

# Men's engagement in and enjoyment of cunnilingus: The role of gendered attitudes, sexual scripts, and masculinity

David Hattie<sup>1</sup>, Kari A. Walton<sup>1</sup>, Cydney Cocking<sup>1</sup>, Devinder Khera<sup>2</sup>, and Cory L. Pedersen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Surrey, British Columbia, Canada

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada

There is currently little research investigating men's lack of engagement in cunnilingus. This study explored reasons why some men do not engage in cunnilingus, as well as characteristics that distinguish those who engage from those who do not. A convenience sample of 935 straight and bisexual/pansexual male participants were asked to indicate whether they have ( $n = 833$ ,  $M_{age} = 37.14$ ,  $SD_{age} = 14.12$ ) or have not ( $n = 102$ ,  $M_{age} = 21.63$ ,  $SD_{age} = 6.11$ ) engaged in cunnilingus. Additionally, we interrogated participants' sexual history, precarious manhood belief, sexist beliefs, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women's genitals. Our results indicated that engagement in cunnilingus is very common among men who have sex with women, with 89.09% of our sample having performed oral sex at least once and the overwhelming majority of engagers (94.47%) indicating enjoyment. However, we also identified that men who do not engage in cunnilingus demonstrated greater levels of homophobia, had more negative attitudes toward women's genitals, and were less likely to be sexually narcissistic than men who did engage in cunnilingus. Endorsement of precarious manhood belief, benevolent sexism, and hostile sexism did not influence engagement in cunnilingus. Results also indicated that the primary reason men do not engage in or enjoy cunnilingus—aside from lack of opportunity—was the perception that cunnilingus is “gross.” Further, men who engaged in oral sex but did not enjoy it demonstrated greater endorsement of both precarious manhood belief and hostile sexism, as well as higher levels of homophobia and more negative attitudes toward women's genitals.

**KEYWORDS:** Attitudes, cunnilingus, homophobia, masculinity, oral sex, sexism, sexual scripts

In 2014, Khaled Mohamed Khaled—professionally known as DJ Khaled—appeared on the *Breakfast Club* radio program, during which he discussed his views on sex (Breakfast Club Power 105.1 FM, 2018). Khaled explained that because he is straight, he does not engage in the use of sex toys. Further, when queried about whether he performed cunnilingus, Khaled informed listeners that he never had and never would; he justified his unwillingness to “go down” by arguing that he provides for his partner fiscally rather than sexually.

When a female interviewer inquired whether Khaled would accept his partner refusing to perform fellatio on him, he maintained, “It's different rules for men . . . you gotta understand, we the king! There are some things that y'all [women] might not wanna do [i.e., perform fellatio]—it gotta get done. You know what I'm saying? I just can't do what you want me to do [i.e., perform cunnilingus]. I just can't.” It is not clear why Khaled felt uncomfortable performing cunnilingus on his partner(s) or why he did not perceive the use of sex toys as a heteronormative act (Breakfast

Club Power 105.1 FM, 2018). This interview dialogue, and the resulting uncertainty surrounding Khaled's motives, inspired this investigation. Herein, we examine whether Khaled's views are common among men by exploring why some men do not perform—or do not enjoy performing—cunnilingus. Moreover, we interrogate whether several different personality and motivational factors might explain differences between men who do and do not perform cunnilingus on women.

## GENDERED ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS ABOUT CUNNILINGUS

In Western cultures, gendered narratives of sex often frame women's sexual pleasure as complicated and elusive and men's pleasure as natural and achievable (Andrejek et al., 2022). Indeed, many believe that bringing women to the pinnacle of sexual pleasure (i.e., orgasm) is more difficult and challenging than bringing men to such a pinnacle (Andrejek et al., 2022; Klein & Conley, 2021;

**CORRESPONDENCE** concerning this article should be addressed to Cory L. Pedersen, Kwantlen Polytechnic University Faculty of Arts–Psychology, 12666 72nd Avenue, Surrey, British Columbia V3W 2M8, Canada. E-mail: [cory.pedersen@kpu.ca](mailto:cory.pedersen@kpu.ca)

**Author note:** Portions of this article were presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality (online 2021). The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

© Sex Information and Education Council of Canada, 2023

*The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 2023 • <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjhs-2022-0058>

This advance access version may differ slightly from the final published version

Welling, 2014). Although there is indeed substantial variability in women's capacity for and experience of orgasm (Graham, 2010), research has found that women most frequently report orgasm during sexual activities that involve direct clitoral stimulation, such as during cunnilingus (Andrejek et al., 2022; Armstrong et al., 2012; Blair et al., 2018; Mahar et al., 2020). However, cunnilingus—if it occurs at all—is often perceived as a chore and merely a precursor to other sexual acts (i.e., penetrative sex) relative to fellatio, which is often performed for its own sake (Andrejek et al., 2022; Braun et al., 2003; Lewis & Marston, 2016).

Further, women are often socially expected to be disproportionately responsible for performing oral sex—a standard that emerges, in part, from cultural emphasis on the importance and presence of men's pleasure above women's (Andrejek et al., 2022; Davis et al., 2018; Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013; Klein & Conley, 2021). For instance, Stone and colleagues (2006) found that 43% of their mixed-gender sample expected that men should receive fellatio during a straight sexual encounter, while only 20% expected that women should receive cunnilingus. Moreover, 15.3% of men in a college student sample explicitly stated that they refuse to perform cunnilingus on women despite expecting to receive fellatio (Jozkowski & Peterson, 2013). Finally, Klein and Conley (2021) found that men feel more entitled to sexual pleasure than women—and are generally perceived as being more deserving of it. Thus, if women feel less entitled to pleasure, they may be more willing to internalize and accept minimum standards for it (Klein & Conley, 2021; McClelland, 2010).

## RATES OF ORAL SEX PERFORMANCE AND RECEIPT

Research by Wood and colleagues (2016) indicates that men receive oral sex (63%) more often than they perform it (52%), whereas women perform oral sex (59%) more often than they receive it (44%). This finding mirrors previous research by Barrios and Lundquist (2012), who found that straight men reported receiving fellatio 90% of the time during their last hookup encounter yet performed cunnilingus only 55% of the time. Though Blair and colleagues (2018) found no difference in heterosexual men's and women's frequency of oral sex receipt in the context of romantic relationships, several studies nonetheless suggest that heterosexual women report the lowest frequency of orgasm compared to men, lesbian women, and bisexual women (Armstrong et al., 2012; Barrios & Lundquist, 2012; Blair et al., 2018; England & Thomas, 2006; Frederick et al., 2018; Garcia et al., 2014). Such findings indicate that there is currently an inequality gap between men's and women's orgasms—the oft cited “orgasm gap” (Wade et al., 2005)—which some scholars have attributed to sexual scripts that prioritize penetrative sex with a co-occurring absence of focus on clitoral stimulation and cunnilingus (Blair et al., 2018; Mahar et al., 2020).

Women's receipt of cunnilingus is also influenced by contextual factors; women are more likely to expect and receive cunnilingus during sex with a relationship partner than they are during a casual encounter—with the additional caveat that, in the latter context, women must be assertive to receive cunnilingus (Armstrong et al., 2012; Backstrom et al., 2012). Conversely, straight men report

high rates of fellatio receipt during both casual and relational sexual encounters (Armstrong et al., 2012). Other research indicates that cunnilingus is often excluded from straight sexual encounters unless it is paired with fellatio reciprocation; that is, fellatio may occur without reciprocation, whereas cunnilingus often does not (Andrejek et al., 2022; Vannier & O'Sullivan, 2012). Finally, women's receipt of cunnilingus may be influenced by individual factors, including poor body image or low genital self-esteem, low sexual desire/arousal, a lack of confidence in partner skill, or a tendency to prioritize a partner's pleasure over their own (Herbenick, 2009; Hoskins et al., 2022; Salisbury & Fisher, 2014). Some evidence suggests that men in mixed-sex relationships are significantly more likely to enjoy cunnilingus than women enjoy fellatio (Blair et al., 2018; Pinkerton et al., 2003; Wood et al., 2016), suggesting that women's lower likelihood of receiving oral sex may be related to their reluctance to perform it.

The previously observed disparity in men's and women's receipt of oral sex—and men's seemingly lower likelihood to perform cunnilingus—may also be explained by gendered expectations of fellatio and cunnilingus, the perception of the vulva as unhygienic or “gross,” sexual narcissism, sexism, prioritizing men's sexual needs over women's, or insecurity/feelings of incompetency regarding sexual performance (Damon, 2000; Fahs & Swank, 2021; Johansson & Hammarén, 2007; Klein & Conley, 2021; Lewis & Marston, 2016; McNulty & Widman, 2013; Ringrose & Harvey, 2015; Stick & Fetner, 2020; Vannier & O'Sullivan, 2012). These factors, in turn, may arise from social scripts that influence beliefs and ideas about engagement in cunnilingus.

