

Deconstructing The Construction Of Distinct Female And Male Sexual Natures

INTRODUCTION

Female and male sexuality have been constructed as distinct, and with this distinction comes differing expectations, attitudes and treatments. Sexuality, though often misattributed as a solely private matter, is political and imbued with unequal power relations (Millett, 1970). These constructions contribute to the production and maintenance of gender inequalities through: preventing women from feeling entitled to sexual pleasure (MacKinnon, 1989; Farvid and Braun, 2006; McClellan, 2014; Orenstein, 2017); allowing men's reduced responsibility over their sexual behaviour (Potts, 2001; Farvid and Braun, 2006); and enforcing double standards which both frame women as to blame for men's sexual actions (LeMoncheck, 1997; Weiss, 2010; Wood and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2015) and encourage the reproduction of distinct sexual behaviours (Oliver and Hyde, 1993; Wood and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2015). This essay will challenge the conceptualisation of distinct female and male sexual natures through deconstruction. Deconstruction provides a crucial tool for feminist analysis, allowing binary logic to be dismantled (Poovey, 1988). Progress has been made in deconstructing distinct sexual natures relating to; women's feelings of entitlement to sexual pleasure (Yuxin and Ying, 2009; Kraus, 2017), shifts in holding men accountable for their sexual actions (Bulgarella, 2018; Wadman, 2018), and harnessing education for deconstructive endeavours (Petersen and Hyde, 2010; Orenstein, 2017; Enright, 2019). However, whether progress has produced a new construction of a sexually agentive woman which inflicts additional constraints is raised (Gill, 2008). On a whole, the disparities in how female and male sexuality have been constructed contribute to the survival of the patriarchy and hence deconstruction is a feminist battle.

THE CONSTRUCTION, DECONSTRUCTED

Medical and historical accounts enforcing a binary between male and female sexuality have contributed towards the idea that distinct sexual natures are innate (Gray, 1992; Braun, Gavey and McPhillips, 2003). This idea of sexuality as binary and innate poses that differences are dependent on one's biological sex. Historically, the medical profession forwarded that

women's sexual desires were synonymous with sickness, in need of medical intervention (Ehrenreich and English, 1973; Frank, 2010). Records reveal that female masturbation alarmed doctors, with cases of clitorrectomy performed on women and children as young as five as a 'cure' for masturbation and to prevent future orgasm (Ehrenreich and English, 1973; Wood and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2015). While 19th century medical treatment relating to women's sexual desires was clearly preposterous, it was successful at controlling and condemning women's sexuality (Ehrenreich and English, 1973). This context of sexism formed the basis in which distinct female and male sexual natures were constructed and while shifting with modern times, they continue to replicate sexist double standards. Male sexuality is associated with an inherent sex drive, uncontrollable urges, sexual needs (Braun, Gavey and McPhillips, 2003; Wood and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2015), multiple sexual partners and domination (Millett, 1970; Petersen and Hyde, 2010). On the other hand, female sexuality is associated with passivity and subordination (Millett, 1970; Poovey, 1988; MacKinnon, 1989; Lescadre, 2018), alongside the oxymoron of virginal purity entangled with hyper-sexualisation (LeMoncheck, 1997). On a whole, sexist attitudes and assumptions from historical episodes and medical interventions have infiltrated modern constructions of sexuality, positioning women's sexuality as subordinate and oppositional to men's.

Constructions of men and women within patriarchal relations have produced distinct constructions of sexuality, however, these can be deconstructed. Feminists can use deconstruction to reveal the binary of the sexes as socially constructed, rather than a reflection of biological fact (Poovey, 1988). For example, Petersen and Hyde (2010) found that nations and ethnic groups with higher levels of gender equity have less gender differences for multiple sexual behaviours. Additionally, there is evidence that the sexes' experiences of sexual desire and activity is alike. For example, Jackson (2017) highlights there are minimal differences between the neurological basis of sexual excitement and psychological experience for women and men. Moreover, Conley (2016) reveals the mythical nature of the distinct constructions of male and female sexual natures that presents women as oppositional to men in relation to their desire for casual sex. Research indicates that women do not accept invitations for casual sex to the same extent as men, not due to biological determinism, but because for women the conditions of casual sex can include public humiliation coupled with bad sex (Conley, 2016). This experience of 'bad sex' in casual

