

An Alternate Theory of Sexuality: Exploring the Relationship between Sexual  
Experience, Sexual Awareness and Sexual Attitudes

by

Jessica Dexter Blake

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

in

Counselling Psychology

Department of Educational Psychology  
University of Alberta

© Jessica Dexter Blake, 2014

### **Abstract**

Sexual behavior is a dynamic aspect of human life that is influenced by experience, awareness, ideas, beliefs, culture and society. Many different explanations are used to explain the desire to engage in sexual behaviors that are considered to be non-conventional or non-normative. This study explored the relationship between sexual experience, sexual awareness and sexual attitudes. Responses on measures of Sexual Awareness, Sexual Experience, Attitudes Towards Unconventional Sexuality, and Sexual Orientation were compared between samples of swingers, individuals who identify as LGBT and students. The results supported the hypothesis for a relationship between sexual experiences, sexual awareness, and sexual attitudes. Swingers scored consistently and significantly higher than the LGBT group and the students, while the LGBT group scored consistently between the swingers and students. It is unlikely that demographic differences could account sufficiently for the results of this study.

*Keywords: Sexuality, Awareness, Experience, Sexual Orientation, Swingers*

## Preface

This thesis is an original work by Jessica Blake. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name, “An Alternate Theory of Sexuality: The Influence of Sexual Awareness and Orientation”, No. Pro00037554, Mar 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013.

I have always found the concept of human sexuality quite fascinating. I think of it as a river, always flowing, changing, rising, falling, running, turning, curving, and ebbing in response to geological (external) formations towards one great goal: the ocean (personal satisfaction). Just like rivers, our sexual experiences often link up with others and for moments, our waters combine. Our waters (ideas, attitudes, experiences) mix and for a time we may run together until we go our separate ways (river divides into two). We continue our journey, changed by our past and redirected towards a future desire or destination. As rivers search for oceans, we also seek our own personal satisfactions and the satisfactions of others.

Just as rivers are fed by rain and water runoff, our own ideas and attitudes towards sexuality are influenced by our social environment, friends, families, cultures, and society. Sometimes we perceive something to be right or wrong, dangerous or harmless, pleasurable or painful and then choose either to continue or to move on. I have often reflected on my own sexuality being influenced by four broad categories, including my own sexual attitudes, sexual awareness, sexual experience and sexual orientation.

I have often wondered how do people become interested in what they do? Through what mechanisms do people explore bondage, domination, and sadomasochism (BDSM), extra-marital copulations (swinging) and other forms of non-conventional sexuality? I have found pseudo-explanations for these activities woefully unsatisfying. People do not get up in the morning and say, “I’m bored, I think I will go see a dominatrix tonight”, nor do couples wake up and say, “Honey, last night was great but let’s go out, spice things up and have sex with other people tonight”.

Reflecting on my own sexual experiences, the best explanation I have developed is that of a kiss. Growing up, I witnessed my parents kissing and experienced them sharing kisses with me. I was aware that kissing existed, I had an open attitude towards kissing, and I had a previous experience that said kissing was enjoyable. When my first school-crush and I met under the jungle gym playground, and I finally had access to the experience of kissing, I took advantage of the opportunity and experienced my first kiss. It was so pleasurable, that not only did I want to do it again, but next time I wanted to use my tongue, what I heard referred to as “French kissing”. Then, another thought popped into my head as well, “Is it as good with boys as it is girls?”

Using this example, I started to build my own ideas on how someone might become interested in more unconventional sexual experiences. I thought that perhaps like kissing, once we become aware that something exists, and we have an open attitude, then we may actively try to engage in that experience, especially once we have access. Therefore, someone who has previous

experience with bondage may wish to “add” another experience (behavior) next time he or she engages in that behaviour. For example, that same person may seek the services of a dominatrix to really experience or expand on his or her previous experiences with bondage. However, this would require an open attitude towards seeing a dominatrix and the awareness that one exists.

And thus, like a river, another turn is now part of the flow of our sexuality. Branching off in new directions, acted upon by outside forces. Sometimes, our lives come into contact with new and exciting people who take us by the hand and lead onto a wild new adventure, just as an earthquake or landslide may shape a new course for that river. And always, we continue to flow, sometimes rushing-rapid torrents of passion, crashing through new terrains and new experiences. Yet, at other points, simply drifting down calm peaceful waters and simply relaxing with the soft current. So, perhaps like white-water rapids, or an old steamboat on a wide flat river, sit back and enjoy the ride, because you never know what is around the next corner.

## **Dedication**

I would like to dedicate this research to my all of my remarkable LGBT and Swinging friends who have altruistically shared of themselves and supported me through this unimaginable adventure. This research belongs to you, as a testament to the wholeheartedness that we live in our daily lives. The fact that we do not conform and let conventional ideas or stereotypes define who we are or who we will be; rather, forging ahead off the beaten pathway, marching to the beat of our own drum and continuously exploring all of the wondrous possibilities the world has to offer.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge Jon and Dee, who own and operate Intimate Times Edmonton, for supporting me in not just one, but two research projects spanning my academic career. I would also like to acknowledge the Institute for Sexual Minority Studies and Services, and the people of that organization who helped support me in accessing to the sexual minority population for this study. I would further like to acknowledge Mr. Larry Hancock, who generously lent the use of his home, living room, and office to the work of this thesis. His support has been overwhelming in the time I have known him. I send my warmest regards to both my supervisors, Dr. Kristopher Wells, and Dr. George Buck for their constant feedback and support, as well as Dr. Leighton for chairing my defense. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Melike Schalomon, who in my life, has left this world a little better than she found it. Without her suggestion to complete an honours project in 2009, none of this would have transpired. Ideas change lives.

“What is peculiar to modern societies, in fact, is not only that they consigned sex to a shadow existence, but that they dedicated themselves to speaking of it *ad infinitum*, while exploiting it as *the* secret.”

Michel Foucault

“Mama's in the kitchen, swingin' a date,  
With a new milkman, and his best friend's mate  
The house is rockin', to the ground  
Her daddy ain't happy, no he's missin' out”

Joel & Ryan O'Keeffe



## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter I.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Primary Research Objective.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Situating the Researcher .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Labels and Definitions.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>The Ontology of Sexuality.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>The Repressive Hypothesis .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Historical Context.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Repressive Theory and this Study.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Chapter II .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Literature Review .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Swinging: A Historical Review .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Swinging: A Contemporary Account.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Variables Influencing Sexuality .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Hypotheses of the Study .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Chapter III.....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Research Methodology .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Participants .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Survey Measures.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Procedure.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Chapter IV.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Results .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Statistical Analysis.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Group Comparisons on Measures of Sexuality .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Chapter V .....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Interpretation and Discussion.....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Limitations of this Study.....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Concluding Prospective .....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Epistemology of Sexuality .....</b>	<b>104</b>

<b>References .....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>Appendix A – Consent Form .....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>Appendix B – Debriefing Form for Minors .....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>Appendix C – Debriefing Form .....</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Appendix D – LGBT Advertisement.....</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>Appendix E – Swinger Advertisement .....</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>Appendix F – Student Advertisement .....</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>Appendix G – Research Survey Questions .....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>Part 1 - Demographic questions.....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>Part 2 - Attitudes Toward Unconventional Sex Scale.....</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Part 3 - Assessing Multiple Facets of Attraction to Women and Men...</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Part 4 - Sexual Awareness Questionnaire.....</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>Part 5 - Sexual Experience Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>Part 6 – Measure of Unusual Sexual Behaviors. ....</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>Part 7 - The Sell Scale of Sexual Orientation .....</b>	<b>136</b>

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1 – ANOVA differences between Groups for Demographics.....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Table 2 – Differences between Groups by Age, Country and City .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Table 3 – Percent and Count of Groups by Country and City .....</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Table 4 – Differences between Groups for Relationship.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Table 5 – Differences between Groups for Mother Tongue.....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Table 6 – Differences between Groups for Sex Course .....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Table 7 – Differences between Groups for Sex Course Details.....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Table 8 – Differences between Groups by Sex .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Table 9 – Differences between Groups for Ethnicity.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Table 10 – Differences between Groups for Religion .....</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>Table 11 – ANOVA differences between Groups on Measures of Sexuality</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Table 12 – Tukey HSD Differences By Group on Measures of Sexuality....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Table 13 – Tests of Between-Subject Effects .....</b>	<b>77</b>

## **Glossary**

**BDSM:** (Bondage Domination Sadomasochism): An umbrella term used to refer to kink and fetish related behaviours. This would include, Bondage & Discipline (B&D), Domination & Submission (D&S), and Sadism & Masochism (S&M) (Wismeijer, and van Assen, 2013).

**Sexual Double Standard:** refers to the double standard that has historically and currently existed between gender expectations and sex. For example, normally it is considered ok and even encouraged for men to have sex with as many females as possible, while it is expected that a female should stay pure and chaste till her wedding day. Simply put, it is better for a man to have lots of sex but a woman should restrain herself (Rudman, Fetterolf, & Sanchez, 2013)

**Bisexual-Flexible:** this term was used by both females and males to describe their occasional bi-sexual experiences. (J. Miles, personal communication, June 2013).

**Bi-situational:** this term was is also used by both females and males to describe their occasional bi-sexual experiences, however, they stated that the bisexual occurrences only occurred with people they knew and trusted for a long period of time. (J. Miles, personal communication, June 2013; “Urban Dictionary”, 2014).

**Full-Swinging:** is used by some swingers to convey to other swingers that they are into full mate swapping behaviours. For example, that they engage in sexual behaviours with people other than their spouse (“Life on the Swingset”, 2014; K. Rudiger, Personal Communication, May 27, 2013).

**Hook ups (hooking up):** This term is currently being used as a substitute for “one night stands”. A one night stand indicated that sexual behaviours were engaged by two people for one encounter, usually after meeting only a few hours before. For example, at a bar (Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012).

**LGBT:** Carroll, Gilroy, and Ryan (2002) describe the term LGBT as a catch all phrase for many different sexual minorities that currently exist, although their definition is based on conventional behaviours associated with term. The term LGBT comes from lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. However, the expansion of this term is to include all self-identities and not based on past experiences, as suggested by Diamond (1998) and Witeck (2014).

**Mate-Swapping:** A term used to refer to couples who swing or consider themselves swingers (Varni, 1974).

**Shrimping:** The act of orally pleasuring toes or having your toes orally pleased

Soft-Swinging: is used by some club members to describe a softer style of swinging, where they don't mind being watched, or watching others, but do not tend to have penetrative sex with other couples. Usually, used to infer they enjoy the sexual energy occurring in a room of people engaged in sexual behaviours, and may involve fondling, kissing or oral sex with others ("Life on the Swingset", 2014; K. Rudiger, Personal Communication, May 27, 2013).

Swingers: Varni (1974) described swingers, as individuals in a committed marital relationship having extra-marital copulations with other individuals in committed relationships, with the full consent and knowledge of the other partner. Varni described swingers as normally playing together, and used the term, "mate-swapping" to reflect the behaviour or trading wives or husbands from two couples to engage in heterosexual behaviours (Varni, 1974).

Swinging: Refers to the act of swinging, which as Varni (1974) defined as individuals in a committed marital relationship having extra-marital copulations with other individuals in committed relationships, with the full consent and knowledge of the other partner (Varni, 1974).

Watersports: The act of being urinated on or urinating on other(s) (Sullivan & Reynolds, 2003).

## **Chapter I**

### **Introduction**

I am constantly fascinated by the variety and dynamic nature of human sexuality. In part, this fascination is due to both my own variety of experiences, and those experiences that other have shared with me. Constantly, I am surprised by what others have to share about their own unique sexual experiences and exploits. Often, when I share my own experiences, people are equally surprised and curious. I began to wonder, how can a behaviour that brings so many people such pleasure, also be the topic of such shame. I started acquiring books on sexuality and watching documentaries on television that discussed sexuality, but I soon noticed most of these media sources discussed only conventional and normative sexual experiences, and I was left wondering about the often unspoken non-conventional and non-normative aspects of sexuality.

I became interested in studying sexuality during the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of my undergraduate degree at Grant MacEwan University. I was discussing with friends ideas for research topics, when one of them off handedly mentioned that I should do a project on swingers. At the time, I had no idea what or who swingers were, but by the time they explained to me what swingers did and who they were, I could not wait to start doing some research. My initial searches into the literature resulted in few results and mixed emotions. Although there appeared to be a rush of research in the early 1970s, it seemed to have become non-existent by the 1990s (Jenks, 1998). However, I started researching literature on swinging and

swingers. Some of the early research by Gilmartin (1974) and Varni (1974) suggested that swingers have more liberal attitudes, and further suggested that swingers may have a highly developed sense of sexual awareness. As a result, I decided to conduct a study in my undergraduate program, to test the relationship between the sexual experience, sexual awareness and sexual attitudes of swingers. I also conducted a follow up test to explore the sexual orientation of swingers as well, and although data suggested swingers were more likely to have bisexual and homosexual experiences, ultimately this data was insufficient to draw a meaningful conclusion about the relationship between sexual experience and sexual orientation.

### **Primary Research Objective**

The overarching purpose of this master's thesis is to promote the development, understanding, and knowledge of human sexuality. Currently, there is very little research on how the factors of sexual awareness, sexual attitudes, sexual experiences and sexual orientation are related to each other, if at all (Blake, 2012). In accordance with Rubin (2001) the purpose of my research is to help bring light to the fringes of human sexuality, in part by comparing the relationship of four aspects of sexuality between three groups of individuals. There are models that examine the process through which sexual identities are shaped and formed (Wilkinson & Pearson, 2013; Diamond, 1998), and there is some previous research into swingers, including some on the reasons why couples engage in extra marital copulations (Bartell 1970, Gilmartin, 1974; Jenks 1998). However,



to date there is no broad or encompassing model of sexuality that can explain why individuals engage in such a wide variety of sexual activities.

The hypothesis for the current study is that sexuality may be explained by the relationship between four broad factors that influence human sexuality.

Previous research has suggested that attitudes and awareness are continually shaped by external forces and environments, such as education, religion and social surroundings (Varni, 1974). However, research has yet to examine the relationship between sexual experience, sexual awareness, sexual attitudes, and sexual orientation. Therefore, to provide an enriched model of understanding for human sexuality, my research will examine the relationship of sexual experience, sexual awareness and sexual attitudes. It will also examine the role of sexual orientation in mediating sexual awareness and sexual attitudes.

There are many different theories of sexuality related to evolutionary psychology, social learning theory, and social structure theory (Peterson & Hyde, 2010). It is intriguing how other theories of sexuality, such as that presented by Foucault (1980), who contends that sexuality can even be controlled and modified as a form of control for society. Perhaps, what is deemed to be non-normative today, is just a return to times before the industrial revolution and before societies were concerned with birth rates, work forces, and population control. Although these theories may help to explain how sexuality developed as it has today, the models are currently insufficient to explain non-conventional sexual activities (i.e. swinging, bdsm, etc.) that occur within human sexual experience. The principal purpose of this study was to develop understanding and knowledge of how and

why people engage in non-normative sexual behaviours that seem in direct contradiction to conventional behaviours concerning sexuality. Specifically, it would be interesting to understand how swingers' sexual behaviours fit within Foucault's repressive hypothesis and Diamond's (1997) evolutionary perspective concerning sexuality.

The secondary purpose of this study was to test the relationship between sexual awareness, sexual experience, sexual orientation and attitudes towards unconventional sexuality, if a relationship does indeed exist. By expanding our understanding of the relationship of these four factors, it is hypothesized that explanations for non-normative sexual behaviours could be provided.

Specifically, before an individual engages in a particular sexual behaviour, he or she would likely need a previous, similar sexual experience to the behaviour about to be engaged upon, as well as awareness that it may be pleasurable, and an open attitude towards trying the novel sexual experience. Furthermore, depending on the sex and gender of the individuals involved, a non-heterosexual orientation may also be required. Therefore, it is hypothesized that the results of this study will provide evidence supporting the relationship between these four aspects of sexuality, and perhaps suggest ways in which these factors influence non-normative sexual behaviour.

To provide support for this explanation of non-normative sexuality, two groups of interest and a control group of participants were invited to participate in this research. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire comprised of several scales to gauge sexual experience, sexual awareness, sexual attitudes and

sexual orientation. The first group of participants was comprised of individuals who engage in extra-marital copulations (swingers). The second group of participants was comprised of individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT). Lastly, a third group of participants comprised of undergraduate university students was selected at random from large classes. The data from the three groups was analyzed for differences between groups, and relationships within groups. It was expected that individuals with higher levels of sexual experience would also have higher levels of sexual awareness, more open attitudes towards sexuality and more bisexual and same-sex experiences. Relationships between these four factors were then used as a model to help explain the development and persistence of non-normative sexual behavior.

### **Situating the Researcher**

Although there are many different professionals from multiple fields interested in promoting sexual diversity, sexuality, and sexual health, there is little research into the motivations for becoming a sexuality professional (Luria, Byers, Voyer, & Mock, 2013). In Luria et al.'s (2013) study, the motivations examined included childhood experiences, sexual attitudes, sexual communication, sexual satisfaction, and sexual functioning. The results of Luria et al.'s study indicated on average, that professionals ranked desire to contribute to the profession and to better the human condition as the primary reasons to become sexuality professionals.

Upon reflecting, my motivations for conducting this research align largely with wishing to promote knowledge and understanding in a special area of human

experience. I choose to conduct my research on swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT, as I am in a unique position to have access to both of these communities. Furthermore, as discussed in the *Preface*, I was unhappy with the popular pseudo explanations used by people to explain unconventional sexual behaviours. I use the word pseudo explanation, as normally someone does not engage in activities because they are bored. For example, being bored would suggest that someone who has always had opposite sex attractions, relations, and experiences, would have absolutely nothing else to do, and therefore engages in same-sex behaviours to escape boredom. The logic behind this rationale is factitious, and still does not explain how or why that person decided to engage in same-sex behaviours. I contend that human sexuality is more complex and deserves a better explanation as to how and why people engage in certain behaviours, rather than relying on inaccurate statements such as boredom. During my undergraduate honours project, I started researching literature into swingers in 2011, and I thought I might have the potential to make a strong contribution to the study of sexuality.

Initially, my search was hopeful. I discovered a range of research on swingers, ranging from sexual attitudes to experiences. It was during this search that I discovered swingers generally had liberal sexual attitudes. I was curious as to the relationship between their experiences and sexual awareness. After discussing this idea with my supervisor, we decided that swingers probably have opportunity for same-sex interactions and a highly developed sense of sexual awareness. Therefore, I started to build a theory surrounding the use of kissing as

an example. Our parents kiss us from a young age, and we come to understand kissing as a pleasant, physical action that represents meaningfulness and love. Since we have the experience of kissing, and we witness our parents kissing, we therefore develop an open attitude towards kissing. Then when we come of an age where we find someone that we like, we kiss them, as we have an awareness that kissing exists and is pleasurable, and an open attitude towards kissing. So perhaps after the first or several kisses, we have learned that French kissing (exchanging tongues) exists, and try it the next time we kiss someone. Therefore, the experience of kissing is expanded, and if it is pleasurable, then a new awareness and open attitude for French kissing is developed. I wanted to test whether this tri-factor theory developed with kissing, and the experience, awareness, and attitudes that go along with kissing could be applied to sexuality.

The results from my undergraduate research supported the tri-factor hypothesis, in that there may be a positive relationship between sexual awareness, sexual experience, and open attitudes towards unconventional sexuality. Furthermore, the results also suggested that swingers engaged in more same-sex and bisexual sexual experiences than students. However, it was unclear if sexual orientation influenced sexual experience or if sexual experience influences sexual orientation (Blake, 2012). Therefore, I hoped that this research would support the earlier results suggesting a relationship between sexual experience, sexual awareness, and open attitudes towards sexuality, as well as providing some insight as to whether sexual orientation influencing sexual experiences or if perhaps sexual experiences can influence sexual orientation. Secondly, the

undergraduate research was conducted independently of a specific theory in which to ground the research, and which could be used to help generalize the results.

It is highly unlikely that I would have been able to conduct this research without my personal contacts in both the swinging and LGBT community. Thus, although my motivations, like those of participants in Luria et al.'s (2013) study, are altruistically based, I selected this research due to my unique "insider" position. Replication of this research would be difficult, as it requires friendships and networks that allow access to the participant sample. For example, it was my personal friendship with swingers that allowed me to meet the owners of the club and eventually gain permission for my undergraduate study. Then, it was my relationship with the owners of the club that granted me access for my master's research. Being granted permission to advertise was only the first step, and the second step included spending both Friday and Saturday nights at the front door, handing out over 300 printed advertisements (See Appendeix E), and personally answering questions from individuals entering the club. I also required permission from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board to advertise and handout these flyers, which is also a necessary and sometimes difficult step in the process. Research in this area is further hampered by the fact that very few bar and club owners are willing to support research, as they are concerned their patrons will view it as an invasion of privacy and are afraid to lose valuable clientele. Although I was able to hand out over 300 printed flyers, only about 2 out of 3 people each night actually accepted one.

As Poole, Giles and Moore (2004) highlight, studying sexuality is not for the faint of heart. The results from Poole et al.'s research indicate that studying sex could have both positive and negative consequences for the researcher. Reactions from friends, family, colleagues and others can range from positive and optimistic to outrage at exploring what is still considered such a taboo subject to many people. Furthermore, as Johnson and Clark (2003) discuss, researchers often report feeling under-prepared to overcome some of the unique challenges and obstacles they may encounter when conducting research into sensitive areas. I had a personal experience of this challenge in July 2013 while beginning my data collection. At that time, I only had approximately 50 swinger participants and I was hoping for well over 100. This gap caused a great deal of anxiety and stress and I worried about what I would have to do if I could not get enough participants by the Fall. However, it is recruitment challenges like the ones I experienced, which make this study that much more important in helping extend scientific knowledge and understanding concerning non-normative sexuality.

### **Labels and Definitions**

Often human sexual behaviour is lumped into broad categories based on gender, gender identity, biological sex, sexual attraction, whether to same-sex partners, opposite sex partners, single partners, multiple partners, objects, settings, and environments (Carroll, Gilroy, & Ryan, 2002). For example, sexual orientation is often configured into two broad categories, including heterosexual (straight), or non-heterosexual (lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender; LGBT). First, the term gender refers to what society classifies as masculine or feminine

accordingly to cultural norms. However, gender identity is one's own self-identity to either masculine gender or feminine gender or both (Carroll et al., 2002).

Historically, sexual behaviours have been used to define sexual orientation (Witeck, 2014). Therefore, it would follow that only people who have same-sex experiences would be considered gay or lesbian. However, as Diamond pointed out in her studies on lesbianism, many women self-identified as lesbian but had yet to have a single lesbian experience (Diamond, 1998). Diamond's evidence does suggest that using sexual-experiences is an inappropriate way of determining sexual orientation, especially since self-identity can be different from what society would classify. Carroll, Gilroy, & Ryan's (2002) definitions are based on conventional behaviours, such as a man having sex with a man would be gay. Therefore, incorporating evidence from Diamond's research, that experience does not always correlate to self-identity, for the purposes of this research, the term LGBT will be used for people who self-identify as such, regardless of previous experiences or conventional society expectations of what those terms indicate.