## SEXUAL SCRIPTS, MASCULINITY, AND THE ROLE OF PRECARIOUS MANHOOD

Social scripts are culture-specific, internalized behaviours, actions, and consequences that are expected in a particular situation, environment, or context (Wiederman, 2015). Social scripts act as templates to create meaning based on the beliefs or expectations of a particular group (Wiederman, 2015). Sexual scripts, in turn, are social scripts that apply to sexual contexts; they are used to create meaning in sexual activity that dictates what is, or what is not, acceptable sexual behaviour for a particular group (e.g., men and women) (Simon & Gagnon, 1984, 1986; Wiederman, 2015). One such example is that men are expected to assert dominance in straight sexual encounters by initiating sexual activity and sexual conversations, whereas women are expected to be passive recipients of men's sexual advances (Sakaluk et al., 2014). Further, heteronormative sexual scripts place emphasis on penile-vaginal penetrative sex over other forms of sexual activity, such as cunnilingus (Andrejek et al., 2022). Cunnilingus may challenge traditional sexual scripts for men because while performing it—relative to receiving fellatio or engaging in penetrative sex—a man is in a submissive position by “servicing” and catering to a woman, rather than being in a dominant position, being serviced (Baumeister, 1988; Gagnon & Simon, 2005; Sanchez et al., 2012). Indeed, some men (and some women) eroticize sexist stereotypes that relegate women to positions of submission and men to positions of dominance, whose pleasure should be

prioritized (Dienberg et al., 2022; Klein & Conley 2021; Sanchez et al., 2012; Satinsky & Jozkowski, 2015).

Although the performance of oral sex on either a man or a woman is a conceptually similar activity, sexual scripts of male dominance and control ascribe different consequences for men who perform cunnilingus (Gagnon & Simon, 2005). This reality calls to mind a first-season episode of the popular television series *The Sopranos*, where mob character Uncle Junior warns his girlfriend that she cannot reveal his enjoyment of cunnilingus for fear of negative consequences—“they think if you suck pussy, you’ll suck anything. It’s a sign of weakness,” he claims (Chase et al., 1999–2007). The conflict between adhering to sexual scripts and performing cunnilingus may thus lead some men to avoid engagement in the activity to maintain a sense of masculinity and avoid appearing submissive. For instance, while some research has found that men are more likely than women to report that performing oral sex is very pleasurable (Blair et al., 2018; Pinkerton et al., 2003; Wood et al., 2016)—and that men who reciprocate cunnilingus view themselves as caring, sensitive, and generous lovers (Braun et al., 2003)—the discrepancy between the number of men who receive oral sex versus those who perform it nonetheless exists, suggesting that adherence to sexual scripts may influence willingness to participate in a desired sexual behaviour (e.g., Sanchez et al., 2012).

Further, strict adherence to sexual scripts often necessitates the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity—endorsing a hierarchy that has men dominant over women while engaging in socially approved practices and avoiding others to prove one’s manhood (Alden & Parker, 2005; Scott, 2014). For many straight men, such masculinity achievement involves sexual prowess, knowledge of the female body, and the requisite skills (i.e., sexual adequacy; see Mahar et al., 2020; Masters & Johnson, 1970) necessary to provide sexual pleasure to female partners through penetrative sex (Backstrom et al., 2012; Chadwick & van Anders, 2017; Gagnon & Simon, 2005; Pascoe, 2007). Indeed, a cursory search of social media provides ample anecdotal evidence that some men identify cunnilingus as a threat to masculinity. One Twitter post asserted that “once you eat a woman’s pussy, she wears the pants in the relationship. You’re the bitch.” Another claimed that “eating girls out is submissive. You are what you eat. If you, as a man, eat pussy, you are one,” while yet another maintained that “there is nothing wrong with satisfying your girl. So do it with your penis (powerful & dominant) and not your tongue (weak & submissive).” Considering that various forms of media may influence perceptions of labia and engagement in sexual behaviour (Dubinskaya et al., 2022; Koning et al., 2009; Maki et al., 2022; Mowat et al., 2020; Sharp et al., 2016), exposure to such content could serve to reinforce negative perceptions of cunnilingus as antithetical to masculinity. We theorize that men who ascribe to rigid sexual scripts and views of masculinity—and who endorse precarious manhood beliefs, or ideas that masculinity is difficult to win and easy to lose (Vandello et al., 2008)—perceive the performance of cunnilingus as a particular threat; by adopting a sexually “submissive” role, they lose their right to call themselves “real” men, leading them to avoid or dis-like engagement in the activity.

## HOSTILE AND BENEVOLENT SEXISM

Hostile sexism is a set of sexist attitudes that promote hostility and hatred toward women, while benevolent sexism proscribes traditionally restrictive social scripts toward women but with a positive affect and tone (Glick & Fiske, 1996). To the best of our knowledge, no study has yet explored the relationship between sexism and the willingness of men to engage in cunnilingus. There are, however, positive associations among sexism, adherence to traditional sexual scripts, and reciprocity inequality (Sanchez et al., 2012; Satinsky & Jozkowski, 2015). As noted, traditional sexual scripts expect men to initiate sexual encounters and be dominant, while women are expected to be submissive and neglect their own sexual needs in favor of ensuring their partner’s sexual satisfaction (Andrejek et al., 2022; Sakaluk et al., 2014; Sanchez et al., 2012). Thus, we theorize that men who endorse sexist attitudes—particularly hostile sexism—will also be disinclined to engage in cunnilingus due to their overall antagonism toward women and the consequences of breaking traditional sexual scripts of dominance (Sanchez et al., 2012).

## SEXUAL NARCISSISM

Sexually narcissistic individuals are sexually exploitive and sexually entitled, exhibit low sexual empathy, and present with an inflated sense of sexual prowess (McNulty & Widman, 2013). The specific link between sexual narcissism and engagement in cunnilingus, to our knowledge, has not been explored; however, given previous research on sexual narcissism more broadly, we theorize that sexually narcissistic men may believe they can sexually satisfy women without cunnilingus or should not have to reciprocate oral sex due to sexual entitlement (McNulty & Widman, 2013).

## FEARS OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Given the relative absence of cunnilingus discussion in most formal sexuality education (Jones et al., 2016)—and a focus on heteronormative sexuality positioning penile/vaginal sex as the most prominent sexual behaviour (Dotson-Blake et al., 2012; Fahs & Swank, 2021; Hans et al., 2010)—some men might misattribute sexual acts not involving penile penetration as homosexual in nature. It is also possible that misattributed homosexual acts may be seen as inherently submissive due to the implicit inversion stereotype that gay men are more similar to women than straight men (Kite & Deaux, 1987; Wong et al., 1999). Evidence to this is found in both science and anecdote. For instance, Wells (1991) noted that men in his sample were reluctant to participate in sexual activities they identified as stereotypically feminine or homosexual, such as taking a passive sex role and gentle genital caressing. In popular culture—particularly on social media sites like Twitter and Instagram—it is not uncommon to find references to homosexuality in acts of cunnilingus; one Twitter post boldly maintained that “eating pussy is gay because you’re literally [sic] slurping down estrogen.” We therefore theorize that men who endorse homophobic views will be less likely to engage in or enjoy performing cunnilingus.



## THE VULVA AS UNSIGHTLY

In Western cultures, beauty standards for women often focus on the face, buttocks, and breasts while largely ignoring the rest of the body, including the vulva (Backstrom et al., 2012). When the vulva is referenced, cultural scripts—often perpetuated by feminine hygiene advertisements and advice columns for women—represent the vulva as generally unhygienic, “nasty,” “messy,” or “droopy” (Braun & Wilkinson, 2001; Nurka & Jones, 2013; West, 2016) and a source of humor with respect to a “fishy” taste and smell (Braun & Kitzing, 2001; Gagnon & Simon, 2005). Subsequently, the most popular aesthetic representation of the vulva in both pornographic and nonpornographic media is a “tucked-in” and clean appearance (Jones & Nurka, 2015; Sharp et al., 2016) maintained by hair removal or plastic surgery (Braun 2005; Braun & Kitzing, 2001; Braun & Wilkinson, 2001), yet even surgically altered vulvas fail to meet the societal and personal idealized standard (see Oswald et al., 2022; Skoda et al., 2021). The negative social perception of labia contributes to women’s low genital self-esteem and may lead to internalized disgust with their own “imperfect” genitalia—potentially resulting in a decreased propensity to request or accept cunnilingus during a sexual encounter (Herbenick, 2009; Hoskins et al., 2022). We therefore propose that negative perceptions of the vulva may perpetuate the stereotype that performing cunnilingus is a “dirty” activity and will be related to men’s disengagement from and dislike of cunnilingus (Herbenick, 2009; Reinholtz & Muehlenhard, 1995).

