# Polyamory and Open Sexuality

**Course Syllabus**

**August 23, 2017**

## Wednesdays 10:00 am to 12:30 pm

##### Logan Hall 125

**Fall Term 2017**

**Psych 450 section 5, CRN 59280**

**Psych 650 section 5, CRN 56291**

## Instructor:

## Geoffrey Miller, Associate Professor of Psychology

Office hours: Thursdays 11 am to noon, Logan Hall 160

[gfmiller@unm.edu](mailto:gfmiller@unm.edu), 277-1967 (office)

**Brief course description**

This new seminar will cover empirical research on the psychology of polyamory, open relationships, and other increasingly popular forms of ‘consensual non-monogamy’. It will include interdisciplinary readings and active discussions about alternative mating patterns, their pros and cons, their psychological challenges, and their social, clinical, legal, and moral implications.

## Overview

This is the first class on polyamory and open relationships ever taught at UNM.

It will cover the various forms of ‘consensual non-monogamy’ (CNM) that are increasingly popular among young Americans. More than 50% of Millennials surveyed say that monogamy is not their ideal relationship structure, and the proportion of young adults practicing CNM is already higher than the proportion who identify as LGBTQ+. Yet CNM remains heavily stigmatized in American society, unprotected by law as a sexual orientation and identity, and largely ignored in clinical psychology training.

This will be a very interdisciplinary class, drawing ideas, insights, and findings from a wide range of fields and perspectives, including:

* Insights from evolutionary biology, sexual selection theory, evolutionary psychology, sex research, anthropology, sociology, economics, and behavior genetics.
* The psychology of intimate relationships, individual differences, and moral values to understand alternative relationship patterns, and how they differ from monogamist dating scripts and sexual norms in contemporary America.
* The prehistory of primate mating systems, the origins of human sexuality, and the costs and benefits of social monogamy.
* The history of polygamous and monogamous marriage, and the reproductive and cultural benefits and costs of different mating norms and socio-sexual systems.
* The pros and cons of different moral ideals about open relationships, from ‘relationship anarchy’ to ‘hierarchical poly’ to ‘the Lifestyle’.

We’ll focus on emotional, moral, practical, and social issues such as sex differences, sexual and emotional jealousy, communication, conflict resolution, time management, co-parenting, misconceptions, stigma, and the cognitive and personality traits associated with successful polyamory. We’ll also explore the broader social, familial, cultural, economic, and political implications of new relationship patterns, such as alternative family structures, work patterns, and living arrangements.

The class may be especially interesting to students going into clinical psychology, psychiatry, social work, or other caring professions, since most clinical courses pay little attention to the distinctive features and challenges of alternative relationship patterns. Just as therapists in the last couple of decades had to become LGBTQ+-aware to support clients with alternative sexual orientations and gender identities, in the near future, it will crucial to be ‘poly-aware’ and ‘poly-positive’.

We’ll meet Wednesdays 10:00 am – 12:30 pm in Logan Hall 125. Readings will be a mixture of journal papers and book chapters. Grades will be based mostly on class discussion and one term paper completed in three stages. We may have a few guest lectures from local and visiting experts such as Drs. David Ley, Diana Fleischman, etc.

**Course mechanics**

## We will meet once a week for two and a half hours, from 10:00 am to 12:30 pm on Wednesdays. I expect you to arrive punctually, with bags unpacked, readings in front of you, and your brain ready to participate, by 10:00 am. There will be a 10-minute break about half way through each class.

## If you have to miss a class for any reason, please let me know by email as soon as you know you’ll be absent. Unexplained absences will reduce your grade by reducing your class participation score.

**Required book to buy:**

***Designer Relationships*** (2015) by Mark A. Michaels and Patricia Johnson. Cleis Press, ASIN B00UJX20N8

* From Amazon.com: paperback about $16 new, Kindle $10 <https://www.amazon.com/Designer-Relationships-Monogamy-Polyamory-Optimistic-ebook/dp/B00UJX20N8/>
* From UNM Bookstore: paperback about $15 new, $12 used
* This is the simplest, most up-to-date overview of polyamory and open relationships

**Readings**

Each week there will be 3 or 4 assigned readings, mostly journal papers or book chapters, which should take about 3 hours on average to read. *Please do not take this course if you cannot commit about 3 hours a week to doing the readings*. The educational benefits of the course depend on you doing the readings on time, so you can contribute to class discussions. If you don’t read the assignments, you won’t learn much; if you do read them attentively, you’ll learn a lot. Some of the readings are harder than others; some weeks require more reading than other weeks. You won’t be expected to do any readings before the first class.

