COMS 411/541 Sexuality and Public Discourse
Concordia University
Department of Communication Studies
Dr. Stefanie Duguay
Winter 2021
Tuesday 4:15-7:00pm (Remote/Online)

Office Location: #workfromhome
Office Hours: Over Zoom on Wednesdays from 1:00-3:00pm; use [url] to book or email to arrange a different time if necessary.
Email: stefanie.duguay@concordia.ca
Include COMS411/541 in subject line; responses generally sent within 24 business hours.
Teaching Assistant: [information redacted]

Calendar Description
This course analyzes and explores the ways sexuality circulates in and as public discourses. Through a variety of conceptual formations and critical conceptualizations of "the public" and "sexuality," this course analyzes conceptually and critically how sexuality and the notion of the public are mutually constitutive. The seminar is interdisciplinary and draws upon works in feminist studies, queer theory, political philosophy, history, cultural studies, and communication theory.

Prerequisites
400-level courses, unless otherwise indicated, are open to students who have successfully completed 48 university credits or who have received permission from the Department.

Course Description
To describe sexuality and public discourse as mutually constitutive is to understand how these two facets of society create, shape, reinforce, and perpetuate each other. On one hand, sexuality can refer to physical acts, orientations of desire, and aspects of identity. On the other, public discourse is that which constitutes a worldview or a set of beliefs, values, norms, and rituals. Public discourse is often generated through language, spread in the media, and entrenched within institutions. Multiple elements of sexuality generate public discourse, such as young people's sexual conduct leading to widespread sex panics in the news (and on Oprah, Dr. Phil, etc). In turn, public discourse fuels the labels, categories, and moral judgements that shape views about sexuality. Media is produced that aims to provoke sexual desires (e.g. pornography), represent sexual identities (e.g. Queer Eye), and also convey self-representations of sexuality (e.g. YouTube coming out videos). Both public discourse and sexuality are shaped by and contextualized within historical and contemporary social, political and economic conditions as well as relations of race, class, ability, and gender. This course explores these messy overlaps by first approaching foundational concepts relating to publics and sexuality and then moving into topics of historic and current relevance that explore how public discourses of sexuality influence our relationships, media, sense of self, and livelihood.

Course objectives/learning outcomes

By the end of this course, you will be able to:
- Identify how sexuality and public discourse are mutually constitutive across multiple areas of public life;

1

- Critically analyze constructions of sexuality in relation to public space, media, and cultural artifacts;
- Question, critique, and apply multi-disciplinary theoretical lenses to popular discourses of sexuality, proposing alternative perspectives and counter-arguments;
- Demonstrate fortified skills related to critical thinking, analytical reflection and discussion, writing, creativity, and time management.

Course materials
All readings and related materials will be available through Concordia Course Reserves (unless a link is provided). **Required readings** are listed first and must be completed for each week; **additional readings** are provided for further exploration and for application to course assignments, and their completion is not mandatory on a weekly basis. Background readings are sometimes listed for deeper understanding of the topic and reference key ideas in lectures. I reserve the right to make changes to the syllabus during the semester as necessary with the goal of fully addressing class needs and improving your learning experience.

Format of the Course

As part of emergency COVID-19 measures, this course will be taught remotely and not in-person. It will involve asynchronous tasks (e.g. readings, discussion board responses) that you can work through independently along with synchronous teaching and discussions over Zoom. Unless otherwise noted in Moodle, each week you will need to:

1. **Read** – Complete the week's required reading and/or any preparatory video/audio, and skim the additional readings (check out introductions, abstracts, and section titles to see what they're about, as they may be helpful for assignments). Submit a reading reflection following the instructions below if this is a week you have chosen to do so.
2. **Engage** – Navigate to the week's discussion board where your classmates have posted Three Minute Explainers about the additional readings along with questions. Leave at least one comment on two **different** Explainer discussion threads after watching the talks, responding directly to the question posed and/or building on others' responses. Note: Discussion boards start in Week 4.
3. **Do** – Complete any other activities in Moodle in order to apply the week's concepts and extend your learning. Otherwise, work on assignments.
4. **Learn and Discuss** – Participate in the weekly Zoom session to discuss concepts with the instructor and classmates, ask questions, and receive clarification about lessons and assignments. These sessions will include some teaching and discussion about the required readings and the additional readings/Three Minute Explainers. They will also include time for developing your ideas relating to assignments. An approximate schedule for Zoom sessions is as follows:
   4:55-5:05pm – Informal chat
   5:05-5:45pm – Lecture and discussion
   5:45-6:00pm – Break
   6:00-7:00pm – Further discussion and activities/workshopping assignments
   (class end times may differ according to specific weeks but you should plan to be present the entire time)