encounters was indicated in a study by Armstrong, England and Forgarty (2012: 456) where a recurring response from men about concerns for women's pleasure in college hook-ups was 'I don't give a shit'. Further, women are indeed stigmatised more than men for engaging in casual sex, often being referred to as 'sluts' (Abbey, 2011; Conley, 2016). Importantly, when these two factors were controlled for, Conley (2016) found that gender differences in casual sex disappeared. This conclusion is further supported by a study of bisexual men and women where no gender differences were found in invitation acceptance for casual sex when the proposer was a woman, however, when it was a man, the bisexual women were less likely to accept (Conley, 2016). Hence, the reported differences in casual sex engagement can be part explained as a result of men being perceived as less appealing casual sex proposers than women (Conley, 2016). Conley (2016) concluded that engagement in casual sex is not biologically determined, but socially produced due to the potential of humiliation coupled with the perceived enjoyment. Deconstructing the claim that distinct sexual natures predicts casual sex propensity highlights the fragility of such claims that fail to acknowledge the environmental factors influencing behaviour. Therefore, the evidence demonstrates that distinct sexual natures are socially and culturally constructed, not innate.

THE IMPORTANCE OF DECONSTRUCTION

The belief that women and men have distinct sexual natures persists (Jackson, 2017) and so it remains an essential feminist battle to challenge these assumptions and reveal their unjust outcomes. There is a vested interest within the male-dominated and heterosexual society for women to be confined to a sexual nature that preserves their subordination (LeMoncheck, 1997). On the basis of this interest, constructions of distinct sexual natures have produced unequal power relations whereby male and female sexuality are judged and treated with differing standards (Petersen and Hyde, 2010). McClellan's (2014) concept of intimate justice positions sexual experiences, attitudes and evaluations within a socio-political context of gender inequality, highlighting that sex has political and personal implications. Intimate justice provides a pivotal feminist tool, demanding consideration of what research demonstrates about who is entitled to enjoy an experience, who is the beneficiary and what disparities are evident in how sexual satisfaction is calculated. Hence, in line with intimate justice (McClellan, 2014), this essay will argue that distinct constructions of male and female

sexuality have negative implications on gender equality, further justifying their deconstruction.

The construction of distinct sexual natures prevents women from feeling entitled to sexual pleasure, positioning women's sexuality as repressed until ignited by men and existing to satisfy men's sexual needs. The shame associated with women's sexuality and pleasure is perpetuated by language, or lack thereof (Orenstein, 2017; Enright, 2019). At infancy parents of boys are more likely to name all their body parts, however parents of girls go from navel to knees, leaving the parts in-between unnamed (Orenstein, 2017). Failing to name the vulva or speak about the clitoris allows ignorance and stigmatisation to rise (Enright, 2019). When this silence surrounding the female genitals is in conjunction with mainstream porn positioning male pleasure as paramount (MacKinnon, 1989), it is unsurprising that female pleasure becomes taboo. One study found that over half of girls aged fourteen to seventeen had never masturbated, raising the infeasibility of expecting them to enter partnered sexual experiences able to articulate their desires (Orenstein, 2017). This is concurrent with further evidence reporting women masturbate less than men (Oliver and Hyde, 1993; Petersen and Hyde, 2010). Though shame associated with female masturbation may result in underreportings, the findings remain significant, at a minimum signifying the guilt that coincides with pursuing female pleasure. Research indicates that while young women feel entitled to sexual behaviour, they do not inevitably feel entitled to enjoy it (Orenstein, 2017). Moreover, McClellan (2014) found that women were more likely than men to position their partner's pleasure as a measure of their own sexual satisfaction, demonstrating how the construction of the female sexual nature as existing to satisfy men has infiltrated women's internal understandings of satisfaction. Likewise, research has found that while bad sex for men typically meant not orgasming, for women, it meant pain or coercion (Enright, 2019). Hence, it is important to unlearn these distinct constructions of male and female sexual natures whereby women are socialised to be passive and subordinate during heterosexual sex (MacKinnon, 1989), positioned as objects (Poovey, 1988) for male consumption and pleasure (Farvid and Braun, 2006; Gill, 2008). On a whole, the constructed distinct female and male sexual natures are in dire need of deconstruction due to their detrimental effect on women's feelings of entitlement to pleasure and their ability to articulate their sexual needs and desires in heterosexual sexual relations.