## FOCUS OF THE CURRENT STUDY

This study explored reasons why some men do not engage in cunnilingus, as well as characteristics that distinguish those who engage from those who do not. Based on previous research, we hypothesized that men who do not engage in cunnilingus would score higher on measures of precarious manhood belief, sexism, sexual narcissism, and homophobia and would have more negative attitudes toward women’s genitals. For exploratory purposes, we also examined whether the variables of precarious manhood belief, sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women’s genitals differ among men who engage in cunnilingus but report either liking or disliking the activity.

## METHODS

### Participants

Following research ethics board approval, participants 16 years of age or older<sup>1</sup> who self-identified as men sexually interested in women (i.e., straight, bisexual, or pansexual) were recruited through various social media sites and online spaces dedicated to psychology and sexology research (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Reddit). Additionally, participants were recruited using

the research participant pool of a sizable Western Canadian university. All recruitment materials involved standardized scripts drawn from the informed consent form which advertised a study about “men’s attitudes and behaviours regarding oral sexual encounters with women.” The initial dataset included 1,235 participants. From this, 86 were excluded for failing to answer the primary dependent variable (i.e., have you performed oral sex on a woman?), and an additional 214 participants were excluded for failing to respond to any dependent variables (e.g., sexism, homophobia, precarious manhood, etc.). The final sample was composed of 935 men (cisgender  $n = 917$ ) with data collected between August 2020 and August 2021.<sup>2</sup>

An independent samples t-test revealed that men who engage in cunnilingus were significantly older than their

**TABLE 1.** Distribution of Demographic Characteristics by Cunnilingus Engagement Status ( $N = 935$ )

	Non-engagers $n = 102$ $M_{age} = 21.63$ ( $SD = 6.11$ ), % ( $n$ )	Engagers $n = 833$ $M_{age} = 37.14$ ( $SD = 14.12$ ), % ( $n$ )
Ethnicity		
White	49 (48.0) <sub>a</sub>	644 (77.3) <sub>b</sub>
Ethnic minority	51 (50.0) <sub>a</sub>	177 (21.2) <sub>b</sub>
Did not specify	2 (2.0)	12 (1.4)
Relationship status		
Committed	14 (13.7) <sub>a</sub>	563 (67.6) <sub>b</sub>
Noncommitted	88 (86.3) <sub>a</sub>	270 (32.4) <sub>b</sub>
Education		
Some high school	20 (19.6) <sub>a</sub>	17 (2.0) <sub>b</sub>
Completed high school	19 (18.6) <sub>a</sub>	52 (6.2) <sub>b</sub>
Some college/university	44 (43.1) <sub>a</sub>	252 (30.3) <sub>b</sub>
Completed college/university	19 (18.6) <sub>a</sub>	512 (61.5) <sub>b</sub>
Sexual orientation		
Straight	76 (74.5)	672 (80.7)
Bisexual/pansexual	26 (25.5)	161 (19.3)
Previous sexuality education		
Yes	84 (82.4)	564 (67.7)
No	18 (17.4)	269 (32.3)

*Notes.* Some demographic variables were recoded to satisfy statistical assumptions. Recoding procedures included regrouping as little as possible to retain accurate demographic information: ethnic minority (inclusive of Black, Asian, South Asian, Hispanic/Latin American, Middle Eastern, Indigenous/Aboriginal, Pacific Islander, and Multiracial categories); noncommitted relationship status (inclusive of single, casually dating, separated, divorced, widowed); completed university (inclusive of graduate, postgraduate, and vocational degrees). Columns with differing subscripts are significantly different,  $p < 0.05$ . Percentages appear in parentheses.

<sup>1</sup> 16 years is the legal age to provide sexual consent in Canada.

<sup>2</sup> Due to our research ethics board requirements of participant anonymity and privacy, survey metadata (e.g., IP addresses and geolocations) were not collected. As such, participants cannot be identified or compared based on their recruitment avenues, and we cannot determine which avenue was the most successful for recruiting participants.

non-engaging counterparts,  $t(933) = -10.97, p < 0.001$ . Further, chi-square analyses indicated significant differences between engagement groups in reported ethnicity,  $\chi^2(2) = 41.48, p < 0.01$ ; relationship status,  $\chi^2(1) = 111.57, p < 0.001$ ; and highest level of completed education,  $\chi^2(3) = 123.35, p < 0.001$ . No significant difference between engagement status groups was reported in sexual orientation,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.16, p = 0.142$ . Table 1 presents participant demographics by engagement status.

A second independent samples t-test among only engagers of cunnilingus revealed no significant age difference between men who reported either enjoying or disliking cunnilingus,  $t(831) = -0.705, p = 0.481$ . Further, chi-square analyses indicated no significant differences between enjoyment status groups in ethnicity,  $\chi^2(2) = 4.60, p = 0.001$ ; highest level of completed education,  $\chi^2(3) = 1.92, p = 0.590$ ; or sexual orientation,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.117, p = 0.732$ . However, significant differences were found between enjoyment status groups in relationship status,  $\chi^2(1) = 8.68.57, p = 0.003$  (see Table 2).

**TABLE 2.** Distribution of Demographic Characteristics by Cunnilingus Enjoyment Status ( $N = 833$ )

	Dislike $n = 46$ $M_{age} = 35.72$ ( $SD = 14.61$ ), % ( $n$ )	Enjoy $n = 787$ $M_{age} = 37.23$ ( $SD = 14.10$ ), % ( $n$ )
Ethnicity		
White	31 (67.4)	613 (77.9.0)
Ethnic minority	13 (28.3)	164 (20.8)
Did not specify	2 (4.3)	10 (1.3)
Relationship status		
Committed	22 (47.8) <sub>a</sub>	541 (68.7) <sub>b</sub>
Noncommitted	24 (52.2) <sub>a</sub>	246 (31.3) <sub>b</sub>
Education		
Some high school	0 (0)	17 (2.2)
Completed high school	3 (6.5)	49 (6.2)
Some college/university	17 (37.0)	235 (29.9)
Completed college/university	26 (56.5)	486 (61.8)
Sexual orientation		
Straight	38 (82.6)	634 (80.6)
Bisexual/pansexual	8 (17.4)	153 (19.4)
Previous sexuality education		
Yes	564 (67.7)	84 (82.4)
No	269 (32.3)	18 (17.4)

Notes. Some demographic variables were recoded to satisfy statistical assumptions. Recoding procedures included regrouping as little as possible to retain accurate demographic information: ethnic minority (inclusive of Black, Asian, South Asian, Hispanic/Latin American, Middle Eastern, Indigenous/Aboriginal, Pacific Islander, and Multiracial categories); noncommitted relationship status (inclusive of single, casually dating, separated, divorced, widowed); completed university (inclusive of graduate, postgraduate, and vocational degrees). Columns with differing subscripts are significantly different,  $p < 0.05$ . Percentages appear in parentheses.

## Measures

### Demographics

Participants responded to a six-item questionnaire regarding their gender and sexual orientation (to ascertain participant eligibility), age, ethnicity, relationship status, and highest level of completed education.

### Cunnilingus Questionnaire

The cunnilingus questionnaire created for this study involved a six-item branching survey inquiring about a participant's history of engagement in cunnilingus. The first item determined whether participants had ever performed cunnilingus. If participants selected "no," they were given a single follow-up item asking, "Why have you never performed oral sex on a woman?" with response options to select all that applied from among the following: (a) I have never had the opportunity, (b) I fear that I would be incompetent at performing oral sex, (c) I feel that oral sex is gross, (d) I do not feel a need to please my partner orally, (e) I feel I will seem gay if I perform oral sex, (f) I would not feel manly performing oral sex, (g) my partner(s) did not enjoy oral sex, and (h) an open-ended response option for reasons not previously provided.

Participants who responded "yes" to the initial question were provided several follow-up items, one of which inquired, "Do you enjoy performing oral sex on a woman?" Participants who responded "no" were provided several response options to indicate why they do not enjoy it, which were identical to those previously provided for participants who indicated they had never performed cunnilingus (with "never having had the opportunity" removed). Participants who responded "yes" were further asked about the frequency that they perform cunnilingus using a scale ranging from 1 (very rarely) to 5 (very commonly). They were then asked to evaluate their ability in performing cunnilingus on a scale ranging from 1 (very poorly) to 5 (very well).

### Precarious Manhood Beliefs

The PMB scale consists of seven items assessing the perceived precariousness of manhood—the degree to which manhood is seen as tenuous and elusive (Vandello et al., 2008). The measure is composed of items such as "manhood is something that can be taken away" and "manhood is not assured—it can be lost." Participants responded to each item using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all true) to 6 (very true), with totaled scores ranging from 0 to 42. Higher scores indicated greater endorsement of the precariousness of manhood ( $\alpha = 0.87$ ).

