifying'. Targeting potential participants who do not identify within these presentations would have enriched my analysis.

3.9.2 Intersectionality of Race

Most of my population identified as Caucasian. I had one participant who identified their race as "Technically I am Heinz 57, but on paper I'm Caucasian." Racial identity plays a role in evaluations of the self (Collins et al., 2016) and evaluations of the other (Collins et al., 2016; Liu, 1995) in the dating world (Lui, 1995; McIntosh et al., 2011) and would have been discussed if I had representation from women of colour in my sample.

3.9.3 Intersectionality of Location

My entire sample came from North America. I did not ask participants if they had previously lived elsewhere but as of the time of the interview, they were all located

within North America. As discussed earlier, shared knowledge occurs as a result of location, time, and space (Gergen, 2001; Scotland, 2012; Wolgemuth, 2016).

Participants outside North America would have brought in the influence of location (space, context, and ideology) on the stories.

4 Findings

Within the 6 interviews, 2 were not usable for data as the participants gave short yes/no answers instead of stories around their interactions. I believe that they were nervous and uncomfortable, and I did not pressure them to continue. Their data was therefore withdrawn from the study.

Objectification is defined differently depending on the discipline that is defining it; however, they mostly involve the reduction of humans from complex characters to a flat typology (Calgero et.al, 2011; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Gervais et.al, 2013; Moradi & Huang, 2008). Sexual objectification focuses on the reduction of humans to parts of their body (Kozak et. al, 2009; Nussbaum, 1995; Szymanski et. al, 2011). Most of the participants in this study were familiar with the concept of objectification although they all asked for clarity. In order to make sure everyone had the same understanding for the interviews, participants were provided with the definition of “objectification: the reducing of someone to their physical self (i.e., size, race, gender etc.) and/or their appearance (i.e., femme, butch).” (See Appendix A for interview script).

The reader may find it helpful to refer to definitions of terminology list page viii in processing the participants scripts.

4.1 Instances of Objectification found in this data set

4.1.1 Objectification: Denial of Subjectivity

We have an idea about who we are as a person. We have personality, likes, dislikes, sense of humor, etc. that together form part of who we are. Subjectivity is the compilation of these attributes. Denial of subjectivity is when we are seen (evaluated, treated) without consideration for our traits (Nussbaum, 1995). When we are denied our unique characteristics, we are being objectified.

Example 1

Jenn: do you fit a particular type?

Ans: a little bit more on the butch side.

Jenn: do you find that people objectify you for this butch side?

Ans: yes

Jenn: can you tell me what that would look like?

Ans: that's how I feel inside. I may dress that way but that's not who I feel like I am.

Jenn: OK, you said people interact with you like you are butch but you don't feel like you are, can you tell me more how you would identify?

Ans: I guess (my girlfriend would tend to disagree with me) but more femme

Jenn: OK, what is it that you think makes the characteristics of either butch or femme?

Ans: I guess taking initiative in things, opening the door for you or that sort of stuff.

Jenn: do you think there's a particular look?

Ans: I guess short hair, flannel clothes, jeans & tie

Example 1 demonstrates the participant's understanding that they are read by others as 'butch' but do not feel that characterizes them accurately. When asked to list some of the characteristics of 'butch,' the participant relays "*taking initiative, opening the door...*" which is in contradiction to their courtship comforts "*I guess to wait for them to initiate or follow through; I'm not the initiator.*" While this individual is aware of the rules of dating, they identify as 'more femme' and not the initiator, while being aware they are presumed to act butch. Her appearance is defining how people interact with her instead of recognizing that she has a more passive nature.

Example 2

Jenn: have you spoken with people who looked a particular way but didn't match the look? Do you find that often.

Ans: not often but "I know exactly what you are talking about".

Jenn: So how do you think our interactions are impacted by how we look? Do you think that you appear as butch but don't identify that way, does that influence the way you interact with others?

Ans: I think so.

Jenn: Can you tell me a bit more about that?

Ans: People who are butch might see me as competition or not someone they would be interested in for a relationship. My girlfriend is still shaking her head because she doesn't think I seem femme.

Example 2 shows we make judgements daily on people based on their appearances (our prejudices and stereotypes are found here). Examples 1 and 2, are two instances where the participant is recounting being denied their subjectivity. The participant, sitting next to their partner while talking to me on the phone, is telling me about their internal feelings of being 'more femme' and twice her partner denies those feelings – “*(my girlfriend would tend to disagree with me) but more femme*”, and later “*My girlfriend is still shaking her head.*” The participant is describing being denied their subjective femme self by others and their partner is reinforcing that denial. Despite the long-term relationship these two are in, the partner continues to deny the participant's sense of self. This is a form of relational aggression; the partner hears the participant operating outside the norms of the group and is refusing to acknowledge the participant's feelings. Further on in the interview, I ask this participant “*You say you identify as more femme; how does it make you feel when your girlfriend shrugs that off?*” The participant replied, “*I just know anyways, it doesn't really matter.*” The participant still sees themselves as unique, however, they allow their long-term partner to contradict. The long-term girlfriend is shaking her head as the participant is expressing who she is.

4.1.2 Objectification: Reduction to Appearance

When we first encounter a person, we make several judgements based on their appearance. Someone wearing a blazer and black shoes during the day may be going to work. Someone who is wearing shorts and a tank top may be going to the beach. We not only make judgements around their appearance as to their activities but also opinions on their personality, their beliefs, and their worth to us (Nussbaum, 1995). For

example, flannel shirt and a tie, short hair presupposes an individual as being butch. Being butch also carries personality characteristics such as being more aggressive.

Example 3

Jenn: So, after there's an exchange of emojis, and you decide that each one is interested, what happens then?

Ans: For the most part its always been me, like when can we get together? But there have been a couple of people who have taken more initiative on the actually initiating getting together part and that's always interesting. I feel like I am like a femme-presenting person, people are caught off guard to find out that I am typically the aggressor, not necessarily aggressive but I like to move the ball along. Direct is good and not a lot of endless conversation back & forth like weeks over text, like no thank you very much.

Example 3 shows that the storyteller acknowledges that there are designated roles that are scripted to play in an interaction based on how someone looks. The participant is discussing the 'back and forth get to know you' conversations that people have before they meet in person. Interestingly, this participant indicates that they are the aggressor, but only aggress to a certain point then turn the control to the other as seen in the exchange below.

Example 3 continued

Ans: why don't you come over to my house and we can play board games its like an open invitation we could just play board games or we could not just play board games, that's kinda like on YOU. That's where my forwardness stops, I will initiate getting together I will initiate you coming to my house but after that it's up to you. That's basically how that goes.

It is unclear from the interview if the discontinuation of being the aggressor past a certain point is due to fear of rejection or as a result of acting in accordance with the interpersonal understanding of femme presentation. It is, however, clear that this person understands that their femme appearance should follow certain rules and that their actions are incongruent with the shared understanding of that femme appearance (not sexually aggressive). The intrapsychic evaluation of herself is that she presents as femme and therefore is acting outside the rules – she is reducing herself to her appearance. In addition, the “*caught off guard*” as a reaction to the participant acting outside her designated role re-enforces that femme presenting does not mean aggressive.

Example 4

Jenn: Do you have a type in terms of women that you are attracted to?

Ans: Butch

Jenn: Personality wise or looks wise?

Ans: Like you 😊 lol

The interview with the participant in example 4 was done through Facebook messenger (participant's choice), hence the emoticon in the interview. My presentation is read by others as butch even though I do not identify as butch. The continuation of example 4 (below) is a compilation of the characteristics that the participant is ascribing to butch folk.

Example 4 continued

Jenn: Would you date someone that identified as femme?

Ans: Yes. I have. But mostly butches.... I don't mind pursuing. But I like them to pay. Cause I am the femme one.

Jenn: Can you tell me what "butch" means to you?

Ans: Someone who can wear a tie. Or just boy clothes, That's all I got. Lol

Jenn: If you were going to act in a play and they told you to act butch, what would that look like? Is there a personality that goes with it?

Ans: Yes, kinda a bit gruff...kinda a bit tough. I'd wear something more boyish.... A flannel shirt over a t-shirt.

Example 4 shows how clothing can be read to indicate someone's personality – "a bit tough"; someone's role in an interpersonal interaction – "I like them to pay"; and their value to us – "butch...like you 😊." By calling me butch, the participant is presupposing that I have these characteristics (which for the most part do not match who I am). Who knew a flannel shirt could mean so much? Author's note – I have never worn flannel a day in my life.

4.1.3 Objectification: Reduction to the Body

In opposition to Gestalt, reduction to the body is being seen not as whole but parts of a body (Nussbaum, 1995). The value of a person is made up of their body parts. The interviews that I conducted did not result in many different examples of reduction to a body part, however there was a re-occurring form of reduction across participants. In this data, examples of this form of objectification were shown in the transphobic admissions of the participants.