Most of the required readings will be scientific papers from psychology journals, which I have uploaded to the course’s UNM Learn site. I’ve assigned mostly short papers – their average length is about 8 pages. I recommend printing out hardcopies so you can underline and take notes more easily. You can keep the printed papers in a 3-ring binder for easy reference. There will be a total of about 45 journal papers, plus one 120-page book, to read during the term.

I expect all of each week’s required readings to be completed well before class, so you have time to digest them, think about them, compare and contrast them, and prepare intelligent comments and questions about them. Last-minute reading will not result in good comprehension or good in-class discussion. If you see a word, term, or concept that you don’t understand when reading, don’t just gloss over it and hope for the best; instead, look it up through Google search or Wikipedia. I’ve tried to find good, short, recent, interesting readings that aren’t too technical, but there will be some jargon that you’ll need to look up.

In the course schedule on the last few pages of this syllabus, I’ve included page-counts of actual text to read (not including references in the bibliography) for each assignment. The journal papers will probably take 3-4 minutes per page. Plan your study time accordingly.

**Grading.**

There will be no tests or exams in this course. Instead, your grade will depend on two kinds of work:

* **40% of grade: class attendance, participation, and discussion points** (see below)
* **60% of grade: one term paper**, due in three stages (see below)

# Class attendance, participation, and discussion points: 40% of final grade

Most of our class time will be spent discussing the readings. Sometimes I’ll give little mini-lectures for a few minutes on particular ideas or findings that might need explaining from the readings. But for most of each class, I’ll be moderating discussions and debates among you, the students.

So, I expect regular attendance, knowledge of assigned readings, active participation and intellectual engagement, and thoughtful questions and commentaries about the readings. I will keep records of who attends each class, who asks good questions and makes insightful comments, who seems to have done the readings conscientiously, and who contributes to making this class an intellectually vibrant and rewarding experience for the other students.

**Before each class, you should write down one good discussion point about each assigned reading**. Since there are three or four assigned readings for a class, you should have at least three or four discussion points ready to go.

Each discussion point could be a thoughtful comment, question, critique, or comparison to other readings, theories, or findings. It should not just summarize the reading’s argument, but it should show that you have understood the reading, and developed your own thoughts in response. It should not just be a personal reaction or anecdote vaguely related to the reading, but it could relate the reading’s ideas to current events, controversies, or real-life issue. The best discussion points are both funny and intellectually serious.

If you haven’t understood the reading well enough to prepare a discussion point, you should be ready to say what specific theories, concepts, or findings you found most confusing, and why. If you didn’t understand something after reading it carefully, other students probably didn’t either, and we should discuss and clarify it.

You should write out these discussion points before each class, expressed clearly and concisely enough that you can read them our loud quickly, and written down clearly so you can read them.

I won’t collect these discussion points, but I will call on students to read them aloud to the class. If I call on you and you haven’t done that particular reading or prepared a thoughtful comment, your participation grade will be lower for that class. If I call on you and you have a great comment that sparks a lot of discussion, your participation grade will be higher.

If you’re shy, introverted, or anxious, knowing that you have good discussion points written down ahead of time will make it easier for you to speak up without feeling awkward. I want these discussions to be as easy and comfortable for everyone as possible.

The best discussion points do not just show off how clever you are, but are effective at getting other students engaged in the intellectual life of our class. You’ll learn as the term progresses what kind of comments are good discussion-sparks and which fall flat.

## Term paper in 3 stages: 60% of final grade

The term paper determines 60% of your course grade, and will be developed in three stages that will be graded separately. You can choose any topic related to the course content and course readings. The final paper should be about 3,000 words, plus references – that’s about 12 pages double-spaced. I care more about clarity, insight, research, and the flow of argument than about length per se.

The final term paper must be in standard APA (American Psychological Association) research paper format. If you’re not familiar with APA style, skim the *APA Publication Manual* for details, or see one of the online sites that summarizes its key points, such as <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/> All 3 stages should be printed single-sided on standard size white paper, with 1 inch margins, double-spaced, in 12 point Arial or Times Roman font.