### Ambivalent Sexism Inventory—Short Form

The ASI-SF (Glick & Fiske, 1996) measures ambivalent (i.e., hostile and benevolent) sexist attitudes across 12 items. The first 6 comprise the hostile sexism subscale, with items including statements such as "women seek to gain power by getting control over men" and "women exaggerate problems they have at work." The remaining 6 items comprise the benevolent sexism subscale, with items including statements such as "many women have a quality of purity that few men possess" and "women should be cherished and

protected by men.” Each item is rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Totaled scores for each subscale range from 6 to 30, with higher scores indicating greater hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes. In the present study, the scale achieved good internal consistency reliability for both the hostile ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ) and benevolent sexism ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ) subscales.

### **Sexual Narcissism Scale**

The SNS (Widman & McNulty, 2010) is a 20-item scale measuring the manifestation of narcissistic tendencies in sexual situations. Each item is measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The measure includes items such as “I could easily convince an unwilling person to have sex with me” and “I should be permitted to have sex whenever I want it.” Scoring includes reversing two items and summing for total scores ranging from 20 to 100. Higher scores indicate greater sexual narcissism ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ).

### **Homophobia Scale**

The HS (Wright et al., 1999) is a 25-item measure evaluating the cognitive, affective, and behavioural components of homophobia. The measure includes items such as “homosexuality is acceptable to me” and “homosexuality is immoral” measured on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Totaled scores range from 25–125, where higher scores indicate greater homophobia ( $\alpha = 0.93$ ).

### **Attitudes Toward Women’s Genitals Scale**

The ATWGS (Herbenick, 2009) is a 10-item measure evaluating attitudes toward the appearance and attractiveness of women’s genitals. Each item is measured on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Examples include “women’s genitals smell bad” and “women’s genitals are ugly.” Totaled scores range from 10 to 40, with lower scores indicating greater negative attitudes toward women’s genitals ( $\alpha = 0.89$ ).

### **Procedure**

Participants were recruited and directed to an online survey hosted on the Qualtrics survey platform. After attaining informed consent, participants completed the demographics form—those who did not meet the inclusionary criteria were automatically directed out of the survey. Eligible participants continued to complete the following measures: the cunnilingus questionnaire, the Precarious Manhood Beliefs Scale, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, the Sexual Narcissism Scale, the Homophobia Scale, and the Attitude Toward Women’s Genitals Scale. Following completion of the study measures, participants were provided with an online debriefing form detailing the purpose of the study and the contact information of the research ethics board and principal investigator for follow-up questions. The study had a median completion time of approximately 11 minutes.

## **RESULTS**

### **Statistical Analyses**

A one-way multivariate analysis of co-variance (MANCOVA), followed by a discriminant function analysis, were determined as the best analyses for this study’s research question of whether measures of precarious manhood belief, sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women’s genitals distinguish men who engage in cunnilingus from those who do not. Reasons for men not engaging in cunnilingus were explored by examining frequency data.

Finally, among those who engaged in cunnilingus, we interrogated differences in measures of precarious manhood belief, sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women’s genitals between engagers who reported enjoying and not enjoying the activity in a second one-way MANCOVA and follow-up discriminant function analysis.

### **Descriptive Data**

Overall, our findings revealed that engagement in cunnilingus is very common among men who have sex with women, with 89.09% of our sample having performed oral sex at least once and the overwhelming majority of engagers (94.47%) indicating enjoyment. Further, most participants had low levels of sexism and generally positive attitudes toward women’s genitals, though differences were found across both engagement and enjoyment status. Table 3 provides descriptive differences for engagers and non-engagers on our dependent variables of precarious manhood belief endorsement, hostile and benevolent sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women’s genitals. Table 5 provides descriptive differences between enjoyers and non-enjoyers on these same six dependent variables.

### **Analyses of Differences between Engagement and Non-Engagement Status**

A one-way MANCOVA—controlling for participant age—examined differences between men who engage in cunnilingus from those who do not on the dependent variables of precarious manhood belief, hostile and benevolent sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women’s genitals.<sup>3</sup> A statistically significant effect was obtained, *Wilks’s*  $\Lambda = 0.87$ ,  $F(6, 927) = 14.39$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.09$  (see Table 3).

A follow-up discriminant function analysis examined engagement status as the dependent variable and precarious manhood belief, hostile and benevolent sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women’s genitals as predictor variables. A single discriminant function revealed a reliable association between engagement status and three of the six predictors,  $\chi^2(6) = 129.21$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . As seen in Table 4, we found partial support for H1; the loading matrix of correlations suggests that the variables of sexual

<sup>3</sup> MANCOVA analyses were conducted on men who engage in cunnilingus compared to men who do not with the addition of relationship status and highest level of completed education as covariates. Violations to assumptions of independence and homogeneity of regression slopes were found, necessitating the removal of these covariates from analyses.

**TABLE 3.** Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables by Engagement Status (Controlling for Age)

	Min	Max	M	SD	SE	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper
Engagers ( <i>n</i> = 833; 89.09%)							
Precarious manhood belief	0	42	14.89	9.21	0.32	14.25	15.53
Benevolent sexism	3	30	16.45	5.48	0.17	16.11	16.78
Hostile sexism	6	30	14.67	4.79	0.19	14.30	15.05
Sexual narcissism	15	100	47.13	10.85	0.38	46.37	47.89
Homophobia	7	125	37.69	14.46	0.51	36.68	38.70
Attitudes toward women's genitals	3	40	34.94	4.41	0.15	34.64	35.24
Non-engagers ( <i>n</i> = 102; 10.91%)							
Precarious manhood belief	0	40	16.38	10.43	0.97	14.47	18.28
Benevolent sexism	6	30	16.79	5.80	0.51	15.80	17.78
Hostile sexism	6	28	15.56	5.11	0.58	14.43	16.69
Sexual narcissism	11	79	43.73	12.21	1.15	41.47	45.99
Homophobia	24	90	45.93	16.77	1.54	42.91	48.95
Attitudes toward women's genitals	12	40	30.52	5.43	0.46	29.64	31.40

Notes. *N* = 935. Higher score totals indicate greater endorsement of each construct. Precarious manhood belief range = 0–42; benevolent and hostile sexism range = 6–30; sexual narcissism range = 20–100; homophobia range = 25–125; attitudes toward women's genitals range = 10–40.

narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women's genitals served as significant predictors, though sexual narcissism did not differentiate between engagers and non-engagers in the expected direction. The derived canonical coefficient generated by this discriminant analysis also revealed that 89% of cases could be correctly classified as either engagers or non-engagers based on the dependent variable scores. These results indicate that this set of constructs in combination provide significant discrimination between men who engage and who do not engage in cunnilingus.

### Reasons for Lack of Engagement Among Non-Engagers

Motivational factors were used as exploratory variables to investigate reasons for lack of cunnilingus among men who do not engage in it (*n* = 102). The most highly endorsed reasons included a lack of opportunity (73.53%), the perception of cunnilingus as “gross” (13.73%), an absence of partner interest (5.88%), and religious reasons (2.94%). The least frequently endorsed items (at 1% each) included feelings of incompetence, the perception of cunnilingus as “unmanly,” and being medically incapable (see Appendix, Table A1).

**TABLE 4.** Discriminant Function Analysis: Classifying Engagers and Non-Engagers

Variable	Correlations with discriminant function	Univariate <i>F</i> (1, 932)
Precarious manhood belief	−0.23	2.06
Benevolent sexism	−0.03	0.401
Hostile sexism	−0.16	2.10
Sexual narcissism	0.27	7.68*
Homophobia	−0.48	25.22*
Attitudes toward women's genitals	0.81	47.34*

  

Classification summary			
Actual group	Functions at group centroids	Predicted group	
		Engagers YES	Non-engagers NO
Engagers YES	0.135	815 (97.8%)	18 (2.2%)
Non-engagers NO	−1.10	86 (84.3%)	16 (15.7%)
88.9% of cases correctly classified			

\*  $p < 0.001$ .

### Analyses of Differences Between Enjoyers and Non-Enjoyers

A one-way MANCOVA—controlling for highest level of completed education given differences in educational attainment—examined differences in precarious manhood belief, hostile and benevolent sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women's genitals between engagers who enjoy and who do not enjoy cunnilingus (*n* = 833).<sup>4</sup> That is, among practitioners of cunnilingus, we explored whether differences exist between men who reported enjoying cunnilingus and men who dislike it (despite their engagement). A statistically significant MANOVA effect was obtained, *Wilks's*  $\Lambda = 0.88$ ,  $F(6, 825) = 19.59$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , partial  $\eta^2 = 0.13$  (see Table 5).

A follow-up discriminant analysis examined enjoyment status as the dependent variable and precarious manhood belief, sexism, sexual narcissism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women's genitals as predictor variables. A single discriminant function revealed a reliable association between enjoyment status and four of the six predictors,  $\chi^2(6) = 109.63$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . The variables of precarious manhood belief, hostile sexism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women's genitals served as significant predictors, and the derived canonical

<sup>4</sup> MANCOVA analyses were conducted on men who enjoy cunnilingus compared with men who do not with both relationship status and highest level of completed education as covariates. Violations to assumptions of independence and homogeneity of regression slopes were found for relationship status, necessitating the removal of this covariate from analyses. Educational attainment level showed no such violations and was thus retained in the analysis.