Labels can have both positive and negative effects when applied to people. As Reicherzer (2005) discusses, labels can be used to make people feel ashamed, hurt, depressed and even silenced. However, labels can also be used to build a positive sense of self, identity, and can also be used as a framework to identify correct behaviours consistent with one's own identity (Yarbrough & McIntosh, 2013). However, the purpose of this study is to examine and explore the relationship of aspects of sexuality and not the definitions or labels trying to explain sexual orientations or attractions. Therefore, although the term LGBT is



used throughout this study, it is intended to refer to multiple sexual orientations and identities, regardless of exact or specific sexual attractions or behaviours.

The term swinger is used to refer to individuals who engage in extra marital or extra relationship copulations with the full knowledge and consent of their partners (Varni, 1974). This also includes individuals who are not currently in a relationship but have been in one in the past. Lastly, student participants in this study were over 18 years of age and attend a post-secondary institution.

### **The Ontology of Sexuality**

The study of sexuality is not about an outcome or a final destination, as sexuality is dynamic and constantly changing in response to previous experiences, media influences, and future expectations. (Haavio-Mannila, & Kontula, 1997). As Butler (2004) describes, gender is the active act of selecting and endorsing a set of mannerisms, behaviors, and beliefs, so too is the active pursuit of sexuality. Foucault (1980) describes the repressive theory of sexuality as the control and censorship of sexuality. What was once considered normal, and even publically embraced and cheered, became sinful, immoral, and shameful. It would seem that sexual truth has been portrayed as deviant, and all sexual acts not affiliated with procreation, were therefore perverted and morose (Foucault, 1980). Rubin (2001) described the fringes of sexuality, but perhaps it would be better labeled as the truth of sexuality. Therefore, it could be suggested that the truth of sexuality, which perhaps is still repressed at its center, is visible at the fringes, and perhaps sexuality is actually fun, exciting, and even exhilarating. What was once public

and universal knowledge has been hidden and replaced by an imposed sense of guilt and shame about sexuality, rather than allowing sexuality to grow freely.

We know sexuality exists because people engage in sexual behaviours. Perhaps what we do not realize is that most sexual behaviours are natural, with the exception of a few morally incomprehensible acts such as sex without consent or with young children. Therefore, are swinging, same-sex behaviours or other behaviours truly alternative in nature? Or is this a simple return discourse to a pre-Victorian era sexuality? It may be the swinger's attitudes, which promote the open atmosphere in the swingers club, and this open atmosphere in turn allows individuals to develop their own sexual awareness and experiences. It is unclear whether swingers are part of a fugitive subculture, or have become a kind of semi-accepted deviant subculture, but regardless, it would still be considered non-normative when compared to the normative non-swingers.

No study of sexuality can be complete without first exploring what sexuality is, how it became understood, and how it is actually controlled and regulated. Ressing and Pukall (2013) describe a flurry of sexuality research in Canada, in their editorial for the special issue of the *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* focusing on sexuality research in Canada. The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2014) defines sexuality as the sexual habits and desires of a person, including, a) the condition of having sex, b) sexual activity, c) expression of sexual receptivity or interest especially when excessive. The condition of having sex describes the act of being sexual, regardless if with other people, non-humans, objects, etc. Furthermore, the state of being sexual implies

that sexual states can be more than just physical, but psychological and emotional divisions as well. The expression of sexual receptivity, or interest when sexually receptive further suggests all behaviours that an individual may engage in when they are sexual receptive. That is to say, when they want or intend to engage in sexual activity. Therefore, based on the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary's definition, the study of sexuality could be argued to be the study of all sexual habits and desires of a person.

Rubin (2001) suggests that no study of sexuality could be complete without a thorough exploration and understanding of the fringes of sexuality. Rubin's description implies that there is at least one division in human sexuality, since if a fringe of sexuality exists, then there must be a center of sexuality as well. The Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary does not suggest that sexuality is broken down into different categories, since it describes sexuality as the sexual habits and desires of a person. The idea of a division in sexuality suggests that there are differences in how we think about sexuality, what constitutes normal sexuality, and what does not? Furthermore, as Haavio-Mannila, and Kontula (1997) discussed, what we consider to be conventional sexuality, or what is expected of us by our gender, is constantly changing, and acted upon, by media, our culture, different generations, and previous experiences versus future expectations. When someone decides to engage in non-normative behaviours, explanations such as "Oh, they were bored" or "Oh, they were just looking to spice things up", are used to explain this shift in sexual behaviours. So another

question remains, where did this division come from and what impact does it have on the study of sexuality?

### **The Repressive Hypothesis**

Perhaps one theory that can be used to answer this question, is the repressive hypothesis theory presented by Michael Foucault. Foucault (1980) discusses how the industrial revolution, and the societal changes in Victorian England shaped the lens through which we view sexuality today. For example, Foucault argues that sexuality was very different before the Victorian-era. In fact, Foucault describes pre-Victorian England much the same way I would have described scenes from the swingers club. Foucault's imagery of sexuality predating the Victorian-era is one of open transgressions (sexual acts), shameless discourse (sexual acts without guilt), with anatomies shown and intermingled at will (displaying and physically touching genitalia). I would describe the swingers club as a place of easy interactions between people in various states of dress, many of which are curious and wanting to engage in sexual activities without shame or guilt, and with a variety of other partners. In fact, the swingers club sounds a lot like pre-Victorian England at a glance, when this type of open sexuality was at the main center of sexuality and not the fringe. Yet, there is one glaring, single discrepancy between the two places, and that is the acts in the swingers club still occur in a private, non-descript location, away from the public eye, and where a membership is required to gain access. In Foucault's pre-Victorian England, this would occur anywhere and everywhere, regardless of who was watching, and often with the cheers, laughter and encouragement from the

onlookers witnessing the sexual behaviour. What then, could explain the reason for taking these public acts of sexuality and removing them from the center stage and into the fringes of a non-descript swingers club 200 years later?

Foucault suggests that the answer is simple in its complexity, in that sexuality became an avenue of control for the Victorian bourgeoisie. Victorian England was a time when England was becoming the world's super power, thanks mainly to industrialization and a large labor force. A labor force that had to be managed, controlled, and maintained. Therefore, Foucault contends that sexuality was brought under control to manage the labor force, and sexuality became carefully confined. Sexuality, which was once an expression for everyone, became a secret for everyone, and silence was the only law (Foucault, 1980). People no longer talked about sex or sexual behaviours, and it was only allowed in the bedroom between a man and a woman, as this was deemed to be proper. It became proper, since it led to offspring that could eventually become workers for the industrial revolution, and decreased the number of illegitimate children that ended up in orphanages and became dependent on the state for assistance. Furthermore, Foucault suggests that this was accomplished using the help of different religions in which sex became sinful. Not just sex, but even thoughts, desires, voluptuous imaginings, delectations, and bodily movements all became sinful, and therefore subject to confession and guidance of the church. For example, by controlling desires and sexual urges, individuals who would otherwise engage in sexual acts, which did not lead to desirable future workers, now had to force themselves to have 'moral' desires and sexual urges. This also

effectively prohibited the study and research of sexuality from post-secondary institutions. Sex had therefore become officially censored and restricted (Foucault, 1980). Sex had become something hidden, it did not show itself, it remained behind closed doors, and the pleasures of sexuality became either forgotten or forbidden. In this way, the behaviour of sexuality was removed and confined to the bedroom between males and females, and the awareness of sexuality was abolished through the censorship of what people were allowed to talk about and say. Sex became a function of procreation and was no longer about pleasure, fun or exploring desires.

It would seem the first part of the war on sexuality was running smoothly. Sexual behaviours became repressed and forced into the bedroom for all heterosexual individuals. The question became what to do with everyone else, such as the people interested in same-sex behaviours, those not interested in sex, and boundless other sexual behaviours and activities. Foucault (1980) describes the underlying theme for this, such as a person driven mad by sex, the pervert, the nymphomaniac and in which their natures were deemed illegitimate by sexual influence, and therefore their behaviours could be contrived as crimes against nature. Suddenly, sodomy, bestiality, precocious little schoolgirls, ambitious schoolboys, ramblers with bizarre impulses all became unwell, and sick. If they could not be locked up in prisons for crimes, they could always be locked up in asylums awaiting treatment. Foucault contends that perhaps in the most perverse nature possible, sexuality was allowed to take its course, society was deemed by and large to be perverted. Then, to undo this perversion, one must act in

accordance with a single set of strict rules regarding sexuality, so one does not become perverse or perverted, and rather can become moral and proper (Foucault, 1980). Sex as it was before the Victorian-era was deemed dangerous, as people would and quite conceivably want to have sex, rather than work. Furthermore, this made any type of census work extremely difficult, and multitudes of unwanted children ended up in orphanages and work houses, which normally required state support to function. People would become much easier to control, when they were at home, producing families, and working in the factories.

It is from this repressive hypothesis, sexual script inferences can be developed and applied. Once sexuality was censored, confined, and controlled, new socially acceptable gender roles were constructed and embraced that were in accordance with this new, normative view on sexuality. Stone and McKee (2002) review these identities in mid-20th century American Culture, and describe the American Man as a hard-working, single man against the world, who is able to overcome adversity, while providing a living for his wife and children. Women were seen as the softer sex, and provided more for community and fellowship than the men. Scripts for the abstinence from sexuality were still embraced in America as they were in England. For example, one of the leaders against male masturbation was John Kellogg, of Kellogg's Cornflakes, which were originally marketed as cereal, which would decrease a man's urge to masturbate (Stone and McKee, 2002). The social script in the United States of America became that of a heterosexual man and woman, who did not embrace sexuality, and were even in some cases against sexuality. Homosexuality was "unmanly", and came under

attack by heterosexual, hyper-manly men. Further writings at the time described the homosexual as essentially an unhappy person, who was sinful, potentially a treasonous criminal, and could always be seeking the molestation and seduction of otherwise heterosexual children (Stone and McKee, 2002). Although the social roles for men and women may have differed between America and England, the constraint on sexuality was evident in both cultures, from social attitudes towards sexuality, to the criminal nature of sexual deviants such as homosexuals.

These social scripts also have influence over the development of gender and gender roles as well. Butler (2004) discusses the implications of gender and being human, and the political, sexual, and moral interaction between these concepts. For example, if marriage is between a man and a woman, if two men or two women are not allowed to be married, does it make them less than human? This, Foucault would argue, is another example of the repression of sexuality. It seems to enter and dominate all spheres of human life. Suddenly, sexuality has political implications for your life in whether you may marry or not marry, and whether you are accepted or ostracized by society.

### **Historical Context**

In Diamond's book, *Why is Sex Fun?*, Diamond (1997) discusses the features of human sexual reproduction in terms of the evolutionary advantage that may have led to its development. Specifically, there are two features concerning human sexuality historically that seem to have direct bearing on this study. The first is the development of human mating practices, as to whether they were



promiscuous in nature, harem forming, or monogamous. The second feature is hidden ovulation.

Diamond (1997) contends that along our evolutionary line, and using comparative studies with our two closest cousins, the gorillas and chimpanzees, humans at one time or another seem to have shifted between promiscuous sexual behaviours, harem-forming behaviours, and monogamous sexual behaviours. Evidence for this occurs from chimps, who are promiscuous in nature, gorillas who are harem forming, and humans, who Diamond argues across cultures are currently and largely monogamous. He suggests that DNA testing in the US and Britain shows that over 70-90% of babies born are with the mother's husband or common law husband. This is important as it shows that humans, even though we live in cities with access to age appropriate mates, tend to select one mate and develop monogamous relationships. However, evidence does suggest that evolutionarily speaking, humans were at one point, either promiscuous in nature or harem forming. Diamond does specify that some cultures today still practice harem-forming behaviours, but that even in these cultures, a male usually copulates with only one female at time until she is pregnant.

The second development of hidden ovulation is also important for the development of human mate bonding. Diamond contends our preference for monogamous mates may be based in the fact that we do not have visible signs during ovulation. Chimps, who practice promiscuity, develop a bright red vagina when a female is most fertile, and even gorillas develop a reddish tinge around the vagina as well. Since, not even human females know precisely when they are

ovulating, the best way for a male to ensure his genetic lineage is to copulate with the female as many times as possible over the course of weeks to ensure conception. From an evolutionary perspective, this would take up a lot of resources, both in calories and in time. Therefore, one possible payoff for all of this sex, is that it evolved to be fun, and enjoyable and pleasurable (Diamond, 1997). Unlike other species, and even birds who practice monogamy, humans and a very few others species are the only species who engage in sexual behaviours, without procreation being the sole reason for doing so.

Therefore, there is evidence to suggest that humans have engaged in all three mate bonding styles at some point in our history. It is more likely to ensure genetic survival, that human sexuality shifted across styles in response to environmental challenges. However, if sex was pleasurable and fun, and required for genetic survival, the question remains as to why many attitudes today disregard sex as pleasurable, or should be used entirely for procreative reasons. The answer may once again be found in context of environmental changes and challenges.

There is a historical significance for sexuality being brought under societal control. As Laqueur (1990) discusses, attitudes towards sexuality during antiquity were defined in largely hierarchical terms. This was during a time of philosophers, empires and conquerors. Never before had the world seen a rise of such great empires, from Greek and Roman, to Chinese and Korean. Once again with environmental changes, came social changes and arguably changes in attitudes as to how sex was viewed. Laqueur described this in terms of the 'one-

sex' or "female as male" model, in which the male was the center, and sexuality was ascribed accordingly. This was during a time where sex and power was intertwined tightly with culture and politics. Laqueur describes this as being the resounding perspective, with the male standing as the father figure, until the 18<sup>th</sup> century. However, social times were changing once again and the one-sex model was becoming increasingly outdated. A newer model was required to exploit the differences in gender, and to ensure each stayed in their own domain. Laqueur refers to this as the two-sex model, and Foucault (1980) contends that this gender identity was developed to ensure a control over sexuality.

So, it would seem that sex has been largely utilized over the ages to exert a control and dominion over populations by a revolving set of authorities. What was once fun and pleasurable, and a large reason for survival according to Diamond (1997), became a tool of control, and found itself linked with political power and culture. According to Laqueur (1990), the relationship between sex and power was used to ensure a male dominated society as far back as antiquity. Foucault (1980) contends that authorities then repressed all other forms of sexuality, to ensure that heterosexuality would become the normative sexual behaviour, to once again exert control over aspects of people's lives.

### **Repressive Theory and this Study**

Foucault suggests that sexuality in the Victorian-era was silenced, and removed from everyday life. Although, society does seem to be more tolerant, notions such as alternative sexualities are still persistent (Stone & McKee, 2002). For example, even in this study, sexual behaviours are described as non-

normative, that is, not what would be considered normal by societal standards. Furthermore, explanations such as “boredom” and “spicing things up” are often used to explain this engagement in deviant sexual behaviour, and deviation from normal, heterosexual behaviour. Foucault does discuss sexuality in three terms. He discusses sexual behaviours as particular sexual acts, but also discusses sexual awareness and sexual attitudes. Evidence for this comes from his expression of sexual acts in public places and the act of sex as being banished to the bedroom by becoming chargeable offences for lewd and lascivious behaviour. Furthermore, he discusses how sexual imagery, thoughts and desires, fell into the realm of the church. These thoughts and desires are linked to sexual awareness. Lastly, he describes how the judicial system and medical system would deal with sexual deviants, this arguably is related to sexual attitudes. In Foucault’s theory, sexual behaviours were mostly banned, awareness was thought to be immoral and handled by the church and confession, and attitudes towards open or non-normative forms of sexuality were largely closed-off and people were deemed to be sick and in need of treatment.

Therefore, this study explores the relationship between sexuality and Foucault’s repressive theory. Foucault’s repressive theory suggests that sexual attitudes closed off towards any pre-Victorian forms of sexuality. Varni (1974) suggested that swingers would have liberal attitudes towards non-normative sexuality, which coincides with repressive theory, as attitudes would have to be more liberal to remove sexuality strictly from monogamous procreative sexual activity. Furthermore, this liberal attitude would promote an increase in different

sexual behaviours as an individual would be more willing to engage in a variety of sexual experiences. Gilmartin (1974) suggests swingers are less religious than non-swingers, which also coincides with repressive theory as religion and the use of the term “immoral” was used extensively to control sexual behaviours. Weis, Rabinowitz, and Ruckstuhl (1992) suggest that courses in sexual education, perhaps increasing sexual encounters and experiences, generate increased permissive sexual attitudes of the students attending those specific courses. Therefore, even incorporating repressive theory into this study, there is evidence to suggest that sexual experience, sexual attitudes and sexual awareness are related, as each factor is interconnected to open-mindedness.

Lastly, the social environment plays a very large role in human sexuality. According to Foucault’s (1980) theory, it was by controlling the social environment, that the Victorian bourgeoisie were able to control society’s sexuality. Furthermore, according to Haavio-Mannila and Kontula (1997), the social environment influences previous sexual experiences, and future expectations. An example of this theory comes from Bradshaw, Kahn and Saville’s (2010) exploration into the “Hooking-up” culture in university. They discovered that many men and women had similar views on hooking up in university, and even similar views concerning the health risks associated with it. Garcia et al. (2012) also discussed how media sources such as movies and television are changing society’s perceptions concerning one-night stands and hookup culture. Therefore, the social environment more than likely does influence sexual attitudes and perhaps sexual awareness can then influence sexual

experiences. Wilson (1995) suggested that individuals living in urban areas also have more permissive attitudes towards sexuality as well. Clearly the social environment plays an essential role in the development and reinforcement of sexuality.

Therefore, there is evidence to suggest that the social environment does play an instrumental role in the expression and repression of human sexuality. The primary purpose of this study is to expand our knowledge and understanding concerning human sexuality, by exploring how swingers' sexual behaviours fit within Foucault's (1980) repressive hypothesis and Diamond's (1997) evolutionary perspective. Already there seems to be an evolutionary basis for swinging behaviour, as our ancestors were at some point promiscuous. However, there seems to be an evolutionary payoff in having sex even without a guaranteed payoff, in that it is fun, and presumably supports pair bonding. The second purpose of this study is to support a tri-factor model of sexuality, which could explain how swingers start swinging in the first place, and are able to overcome the sexual attitudes that have been associated with non-normative behaviours.

## Chapter II

### Literature Review

Human sexuality is dynamic, ever changing and an evolving aspect of daily life. Sexuality is continuously influenced by many different factors including previous sexual experiences, current sexual expectations and future desires (Haavio-Mannila, & Kontula, 1997). Furthermore, evidence suggests that human sexual behaviours change in response to dynamics in society from generation to generation (Haavio-Mannila, & Kontula, 1997). Sexuality is a key aspect of human existence and research suggests that it is correlated with happiness, psychological well-being, and relationship satisfaction (MacNeil & Byers, 2009). Sexuality, therefore, both influences our present and future desires based on previous experiences, but is also mediated by current societal expectations and generational attitudes.

Research into human sexuality has also changed in response to changes in the social environment and cultural attitudes. As Rubin (2001) discusses, due to the social changes of the 1960s, research into alternative lifestyles peaked in the 1970s and then declined thereafter. For example, one of the topics that seemed to capture researchers' attention was swinging, group marriages, and communes. Of particular interest was how these new social structures would change the previous perception of what constituted a nuclear family structure (Rubin, 2001). Rubin concludes that no study of sexuality would be complete while focusing solely on the conventional and leaving the fringes of sexuality unexamined.

More recently, Barker and Langdrige (2010) published a review and reflection article on the current state on research into non-monogamies. They describe a recent increase in research on non-monogamies and further discuss the consequences of polarizing such work into categories of either praising or condemning such relationships. One reason for the recent increase in research may be the result of media exposure and bringing awareness to otherwise little known facets of sexuality. Barker and Langdrige discuss that research often focuses on one “type” of non-monogamy, then employs either a face-to-face interview method or a survey and usually has a monogamous comparison group. Alternatively, another research approach is to compare different forms of non-monogamy, for example, “swingers” versus “gay-open relations”, but this is seldom done, due to difficulties with recruiting sufficient participants and interpreting the results. It is possible that these types of division in research can lead to difficulties when interpreting the results, as it is presumed that different scales, and different definitions are used not just by researchers, but even by the participants as well. Additionally, it is possible for this type of division to cause problems in the understanding and definition of different labels, terms and categories. Lastly, Barker and Langdrige predict that future research will focus on theories about how non-monogamous relationships are constructed and result in new approaches to how these relationships are studied.

A possible explanation for the reasons for the small resurgence in the interest into swinging, may be that extra marital copulations (swinging) have become increasingly prevalent in North American culture. Evidence from



previous research suggests that in 1998 there were over 400 swinger clubs in America and that conventions hosting swinging events generated millions of dollars in commerce (Jenks, 1998). Another review of the literature on swinging couples by Christopher and Sprecher (2000), emphasized that even though less than 4% of married Americans reported having extramarital sex, this still constitutes a great number of individuals. Research from Europe also supports this rising trend in swinging. For example, D'Orlando (2010) conducted an analysis of the economic impact of swingers on prostitution and other sex-trade industries. D'Orlando concluded that swingers are a growing trend in Italy, and will continue to grow as the stigma surrounding swinging continues to decline.

For the purposes of my research, factors affecting sexuality will be divided into two broad categories of external influences and internal influences. DeMaris (2009) divided factors for extra marital relationships into distal and proximal categories. DeMaris identified several distal factors, including gender, gender socialization, race, education, religion, experiencing a divorce, exposure to a negative role model and cohabitation before marriage, as influencing extra marital sex. DeMaris identified proximal factors as having access to the experience, willingness of a prospective partner, and quality of the couple's bond. It should be noted that this research was examining extra marital copulations without the partner's awareness, knowledge or consent, which is also known colloquially as "cheating". Swinging is defined as having extra marital copulations with the full knowledge and consent of the partner (Varni, 1974). One factor of sexuality not included in DeMaris's research was sexual orientation and, by default it is

assumed all encounters were heterosexual in nature. DeMaris's study included several factors of sexual influence, including gender, race, education and religion, which are also included in my study. Although sexual orientation was not included in the DeMaris study, it was examined in the current study.

Sexual orientation, like sexuality, can be considered a dynamic, changing process, especially in relation to self-identity. For example, individuals are often asked to categorize themselves according to set labels such as straight, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. As evidenced by Diamond and Savin-Williams (2000), sexual identity development can be attributed to early attractions and behavior. Summarizing findings from two different studies, Diamond and Savin-Williams developed a model coding the development of same-sex identity for sexual-minority women. First, the authors examined the differences between almost exclusive same-sex attractions and only incidental (or singular) same-sex attractions. Furthermore, they examined the quality of the attraction and the age or timing when these attractions took place. The results from Diamond and Savin-Williams' study suggested that there exists incredible variability in the development of sexual identities. The quality of attractions and the context (environment and relationship to the other person) of both same-sex and opposite-sex were significantly more important in the development of sexuality than the age of the person (timing) of when these attractions take place.

One of the most daunting tasks when conducting sexuality research concerns definitions, nomenclature and labels. Diamond and Savin-Williams (2000) cautioned against the use of labels for different categories, such as lesbian

or bisexual. Instead, they argued that individuals should be identified in terms of their full range of attractions to men and women, both emotionally and sexually. They argued that a multidimensional approach to self-identity would be more accurate and would perhaps allow the participant to feel engaged with the research and researcher.