You are expected to complete steps 1-3 prior to the weekly Zoom session, which will take place on **Tuesdays from 4:55-7:00pm** (unless otherwise posted). You may wish to schedule the same block of time as you would if the class were taking place in person (Tuesdays from 4:15-

7:00pm), doing the readings beforehand and completing steps 2-3 that day prior to the Zoom session. Generally, all asynchronous materials for the week will be posted by the previous Thursday, providing multiple days for completing these steps.

Assignments and Grading

Assignment	Weighting (%)	Due Date
Participation • Reading Reflections • Discussion Board	20	Ongoing
Three-Minute Explainer	15	Sign-up before February 1st
Artifact Analysis	20	Feb. 25
Popular discourse critique and counter-discourse project		
• Project proposal	5	February 4
• First iteration and peer feedback	10	March 18 -1st Iteration March 25 - Feedback
• Final Project	20	April 8
• Reflection	10	April 18

Course Participation – 20%
This is an interactive course that focuses on active learning through participation. In this format, you will learn from each other as well as the lectures and course readings. Your participation grade will be split between the following components:

- **Reading Reflections – 10%**
  For (at least) five weeks of your choosing, you will need to submit a short reflection about one of the **required** readings (or audio/video, etc) for that week. Your reflection should be 150-250 words (maximum) and should identify something that caught your attention (e.g. an important point or concept; something you agree or disagree with). The reflection must end with a **question** that will contribute to our discussion over Zoom. To receive full marks, it must be clear that you have done the reading and paid close attention – you can make this clear by referring to page numbers, quoting the text, discussing specific ideas, and defining all concepts included in your reflection. If it is not clear that you have done the reading, or if either part of the reflection is missing, you will receive partial marks.
  Reflections must be submitted in Moodle by **10:00am Tuesday morning** before the class to which they relate.

- **Discussion board – 10%**
  Starting in Week 4, a small number of your classmates will be sharing short videos or audio clips (Three Minute Explainers) about the additional readings each week. You will need to leave at least one comment on two **different** discussion board threads each week for (at least) five weeks. Your comments should contribute to the discussion and reflect your understandings of the topic in relation to the video lectures and required readings (bring your classmate's talk together with these other ideas!). Comments must be posted before the Zoom session each week in order to count for grades.

Three Minute Explainer – 15%
You will sign up to create a short 3-minute video or audio presentation (which can range from 3-5 minutes maximum) about one of the additional readings for a particular week. Your presentation should clearly summarize the key points of the reading, define its central concepts, and explain these using relevant examples.
You will end your talk by posing **one question** that is related to the reading in order for the class to discuss. Creativity and audience engagement will be important for conveying the reading's key points. You can use any device and program for recording your talk so long as the file can be uploaded to Moodle (max file size 250MB) or linked for students to watch/listen. See Moodle for grading sheet.

Talks are due **by noon on the Thursday** before the class for which you have signed up (5 days prior to our Zoom class). **To submit your Explainer, complete the following steps:**
- Create a new discussion thread in that week's discussion board, using the reading's title as the title for your thread.
- Write out the full reference for your reading (author, date, etc) and the question that you pose at the end of your talk.
- Upload or link to your talk.
- Post the thread.
- Engage with your classmates' comments throughout the week, contributing to the discussion with the knowledge you gained from the reading and answering any subsequent questions they raise. You will be invited to discuss this conversation further in the Zoom session, and to raise additional questions, thoughts, and ideas based on your close engagement with the week's topic.