Example 5

Jenn: When you go for coffee with someone, are there any identity flags that would deter you from dating them?

Ans: I don't date trans ppl.

Jenn: Ok

Jenn: You said before that you wouldn't date a trans person. May I ask why?

Ans: I don't want to deal with them transitioning. May not be fair. But I just wouldn't. They are one thing then something different.

People know that the reduction is wrong, "May not be fair" but continue to propagate that the body itself is where we see the worth in the person. Unfortunately, it is my experience that WSW see their orientation as one to the vulva/vagina and not to women, as illustrated in example 6.

Example 6

Ans: The only sexual orientation that I will not date I'm sorry that community is going to hate me but you want me to be honest: trans male to female preop is a no to me.

Jenn: I think that's a common feeling across the community that people have expressed.

*Ans: post op preop There are certain things I am attracted to, I am a **lesbian** (emphasis from the participant on the word lesbian)*

The participants in examples 5 and 6 both understand that their comments are transphobic: “*May not be fair*” and “*I’m sorry that community is going to hate me.*” Both of these participants also did not identify themselves as individuals who objectify others, however as illustrated with their quotes, this is objectification. Genital preference (as labeled by some literature) more aptly - transphobia – places the worth of that person solely on their genitalia.

4.1.2 Ownership/Commodity

Many scholars have looked at women as being commodified by society. Women are objectified and reduced to objects to be consumed by society. Nussbaum (Nussbaum, 1995; Plaxton, 2016) examines the concept of fungibility – that objects or persons who have been objectified are traded as parts that are interchangeable. The commodities market, according to Marx (Chattopadhyay, 2018) carried with it, its historical values. The commodity was not valued based on production or labour but was derived from the social (Chattopadhyay, 2018; Nussbaum, 1995; Plaxton, 2016). In this sense, Nussbaum’s commodification of women with Marx’s demarcation of value limits the

objectified person to be valued based on hegemonic norms. To illustrate, the objectified woman is seen as parts that are interchangeable with other commodified women and is then valued for the standards of beauty. An hourglass figure would be worth more to the person possessing it than an apple-shaped body. The person holding the hourglass figure is then recognized as being higher in social status. The more we follow the rules of what is seen as valuable, the more we fit into the structure of society.

Example 7

“Or more butch may have a little more testosterone and kind of be attracted to the pretty ones. Or some of the little pretty ones do what to be taken care of. That’s where we have pillow princesses and all that, I’m sorry I’m a feminist and very independent. I’ll get on a tangent. That’s where you become that and sometimes that works. That opposite attraction works where they want somebody to be more dominant and the other one wants them to be more pretty and laid back & fluffy & soft.”

Example 8

“For the most part, all my queer friends fall into that. I don’t have any masculine leaning friends that are attracted to masculine leaning folks. It’s just not really a thing. I’m not sure if that’s something that’s conditioned into us like “little baby gays” that you have to fit into this mould and I feel like the odd time that it does happen it not so much like when two fem-presenting queers get together but definitely when two masculine folks get together its’ like that weird, that can’t happen like “who’s gonna be the top now.” Which is really unfortunate & silly but its definitely a conversation that exists in the world

because a lot of fems are really angry when two butches get together it's like well shit now what are we going to do. They can't date each other that's not acceptable."

Example 9

"I am pretty feminine. I like butches. I am not super femme. But femme enough"

Examples 7-9 show that the pairing of the aggressive with the passive, the masculine with the feminine. No matter the sexual orientation, the heterosexual dyad is normalized.

Example 10

"Jenn: We label, we have these hierarchies, like this person is a better lesbian than this person based on..."

"Gold stars are better and the Bi's are way over here with the polys? & the asexuals & the gender fluids & the pans? Other ones I can't remember all of them, I'm trying and I'm respectful, but I can't remember all of them.... the "+" includes too broad of a spectrum but I'm getting close. It's the judgement and I don't know why."

Example 11

"I feel like there's obvious privileges in het culture but I feel like there's more privilege in butch culture than in fem culture because I feel like there's less of them and so they have more options and have more at their disposal. I think a lot of them really know that. just my experience."

Examples 10 and 11 are the participants discussing who is seen as having the most privilege in WSW communities. Again, reflecting the ideological norms, the masculine is more valuable than the feminine. The hierarchy is not only used to increase the value of some individuals but also to devalue others.

Example 12

“I’ve dated a couple bi’s. I’m remotely ok but I don’t deal with the young ones that have recently been with a man and popped out a baby. There are certain little things that I don’t put my heart out there willing to get squished, been there done that a few times & I’m not going to be that vulnerable but Bi’s to a certain extent, if they’re grown & know who they are and ... who they are, I’m good on that one.”

This is a part of the hierarchy that I call the propinquity to the penis. The closer in time, space, and orientation to a penis devalues the person as a potential paramour.

Sexuality is understood as biologically based. Biology is not seen as fluid. Therefore, fluidity in sexual orientations (such as bisexuality) is devalued unless their identity is solidified. Like example 12 indicates, “if they are grown and know who they are.”

5 Discussion

At the outset of this thesis there were several questions I asked myself:

- Did I really objectify those women in the restaurant?
- How have women made objectifying language part of their conversation?
- Why would women objectify each other?
- What are the long-term negative impacts on members of the LGBTQ+ communities?

5.1 Did I really objectify those women?

I did objectify those women. Objectifying women is part of the normal. “All women live in sexual objectification the way fish live in water” (as cited in Nussbaum, 1995 p. 250)

In order to fit into the group, we adopt the norms of the group. If I challenged what was being said in that moment, I most likely would have been made fun of. In social situations we are apt to go along with the behaviour that will make us fit in. If we feel like we are on the periphery of the group, we work harder to conform to the norms of the group. We become louder in our enforcement of the norms (objectifying women) in order to secure our sense of belonging in that situation. My desire to fit in overrode my social justice warrior. The objectification of women may be normalized as a behaviour, but it is not in line with my morals which dictates that humans be treated with respect and dignity.

5.2 How have women made objectifying language part of their conversation?

In order to communicate with one another, we must share a common language. That language does not necessarily mean a verbal language but can be one of body language, sign language, imagery, etc. The important part of the language is that it is understood. Groups have their own languages that arise. Their language is formed from the ideologies of that group. The language in the group then allows members of the group to communicate effectively. The intragroup language also functions to keep people that are not a part of the group out of the group (Talbot, 2014). In talking to my participants, the similarities that arose in discussing the 'butch' were shocking. Despite the increasing visibility of other representations of WSW, the butch/femme dynamic holds strong. The continued pairing of butch/femme coupling may not be the number of couples with this dynamic but the visibility of the couples themselves. Butch is an aesthetic that can be easily identifiable. Because it is visible to be butch, the butch person becomes the mental representation or the stereotype of a WSW. Being butch is a look, a personality, a stereotype, a suitable partner for a femme. The butch/femme dyad is representative of the male/female coupling in heterosexuals. According to Edelman (2004), for the non-heterosexual to hold value in a world of reproduction they must emulate the heterosexual pairing. The burgeoning focus on the family as the future focuses the learning of our sexual scripts toward reproduction. We have a shared understanding of the hierarchy of sexualities in the heterosexual and the WSW realms. The language used to communicate in WSW communities then reflects the reproductive ideologies but also the hierarchical ideologies.

Not only is there a shared language of terms, there is also a shared gaze that indicates interest in someone. Looking a person from foot to head is a social indicator of sexual interest. One of my participants performed this action when asked how you tell someone that you are interested in them. This look is not solely found in WSW communities. It is a replication of the camera pan that Mulvey (1975) described. The communication that occurs in groups is learned. We endorse the communication unconsciously based on our need to belong.

5.2 Why would women objectify each other?

Objectification of women is not always a bad thing (Nussbaum, 1995). In terms of sexual objectification, objectifying a sexual partner can be part of the arousal. Nussbaum (1995) cautions in her analysis that the person's autonomy must be maintained. The objectification should be situational and not universal. For example, a person can perform butch in a sexual situation if that is a turn on, but it should be seen as a performance and should not limit the identity of that person. It is the removal of autonomy that is the transgression in objectifying someone (Nussbaum, 1995). The types of objectification that were found in the data were in service of enforcing the norms of the group. We reinforce transgressions of sexuality through reducing individuals to objects. This is a form of relational aggression – the denial of an individual's humanity here is working to maintain power structures.

If we want to be of value to the group, we can tell others how they must feel based on the set of ideas that maintain the hierarchy of worth. Simultaneously, like Foucault (2008)

discussed, the power structure is internalized and occluded from conscious endorsement of the ideologies. Once we have internalized the power structures, we become enforcers policing others back in line.