However, it is important to acknowledge that these negative implications on women's pleasure due to the construction of distinct female and male sexual natures do not necessarily limit all women. For some sex-encounters, the orgasm gap vanishes, with women and men climaxing at the same rate (Ornstein, 2017). Research has indicated that lesbian and bisexual women report feeling liberated from standards and sexual scripts (Ornstein, 2017), potentially equipped to withstand cultural forces aiming to undermine women's articulations and experiences of sexual agency (Ussher, 2005). Nonetheless, these findings further support the argument that constructions of distinct female and male sexual natures are not innate and can be deconstructed.

Secondly, claiming an inherent male sex drive and uncontrollable sexual impulses weakens men's responsibilities over their sexual actions. The penis has been constructed as a separate entity to the self, allowing men to distance themselves from their sexual behaviours to avoid responsibility (Potts, 2001; Farvid and Braun, 2006). For example, Farvid and Braun (2006) reported that within women's magazines, the male sex drive discourse was drawn upon to justify men's infidelity, whereas women's unfaithful behaviour was addressed with condemnation. Thus, this discourse protects men's reputations from convictions of infidelity, unprotected sex and sexual assault and in doing so defends societal male dominance (Farvid and Braun, 2006). Hence, the construction of the distinct male sexual nature is in need of deconstruction as it exonerates men from their responsibility in sexual matters, thereby placing women at risk of sexual assault and other injustices.

Thirdly, this construction enforces double standards that do not only exonerate men from their sexual actions but also position women as responsible. This constructed female sexuality allows patriarchy to prosper through the sexualisation of women's appearances to transfer blame, thereby protecting male power and privilege (LeMoncheck, 1997). For instance, there are countless examples of rape victims deemed responsible due to their clothing (Workman and Freeburg, 1999; Edwards et al., 2011; Devaney, 2018; Safronova, 2018). For example, an Amnesty International poll found that 26% of participants believed women are partially or wholly responsible for rape when wearing sexy or revealing apparel (Edwards et al., 2011). This conflation of appearance and sexuality preserves gender-based

oppression, with colossal effects for women on individual and systemic levels (Travis et al., 2000). Moreover, the gender double standards in relation to alcohol consumption (De Visser and McDonnell, 2012) influence how blame is attributed for sexual interactions. While men's consumption of alcohol is often negatively correlated with responsibility over sexual actions, the opposite is true for women who experience increased blame (Wood and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2015). Weiss' (2010) study illustrated the responsibility felt by women for men's sexual actions, with one participant stating they felt to blame for failing to avoid a drunk sexually aggressive offender. Hence, the inequality produced through these distinct sexual natures is twofold; firstly positioning men as incapable of controlling their sexual desires, and secondly positioning women as responsible for when sexual interaction occurs. These double standards have implications across women's lives. For example, in cases of co-workers, female victims are less likely to report assault due to an increased risk of stigma, gossip and defamation (Weiss, 2010). On a whole, the construction of distinct sexual natures protects male power and privilege, threatening women's safety and risk of punishment for men's sexual behaviour.

Finally, the double standards encourage men and women to behaviourally conform to distinct constructions, thereby preventing deconstruction. Engagement in casual sex is viewed differently depending on if the partaker is a woman or a man (Abbey, 2011). Abbey (2011) highlights that when one compares the words for women who have sex with multiple partners and those for men, those associated with the women are negative, while those with the men are positive, and this trend transcends generations. Punishing women who defy patriarchal constructions of female sexuality (LeMoncheck, 1997), as in the above example, is evidence of the double standards that reproduce distinct sexual behaviours. This mechanism of constructing gendered subjects can be explained by social learning theory which posits that through the process of imitation alongside rewards or discouragement, an individual's behaviours are shaped (Oliver and Hyde, 1993; Wood and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2015). Therefore, a product of the construction of distinct sexual natures is double standards that condition men and women to behave in line with their assigned sexual natures, thereby perpetuating gender inequalities.