Artifact Analysis – 20%
Choose a cultural artifact and analyze it using relevant course concepts. Broadly defined, a cultural artifact is discourse in material form. It can be an item (e.g. clothing, food), image, book, or other media (e.g. film, tv show, website, social media post), building, technology, tool, or arrangement of public space. In your paper, provide some background about the artifact. Then draw on course readings and concepts to examine its role in sexuality in public discourse. Discuss how the artifact materializes/concretizes public discourse and how it shapes (views, beliefs, values, interactions, etc, relating to) sexuality. Conclude your paper by proposing a change to this artifact that would shift how it interfaces with public discourse and sexuality. You will not need to conduct extensive outside research for this paper but you will need to incorporate class concepts and readings as well as some sources that provide background on your chosen artifact. See Moodle for grading sheet.
1,200-1,500 words (excluding reference list).

Popular Discourse Critique and Counter-Discourse Project
This course highlights how discourses of sexuality often circulate widely throughout popular culture without critical interrogation. Upon analysis, and through the lens of multi-disciplinary and intersectional perspectives, it is possible to critique such discourses and identify their impact on individuals and society more broadly. Many popular discourses are perpetuated at individual, group, and institutional levels, and can contribute to exclusion, violence, inequality, and other consequences.

In teams of up to 3 or solo, your semester-long project in this course will be to:
- Select a popular discourse relating to sexuality to examine. This can be a discourse noted in the syllabus, readings, or lectures, or a different discourse you have come across elsewhere.
- Critique this popular discourse through the application of course concepts and further research. Start from the foundational and conceptual course content and readings for your critique, and extend this through further research relating to the topics, artifacts, people and publics this discourse touches.
- Propose a counter-discourse that is informed by the scholarly lenses engaged with in this course. Demonstrate how this counter-discourse could impact sexuality, such as in relation to beliefs, values, practices, laws, institutions, publics, etc.

To achieve this, you will produce a final output that can take a creative format or the form of a conventional written paper. A creative output may be a video, podcast, website, game, app design, visual work, etc. With whichever format you choose, you will need to reflect on how you are also producing an artifact through which discourses are materialized in particular ways. Note: Written papers will need to be 2,000-2,200 words maximum; audio/video outputs should be 20 minutes or less (they can be longer but only the first 20 minutes will be graded). You will complete the following steps to develop, create, share, and reflect on your project:

1. **Project Proposal – 5%**
   You will submit a proposal detailing: the popular discourse you have chosen and why, as well as early brainstorming of counter-discourse(s); the final output to be delivered and why this format has been chosen; key tasks and milestones for accomplishing this; a timeline for completing the work; a mitigation strategy for addressing unanticipated issues or setbacks. The proposal should be **2 pages maximum**, single spaced (this is different from the other written assignment guidelines). Please note: Unless you make specific bookings, you will not have access to the Communication Department's production equipment for this project, and considering the pandemic restrictions, this may not even be possible. The use of personal devices and non-professional equipment is completely acceptable. Attach a signed Group Contract (template on Moodle) to the proposal if working as a team.

2. **First Iteration and Peer Feedback – 10%**
   This will be a chance to share a first iteration of your project and to receive feedback about how it can more effectively achieve its aims. By the designated dates you will need to:
   a) Post about the status of your project (following instructions on Moodle) and attach any supporting content (e.g. mock-ups, drafts, first clips). The further along your project is, and the more you are able to share, the most effective you will find the peer feedback. Worth 5%

b) Provide feedback to at least **two** other classmates, structuring your feedback according to the instructions posted in Moodle. Your feedback should include full responses that are constructive and useful for the project. Worth 5%

3 and 4. Final Project and Reflection – 30%
The final project and reflection will be graded together even though they will be submitted separately. First, you will submit your final project in Moodle (as a file or linked media) for others to engage with. You will have the chance to explain and discuss your project with others. Then you will develop a reflection, which can be a 3-5 minute video, audio, or a written submission (1,000 words max) that responds to the following:

- What is your chosen popular discourse and how does your project critique it?
- What counter-discourse(s) does your project communicate?
- How is the artifact (video, podcast, paper, etc) you have created, and the way it is (or could be) encountered, implicated in the circulation of discourse?
- What would be a next step for this project if time/resources were not an issue? How would you extend the critique or proposed counter-discourse and/or change the output, and what impact might this have?