The reason I asked myself this question at the outset is that I was wondering why I would objectify women given that I identify as a woman, how is that harmful to my sense of self. Would I not act with more respect toward a group with which I identify? The answer is that we are normalized to objectify women and our paramours. The internalization of hierarchical values does impact our sense of self. Self-objectification is as much a part of women's lives as objectification from others is. In order to avoid the objectification of our self and others, we must interrogate the ideologies that guide our actions. That takes a lot of work and it can place us in a dangerous location in terms of group affiliation.

5.3 What are the long-term negative impacts on members of the LGBTQ+ communities?

Recently in the Vancouver Dyke March, a part of Pride weekend that centers around women in the gay communities, has been bombarded with transphobic messages. In 2018, a group of TERF (trans-exclusionary radical feminists) protested at the Dyke march which starts off the celebration. The group had placed rocks on the grounds of the park where the march ends that contained transphobic messages. In 2019, a group of self-identified lesbians showed up to the celebration with t-shirts that had a uterus with the word lesbian written on top of it. The group believes that trans persons are

relegated to their gender assigned at birth. Their own argument is that lesbians are found in the pairing of two individuals with XX chromosomes. Chromosomes are not visible. Chromosomes of XX do not always result in 'female' babies but it is a shorthand for discriminating against individuals who are born 'male.' The article written by one of the members of the group is called *Lesbians are being excluded from the Vancouver Dyke March in the name of 'inclusivity.'* The tag line below the title of the article is *Lesbians are being harassed and bullied out of their own spaces and events by trans activists and their allies.* The group is identifying their activism:

"Having chosen "lesbian heroes" as our theme for this year's March, we carried homemade signs that featured lesbians we admire — our lesbian heroes — pioneers who have made significant contributions to lesbian culture or allies in the ongoing struggle for lesbian sexual autonomy." (Cormier, 2018)

The hypocrisy of this group is wanting space for their discriminatory statements – trans women and not real women. They wanted the dyke march to deem TERF (Trans-exclusionary Radical Feminists) as hate speech. The group of lesbians wants to espouse their beliefs despite the marginalizing that it performs but does not want to be called out for their marginalization of others. The Toronto Pride Parade in 2016 was halted when Black Lives Matter sat down in silent protest of the whiteness of pride. The protest was polarizing in the communities across Canada. Some saw it as a positive act to increase visibility of minorities of LGBTQ+ communities. Others saw it as an act against the Toronto Pride seen in a negative light by many. In Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual,

and Trans (LGBT+) communities, there has been a consistent lack of progress for people of colour, bisexuals, trans, and gender non-conforming individuals (Berebu, 2017; Lamble, 2009). There is a sense of activism in gay communities but there is resistance of acknowledging that gay activism is not inclusive of everyone. It is the unconscious endorsement of ideologies that allow us to act out discrimination while maintaining our sense of self as an activist.

6 Conclusion

The field of sexuality studies is broadening to include the socialized. Despite the increasing investigations of the learned aspects of sexualities, we are still binding our research in a 'one truth' system of science. The truth of sexuality is that sex is for procreation. The naturalization of our sexual scripts removes the ownership that we have in their enactment. If our sexuality is biology based then we have no agency in our sexual self. We are distanced from the consequences of our actions. In a group that incorporates our identity as well as our sexuality the goal of the behaviour guides our actions more than our sense of self. This thesis is just a beginning to exploring the influence of our learning on the operation of our intrapsychic self and our interpersonal interactions. In future, I hope to examine the discordance between the sense of self and our behaviours. The strengths of this inquiry are that it incorporates both aspects of the sexual script (intra and inter). Other inquiries have focused on one or the other. The limitations are found in the concentration of knowledge and participants in the western world. The ideologies of sex and sexualities are varied. People are more diverse than my sample of participants and inclusion of other voices would greatly expand my interpretations.

References

- Allen, N. (1998). Maori Vision and the Imperialist Gaze. In T. Barringer & T. Flynn (Eds.) *Colonialism and the Object: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum* (pp. 144-152). Routledge.
- Andersen, S. M. & Chen, S. (2002) The Relational Self: An Interpersonal Social-Cognitive Theory. *Psychological Review*, 109 (4), 619-645. DOI: 10.1037//0033-295X.109.4.619
- Bancroft, J. (2002) Biological Factors in Human Sexuality. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 39(1), 15-21.
- Bancroft, J. (2005). The endocrinology of sexual arousal. *Journal of Endocrinology*, 186(3), 411-427. doi:10.1677/joe.1.06233
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Bargh, J. A., & Morsella, E. (2008). The unconscious mind. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(1), 73-79. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00064.x
- Barnes, M. (2014). Anticipatory Socialization of Pregnant Women. *Sociological Perspectives*, 58(2), 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121414564883>
- Bass, A. (2018). *Fetishism, Psychoanalysis, and Philosophy: The Iridescent Thing*. Routledge.
- Beghetto, R. A. & Plucker, J. A. (2016) The Relationship Among Schooling, Learning, and Creativity: "All Roads Lead to Creativity" or "You Can't Get There from Here?". In J. C. Kaufman (Ed.), *Creativity and Reason in Cognitive Development* (pp. 316-332). Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511606915.019
- Bem, S. L., & Bem, D. J. (1973). Does sex-biased job advertising Baid and abet^ sex discrimination? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 3, 6–18. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1973.tb01290.x.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88, 354–364. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354.
- Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Signs*, 8, 598–616. doi:10.1086/493998.

Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bem, S. L. (1995). Dismantling gender polarization and compulsory heterosexuality: Should we turn the volume down or up? *Journal of Sex Research*, 32, 329–334. doi:10.1080/00224499509551806.

Bem, S. L. (1998). *An unconventional family*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Berlant, L. (2012). *Desire Love*. Punctum Books.

Berube, A. (2017) How Gay Stays White and What Kind of White it Stays. In M. S. Kimmel (Ed.), *Privilege: A Reader*, (pp. 180-208).

Boisvert, L., Aaronson, A., & desLibris - Books. (2019). In Aaronson A. (Ed.), *Screwed: How women are set up to fail at sex*. Toronto;LaVergne;: Dundurn.

Borver, J., Gurevich, M. & Mathieson, C. (2008) (Con)Tested Identities: Bisexual Women Reorient Sexuality. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 2(2-3), 23-52. DOI: 10.1300/J159v02n02_03

Bossio, J. A., Singh, M., & Pukall, C. F. (2018). Concurrent assessment of penile blood flow and circumference as indicators of male sexual arousal. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 15(11), 1570-1578. doi:10.1016/j.jsxm.2018.08.016

Braun, S., & Davidson, A. (2016). Gender (Non)conformity in Middle Childhood: A Mixed Methods Approach to Understanding Gender-Typed Behavior, Friendship, and Peer Preference. *Sex Roles*, 77(1-2), 16-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0693-z>

Braun, V. & Kitzinger, C. (2001) “Snatch,” “Hole,” or “Honey-pot”? Semantic categories and the problem of nonspecificity in female genital slang, *Journal of Sex Research*, 38:2, 146-158, DOI: 10.1080/00224490109552082

Bridges, D., (2017). *Philosophy in educational research: Epistemology, ethics, politics and quality*. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-49212-4

Brivot, M., & Gendron, Y. (2011). Beyond panopticism: On the ramifications of surveillance in a contemporary professional setting. *Accounting, Organizations And Society*, 36(3), 135-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2011.03.003>

Browne, K. (2002). *Power, Performativities & Place: Living Outside Heterosexuality* (Ph.D). University of Gloucestershire.

Browne, K. (2005) Snowball sampling: using social networks to research

non-heterosexual women, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8:1, 47-60, DOI:10.1080/1364557032000081663

Brown, V. A., Harris, J. A., & Wheeler, L. (2014). *The human capacity for transformational change: Harnessing the collective mind*. London; Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203107874

Bunniss, S., & Kelly, D. R. (2010). Research paradigms in medical education research. *Medical Education*, 44(4), 358-366. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03611.x

Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, December 2018

Calogero, R. M., Tantleff-Dunn, S. & Thompson, J. K. (2011) Objectification Theory: An Introduction. In R. M. Calogero, S. Tantleff-Dunn & J. K. Thompson (Eds.), *Self-Objectification in Women: Causes, Consequences, and Counteractions* (pp. 3-21) American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12304-001>

Cartier, M. (2014). *Baby You Are My Religion: Women, Gay Bars, and Theology Before Stonewall*. New York: Routledge.