### **Swinging: A Historical Review**

Much of the research on swinging in the early 1970's was focused on the myths and social ideas that swinging, like homosexuality, was due in part to poor mental health, sexual deviancy, poor marriages or some combination thereof (Gilmartin, 1974). For example, in Denfield and Gordon's (1970) research, the authors presented swinging as a positive outcome of social deviance that in fact might help to promote social order. They suggested that pornography making its way into the home might in fact not be a negative event, especially if it leads to a decrease in the number of males seeking prostitution. The authors also discussed how swinging might increase a couple's likelihood of staying together, as it provides an activity which requires planning and preparation, allows opportunities for discussion, and is monitored by both partners, in effect, stimulating good, open communication. Denfield and Gordon concluded that swinging would allow for the relief of any sexual monotony, provide positive interactions between partners and therefore not undermine the marriage.

Bartell's (1970) research also suggested positive consequences of swinging and concluded that swinging offers couples a chance to relive their youth, get dressed up, go out and attempt the seduction of others. These activities

allowed couples to experience sexual excitation due to new sexual experiences and from the discussion of sexual experience. Furthermore, Bartell found these activities to be inherently reinforcing as each partner experiences being attractive to a new mate without being guilty or at fault. Bartell also discussed the “excitement” in writing letters, posting advertisements, and the sheer thrill in sharing something deemed taboo. Lastly, Bartell also concluded that couples benefit from spending extra time together, including searching for other couples, looking for swinger parties, weekend trips together, and broadening their social horizon.

Although this research demonstrates that swinging has many positive consequences, which had not been previously identified, the cause of swinging was still thought to be rooted in relationship discord or sexual deviancy. Correspondingly, Gilmartin (1974) tested for differences between swingers and non-swingers with respect to relationship discord, dissatisfaction, and satisfaction. The results indicated there were no differences between groups for relationship dysfunction and neither group reported being any more or less happy than the other. This result was also confirmed by Ramey (1975) who determined that before individuals in relationships decided to have intimate friendships (sexual experiences with close friends), they often had a long period of solidifying their primary relationship and adjusting to the idea of having sex with others. The results of this research provide evidence that open relationships are just as stable as non-open relationships. Although Ramey’s study included non-monogamous individuals, only 11% of whom identified themselves as swingers, participants

described their open lifestyle as more rewarding than previous lifestyles, and enjoyed being open and honest about their sexual relationships with their partner.

Perhaps the relationship dysfunction hypothesis was a product of the zeitgeist of the 1960s and 1970s, but the logic of the hypothesis is fallacious. It seems highly unlikely that if a relationship were in trouble, the couple would have the time and energy required to engage in swinging. For example, they would lack the time to discuss and communicate the effect swinging would have on their relationship and then the energy to go out, meet people, and engage in coitus. Therefore, it is more likely that well-functioning adults in well-functioning relationships would be more likely to engage in swinging. In support of this hypothesis, Duckworth and Levitt's (1985) research found that the majority of swinging couples reported a healthy marital relationship, and that they felt swinging had increased love and trust in their marriage.

Dixon's (1985) research tested for differences between swinging heterosexual husbands and swinging bisexual husbands in marital happiness. Dixon's sample of mainly Caucasian, middle to upper middle class, male swingers with above average levels of education, was similar to those of previous studies by Bartell (1970) and Smith and Smith (1970). Dixon asked participants to rate how they felt about marital satisfaction and how they felt their spouses rated marital satisfaction. The samples were matched for age and duration of marriage, swinging activities, and orgasms from activities with female partners, with male partners (bisexual sample), from masturbation, from other sources and fantasies. The results from this research indicated that the bisexual males reported

more orgasms from activities with female partners and from masturbation, but lower levels of overall sexual satisfaction than heterosexual males. The bisexual males scored significantly lower than the heterosexual males in marital satisfaction. Dixon was very clear in saying that this did not mean bisexual husbands were in unhappy relationships as both groups still had very high levels of marital satisfaction. Dixon hypothesized that perhaps this slightly lower rating of marriage satisfaction could be explained by negative reactions from wives to multi-male activities, or perhaps from social stigma accompanied with multi-male activities. No theories or suggestions were provided to explain why this might be the case, but it may be possible that swinging husbands had a high enough sexual awareness to overcome negative social reactions and continue to engage in swinging.

### **Swinging: A Contemporary Account**

There has been little research conducted into the lifestyle since the 1970s (Rubin, 2001; de Visser & McDonald, 2007). Jenks (1998) discusses the reasons for the decline and somewhat stagnant research into swinging as possibly being caused by low participation rates, difficulty in the interpretation of results, and little academic validation or praise. It is further possible that swinging is still considered taboo in contemporary academic circles which limits the amount of research in the field. However, despite these drawbacks, there has been some recent research into the emotional management and sexual orientation of couples involved in swinging.

Swinging involves consensual mate swapping by couples, which can allow for negative emotional reactions, such as jealousy, to occur. De Visser and McDonald (2007) conducted a study to explore the process by which husbands in swinging couples manage jealousy. It is hypothesized that jealousy would be an expected reaction by anyone who found out that his or her partner was engaged in extra marital relationships. De Visser and McDonald interviewed husbands from swinging relationships and asked them to discuss jealousy control and management. The results from these interviews provided evidence to suggest that swingers did not try to eliminate jealousy, but rather minimize it, and in some cases, use it towards sexual excitement. Furthermore, results indicated the husbands were also able to navigate between physical intimacy and emotional intimacy, which allowed them to enjoy their partners' pleasure (de Visser & McDonald, 2007). Therefore, it seems plausible that emotional jealousy need not occur if physical pleasure is taking place in an emotionally supportive context (de Visser & McDonald, 2007). This result also indirectly supports the hypothesis that many swingers are in strong, healthy relationships, as that strong healthy emotional support would be required to prevent jealousy from occurring. Furthermore, it also demonstrates swingers have an open attitude towards sex with other people and an increased awareness of the pleasure of someone else being pleased.

Swinging is a sexual experience in which same sex contact is more than likely to occur. This can include female-on-female sexual contact and male-on-male sexual contact. However, the question of whether or not this same-sex

contact is equally likely for males as females is still unanswered. For example, Frank (2008) discusses the perceived lack of male-on-male sexual contact in swinging. Specifically, Frank highlights the perceived notion held by some that swinger males were actually resistant to the idea of male homosexuality. However, as swinging is an umbrella term for a variety of different sexual behaviours, including but not limited to, voyeurism and exhibitionism, to soft swinging (light touching, kissing and fondling), to full swinging (sexual intercourse), this belief that some swingers are homophobic may be unfounded. Furthermore, Frank discusses how these swinger males are still in the presence of other naked males, watching sexual intercourse occur, and often watching other males ejaculate. Frank concludes that swingers are far less likely to be homophobic than perhaps believed by some others, and since sexual pleasure is a main focus of swingers, male-on-male sexual contact is likely tolerated.

Sexual satisfaction in relationships has been the focus of a large amount of research for a number of years. For example, Christopher and Sprecher (2000), using data from national surveys, determined that married couples were usually sexually satisfied and described how the quality and quantity of sex are associated with feelings of love. Their research also suggests that sex outside of the marriage is still one of the more stigmatized forms of sexuality (Christopher & Sprecher, 2000). The review of literature in this area also demonstrated that there are significant differences in sexuality between committed gay and lesbian relationships and heterosexual relationships. However, one important finding was that gay male couples seemed to be more accepting of non-monogamy than



lesbian and heterosexual couples (Christopher & Sprecher, 2000). Although no explanation was provided as to why this may be the case, it should be noted that this finding does not mean gay males are practicing non-monogamy any more than heterosexual or lesbian couples, only that they appear more open to it. This research does support the hypothesis that swingers who enjoy sex with other couples could benefit from an increase in quality and quantity of sexual encounters, and could experience increased love and affection. It is also reasonable to hypothesize that swingers may have developed communication skills necessary to express the benefits from swinging while downplaying the negatives from swinging in a clear and concise manner to their partners.

Evidence supporting the hypothesis of increased communication between swingers can be extrapolated from previous research. For example, Byers (2011) discussed that sexual communication is an important factor in relationships, in parenting children, and between health care providers and patients. Byers also found evidence suggesting that sexual communication can lead to more satisfying relationships, positive sexual health, and well-being. Byers also suggests that partners who discuss their sexual likes and dislikes with each other experience greater sexual well-being. Furthermore, it suggests that withholding sexual desires and sexual communications from partners often led to decreased sexual well-being and satisfaction (Byers, 2011).

Byers also found evidence to suggest that sexual education classes benefited from clear and definite communication concerning sexuality. Interestingly, a majority of the sample of teachers surveyed were in favor of

sexuality classes in elementary school, but only a few were actively comfortable teaching sexuality classes. Furthermore, teachers felt that children benefited from the sexual education classes and developed more open attitudes, and an increased understanding of their own sexuality (Byers, 2011). What is interesting with this research, is that the teachers felt that the children developed more open sexual attitudes, and increased their sexual awareness, but that the teachers did not report feeling their own attitudes or awareness changing. Therefore, it is possible that sexual communication is a function of sexual awareness. Furthermore, it demonstrates that people have different comfort levels discussing sex related material. Therefore, individuals who engage in swinging behaviours, should have an easier time discussing sex related material, and pertaining to different areas of sexual preferences such as, partners, desires, fantasies, and experiences.

### **Variables Influencing Sexuality**

Sexuality is a dynamic topic of study and is continuously influenced by a variety of factors, including area of residence (social environment), religion and religious adherence, and education. DeMaris' (2009) research suggests ways in which religion plays an important role in mitigating the risk of extra marital copulations. The more religious a person was, the less likely they were to engage in affairs. This result is supported by earlier research, which suggested swingers were less likely to be religious than non-swingers (Bartell, 1970; Gilmartin, 1974). Bartell's and Gilmartin's conclusions concerning swingers, were later confirmed by Wilkinson and Pearson (2013), who suggested that one of the important factors in sexual identity development is religious context. Specifically,

Wilkinson and Pearson (2013) explored the relationship between sexual identity and religious identity during adolescence. Wilkinson and Pearson explored how sexual scripts, such as desires, fantasies, and attractions, influenced how adolescents felt about their sexual identity, and how they reported it within a religious context. Wilkinson and Pearson compared individuals in religious and non-religious schools, and determined that on average, individuals in religious schools reported less same-sex attractions, than non-religious schools, and that many individuals in religious schools held more traditional views of sex, including, abstinence until marriage. Therefore, Wilkinson and Pearson concluded that religious context does influence sexual identity in adolescents, and shapes their own sexual awareness and attitudes. Therefore, it would follow that swingers would have less religious affiliation, especially if the religion is in conflict with their own views on sexuality.

Consistent with Wilkinson and Pearson's (2013) hypothesis, the results of their study supported the suggestion that female students attended more religious schools and were less likely to report same-sex attractions. Men and women who identify as occasionally or situational bisexual (bisexual-flexible) also were most likely to attend high schools that were less associated with religion. The results of this study show an important interaction between self-reporting same-sex attractions and religion (Wilkinson & Pearson, 2013). From the results of this research, it is possible to hypothesize that swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT will have lower levels of religious identity than the students.

Furthermore, it is suggested that individuals who report same-sex attractions will also report fewer religious affiliations.

Education is another variable that was hypothesized to affect sexual awareness and identity. Since the introduction of sexual education into the classroom changes individuals' awareness of sexuality, research has been conducted to explore just what those changes might be. For example, Weis, Rabinowitz, and Ruckstuhl (1992) conducted such a study to determine if students enrolled in sexuality classes at a local university experienced changes in their own perceived sexuality. The researchers asked students to complete a sexual behavior and attitudes scale at the beginning of the course and after the course was completed. The results of the study indicated that although the frequency of students' sexual encounters and behaviours did not increase, attitudes became more permissive at the end of the course. The results of this study showed that there is a correlation between formal sexuality education and changes in sexual attitudes.

One of the limitations to this study was that students who participated in the study were not part of a random sample. It is reasonable to suspect that the students who signed up for the sexuality class were already interested in sexuality, curious about exploring more about sexuality, already quite sexually aware, or a combination thereof. Regardless of this particular limitation, the data from Weis et al.'s (1992) study does indicate that education can affect sexuality. Weis et al. commented on the fact that students in their study may have already had more permissive attitudes towards sexuality, and reportedly had engaged in premarital

sexual intercourse, fellatio, cunnilingus, with the vast majority reporting having had more than one partner. However, it should be noted that this does not automatically mean that students enrolled in the sexuality classes were in any way different from the students not enrolled in the sexuality classes.

It is possible that education alone is not the only influence on sexuality. There seems to be a perception in culture and media that college and university is a time of experimentation and casual sex. Evidence suggests that the development of a sexual identity is fluid and shifting over time in relation to different factors acting on it such as culture and society (Hammack, et al., 2009). In their article, Lyons et al. (2013) discussed the impact of sexual attitudes as being the key mediating factor between educational status and casual sexual behavior. Interestingly, the results indicated that individuals who did not enroll in a 4-yr university degree were likely to engage in more casual sex than individuals who did enroll in university. It is important to note, that this study did not take into account the types of sexual experiences undertaken, and focused entirely on heterosexual relationships. However, the results did support Weis et al.'s (1992) data, which suggests that students might have more liberal attitudes towards sexuality, but not necessarily engage in more sexual experiences when compared to individuals who did not take sexuality courses.

Smith and Smith (1970) were among the first researchers to find evidence of a correlation between education and swinging. Smith and Smith's results suggested that swingers were upper middle class and had above average levels of income and education. Jenks (1985) replicated and expanded upon this finding,

and also provided evidence that swingers were predominantly Caucasian, upper-middle class and had above average levels of university education. One limitation is that both Smith and Smith, and Jenks did not clarify which courses in university swingers had taken, although it is possible that some of them had exposure to some type of sexual education or sex-related course, perhaps through sociology or psychology in general studies. Based on this data, it is hypothesized that both swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT are more likely to have taken a course in human sexuality than the students.

The social environment plays a key role in the development of sexuality. As Haavio-Mannila and Kontula (1997) discussed in their research, sexuality takes place in a societal and generational context. It is also likely that sexuality is influenced by geographic location, such as residence in an urban center (city) versus a rural, agricultural town. Wilson's (1995) research examined the influence of urbanization on human sexuality. Evidence from the National Opinion Research Center General Social Survey suggested that people living in cities had more permissive attitudes towards non-conventional sexuality, such as homosexuality and swinging, than did individuals living in rural areas. Although this data suggested that attitudes of urban dwellers were more permissive (liberal) towards different types of sexuality, Wilson was clear to underline this did not mean they were engaging in these types of sexual behaviors. Furthermore, it remained unclear whether the size of the urban center affected how much permissive attitudes increased towards non-conventional sexuality. The results of this research suggest that swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT are

more likely to be from urban centers or are more likely to have relocated from rural areas to urban centers, than residing in rural areas.

The social environment also influences sexuality through culture and popular media beliefs. As Garcia, Reiber, Massey, and Merriwether (2012) discuss in their research, "hookups", or the brief, uncommitted encounters among individuals who are not romantic partners or dating each other, are becoming increasingly common. Citing media sources such as television, music and movies, Garcia et al. suggest that researchers should be aware of the influence that contemporary hookup culture has on individuals emerging into young adulthood. They suggested that there is link between what individuals witness in media, and their own behaviour. For example, they argue that there is a relationship between the increasing hook-up culture in media, such as television and movies which support one night stands witnessed in college, and the open attitudes towards hook up culture by college students. Therefore, Garcia et al. contend that researchers cannot ignore the influence that media has on sexual awareness, and more specifically sexual scripts, or what individuals believe should happen in a particular context. They suggest that this sexual awareness of what should happen may also influence how individuals respond to questions concerning sexual behaviours and attitudes, however, contend that more research is needed in this area. Regardless, if hook up culture is becoming more dominate in media, and university students are developing sexual scripts relative to media sources, then their scores concerning sexual experiences and sexual attitudes may be artificially increased.

Bradshaw, Kahn and Saville (2010) explored a sample of university men and women's views on preferences for, and risks and benefits associated with dating and hooking up. The results indicated that both men and women identified similar risks and benefits for hooking up and dating, but that men preferred hooking up, whereas women preferred dating. The results of this research indicate that although media influences sexuality, there are still gender differences in the way that information is perceived. This gender difference has also been supported in research concerning gay males, who also tend to have more sexual partners and open relationships (Christopher & Sprecher, 2000). Therefore, it is hypothesized that exposure to media, and the social environment should influence the sexual awareness of different individuals, even if genders are affected differently.

Although it seems reasonable to suggest that individuals who are exposed to this liberal view of sexuality in the media would be engaging in sexual behaviours earlier in life and perhaps have even more sexual encounters, research indicates this may not be the case. According to a study by Steinberg and Monahan (2010), there was no evidence to suggest that adolescents are engaging in sexual behaviours earlier now than children were a generation ago, regardless of exposure to sexualized media. This evidence supports the possibility that despite exposure to sex in the media, through film, television, internet and music, sexual behaviours are not necessarily on the rise.

The implied causal link between exposure to sex in the media and early sexual behaviours is not supported by this research. However, one of the limitations to the Steinberg and Monahan (2010), study was the reliance on sexual



behaviours. The participants in the study were not asked to rate their own sexual awareness or sexual attitudes before, during and after exposure to sex in the media. It is possible that the influence of the social environment acts upon attitudes and/or awareness, but is not enough to affect sexual behaviour. The logic of this conclusion becomes apparent when examining Diamond and Savin-Williams's (2000) conclusions that quality and quantity of sexual attractions are more important to developing sexual behaviours than the timing of the sexual attractions. Perhaps exposure to stimuli is not enough to warrant acting on sexual attractions. Perhaps other factors including access to sexual experience and an open attitude towards sexual behaviours are also required. Lastly, as Steinberg and Monahan discuss, just because there was no strong correlation between exposure to sex in the media and sexual behaviours, does not mean there is no impact on sexual development from exposure to sex in the media.

Not only is the social environment important for mediating human sexuality, but our attitudes can influence our sexual activity as well. Lemer, Blodgett Salafia, and Benson (2013) conducted a study to determine the impact of sexual attitudes and body image on a sample of college women's sexual activity. The results from the sample of 401 women indicated that women who tended to have more liberal attitudes towards sexuality also had high body satisfaction and the highest levels of sexual activity. It is important to note that for the purposes of Lemer, Blodgett Salafia, and Benson's study, sexual activity was defined as genital touching, intercourse, oral sex or anal sex. The sample of women was presumably heterosexual in orientation and no data on bisexual or same-sex

attractions was collected. However, the results of this research do indicate that sexual activity is the product of a complex cognitive process. The results indicated the way individuals feel about their bodies combined with either a conservative or a liberal attitude towards sexuality, does influence the amount of sexual activity individuals engage in.

Perhaps one of the most important factors influencing sexuality is gender. Many different theories and models have been developed to explain these differences, including theories based on evolutionary psychology, cognitive social learning theory, social structure theory, and gender similarities hypothesis (Peterson & Hyde, 2013). Varieties of different sex and sex-related studies have indicated that differences exist between genders regarding the level of experience and type of experiences, and attitudes. Peterson and Hyde (2013) engaged in a large, meta-analytic review of the research on gender difference conducted between 1993 and 2007. The results of the meta-analysis suggest a difference between genders on some sexual behaviour and some sexual attitudes. However, differences between genders were also dependent on gender equity in a given culture and age.

Results of the Peterson and Hyde (2013) meta-analysis indicate that some differences exist between genders in sexual experience and sexual attitudes. The results suggest that males report having slightly more sexual experiences than females, and have slightly more permissive or liberal attitudes than females. Peterson and Hyde are careful to highlight the differences between genders in these areas are small (i.e. small effect size) and that only masturbation,

pornography use, attitudes towards casual sex, and casual sex yielded medium effect sizes (Peterson & Hyde, 2013). Gender does not seem to operate independent of culture, but in fact seems to be mediated by societal influences. For example, gender differences were great in societies that had a wider gender disparity, and gender differences were smaller in societies that had great gender equality. Perhaps most surprising and rarely discussed is the finding that gender differences decreased with age (Peterson & Hyde, 2013). The results of this meta-analysis are important, as it suggests that swingers who tend to have a mean age of between 35 and 45, may be less likely to be affected by gender differences in terms of sexual experiences and sexual attitudes than non-swinging individuals. It is also important to note that sexual attitudes may be influenced by age and possibility influence the sexual awareness of individuals who identify as LGBT.

Gender differences exist and are reinforced as part of a social environment as well. Rudman, Fetterolf and Sanchez (2013) reviewed the existence of the sexual double standard (SDS) between males and females, particularly within female control theory and male control theory. The results indicated that both genders discouraged woman from engaging in casual sex, perhaps to protect them from negative social stigmas. Baumeister and Twenge (2002) conducted a study reviewing stifled female sexuality, hypothesizing that sex is a resource that women can utilize to their advantage, presumably to compensate for social or economic disadvantages. The results further suggested an evolutionary adaption of males for the suppression of female sexuality to prevent male mate poaching. Male mate poaching is a hypothesis that states a male may lose his mate if another

male is deemed to have better sexual performance by the sexually liberated female (Baumeister & Twenge, 2002). Hypothetically, to prevent this from happening, it would be in the male's best interest to prevent his mate from becoming more sexually aware. However, couples in a swinging relationship openly encourage each other's pleasure, and even the term wife-swapping has been used to refer to swinging. Therefore, swingers seem to be able to overcome completely both the SDS and evolutionary benefits of encouraging female sexuality, rather than limiting it.

The results of both Baumeister and Twenge, and Rudman, Fetterolf and Sanchez's research confirm that swingers would need to be in very stable, trusting relationships to engage in swinging. Furthermore, individuals who swing must have some type of jealousy control mechanism to prevent negative emotional reactions if they encounter swingers who may outperform them sexually.

### **Hypotheses of the Study**

Given the key findings outlined in the literature review, my study hypothesizes that swingers have significantly high levels of sexual experience, increased sexual awareness, and more open attitudes towards unconventional sexuality than non-swinging students. More specifically,

1. Swingers are hypothesized to have significantly more bisexual and same-sex attractions than students.
2. Swingers are hypothesized to have significantly greater strengths of sexual attraction, and greater breadth of sexual attraction than students.

3. Swingers are hypothesized to have significantly fewer heterosexual and asexual attractions than students.
4. Individuals who identify as LGBT are hypothesized to have higher sexual experience, sexual awareness and more open attitudes towards unconventional sexuality than students.
5. Individuals who identify as LGBT are hypothesized to have more bisexual and same-sex sexual attractions than students.
6. Individuals who identify as LGBT are hypothesized to have greater strengths of sexual attraction, and greater breadth of sexual attraction than students.
7. Individuals who identify as LGBT are hypothesized to have significantly fewer heterosexual and asexual attractions than students.
8. It is hypothesized that there will be few, if any significant differences between swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT with respect to sexual awareness, open attitudes towards unconventional sexuality, and sexual experience.
9. It is hypothesized that there will be few, if any significant differences between swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT with respect to strength of sexual attraction and breadth of sexual attraction.

From these hypotheses, predictions can be made as to the relationship between sexual experience, sexual awareness, and attitudes towards sexuality. Furthermore, a prediction can be made as to the relationship between sexual orientation and sexual experience. It is possible sexual orientation does affect

sexual experience, but only if there is sufficient sexual awareness and an open attitude towards unconventional sexuality.