Discuss and apply specific course concepts and readings in your reflection, citing the authors. Attach a bibliography of all works cited as a Word document. See Moodle for grading sheet.
For groups: Each group member must submit their own, original reflection and bibliography. While it makes sense that reflections would be similar, since you collaborated on the same project, they should not be identical given that they will be completed individually.

Guidelines for written assignments:
- Unless otherwise specified, all written work must follow APA formatting and referencing (https://library.concordia.ca/help/citing/apa.php)
- Respect the word limit and include your total word count at the end of the paper before your reference list; word counts exceeding +/- 10% of the word limit will affect your grade
- Do not cite course lectures; cite course readings directly
- All written work should be in 12-point font, Times New Roman (Arial, Calibri, and Cambria are also acceptable) and double-spaced with regular (MS Word default) page margins
- Include page numbers at the bottom of each page
- Electronic submissions **must** be Microsoft Word documents (**not PDF** or other formats)
- File names should follow the format lastname_short assignment title_course code (e.g. Duguay_Artifact Analysis_COMS 411)

Attendance and participation – These are not regular circumstances. As a result, flexibility is built into the course's participation requirements (i.e. it is ok if you miss a reading reflection or discussion board). Though it is important to note that your contributions will be graded on a weekly basis. You will be expected to have completed the reading reflections and discussion board posts **prior to the weekly Zoom session** from 4:55-7:00pm on Tuesdays.

Since seminar courses involve discussion of concepts and collaborative thinking, the weekly Zoom sessions are essential to this course. They will help you to understand and apply course

concepts with your peers – engaging with knowledge and skillsets that are directly applicable to the assignments. Therefore, while attendance and participation on Zoom are not graded, they are important to your success in this course. If you miss a Zoom session, you will be responsible for catching up on lessons by contacting classmates, doing the readings and reviewing the slides once they are posted to Moodle.

When participating through Zoom, please be aware of the following:

- You will get the most from engaging in active participation. As such, if you attend the Zoom session please commit to being near your computer for the full duration and participating when possible, especially if asked to discuss in small groups;
- You can change your screen name to the name you prefer to be called;
- You can attend without your video on;
- Please mute yourself unless you are speaking;
- Anything written in the chat box can be downloaded and seen by the instructor (and possibly other Concordia admins or Zoom employees) after the session, even if you use private messaging;
- Zoom sessions will end on time - if you have further questions, please send them by email or arrange to discuss during office hours; some weeks the TA and/or instructor will be available after the main session to answer questions or discuss topics further;
- It is important to treat your classmates with the same respect that you would in person and to do everything possible to contribute to making this a safer space and a welcoming learning community.
- Note that, as a part of this course, some or all of the lectures and/or other activities in this course may be recorded. Recordings will be focused on the instructor and will normally exclude students. It is possible, however, that your participation may be recorded. If you wish to ensure that your image is not recorded, speak to your instructor as soon as possible. Also, please note that you cannot share recordings of your classes and that the instructor will only share class recordings for the purpose of course delivery and development. Any other sharing could result in a violation of the law and applicable University policies, and may be subject to penalties.

Language and subject matter

As we will explore, discourse – and language as an instantiation of discourse – is always changing. Some of the readings in this course use older terms to refer to identity and groups; these should be read in light of the context of their writing as well as considered in terms of what might be useful for today's context and what has shifted. Some of the readings critique slurs and offensive remarks – and some public discourses that we will examine are offensive and damaging. At times, examples of these terms, words, and discourses will be included in these readings and discussed in class for analytical purposes. This discussion does not condone the use of these terms outside of analysis or with harmful intention toward others. At all times, the instructor strives toward the use of anti-oppressive language and encourages others to do so. I am not always likely to get it right and I welcome compassionate correction.

Topics in this course relate to subjects of power, oppression, exclusion, discrimination, violence, or other material that may be disturbing. I encourage you to practice care, taking breaks and discussing your responses to these subjects with supportive others. If there is a particular reading or week in which you are unable to engage with the subject matter for personal reasons, then I invite you to instead focus your efforts and assignments on the other materials or weeks of content.