Cassese, E. C. & Bos, A. L. (2013) A Hidden Curriculum? Examining the Gender Content in Introductory-Level Political Science Textbooks. *Politics & Gender*, 9(2), 214-223. doi:10.1017/S1743923X13000068

Cast, A. D. (2003). In P. J. Burke, T. J. Owens, R. T. Serpe & P. A. Thoits (Eds.), *Advances in Identity Theory and Research* (pp. 41-53). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Chattopadhyay, P. (2018) *Socialism and Commodity Production: Essay in Marx Revival*. Koninklijke Brill

Chen, S., Boucher, H. C. & Parker Tapias, M. (2006) The Relational Self Revealed: Integrative Conceptualization and Implications for Interpersonal Life. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(2), 151-179. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.132.2.151

Cherney, I. (2018). Characteristics of Masculine and Feminine Toys and Gender-Differentiated Play. In E. S. Weisgram & L.M. Dinella (Eds.), *Gender Typing of Children's Toys: How Early Play Experiences Impact Development* (pp. 73-93). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000077-005>

Chivers, M. L., Rieger, G., Latty, E., & Bailey, J. M. (2004). A sex difference in the specificity of sexual arousal. *Psychological Science*, 15(11), 736-744. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00750.x

- Chivers, M. L., Seto, M. C., Lalumière, M. L., Laan, E., & Grimbos, T. (2010). Agreement of self-reported and genital measures of sexual arousal in men and women: A meta-analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39(1), 5-56. doi:10.1007/s10508-009-9556-9
- Chun, J. S., & Choi, J. N. (2014). Members' needs, intragroup conflict, and group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(3), 437-450. doi:10.1037/a0036363
- Christie, N. (2016) Death as Punishment. In L. Scherdin (Ed.), *Capital Punishment: A Hazard to a Sustainable Criminal Justice System?* (pp. 61- 75). Routledge.
- Clarke, H., & Arnold, K. (2017). Diversity in gender stereotypes? A comparison of heterosexual, gay and lesbian perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences De L'administration*, 34(2), 149-158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.1437>
- Clifford, C. & Orford, J. (2007) The Experience of Social Power in the Lives of Trans People. In V. Clarke & E. Peel (Eds.), *Out in Psychology Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Queer Perspectives* (pp.195-216). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Conte, M. (2017). *More Fats, More Femmes, and No Whites: A Critical Examination of Fatphobia, Femmephobia and Racism on Grindr* (MA). Carleton University.
- Cormier, D. (2018). Lesbians are being excluded from the Vancouver Dyke March in the name of 'inclusivity'. Retrieved 5 March 2020, from <https://www.feministcurrent.com/2018/08/13/lesbians-excluded-vancouver-dyke-march-name-inclusivity/>
- Coyne, S. M. & Ostrov, J. M. (2018) The Development of Relational Aggression: An Introduction. In S.M. Coyne & J. M. Ostrov (Eds.), *The Development of Relational Aggression* (pp. 1-11). Oxford Scholarship Online. DOI:10.1093/oso/9780190491826.003.0001
- Crawley, S., & Willman, R. (2017). Heteronormativity made me lesbian: Femme, butch and the production of sexual embodiment projects. *Sexualities*, 21(1-2), 156-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716677484>
- De Drue, C. K. W. (2007) Minority Dissent, Attitude Change, and Group Performance. In A. R. Pratkanis (Ed.), *The Science of Social Influence: Advances and Future Progress* (pp. 247-270). Psychology Press.
- de Lemus, S., Moya, M., & Glick, P. (2010). When contact correlates with prejudice: Adolescents' romantic relationship experience predicts greater benevolent sexism in boys and hostile sexism in girls. *Sex Roles*, 63(3-4), 214-225. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9786-2

De Lissovoy, N. (2012). Education and Violation: Conceptualizing Power, Domination, and Agency in the Hidden Curriculum. *Race Ethnicity And Education*, 15(4), 463-484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2011.618831>

de Wit, Frank R. C, Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 360-390. doi:10.1037/a0024844

Diamond, L. M. (2013) Concepts of Female Sexual Orientation. In C. J. Patterson & A. R. D'Augelli (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology and Sexual Orientation* (pp. 1-31). Oxford Scholarship Online. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199765218.003.0001

Diamond, L. M. (2017) Three critical questions for future research on lesbian relationships, *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 21:1, 106-119, DOI: 10.1080/10894160.2016.1143756

Diamond, L., & Butterworth, M. (2008). Questioning Gender and Sexual Identity: Dynamic Links Over Time. *Sex Roles*, 59(5-6), 365-376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9425-3>

DiFonzo, N. & Bordia, P. (2007) Rumors Influence: Toward a Dynamic Social Impact Theory. In A. R. Pratkanis (Ed.), *The Science of Social Influence: Advances and Future Progress* (pp. 271-295). Psychology Press.

Dworkin, S. H. (2013) Bisexual Identities. In C. J. Patterson & A. R. D'Augelli (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology and Sexual Orientation* (pp. 1-20). Oxford Scholarship Online. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199765218.003.0003

Ebrahimi-Fakhari, D., & Sahin, M. (2015). Autism and the synapse. *Current Opinion in Neurology*, 28(2), 91-102. <https://doi.org/10.1097/wco.0000000000000186>

Endendijk, J., Groeneveld, M., van der Pol, L., van Berkel, S., Hallers-Haalboom, E., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M., & Mesman, J. (2016). Gender Differences in Child Aggression: Relations with Gender-Differentiated Parenting and Parents' Gender-Role Stereotypes. *Child Development*, 88(1), 299-316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12589>

Edelman, L. (2004). *No future*. Duke University Press.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (2012). *Sex/Gender: Biology in a Social World*. New York: Routledge.

Feder, E. (2014). *Making Sense of Intersex: Changing Ethical Perspectives in Biomedicine* [Ebook] (pp. 1-18). Indiana University Press.

- Felkins, S. (2019). The Weight I Carry: Intersections of Fatphobia, Gender, and Capitalism. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 40(3), 180. <https://doi.org/10.5250/fronjwomestud.40.3.0180>
- Fine, C. (2014). His brain, her brain?. *Science*, 346(6212), 915-916. doi: 10.1126/science.1262061
- Fine, C., Jordan-Young, R., Kaiser, A. & Rippon, G. (2013) Plasticity, Plasticity, Plasticity...and the Rigid Problem of Sex. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 17(11), 550-551. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.08.010>
- Fiske, S.T. (2011). *Envy Up, Scorn Down: How Status Divides Us*. (1 ed.). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Forsyth, D. R. (2000) Social Comparison and Influence in Groups. In J. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.) *Handbook of Social Comparison: Theory and Research* (pp. 81-103). Springer Science + Business Media. DOI 10.1007/978-1-4615-4237-7
- Foucault, M (2008) "Panopticism" from "Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison". *Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Fredrickson, B., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification Theory: Toward Understanding Women's Lived Experiences and Mental Health Risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(2), 173-206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x>
- Gagnon, J., & Simon, W. (2017). *Sexual conduct*. Routledge.
- Gane, N. (2012) The Governmentalities of Neoliberalism: Panopticism, Post-Panopticism and Beyond. *The Sociological Review*, 60, 611-634. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2012.02126.x
- Gedeon, P. (2015) Spontaneous Order and Social Norms Hayek's Theory of Socio-Cultural Evolution. *Society and Economy* 37, 1-29. DOI: 10.1556/SocEc.37.2015.1.1
- Gelman, S. & Gottfried, G. M. (2016) Creativity in Yung Children's Thought. In J. C. Kaufman (Ed.), *Creativity and Reason in Cognitive Development* (pp. 221-243). Cambridge University Press. doi: 0.1017/CBO9781139941969.002
- Gergen, K. (2001). Psychological science in a postmodern context. *American Psychologist*, 56(10), 803-813. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.56.10.803>
- Gervais, S., Bernard, P., Klein, O., & Allen, J. (2013). Objectification and (De)Humanization. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-6959-9>

Gibon, J., Unsain, N., Gamache, K., Thomas, R., De Leon, A., & Johnstone, A. et al. (2016). The X-linked inhibitor of apoptosis regulates long-term depression and learning rate. *The FASEB Journal*, 30(9), 3083-3090. doi: 10.1096/fj.201600384r

Glasford, D. E., Dovidlo, J. F. & Pratto, F. (2009) I Continue to Feel So Good About Us: In-Group Identification and the Use of Social Identity-Enhancing Strategies to Reduce Intragroup Dissonance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(4), 415-427. DOI: 10.1177/0146167208329216

Glăveanu, V., & Tanggaard, L. (2014). Creativity, Identity, and Representation: Towards a Socio-Cultural Theory of Creative Identity. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 34, 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2014.02.002>

Goldey, K., Posh, A., Bell, S., & van Anders, S. (2016). Defining Pleasure: A Focus Group Study of Solitary and Partnered Sexual Pleasure in Queer and Heterosexual Women. *Archives Of Sexual Behavior*, 45(8), 2137-2154. doi: 10.1007/s10508-016-0704-8

Goldstein, N. J. & Cialdini, R. B. (2007) Using Social Norms as a Lever of Social Influence. In A. R. Pratkanis (Ed.), *The Science of Social Influence: Advances and Future Progress* (pp. 167-191). Psychology Press.