## **Chapter III**

### **Research Methodology**

#### **Participants**

The student sample for this research was recruited from a University located in a large Canadian city through posted advertisements located in different faculties and buildings on campus (See Appendix F – Student Advertisement). The advertisements were posted from August 2013 to early November 2013 and removed once the open survey period was complete. The swinger sample for this research was recruited from a swingers' club in the same city and through word of mouth (snow-ball sampling). The advertisement was posted in highly visible locations within the swingers' club, with prior-approval from the manager/owner, whereby any members willing to participate in the research would be able to see it readily. Further advertisements were handed out by the researcher on Friday and Saturday nights to members willing to take the information (See Appendix E – Swinger Advertisement). The LGBT sample for this research was recruited using communication networks provided by a university-based LGBTQ organization. An email was drafted and sent out via their communication networks. The email was written based on the information presented on the LGBT advertisement (See Appendix D – LGBT Advertisement). Individuals who identified as LGBT were also invited to participate through word of mouth, from advertisements handed out during local LGBT pride celebrations, and via a Facebook page setup to support and advertise this research.

Initially there were 159 student responses, 193 swinger responses, and 170 LGBT responses. However, upon review of the data, 2 swinger responses, 4 LGBT responses and 3 student responses were deleted as the participants had not provided consent to participate in the research. A further 62 swinger responses, 24 student responses and 37 LGBT responses were deleted as the participants had failed to click 'Submit' on the debriefing form indicating they were willing to have their responses used in the research.

Additionally, 5 more swinger responses, 2 student responses, and 1 LGBT response were deleted as they were missing large amounts of data, including responses to 5 or more consecutive questions. McKnight, McKnight, Sidani, and Figueredo (2007) suggest that the researcher decide what an acceptable number of nil-responses is, before deleting a response set from a participant. They contend that missing data is not always easily rectified, and researchers must take precautions before deleting response sets. They suggest that researchers first consider how many subjects they have, and what they hope to gain or may lose by deleting the response set. Since there were enough participants to warrant a significant effect size, it was decided response sets would be deleted after 5 consecutive responses for two reasons. The first reason is that one measure used in this research is only 5 questions long (ATUS), and others like the MUS are only 14 questions, where 5 questions represents 37% of that measure. The second reason that 5 responses was selected, was because, although a few participants failed to answer 1 or 2 consecutive questions, all participants who failed to answer 5 consecutive answers in a row, also had other large gaps of up to 16 responses.



Therefore, these 8 responses were deleted as the researcher hoped to gain a stronger response set, while not affecting the effect size of the sample. Lastly, 3 swinger responses, 1 student response, and another 2 LGBT responses were deleted as the participants did not provide locations for country of residence and city of residence. Once again, McKnight et al. discuss that before deleting response set, the researcher should determine what they hope to gain by doing so. Since the sample for this research was large enough, these last 5 responses were deleted since it could not be determined where they were located, and how their location may influence their answers. A total sample of 121 swinger responses, 126 LGBT responses, and 129 student responses remained eligible and were used for analysis in this research study.

### **Survey Measures**

Since this research was intended to identify the influence and interaction of multiple factors of sexuality across many different groups and required hundreds of participants, this research utilized a survey comprised of several questionnaires and was administered via the Internet. The questionnaire for this survey was comprised of seven sections, including, 1) Demographics, 2) Attitudes Towards Unconventional Sexuality (ATUS), 3) Assessing Multiple Facets of Attraction to Women and Men (MFA), 4) Sexual Awareness Questionnaire (SAQ), 5) Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ), 6) Measure of Unusual Sexual Behaviour (MUS), and 7) The Sell Scale of Sexual Orientation (SSSO).

There were multiple reasons for including a demographics section in this study. Since research on swingers has not been conducted for some time, having a

demographics section would help to identify any changes in the background of couples who engaged in swinging over the last 40 years. Since previous research on couples who swing indicates (Bartell, 1970; Gilmartin, 1974; Jenks, 1985; Smith & Smith, 1970) that swingers are largely Caucasian, and have little religious affiliation, the demographics section included a question concerning race and ethnicity, and religion. Furthermore, since research suggests that individual attitudes are more permissive in larger urban centers and after having taken courses in sexuality, questions on area of residence and previous courses in human sexuality were also included (Weis, Rabinowitz, & Ruckstuhl, 1992; Wilson, 1995). Lastly, questions concerning the age and marital/relationship status of the participants were also included. The demographic questions were identical to the questions used by Statistics Canada (Census, 2006). It was important to use questions and answers relevant to a Canadian population, since this research was being conducted in a large Canadian city.

Research indicates that couples who swing tend to have more permissive attitudes towards sexuality (Bartell, 1970). In addition, individuals who identify as LGBT and engage in same-sex behaviours may also have more liberal sexual attitudes (Diamond, & Savin-Williams, 2000). Therefore, the Attitudes Toward Unconventional Sex Scale (ATUS) was used to assess participants' attitudes towards unconventional sexuality (Fincham & Bradbury, 1987). The ATUS is a 5-question, Likert-type scale, that asks participants to rate their sexual preferences, sexual behaviours, preference of predictable sexual behaviours and willingness to participate in different sexual practices. One limitation of this scale

is the reliance on participants' subjective ideas of what behaviours are conventional and unconventional. However, the scale does demonstrate the "attitudes" individuals have about their sexual experiences and behaviours. Furthermore, since the participants for this research were largely from the same city, what constitutes conventional sexuality may be relatively similar due to the same societal influences. This should help mitigate differences in results due to the subjective judgments and personal differences about what is normally considered conventional or unconventional.

The Sexual Awareness Questionnaire (SAQ) scale was included to assess participants' level of sexual self-awareness (Snell, Fisher, & Miller, 1991). This scale is particularly useful as it is made up of four subscales including; 1) sexual consciousness (internal, private sexual cues), 2) sexual monitoring (sensitivity to how attractive others find you), 3) sexual assertiveness (self-reliance in sexual decision-making), and 4) sexiness consciousness (own public sexiness) (Snell, Fisher, & Miller, 1991). In my previous undergraduate research, the swingers scored significantly higher across these subscales with the exception of sexiness consciousness than students (Blake, 2012). This result could be explained due to a generational effect, where younger generations are more sexually conscious than older generations. This scale has alphas ranging from 0.79 to 0.92 for the SAQ subscales. The SAQ subscales are also reported to have high convergent validity with the Zuckerman Human Sexuality Questionnaire (ZHSQ). The ZHSQ has a test-retest reliability coefficient of 0.94 for males and 0.95 for females (Zuckerman, 1988). It should be also noted that the ZHSQ was based and

developed using largely heterosexual samples. However, sexual awareness should change regardless of heterosexuality or same-sex attractions, as it measures only the perceived sexual self-awareness by participants.

The Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) was included in this study to assess each participant's sexual experience (Trotter & Anderson, 2007). The SEQ was selected for this study because it was developed in Canada, and had been recently developed at the time of this research. The questionnaire was originally developed to examine discrepancies between definitions of sexual behaviours and actual sexual behaviours. One of the most difficult issues surrounding sexuality research is using clear and concise terms that mean the same thing to each participant (Trotter & Anderson, 2007). The scale was developed using a sample of 150 students to define different behaviours as having sex, not having sex, a loss of virginity, and to indicate whether they would engage in that activity with a member of the same and/or opposite sex. For example, a gay woman would most likely not engage in penile-vaginal intercourse, and so her score would be calculated using this question, and she would have a lower score than a bisexual woman who does engage in penile-vaginal intercourse. At the time of this work, no research has been done to validate this scale. However, this scale was selected due to its Canadian origins, as this study was conducted in Canada, and having a significant majority of students from Trotter and Anderson's research agreeing on sexual definitions strongly suggests that the participants in this research would also strongly agree on what defines sexual behavior. It was also selected due to its

recent development, which is important as sexual definitions can change rapidly, especially from generation to generation (Haavio-Mannila, & Kontula, 1997).

For the purposes of this research, a second scale of sexual experience was developed. Since the SEQ was developed for the research and development of sexual definitions within a university setting, the scale emphasized very conventional sexual behaviours. For example, questions included terms like penile-vaginal intercourse, penile-anal intercourse, and oral sex. It was decided that a second scale should be developed to include more unconventional sexual behaviours, particularly those that may be engaged in by swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT. The Measure of Unusual Sexual Behaviours (MUS) was developed for use in my undergraduate research by myself, based upon questions posed to individuals signing up for membership on a local swingers club and an international dating site. It was decided that since these questions are posed to individuals interested in swinging, that they must be behaviours 'usual' or 'normal' to swingers and swinging (Blake, 2012). Furthermore, there is a concern that due to the nature of swinging, swingers would be likely to have engaged in all the behaviours listed on the SEQ and therefore using solely the SEQ would result in a ceiling effect and an incomplete profile of the full sexual experience of swingers.

The MUS was developed based on questions from a local swingers' website and an international dating website during registration as a member. When signing up for swinging websites such as [adultfriendfinder.com](http://adultfriendfinder.com) or [intimatetimes.com](http://intimatetimes.com), potential members are asked to construct a profile. This

profile often includes a list of sexual behaviours not found on the SEQ. For example, the websites asked members if they participated in particular unconventional sexual behaviours (fetishes) such as shrimping, watersports, and BDSM. Therefore, the questions in this 14 point scale include “Have you ever been tied up during sex?” and “Have you ever engaged in watersports?”. Answers for most questions included, “yes”, “no”, and in some cases, “I don’t know what that is”, which for the purpose of statistical analysis was included under “No”. The MUS was not independently validated before being administered for the study, however, the MUS does have face validity as the themes of fetish seem to be consistent on different swinger websites. Validity is defined by Messick (1995) as the extent to which a particular score accurately represents the construct being measured. Face validity is a form of validity, whereby the questions are thought to be related to construct being measured simply by reviewing the content of the questions. However, Messick also discusses social validity, which is the social relevance of the score from a particular measure. In this research, the MUS could be argued to have social validity as well, since swinger websites ask these questions, then this study should ask them as well. Since swinger websites ask these questions, it is suggested that these less common forms of sexual experiences are sometime acted upon and it is important to ask these questions to fully explore and measure sexual experience beyond more normative forms (Blake, 2012). There was no evidence from my undergraduate research any modifications to the MUS were necessary. Before beginning my master’s work a

review of the questions presented to swingers was conducted, but the questions remained unchanged and similar to the MUS.

Perhaps the most challenging factor of sexuality to assess is sexual orientation. As research suggests, using categories such as heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, etc, and asking people to self-identity, especially individuals who consider themselves non-heterosexual, may be an ineffective way to study sexuality (Diamond, & Savin-Willams, 2000). This work is based in part on Diamond's earlier (1998) work in which she discovered that although many women in her sample identified as lesbian, not all of them had had any same-sex contact. Therefore, to gauge an individual's sexual orientation accurately, it may be more effective to assess sexuality along several continua, instead of using narrow categories. To aid in the most complete sexual orientation assessment possible, this study used two sexual orientation scales that are both based on the "sexuality as a sexual continuum hypothesis" (Diamond, & Savin-Willams, 2000).

The first scale included in this research is the Multiple Facets of Attraction to Women and Men (MFA). The MFA was developed to divide attraction into three broad categories, including same-sex attraction, opposite attraction and strength of attraction (Diamond, 1998). Therefore, each participant had scores on same-sex attractions, opposite-sex attractions, and strength of attraction for a total of three scores. The MFA includes a physical and emotional subscale to both same-sex and opposite attractions. Secondly, the MFA includes questions that require the participant to rate strength of these attractions to the same-sex and

opposite sex. Final analysis allows the examination of each participant's emotional attraction and physical attraction, as well as the strength of these attractions for both same-sex and opposite sex attractions. This is important as many people, especially people who identify as bisexual, have multiple attractions to multiple people of either sex. Therefore, sexual orientation on the MFA is measured on different continuums, allowing for a much more precise and accurate representation of sexuality.

The second scale of sexual orientation included in this study is the Sell Scale of Sexual Orientation (SSSO). The SSSO is an expanded version of the MFA and assesses sexual orientation along four continua, including, heterosexuality, bisexuality, homosexuality, and asexuality (Gonsiorek, Sell, & Weinrich, 1995). However, the SSSO also allows the breadth and strength of sexual attractions to be measured. Although not part of the original scale, the breadth and strength of sexual attractions was calculated in previous research using this scale (Blake, 2012). This is extremely important for this research as it allows evaluating each participant along each of the continua. Like the MFA, each participant was assessed for his or her scores on each continuum of sexual orientation for a total of six scores. Secondly, each group can then be assessed for overall tendencies. For example, when used in previous research on similar samples, the results indicated swingers were predominantly heterosexual, but had significantly more bisexual and homosexual experiences and higher strengths of attraction than the students. The students were significantly more heterosexual and asexual than the swingers (Blake, 2012).



## **Procedure**

Before this research was initiated, ethics approval from the University of Alberta, Research Ethics Board (REB) was obtained. The REB reviewed and approved the methods and procedure of this study before the survey was open on-line and before any data was collected. Participants for my research study accessed the survey directly by entering the URL for the website hosting the survey. Each group of participants had a different URL to help prevent confusion during data collection. The opening page included a consent form (See Appendix A – Consent Form) that asked the participants to confirm that they were at least 18 years of age or older, and that they had read and understood the risks and benefits of participating in this research. Participants indicated their agreement to participate by clicking on the ‘agree’ button, and then moved on to the actual survey. Participants who were not 18 years or older were sent to a debriefing form for minors explaining why they could not participate in this research (See Appendix B – Minor Debrief Form). Participants were informed that they could skip any questions they did not feel comfortable answering and were allowed to leave the survey at any time. At the end of the survey, each participant was directed to the debriefing form (See Appendix C – Debrief Form). After reading the debriefing form, participants were asked to click either “Submit” to submit their answers, or “Do Not Submit” if they did not want their answers used in the survey. The data was collected via SurveyMonkey software and analyzed using Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, once all the participants completed the survey.

## Chapter IV

### Results

#### Statistical Analysis

There were no significant differences between groups with respect to Religion or Ethnicity. However, there were significant differences between groups for Age, Country, City, Relationship Status, Mother Tongue, participation in a Human Sexuality Course (Sex Course) and whether the course was taken at a university (Sex Course Details), and sex (MTF) (See Table 1). Comparisons between variables as accomplished using Analysis of Variance. A Tukey Honest Significant Difference (Tukey HSD) test was used to determine the means that were significantly different between each group (Kraemer and Thiemann, 1987).

**Table 1**

*ANOVA Differences between Groups for Demographics*

Measure	SS	(df)	(MS)	(F)	(Sig.)
Age	15682.4	2	7841.2	78.9	.000**
Country	0.8	2	0.4	10.0	.000**
City	62.2	2	31.1	22.5	.000**
Relationship	110.6	2	55.3	30.2	.000**
Religion	7.5	2	3.7	0.7	.494
Ethnicity	5.8	2	2.9	0.6	.544
MotherTongue	0.6	2	0.3	3.2	.040*
SexCourse	2.0	2	1.0	4.8	.009*
SexCourseDetails	6.4	2	3.2	19.3	.000**
MTF	13.2	2	6.6	7.4	.001**

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$

With respect to age, there were no significant differences between the swinger group and LGBT group. The swingers and the LGBT group were significantly older than the students, and had more variability in age (for means and

standard deviations see Table 2). The swingers and students were more likely to be from Canada, whereas the LGBT group, although predominantly Canadian, included more individuals from the United States of America (see Table 2). For example, the swingers and students only had 1 and 2 individuals respectively participate from the USA, whereas the LGBT group had 14 individuals from the USA (see Table 3).

**Table 2**

*Differences between Groups by Age, Country and City*

Measure	(M)	(SD)	(Min)	(Max)
Age				
Swingers	38.3	9.8	20	64
LGBT	35.9	13.5	18	64
Students	23.6	4.8	18	46
Country*				
Swingers	1.0	0.1	1	2
LGBT	1.1	0.3	1	2
Students	1.0	0.1	1	2

\*Country of residence with a mean of close to 1.0 indicates that most participants were from Canada.

**Table 3**

*Percent and Count of Groups by Country and City*

Country	<u>Swingers: n= 121</u>		<u>LGBT: n=126</u>		<u>Students: n=129</u>	
	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Count</i>
Canada	99.2	120	88.9	112	98.4	127
US	0.8	1	11.1	14	1.6	2
City						
L.C.C*	45.5	55	42.1	53	76.7	99
Surrounding*	12.4	15	1.6	2	4.7	6
Outside*	31.4	38	34.9	44	12.4	16
D/N Answer*	9.9	12	10.3	13	5.4	7
City in US	0.8	1	11.1	14	0.8	1

\*Large Canadian City; Areas surrounding Large Canadian City; Outside of Large Canadian City; Did Not Answer.

The three groups differed significantly from each other with respect to city of residence. The students were the most likely to be from a large Canadian city, as the

university is located in a large Canadian city. There was more variation in the location of the LGBT group, with more individuals who identify as LGBT living outside the large Canadian city and the US (See Table 2). There was also more variation in the location of the swinger group compared to the students, with more swingers living in the surrounding areas and outside the large Canadian city as well (See Table 3).

There were significant differences between all three groups with respect to relationship status. The swingers were predominantly married, whereas the LGBT group was more likely to be Living Together, Dating or Single (See Table 4). The students were the most likely to be Dating or Single (See Table 4). Although an ANOVA calculation determined there were significant overall differences between groups for Mother Tongue (first language), a Tukey Multiple HSD multiple comparison indicated that there was no significant differences between any two individual groups (See Table 5).

**Table 4**

*Differences between Groups for Relationship*

	<u>Swingers: n= 121</u>	<u>LGBT: n=126</u>	<u>Students: n=129</u>
Relationship	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Single	3.3	20.6	27.9
Dating	9.9	24.6	37.2
Living.*	15.7	31.7	15.5
Married	60.3	8.7	11.6
Divorced*	3.3	1.6	0.0
None of.*	7.4	12.7	7.8

\*Living Together; Divorced/No Sexual Relationship; None of the Above

**Table 5***Differences between Groups for Mother Tongue*

	<u>Swingers: n= 121</u>	<u>LGBT: n=126</u>	<u>Students: n=129</u>
First Language	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
English	93.4	92.1	84.5
Not English	6.6	7.9	15.5

Swingers were significantly less likely than the LGBT group to have taken a course in Human Sexuality. There were no significant differences between the students and the other two groups for participating in a course on Human Sexuality (See Table 6). Of the individuals who had taken a course in Human Sexuality, the Swingers were significantly less likely to have taken the course at a University, than the students or LGBT group. There were no significant differences between the students and LGBT group, and both groups predominantly took courses in human sexuality at a University (See Table 7).

**Table 6***Differences between Groups for Sex Course*

	<u>Swingers: n= 120</u>	<u>LGBT: n=126</u>	<u>Students: n=129</u>
Sex Course	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Yes	21.7	39.7	30.2
No	78.3	60.3	69.8

**Table 7***Differences between Groups for Sex Course Details*

	<u>Swingers: n= 120</u>	<u>LGBT: n=126</u>	<u>Students: n=129</u>
Sex Course	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
University	5.8	31.7	25.6
Not at University	16.2	8.7	4.7

There were significant differences between the students and the swingers and LGBT groups with respect to sex. The students had significantly more females complete the survey than the swingers or LGBT group. This is consistent

with current student demographics at the university in which there are more female than male students overall. There were no significant differences between the swingers and LGBT group (See Table 8).

There were no significant differences between groups for Ethnicity and Religion. All three groups were predominantly Caucasian, although the student group had the most variation for ethnicity (See Table 9). Furthermore, all three groups were predominantly Atheist/Agnostic or Other with respect to Religion (see Table 10).

**Table 8**

*Differences between Groups by Sex*

Sex	Swingers: n= 121		LGBT: n=126		Students: n=129	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Male	53.4	62	38.7	48	30.7	39
Female	45.7	53	46.0	57	68.5	87
Transgender	0.9	1	15.3	19	0.8	1

**Table 9**

*Differences between Groups for Ethnicity*

Ethnicity	Swingers: n= 121		LGBT: n=126		Students: n=129	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Aboriginal	4.2	5	2.4	3	1.6	2
Arab/ West Asian	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.8	1
Black	0.0	0	0.8	1	0.8	1
Chinese	0.0	0	2.4	3	6.2	8
Filipino	0.0	0	0.8	1	0.0	0
Japanese	0.8	1	0.0	0	0.0	0
Latin American	2.5	3	1.6	2	3.1	4
South Asian	0.0	0	0.8	1	0.8	1
South East Asian	0.0	0	0.0	0	1.6	2
Caucasian	90.0	109	88.9	112	79.8	104
Other	2.5	3	2.4	3	5.4	7

**Table 10***Differences between Groups for Religion*

	<u>Swingers: n= 121</u>	<u>LGBT: n=126</u>	<u>Students: n=129</u>
Religion	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Catholic	9.9	4.8	16.3
Protestant	9.9	15.9	8.5
Muslim	0.0	0.8	0.8
Hindu	0.0	0.0	0.8
Jewish	0.0	1.6	1.6
Other*	19.8	19.8	7.8
Atheist*	52.1	43.7	58.1
Left Blank	8.3	13.5	6.2

\*Other Religion; Atheist/Agnostic

**Group Comparisons on Measures of Sexuality**

There were significant differences between groups with respect to each measure of sexuality, with the exception of the Sexual Monitoring tendencies subtest of the Sexual Awareness Questionnaire (See Table 11). Differences between groups were tested using a Tukey HSD post hoc procedure on SPSS. Swingers scored significantly higher on the Attitudes Towards Unconventional Sex scale (ATUS) than the LGBT group and students. Furthermore, the LGBT group scored significantly higher on the ATUS than the students. This indicates that swingers have more open attitudes than the LGBT group and the students, while the LGBT group has more open attitudes than the students (See Table 12).

Swingers scored significantly higher than both the LGBT group and students on both the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) and the Measure of Unusual Sexual Behaviours (MUS). This indicates that swingers had a significantly wider range of sexual experiences than both the LGBT group and student group. Furthermore, the LGBT group scored significantly higher on the

SEQ and MUS than the students, indicating the LGBT group had a wider range of sexual experiences than the students (See table 12).

The Sexual Awareness Questionnaire has an overall measure of sexual awareness and four subtests. On the overall measure of sexual awareness, swingers scored significantly higher than the LGBT group and the student group. However, there was no significant difference between the LGBT group and the student group on the overall measure of sexual awareness. The first subtest of the SAQ is Sexual Consciousness (SAQ 01). Each group differed significantly from both other groups, with swingers scoring highest, and students scoring lowest. The second subtest on the SAQ is Sexual Monitoring Tendencies (SAQ 02). There were no significant differences between groups on this measure. The third subtest is a measure of sexual assertiveness (SAQ 03). The swingers scored significantly higher than the LGBT group and the students on the SAQ 03, and the LGBT group scored significantly higher than the students did. The fourth subtest on the SAQ is the Sex Appeal Consciousness measure (SAQ 04). The swingers scored significantly higher than the LGBT group and the students on the SAQ 04, and the LGBT group scored significantly higher than the students did (See table 12).