PROGRESS

Despite hindrance from double standards, there has been progress in the deconstruction of distinct sexual natures. For instance, there is evidence that women's feelings of entitlement to and attainment of sexual pleasure is increasing. Yuxin and Ying (2009) highlight that while Li in 1998 found discussion of female masturbation taboo, the discourse has progressed, with female masturbation perceived as more healthy and normal. Increasingly, female masturbation is seen as empowering; freeing heterosexual women from seeking and relying on sexual satisfaction from men (Yuxin and Ying, 2009). Kraus (2017) compared data on masturbation and discovered that from 2012 to 2017, the masturbation behaviours of women became much more similar to men. This progress is reflected in the representation of female masturbation in forms of cultural production, such as the media (Kraus, 2017). The promotion of greater masturbation equality contributes to the shifting of cultural scripts of sexuality, aiding the deconstruction of distinct sexual natures (Kraus, 2017). It has been argued that masturbation related gender differences are central to all gender differences in sexuality (Oliver and Hyde, 1993), and hence progress could have far reaching effects on overall constructions of sexual natures. Therefore, while there is a long road ahead in terms of embracing and attributing value to female pleasure cross-culturally, the case of female masturbation reveals that progress has been made in its de-stigmatisation and partial deconstruction of distinct sexual natures.

Furthermore, increasingly men are being held accountable for their sexual actions. The #MeToo movement encapsulated this shift, challenging the deep-rooted social norm of overlooking sexual harassment (Bulgarella, 2018). For example, the movement has resulted in policy changes and increased pressures for institutions to report on sexual harassment, such as in academic science, engineering, and medicine, whereby sexual misconduct was previously disregarded (Wadman, 2018). The #MeToo movement, in exposing men's sexual misconduct, shifts social codes, threatening the acceptability of sexual harassment in the workplace. Consequently, the movement challenges the discourse that the distinct male sexual nature is innate and that a man's sexual desires are uncontrollable and therefore exonerated from responsibility. Hence, progress has been made in challenging the construction of distinct sexual natures through efforts to hold men accountable for their sexual actions.

Finally, education consistently recurs in the literature as essential in deconstructing misconceptions of sexuality and reducing gendered attitudes and behaviours. It is argued that pressures to comply with gendered sexual norms are weakened with the awareness that women and men have similar sexual behaviours and attitudes (Petersen and Hyde, 2010). Accordingly, it is predicted that the more sexually liberal a nation is, the more it will witness the narrowing of sexual gender differences (Petersen and Hyde, 2010). A pivotal tool for shaping awareness and educating on sexuality is one's use of language (Wood and Fixmer-Oraiz, 2015; Orenstein, 2017; Enright, 2019). A study on Dutch and American girls revealed that the Dutch participants had less negative results from sex such as disease, regret and unwanted pregnancy and had more positive outcomes, including communication skills and enjoyment (Orenstein, 2017). This was due to the narrative that the Dutch participants shared with their doctors, teachers and parents who spoke to them from an early age about sex, pleasure and mutual trust (Orenstein, 2017). This study provides insight into fostering change through the way sex is discussed, indicating the effectivity of integrating discussions into everyday life to educate on pleasure and responsibility (Orenstein, 2017). These insights are expressed by Enright (2019) who argues that a failure to discuss sex with transparent language perpetuates taboo and shaming, resulting in the reproduction of sexual inequalities that place women's sexuality as subordinate to men's. Furthermore, Warner (1999) provides a harrowing insight, highlighting the importance of open discussions and sex education with reference to the AIDS crisis, stressing how silence lead to further stigmatisation and subsequent deaths. On a whole, education is a powerful tool feminists have harnessed to deconstruct constructions of distinct female and male sexual natures to change perceptions, attitudes and behaviour.

Undeniably progress has been made in dismantling constructions of the subordinate female sexual nature, however, there is debate as to whether this progress inflicts further restraints on women. A feminist poststructuralist approach can be used to investigate whether sexual agency contours into regulation, in which new constructions of the female sexual nature impose additional impediments as to how a woman can express her sexuality (Gill, 2008). Gill (2008) suggests that the increase of women's sexual agency in advertisements (Goldman, 1992; Winship, 2000) may not be sufficient in fulfilling the absent discourse of female desire.