Gray, M. (2002). Urban surveillance and panopticism: Will we recognize the facial recognition society? *Surveillance & Society*, 1(3), 314-330. doi:10.24908/ss.v1i3.3343

Griffin, B. (2018). Hegemonic Masculinity as a Historical Problem. *Gender & History*, 30(2), 377-400. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.12363>

Gurevich, M., Bower, J., Mathieson, C. M. & Dhayanandhan, B (2007) 'What Do They Look Like and Are They among Us?': Bisexuality, (Dis)closure and (Un)viability. In V. Clarke & E. Peel (Eds.), *Out in Psychology Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Queer Perspectives* (pp.217-241). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Guzman-Karlsson, M. C., Meadows, J. P., Gavin, C. F., Hablitz, J. J. & Sweatt, J. D. (2014) Transcriptional and Epigenetic Regulation of Hebbian and Non-Hebbian Plasticity. *Neuropharmacology*, 80, 3-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropharm.2014.01.001>

Haaker, J., Molapour, T., & Olsson, A. (2016). Conditioned social dominance threat: observation of others' social dominance biases threat learning. *Social Cognitive And Affective Neuroscience*, 11(10), 1627-1637. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw074>

Haines, M. E., Erchull, M. J., Liss, M., Turner, D. L., Nelson, J. A., Ramsey, L. R., & Hurt, M. M. (2008). Predictors and effects of self-objectification in lesbians. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(2), 181-187. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00422.x

Halberstam, J. (2018). *Female masculinity*. Duke University Press. doi: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.1215/9781478002703>

Hanish, L. D., Sallquist, J., DiDonato, M., Fabes, R. A., & Martin, C. L. (2012). Aggression by whom-aggression toward whom: Behavioral predictors of same- and other-gender aggression in early childhood. *Developmental Psychology*, 48(5), 1450-1462. doi:10.1037/a0027510

Hegarty, P. (2018). *A Recent History of Lesbian and Gay Psychology: From Homophobia to LGBT*. New York: Routledge.

Hill Collins, P. & Bilge, S. (2016) *Intersectionality*. Polity Press.

Hines, M. (2004). *Brain gender*. Oxford University Press.

Hines, M. & Davis, J. (2018). Sex Hormones and Children's Gender-Typed Toy Play. In E. S. Weisgram & L.M. Dinella (Eds.), *Gender Typing of Children's Toys: How Early Play Experiences Impact Development* (pp. 97-120). American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0000077-006>

Hipp, J., Tita, G. & Boggess, L. (2009) Intergroup and Intragroup Violence: Is Violent Crime an Expression of Group Conflict or Social Disorganization? *Criminology*, 47(2), 521-564. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2009.00150.x

Ho, A., Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Levin, S., Thomsen, L., Kteily, N., & Sheehy-Skeffington, J. (2012). Social Dominance Orientation. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(5), 583-606. doi: 10.1177/0146167211432765

Hogg, M. A. (2000) Social Identity and Social Comparison. In J. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Comparison: Theory and Research* (pp. 401-421). Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.

hooks, b. (2015). *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Routledge.

Hopp, W. (2020) *Phenomenology: A Contemporary Introduction*. Routledge. DOI<https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.4324/9781003047216>

Hunting, G. (2014) *Intersectionality-Informed Qualitative Research: A Primer*. The Institute for Intersectionality Research & SFU Policy.

Jackson, S. (2005) Sexuality, Heterosexuality and Gender Hierarchy: Getting Our Priorities Straight. In C. Ingraham (Ed.) *Thinking Straight: The Power, the Promise, and the Paradox of Heterosexuality* (pp. 15-37). Routledge.

Jackson, S. (2011). Heterosexual hierarchies: A commentary on class and sexuality. *Sexualities*, 14(1), 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460710390572>

Jacobs, C. E. (2016). Developing the “Oppositional gaze”: Using critical media pedagogy and black feminist thought to promote black girls’ identity development. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 85(3), 225-238. doi:10.7709/jnegroeducation.85.3.0225

Johansson, T. (2007). *The Transformation of Sexuality: Gender and Identity in Contemporary Youth Culture*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315552088

John-Steiner, V. (1999). Sociocultural and Feminist Theory: Mutuality and Relevance. In S. Chaiklin, M. Hedegarrd & U.J. Jensen (Eds.), *Activity Theory and Social Practice* (pp. 201-244).

Kaplan, E. A. (1997) *Looking for the Other: Feminism, Film, and the Imperial Gaze*. Routledge.

Karsay, K., Knoll, J., & Matthes, J. (2018). Sexualizing media use and self-objectification: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 42(1), 9-28. doi:10.1177/0361684317743019

Kawa, S., & Giordano, J. (2012). A brief historicity of the diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: Issues and implications for the future of psychiatric canon and practice. *Philosophy, Ethics, and Humanities in Medicine : PEHM*, 7(1), 2-2. doi:10.1186/1747-5341-7-2

Kiesling, S. (2013). Flirting and ‘normative’ sexualities. *Journal of Language And Sexuality*, 2(1), 101-121. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jls.2.1.04kie>

Kilbourne, J. (1999). *Deadly persuasion*. Free Press.

Kilbourne, J. (2020). *Still Killing Us Softly - Advertisings Image of Women*. Presentation.

Kim, H., Cho, M., Shim, W., Kim, J., Jeon, E., Kim, D., & Yoon, S. (2016). Deficient autophagy in microglia impairs synaptic pruning and causes social behavioral defects. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 22(11), 1576-1584. doi: 10.1038/mp.2016.103

Kincaid, J. R. (2001). It’s Not about Sex. In L. Berlant & L. Duggan (Eds.) *Our Monica, Ourselves* (pp. 73-85). NYU Press.

King, A., Almack, K. & Jones, R. L. (2019) Introduction: Intersections of Ageing, Gender and Sexualities. In A. King, K. Almack & R. L. Jones (Eds.), *Intersections of Ageing, Gender and Sexualities* (pp. 1-8). Policy Press.

Korsgaard, M. A., Soyoung Jeong, S., Mahony, D. M., & Pitariu, A. H. (2008). A multilevel view of intragroup conflict. *Journal of Management*, 34(6), 1222-1252. doi:10.1177/0149206308325124

Kozak M., Frankenhauser, H. & Roberts, T. (2009) Objects of Desire: Objectification as a Function of Male Sexual Orientation. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(3), 225-230. DOI: 10.1037/a0016257

Krakauer, I. D. & Rose, S. M. (2002) The Impact of Group Membership in Lesbians' Physical Appearance. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 6(1), 31-43.

Kranz, G. S., Hahn, A., Kaufmann, U., Küblböck, M., Hummer, A., Ganger, S., Seiger, R., Winkler, D., Swaab, D. F., Windischberger, C., Kasper, S., & Lanzenberger, R. (2014). White matter microstructure in transsexuals and controls investigated by diffusion tensor imaging. *The Journal of neuroscience : the official journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, 34(46), 15466–15475. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2488-14.2014>

Kuckartz, U. (2013) Three Basic Methods of Qualitative Text Analysis. In U. Kuckartz & A. McWhertor (Eds.), *Qualitative Text Analysis: A Guide to Methods, Practice & Using Software* (pp. 65-120). DOI: <https://dx-doi-org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.4135/9781446288719.n4>

Lamble, S. (2009). Unknowable bodies, unthinkable sexualities: Lesbian and transgender legal invisibility in the toronto women's bathhouse raid. *Social & Legal Studies*, 18(1), 111-130. doi:10.1177/0964663908100336

Lane, N. (2015). All the Lesbians are White, All the Villages are Gay, but Some of Us are Brave: Intersectionality, Belonging, and Black Queer Women's Scene Space in Washington DC. In k. Browne & E. Ferreira (Eds.), *Lesbian Geographies: Gender Place and Power* (pp.219-247). Routledge.

Lantolf, J. P. & Poehner, M. E. (2014) *Sociocultural Theory and the Pedagogical Imperative in L2 Education: Vygotskian Praxis and the Research/Practice Divide*. Routledge.

Law, J., & Urry, J. (2004). Enacting the social. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 390-410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0308514042000225716>

Lazar, M. M. (2014). Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Relevance for Current Gender and Language Research. In S. Elrich, M. Meyerhoff & J. Homes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality Second Edition* (pp. 180-199). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lea, M., Spears, R., & Watt, S. (2006). Visibility and anonymity effects on attraction and group cohesiveness. *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, 37(4), 761-773. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.398

Leaper, C. & Bigler, R. S. (2018). Societal Causes and Consequences of Gender Typing of Children's Toys. In E. S. Weisgram & L.M. Dinella (Eds.), *Gender Typing of*

Children's Toys: How Early Play Experiences Impact Development (pp. 287-308). American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0000077-013>

Le Bon, G (1995) *The Crowd*. Transaction Publishers.