Late assignments – All assignments are due on the date specified and must be submitted by the deadline. If you will require an extension, you must bring this to my attention by email **in advance** of the deadline and generally **one week or more in advance**. Given the current circumstances, I am aware of the need for flexibility, so please do get in contact if you require an extension! If I have not granted an extension, the following late policy will apply: 1 grade point will be deducted from the total grade for every 24 hours that an assignment is late for up to 72 hours (accumulating a maximum 3-point deduction). Assignments more than three days late will receive a **zero** grade. Late assignments may not receive written comments or feedback. Note: There are no extensions for participation-related grades, the First Iteration and Peer Feedback, or the Three Minute Explainer since these assignments are time-sensitive.

Questions, emails, and grade reassessment – Feel free to ask questions over email and during our weekly Zoom sessions. If you pose questions live during the Zoom sessions, your classmates will also benefit from hearing the responses. If you send a question by email, you may have to wait up to 24 business hours for a response. If you wish for an assignment to be reassessed, you will need to send me a written explanation over email for why the piece should be reassessed and then arrange to discuss the assignment during office hours or by appointment. If you experience any technical difficulties, issues accessing links/resources/readings, or any other challenges to participating in the course, please get in contact as soon as possible.

[Official university policies removed from this version – if you are a student in this course, please use the version distributed to you]

Schedule

WEEK 1: January 19 – Everyone's talking about sex
We will kick off the course with a discussion of how sexuality and public discourse are mutually constitutive. This will involve a gentle introduction to Foucault's genealogy of sexuality and his observations about the incitement to produce discourse about sexuality. Popular discourses to examine: "You can't talk about sex!" or "Sex is so taboo/edgy/provocative…"

Recommended reading:
Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Volume 1.* New York: Random House
    Part 1: We "Other Victorians" pp. 3-13

Additional reading:
    Farvid, P. & Braun, V. (2018). A critical encyclopedia of heterosex. In K. Hall and R. Barrett (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Sexuality.* Oxford University Press.

WEEK 2: January 26 – Sex as public, private, both?
We will be making sense of the relationship of sex to public spaces and institutions, even though it is often constructed as something relegated to the private sphere. Popular discourses to examine: "I'm fine with _____, I just don't want to see it." Or "Get a room."

Required reading:
    Berlant, L. & Warner, M. (1998). Sex in public. *Critical Inquiry*, 24(2), 547-566.

Additional reading:
    a) Warner, M. (2002). *Publics and counterpublics.* New York: Zone Books.
        Chapter 2 "Publics and counterpublics" pp. 65-124
    b) Orne, J. (2011). 'You will always have to "out" yourself': Reconsidering coming out through strategic outness. *Sexualities, 14*(6), 681-703.
    c) Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
        Chapter 1 "Epistemology of the closet" pp. 67-90.

Course add/drop deadline January 26

WEEK 3: February 2 – Sexual orientations and identities
How do sexual identities come to be understood in our society? What are orientations? We will return to Foucault's writings to understand the development of discourse around sexual identity. We will also delve into Sara Ahmed's phenomenological analysis of orientations, which identifies deviations from the straight line of heterosexuality. Popular discourse to examine: "You can be anything you want these days."

Required reading:
    a) Ahmed, S. (2006). Orientations: Toward a queer phenomenology. *GLQ, 12*(4), 543-574.
    b) Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Volume 1.* New York: Random House
        pp. 42-44 (section number 2 only)

Additional reading:
   a) Esterberg, K.G. (1996). "A certain swagger when I walk": Performing lesbian identity. In S. Seidman (Ed.), *Queer Theory/Sociology,* pp. 259-279. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
   b) Weeks, J. (1996). The construction of homosexuality. In S. Seidman (Ed.), *Queer Theory/Sociology,* pp. 41-63. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
   c) Cover, R. (2019). Competing contestations of the norm: Emerging sexualities and digital identities. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*. doi. 10.1080/10304312.2019.1641583

Research Proposal due in Moodle on Thursday, February 4 by 9:00pm

WEEK 4: February 9 – Heterosexual dating scripts and the charmed circle
In the 1980s, Gayle Rubin conceptualized the "charmed circle" as a way to understand how some sexual practices are accepted as normal, or even privileged, while others are defined as deviant or off limits. Kath Albury uses this framework to discuss the contemporary hook up culture facilitated through dating apps and explain the shock and panic that Tinder often garners. This discussion of hook up culture necessitates reflecting on enduring and shifting sexual double standards within heterosexual roles as well as a history of sex panics. Popular discourse to examine: "Hooking up is killing romance."