The first measure on the Sell Scale of Sexual Orientation (SSSO) is asexuality. The ANOVA indicated an overall significant group effect, but no single group differed significantly from any other group. Overall, the students scored highest, and the swingers scored lowest. Since the Tukey HSD is a very



conservative test, it is therefore determined there is no significant differences between groups concerning scores on asexuality (See table 11 and table 12).

The second subtest on the SSSO is a measure for heterosexuality. The LGBT group scored significantly lower than the swingers and the students, indicating the LGBT group was significantly less likely to identify as heterosexual, experience heterosexual attractions, or engage in heterosexual behaviours than swingers or students. There was no significant difference between students and swingers. The third subtest on the SSSO is a measure of bisexuality. Both the swingers and the LGBT group scored significantly higher than the students did, and there was no significant difference between the swingers and LGBT. The fourth subtest on the SSSO is a measure for homosexuality. On this subtest the LGBT individuals scored significantly higher than the swingers and the students, and there were no significant differences between swingers and students (see Table 12).

The fifth and sixth subtest on the SSSO are measures for breadth of sexuality and strength of sexual attractions. The swingers scored significantly higher on both measures than the LGBT group and students, and on both measures there were no significant differences between the LGBT group and the students (See Table 12). The swingers had the widest range and breadth of sexual attractions. Furthermore, the swingers also had the strongest sexual attractions to different individuals as well.

On the first three subtests of the Multiple Facets of Attraction to Men and Women, including, 1) the percentage of physical attractions to the opposite sex

(MF1), 2) percentage of emotional attractions to opposite sex (MF2), and 3) percentage of sexual fantasies to opposite sex (MF3), the swingers scored significantly higher than the LGBT group. The swingers also scored significantly higher than the students on the MF1 and MF2, however, there was no significant differences between swingers and students on MF3. Lastly, the students scored significantly higher than the LGBT group on MF1, MF2 and MF3 (See Table 12).

The swingers and students scored significantly higher than the LGBT group on the MF4 (frequency of emotional attractions to the opposite sex), although there was no significant difference between swingers and students. The swingers and students scored significantly lower than the LGBT group on the MF5 (frequency of emotional attractions to the same-sex), although there was no significant difference between swingers and students. On the MF6 (Frequency of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex), swingers scored significantly higher than the both the LGBT group and the students, and the students scored significantly higher than the LGBT group (See Table 12).

On the MF7 (Percentage of sexual fantasies to the same sex), the swingers and students scored significantly lower than the LGBT group, and there was no significant difference between the swingers and LGBT group. On the MF8 (Intensity of physical attractions to opposite sex), the swingers scored significantly higher than both the LGBT group and students, and the students scored significantly higher than LGBT group as well. On the MF9 (Intensity of physical attractions to the same sex), the swingers and students scored

significantly lower than the LGBT group, and there was no significant difference between the swingers and LGBT group (See Table 12).

The swingers scored significantly higher than the LGBT group on the MF10 and MF12 (Strongest attraction to the opposite sex and Desire for sexual activity with the opposite sex). There was no significant difference on the MF10 between the swingers and the students, although the swingers scored significantly higher than the students did on MF12. The swingers and students scored significantly lower on the MF11 and MF13 (Strongest attraction to the same-sex and Desire for sexual activity with the same-sex) than the LGBT group and there was no significant difference between swingers and students (See table 12).

**Table 11**

*ANOVA Differences between Groups on Measures of Sexuality*

Measure	Swingers		LGBT		Students		F(df)	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
A.T.U.S	28.0	4.6	23.9	6.0	21.6	6.0	41.5(2,371)	<0.001**
S.E.Q.	30.1	2.7	26.9	5.2	24.6	7.6	30.9(2,373)	<0.001**
M.U.S.	6.5	2.5	5.1	2.7	4.3	2.0	26.6(2,373)	<0.001**
S.A.Q. 00 <sup>a</sup>	122.9	13.6	116.1	14.5	114.5	14.2	12.5(2,373)	<0.001**
S.A.Q. 01 <sup>a</sup>	25.6	3.8	23.9	4.3	23.2	4.3	10.5(2,373)	<0.001**
S.A.Q. 02 <sup>a</sup>	29.9	4.3	29.2	4.5	29.3	4.8	1.0(2,373)	0.384
S.A.Q. 03 <sup>a</sup>	22.7	4.7	21.0	5.3	21.0	5.2	4.2(2,373)	0.016*
S.A.Q. 04 <sup>a</sup>	8.4	3.4	6.9	3.0	5.9	3.0	19.8(2,373)	<0.001**
A-Sex <sup>b</sup>	0.1	0.8	0.5	1.7	0.6	1.9	3.2(2,373)	0.041*
Hetero <sup>b</sup>	19.2	5.5	3.9	6.3	18.0	8.0	193.4(2,373)	<0.001**
Bi-Sex <sup>b</sup>	5.2	6.0	4.4	5.6	2.8	3.9	7.2(2,373)	0.001**
Homo <sup>b</sup>	3.0	4.5	7.4	4.0	2.5	3.5	55.2(2,373)	<0.001**
Breadth <sup>b</sup>	10.3	4.8	7.0	3.6	6.3	3.4	40.6(2,373)	<0.001**
Strength <sup>b</sup>	18.0	4.3	14.1	4.8	14.6	4.5	26.1(2,373)	<0.001**
M.F. 1 <sup>c</sup>	80.0	23.8	19.3	26.2	74.1	31.3	162.2(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 2 <sup>c</sup>	80.7	25.6	22.7	28.7	71.2	33.1	121.7(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 3 <sup>c</sup>	80.3	24.9	22.2	29.0	73.3	35.4	119.7(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 4 <sup>c</sup>	4.5	1.8	2.3	1.7	4.7	1.7	64.5(2,343)	<0.001**

M.F. 5 <sup>c</sup>	1.8	1.2	4.5	1.7	2.2	1.6	103.8(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 6 <sup>c</sup>	5.3	1.1	2.4	1.8	4.5	1.6	104.5(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 7 <sup>c</sup>	2.4	1.5	4.5	1.5	2.5	1.8	59.1(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 8 <sup>c</sup>	3.8	0.9	2.0	1.3	3.3	1.2	70.4(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 9 <sup>c</sup>	2.0	1.1	3.6	0.9	2.2	1.1	79.0(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 10 <sup>c</sup>	4.5	0.9	2.4	1.6	4.3	1.2	101.2(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 11 <sup>c</sup>	2.4	1.5	4.3	1.0	2.7	1.5	64.6(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 12 <sup>c</sup>	4.3	0.8	1.9	1.4	3.7	1.3	122.8(2,343)	<0.001**
M.F. 13 <sup>c</sup>	2.2	1.4	3.7	1.1	2.1	1.3	50.8(2,343)	<0.001**

*Note:* In general, higher scores on all measures listed above are indicative of stronger sexual orientation, more unconventional sexuality, or greater sexual openness.

<sup>a</sup>: Measures within the SAQ scale, with SAQ 00 measuring Overall score, SAQ 01 measuring Sexual Consciousness, SAQ 02 measuring Sexual Monitoring Tendencies, SAQ 03 measuring Sexual Assertiveness, and SAQ 04 measuring Sex Appeal Consciousness.

<sup>b</sup>: Measures calculated from the S.S.S.O. scale, including, Asexuality, Heterosexual, bisexual, Homosexual, Breadth of sexual attractions, and Strength of sexual attractions.

<sup>c</sup>: M.F.1-Percentage of physical attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.2- Percentage of emotional attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.3- Percentage of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex; M.F.4-Frequency of emotional attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.5- Frequency of emotional attractions to the same-sex; M.F.6- Frequency of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex; M.F.7- Percentage of sexual fantasies to the same-sex; M.F.8-Intensity of physical attraction to the opposite sex; M.F.9- Intensity of physical attraction to the same-sex; M.F.10-Strongest attraction to the opposite sex; M.F.11- Strongest attraction to the same-sex; M.F.12- Desire for sexual activity with the opposite sex; M.F.13-Desire for sexual activity with the same-sex.

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$

**Table 12**

*Tukey HSD Differences by Group on Measures of Sexuality*

Group by Group	Mean Difference	<i>p</i>
A.T.U.S		
Swingers * LGBT	4.15	<0.001**
Swingers * Students	6.39	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	2.24	<0.001**
S.E.Q		
Swingers * LGBT	3.18	<0.001**
Swingers * Students	5.53	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	2.35	<0.001**
M.U.S.		
Swingers * LGBT	1.43	<0.001**

Swingers * Students	2.19	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	0.75	<0.001**
S.A.Q.00		
Swingers * LGBT	6.84	<0.001**
Swingers * Students	8.47	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	1.63	0.627
S.A.Q.01		
Swingers * LGBT	1.67	0.005*
Swingers * Students	2.34	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	0.67	0.401
S.A.Q.02		
Swingers * LGBT	0.72	0.426
Swingers * Students	0.66	0.481
LGBT * Students	-0.06	0.994
S.A.Q.03		
Swingers * LGBT	1.61	0.037*
Swingers * Students	1.65	0.030*
LGBT * Students	0.04	0.998
S.A.Q.04		
Swingers * LGBT	1.52	0.001**
Swingers * Students	2.50	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	0.99	0.034*
Asexuality		
Swingers * LGBT	-0.438	0.081
Swingers * Students	-0.455	0.062
LGBT * Students	-0.017	0.996
Heterosexuality		
Swingers * LGBT	15.21	<0.001**
Swingers * Students	1.01	0.403
LGBT * Students	-14.10	<0.001**
Bisexuality		
Swingers * LGBT	0.76	0.501
Swingers * Students	2.45	0.001**
LGBT * Students	1.70	0.028*
Homosexuality		
Swingers * LGBT	-4.35	<0.001**
Swingers * Students	0.56	0.519
LGBT * Students	4.91	<0.001**
Breadth		
Swingers * LGBT	3.21	<0.001**
Swingers * Students	3.97	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	0.76	0.227
Strength		
Swingers * LGBT	3.91	<0.001**
Swingers * Students	3.39	<0.001**
LGBT * Students	-0.52	0.301

M.F.1	Swingers * LGBT	60.76	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	5.98	<0.001**
	LGBT * Students	-54.78	<0.001**
M.F.2	Swingers * LGBT	57.98	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	6.41	0.037*
	LGBT * Students	-48.57	<0.001**
M.F.3	Swingers * LGBT	58.11	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	6.97	0.176
	LGBT * Students	-51.14	<0.001**
M.F.4	Swingers * LGBT	2.25	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	-0.13	0.839
	LGBT * Students	-2.38	<0.001**
M.F.5	Swingers * LGBT	-2.75	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	-0.42	0.086
	LGBT * Students	2.33	<0.001**
M.F.6	Swingers * LGBT	2.93	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	0.87	<0.001**
	LGBT * Students	-2.06	<0.001**
M.F.7	Swingers * LGBT	-2.13	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	-0.14	0.780
	LGBT * Students	1.99	<0.001**
M.F.8	Swingers * LGBT	1.74	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	0.42	0.010*
	LGBT * Students	-1.31	<0.001**
M.F.9	Swingers * LGBT	-1.64	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	-0.18	0.370
	LGBT * Students	1.45	<0.001**
M.F.10	Swingers * LGBT	2.21	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	0.27	0.231
	LGBT * Students	2.24	<0.001**
M.F.11	Swingers * LGBT	-1.94	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	-0.29	0.216
	LGBT * Students	1.94	<0.001**
M.F.12	Swingers * LGBT	2.41	<0.001**

	Swingers * Students	0.58	<0.001**
	LGBT * Students	-1.82	<0.001**
M.F.13			
	Swingers * LGBT	-1.47	<0.001**
	Swingers * Students	0.07	0.915
	LGBT * Students	1.53	<0.001**

M.F.1-Percentage of physical attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.2- Percentage of emotional attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.3- Percentage of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex; M.F.4-Frequency of emotional attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.5- Frequency of emotional attractions to the same-sex; M.F.6- Frequency of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex; M.F.7- Percentage of sexual fantasies to the same-sex; M.F.8-Intensity of physical attraction to the opposite sex; M.F.9- Intensity of physical attraction to the same-sex; M.F.10-Strongest attraction to the opposite sex; M.F.11- Strongest attraction to the same-sex; M.F.12- Desire for sexual activity with the opposite sex; M.F.13-Desire for sexual activity with the same-sex.

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$

There were significant interaction effects between sex and group on the majority of the sexuality measures, including, ATUS, SEQ, SAQ 00, SAQ 02, asexuality, heterosexuality, bisexuality, homosexuality, breadth of sexuality, strength of sexuality, and MF1 through to MF13, except for MF4 (See Table 13). Sex was initially divided into three categories for the purposes of this research study including, male, female and transgender (TG), which included all transgender and both male-to-female and female-to-male transsexual individuals. However, as there was only one TG individual in the swinger and student group, the group by sex comparisons include males and females only on the MFA scales.

The swinger females had significantly more open attitudes than either the LGBT females or student females on the ATUS. There were far fewer differences between scores for the males in each group on the ATUS (See Table 13). There is only one TG response for both the swinger and student sample, making sex by group comparisons is difficult on the SEQ and MUS. Both the male and female

swingers have much higher scores on the SEQ and MUS than the LGBT and student males and females. However, the TG individuals in the sample have a lower score on both the SEQ and MUS. Therefore, there is a small sex by group difference on the SEQ and no sex by group difference on the MUS (See table 13).

There was an overall trend across the Sexual Awareness Questionnaire, including the 4 subtests, where both male and female swingers scored slightly higher than either the LGBT or student males and females. However, there was only a significant group by sex difference on the overall SAQ and Sexual Monitoring Tendencies subtest (SAQ 02), which is associated with a very high score provided by the TG student over the other individuals who identify as TG in the swinger and LGBT groups (See Table 13).

On the measure of asexuality, there were significant effects for sex, group and sex by group interactions. The swingers were much lower on asexuality than the LGBT group and students. Then, the TG individual response was much higher than the TG responses in the LGBT group. On the measure of heterosexuality, LGBT males and females were significantly lower than swinger and student males and females and over all, both the swinger and student groups are higher than the LGBT group (See Table 13).

On the measure of bisexuality, there were significant effects for sex, group and sex by group interactions. The swinger females scored significantly higher than other females and overall the swinger group scored higher than the student group on the measure bisexuality. The TG individual response was much higher than the TG responses in the LGBT group. On the measure of homosexuality,



there were significant effects for sex, group and sex by group interactions. Female swingers scored significantly higher than student females, and both the swinger and LGBT group scored higher on this measure than the student group (See Table 13).

On the measure for breadth of sexuality, there were significant effects for group, and sex by group interactions. The swingers scored significantly higher than the LGBT and student group, and the female swingers were higher than the student females. On the measure for strength of sexuality, there were significant effects for sex, group and sex by group interactions. The swingers scored higher overall than the LGBT group and students. And lastly, the females scored higher than the males (See Table 13).

On the MF1, MF2, and MF3, there were significant effects for group, and sex by group interactions. The swingers and students scored higher across the three measures than the LGBT group and the swingers were significantly higher than the students, although only significantly so in MF1 and MF2. Furthermore, the male swingers scored the highest in all three measures while the males in the LGBT group scored the lowest in all three categories.

There was no sex by group effect on MF4, although there was a sex and group effect. Both the swingers and students scored significantly higher than the LGBT group and the females scored higher on the MF4 than the males. On the MF5, there was no sex effect, but there was a group and sex by group effect. Both the students and swingers scored significantly lower than the LGBT group and the swinger males scored the lowest, while the LGBT male scored the highest. On the

MF6, there were significant effects for group, and sex by group interactions. The swingers scored higher than the LGBT group and students, while the students scored higher than the LGBT group. The females scored higher than the males and male swingers scored the highest, while the males in the LGBT group scored the lowest (See Table 13).

The MF7, MF8, and MF9, all had group and sex by group effects, and MF8 and MF9 had sex effects as well. On the MF7, there was no significant difference between swingers and students, however, both the swingers and students scored lower than the LGBT group, and male swingers scored the lowest, while the LGBT group males scored the highest. On the MF8, the swingers scored higher than both the students and LGBT group, and the students scored higher than the LGBT group. Furthermore, the males, regardless of group scored lower than the females. On the MF9, the LGBT group scored higher than the students and swingers, although there was no difference between swingers and students. the male swingers scored the lowest, while the LGBT males scored the highest. However, overall the females scored higher than the males on the MF9 (see Table 13).

On the MF10, MF11, MF12, and MF13, there were significant effects for sex, group, and sex by group interactions. On the MF10 and MF12, the swingers scored higher than both the students and LGBT group, and the students scored higher than the LGBT group. Furthermore, in both MF10 and MF12, the females scored slightly higher than the males, although in both cases female and male swingers scored higher than any other group. The LGBT group scored higher than

both the swingers and students on the MF11 and MF13. There were no significant differences between the swingers and students in either the MF11 or MF13. In both the MF11 and MF13, swinger males scored the lowest whereas LGBT females scored the highest. Overall, females scored higher than the males on both subtests (See Table 13).

**Table 13***Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Dependent Variable	Source	F(df)	p
A.T.U.S.	Sex	0.01(2,356)	0.991
	Group	1.80(2,356)	0.167
	Sex * Group	2.92(4,356)	0.021*
S.E.Q	Sex	4.47(2,358)	0.012*
	Group	15.89(2,358)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	3.98(4,358)	0.004*
M.U.S	Sex	1.45(2,358)	0.236
	Group	0.94(2,358)	0.393
	Sex * Group	0.70(4,358)	0.595
S.A.Q.00	Sex	0.79(2,358)	0.453
	Group	2.27(2,358)	0.105
	Sex * Group	2.81(4,358)	0.026*
S.A.Q.01	Sex	0.13(2,358)	0.874
	Group	0.33(2,358)	0.721
	Sex * Group	1.95(4,358)	0.101
S.A.Q.02	Sex	2.83(2,358)	0.060
	Group	2.82(2,358)	0.061
	Sex * Group	2.69(4,358)	0.031*
S.A.Q.03	Sex	2.56(2,358)	0.079
	Group	0.52(2,358)	0.954
	Sex * Group	1.53(4,358)	0.192
S.A.Q.04	Sex	1.16(2,358)	0.315
	Group	2.61(2,358)	0.075

Asexuality	Sex * Group	0.24(4,358)	0.913
	Sex	3.93(2,358)	0.021*
	Group	5.47(2,358)	0.005*
	Sex * Group	2.39(4,358)	0.051*
Heterosexuality	Sex	4.56(2,358)	0.011*
	Group	14.82(2,358)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	16.73(4,358)	<0.001**
Bisexuality	Sex	35.76(2,358)	<0.001**
	Group	8.11(2,358)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	6.26 (4,358)	<0.001**
Homosexuality	Sex	15.59(2,358)	<0.001**
	Group	4.48(2,358)	0.012*
	Sex * Group	11.00(4,358)	<0.001**
Breadth	Sex	0.06(2,358)	0.940
	Group	6.04(2,358)	0.003*
	Sex * Group	4.27(4,358)	0.002*
Strength	Sex	17.79(2,358)	<0.001**
	Group	9.05(2,358)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	3.07(4,358)	0.016*
M.F.1	Sex	0.33(1,340)	0.565
	Group	174.79(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	26.72(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.2	Sex	0.40(1,340)	0.528
	Group	120.99(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	12.95(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.3	Sex	0.87(1,340)	0.351
	Group	128.54(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	22.90(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.4	Sex	17.13(1,340)	<0.001**
	Group	60.41(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	2.91(2,340)	0.056
M.F.5	Sex	<0.01(1,340)	0.983
	Group	101.76(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	11.26(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.6			

M.F.7	Sex	6.13(1,340)	0.014*
	Group	115.84(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	17.79(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.8	Sex	0.88(1,340)	0.350
	Group	60.33(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	20.74(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.9	Sex	57.75(1,340)	<0.001**
	Group	82.65(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	4.12(2,340)	0.017*
M.F.10	Sex	12.83(1,340)	<0.001**
	Group	86.26(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	27.62(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.11	Sex	29.80(1,340)	<0.001**
	Group	108.27(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	6.21(2,340)	0.002*
M.F.12	Sex	17.63(1,340)	<0.001**
	Group	69.50(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	23.01(2,340)	<0.001**
M.F.13	Sex	45.04(1,340)	<0.001**
	Group	138.29(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	4.12(2,340)	0.017*
	Sex	14.63(1,340)	<0.001**
	Group	53.10(2,340)	<0.001**
	Sex * Group	24.50(2,340)	<0.001**

M.F.1-Percentage of physical attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.2- Percentage of emotional attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.3- Percentage of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex; M.F.4-Frequency of emotional attractions to the opposite sex; M.F.5- Frequency of emotional attractions to the same-sex; M.F.6- Frequency of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex; M.F.7- Percentage of sexual fantasies to the same-sex; M.F.8-Intensity of physical attraction to the opposite sex; M.F.9- Intensity of physical attraction to the same-sex; M.F.10-Strongest attraction to the opposite sex; M.F.11- Strongest attraction to the same-sex; M.F.12- Desire for sexual activity with the opposite sex; M.F.13-Desire for sexual activity with the same-sex.

\*  $p \leq 0.05$

\*\*  $p \leq 0.001$

## Chapter V

### Interpretation and Discussion

The first hypothesis tested in this study was that swingers have significantly more bisexual and homosexual attractions than students. The results of this study only partially supported this hypothesis. According to the SSSO-Bisexuality measure, swingers had significantly more bisexual attractions than the students, but there were no significant differences between students and swingers for homosexual attractions. This result was consistent with all sub-scales of attraction to the same-sex on the MFA scale.

The second hypothesis tested in this study was that swingers have significantly lower scores on heterosexuality and asexuality. This hypothesis was not supported by the results of this study. There was no significant difference between groups for asexuality or between swingers and students on the heterosexuality measure of the SSSO. However, on some subscales of the MFA, the swingers had significantly more attractions to the opposite sex than students do. The swingers scored significantly higher than the students on the subscales for percentage of physical and emotional attractions to the opposite sex, the frequency of sexual fantasies to the opposite sex, the intensity of physical attractions to the opposite sex, and desire for sexual activity with the opposite sex. Therefore, it seems that although swingers engage in significantly more bisexual activities than students, they are significantly more heterosexual in their attractions, whether physical or emotional, have significantly more sexual fantasies and experience attractions of greater intensity.

The third hypothesis tested by this study was that swingers have a significantly greater breadth of sexuality and a significantly greater strength of sexual attraction than students. This hypothesis was fully supported by the results of this study. The results from the first and second hypotheses support this hypothesis as well, as it is possible that since swingers have greater strengths of sexual attraction, swingers therefore also have higher levels of heterosexual attractions than students. Therefore, the second hypothesis should not have been supported. Secondly, the swingers did experience more bisexual attractions than the students did. Therefore, it does follow that swingers should have a greater breadth of sexual attractions than the students as well.

The fourth hypothesis of this study was that individuals who identify as LGBT would have more open attitudes towards unconventional sexuality, more sexual experience, and greater sexual awareness than students. The results of this study partially supported this hypothesis. The LGBT group had significantly higher scores on the ATUS, SEQ, and the MUS, but only scored significantly higher than the students on the measure of Sex Appeal Conscious (SAQ 04). This suggests that the LGBT group did have more open attitudes towards unconventional sex, had more sexual experience, had more unusual sexual experiences, and more sex appeal consciousness of the SAQ than students. It should also be noted that the students never scored significantly higher than the LGBT group on any of the SAQ measures and that there were no differences on measuring Sexual Monitoring Tendencies (SAQ 02).