Lee, J. (2014). A hidden curriculum in Japanese EFL textbooks: Gender representation. *Linguistics And Education*, 27, 39-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.07.002>

Levitt, H., Gerrish, E., & Hiestand, K. (2003). The Misunderstood Gender: A Model of Modern Femme Identity. *Sex Roles*, 48(3/4), 99-113.

Liben, L., & Bigler, R. (2015). Understanding and Undermining the Development of Gender Dichotomies: The Legacy of Sandra Lipsitz Bem. *Sex Roles*, 76(9-10), 544-555. doi: 10.1007/s11199-015-0519-4

Li, J., Chai, A., Wang, L., Ma, Y., Wu, Z., & Yu, H. et al. (2015). Synaptic P-Rex1 signaling regulates hippocampal long-term depression and autism-like social behavior. *Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences*, 112(50), E6964-E6972. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1512913112>

Lips, H. M. (2019) *Gender: The Basics*. Routledge.

Liu, J. H., Miller Campbell, S. & Condie, H. (1995). Ethnocentrism in Dating Preferences for an American Sample: The Ingroup Bias in Social Context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 95-115.

Longfellow, B. (1991). In the realm of pleasure: Von sternberg, dietrich and the masochistic aesthetic Film Studies Association of Canada / Association canadienne d'études cinématographiques.

Lyons, T., Krüsi, A., Pierre, L., Kerr, T., Small, W., & Shannon, K. (2016). Negotiating Violence in the Context of Transphobia and Criminalization. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(2), 182-190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315613311>

Ma, L., Yang, B., Wang, X., & Li, Y. (2017). On the dimensionality of intragroup conflict: An exploratory study of conflict and its relationship with group innovation performance. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 28(5), 538-562. doi:10.1108/IJCMA-07-2016-0061

Manokha, I. (2018) Surveillance, Panopticism, and Self-Discipline in the Digital Age. *Surveillance & Society*, 16(2), 219-237.

Manzella, S. (2019). It's 2018. Why are we still calling ourselves gold star gays? Retrieved 7 September 2020, from <http://www.newnownext.com/platinum-gay-gold-star-lesbian-labels-why/04/2018/>.

McIntosh, W., Dawson, B., Scott, A., & Locker, L. (2011). Willingness to Date across Race: Differences among Gay and Heterosexual Men and Women. *Psychological Reports*, 108(3), 711-716. <https://doi.org/10.2466/07.pr0.108.3.711-716>

Martin, C. L. & Cook, R. E. (2018). Cognitive Perspectives on Children's Toy Choices. In E. S. Weisgram & L.M. Dinella (Eds.), *Gender Typing of Children's Toys: How Early Play Experiences Impact Development* (pp. 141-164). American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0000077-006>

Martin, C. L. & Ruble, D. N. (2010) Patterns of Gender Development. *Annu Rev Psychol*, 61, 353-381. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100511.

Martin, E. (1991). The egg and the sperm: How science has constructed a romance based on stereotypical male-female roles. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 16(3), 485-501. doi:10.1086/494680

Martin, K., & Luke, K. (2010). Gender Differences in the ABC's of the Birds and the Bees: What Mothers Teach Young Children About Sexuality and Reproduction. *Sex Roles*, 62(3-4), 278-291. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9731-4

Martin, J. (2004) Self-Regulated Learning, Social Cognitive Theory, and Agency, *Educational Psychologist*, 39:2, 135-145, DOI: 10.1207/s15326985ep3902_4 To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3902_4

Mason, G (2002) *The Spectacle of Violence: Homophobia, Gender and Knowledge*. Routledge.

McDougall, W. (2012). The Group Mind A Sketch of the Principles of Collective Psychology. Project Gutenberg.

McRobbie, A. (2013). Angela McRobbie interviews herself. *Cultural Studies*, 27(5), 828-832. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2013.773677>

Mitricheva, E., Kimura, R., Logothetis, N. K., & Noori, H. R. (2019). Neural substrates of sexual arousal are not sex dependent. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - PNAS*, 116(31), 15671-15676. doi:10.1073/pnas.1904975116

Moore, M. (2010). Human Nonverbal Courtship Behavior - A Brief Historical Review. *Journal of Sex Research*, 47(2-3), 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490903402520>

Moradi, B., & Huang, Y. (2008). Objectification theory and psychology of women: A decade of advances and future directions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(4), 377-398. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00452.x

- Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. *Screen*, 16(3), 6-18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/16.3.6>
- Mulvey, L. (2004) Looking at the Past from the Present: Rethinking Film Theory of the 1970s. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(1), 1286-1292.
- Nagel, J. (2000) Ethnicity and Sexuality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 107-133.
- Nemoto, T., Bodeker, B., & Iwamoto, M. (2011). Social Support, Exposure to Violence and Transphobia, and Correlates of Depression Among Male-to-Female Transgender Women with a History of Sex Work. *American Journal of Public Health*, 101(10). Retrieved 7 September 2020
- Ninivaggi, F. (2015). "Two-ness": The Mind's Binary Code. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/blog/envy/201506/two-ness-the-mind-s-binary-code>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1995) Objectification. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 24(4), 249-291.
- Obradors-Campos, M. (2011). Deconstructing Biphobia. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 11(2-3), 207-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2011.571986>
- O'Donoghue, T. (2019). Planning your qualitative research thesis and project: An introduction to interpretivist research in education and the social sciences (2nd ed.). Milton: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781351165563
- Pasterski, V., Golombok, S. & Hines (2010). Sex Differences in Social Behavior. In P. K. Smith & C. H. Hart (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Childhood Social Development* (pp. 281-298). Blackwell Publishing.
- Pearce, R., Erikainen, S., & Vincent, B. (2020). TERF wars: An introduction. *The Sociological Review*, 68(4), 677-698. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120934713>
- Peplak, J., Song, J. H., Colasante, T. & Malti, T. (2017) "Only You Can Play with Me!" Children's Inclusive Decision Making, Reasoning, and Emotions Based on Peers' Gender and Behavior Problems. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 162, 134-148. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.04.019>
- Phua, V. C. & Kaufman, G. (2003). The Crossroads of Race and Sexuality: Date Selection Among Men in Internet "Personal" Ads. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(8), 981-994. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03256607>
- Picower, B (2012) *Practice What You Teach: Social Justice Education in the Classroom and the Streets*. Routledge
- Pinsonneault, A. & Heppel, N. (1997) Anonymity in Group Support Systems Research: A New Conceptualization, Measure, and Contingency Framework, *Journal of*

Management Information Systems, 14:3, 89-108, DOI: 10.1080/07421222.1997.11518176

Plaxton, M. (2016) Nussbaum on Sexual Instrumentalization. *Crim Law and Philos*, 10, 1-16. DOI 10.1007/s11572-013-9290-1

Ponterotto, J. G. (2006). Brief Note on the Origins, Evolution, and Meaning of the Qualitative Research Concept Thick Description. *The Qualitative Report*, 11(3), 538-549. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol11/iss3/6>

Ponterotto, J. G. (2010). Qualitative research in multicultural psychology: Philosophical underpinnings, popular approaches, and ethical considerations. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(4), 581-589. doi:10.1037/a0012051

Postmes, T., Spears, R., Sakhel, K., & de Groot, D. (2001). Social Influence in Computer-Mediated Communication: The Effects of Anonymity on Group Behavior. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(10), 1243-1254. doi: 10.1177/01461672012710001

Prasad, A. (2013) Playing the Game and Trying Not to Lose Myself: A Doctoral Student's Perspective on the Institutional Pressure for Research Output. *Organization*, 20(6), 936-948. DOI: 10.1177/1350508413486274

Prati, G. (2012) A Social Cognitive Learning Theory of Homophobic Aggression Among Adolescents, *School Psychology Review*, 41:4, 413-428, DOI: 10.1080/02796015.2012.12087497 To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2012.12087497>

Queen, R. (2014). Language and Sexual Identities. In S. Elrich, M. Meyerhoff & J. Homes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality Second Edition* (pp. 203-219). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Quinn D.M., Chaudoir, S. R. & Kallen, R. W. (2011). Performance and Flow: A Review and Integration of Self-Objectification Research. In R. M. Calgero & S. Tantleff-Dunn (Eds.) *Self-Objectification in Women: Cause, Consequences, and Counteractions* (pp. 119-138). American Psychological Association.