Required reading:
   a) Albury, K. (2018). Heterosexual casual sex: From free love to Tinder. In C. Smith, F. Attwood, and B. McNair (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to media, sex and sexuality,* pp. 81-90. New York: Routledge.
   b) Rubin, G. (1984). Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality. In C. Vance (Ed.), *Pleasure and danger*. New York: Routledge.
      "Sexual thoughts" **pp. 148-155 only**

Additional reading:
   a) Bogle, K. (2008). Hooking up: Sex, dating, and relationships on campus. New York and London: New York University.
      Chapter 6 "Men, women, and the sexual double standard" pp. 96-127
   b) Pinsky, D. (2019). Doing gender online through flirtation: Digitally mediated romantic interactions among college students. *RESET, 8.* Retrieved from https://journals.openedition.org/reset/1303
   c) Irvine, J. M. (2007). Transient feelings: Sex panics and the politics of emotions. *GLQ, 14*(1), 1-40.

WEEK 5: February 16 – Indigenous experiences, colonial heteronormativity, and sexual racism
This week integrates Indigenous perspectives and experiences of sexuality in ways that identify the sexual structures imposed through colonialism. It also interrogates claims of sexual preference that are based on racist discourses. Critiques of sexual racism, which is often disguised as a preference, add an intersectional lens that is absent from Rubin's charmed circle. Popular discourses to examine: "Polyamory is something new" and "They're just not my type."

Required listening:

Young, A. (Producer). (2020, February 5). Dr. Kim TallBear on reviving kinship and sexual abundance [Audio podcast]. *For the Wild. https://forthewild.world/listen/kim-tallbear-on-reviving-kinship-and-sexual-abundance-157* (also available through Spotify)

Additional reading:
a) Carlson, B. (2019). Love and hate at the cultural interface: Indigenous Australians and dating apps. *Journal of Sociology.* https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783319833181
b) Daroya, E. 2018. "Not into chopsticks or curries": Erotic capital and the psychic life of racism on Grindr. In D. W. Riggs. Ed, *The psychic life of racism in gay men's communities,* pp. 67-80. London: Lexington Books.
c) Mowlabocus, S. (2021). A Kindr Grindr: Moderating race(ism) in techno-spaces of desire. In R. Ramos and S. Mowlabocus (Eds.), *Queer Sites in Global Contexts.* Routledge.
d) Mason, C. L. (2016). Tinder and humanitarian hook-ups: The erotics of social media racism. *Feminist Media Studies, 16*(5), 822-837.
e) Finley, C. (2011). Decolonizing the queer Native body (and recovering the Native bull-dyke): Bringing "sexy back" and out of Native Studies' closet. In Q. Driskill, C. Finley, B. Joseph, and S.L. Morgensen (Eds.), *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical interventions in theory, politics, and literature,* pp. 31-42. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

WEEK 6: February 23 – Queer politics and HIV/AIDS
The development of the AIDS crisis in the 1980s reflected stigmatization and homophobia as well as political negligence and pharmaceutical companies looking to profit from an epidemic. The inaction of public institutions to save the lives of people living with AIDS sparked a new wave of queer activism that was less focused on identity politics and more about radical action and challenges to structures of inequality. This class also looks at how the legacy of AIDS still affects sexual practices today. Popular discourses to examine: "Queer is a catch-all term for anyone who is not heterosexual," and "A crisis caused by a virus that is spread through intimate contact is unprecedented."