Instead, the sexual agentivity presented becomes included in the apparatus that confines the female sexual experience (Gill, 2008). This negative consequence of deconstructing the female sexual nature was articulated by Enright (2019) who stated ‘we are ashamed of wanting sex and not wanting sex’. This suggests that there needs to be greater emphasis on the fluidity of sexuality for both women and men so that deconstruction does not become the reconstruction of confines. On a whole, though the construction of the female sexual nature as passive, subordinate, and lacking in sexual desire has witnessed deconstructive progress, arguably this change has produced a new tyranny in which women feel pressured to prove their liberation through the sexualisation of the self.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the construction of distinct female and male sexual natures are; socially constructed, producing gender inequalities, and in need of deconstruction. The distinct construction of female and male sexual natures produce gender inequalities via: obstructing women from feeling entitled to sexual pleasure, exonerating men from responsibility over their sexual actions, and inflicting double standards which blame women for the sexual actions of men and nurtures the reproduction of gendered sexual behaviours. Progress has been made through a variety of means such as education and in regards to; women’s perceptions of their entitlement to sexual pleasure and increasing men’s accountability for their sexual actions. However, it has been argued that by asserting a new sexually agentive female sexual nature a double-edged sword is produced, whereby new restraints are placed on women to prove their ‘sexual liberation’ through the sexualisation of the self. This highlights the importance of deconstructing with an emphasis on the fluidity of sexuality that need not be sexed, rather than reconstructing new constraints. In conclusion, distinct constructions of female and male sexual natures are socially and culturally produced, and hence fit for deconstruction; a feminist endeavour that is underway.

Word Count: 3269

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Louise Brown (2019)

Armstrong, E.A., England, P. and Fogarty, A.C.K. (2012). 'Accounting for Women's Orgasm and Sexual Enjoyment in College Hookups and Relationships.' *American Sociological Review*, 77 (3), 435-462.

Braun, V., Gavey, N. and McPhillips, K. (2003). 'The 'Fair Deal'? Unpacking Accounts of Reciprocity in Heterosex.' *Sexualities*, 6 (2), 237-261.

Bulgarella, C. (18 October 2018). 'What Happens When Women Stop Protecting Men: Understanding The #MeToo's Backlash' Forbes. [Online] Available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/caterinabulgarella/2018/10/18/what-happens-when-women-stop-protecting-men-understanding-the-metoo-backlash/#5e7823692088> [Accessed 27 April 2019].

Conley, T. (2016). 'We Need to Rethink Casual Sex'. [Online] TEDx. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/terri_conley_we_need_to_rethink_casual_sex [Accessed 2 May 2019].

Devaney, S. (2018). 'A Woman's Underwear Has Been Used as Evidence in a Rape Trial – Again' Stylist. [Online] Available at: <https://www.stylist.co.uk/life/rape-trial-county-cork-ireland-lacy-underwear-court-case-twitter-reaction/236844> [Accessed 1 May 2019].

De Visser, R.O. and McDonnell, E.J. (2012) "'That's OK. He's a guy': A mixed-methods study of gender double-standards for alcohol use.' *Psychology & Health*, 27 (5), 618-639.

Edwards, K., Turchik, J., Dardis, C., Reynolds, N. and Gidycz, C. (2011). 'Rape Myths: History, Individual and Institutional-Level Presence, and Implications for Change.' *Sex Roles*, 65 (11-12), 761-773.

Ehrenreich, B. and English, D. (1973). *Complaints and Disorders: The Sexual Politics of Sickness*. 2nd edn. New York: Feminist Press.

Louise Brown (2019)

Enright, L. (2019). 'Thinking on Monday: Vagina – A Re-Education'. [Public Lecture]. 15 April 2019, Conway Hall, London.

Farvid, P. and Braun, V. (2006). '“Most of Us Guys are Raring to Go Anytime, Anyplace, Anywhere”: Male and Female Sexuality in Cleo and Cosmo.' *Sex Roles*, 55 (5-6), 295-310.

Frank, E. (2010). 'The Color of Self-Love: Exposing Racism in Black Female Masturbation Research'. [Online] UCLA: Center for the Study of Women. Available at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5zs6r2wx> [Accessed 7 May 2019].