Rahman, Q., Sharp, J., McVeigh, M., & Ho, M. (2017). Sexual Orientation-Related Differences in Virtual Spatial Navigation and Spatial Search Strategies. *Archives Of Sexual Behavior*, 46(5), 1279-1294. doi: 10.1007/s10508-017-0986-5
Resolution on Appropriate Affirmative Responses to Sexual Orientation Distress and Change Efforts. (2009). Retrieved 4 November 2020, from <https://www.apa.org/about/policy/sexual-orientation>

Reyes, J. R., Vollmer, T. R., & Hall, A. (2017). Comparison of arousal and preference assessment outcomes for sex offenders with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 50(1), 27-37. doi:10.1002/jaba.364

Rippon, G., Jordan-Young, R., Kaiser, A. & Fine, C. (2014) Recommendations for Sex/Gender Neuroimaging Research: Key Principles and Implications for Research Design, Analysis, and Interpretation. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 8(650), 1-13. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2014.00650

Robinson, K. (2005). 'Queerying' Gender: Heteronormativity in early Childhood Education. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 30(2), 19-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/183693910503000206>

Roof, J. (2016). *What Gender Is, What Gender Does*. University of Minnesota. <https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816698578.003.0008>

Rothblum, E. (2012) Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Communities.. In C. J. Patterson & A.R. D'Augelli (Eds.) *Handbook of Psychology and Sexual Orientation* (pp.1-22). Oxford Scholarship Online. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199765218.003.0021

Rose, & Hospital. (2018). Women's love and friendships. In C. B. Travis, J. W. White & PsychBOOKS (Eds.), *APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women (First ed.)* (pp. 117-131). Washington. American Psychological Association. Doi: 10.1037/ 0000060-007

Rohy, V. (2014) *Lost Causes: Narrative, Etiology, and Queer Theory*. Oxford Scholarship Online. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199340194.001.0001

Rutkowski, A., & Saunders, C. (2019). *Emotional and cognitive overload*. Routledge.

Sadler, T. W., & LWW Health Library - Premium Basic Science Collection. (2019). *Langman's medical embryology* (Fourteenth ed.). Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer.

Salim, S., McConnell, A., & Messman-Moore, T. (2020). Bisexual Women's Experiences of Stigma and Verbal Sexual Coercion: The Roles of Internalized Heterosexism and Outness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 44(3), 362-376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684320917391>

Samons, S. (2009). *Sexual Orientation in Male-to-Female Transgender People*. New York: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9780203843703

Sanchez, D. T., & Broccoli, T. L. (2008). The romance of self-objectification: Does priming romantic relationships induce states of self-objectification among women? *Sex Roles*, 59(7), 545-554. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9451-1

Sánchez, F., & Vilain, E. (2012). Transgender Identities: Research and Controversies. *Handbook of Psychology and Sexual Orientation*, 42-54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199765218.003.0004>

Singer, L. (1993). *Erotic Welfare: Sexual Theory and Politics in the Age of the Epidemic*. Routledge.

Sandelowski, M. (2009;2010;). What's in a name? qualitative description revisited. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 33(1), 77-n/a. doi:10.1002/nur.20362

Sassatelli, R. (2011) Interview with Laura Mulvey: Gender, Gaze and Technology in Film Culture. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 28(5), 123-143. DOI: 10.1177/0263276411398278

Schoenwolf, G. C., Bleyl, S. B., Brauer, P. R., Francis-West, P. H., & ClinicalKey Flex. (2015;2012;). *Larsen's human embryology* (Fifth ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Churchill Livingstone.

Scicluna, R. M. (2017) *Home and Sexuality: The 'Other' Side of the Kitchen*. Palgrave Macmillan Studies in Family and Intimate Life. doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-46038-7

Scotland, J. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms. *English Language Teaching* (Toronto), 5(9), 9. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n9p9

Sherlock, L. (2016). Research with queers, peers and 'Elites': A Queer/Feminist approach to participant demographics. (pp. 191-210) Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi:10.1108/S1042-319220160000014022

Sherriff, N., Gugglberger, L., Hall, C., & Scholes, J. (2014). "from start to finish": Practical and ethical considerations in the use of focus groups to evaluate sexual health service interventions for young people. *Qualitative Psychology* (Washington, D.C.), 1(2), 92-106. doi:10.1037/qup0000014

Semenza, C. (2017) The Unconscious in Cognitive Science: A Few Suggestions for Psychoanalysis. In M. Leuzinger-Bohleber, S. Arnold & M. Solms (Eds.), *The Unconscious: A Bridge Between Psychoanalysis and Cognitive Neuroscience* (pp. 93-112). Routledge.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2004). *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression - 99 edition* (99th ed.). Cambridge Univ. Press.

Skidmore, E. (2011). Constructing the "Good Transsexual": Christine Jorgensen, Whiteness, and Heteronormativity in the Mid-Twentieth-Century Press. *Feminist*

Studies, 37(2), 270-300. Retrieved 7 September 2020, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23069901>.

Smith, M. (2017) Queering the Historic House: Destabilizing Heteronormativity in the National Trust. In B. Pilkey, R. M. Scicluna, B. Campkin & B. Penner (Eds.), *Sexuality and Gender at Home: Experience, Politics, Transgression*. (pp. 105-120). Routledge.

Smolak, L. & Murnen, S. (2011). The Sexualization of Girls and Women as Primary Antecedent of Self-Objectification. In R. M. Calgero & S. Tantleff-Dunn (Eds.) *Self-Objectification in Women: Cause, Consequences, and Counteractions* (pp. 53-75). American Psychological Association.

Solms, M. (2017) "The Unconscious" in Psychoanalysis and Neuroscience: An Integrated Approach to the cognitive Unconscious. In M. Leuzinger-Bohleber, S. Arnold & M. Solms (Eds.), *The Unconscious: A Bridge Between Psychoanalysis and Cognitive Neuroscience* (pp. 16-35). Routledge.

Spears Brown, C. & Stone, E. (2018). Environmental and social contributions to children's gender-typed toy play: The role of family, peers, and media. In E. S. Weisgram & L.M. Dinella (Eds.), *Gender Typing of Children's Toys: How Early Play Experiences Impact Development* (pp. 121-140). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000077-007>

Statistical Manual for the Use of Institutions for the Insane. (New York: The National Committee for Mental Hygiene, Bureau of Statistics, 1918.). (1918). *American Journal Of Psychiatry*, 75(2), 301-301. doi: 10.1176/ajp.75.2.301

Steinel, W., van Kleef, G. A., van Knippenberg, D., Hogg, M. A., Homan, A. C., & Moffit, G. (2010). How intragroup dynamics affect behavior in intergroup conflict: The role of group norms, prototypicality, and need to belong. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 13(6), 779-794. doi:10.1177/1368430210375702

Stets, R., & Meyer, I. (2005). The Trouble With "MSM" and "WSW": Erasure of the Sexual-Minority Person in Public Health Discourse. *American Journal of Public Health*, 95(7), 1144-1149. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2004.046714>

Stokoe, E. & Attenborough, F. (2014). Gender and Categorical Systems. In S. Elrich, M. Meyerhoff & J. Homes (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality Second Edition* (pp. 161-179). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Studlar, G. (1989). *Camera Obscura: Feminism, Culture, And Media Studies*, 7(2-3), 300-304. doi: 10.1215/02705346-7-2-3_20-21-300

Stulberg, L. (2018). *LGBTQ social movements*. Polity Press.

Szanto, T. (2013). How to share a mind: Reconsidering the group mind thesis. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 13(1), 99-120. doi:10.1007/s11097-013-9323-1

Szymanski, D. M., Szymanski, D. M., Henrichs-Beck, C., & Henrichs-Beck, C. (2014). Exploring sexual minority Women's experiences of external and internalized heterosexism and sexism and their links to coping and distress. *Sex Roles*, 70(1), 28-42. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0329-5

Talbot, M. (2014) Language, Gender and Popular Culture. In S. Ehrlich, M. Meyerhoff & J. Holmes (Eds.) *The Handbook of Language, Gender, and Sexuality* (pp. 604-624). Wiley Blackwell.

Tarver, E. C. (2011) New Forms of Subjectivity: Theorizing the Relational Self with Foucault and Alcoff. *Hypatia* 26(4), 804-825.

Taylor, A. (2018). "Flabulously" femme: Queer fat femme women's identities and experiences. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 22(4), 459-481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10894160.2018.1449503>

Taylor, C. & Peter, T., with McMinn, T.L., Elliott, T., Beldom, S., Ferry, A., Gross, Z., Paquin, S., & Schachter, K. (2011). Every class in every school: The first national climate survey on homophobia, biphobia, and transphobia in Canadian schools. Final report. Toronto, ON: Egale Canada Human Rights Trust.

Thompson, M., & Dahling, J. (2012). Perceived social status and learning experiences in Social Cognitive Career Theory. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 351-361. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.001

Torres, S. (2001). Sex of a Kind: On Graphic Language and the Modesty of Television News. In L. Berlant & L. Duggan (Eds.) *Our Monica, Ourselves* (pp. 102-115). NYU Press.

Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans – TCPS 2 (2018). (2010). Retrieved 4 March 2020, from https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html

Turner, M. E., Pratkanis, A. R. & Struckman, C. K. (2007) Groupthink as Social Identity Maintenance. In A. R. Pratkanis (Ed.), *The Science of Social Influence: Advances and Future Progress* (pp. 223-246). Psychology Press.