For graduate students, my goal is for you to produce a paper that could serve as a useful part of your master’s thesis, comprehensive examination, or dissertation – or that you could submit to a decent journal as a review or commentary piece.

To make sure that you are thinking, researching, and writing the paper on a good schedule throughout the semester, you’ll submit the three assignments about one month apart. I’ve used this system in many previous classes, and it really helps students pace their work and avoid any last-minute panic about their papers.

Stage 1 (due in Class Sept 27): Provisional title, abstract, and annotated bibliography due in class (10% of final course grade).

Turn in a hardcopy document in class that day, including:

1) A provisional title, ideally about 8-20 words, that concisely explains what you think you’ll write about for the rest of the term. The title should be clear, concise, detailed, and take a stand on some issue in emotions research. A bad example title would be “Polyamory and politics” – it’s too vague. A better example title would be “Polyamory’s implications for marital equality and family law”. If you change your mind about your topic later, no problem, just tell me in an email later. Pick a topic that you feel passionate about – you’ll have to live with it for several months! (Of course, also include your name under the title).

2) A one-paragraph abstract, just under your title, in APA format, ideally about 150-250 words. Your title alone should give me a clear idea what you expect to write about. This abstract should go into more detail, demonstrating that you’ve already been doing some background reading about your issue, and you’re already starting to develop some of your own ideas. It should give me a sense of how you’ll structure your final term paper, how your flow of argument will go, and what kind of examples and findings you’ll use to support your points. The best abstracts have no wasted words or fluff: they get straight to the point and have real detail.

3) A provisional bibliography, after the abstract, listing about 10 to 20 sources relevant to your topic *that you have actually read*. Most of them should be journal papers; a few could be books (if you really had time to read them); they should not just be online resources, blogs, popular science features, etc. They should not all be from the syllabus here – you should use UNM’s online library resources and Google Scholar to find additional journal papers. In citing them, use standard APA reference format, e.g. as explained here: <http://www.library.cornell.edu/resrch/citmanage/apa> .

Also, you should explain each reference’s relevance to your topic with a brief annotation right after the APA citation. A good annotation would be “This paper critically reviews 18 recent studies confirming sex differences in sexual versus emotional jealousy.” A bad annotation would be “Reviews jealousy research”.

After I get this initial packet from you, I will write comments and suggestions on it and return it as soon as I can.

**Stage 2 (due in class Nov. 1): Revised abstract, outline, and annotated bibliography due in class (20% of course grade).**

Before doing this assignment, you should consider very carefully the comments and suggestions that I gave on your stage 1 assignment. Students who take my feedback seriously tend to get better grades.

The assignment format here is similar: turn in a hardcopy documentin class that day, printed single-sided on standard size white paper, with 1 inch margins, double-spaced, in 12 point Arial font. This assignment should include:

1) A revised title – ideally, more specific, clear, and exciting than before, but still about 8-20 words; include your name under the title.

2) A revised abstract that shows further research, thought, and organizational strategy, still about 150-250 words

3) An outline, around 2 pages long, that shows the planned structure of your paper. It should clearly show your flow of argument, and the specific theories, findings, and issues that you’ll consider.

The outline should include about 4 to 7 section headings that describe the overall organization of your term paper. A bad section heading would be a vague place-holder, such as “Introduction” or “Conclusion”. A good section heading would be much meatier, e.g. “Introduction: Three theories about the group-level benefits of monogamy”.

Under each section heading, you should have outline entries that show how you’ll flesh out your arguments. A bad entry would be “Ryan’s ideas.” A good entry would be “Ryan’s 2011 ideas about bonobo vs human mating patterns”. Outline entries can also cite bibliography entries as above.

4) A revised annotated bibliography. This should include about 20 to 30 references that you have actually read, and that you plan to cite in the final paper.

After I get this revised packet from you, I will write comments and suggestions on it and return it as soon as I can. This should allow you to submit a really good final draft, and I hope it will help you improve your writing generally.

##### Stage 3 (due the Friday after last class, before Final Exam week, on Dec. 8, by 4:00 pm): Final term paper due (30% of course grade):

##### *Turn it in to Geoffrey Miller’s mailbox in the Psychology Front Office, Logan Hall by* 4:00 pm, and *get it stamped by a front office staff member with the official date and time that you turn it in*.