**TABLE 5.** Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables by Enjoyment Status (Controlling for Educational Attainment)

	Min	Max	M	SD	SE	95% CI	
						Lower	Upper
Enjoy ( <i>n</i> = 787; 94.47%)							
Precarious manhood belief	0	42	14.50	9.03	0.33	13.86	15.14
Benevolent sexism	6	30	16.42	4.74	0.17	16.08	16.76
Hostile sexism	3	30	14.52	5.40	0.19	14.14	14.90
Sexual narcissism	15	100	47.02	10.75	0.39	46.26	47.78
Homophobia	21	125	37.29	14.10	0.51	36.29	38.30
Attitudes toward women's genitals	3	40	35.43	4.06	0.15	35.14	35.72
Dislike ( <i>n</i> = 46; 5.52%)							
Precarious manhood belief	1	42	19.25	11.02	1.35	16.61	21.90
Benevolent sexism	6	28	17.20	5.68	0.71	15.81	18.59
Hostile sexism	6	30	16.93	6.23	0.80	15.35	18.51
Sexual narcissism	28	78	49.42	12.42	1.60	46.28	52.56
Homophobia	7	100	43.45	20.00	2.12	39.28	47.61
Attitudes toward women's genitals	15	37	28.76	5.34	0.61	27.56	29.96

Notes. *N* = 833. Higher score totals indicate greater endorsement of each construct. Precarious manhood belief range = 0–42; benevolent and hostile sexism range = 6–30; sexual narcissism range = 20–100; homophobia range = 25–125; attitudes toward women's genitals range = 10–40.

**TABLE 6.** Discriminant Function Analysis: Classifying Enjoyment and Dislike Among Engagers (*n* = 833)

Variable	Correlations with discriminant function	Univariate <i>F</i> (1, 831)
Precarious manhood belief	−0.32	11.77*
Benevolent sexism	−0.10	1.16
Hostile sexism	−0.27	8.50+
Sexual narcissism	−0.14	2.13
Homophobia	−0.26	7.94+
Attitudes toward women's genitals	0.98	113.17*

  

Classification summary			
Actual group	Functions at group centroids	Predicted group	
		Enjoyment	Dislike
		780 (99.1%)	7 (0.9%)
		39 (84.8%)	7 (15.2%)
		94.5% of cases correctly classified	

*p* < 0.01. \**p* < 0.001.

coefficient revealed that 95% of cases could be correctly classified as either enjoying or not enjoying cunnilingus by their precarious manhood belief, hostile sexism, homophobia, and attitudes toward women's genitals scores (see Table 6). Finally, an examination of frequency data (see Appendix, Table A2) indicated that among the 46 participants who reported engaging in yet disliking cunnilingus, the most commonly endorsed reason for not enjoying the practice was due to the perception of cunnilingus as “gross,” with 45.65% of participants selecting this reason. The second and third most commonly endorsed reasons for not liking cunnilingus despite engagement was an absence of need to please a sexual partner orally (15.22%) and feelings of incompetence in performing cunnilingus (13.04%).

## DISCUSSION

The present research explored why some men do not perform, or do not enjoy performing, cunnilingus on women. We identified various characteristics that distinguish men who engage in cunnilingus from those who do not, interrogated reasons for lack of engagement as well as for lack of enjoyment, and explored characteristics that differentiate men who like and dislike performing cunnilingus.

Our results indicated that engagement in cunnilingus is very common among men who have sex with women, with 89.09% of our sample having performed oral sex at least once. Further, of those who reported engaging in cunnilingus, the overwhelming majority (94.47%) indicated that they enjoy it. These results align with previous findings that men find the performance of oral sex enjoyable (Blair et al., 2018; Pinkerton et al., 2003; Wood et al., 2016) and that men who perform cunnilingus view themselves as good lovers (Braun et al., 2003). Moreover, our results appear to contradict previous research indicating that rates of oral sex performance among men are relatively low compared to women (e.g., Armstrong et al., 2012; Barrios & Lundquist, 2012; Frederick et al., 2018; Garcia et al., 2014; Wood et al., 2016), suggesting that attitudes and norms surrounding cunnilingus are shifting to be increasingly accepting. Though social desirability and selection bias may have influenced our findings, we nonetheless consider these results to reflect a positive trend in men's attitudes toward cunnilingus.

Still, it may also be true that some who have performed (and enjoy performing) cunnilingus are not doing it with particularly high frequency, partly explaining the observed orgasm gap and women's lower likelihood to receive oral sex found in previous research (see Armstrong et al., 2012; Barrios & Lundquist, 2012; Wood et al., 2016). Our results indicated that 76% of cunnilingus enjoyers (i.e., 73% of engagers) reported performing oral sex “commonly” or “very commonly.” Thus, though our sample of men indicated engagement in and positive attitudes toward cunnilingus, some may still be underperforming it, perhaps due to the influence of sexual scripts on men's likelihood to initiate—and women's likelihood to request or accept—cunnilingus (see Blair et al., 2018). Indeed, the primary reported reason for disengagement in cunnilingus was a lack of opportunity



(73.53%)—compared to 13.73% identifying cunnilingus as “gross”—suggesting that among those not performing cunnilingus, many might do so if given the chance. Such evidence further supports a supposition that attitudes and sexual scripts surrounding cunnilingus are becoming increasingly more accepting.

Despite greater engagement in and enjoyment of cunnilingus than expected, we did find that, as hypothesized, men who do not engage in cunnilingus scored significantly higher on a measure of homophobia and had greater negative attitudes toward women's genitals relative to engagers in cunnilingus—though average scores were concentrated around the midpoint of the homophobia scale and in the positive range of attitudes toward women's genitals. Contrary to our expectations, non-engagers did not score higher on measures of precarious manhood belief, sexism, or sexual narcissism.

Our finding that higher levels of homophobia distinguish men who do and do not engage in cunnilingus offers support for the argument of Wells (1991) that some men are reluctant to participate in sexual acts perceived as feminine or homosexual. Performing cunnilingus has often been viewed as a submissive, subservient act (Baumeister, 1988; Gagnon & Simon, 2005, Sanchez et al., 2012), and submissive acts are associated by some with homosexuality (Bishop, 2015; Kite & Deaux, 1987; Wong et al., 1999). These results suggest that some men could benefit from sexuality education which debunks the idea that certain sexual acts should be limited to those of a particular sexual orientation or gender. Still, it remains generally positive that men's overall levels of homophobia were found to be low, possibly indicating a shift in the social narrative outlined previously; as levels of homophobia decrease, perceptions of cunnilingus as a feminine or homosexual act may also decline.

Unsurprisingly, attitudes toward women's genitals were found to significantly distinguish engagers in cunnilingus from non-engagers, such that those with less positive attitudes are less likely to engage in cunnilingus. This provides further evidence that negative perceptions of the vulva relate to men's disengagement from cunnilingus. Moreover, in our exploratory analyses, the perception of cunnilingus as gross was cited as the second most endorsed reason for a lack of engagement among men who never perform cunnilingus and the *most* endorsed reason among men who engage in the activity but do not enjoy it. Although it remains unclear exactly what aspect of cunnilingus participants deemed to be gross (e.g., smell, taste, proximity to urine), it may be that negative attitudes toward women's genitals overall made engagement in the activity undesirable for some men; that is, women's genitals are gross, thus cunnilingus itself is gross. Indeed, Herbenick (2009) and others (see Hoskins et al., 2022) have proposed that positive attitudes toward women's genitals increase both women's desire to receive cunnilingus and men's willingness to perform it. Our findings appear to support these suppositions, though both engagers and non-engagers had generally positive attitudes toward women's genitals overall. We hope our results contribute to deeper discussions of acceptance of women's genitalia across all genders—particularly by sexual health professionals and educators—to foster more positive views of women's genitalia.

Neither hostile nor benevolent sexism significantly differed between engagers and non-engagers of cunnilingus—a surprising finding given previous evidence suggesting positive associations among sexism, adherence to traditional sexual scripts, and reciprocity inequality (Sanchez et al., 2012; Satinsky & Jozkowski, 2015). However, hostile sexism did significantly differentiate between enjoyers and non-enjoyers; men who held more hostile sexist beliefs were more likely to dislike performing cunnilingus. Despite these findings, it is important to note that average scores were concentrated around the lower midpoint of the scale; thus, endorsement of hostile sexism among non-enjoyers was relatively low. Such findings suggest that while sexism does not necessarily reduce men's *engagement* in cunnilingus, hostile sexism—even at moderate to low levels—may be linked to men's *enjoyment* of it.