The fifth hypothesis of this study was that individuals who identify as LGBT have more bisexual and homosexual attractions than students do. This hypothesis was fully supported by the results of this study. The LGBT group scored significantly higher on both the bisexuality and homosexuality measures on the SSSO. The LGBT group also scored higher on the measures of same-sex attractions on the MFA. This indicates that the LGBT group had more sexual fantasies towards the same-sex, had greater intensities of attraction towards the same-sex, and had stronger sexual attractions and great desires for sex with the same-sex.

The sixth hypothesis was that individuals who identify as LGBT have greater strengths and wider breadths of sexuality than students. This result was not supported by the results of this study, and upon reflection the hypothesis itself was based on an erroneous assumption. It was assumed that the LGBT group would have a greater breadth of sexual attractions and stronger sexual attractions when looking at the LGBT group as a whole, rather than individually. However, both the SSSO and MFA look at sexuality, not as an entire group, but as individuals along several continuums. Therefore, an individual who identifies as lesbian would probably not have a breadth of sexuality wide enough to include heterosexual attractions. Therefore, it makes sense that the LGBT would not have greater strengths or wider breadths of sexuality, because at an individual level, having predominantly homosexual attractions is no different from having predominantly heterosexual attractions. As a group, the LGBT group may have



more attractions to men and women, but individually they do not necessarily have attractions to both men and women.

The seventh hypothesis of this study was that individuals who identify as LGBT would score significantly lower on measures of asexuality and heterosexuality than students. The results of this study partially supported this hypothesis. There was no difference between groups on the asexuality measure of the SSSO. The LGBT group did score significantly lower than the students on the heterosexuality measure of the SSSO and significantly lower on measures of attractions to the opposite sex on the MFA. This indicates that the LGBT group did have lower physical and emotional attractions to the opposite sex, fewer sexual fantasies to the opposite sex, lower intensities of sexual attractions and lower desires to engage in sex with the opposite sex.

The eighth hypothesis of this study was that individuals who identify as LGBT would not differ significantly from the swingers with respect to sexual awareness, open attitudes towards unconventional sexuality, and sexual experience. This hypothesis was not supported by the results of this study. It was assumed that the LGBT group would be closer to the swingers in terms of sexual experience, which at a group level may be the case, but not an individual level. The LGBT group scored significantly higher than the students, but significantly lower than the swingers on the ATUS, SEQ, MUS, and SAQ 04. This result is consistent with an individual level analysis. Although individuals who identify as bisexual could have many different sexual experiences and perhaps even more open attitudes and increased sexual awareness, individuals who identify as gay or

lesbian may not have the same sexual experiences and awareness at an individual level.

The ninth hypothesis of this study was that there would be few, if any, significant differences between swingers and individuals who identify as LGBT with respect to strength of sexual attraction and breadth of sexual attraction. The results of this study did not support this hypothesis. Once again, the same erroneous logic was used in developing this hypothesis. This hypothesis was made using a group level analysis, but the results are representative of the average individual response. Therefore, the swingers had significantly stronger attractions and wider breadth of attractions than the students and LGBT group, and there was no difference between the LGBT group and the students.

The swingers consistently scored significantly higher than the LGBT group and the students in regards to open attitudes, sexual experiences and sexual awareness. Although most of the results were expected given the literature review and model presented, the results on the SAQ were unexpected. The assumption regarding the sexual awareness was that individuals who identify as LGBT may have a higher sexual awareness due in part to self-recognition and development of their own sexual identity. It was theorized that this process would be similar to the sexual identity development of swingers, which also would include a self-recognition component and sexual development component. However, as Diamond and Savin-Williams (2000) highlighted, sexual identity and self-identity do not necessarily develop at the same time. Therefore it may have been a mistake

to assume that the development of a same-sex identity would also lead to a development of sexual awareness.

Consistent with previous research, like Gilmartin's (1974) study, the swingers in this study were predominantly atheist or agnostic in terms of religious affiliation and were predominantly Caucasian. The LGBT and student groups were predominantly Caucasian and atheist or agnostic as well. Furthermore, as Wilson (1995) discussed in his research relating sexual attitudes and urbanization, most of the swinger sample, LGBT sample, and student sample was from an urban area. Therefore, it would not be unreasonable to assume that participants in all groups would have similar attitudes towards unconventional sexuality. However, the results indicate that there are significant differences between the groups concerning attitudes and unconventional sexuality. Lastly, many of the participants from the three groups had taken a course in human sexuality at some point in their lives. Weis, Rabinowitz, and Ruckstuhl (1992) suggest that attitudes change with exposure to sexual education. However, once again, if all three groups had similar exposure to sex-education classes, then it could be reasonably expected that each group would have similar attitudes and even similar experiences. It is unlikely that differences in demographics could account for the significant results obtained on the measures of sexuality.

### **Discussion**

Currently there are many different theories that are used to explain sexuality within culture and societal attitudes (Diamond, 1997; Foucault, 1980; Peterson & Hyde, 2010). However, many of these theories fail to explain how

people become interested in non-normative sexual behaviours such as swinging and BDSM. Therefore, the secondary purpose of this study was to support a sexuality model that could be used to explain how people become interested in non-normative sexual behaviours, some of which can be in direct opposition to conventional theories of sexuality. This study sought to support the existence of a relationship between sexual experience, sexual awareness, sexual attitudes and sexual orientation. This relationship could then be used to explain why individuals become involved in non-normative sexual behaviours.

The results from this study do support a relationship between sexual attitudes, sexual awareness and sexual experiences. For example, the swingers consistently scored the highest in these three factors, while the students consistently scored the lowest. The LGBT group consistently scored somewhere in between the swingers and students. The results were further consistent with what would be expected from each group concerning sexual orientation. Perhaps the most interesting finding was the bisexuality score of the swingers on the SSSO. Of the three groups they not only scored the highest on the heterosexual measures, but also scored the highest on the bisexual measure, although not significantly different from the LGBT group. At first glance this does not seem to make much sense, however it provides a significant and interesting detail to the model. It suggests that with open attitudes towards same-sex contact and an awareness that same-sex contact can occur, swingers are then able to engage in same-sex experiences, even if they do not identify as being bisexual. This is

similar to Diamond's (1998) study in which some of the participants identified as lesbian without having any same-sex contact.

The swingers scored the highest on all measures related to sexual experience, sexual awareness, and open sexual attitudes. This result suggests that not only do they engage a wide variety of sexual activities, they also more frequently engaged in sexual behaviours. Swingers have the opportunity to engage in male-on-male or female-on-female sexual contact more frequently than normally available to other individuals. Swingers also have the most open attitudes towards unconventional sexuality, and therefore are likely to be more open to same-sex contact. Lastly, it can be assumed that they are aware same-sex contact can and does occur within the context of swinging, and they are likely aware that other swingers have similar and open attitudes towards same-sex behaviours. It is proposed that this combination of frequent experiences, open attitudes, and increased awareness, allows swingers to engage in sexual behaviours that they would otherwise not participate in or have access to the experience.

Perhaps ironically, as I was conducting my research at the swingers club, a new term was brought to my attention: bi-situational. Apparently, this term was coined to express someone who is bisexual in the right circumstances, but otherwise considers himself or herself to be straight. Urban dictionary defines bi-situational as a usually female on female sexual act that occurs in the spur of the moment and may include the use of alcohol ("Urban Dictionary", 2014). The results from this study seem to support the validity of this term, as swingers report

they are predominantly heterosexual, yet engage in some bisexual experiences as well.

Overall, the results of this study do support a tri-factor model of sexuality that can be used to explain why people may engage in non-normative sexual behaviours. For example, individuals with bondage experience, an awareness that bondage exists, and an open attitude towards bondage, may seek out other individuals with similar attitudes and awareness, thus increasing their experiences with bondage. Once a particular point in experience or awareness has been reached, an individual may decide to engage the services of a dominatrix to expand his or her experiences with bondage. The tri-factor model of sexuality explains this behaviour far more effectively than a superficial explanation, such as, “he or she was just bored”. Similarly, it explains how couples can become engaged in swinging and open relationships. Even if the couple does not have a previous swinging sexual experience, as long as they have an open attitude and awareness that swinging exists, it is likely the couple will attempt to initially meet other swingers to learn more about swinging. Once they have this experience, they may or may not engage in additional meetings with other swinging couples to engage in their first swinging experience. Therefore, the couple is not “bored” or “experiencing relationship disharmony”, but rather actively seeking sexual experiences congruent with their levels of sexual awareness and sexual attitudes.

One interesting finding demonstrated that swingers were more likely to be married than the LGBT group or students. It could be argued that the swingers are predominantly two individuals working together to obtain sexual experiences,

rather than a predominantly single individual from the LGBT or student groups. Given that the majority of swingers are married, it is also more likely they had had longer relationships than participants in the other two groups. One question that was not asked in the study was the number of children that each participant has. It is possible that swingers being predominantly heterosexual, also have children and families, to which swinging may represent a risk. If both partners agree to swinging, and it is kept from the children, then likely there is low risk and no problems. However, swinging presumably adds risks to the relationship, such as finding other mates, children finding out, and other health associated risks. Therefore, the family unit would be jeopardized if one parent found a different mate, or became seriously ill. However, despite possible risks, swingers still continue swinging, and in fact, swinging culture seems to be expanding (Jenks, 1998). The tri-factor model helps explain why couples may begin swinging and in part explains why they continue. Since all three factors are related, the more experiences swingers have with swinging, the more awareness they have regarding swinging, contributing to even more open attitudes towards swinging or other sexual behaviours.

There could be parallel reasons for why swingers continue to swing as well. As Denfield and Gordon (1970) highlighted in their article, swinging offers couples a chance to explore their sexuality in a relatively non-deviant way. For example, they found that many non-swingers did not report mentioning to their spouse when they looked at pornography, whereas this was not a concern with swinging couples. Bartell (1970) went a step further and proposed that swinging

allowed couples to work together, spend time together, go out and meet other couples, work on their communication, and experience each other's pleasure and happiness. Bartell's proposed outcomes of swinging may actually strengthen relationships. He suggested that swinging couples would spend more time together, as they would search for swinging events and other couples together, and then experience pleasure and happiness as positive reinforcement that results from and reinforces the behaviour of swinging. Bartell's reasons for swinging, are surprisingly similar to Diamond's (1997) reasons for hidden ovulation and repeated mating without the guarantee of conception, including for fun, pleasure, and increased mate bonding. Despite the age of this research, as Jenks (1998) and Rubin (2001) discussed, little research has been conducted solely on swingers or why individuals choose to swing. Furthermore, at the time of this study, no literature was found that attempted to explain the benefits of swinging.

Based on Bartell's (1970) hypothesis, swinging may also strengthen the sexual awareness of both partners in a relationship. Many of Bartell's positive outcomes are related to increased sexual awareness. For example, it would be easier for couples to express their sexual boundaries, sexual preferences, and sexual desires, when they are actively engaged in searching for alternative sexual partners. Furthermore, this would allow partners to become more aware of their partner's sexual attitudes and awareness as well.

Perhaps Denfield, and Gordon (1970) were correct when they suggested that the family who swings together stays together. The tri-factor model of sexuality does suggest that if two partners do not have similar awareness and



attitudes, then they will not have similar experiences that could cause conflict in the relationship. For example, if one person has an open attitude towards swinging, while the other person does not, the couple may experience conflict over sexual needs not being met in one case, and feeling unfair sexual demands in the other case. Similarly, if one person in the relationship has had many experiences with bondage and the other person has not, then this may also cause conflict during sexual activities, as one person has very dissimilar experiences from the other. If however, the person with limited experience has an open attitude towards bondage and is willing to try it, then he or she can start building his or her own experience with bondage and the awareness that goes with it. Byers (2011) research indirectly supported this conclusion with her hypothesis that individuals who could talk about sexual intimacy, were found to have higher levels of sexual satisfaction in marriage. However, it is unlikely her sample included many, if any, swinging couples, and it was conducted with predominantly heterosexual couples.

It should be noted that the Measure of Unusual Sexual behaviours (MUS) used in this study is not an independently validated scale of sexual behaviour. The MUS was originally developed for the undergraduate study that preceded this current research. The MUS was based on questions that were listed on different swinging and adult sites during membership requests. The fact that swinger websites were asking new members these questions indicates that the MUS has external validity. Furthermore, the swingers in this study did score significantly higher on this measure than the LGBT and student groups. The value of the MUS

lies in the fact it asks questions about non-normative sexual behaviours. The SEQ asks questions that could be considered quite normative in nature. For example, “Have you engaged in penile-vaginal intercourse?” or “Have you engaged in fellatio (penis in mouth contact)?” Since the current study wanted to explore non-normative sexual behaviours, the MUS was included since it asked questions concerning shrimping (toes in mouth), watersports (act of being urinated on or urinating on others), and bondage. Perhaps not ironically, given the current state of literature and conventional theories of sexuality, at the time of this research there was no scale of non-normative sexual experiences available. Therefore, the scores on the MUS should be considered to have face validity, since a recent review of the swinging website still asked the same questions, however, it does not mean that the MUS is necessarily psychometrically sound, nor is it independently validated.

The sexual awareness questionnaire (SAQ) was selected for this study since it was thought to offer a comprehensive measure of sexual awareness. Included in the scale is an overall measure of sexual awareness, and four sub measures, including sexual consciousness, sexual monitoring tendencies, sexual assertiveness, and sexual appeal consciousness. The SAQ at present is the most comprehensive measure for sexual awareness. However, two assumptions were made by the researcher for this study. The first is that the development of sexual awareness is independent of the development of sexual identity. The second assumption is, that sexual awareness is the same for individuals, regardless of sexual orientation. For example, someone who is heterosexual in orientation

should answer the question, “I can tell when others think I am sexy”, the same as a person who is homosexual in orientation. This would constitute support for an argument for the relationship between experience and awareness. It is reasonable to expect that someone with more sexual experiences, such as a larger number of sexual partners, would be more aware when someone else thinks they are attractive or sexy, regardless of gender or sexual orientation, due to having more experiences with attraction.

Lemer, Blodgett Salafia, and Benson (2013) highlight a relationship between body image and level of sexual activity in a group of college females. The results indicated how women with a higher level of confidence in their own body image often felt more attractive and engaged in more sexual activities. It is conceivable that women, and perhaps even men, in the swinger sample of this study have a higher level of confidence in their own body image. This study did not include a body self-satisfaction measure, and it is recommended that any follow up studies include a measure to help gauge body confidence. It is possible that there is a link between body image and sexual awareness and two of the subtests for the SAQ are sexual consciousness and sexual monitoring tendencies. However, this would be an avenue for future investigation, and the authors of the SAQ did not mention body image as a part of the SAQ at the time of publishing.

### **Limitations of this Study**

One of the limitations of this study is the reliance on introspective self-report data. For example, the sexual orientation scales, the MFA and SSSO, required participants to think about their emotional, physical, and sexual

attractions to the same-sex and opposite sex, and then attribute a number to that attraction. This number might be different if the test was administered more than once to each participant, that is, the test may have low test-retest reliability. Furthermore, both scales required participants to classify their sexual orientation into a particular category, such as heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual or asexual. Some participants identified this section of the research as the most difficult part to complete. For example, one male participant who is sexually attracted to male-to-female transsexual girls (Tgirls), asked in a follow up email how this would define his sexual orientation. I also received verbal feedback from swingers, during my Friday and Saturday promotion nights, who were also unsure how to answer these particular questions. Many of the women described themselves as being open to bisexual encounters, but not necessarily emotionally or physically attracted to women. Interestingly, this does support the use of the term “bi-situational”, insofar as these participants were willing to have sex with females, even if they were not otherwise physically or emotionally attracted to females. Thus far, my research has been unable to answer the question of how these attractions relate to a definition of sexual orientation. However, the scope of this project was to determine support for the tri-factor theory of sexuality, which suggests that attractions to person can occur with adequate awareness, open attitudes and previous experience, not to determine how this translates into a direct sexual orientation label.

Since participants only completed the survey once, two surveys on sexual orientation were used to verify their orientation. There was agreement between

score on both scales during analysis, which was used as a convergent validity check. Therefore, the scores can be considered to be reliable and valid, despite a reliance on the subjective views of the participants. Furthermore, the data suggests that even when using self-report methods for sexuality research, test-retest reliabilities may still range from 0.7 to 0.9 (Nyitray et al. 2010). In fact, results from the Nyitray et al. (2010) study indicated that “refusal to answer a question” was a significant factor in test-retest reliabilities. It can be hypothesized that since participants who refused to answer three questions or more in a row were removed, the results should have high test-retest reliability.

A second limitation of this study is the reliance on subjective views of what constitutes conventional and non-conventional sexuality. The ATUS scale relies on participants’ perceptions of a) what is conventional and nonconventional sexual behaviour, and b) making a judgment as to whether or not their sexual behaviours fit into each category. Since no guidelines were given to help participants decide what sexual behaviours fit into each category, it is possible there was some overlap between participants in what was considered conventional and nonconventional. The samples from the three groups were large enough that any individual subjective differences on conventional and non-conventional definitions should not affect overall results. Furthermore, all participants from each group were predominantly Canadian and Caucasian, so it is reasonable to assume that most participants had similar views of what constitutes conventional and non-conventional sexuality from media and cultural exposure (Haavio-Mannila, E., & Kontula, 1997; Wilson 1995). Lastly, the results of the study do

suggest that views of conventional and non-conventional sexuality were fairly equivalent between groups, as swingers scored the highest, and which is to be expected given their sexual history and background.

A third limitation to this study was the relative restriction of the sample to swingers from one metropolitan city. Although this study was advertised to a variety of LGBT clubs and safe spaces across Canada, and to three swinger clubs in one province, only one swinger club agreed to help advertise and support the research. The other two clubs politely declined claiming it might invade the privacy of its members and therefore affect business, despite the completely anonymous nature of the study. As a result, swinger participation in this research relied upon advisements in one local club and through word of mouth.

Unfortunately, this impacts the generalizability of the results for swingers, which may be lower than for individuals who identified as LGBT. There is no reason to believe that swingers in this research would vary greatly from other swingers, and in fact, the swingers in this study demographically matched swingers in research conducted in the 1970s.

A fourth limitation to this research was the reliance on students to comprise the control group. Students are used in a variety of sexuality related studies and the development of sexuality related measures (Bradshaw, Kahn, & Saville, 2010; Diamond, 1998). However, it is unclear how well heterosexual individuals represent the population as a whole (Rubin, 2001). Students may have greater sexual awareness and sexual experience than other individuals due to their social environment and exposure to sexual education. This study only included

swingers, individuals who identify as LGBT, and a group of students due to the ease of sampling. However, it is suggested that further study be conducted to test for differences between students and a more representative sample of the population.

A fifth limitation to this study was a reliance on conventional terms of sexual identity and orientation. As the focus of this project was on the relationship between four factors of sexuality, the opportunity to elaborate or update sexual identity terms and definitions was missed. Due to the nature of sexuality research, and the analysis of results, the questionnaire relied on strict reliance to the scales that comprised it. No additional answers were included beyond the ones provided in the scales, such as, “if yours is not listed, please provide a term and short description of your sexual identity or orientation”. Therefore, although feedback was obtained from emails and word of mouth directly to the researcher, an opportunity was missed to expand the nomenclature that comprises the sexualities in this study. Although each participant was assessed on separate continuums of sexuality, as Diamond and Savin-Willams (2000) suggested, a reliance on categories when conducting research on sexuality is not advised, as individuals may not feel that a particular category completely defines them or adequately represents their sexual attractions. Therefore, one recommendation from this researcher, is that any follow up studies into sexuality should modify existing scales if possible to be more accommodating for any new terms and definitions that may be used by participants, as older scales may not be up-to-date with most recent definitions and terms.

Congruent with the fifth limitation, and the difficulties with labels and categories, another limitation with this study concerns the transgendered sample of this research. The questions that were used to determine if an individual was transgender, were not specific to determine whether they were male to female or female to male and how this would relate to their view of their own sexual orientation. Due to this limitation, it could simply not be determined how these individuals may identify their own sexual orientation, whether predominantly sexually attracted towards males, females, or other individuals who identified as TG, and subsequently was not included in some of the analysis. Although there was only a total of 21 participants who identified as TG, an opportunity to explore how these individuals identified and approached sexual orientation and attraction was not included.

### **Recommendations**

The purpose of this study was to expand the knowledge and understanding of human sexuality in one neglected area of research (swingers) and a newer area of research (individuals who identify as LGBT). The secondary purpose of this study was to provide evidence to support a tri-factor model of human sexuality, through primarily studying the relationship between sexual experience, sexual awareness, and sexual attitudes. Although the results of my undergraduate work and this master's thesis support this tri-factor model, more research should be conducted, especially concerning the limitations of this study and for further development concerning the understanding of human sexuality. The following



recommendations are suggested for anyone continuing with sexuality research, especially as Rubin (2001) highlighted, on the fringes of sexuality.

The first recommendation for future research is to replicate or expand this research using other metropolitan areas in Canada, the United States, and even outside of North America. Perhaps the most beneficial aspect would be to examine differences between swingers or individuals who identify as LGBT from different locations around the world, including different cultures, ethnicities and societies. Due to the highly localized sample in this study, generalizations to other parts of Canada and the US should be made with caution. Completing a follow up study with a wider range of participants would help with generalizing of results. For example, one suitable place to conduct a future study would be to access swinging resorts or swinging conferences, as this would allow access to swingers from different locations. This would provide access to a group of individuals from all over North America and other parts of the world.

The second recommendation for future research is to expand on this study to include different groups of individuals involved in other areas of sexuality. For example, conducting a study using a group of individuals comprising a particular fetish organization (i.e. Come Out and Play Edmonton) or a particular sexual community (Edmonton O Society, EOS), to determine if the types of sexual experiences change sexual attitudes or sexual awareness. It is possible that awareness and attitudes are linked through multiple experiences in multiple areas, versus many experiences in a single area.

The third recommendation is based on the limitation from using the SEQ and the MUS measures independently. The MUS has not been independently validated, although it may have some face validity and construct validity. The MUS was developed from questions on a swinger registration site, and the swingers did score the highest on this new measure. Therefore, as a measure of unusual sexual behaviours, it does seem to measure non-normative sexual behaviours, from a swinging perspective. However, it is more than likely not a complete list, and it is doubtful that it incorporates all non-normative sexual behaviours that exist. It is therefore recommended that future studies should try to include a single, comprehensive sexual experience measure that ranges from normative to non-normative sexual behaviours. At the time of this study, such a measure did not exist.

The fourth recommendation for future research includes modifying existing scales to be more reflective of current terminology. The SSSO and MFA used together did provide convergent support for the sexual orientation of swingers, individuals who identify as LGBT, and students. However, both of those scales were limited in fact that they only provided set answers for self-identification. Consistent with the limitation pointed out by participants, it is recommended that an open answer be provided as well as the set responses, for example, predominantly heterosexual, slightly heterosexual, both heterosexual and homosexual, slightly homosexual, and predominantly homosexual. These scales were used in the present research because modifying a scale may decrease its overall reliability and validity. However, by modifying the scale, the overall

study might have been more reflective of the different sexual orientation terminologies that are currently being used. Since the LGBT group was expected to incorporate sexual and gender minority individuals, including newer terms for sexual orientation and gender diversity should not detract from or hinder future research, even if scales are modified slightly to include the use of an additional open answer option.