Gill, R. (2008). 'Empowerment/Sexism: Figuring Female Sexual Agency in Contemporary Advertising.' *Feminism & Psychology*, 18 (1), 35-60.

Goldman, R. (1992). *Reading Ads Socially*. London: Routledge.

Gray, J. (1992). *Men Are From Mars, Women Are From Venus*. London: HarperCollins.

Jackson, R.M. (2017). *Down So Long . . . The Puzzling Persistence of Gender Inequality*. [Online] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at: <http://www.nyu.edu/classes/jackson/sex.and.gender/Readings/DownSoLong--Sexuality.pdf> [Accessed 11 March 2019].

Kraus, F. (2017). 'The Practice of Masturbation for Women: The End of a Taboo?.' *Sexologies*, 26 (4), 35-41.

LeMoncheck, L. (1997). *Loose Women, Lecherous Men: A Feminist Philosophy of Sex*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lescadre, G. (13 December 2018). 'Ending the Stigma of Female Masturbation' The Vermont Cynic. [Online] Available at: <https://vtcynic.com/opinion/ending-the-stigma-of-female-masturbation/> [Accessed 11 March 2019].

Louise Brown (2019)

MacKinnon, C.A. (1989). *Towards A Feminist Theory Of The State*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

McClellan, S.I. (2014). “‘What Do You Mean When You Say That You Are Sexually Satisfied?’” A Mixed Methods Study.’ *Feminism & Psychology*, 24 (1), 74-96.

Millett, K. (1970). *Sexual Politics*. London: Virago.

Oliver, M.B. and Hyde, J.S. (1993). ‘Gender Differences in Sexuality: A Meta-Analysis.’ *Psychological Bulletin*, 114 (1), 29-51.

Orenstein, P. (2017). ‘What Young Women Believe About Their Own Sexual Pleasure’.
[Online] TEDWomen. Available at:
https://www.ted.com/talks/peggy_orenstein_what_young_women_believe_about_their_own_sexual_pleasure [Accessed 2 May 2019].

Petersen, J.L. and Hyde, J.S. (2010). ‘A Meta-Analytic Review of Research on Gender Differences in Sexuality, 1993–2007.’ *Psychological Bulletin*, 136 (1), 21-38.

Poovey, M. (1988). ‘Feminism and Deconstruction.’ *Feminist Studies*, 14 (1), 51-65.

Potts, A. (2001). ‘The Man With Two Brains: Hegemonic Masculine Subjectivity And The Discursive Construction Of The Unreasonable Penis-Self.’ *Journal of Gender Studies*, 10 (2), 145-156.

Safronova, V. (15 November 2018). ‘Lawyer in Rape Trial Links Thong With Consent, and Ireland Erupts’ The New York Times. [Online] Available at:
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/15/world/europe/ireland-underwear-rape-case-protest.html>
1 [Accessed 1 May 2019].

Louise Brown (2019)

Travis, Cheryl B., Meginnis, Kayce L. and Bardari, Kristin M. (2000) 'Beauty, Sexuality, and Identity: The Social Control of Women', in Travis Cheryl B. and White Jacquelyn W. (eds.), *Sexuality, Society, and Feminism*. Washington: American Psychological Association, 237-272.

Ussher, J. (2005). 'The Meaning of Sexual Desire: Experiences of Heterosexual and Lesbian Girls'. *Feminism & Psychology*, 15 (1), 27-32.

Warner, M. (1999). *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Weiss, K.G. (2010). 'Too Ashamed to Report: Deconstructing the Shame of Sexual Victimization.' *Feminist Criminology*, 5 (3), 286-310.

Winship, J. (2000). 'Women outdoors: Advertising, Controversy And Disputing Feminism In The 1990s.' *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3 (1), 27-55.

Wood, J.T. and Fixmer-Oraiz, N. (2015). *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender and Culture*. 12th edn. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Workman, J. and Freeburg, E. (1999). 'An Examination Of Date Rape, Victim Dress, And Perceiver Variables Within The Context Of Attribution Theory.' *Sex Roles*, 41 (3-4), 261-277.

Yuxin, P. and Ying, P.H.S. (2009). 'Gender, Self and Pleasure: Young Women's Discourse On Masturbation In Contemporary Shanghai.' *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 11 (5), 515-528.