Also contrary to our expectations, higher levels of sexual narcissism were found among engagers of cunnilingus, with lower levels among non-engagers. Though there is a dearth of literature examining the relationship between cunnilingus and sexual narcissism, given the negative association between narcissism and sexual satisfaction of partners (McNulty & Widman, 2013), we hypothesized that non-engagers would be more sexually narcissistic due to a sense of sexual prowess in the absence of cunnilingus or a sense of entitlement prohibiting reciprocation. Though we found opposing results, there is also evidence that higher levels of sexual narcissism relate to a grandiose sense of confidence and sexual skill (McNulty & Widman, 2013). Perhaps, then, sexually narcissistic men are more likely to engage in cunnilingus due to a grandiose sense of confidence or in an effort to further boost their inflated sense of sexual prowess (Braun et al., 2003; Lewis & Marston, 2016; Wrybeck & Wiederman, 1999). Indeed, these findings may also be indicative of shifting social attitudes around cunnilingus; rather than cunnilingus being perceived as a submissive, emasculating act, it may instead be perceived as a legitimate sexual activity that men can engage in and improve upon—which may be especially motivating for those high in sexual narcissism who seek to position themselves as “better” and more sexually skilled than other men.

Perhaps our most interesting findings are revealed in our exploratory analyses, where we examined differences among men who engage in cunnilingus but either do or do not enjoy it. Differences between enjoyers and non-enjoyers mirrored the results that differentiated engagers and non-engagers with respect to scoring higher in homophobia and having more negative attitudes toward women's genitals. Though still generally positive, our findings do further illuminate that homophobia and attitudes toward women's genitals differentiate between both engagement and enjoyment status.

Additionally, rates of precarious manhood belief and sexual narcissism distinguished between enjoyers and non-enjoyers. Though no differences were found in precarious manhood belief between engagers and non-engagers, a difference was found between enjoyers and non-enjoyers; that is, precarious manhood beliefs were significantly higher among non-enjoyers of cunnilingus. Engagement in cunnilingus may be perceived by some men as sexual subservience or submissive, feminine

behaviour—which would be particularly threatening for men with fragile views of their own masculinity. It may also be that men who endorse precarious manhood beliefs believe that engagement in cunnilingus fulfills necessary sexual scripts of competency and active initiation (Maas & Lefkowitz, 2015; Masters & Johnson, 1970; Sakaluk et al., 2014), while those less likely to endorse precarious manhood belief have alternate motives for engagement in cunnilingus, such as wanting their partners to feel sexually fulfilled (e.g., Vannier & O’Sullivan, 2012). Though our findings are unable to disentangle the myriad reasons why men with higher endorsement of precarious manhood belief dislike cunnilingus, our findings do further illuminate the negative effects of precarious manhood established in previous research (Vandello et al., 2008) and indicate that men would greatly benefit from educational interventions aimed at challenging and redefining rigid ideas about masculinity as it relates to their sexuality. Still, our results do suggest that this effect may be shrinking, as only a small proportion of men disliked engaging in cunnilingus.

Finally, unlike the difference between engagers and non-engagers, sexual narcissism did not influence the relationship between enjoyers and non-enjoyers, indicating that while higher levels of sexual narcissism may make men more likely to engage in cunnilingus, it does not make them any more likely to enjoy it. Collectively, our findings lend support to literature suggesting that some men perform cunnilingus as an obligation or precursor to other sexual acts—in particular, penetrative sex—or because of expectations of reciprocation (see Andrejek et al., 2022; Braun et al., 2003; Lewis & Marston, 2016; Wryobeck & Wiederman, 1999). Indeed, some men who do not enjoy cunnilingus and who would otherwise choose not to engage in it may still feel obligated to do so, perhaps particularly in the context of committed relationships (Armstrong et al., 2012; Backstrom et al., 2012).

## LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

A primary limitation of the present work is in the nature of nonexperimental designs. No causal claims about the role of measured dependent variables on either cunnilingus engagement or cunnilingus enjoyment can be made, given that other variables contributing to engagement or enjoyment were not assessed in this study, including religiosity, political conservatism, sociosexual orientation, and sexual liberalism. Future research on men’s engagement and enjoyment of cunnilingus would benefit substantially from including the measurement of such variables. Additionally, we did not consider a constellation of social identities (e.g., ethnicity/race, sexual orientation, social class) from an intersectional standpoint, which limits our ability to identify nuances in how men think about cunnilingus, which is important given cultural, orientation, and class differences in how oral sex is understood and perceived.

A second notable limitation is selection bias. The sensitive topic and explicit nature of the questions posed in the current study may have turned potential participants away due to discomfort

with the topic of interest; this is a noted issue in sexuality research (Wiederman, 1999). The nature of this bias may have impacted the effects observed, as our self-selected sample—who knowingly chose to answer questions about cunnilingus—may have had different evaluations than a random sample. Future research on cunnilingus engagement would benefit from the use of random samples.

Further, we identified a significant age effect between engagers and non-engagers that certainly impacted our findings. Though we controlled for age effects in our analyses, the more than 15-year age difference between participants in these conditions suggests that with age comes presumably greater experience—and a greater sexual behavioural repertoire that includes engagement in cunnilingus. Further evidence of this theorizing is illustrated by our finding that the most commonly endorsed reason for not engaging in cunnilingus was a lack of opportunity (almost three-quarters of our non-engaging subsample). Future studies should more closely examine the role of sexual experience and sexual repertoires in younger versus older men and their impact on the variables examined herein. Nonetheless, it is important to note that we did address this concern by interrogating differences between enjoyers and non-enjoyers of cunnilingus among engagers only; there was no age effect in this subsample, and we found significant differences in all but two (i.e., benevolent sexism and sexual narcissism) of our variables of interest.

Moreover, in exploring reasons why men did not perform (or did not enjoy performing) cunnilingus, we found that 15.22% of non-enjoyers reported feeling no need to please their partner through oral sex. While this finding could be attributed to ignorance of women’s sexual needs or an endorsement of traditional sexual scripts, it may also be the result of some women not being interested in receiving oral sex. Indeed, 5.88% of non-engagers and 8.70% of non-enjoyers explicitly indicated that their partner(s) did not enjoy cunnilingus (see Appendix, Tables A1 and A2). Thus, despite some men’s willingness to perform cunnilingus, some women do not want to receive cunnilingus, for innumerable personal reasons (e.g., a lack of desire, concern about harming the man’s ego, desire to prioritize the man’s pleasure, desire to avoid reciprocation, poor body image, low genital self-esteem; see Blair et al., 2018; Herbenick, 2009; Hoskins et al., 2022; Salisbury & Fisher, 2014).

Finally, though considerable research suggests that orgasm is important to women’s sexual satisfaction (see Frederick et al., 2016; Fugl-Meyer et al., 2006; Haavio-Mannila & Kontula, 1997; Haning, 2007; Lentz & Zaikman, 2021; Leonhardt et al., 2018; Wetzel et al., 2022; Wongsomboon et al., 2019), some qualitative evidence suggests that men attribute orgasm as more important to sexual satisfaction than do women (Salisbury & Fisher, 2014), explaining why some women do not prioritize receiving cunnilingus—one of the most reliable ways for woman to achieve orgasm—given that it is not seen as required for sexual satisfaction. In a similar vein, though we asked men about reasons why they do not perform or enjoy performing cunnilingus, we did not inquire about reasons why they do. Including such questions would have allowed us

to better explore men's alignment (or lack thereof) with traditional sexual scripts. Future research should seek to understand men's reasons both for and against engaging in cunnilingus, as this may allow for a more thorough examination of men's attitudes toward oral sex.

## CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

We interrogated variables that differentiate men who do and do not engage in and/or enjoy cunnilingus. We found that most men reported both engaging in, and enjoying, performing cunnilingus. Consistent with our hypotheses, homophobia and greater negative attitudes toward women's genitals significantly differentiated men who do and do not engage in cunnilingus, in the expected directions. Unexpectedly, sexual narcissism was associated with increased, rather than decreased, endorsement of engagement in cunnilingus. We also determined that precarious manhood belief endorsement, hostile sexism, homophobia, and negative attitudes toward women's genitals distinguished between engagers who like and dislike the activity. The current work provides further evidence of existing associations among oral sex, femininity, and submissiveness and contributes to calls for both the de-stigmatization of women's genitals and the deconstruction and critical critique of harmful notions of masculinity, sexual scripts, and sexual orientation norms in sexual behaviour (see Santos et al., 2012). Our findings also provide fertile ground for future theorizing on reasons why people engage in cunnilingus and on the development of educational interventions to reduce the negative consequences of precarious manhood belief, homophobia, and attitudes toward women's genitals which collectively may prove beneficial to both women's and men's sexual pleasure.