The fifth recommendation is to remember differences between group and individual responses when conducting sexuality research. Although, a group may be comprised of several individuals with common interests and experiences, that does not mean that each individual in that group has had a particular experience. In this study, I made the mistake of thinking the LGBT group would score higher as whole because individuals could make up for experiences in other individuals. At group level this may have been correct, but because the scales asked for each individual response, individual experience and awareness was analyzed.

The sixth recommendation is to expand on the three factors of sexuality, and to explore what other constructs may relate to human sexuality. As Diamond, and Savin-Williams (2000) identify, sexual identity does not always develop in synchrony with personal identity. Therefore, future research into human sexuality should keep self-identity and sexual identity differences in mind. Congruent with the first recommendation, it is suggested that individuals be allowed to include their own categories of self-identification in addition to the pre-determined answers provided by existing scales. It should also be recognized that just because individuals may engage in same-sex behaviours, that does not mean they might

identify as bisexual, especially if they considered themselves to be predominantly heterosexual. Similarly, the opposite may be true, and those who consider themselves to be predominantly homosexual may still engage in opposite sex behaviours, but not consider themselves to be bisexual.

Other factors that are recommended for exploration include relationships between sensation seeking, and other personality associated factors and non-normative sexual behaviours. There is a possibility that attitudes may be related to individual personal factors. For example, if an individual is more open to non-normative sexual behaviours, he or she may be interested in other non-normative behaviours as well. Furthermore, some people may be more interested in sensation seeking behaviours, and therefore actively seek out highly stimulating events, activities, and behaviours (Zuckerman, 1988).

The seventh recommendation is to explore and examine the influence of environmental factors on sexual attitudes, sexual awareness, and sexual experiences. Evidence suggests that swingers are in a unique environment, which allows same-sex behaviours to occur, even though swingers identify themselves as predominantly heterosexual. Therefore, it is predicted that if other individuals who are either predominantly heterosexual or homosexual in their sexual orientation may still have same-sex or opposite experiences if allowed in a particular environment, such as a club offering such experiences with like-minded people.

The eighth, and final, recommendation is to anyone who is considering doing sexuality research, although it can be difficult, and coworkers, friends, and

family may sometimes question your motives, go ahead and do it anyway. I have learned that sampling is just as hard, if not harder than many people claim, and trying to come up with robust samples in this population is extremely difficult. Furthermore, despite honest and genuine attempts to cover all the angles, and all the definitions and labels, while being an ethical researcher is almost impossible in studying sexuality. Despite my best attempts at being inclusive, using correct language, and the most comprehensive terms I understood, I still received feedback from participants with new terms, definitions, and questions, I had not previously considered. Yet, despite the constant renegotiation, and understanding of being an ethical and inclusive researcher in this area, this experience has been a blessing to me in many different ways. It has allowed me to reflect upon my own sexuality, my own experiences, and my own awareness and attitudes. I have met wonderful people, whom I would have never otherwise met from all three sample groups who have been excited and supportive of my research, if still very ready to tell me everything they think is wrong with it. As Jenks (1998) and Rubin (2001) highlight in their articles, there is a deficit of research in particular areas of human sexuality, and no understanding of human sexuality can be complete unless all areas are explored and understood. And as I said in my Preface, sexuality is like a river flowing, and my own course could not have helped changing direction due to bumping into some wonderful boulders and rocks and ridges along my own course of understanding, development, and pursuit of knowledge.

## Concluding Prospective

### Epistemology of Sexuality

Rubin (2001) posed a question asking whatever happened to group marriages, communes and swingers? He described a flurry of research starting in the 1960s and then a slow diminishment in research until the mid-1980s, before research in this area seemed to halt. Jenks (1998) suggested several reasons for a decline in research investigating alternative sexualities, including access to populations and low academic prestige. Researchers like Johnson and Clark (2003) suggest that many researchers in this area feel under prepared to deal with sensitive topics in this area, and Poole, Giles and Moore's (2004) research suggests, there could even be negative consequences for pursuing research in this area, such as negative reactions from family, friends, and colleagues. It is difficult to know the extent to which we can gain knowledge and understanding in the field of sexuality, as sexuality is constantly changing and re-inventing itself.

There are many models that are used to help examine and explain human sexual behaviour (Wilkison & Pearson, 2013; Diamond, 1998; Foucault, 1980). Currently, there are many different theories surrounding human sexuality, from evolutionary perspectives to repressive theories, although many of these theories cannot quite account for deviation in relatively normative and conventional relationships (Diamond, 1997; Foucault, 1980; Peterson & Hyde, 2010). Yet, as Jenks (1998) highlights, many current models of sexuality are based on a readily supplied sample of participants (students) and often researchers are limited in their opportunities by access to other groups of individuals. For example, without

my personal contacts into the swinging and LGBT communities, I doubt this research would have been possible. Therefore, the primary purpose for this research, is to expand our understanding and knowledge of human sexuality.

Swingers seem to be a group of people who have shed society's traditional views of marriage for the sole purpose of procreation, and instead seem to have reverted to an ancestral state in which sexuality is promiscuous and fun. Swingers seem to have developed their own social environment, in which, open sexual contact between members, regardless of sex is approved and encouraged. From an evolutionary perspective, this behaviour does not seem all that strange at all. It would have allowed members of a tight-knit community to readily share resources, as no single male could be entirely sure which offspring was in fact his (Diamond, 1997). To make a personal observation as well, I never once witnessed any acts of aggression in the swingers club, and after talking with the club owners, only one member has ever had his membership revoked for aggressive behaviour. This suggests that swingers themselves are peaceful and interested more in having a good time than mate guarding behaviours or acts of aggression. This leads to another question. Perhaps when individuals are free to be themselves, and engage in pleasurable activities, they no longer feel the need to be aggressive, or to be better than someone else.

The secondary purpose of this research was to provide support and evidence for a tri-factor model of human sexuality. This model was developed to provide an alternative explanation of how and why people engage in non-normative sexual behaviours that are not based on overly simplistic explanations

such as they were “bored”, or “looking to spice things up”. The results of this study support the relationship between sexual experience, sexual awareness, and liberal sexual attitudes, and this relationship can be used to explain why people may engage in non-normative sexual behaviors. Sexual orientation did not seem to influence sexual awareness or sexual experience. In fact, the results suggest that sexual experience and sexual attitudes might actually influence same-sex behaviours. The swingers scored the highest in terms of bisexuality despite being predominantly heterosexual.

In conclusion, no study of sexuality can ever be complete, as sexuality is constantly evolving and developing in accordance with the environment, societal views, and other influences. This research study does support a tri-factor model that can explain how individuals engage in non-normative behaviours, and perhaps provide some ideas as to why we as a species are inclined towards sex as a recreational activity. However, further research, based both on the recommendations and limitations of this study is still recommended, as we endeavor to understand our sexual behaviours, thoughts, desires, and attitudes.



## References

- Barker, M., & Langdridge, D. (2013). Whatever happened to non-monogamies? Critical reflections on recent research and theory. *Sexualities, 13*(6), 748-772. doi: 10.1177/1363460710384645
- Bartell, G. D. (1970). Group sex among the mid-americans. *The Journal of Sex Research, 6*(2), 113-130. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3811586>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Twenge, J. F. (2002). Cultural suppression of female sexuality. *Review of General Psychology, 6*(2), 166-203. doi:  
10.1037//1089-2680.6.2.166
- Blake, J. D. (2012). *The Relationship Between Sexual Awareness and Sexual Experience*. Unpublished BA thesis manuscript, Department of Psychology, Grant MacEwan University, Edmonton, Canada.
- Bradshaw, C., Kahn, A. S., & Saville, B. K. (2010). To hook up or to date: Which gender benefits?. *Sex Roles, 62*, 661-669. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9765-7
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Byers, S. E. (2011). Beyond the birds and the bees and was it good for you?: thirty years of research on sexual communication. *Canadian Psychology, 52*(1), 20-28. doi: 10.1037/a0022048
- Carroll, L., Gilroy, P. J., & Ryan J. (2002). Counseling transgendered, transsexual, and gender- variant clients. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*, 131-139. doi:10.1002/j.1556-678.2002.tb00175.x

- Christopher S. F., & Sprecher, S. (2000). Sexuality in marriage, dating, and other relationships: A decade of review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 999-1017. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00999.x
- DeMaris, A. (2009). Distal and proximal influences on the risk of extramarital sex: A prospective study of longer duration marriages. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46(6), 597-607. doi: 10.1080/00224490902915993
- Denfield, D., & Gordon, M. (1970). The sociology of mate swapping: Or the family that swings together, stays together. *Journal of Sex Research*, 6(2), 85-100. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3811584>
- de Visser, R., & McDonald, D. (2007). Swinging and roundabouts: Management of jealousy in heterosexual 'swinging' couples. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 459-476. doi: 10.1348/014466606X143153
- Diamond, L. M. (1998). Development of sexual orientation among adolescent and young adult women. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 1085-1095. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.34.5.1085
- Diamond, L., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (2000). Explaining diversity in the development of same-sex sexuality among young women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(2), 297-313. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00167
- Diamond, J. (1997). *Why is Sex Fun? The Evolution of Human Sexuality*. New York, NY: Basic Books
- Dixon, D. JD. (1985). Perceived sexual satisfaction and marital happiness of bisexual and heterosexual swinging husbands. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11,(1-2), 209-222. doi: 10.1300/J082v11n01\_15

- D'Orlando, F. (2010). Swinger Economics. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 39, 295-305. doi: 10.1016/j.socec.2009.12.008
- Duckworth, J., & Levitt, E. E. (1985). Personality analysis of a swingers' club. *Lifestyles: A Journal of Changing Patterns*, 8, 35-45. doi: 10.1007/BF01435913
- Fincham, F.D., & Bradbury, T. N. (1987). The assessment of marital quality: A re-evaluation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49, 797-809. doi: 10.2307/351973
- Foucault, M. (1980). *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*. New York, NY: Random House New York
- Frank, K. (2008). 'Not gay, but not homophobic': Male sexuality and homophobia in the 'lifestyle'. *Sexualities*, 11(4), 465-454. doi: 10.1177/1363460708091743
- Garcia, J.R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology*, 16(2), 161-176. doi: 10.1037/a0027911
- Gilmartin, B. G. (1974). Sexual deviance and social networks: A study of social, family, and marital interaction patterns among co-marital sex participants. In J. R. Smith, and L. G. Smith, (Eds.), *Beyond Monogamy: Recent Studies on Sexual Alternatives in Marriage* (pp. 291-323). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.
- Gonsiorek, J. C., Sell, R., & Weinrich, J. D. (1995). Definition and measurement of sexual orientation. *Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior*, 25, 40-51.

Retrieved from

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/%28ISSN%291943-278X/issues>

- Haavio-Mannila, E., & Kontula, O. (1997). Correlates of increased sexual satisfaction. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 26*, 399-419. doi: 10.1023/A:1024591318836
- Hammack, P. L., Thompson, E. M., & Pilecki, A. (2009). Configurations of identity among sexual minority youth: context, desire, and narrative. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(7), 867-883. doi: 10.1007/s10964-008-9342-3
- Johnson, B. & Clark, J. M. (2003). Collecting sensitive data: The impact on researchers. *Qualitative Health Research, 13*(3), 421-434. doi: 10.1177/1049732302250340
- Jenks, R. J. (1985). Swinging: A replication and test of a theory. *The Journal of Sex Research, 21*, 199-210. doi: 10.1080/00224498509551258
- Jenks, R. J. (1998). Swinging: A review of the literature. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 27*, 507-521. doi: 10.1023/A:1018708730945
- Kraemer, H. C., & Thiemann, S. (1987). *How Many Subjects? Statistical Power Analysis in Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc
- Laqueur, T. (2003). *Solitary Sex: A Cultural History of Masturbation*. New York, NY: Zone Books
- Lemer, J. L., Blodgett Salafia, E. H., & Benson, K. E. (2013). The relationship between college women's sexual attitudes and sexual activity: The

mediating role of body image. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 25(2), 104-114. doi: 10.1080/19317611.2012.722593

Life on the Swing Set. (n.d.). Retrieved May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014, from Life on the Swing Set Website, <http://www.lifeontheswingset.com/4897/full-swap-vs-soft-swap-what%E2%80%99s-the-big-deal/>

Luria, M., Byers, S., Voyer, S. D., & Mock, M. (2013). Motivations and sexual attitudes, experiences, and behavior of sexuality professionals. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 39(2), 112-131. doi: 10.1080/0092623X.2011.606882

Lyons, H., Manning, W., Giordano, P., & Longmore, M. (2013). Predictors of heterosexual casual sex among young adults. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 42, 585-593. doi: 10.1007/s10508-012-0051-3

MacNeil, S. & Byers, S., E. (2009). Role of self-disclosure in the sexual satisfaction of long-term heterosexual couples. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46, 3-14. doi: 10.1080/00224490802398399

McKnight, P. E., McKnight, K. M., Sidani, S., & Figueredo, A. J. (2007). *Missing data: A gentle introduction*. New York, NY: Guilford.

Merriam Webster Online Dictionary. (n.d.). Sexuality. Retrieved May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/sexuality>

Messick, S. (1995). Validity of Psychological Assessment: Validation of inferences from personas' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist*, 50(9), 741-749. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.50.9.741

- O'Keeffe, J., & O'Keeffe, R. (2008). What's eating you?. *Runnin' Wild*. Los Angeles, CA: Capital Records.
- Petersen, J. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2010). Meta-analytic review of research on gender differences in sexuality, 1993–2007. *Psychology Bulletin*, *163*(1), 21-38. doi: 10.1037/a0017504
- Reicherzer, R. (2005). Coming out and living across the life span. In Dana Comstock (Ed.), *Diversity and Development: Critical Contexts that Shape Our Lives and Relationships* (pp.161-184). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Poole, H., Giles, D. C., & Moore, K. (2004). Researching sexuality and sexual issues: implications for the researcher?. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, *19*(1), 79-86. doi: 10.1080/14681990410001640853
- Ramay, J. W. (1975). Intimate groups and networks: frequent consequence of sexually open marriage. *The Family Coordinator*, *24*(4), 515-530. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/583035>
- Rubin, R. H. (2001). Alternative lifestyles revisited, or whatever happened to swingers, group marriages, and communes? *Journal of Family Issues*, *22*, 711-726. doi:10.1177/019251301022006003
- Rudman, L. A., Fetterolf, J. C., & Sanchez, D. T. (2013). What motivates the sexual double standard? More support for the male versus female control theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*(2), 250-263. doi: 10.1177/0146167212472375

- Smith, J.R., & Smith, L. R. (1970). Co-marital sex and the sexual freedom movement. *Journal of Sex Research*, 6, 131-142. doi: 10.1080/00224497009550656
- Snell, W. E., Jr., Fisher, T.D., & Miller, R. S. (1991). Development of the sexual awareness questionnaire: Components, reliability, and validity. *Annals of Sex Research*, 4, 65-92. doi: 10.1007/BF00850140
- Steinberg, L., & Monahan, K.C. (2010). Adolescents' exposure to sexy media does not hasten the initiation of sexual intercourse. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(2), 562-576. doi: 10.1037/a0020613
- Stone, L., & McKee, N. P. (2002). *Gender and Culture in America*. 2nd Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sullivan, G., & Reynolds, R. (2003). Homosexuality in midlife. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 15(3), 153-170. doi: 10.1300/J041v15n03\_14
- Trotter, E. C., & Alderson, K.G. (2007). University students' definitions of having sex, sexual partner, and virginity loss: The influence of participant gender, sexual experience, and contextual factors. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 16, 11-29. Retrieved from <http://www.sieccan.org/cjhs.html>
- Urban Dictionary. (n.d.). Bi-situational. Retrieved April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014, from Urban Dictionary Website, <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Bi-situational>
- Varni, C. A. (1974). An exploratory study of spouse swapping. In J. R. Smith, and L.G. Smith, (Eds.), *Beyond Monogamy: Recent Studies on Sexual*

*Alternatives in Marriage* (pp. 246-59). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins Press.

- Weis, D. L., Rabinowitz, B., & Ruckstuhl, M. F. (1992). Individual changes in sexual attitudes and behavior within college-level human sexuality courses. *The Journal of Sex Research, 29*, 43-59. doi: 10.1080/00224499209551633
- Wilkinson, L., & Pearson, J. (2013). High school religious context and reports of same-sex attraction and sexual identity in young adulthood. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 76*(2), 180-202. doi: 10.1177/0190272513475458
- Wilson, T. C. (1995). Urbanism and unconventionality: The case of sexual behavior. *Social Science Quarterly, 76*, 346-363. Retrieved from <http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0038-4941>
- Wismeijer, A, A.J., & van Assen, M, A.L.M. (2013). Psychological characteristics of BDSM practitioners. *Journal of Sexual Medicine, 10*, 1943-1952. doi: 10.1111/jsm.12192
- Witeck, B. (2014). Cultural change in acceptance of LGBT people: Lessons from social marketing. *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 84*(1), 19-22. doi: 10.1037/h0098945
- Yarbrough, E., & McIntosh, C. A. (2012). Dressing up a ken doll. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health, 16*, 361-372. doi: 10.1080/19359705.2012.697421



Zuckerman, M. (1998). Human sexuality questionnaire. In C.M. Davis, W. L. Yarber & S. L. Davis (Eds.), *Sexuality-related Measures: A Compendium* (pp. 92-98). Lake Mills, IA: Graphic Publishing.

## Appendix A – Consent Form

Study Title:  
An Alternate Theory of Sexuality: The Influence of Sexual Awareness and Orientation

Research Investigator:  
Jessica Blake  
6-102 Education North  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2G5  
[jblake@ualberta.ca](mailto:jblake@ualberta.ca)  
(780) 492-9275

Supervisor (if Applicable):  
Professor George Buck  
6-102 Education North  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2G5  
[gbuck@ualberta.ca](mailto:gbuck@ualberta.ca)  
(780) 492-9275

### Background

- You are being invited to participate in this research project. The purpose is to provide further knowledge in the area of human sexuality. Specifically to help determine how certain factors of sexuality are related.
- I am conducting this research for my Master's Thesis at the University of Alberta.
- There is no outside source of funding for this project. I am simply doing it to help fill gaps in knowledge as it is a topic I find fascinating.

### Purpose

- The purpose of this research is to help provide knowledge in areas of human sexuality. By examining how factors of sexuality change between groups, we can discover how factors of sexuality are related. This can help in a number of areas including, individual counseling, and relationship counseling.

### Study Procedures

- This research will be conducted via the internet using an online questionnaire. It is estimated you will need 15-30 minutes to finish. At no time will any personal, indication, information be requested or collected. All completed questionnaires will consist only of answers submitted by each participant. Once the raw data has been processed, only group averages will be used for final results.
- As this research is being conducted at the University of Alberta, the researchers of this study have taken all appropriate actions to ensure this research is conducted in an ethically responsible manner.

## Appendix A – Consent Form Continued

### Benefits

- Since this questionnaire requires participants' to reflect and think about their sexual behaviours. It is possible that participants will come to a deeper understanding of their own sexuality.
- We hope that the information we get from doing this study will help us better understand the dynamic nature and fluidity of human sexuality. The information from this study will help provide understanding and knowledge of human sexual behaviours.
- There is no compensation offered to participants, other than appreciation on behalf of the researchers.

### Risk

- We do not foresee any serious risks to people who participate in this study. However, in the event that any questions may cause distress you may skip any questions you would like. You may also leave the survey at any point.
- We do not think there are any risks to participant. You may become upset by being reminded of your own or another's past or present behavior. If you do feel uneasy or are concerned, we urge you to contact local distress help lines. If you live in Edmonton, the telephone number for the Support Network's 24-hour Distress Line is 780-482-HELP (4357). If you do not live in the Edmonton area, contact Dr. George Buck, [gbuck@ualberta.ca](mailto:gbuck@ualberta.ca). He will help you in finding contact numbers of support agencies in your area.

### Voluntary Participation

- You are free to participate or not participate in this study. You are allowed to skip questions, and/or withdraw from the study at any time. Once your start, you are free to skip any questions that you do not like. If you choose to participate but later change your mind, you may withdraw from the study at any time. In this case, all answers you provided will be deleted. You will be asked to complete you questionnaire by clicking a submit button. After, your answers will no longer be identifiable as from a particular person. Your answers cannot be withdrawn from analysis after clicking submit.

## Appendix A – Consent Form Continued

### Confidentiality

- Your identity will remain unknown and all data will remain confidential. Only the investigators will have access to the data from this research. No information about your personal identity is collected at any point. All raw data will be destroyed once it has been entered into analysis. You will not be identified in any way on the data sheets. Thus, your identification will not appear in any report or publication.
- All raw data will be stored on Dr. George Buck's locked computer. No printed copies will be made. The group data will be stored for 5 years before being deleted (destroyed). Only final results in the thesis will be made available.
- A copy of the thesis will be available anyone in the University Library.

### Further Information

- If you have any questions about participation in this study, please contact Dr. George H. Buck. He is the Associate Chair & Graduate Coordinator, Dept. of Educational Psychology. The office is located at 6-102 Education North, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2G5. You may also contact Dr. Buck over e-mail at [gbuck@ualberta.ca](mailto:gbuck@ualberta.ca).
- If you have concerns about this study, you may contact the Research Ethics Office. Their number is 492-2615.

## Appendix A – Consent Form Continued

Title of Project: An Alternate Theory of Sexuality: The Influence of Sexual Awareness and Orientation

Principal Investigator(s): Jessica Blake, Masters Student, University of Alberta, Department of Education.

Co-Investigator(s): George H. Buck, Ph.D., Associate Chair & Graduate Coordinator, Dept. of Educational Psychology.

[Clickable Buttons]

Do you understand that you have been asked to be in a research study? [Yes] [No]

Have you read and understood the consent form? [Yes] [No]

Do you understand the benefits and risks involved in taking part in this research study? [Yes] [No]

Do you understand that you can contact any of the principle researchers? [Yes] [No]

Do you understand that you are free to not to participate? [Yes] [No]

Has the issue of confidentiality been explained to you? Do you understand who will have access to your information? [Yes] [No]

Confirmation of eligibility to participate:

I am in a private place in order to complete the questionnaires  
[YES] [NO]

Did you understand the information in this consent form?  
[YES] [NO]

Are you legally classified as an adult (i.e. not a minor?)  
[YES] [NO]

Statement of consent:

I have read and understand the risks, benefits, and procedures involved in in this project. I understand that my participation is voluntary. I understand that I do not have to answer every question and can stop at any time. I understand all data from this research will be kept confidential. I hereby consent to participate in this study.

[YES, I AGREE]

[NO, I DO NOT AGREE]

## **Appendix B – Debriefing Form for Minors**

### Sexuality and Awareness

The study linked to this site involves answering questions of a sexually explicit nature. You indicated that you are below the age of 18. This means that you are not legally classified as an adult (i.e. that you are a minor). Therefore, you are not eligible to participate in this study. Please note, if you are enrolled in introductory educational courses at the University of Alberta, you will not receive course credit for the current study because you were not eligible to sign up to participate in this research. Please participate in another study instead.