Required reading:
a) Cohen, C. J. (2005). Punks, bulldaggers, and welfare queens: The radical potential of queer politics? In E. P. Johnson & M. G. Henderson, *Black queer studies: A critical anthology,* pp. 21-52. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Additional reading:
a) Berlant, L. & Warner, M. (1995). What does queer theory teach us about x? *PMLA, 110*(3), 343-349.
b) Spieldenner, A. (2016). PrEP whores and HIV prevention: The queer communication of HIV Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP). *Journal of Homosexuality, 63*(12), 1685-1697.
c) Race, K. (2010). Click here for HIV status: Shifting templates of sexual negotiation. *Emotion, Space and Society, 3,* 7-14.
d) Neuman, S. (2018). Grindr admits it shared HIV status of users. *NPR.* Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2018/04/03/599069424/grindr-admits-it-shared-hiv-status-of-users
e) Bryne, J. (2015). When condoms aren't enough. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2015/12/truvada-hiv-prep-stigma/418119/?fbclid=IwAR3lYS3Qenb5EdVHFp2S2ovGh0M08QFhx-1ZGonDD9f5VIKSUxNjE9iy3vU

f) Lentini, G. (2020). Unprecedented: A queer perspective on COVID-19. *Bloop.* Retrieved from https://www.grindrbloop.com/zine/2020/unprecedented

Background reading:
a) Warner, T. (2002). *Never going back: A history of queer activism in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
   Chapter 11 "AIDS radicalization, queer nation, and identity politics" pp. 247-265
b) Gamson, J. (1995). Must identity movements self-destruct? A queer dilemma. *Social Problems, 42*(3), 390-407.

Artifact Analysis paper due in Moodle on Thursday, February 25 by 9:00pm

March 2 – Reading Week – No class

WEEK 7: March 9 – Further reflecting on queer politics and activism/catch-up week
This week is for you to work according to your capacity and needs. There are no required readings or tasks. If you are able to extend your reflection and application of concepts from Week 6, you may wish to watch one of the following films that depict queer activism in the face of the AIDS crisis. However, these films are necessarily intense and emotional, and may be challenging to watch (especially in the midst of a pandemic when we're thinking a lot about infection, risk, health, and safety). You can choose whether or not to watch them – or to maybe discuss the topic with someone who lived through this time, asking them if they observed activist efforts. This week should also be dedicated to working on your final project; we will have a co-working and troubleshooting session for this on Tuesday.

Optional screening:
Campillo, R. (Director). (2017). *BPM (Beats per minute)* [Film]. Les films de Pierre.
Available at: https://media3-criterionpic-com.lib-ezproxy.concordia.ca/htbin/wwform/006?T=MK20050
Warning: sexual content; intense subject matter; incredibly sad ending
Or
Hubbard, J. (Director). (2012). *United in anger: A history of ACT UP* [Documentary]. New York State Council on the Arts. https://youtu.be/MrAzU79PBVM

Reflection questions:
• What was the existing public discourse about HIV/AIDS?
• What are all the ways ACT-UP worked to shaped public discourse?
• Who were their targets/audiences? How did they tailor their messages?
• How were queer politics reflected in ACT-UP's composition, organizing and messages?

WEEK 8: March 16 - Homonormativity, commercialization, and post-gay possibilities
Recent social and economic developments have led to the rise of homonormativity, as an aspiration toward full citizenship for LGBTQ people attained through individualized consumption, assimilation to dominant norms, and privatized domesticity. We will discuss the prevalence of homonormative attitudes, the commercial targeting of LGBTQ consumers, and notions that we may be entering a post-gay era without further need for LGBTQ political organizing. Popular discourses to examine: "We're all the same"/#samelove and "Who even needs labels?"

Required reading:
   a) Lovelock, M. (2017). 'Is every YouTuber going to make a coming out video eventually?' YouTube celebrity video bloggers and lesbian and gay identity. *Celebrity Studies, 8*(1), 87-108.
   b) Watch: Ingrid Nilsen. (2015). Something I want you to know (Coming out). [YouTube video, 19:12]. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/Eh7WRYXVh9M
   c) Watch: ConnorFranta. (2014). Coming out [YouTube video, 6:27]. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/WYodBfRxKWI

Note: If you submit a reading reflection for this week, it must engage with the required reading and not only the videos.

Additional reading:
   a) Squires, K.K. (2019). Rethinking the homonormative? Lesbian and Hispanic Pride events and the uneven geographies of commoditized identities. *Social & Cultural Geography, 20*(3), 367-386.
   b) Foeken, E. & Roberts, S. (2019). Reifying difference: Examining the negotiation of internal diversity on a (post-)lesbian subreddit. *Sexualities, 22*(7-8), 1268-1287.
   c) Nash, C. J. (2013). The age of the "post-mo"? Toronto's Gay Village and a new generation. *Geoforum, 49,* 243-252.
   d) Ghaziani, A. (2011). Post-gay collective identity construction. *Social Problems, 58*(1), 99-125.