## ORCID IDs

Kari A. Walton  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5133-556X>  
 Devinder Khera  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5548-4549>  
 Cory L. Pedersen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9769-3207>

## REFERENCES

- Alden, H. L., & Parker, K. F. (2005). Gender role ideology, homophobia and hate crime: Linking attitudes to macro-level anti-gay and lesbian hate crimes. *Deviant Behavior*, 26(4), 321–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016396290931614>
- Andrejek N., Fetner T., & Heath, M. (2022) Climax as work: Heteronormativity, gender labor, and the gender gap in orgasms. *Gender & Society*, 36(2),189–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08912432211073062>. Medline:35185280
- Armstrong, E. A., England, P., & Fogarty, A. C. (2012). Accounting for women's orgasm and sexual enjoyment in college hookups and relationships. *American Sociological Review*, 77(3), 435–462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412445802>
- Backstrom, L., Armstrong, E. A., & Puentes, J. (2012). Women's negotiation of cunnilingus in college hookups and relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.585523>. Medline:22010825
- Barrios, R. J., & Lundquist, J. H. (2012). Boys just want to have fun? Masculinity, sexual behaviors, and romantic intentions of gay and straight males in college. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 9(4), 271–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2012.716749>
- Baumeister, R. F. (1988) Gender differences in masochistic scripts. *Journal of Sex Research*, 25(4), 478–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498809551477>
- Bishop, C. J. (2015). Emotional reactions of heterosexual men to gay imagery. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 62(1), 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957125>. Medline:25153351
- Blair, K. L., Cappell, J., & Pukall, C. F. (2018). Not all orgasms were created equal: Differences in frequency and satisfaction of orgasm experiences by sexual activity in same-sex versus mixed-sex relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 55(6), 719–733. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1303437>. Medline:28362180
- Braun, V. (2005). In search of (better) sexual pleasure: Female genital “cosmetic” surgery. *Sexualities*, 8(4), 407–424. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460705056625>
- Braun, V., Gavey, N., & McPhillips, K. (2003). The ‘fair deal’? Unpacking accounts of reciprocity in heterosex. *Sexualities*, 6(2), 237–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460703006002005>
- Braun, V., & Kitzinger, C. (2001). The perfectible vagina: Size matters. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 3, 263–277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050152484704>
- Braun, V., & Wilkinson, S. (2001). Socio-cultural representations of the vagina. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, 19(1), 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646830020032374>
- Breakfast Club Power 105.1 FM. (2018, May 7). *Breakfast Club Classic: DJ Khaled explains why he doesn't go down on his wife* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W87MssOF7nY>
- Chadwick, S. B., & van Anders, S. M. (2017). Do women's orgasms function as a masculinity achievement for men? *Journal of Sex Research*, 54(9), 1141–1152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1283484>. Medline:28276934
- Chase, D., Grey, B., Green, R., Burgess, M., Landress, I. S., Winter, T., & Weiner, M. (Executive Producers). (1999–2007). *The Sopranos* [TV series]. Chase Films; Brad Grey Television; HBO Entertainment.
- Damon, W. (2000). The relations of power and intimacy motives to genitoerotic role preferences in gay men: A pilot study. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 9(1), 15–30. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2001-14493-002>
- Davis, A. C., Carrotte, E. R., Hellard, M. E., & Lim, M. S. C. (2018). What behaviors do young heterosexual Australians see in pornography? A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Sex Research*, 55(3), 310–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1417350>. Medline:29333877



- Dienberg, M., Oschatz, T., Kosman, E., & Klein, K. (2022). Does clitoral knowledge translate into orgasm? The interplay between clitoral knowledge, gendered sexual scripts, and orgasm experience. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*. Advanced online publication, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623x.2022.2147112>. Medline:36411727
- Dotson-Blake, K. P., Knox, D., & Zusman, M. E. (2012). Exploring social sexual scripts related to cunnilingus: A profile of college student perceptions. *Professional Counselor*, 2, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.15241/kpd.2.1.1>
- Dubinskaya A., Dallas, K., Eilber, K., Scott, V., & Anger, J. (2022). Female genitalia in pornography: The source of labiaplasty trends? *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 19(4), Supplement 1, S21–S22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2022.05.098>
- England, P., & Thomas, R. J. (2006). The decline of the date and the rise of the college hook up. In A. S. Skolnick & J. H. Skolnick (Eds.), *Families in transition* (14th ed., pp. 151–162). Allyn and Bacon.
- Fahs, B., & Swank, E. (2021). Reciprocity, partner pressure, and emotional labor: Women discuss negotiations around oral and anal sex. *Sexuality & Culture*, 25, 217–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-020-09766-w>
- Frederick, D. A., John, H.K.S., Garcia, J. R., & Lloyd, E. A. (2018). Differences in orgasm frequency among gay, lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual men and women in a U.S. national sample. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 47, 273–288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-017-0939-z>. Medline:28213723
- Frederick, D. A., Lever, J., Gillespie, B. J., & Garcia J. R. (2016). What keeps passion alive? Sexual satisfaction is associated with sexual communication, mood setting, sexual variety, oral sex, orgasm, and sex frequency in a national U.S. study. *Journal of Sex Research*, 54(2), 186–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2015.1137854>. Medline:26900897
- Fugl-Meyer, K. S., Öberg, K., Lundberg, P. O., Lewin, B., & Fugl-Meyer, A. (2006). On orgasm, sexual techniques, and erotic perceptions in 18- to 74-year-old Swedish women. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 3(1), 56–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-6109.2005.00170.x>. Medline:16409218
- Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (2005). *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality* (2nd ed.). Aldine Transaction.
- Garcia, J. R., Lloyd, E. A., Wallen, K., & Fisher, H. E. (2014). Variation in orgasm occurrence by sexual orientation in a sample of U.S. singles. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 11(11), 2645–2652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsm.12669>. Medline:25131299
- Graham, C. A. (2010). The DSM diagnostic criteria for female orgasmic disorder. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39(2), 256–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-009-9542-2>. Medline:19784768
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Haavio-Mannila, E., & Kontula, O. (1997). Correlates of increased sexual satisfaction. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 26, 399–419. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1024591318836>. Medline:9251837
- Haning, R. V., O’Keefe, S. L., Randall, E. J., Kommor, M. J., Baker, E., & Wilson, R. (2007). Intimacy, orgasm likelihood, and conflict predict sexual satisfaction in heterosexual male and female respondents. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 33(2), 93–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00926230601098449>. Medline:17365512
- Hans, J. D., Gillen, M., & Akande, K. (2010) Sex redefined: The reclassification of oral-genital contact. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 42(2),74–8. <https://doi.org/10.1363/4207410>. Medline:20618745
- Herbenick, D. (2009). The development and validation of a scale to measure attitudes toward women’s genitals. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 21(3), 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19317610903149692>
- Hoskins, K., Blumenstock, S. M., & Lehmilller, J. (2022, November). *Sexual self-esteem and orgasm frequency in men and women: The unique roles of body image and genital image* [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the Society for Scientific Study of Sexuality, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Johansson, T., & Hammarén, N. (2007). Hegemonic masculinity and pornography: Young people’s attitudes toward and relations to pornography. *Journal of Men’s Studies*, 15(1), 57–70. <https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1501.57>
- Jones, B., & Nurka, C. (2015). Labiaplasty and pornography: A preliminary investigation. *Porn Studies*, 2(1), 62–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23268743.2014.984940>
- Jones, T., Smith, E., Ward, R., Dixon, J., Hillier, L., & Mitchell, A. (2016). School experiences of transgender and gender diverse students in Australia. *Sex Education*, 16(2), 156–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2015.1080678>
- Jozkowski, K. N., & Peterson, Z. D. (2013) College students and sexual consent: Unique insights. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(6), 517–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.700739>. Medline:23039912
- Kite, M. E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: Homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11(1), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1987.tb00776.x>
- Klein, V., & Conley, T. D. (2021). The role of gendered entitlement in understanding inequality in the bedroom. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 13(6), 1047–1057. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19485506211053564>
- Koning, M., Zeijlmans, I. A., Bouman, T. K., & van der Lei, B. (2009). Female attitudes regarding labia minora appearance and reduction with consideration of media influence. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, 29(1), 65–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asj.2008.12.003>. Medline:19233008
- Lentz, A. M., & Zaikman, Y. (2021). The big “O”: Sociocultural influences on orgasm frequency and sexual satisfaction in