This should be the culmination of three months of research, thinking, and writing about a topic that passionately interests you. It should take seriously my feedback on the stage 1 and 2 assignments. It must be in standard APA (American Psychological Association) research paper format; see the *APA Publication Manual* for details. This means double-spaced, single-sided, in 12 point Arial or Times Roman font, with a proper title page, abstract, references, and page numbering. It should be a well-polished document, thoroughly proofread, with very few spelling or grammatical errors.

The final term paper should include the following:

* Title: a clear, descriptive, engaging title, about 8-20 words, and your name
* Abstract: a concise, punchy abstract that interests the reader in your paper, about 150-250 words
* Introduction: Start with a bang. Pose the problem that interests you, and how you’ll approach it. Say where you stand, and why the reader should care. Be specific and clear; mix the theoretical and methodological level of discourse with real-life examples and issues; know when to be funny and when to be serious.
* Body of the paper: depending on what you’re writing about, this could include a literature review, a series of arguments, an overview of relevant ideas and research from a related area or field, a series of methodological analyses, criticism, and suggestions, or anything that advances your points. If you include literature reviews, don’t do generic overviews – review the literature with a purpose, critically, as it pertains to your topic.
* Research proposal: towards the end of your paper, sketch out a new empirical study that could resolve one of the issues you’ve raised in your paper. This could be a brief outline of a proposed experiment, an observational study, analysis of an archival dataset, or any other approach you think would be appropriate. You should explain what data would be collected, how it would be analyzed (roughly), and how the results would give insight into one of your paper’s key outstanding questions. *Many students forget to include this, and lose points as a result*.
* Annotated Bibliography: This should include about 20 to 30 good, relevant references that you’ve actually read; only some of them should be from this class syllabus. If your bibliography includes good, relevant papers and books that I haven’t read before, I will be impressed.

**Grading differences for Psych 650 (graduates) vs. Psych 450 (undergraduates)**

Students taking this course for Psych 650 credit (as graduate students) will be expected to show higher levels of scientific expertise, intellectual sophistication, background research, and writing skill throughout their in-class comments and term paper assignments. In particular, I expect graduate students to (1) read the assigned papers and book chapters more attentively, closely, and critically, (2) make more thoughtful, integrative, and comparative comments on the readings, (3) show higher intellectual maturity, complexity, and flexibility in their responses to scientific controversies, and (4) produce final term papers that could be submitted, with a little polishing, to a decent scientific journal.

**Schedule of topics and readings week by week**

## Class 1: Aug 23: Course overview and mechanics

No assigned readings before first class.

## Class 2: Aug 30: Introduction to polyamory and open relationships

**Readings to complete before this class (43 pp total):**

Michaels & Johnson (2015). *Designer relationships*:

* Foreword & Introduction, pp. x-xv (6 pp text)
* Chapter 1, ‘What is a designer relationship?’, pp 1-16 (16 pp text)
* Chapter 4, ‘Misconceptions about consensual nonmonogamy’, pp. 55-75 (21 pp text)

## Class 3: Sept 6: Introduction to current research on consensual non-monogamy

**Readings (45 pp total):**

Conley, T., Matsick, J., Moors, A. C., et al. (2017). Investigation of consensually nonmonogamous relationships: Theories, methods, and new directions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(2), 205-232. (22 pp. text)

Brandon, M. (2016). Monogamy and nonmonogamy: Evolutionary considerations and treatment challenges. *Sexual Medicine Review, 4*(4), 343-352. (8 pp text).

Haupert, M. L., Gesselman, A. N., Moors, A. C., et al. (2016). Prevalences of experiences with consensual nonmonogamous relationships: Findings from two national samples of single Americans. *J. of Sex & Marital Therapy*, April 20 online, 1-17. (15 pp text)

### Class 4: Sept 13: Varieties of mating systems and relationship agreements

**Readings (48 pp total):**

Michaels & Johnson (2015). *Designer relationships*:

Chapter 2, ‘What is monogamy?’, pp. 17-40 (24 pp text)

Bergstrand, C., & Williams, J. B. (2000). Today’s alternative marriages styles: The case of swingers. *Electronic J. of Human Sexuality, 3*(10), 1-12. (9 pp text).