Vargas-Salfate, S., Paez, D., Liu, J., Pratto, F., & Gil de Zúñiga, H. (2018). A Comparison of Social Dominance Theory and System Justification: The Role of Social Status in 19 Nations. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(7), 1060-1076. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218757455>

Verguts, T., & Notebaert, W. (2008). Hebbian learning of cognitive control: Dealing with specific and nonspecific adaptation. *Psychological Review*, 115(2), 518-525. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.115.2.518>

Voyer, D., Nolan, C., & Voyer, S. (2000). The relation between experience and spatial performance in men and women. *Sex Roles*, 43(11), 891-915. doi:10.1023/A:1011041006679

Weisgram, E. S. (2018). Gender Typing of Toys in Historical and Contemporary Contexts. In E. S. Weisgram & L.M. Dinella (Eds.), *Gender Typing of Children's Toys: How Early Play Experiences Impact Development* (pp. 9-22). American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0000077-002>

Werner, N. E., & Hill, L. G. (2010). Individual and peer group normative beliefs about relational aggression. *Child Development*, 81(3), 826-836. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01436.x

West, C. & Fenstermaker, S. (2002) Doing Difference. In S. Fenstermaker & C. West (Eds.), *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change* (pp. 55-79). Routledge.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H. (2002) Doing Gender. In S. Fenstermaker & C. West (Eds.), *Doing Gender, Doing Difference: Inequality, Power, and Institutional Change* (pp. 3-23). Routledge.

Westwood, S. (2016) *Ageing, Gender and Sexuality: Equality in Later Life*. Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9781315691961

Whitaker, L., Carneiro de Oliveira, P., McPherson, K., Fallon, R., Planeta, C., Bonci, A., & Hope, B. (2016). Associative Learning Drives the Formation of Silent Synapses in Neuronal Ensembles of the Nucleus Accumbens. *Biological Psychiatry*, 80(3), 246-256.

Wiederman, M. W. (1999). Sexuality research, institutional review boards, and subject pools. In G. D. Chastain, & R. E. Landrum (Eds.), (pp. 201-219). Washington;US;DC:: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10322-009

Wildschut, T., Pinter, B., Vevea, J. L., Insko, C. A., & Schopler, J. (2003). Beyond the group mind: A quantitative review of the interindividual-intergroup discontinuity effect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 698-722. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.698<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2015.08.006>

Wolgemuth, J. R. (2016). Driving the paradigm: (failing to teach) methodological ambiguity, fluidity, and resistance in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 22(6), 518-525. doi:10.1177/1077800415615621

Woodard, T. L., M.D, & Diamond, M. P., M.D. (2009). Physiologic measures of sexual function in women: A review. *Fertility and Sterility*, 92(1), 19-34. doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2008.04.041

Wu, A., Marks, M., Young, T., & Beasley, M. (2019). Predictors of Bisexual Individuals' Dating Decisions. *Sexuality & Culture*, 24(3), 596-612. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-019-09651-1>

Young, R., & Meyer, I. (2005). The Trouble With "MSM" and "WSW": Erasure of the Sexual-Minority Person in Public Health Discourse. *American Journal Of Public Health*, 95(7), 1144-1149. doi: 10.2105/ajph.2004.046714

Zahavi, D. (2018) *Phenomenology: The Basics*. Routledge. DOI<https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/10.4324/9781315441603>

Zgoda, K., & Shane, K. (2018). Social justice 280 characters at a time the role of twitter in action. In J. G. McNutt (Ed.), *Technology Activism and Social Justice in A Digital Age* (pp. 74-88). Oxford University Press.

Appendix A: Interview Script

a place of mind



Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality and Social Justice

Title of study: Exploring the Reproduction of Self-Marginalizing Behaviours in Women Who Have Sex With Women

Principal Investigator

Dr. Janice Stewart, PhD, Senior Instructor, Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Social Justice University of British Columbia



Co-Investigator (contact person)

Jenn Clark, BA
MA Candidate, Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Social Justice
University of British Columbia



INTERVIEW SCRIPT

This study seeks to understand how women interact with women that they are sexually attracted to. We would like to hear your stories of interactions you've had with women that you have been sexually interested in or that have been sexually interested in you. Feel free to share whatever stories you would like to with the researcher. This conversation will be led by what you are willing to share. For the purposes of clarity, the researcher may ask you follow up questions. *(This portion should take about an hour depending on how much the participant is willing to share)*

1. Can you tell me some stories of interactions that you've had with women that you were sexually interested in?
2. Can you tell me some stories of interactions that you've had with women that were sexually interested in you?

Examples of Probing Questions:

- How did that make you feel?
- Is this something that happens a lot?

Version 1

- Did you feel as though you didn't want to act this way? Or didn't want to be acted upon this way?
- Do you see any issue with these stories?

After stories have been shared. (This portion may take up to an hour to discuss)

We would also like to understand how women objectify other women when their sexual interest is involved. For these purposes: objectification is the reducing of someone to their physical self (i.e., size, race, gender, etc) and/or their appearance (i.e., femme, butch).

1. Do you have any stories of where you may have objectified women that you have been interested in?
2. Do you have any stories of how you may have been objectified by women that were interested in you?

Examples of Probing Questions:

- How did these interactions make you feel? When you were performing them? When they were acted upon you?
- Do you see any problems with these interactions?
- Would you want to act differently? Do you act differently than how others act toward you?

Appendix B: Consent Form

a place of mind



Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality and Social Justice

CONSENT FORM

Title of study: Exploring the Reproduction of Self-Marginalizing Behaviours in Women Who Have Sex With Women

Principal Investigator

Dr. Janice Stewart, PhD, Senior Instructor, Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Social Justice
University of British Columbia
[REDACTED]

**Co-Investigator
(contact person)**

Jenn Clark, BA
MA Candidate, Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Social Justice
University of British Columbia
[REDACTED]

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

The purpose of this study is to learn more about how women interact with women that they are sexually attracted to.

WHO CAN PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY?

This study is open to self-identified women who are sexually attracted to self-identified women; this could mean lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer cisgender and trans* women. Any person who meets these criteria is eligible to participate.

WHAT DOES THIS STUDY INVOLVE?

Consenting to participate in this study involves one interview. The total time for this interview could range from 1-2 hours. The location of this interview is flexible; it will occur where ever you would feel comfortable discussing the topic of women that you are sexually attracted to.

During the interview, we will go over the procedures for this project, including any specific details or questions you may have. You will be asked to provide some basic demographic information, which will take approximately five minutes. You will then be invited to tell the researcher how you interact with women that you are sexually attracted to and how women that are sexually attracted to you act with you.

This interview could last between 1-2 hours. **This interview will be audio recorded.**

WHAT HAPPENS TO THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY?

The results of this study will be reported in a graduate thesis and may also be published in journal articles or presented at conferences. Once completed, the thesis will be a public document that will be available through the UBC library. If you would like to have a copy of any publications that come out of this research, you may provide an email address to the researcher on a separate document.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE HARMS AND SIDE EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATING?

Some people may feel uncomfortable answering personal questions about being objectified by and/or objectifying others to an interviewer. It is also possible that discussing past experiences may bring up painful or difficult feelings. It is important that you know that you do not have to answer any questions if you do not want to and that you may stop the interview at any time. If you need to someone to talk to about your feelings or experiences during or after this study, you will also be provided with referrals to counselling agencies including ones that are known to LGBTQ+-safe.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY?

There are no direct benefits to participating in this study; however, being a part of research and sharing your experiences can be a positive event.

WILL MY TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL?

Your identity will be kept strictly confidential within the limits of the study. This means that only the Principal Investigator and the Co-Investigator will have access to the audio recordings or data from the interviews. All audio recordings and data files will be encrypted and accessible only to the Principle Investigator and the Co-Investigator of this study. All physical documents will be stored in a locked filing cabinet.

All identifying information will be removed in the publication of materials.

WHO DO I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY DURING MY PARTICIPATION?

If you have any questions or would like further information about the study, you may contact Jenn Clark at [REDACTED] or You may also contact Dr. Janice Stewart at [REDACTED].

WHO DO I CONTACT IF I HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS ABOUT MY RIGHTS AS A SUBJECT DURING THE STUDY?

If you have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, contact the Research Participant Complaint Line at the UBC Office of Research Ethics at 604-822-8598, toll free at 1-877-822-8598 or e-mail RSIL@ors.ubc.ca.

Participant Consent and Signature Page

Taking part in this study is entirely up to you. You have the right to refuse to participate in this study. If you decide to take part, you may choose to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without any penalty.

- Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form for your own records.
- Your signature below indicates that you consent to participate in this study. You do not waive any of your legal rights by signing this form.

Participant Signature

Date (mm/dd/yy)

Printed Name of the Participant signing above