- women. *Sexuality & Culture*, 25(3), 1096–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-020-09811-8>
- Leonhardt, N. D., Willoughby, B. J., Busby, D. M., Yorgason, J. B., & Holmes, E. K. (2018). The significance of the female orgasm: A nationally representative, dyadic study of newlyweds' orgasm experience. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 15(8), 1140–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2018.05.018>. Medline:29960888
- Lewis, R., & Marston, C. (2016). Cunnilingus, young people, and gendered narratives of reciprocity. *Journal of Sex Research*, 53(7), 776–787. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2015.1117564>. Medline:26849152
- Maas, M. K., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2015). Sexual esteem in emerging adulthood: Associations with sexual behavior, contraception use, and romantic relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 52(7), 795–806. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2014.945112>
- Mahar, E. A., Mintz, L. B., & Akers, B. M. (2020). Orgasm equality: Scientific findings and societal implications. *Current Sexual Health Reports*, 12(1), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-020-00237-9>
- Maki, S., Vernaleken, L., Nemes, F. D., Bozic, K., & Cioe, J. (2022). An analysis of vulva appearance in video pornography. *Sexuality & Culture*, 27(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-10014-6>
- Masters, W. H., & Johnson, V. E. (1970). *Human sexual inadequacy*. Bantam Books.
- McClelland, S. I. (2010). Intimate justice: A critical analysis of sexual satisfaction. *Social & Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(9), 663–680. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00293.x>
- McNulty, J. K., & Widman, L. (2013). The implications of sexual narcissism for sexual and marital satisfaction. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(6), 1021–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-0041-5>. Medline:23297145
- Mowat, H., Dobson A. S., McDonald, K., Fisher, J., & Kirkman M. (2020). “For myself and others like me”: Women's contributions to vulva-positive social media. *Feminist Media Studies*, 20(1), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2018.1546209>
- Nurka, C., & Jones, B. (2013). Labiaplasty, race and the colonial imagination. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 28(78), 417–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08164649.2013.868332>
- Oswald, F., Walton, K. A., Khera, D., Champion, A., & Pedersen, C. L. (2022). Evaluations of Black and White female genitalia by labiaplasty status: A pre-registered contextualization, replication, and extension of findings on labial perceptions. *Journal of Sex Research*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/j2gqp>
- Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, you're a fag: Sexuality and masculinity in high school*. University of California Press.
- Pinkerton, S. D., Cecil, H., Bogart, L. M., & Abramson, P. R. (2003). The pleasures of sex: An empirical investigation. *Cognition and Emotion*, 17(2), 341–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999303022291>. Medline:29715727
- Reinholtz, R. K., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (1995). Genital perceptions and sexual activity in a college population. *Journal of Sex Research*, 32(2), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499509551785>
- Ringrose, J., & Harvey, L. (2015). Boobs, back-off, six packs, and bits: Mediated body parts, gendered reward, and sexual shame in teens' sexting images. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 29(2), 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2015.1022952>
- Sakaluk, J. K., Todd, L. M., Milhausen, R., & Lachowsky, N. J. (2014). Dominant heterosexual sexual scripts in emerging adulthood: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Sex Research*, 51(5), 516–531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.745473>. Medline:23672338
- Salisbury, C.M.A., & Fisher, W. A. (2014). “Did you come?” A qualitative exploration of gender differences in beliefs, experiences, and concerns regarding female orgasm occurrence during heterosexual sexual interactions. *Journal of Sex Research*, 51(6), 616–631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2013.838934>. Medline:24350619
- Sanchez, D. T., Fetterolf, J. C., & Rudman, L. A. (2012). Eroticizing inequality in the United States: The consequences and determinants of traditional gender role adherence in intimate relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(2–3), 168–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.653699>. Medline:22380587
- Santos, A. F., Fonseca, L., & Araujo, H. C. (2012). Sex education and the views of young people on gender and sexuality in Portuguese schools. *Educação, Sociedade & Culturas*, 35, 29–44. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232221266>
- Satinsky, S., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2015). Female sexual subjectivity and verbal consent to receiving cunnilingus. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 41(4), 413–426. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623x.2014.918065>. Medline:24794174
- Scott, J. (2014). *A dictionary of sociology* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780199683581.001.0001>
- Sharp, G., Tiggemann, M., & Matisse, J. (2016). Factors that influence the decision to undergo labiaplasty: Media, relationships, and psychological well-being. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, 36(4), 469–478. <https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjv270>. Medline:26893523
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1984). Sexual scripts. *Society*, 22, 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02701260>
- Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 15(2), 97–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01542219>. Medline:3718206
- Skoda, K., Oswald, F., Shorter, L., & Pedersen, C. L. (2021). Perceptions of female genitalia following labiaplasty. *Journal of Sex Research*, 58(7), 943–950. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2020.1808563>. Medline:32852222
- Stick, M., & Fetner, T. (2020). Feminist men and sexual behavior: Analyses of men's sex with women. *Men and Masculinities*, 24(5), 780–801. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184x20980789>

- Stone, N., Hatherall B., Ingham, R., & McEachran, J. (2006). Cunnilingus and condom use among young people in the United Kingdom. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 38(1), 6–12. <https://doi.org/10.1363/3800606>
- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1325–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012453>. Medline:19025286
- Vannier, S. A., & O'Sullivan, L. F. (2012). Who gives and who gets: Why, when, and with whom young people engage in oral sex. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41(5), 572–582. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9745-z>. Medline:22327462
- Wade, L. D., Kremer, E. C., & Brown, J. (2005). The incidental orgasm: The presence of clitoral knowledge and the absence of orgasm for women. *Women & Health*, 42(1), 117–138. [https://doi.org/10.1300/j013v42n01\\_07](https://doi.org/10.1300/j013v42n01_07). Medline:16418125
- Welling, L.L.M. (2014). Female orgasm. In V. Weekes-Shackelford & T. Shackelford (Eds.), *Evolutionary perspectives on human sexual psychology and behavior* (pp. 223–241). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0314-6\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-0314-6_12)
- Wells, J. W. (1991). The effects of homophobia and sexism on heterosexual sexual relationships. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 17(3), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01614576.1991.11074020>
- West, K. (2016). Sexual restrictions beyond anti-gay prejudice: Anal sex, cunnilingus, masculinity and sexual prejudice in Jamaica. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 28(4), 278–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2016.1223251>
- Wetzel, G. M., Cultice, R. A., & Sanchez, D. T. (2022). Orgasm frequency predicts desire and expectation for orgasm: Assessing the orgasm gap within mixed-sex couples. *Sex Roles*, 86(7–8), 456–470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-022-01280-7>
- Widman, L., & McNulty, J. K. (2010). Sexual narcissism and the perpetration of sexual aggression. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39, 926–939. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-008-9461-7>
- Wiederman, M. W. (2015). Sexual script theory: Past, present, and future. In J. DeLamater & R. F. Plante (Eds.), *Handbook of the sociology of sexualities* (p. 7–22). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-17341-2\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-17341-2_2)
- Wiederman, M. W. (1999). Volunteer bias in sexuality research using college student participants. *Journal of Sex Research*, 36(1), 59–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499909551968>
- Wong, F. Y., McCreary, D. R., Carpenter, K. M., Engle, A., & Korchynsky, R. (1999) Gender-related factors influencing perceptions of homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 37(3), 19–31. [https://doi.org/10.1300/j082v37n03\\_02](https://doi.org/10.1300/j082v37n03_02). Medline:10442812
- Wongsomboon, V., Burleson, M. H., & Webster, G. D. (2019). Women's orgasm and sexual satisfaction in committed sex and casual sex: Relationship between sociosexuality and sexual outcomes in different sexual contexts. *Journal of Sex Research*, 57(3), 285–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1672036>. Medline:31584292
- Wood, J. R., McKay, A., Komarnicky, T., & Milhausen, R. R. (2016). Was it good for you too? An analysis of gender differences in cunnilingus practices and pleasure ratings among heterosexual Canadian university students. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 25(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjhs.251-a2>
- Wright, L. W., Jr., Adams, H. E., & Bernat, J. (1999). Development and validation of the Homophobia Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 21(4), 337–347. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1022172816258>
- Wryobeck, J. M., & Wiederman, M. W. (1999). Sexual narcissism: Measurement and correlates among college men. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 25(4), 321–331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/009262399278779>



## APPENDIX

TABLE A1. Motivations for Lack of Engagement in Cunnilingus

<i>"Why have you never performed oral sex on a woman? Please select which reason is MOST applicable to you."</i>	Frequency	Percent
I have never had the opportunity	75	73.53
I feel that oral sex is gross	14	13.73
My partner(s) did not enjoy oral sex	6	5.88
Open-ended option		
Religious reasons	3	2.94
Medically incapable	1	1
I fear that I would be incompetent at performing oral sex	1	1
I would not feel manly performing oral sex	1	1
I do not feel the need to please my partner orally	0	0
I feel that I will seem gay if I perform oral sex	0	0

Notes. The items are ordered by highest endorsed percentage of motivations reported by participants ( $n = 102$ ). One participant response was missing.

TABLE A2. Motivations for Lack of Enjoyment in Cunnilingus

<i>"Why do you not enjoy performing oral sex on a woman? Please select which reason is MOST applicable to you."</i>	Frequency	Percent
I feel that oral sex is gross	21	45.65
I do not feel the need to please my partner orally	7	15.22
I fear that I would be incompetent at performing oral sex	6	13.04
My partner(s) did not enjoy oral sex	4	8.70
Open-ended option		
Unpleasurable/unappealing/unenjoyable <i>for me</i>	3	6.52
Oral/texture sensitivity	1	2.17
It takes too long	1	2.17
Unsure	1	2.17
I would not feel manly performing oral sex	1	2.17
I feel that I will seem gay if I perform oral sex	1	2.17

Notes. The items are ordered by highest endorsed percentage of motivations reported by participants ( $n = 46$ ).