Seguin, L. J., Blais, M., & Goyer, M.-F., et al. (2017). Examining relationship quality across three types of relationship agreements. *Sexualities, 20*(1-2), 86-104. (15 pp text)

### Class 5: Sept 20: Evolution of pair-bonding and social monogamy

##### *\*\*Term paper stage 1 due in class: Provisional title, abstract, and bibliography*

**Readings (26 pp total):**

Finkel, E. J., & Eastwick, P. W. (2015). Attachment and pairbonding. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 3*, 7-11 (4 pp text)

Lukas, D., & Clutton-Brock, T. H. (2013). The evolution of social monogamy in mammals. *Science, 341*, 526-530. (4 pp text)

Miller, G. F. (2013). Mutual mate choice models as the Red Pill in evolutionary psychology: Long delayed, much needed, ideologically challenging, and hard to swallow. *Psychological Inquiry, 24*(3), 207-210 (4 pp text)

Gangestad, S. W., & Haselton, M. G. (2015). Human estrus: Implications for relationship science. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 1*, 45-51. (5 pp text)

Kramer, K. L., & Russell, A. F. (2015). Was monogamy a key step on the hominin road? Reevaluating the monogamy hypothesis in the evolution of cooperative breeding. *Evolutionary Anthropology, 24*, 73-83. (9 pp text)

**Class 6: Sept 27: Human monogamy: Historical origins & cultural functions**

**Readings (40 pp total):**

Michaels & Johnson (2015). *Designer relationships*:

Chapter 3, ‘Mononormative myths’, pp. 41-53 (13 pp text

Miller, G. F. (2001). The dark continent of sexual strategies. (Review of The myth of monogamy by David Barash and Judith Eve Lipton). *Cerebrum, 3*(3), 113-120. (7 pp text)

Scheidel, W. (2009). A peculiar institution? Greco–Roman monogamy in global context. *The history of the family, 14*, 280-291. (9 pp text)

Henrich et al. (2012). The puzzle of monogamous marriage. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B, 367*, 657-669. (11 pp text)

**Class 7: Oct 4: Love, romance, and mating norms**

**Readings (49 pp total):**

Salmon, C. (2012). The pop culture of sex: An evolutionary window on the worlds of pornography and romance. *Review of General Psychology, 16*(2), 152-160. (7 pp text)

Fletcher, G. J. O., et al. (2015). Pair-bonding, romantic love, and evolution: The curious case of Homo sapiens. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*(1), 20-36. (15 pp text)

Moors, A. C., Matsink, J. L., & Schechinger, H. A. (2017). Unique and shared relationship benefits of consensually non-monogamous and monogamous relationships: A review and insights for moving forward. *European Psychologist, 22*(1), 55-71. (13 pp text)

Burleigh, T. J., Rubel, A. N., & Meegan, D. V. (2016). Wanting ‘the whole loaf’: Zero-sum thinking about love is associated with prejudice against consensual non-monogamists. *Psychology & Sexuality, 8*(1-2), 24-40. (14 pp text)

Class 8: Oct 11: Attitudes to non-monogamy: Public awareness and stigma

**Readings (40 pp total):**

Miller, G. F. (2011). Genes fit for a queen: How Kate won her mate. *New Scientist*, April 27. (4 pp)

Matsick, J. L., Conley, T. D., Ziegler, A., et al. (2014). Love and sex: Polyamorous relationships are perceived more favorably than swinging and open relationships. *Psychology & Sexuality, 5*(4), 339-348. (9 pp text)

Johnson, S. M., Giuliano, T. A., Herselman, J. R., et al. (2015). Development of a brief measure of attitudes towards polyamory. *Psychology & Sexuality, 6*(4), 325-339. (12 pp text)

Hutzler, K. T., Giuliano, T. A., Herselman, J. R., et al. (2016). Three’s a crowd: Public awareness and (mis)perceptions of polyamory. *Psychology & Sexuality, 7*(2), 69-87. (15 pp text)

**(Oct 12 - 15: Fall Break)**

**Class 9: Oct 18: Attitudes to non-monogamy: STIs and marriage law**

**Readings (46 pp total):**

Conley, T. D., Moors, A. C., Matsick, J. L., et al. (2015). Sexuality-related risks are judged more harshly than comparable health risks. *International J. of Sexual Health, 27*(4), 508-521. (12 pp text)

Lehmiller, J. J. (2015). A comparison of sexual health history and practices among monogamous and consensually nonmonogamous sexual partners. *J. of Sexual Medicine, 12*(10), 2022-2028. (7 pp text)