Below you will be asked whether you would like to read the full debriefing form. If you click on the ‘Yes’ button below, you will be presented with the form presented to all participants participating in this study. It contains a full description of the research and its hypotheses as well as contact information for the primary researcher, in case you desire further information. If you click ‘No’, you will be taken directly to the exit screen.

[Clickable Buttons]

[YES, I WOULD LIKE TO READ THE FULL DEBRIEFING FORM]

[NO, I WOULD LIKE TO EXIT THE SURVEY]

## **Appendix C – Debriefing Form**

### Sexuality and Awareness

Today, you participated in a research project by Dr. George Buck, Associate Chair & Graduate Coordinator - Dept. of Educational Psychology, Dr. Kristopher Wells, Assistant Professor, University of Alberta and Jessica D. Blake, Graduate Student. Approximately 600 participants, introductory level psychology students, swingers and individuals identifying as LGBT, solicited via various websites, will be invited to participate in this research project.

To date there are many different ideas and opinions as to why people in relationships decide to venture outside of the relationship for sexual pleasure. Some frequent suggestions include dissatisfaction within the relationship or a desire to explore novel sexual behaviors. Many studies have documented the correlation between sexual awareness and urbanization, and between sexual awareness and education. However, few studies have looked at the particular sexual behaviors of individuals, particularly, behaviors that include extra marital sexual activity and same sex experiences. Even fewer studies have examined the sexual behaviors of individuals as they relate to sexual awareness, sexual experience and sexual orientation. Swingers will be defined in this experiment as individuals in a committed relationship who have consensual sex outside of the relationship with other individuals. Individuals who identify as LGBT are conceptualized as having predominated homosexual experience, with possible heterosexual experiences. In this study, we will compare data from swingers, LGBT individuals and introductory level psychology students. All groups will be

compared with respect to their sexual awareness, sexual behaviors, and openness to experience. We expect to find that patterns of sexual behavior will reflect levels of sexual awareness that take openness, orientation and experience to construct.

You were not informed of the precise purpose of this research in the consent form you signed at the beginning of this study. More specifically, you were not told that the main focus of the research is to investigate possible links between sexual awareness and openness to unconventional sexual attitudes. The true hypothesis was withheld from you for scientific reasons. Prior knowledge of the hypothesis might have influenced the way you answered some of the questions in the survey. Please be assured that you have now been informed of the precise nature of the study.

If you have any questions about participation in this study, please contact George H. Buck, Ph.D., Associate Chair & Graduate Coordinator, Dept. of Educational Psychology, 6-102 Education North, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2G5, (780) 492-9275 or via e-mail at [gbuck@ualberta.ca](mailto:gbuck@ualberta.ca).

This project was reviewed by, and received ethics approval through, the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board. In the event that you have any comments or concerns resulting from your participation in this study, please contact the Research Ethics Office, 308 Campus Tower, 8625 – 112 Street, Edmonton, AB T6G 1K8, [reoffice@ualberta.ca](mailto:reoffice@ualberta.ca) or Ph. 780-492-0459.

If you are interested in finding additional information regarding sexuality, and various sexual behaviors, or about homosexuality, bisexuality or transsexuality, a good source for further information would be ‘The Society for



the Scientific Study of Sexuality Site' (<http://www.sexscience.org/>). Copies of the final report will be given to the swingers club for review and a copy will be posted to the University library of thesis documents under Jessica Blake.

Please click on the 'Submit' button below this window to submit your responses and exit the survey.

[Clickable buttons]

[I Agree, SUBMIT]    [I do not Agree, do not SUBMIT my answers]

## Appendix D – LGBT Advertisement



# !!Sexual Awareness Research!!

If you identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender (LGBT), and are over 18 years of age, please consider being a research participant in a scientific study of the sexual awareness and sexual experiences of LGBT individuals!

Currently, there is very little research on the sexual attitudes and sexual behaviours of LGBT individuals, and in order to fill this gap in knowledge, **your participation in this research study would be invaluable**. This research project will examine the sexual attitudes, sexual experience, sexual awareness and sexual behaviours of swingers, undergraduate university students, and individuals who identify as LGBT.

Participation in this research will involve completing an online survey. This survey is **completely anonymous** and at no time will personal information be collected or shared! Participation should not take more than 20 minutes.

The survey is accessible at:

**<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/code47>**

This project is supervised by Dr. George Buck, Associate Chair & Graduate Coordinator, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta and Dr. Kristopher Wells, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta. This research is being conducted by Jessica D. Blake, Graduate Student, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta.

A full consent and debriefing form are available on the website before you participate. Please read the Consent Form fully before beginning the Survey. If you have any questions, either before or after the Survey, you can contact Jessica D. Blake, [jblake@ualberta.ca](mailto:jblake@ualberta.ca), or supervisors Dr. George Buck, [gbuck@ualberta.ca](mailto:gbuck@ualberta.ca), Dr. Kristopher Wells, [kwells@ualberta.ca](mailto:kwells@ualberta.ca)

This research study has received University Ethics Review.

## Appendix E – Swinger Advertisement



# !!Sexual Awareness Research!!

If you are a Swinger, please consider being a participant in this scientific study of sexual awareness and sexual experiences of Swingers!

Currently, there is very little research on the sexual attitudes and sexual behaviours of Swingers, and in order to fill this gap in knowledge, **your participation in this research study would be invaluable**. This research project will examine the sexual attitudes, sexual experience, sexual awareness and sexual behaviours of Swingers, undergraduate university students, and individuals who identify as LGBT.

Participation in this research will involve completing an online survey. This survey is **COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS** and at no time will personal information be collected or shared! Participation should not take more than 20 minutes.

The survey is accessible at:

**<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/code81>**

This project is supervised by Dr. George Buck, Associate Chair & Graduate Coordinator, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta and Dr. Kristopher Wells, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta. This research is being conducted by Jessica D. Blake, Graduate Student, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta. A full consent form and debriefing form are available on the website before you participate.

Please read fully the Consent Form before beginning the Survey. If you have any questions, either before or after the Survey, please contact Dr. George Buck, [gbuck@ualberta.ca](mailto:gbuck@ualberta.ca); Dr. Kristopher Wells, [kwells@ualberta.ca](mailto:kwells@ualberta.ca); or Jessica D. Blake, [jblake@ulberta.ca](mailto:jblake@ulberta.ca)

This research study has received University Ethics Review.

Appendix F – Student Advertisement



# !!Sex Awareness Study!!

If you are a student (and OVER 18), please consider participating for this study of sexual awareness and sexual experiences of Students!

Currently, there is very little research on the sexual attitudes and sexual behaviours of Students, and in order to fill this gap in knowledge, **your participation in this online survey would be invaluable**. This study will examine the sexual attitudes, sexual experience, sexual awareness and sexual behaviours university students, swingers, and individuals who identify as LGBT.

Participation in this research will involve completing an online survey. This survey is **COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS** and no personal information will be collected, or shared! Participation should not take more than 20 minutes.

The survey is accessible at:

**<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/code32>**

This project is supervised by Dr. George Buck, Associate Chair & Graduate Coordinator, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta and Dr. Kristopher Wells, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta. This research is being conducted by Jessica D. Blake, Graduate Student, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Alberta. A full consent form and debriefing form are available on the website before you participate. Please read fully the Consent Form before beginning the Survey. If you have any questions, either before or after the Survey, please contact Dr. George Buck, [gbuck@ualberta.ca](mailto:gbuck@ualberta.ca); Dr. Kristopher Wells, [kwells@ualberta.ca](mailto:kwells@ualberta.ca); or Jessica D. Blake, [jblake@ulberta.ca](mailto:jblake@ulberta.ca)

!!This study has received University Ethics Review!!

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/code32>

Sex Awareness Study Study Study Study Study Study Study Study Study Study Study

## Appendix G – Research Survey Questions

1. I have read and understand the risks, benefits, and procedures involved in participation of this project, which is part of my master's thesis in the Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

I am age 18 or older. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw from participation at any time and may refuse to answer any questions without Penalty. I understand that all data from this research survey will be kept strictly confidential. Survey results will be aggregated and no names or other identifying characteristics will be used.

I hereby consent to participate in this study.

[YES, I AGREE]

[NO, I DO NOT AGREE]

2. How old are you?

*(This question will be programmed in such a way that any answer under 18 would take the participant directly to debriefing for minors)*

### Part 1 - Demographic questions

3. In which country do you live?

- Canada
- United States
- Other

4. If you responded 'Other' on the previous question, please indicate your country of residence below:

5. Where are you living right now?

6. Over the past 10 years, where have you been living? (if different from current area of residence)

7. What type of sexual relationship are you in?

- Single, in no sexual relationship
- Dating
- Living with a sexual partner
- Married
- Divorced or widowed, in no sexual relationship
- None of the above defines my current sexual relationship(s)

8. Are you a practicing
- Catholic
  - Protestant
  - Muslim
  - Hindu
  - Jew
  - Other religion
  - Atheist/agnostic
9. Employing the ethnicity categories used by Statistics Canada (see below), how would you categorize your ethnic background?
- Aboriginal (Inuit, Métis, North American Indian)
  - Arab/West Asian (e.g., Armenian, Egyptian, Iranian, Lebanese, Moroccan, etc)
  - Black (e.g., African, Haitian, Jamaican, Somali)
  - Chinese
  - Filipino
  - Japanese
  - Korean
  - Latin American
  - South Asian
  - South East Asian
  - White (Caucasian)
  - Other
10. Is English your Mother tongue, i.e. was it the first language you learned as a child?
- Yes
  - No
11. Have you ever taken a course in Human Sexuality?
- Yes
  - No
12. If yes, was it
- In a University setting
  - Elsewhere
13. What is your biological (chromosomal) sex?
- Female (biologically female or female to male transsexual)
  - Male (biological male or male to female transsexual)

14. What is your gender, i.e. do you consider yourself to be...
- Female ( e.g., biologically female, male to female transsexuals, male to female transgender)
  - Male (e.g., biologically male, female to male transsexuals, female to male transgender)

### **Part 2 - Attitudes Toward Unconventional Sex Scale**

Instructions - In this section, please answer each question as accurately as you can. Items are rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (strongly Agree).

15. I would describe my sexual preferences as "non-traditional"
16. I like sex most when it is out-of-the-ordinary.
17. I like sex with my partner(s) to be unpredictable.
18. I like to experiment with different sexual practices.
19. Some people might think my sexual preferences are unusual.

### **Part 3 - Assessing Multiple Facets of Attraction to Women and Men**

Instructions - The first few questions below ask about how OFTEN you are attracted to women versus men. It does not matter if the attractions are strong or weak; we are just trying to get a sense of how often they occur. The first question focuses on physical attractions and the second question focuses on emotional attractions. By 'physical, ' we mean the type of attraction that you would associate with a desire for sexual activity. By 'emotional,' we mean the type of attraction that is usually associated with romantic love, including strong desires for emotional closeness and intimacy. Physical and emotional attractions often occur together, but not always. This is why we are asking for them separately.

20. Please provide a number between 0 and 100 to represent the percentage of your day-to-day PHYSICAL attractions which have been directed toward women versus men over the past 6 months. For example, 0% would mean that you have NEVER experienced attractions for women during the past 6 months, 100% would mean that you have ONLY experienced attractions for women during the past 6 months, and 50% would mean that you have been physically attracted to women about half as often as you have been physically attracted to men during the last 6 months. You can provide any number between 0 and 100 (for example, 20%, 83%, 99%).

Percentage of physical attractions directed toward women:

21. Now provide a number between 0% to 100% for the percentage of your EMOTIONAL attractions which are directed to women versus men.

Percentage of emotional attractions directed toward women:

22. In general, what percentage of your sexual fantasies have been about women versus men over the past 6 months?

Percentage of sexual fantasies about women:

23. How often have you experienced a physical attraction for a woman during the past 6 months?

- Almost never
- Less than once a month
- Once or twice a month
- About once a week
- More than once a week
- About every day

24. About how many different women have you been physically attracted to in the past 6 months?

25. If you answered '1' on the last question, is this someone that you are currently sexually or romantically involved with?

- Yes
- No

26. How often have you experienced an emotional attraction for a woman during the past 6 months?

- Almost never
- Less than once a month
- Once or twice a month
- About once a week
- More than once a week
- About every day

27. About how many different women have you been emotionally attracted to in the past 6 months?

28. If you answered "1" the last question, is this someone that you are currently sexually or romantically involved with?

- Yes
- No

29. How often have you had sexual fantasies about a woman, or women in general, in the past month?

- Almost never
- Less than once a month



- Once or twice a month
- About once a week
- More than once a week
- About every day

30. The next question concerns the intensity of your physical attractions for women. This is on a 1 to 5 scale, so that 1 is "no attractions," 3 is a moderate attraction (right in the middle of the scale), and 5 is the most intense attraction you can experience. Thinking about ALL of the attractions to women you have experience in the past 6 months, how would you rate the AVERAGE intensity of those attractions?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

31. How would you rate the intensity of the strongest attraction to a woman that you've experienced in the past 6 months?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

32. When you have sexual thoughts about a woman, or women in general, how strong is your desire to engage in sexual activity? Use the 1 to 5 scale, so 1 is basically "no desire for sexual activity," 3 is in the middle, and 5 is maximum desire for sexual activity.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

The next set of questions focuses on men

33. How often have you experienced a physical attraction for a man during the past 6 months?

- Almost never
- Less than once a month
- Once or twice a month
- About once a week
- More than once a week
- About every day

34. About how many different men have you been physically attracted to in the past 6 months?

35. If you answered '1' on the last question, is this someone that you are currently sexually or romantically involved with?

- Yes
- No

36. How often have you experienced an emotional attraction for a man during the past 6 months?

- Almost never
- Less than once a month
- Once or twice a month
- About once a week
- More than once a week
- About every day

37. About how many different men have you been emotionally attracted to in the past 6 months?

38. If you answered '1' on the last question, is this someone that you are currently sexually or romantically involved with?

- Yes
- No

39. How often have you had sexual fantasies about a man, or men in general, in the past month?

- Almost never
- Less than once a month
- Once or twice a month
- About once a week
- More than once a week
- About every day

40. Thinking about all of the attractions to MEN that you have experienced in the past 6 months, how would you rate the AVERAGE intensity of those attractions? As before, this is on a 1 to 5 scale, so that 1 is "no attraction," 3 is a moderate attraction (right in the middle of the scale), and 5 is the most intense attraction you can experience. Thinking about ALL of the attractions to men you have experience in the past 6 months, how would you rate the AVERAGE intensity of those attractions?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

5

41. How would you rate the intensity of the strongest attraction to a man that you've experienced in the past 6 months?

- 1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5

42. When you have sexual thoughts about a man, or men in general, how strong is your desire to engage in sexual activity? Use the 1 to 5 scale, so 1 is basically "no desire for sexual activity," 3 is in the middle, and 5 is maximum desire for sexual activity.

- 1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5

#### Part 4 - Sexual Awareness Questionnaire

Instructions: The items listed below refer to the sexual aspects of people's lives. Please read each item carefully and decide to what extent it is characteristics of you. Give each item a rating of how much it applies to you by using the following scale.

1 = Not at all characteristic of me.

2= Slightly characteristic of me.

3= Somewhat characteristic of me.

4= Moderately characteristic of me.

5= Very characteristic of me.

*(R) – Reverse scoring on that question.*

43. I am very aware of my sexual feelings.

44. I wonder whether others think I'm sexy.

45. I'm assertive about the sexual aspects of my life.

46. I'm very aware of my sexual motivations.

47. I'm concerned about the sexual appearance of my body.

48. I'm not very direct about voicing my sexual desires. *(R)*

49. I'm always trying to understand my sexual feelings.

50. I know immediately when others consider me sexy.

51. I am somewhat passive about expressing my sexual desires. *(R)*

52. I'm very alert to changes in my sexual desires.

53. I am quick to sense whether others think I'm sexy.

54. I do not hesitate to ask for what I want in a sexual relationship.

55. I am very aware of my sexual tendencies.

56. I usually worry about making a good sexual impression on others.

57. I'm the type of person who insists on having my sexual needs met.
58. I think about my sexual motivations more than most people do.
59. I'm concerned about what other people think of my sex appeal.
60. When it comes to sex, I usually ask for what I want.
61. I reflect about my sexual desires a lot.
62. I never seem to know whether I am turning others on.
63. If I were sexually interested in someone, I'd let that person know.
64. I'm very aware of the way my mind works when I am sexually aroused.
65. I rarely think about my sex appeal. *(R)*
66. If I were to have sex with someone, I'd tell my partner what I like.
67. I know what turns me on sexually.
68. I don't care what others think of my sexuality.
69. I don't let others tell me how to run my sex life.
70. I rarely think about the sexual aspects of my life.
71. I know when others think I'm sexy.
72. If I were to have sex with someone, I'd let my partner take the initiative.
- (R)*
73. I don't think about my sexuality very much. *(R)*
74. Other people's opinions of my sexuality don't matter very much to me. *(R)*
75. I would ask about sexually-transmitted diseases before having sex with someone.
76. I don't consider myself a very sexual person.
77. When I'm with others, I want to look sexy.
78. If I wanted to practice "safe-sex" with someone, I would insist on doing so.

### Part 5 - Sexual Experience Questionnaire

Answer the following with:

- A= Never
- B= Once
- C= A few times (More than once, less than 5 times)
- D= Many times (more than 5 times)

79. Have you ever engaged in deep kissing (French or tongue kissing)?
80. Have you ever engaged in oral (mouth) contact with another's breasts/nipples?
81. Have you ever engaged in someone having oral (mouth) contact with your breasts/nipples?
82. Have you ever engaged in touching, fondling, or manually stimulating another person's genitals?
83. Have you ever engaged in somebody touching, fondling, or manually stimulating your genitals?
84. Have you ever engaged in oral (mouth) contact with another person's genitals?

85. Have you ever engaged in someone having oral (mouth) contact with your genitals?

86. Have you ever engaged in masturbating while in computer contact with another?

87. Have you ever engaged in penile-anal intercourse [penis in anus (rectum)]?

88. Have you ever engaged in masturbating in the presence of another person?

89. Have you ever engaged in penile-vaginal intercourse (Penis in vagina)?

#### **Part 6 – Measure of Unusual Sexual Behaviors.**

90. I enjoy being tied up or tying my partner up during sex

- yes
- no

91. I enjoy bondage as a form of role play

- yes
- no
- I do not know what bondage is

92. I know what a dominatrix is and what a submissive is

- yes
- no

93. I have read 5 or more Bondage-Domination-Sadomasochism (BDSM) books

- yes
- no
- I do not know what BDSM is

94. I have tied up, or been tied up, (Bondage) during sex in the last month at least once

- yes
- no
- I do not know what Bondage is

95. I enjoy having my feet kissed or kissing my partner's feet during sex

- yes
- no

96. I am aroused by answering these questions

- yes
- no

97. I have videotaped myself having sex

- yes

no

98. I have rubbed my feet against my partner's genitals before/during sex

- yes  
 no

99. I have had my partner rub his/her feet against my genitals before/during sex

- yes  
 no

100. I have been on the receiving end of watersport/golden shower games before

- yes  
 no  
 I do not know what watersports/golden showers are

101. I have been on the giving end of watersport/golden shower games before

- yes  
 no  
 I do not know what watersports/golden showers are

102. I like to try new things during sex

- yes  
 no

### **Part 7 - The Sell Scale of Sexual Orientation**

Instructions - When answering the following questions, please focus on the intensity and frequency, of your sexual interest in men and women. Consider times you were: A) sexually attracted to a man or woman; B) had sex fantasies, daydreams or dreams about a man or woman; or C) were aroused by a man or woman.

103. During the past year, my sexual interests have been (choose one answer):

- I have had no sexual interests during the past year  
 Exclusively homosexual  
 Predominately homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual  
 Predominately homosexual, but more incidentally heterosexual  
 Equally heterosexual and homosexual  
 Predominately heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual

- Predominately heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual
- Exclusively heterosexual

104. During the past year, how many different men were you sexually interested in (choose one answer):

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- 11-49
- 50-99
- 100 or more

105. During the past year, on average, how often were you sexually interested in a man (Choose one answer):

- Never
- Less than 1 time per month
- 1-3 times per month
- 1 time per week
- 2-3 times per week
- 4-6 times per week
- Daily

106. During the past year, the most I was sexually interested in a man was (choose one answer):

- Not at all sexually interested
- Slightly sexually interested
- Mildly sexually interested
- Moderately sexually interested
- Significantly sexually interested
- Very sexually interested
- Extremely sexually interested

107. During the past year, how many different women were you sexually interested in (choose one answer):

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- 11-49
- 50-99

- 100 or more

108. During the past year, on average, how often were you sexually interested in a woman (Choose one answer):

- Never
- Less than 1 time per month
- 1-3 times per month
- 1 time per week
- 2-3 times per week
- 4-6 times per week
- Daily

109. During the past year, the most I was sexually interested in a woman was (choose one answer):

- Not at all sexually interested
- Slightly sexually interested
- Mildly sexually interested
- Moderately sexually interested
- Significantly sexually interested
- Very sexually interested
- Extremely sexually interested

Instructions - For the next series of questions please assess the frequency of your sexual contacts. Consider the times you have had contact between your body and another man's or woman's body for the purpose of sexual arousal or gratification.

110. During the past year, my Sexual contacts have been (choose one answer):

- I have had no sexual contacts during the past year
- Exclusively homosexual
- Predominately homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual
- Predominately homosexual, but more incidentally heterosexual
- Equally heterosexual and homosexual
- Predominately heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual
- Predominately heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual
- Exclusively heterosexual

111. During the past year, how many different men did you have sexual contact with (choose one answer):

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3-5
- 6-10



- 11-49
- 50-99
- 100 or more

112. During the past year, on average, how often did you have sexual contact with a man (Choose one answer):

- Never
- Less than 1 time per month
- 1-3 times per month
- 1 time per week
- 2-3 times per week
- 4-6 times per week
- Daily

113. During the past year, how many different women did you have sexual contact with (choose one answer):

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- 11-49
- 50-99
- 100 or more

114. During the past year, on average, how often did you have sexual contact with a woman (Choose one answer):

- Never
- Less than 1 time per month
- 1-3 times per month
- 1 time per week
- 2-3 times per week
- 4-6 times per week
- Daily

115. I consider myself (choose one answer):

- I do not identify with any sexual orientation
- Exclusively homosexual
- Predominately homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual
- Predominately homosexual, but more incidentally heterosexual
- Equally heterosexual and homosexual
- Predominately heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual
- Predominately heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual
- Exclusively heterosexual

116. I consider myself (choose one answer):

- Not at all homosexual
- Slightly homosexual
- Mildly homosexual
- Moderately homosexual
- significantly homosexual
- Very homosexual
- Completely homosexual

117. I consider myself (choose one answer):

- Not at all heterosexual
- Slightly heterosexual
- Mildly heterosexual
- Moderately heterosexual
- significantly heterosexual
- Very heterosexual
- Completely heterosexual

118. I consider myself (choose one answer):

- Not at all bisexual
- Slightly bisexual
- Mildly bisexual
- Moderately bisexual
- significantly bisexual
- Very bisexual
- Completely bisexual