Dryden, J. B. (2015). This is the family I chose: Broadening domestic partnership law to include polyamory. *Journal of Public Law & Policy, 36*(1), 162-188. (27 pp)

Class 10: Oct 25: Jealousy as an evolved emotion and cultural value

##### *\*\*Term paper stage 2 due in class: Revised abstract, outline, and bibliography*

**Readings (50 pp total):**

Buss, D. M. (2013). Sexual jealousy. *Psychological Topics 22*, 2, 155-182. (23 pp text)

Aumer, K., Bellew, W., Ito, B., et alo. (2014). The happy green eyed monogamist: Role of jealousy and compersion in monogamous and non-traditional relationships. *Electronic J. of Human Sexuality, 17*, 1-22. (17 pp text)

Mogilski, J. K., Memering, S. L., Welling, L. L. M., et al. (2017). Monogamy versus consensual non-monogamy: Alternative approaches to pursuing a strategically pluralistic mating strategy. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 46*, 407-417. (10 pp text)

### Class 11: Nov 1: Traits that predict interest in different mating patterns

**Readings (35 pp total):**

Buss, David M. (2009). How can evolutionary psychology successfully explain personality and individual differences? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 4*(4), 359-366. (6 pp text)

Nettle, D., & Clegg, H. (2007). Personality, mating strategies, and mating intelligence. In G. Geher & Miller, G. F. (Eds.), *Mating intelligence: Sex, relationships, and the mind’s reproductive system* (pp. 121-132). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (12 pp text)

Kandrik, M., Jones, B. C., & DeBruine, L. S. (2015). Scarcity of female mates predicts regional variation in men’s and women’s sociosexual orientation across US states. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 36*, 206-210. (4 pp text)

Sizemore, K. M., & Olmstead, S. B., (2016). Willingness to engage in consensual nonmonogamy among emerging adults: A structural equation analysis of sexual identity, casual sex attitudes, and gender. *J. of Sex Research*, 1-12. (11 pp text)

### Class 12: Nov. 8: Ethics for open sexuality

**Readings (27 pp total)**

Michaels & Johnson (2015). *Designer relationships*:

* Chapter 7, ‘Ethical considerations in designer relationships’, pp. 123-129 (6 pp text)
* Afterword, pp. 131-132 (2 pp text)

Earp, B. D., Sandberg, A., & Savulescu, J. (2015). The medicalization of love. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, 24*(3), 323-336. (11 pp)

Fleischman, D. S. (2016). An evolutionary behaviorist perspective on orgasm. *Socioaffective Neuroscience & Psychology, 6*, e32130, 1-10. (8 pp text)

### Class 13: Nov. 15: Therapy with non-monogamous clients

**Readings (36 pp total):**

Graham, N. (2014). Polyamory: A call for increased mental health professional awareness. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 1031-1034. (4 pp text).

Weitzman, G., Davidson, J., & Phillips, R. A. (2009). *What psychology professionals should know about polyamory*. Baltimore, MD: National Coalition for Sexual Freedom. (Read pp. 7-23). (16 pp text)

Duplassie, D., & Fairbrother, N. (2016). Critical incidents that help and hinder the development and maintenance of polyamorous relationships. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 1-17. (16 pp)

### (Nov. 22: No class: Day before Thanksgiving Break, Nov. 23 - 26)

### Class 14: Nov. 29: What monogamous people can learn from poly people, and vice-versa

**Readings (54 pp total):**

Michaels & Johnson (2015). *Designer relationships*:

* Chapter 5, ‘Relationship skills for everyone’, pp. 77-104 (27 pp text)
* Chapter 6, ‘For couples and others’, pp. 105-122 (17 pp text)
* (44 pp total)

Mitchell, M. E., Bartholomew, K., & Cobb, R. J. (2014). Need fulfillment in polyamorous relationships. J*. of Sex Research, 51*(3), 329-339. (10 pp text)

**Class 15: Dec. 6: Last day of class: Topics and readings to be decided by class**

**Readings to be determined (X pp total):**

##### \*\*\* Friday Dec. 8: Final term paper (stage 3) due by 4:00 pm: in Geoffrey Miller’s mailbox in the Psychology Department Front Office, Logan Hall

# (UNM final exams are Dec 11-15, but there’s no final exam in this class)