Background reading:
   Duggan, L. (2002). The new homonormativity: The sexual politics of neoliberalism. In R. Castronovo & D. Nelson (Eds.), *Materializing democracy: Toward a revitalized culture politics,* pp. 175-194. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. (Andrew Sullivan, who Duggan critiques at length, is still perpetuating many of his longstanding ideas in 2019, see for example "The next step for gay Pride").

   First iteration of project posted in Moodle by Thursday, March 18 at 9:00pm

WEEK 9: March 23 - (In)visibility and media representation
Kevin Barnhurst describes LGBTQ visibility in the media as a paradox: it simultaneously raises awareness and can foster tolerance but it can also give rise to assimilation and commercialized, apolitical representations. While this paradox must be considered in relation to the increasing representation of some sexual minorities, others remain almost completely unrepresented in mainstream and formal media outlets. At the same time, particular representations of heterosexuality perpetuate gender and sexual scripts. We will investigate these multiple factors pertaining to the media representation of sexualities. Popular discourses to examine: "We just need better LGBTQ+ representation in the media," and "Representation isn't a problem, haven't you seen [name of film or TV show]?"

Required reading:
Baker, S. & Rutherford, A. (2020). Upgrading *The L Word: Generation Q. M/C Journal, 23*(6). https://doi.org/10.5204/mcj.2727

The L Word: Generation Q – Season 1 Trailer: https://youtu.be/3crYz4DuGrI

Note: If you submit a reading reflection for this week, it must engage with the required reading and not only the trailer.

Additional reading:
a) Kohnen, M. (2015). *Queer representation, visibility, and race in American film and television: Screening the closet.* New York: Routledge.
   Chapter 1 "All that visibility allows, or mapping the discourses of queer visibility" pp. 12-37
b) Waggoner, E. B. (2018). Bury your gays and social media fan response: Television, LGBTQ representation, and communitarian ethics. *Journal of Homosexuality, 65*(13), 1877-1891.
c) Select chapters from *The Routledge companion to media, sex and sexuality,* ebook available through Concordia:
   https://concordiauniversity.on.worldcat.org/oclc/1000393989
   • Asexualities and media
   • Representing trans sexualities
   • Representing lesbians in film and television
   • Representing gay sexualities
   • Fifty shades of ambivalence: BDSM representation in pop culture
   • The politics of fluidity: Representing bisexualities in twenty-first century screen media
   • Sex in sitcoms: Unravelling discourses on sex in *Friends*

Background reading:
a) Himberg, J. (2017). The new gay for pay: The sexual politics of American television production. Austin: University of Texas Press.
   Introduction "The new gay for pay" pp. 1-16
b) Barnhurst, K. (2007). Visibility as paradox: Representation and simultaneous contrast. In K. Barnhurts (Ed.), *Media Queered: Visibility and its discontents,* pp. 1-22. New York: Peter Lang.

   Peer feedback on projects due in Moodle on Thursday, March 25 at 9:00pm

DISC deadline March 29

WEEK 10: March 30 - Social media and sexual self-representation
Although today's social media platforms and apps enable people to represent themselves and their sexuality, these technologies also provide particular contexts for these self-representations. We will discuss how sexuality is represented through digital media, touching on the history of online sexual self-representation and considering the technical features, algorithms, and social norms that shape today's practices of communicating sexuality and sexual identity. Discourses to examine: "Social media changes everything" or "You can be yourself online."

Required reading:
Cho, A. (2018). Default publicness: Queer youth of color, social media, and being outed by the machine. *New Media & Society, 20*(9), 3183-3200.

Additional reading:

a) Renninger, B. (2015). "Where I can be myself…where I can speak my mind": Networked counterpublics in a polymedia environment. *New Media & Society, 17*(9), 1513-1529.
b) Herrera, A. P. (2017). Theorizing the lesbian hashtag: Identity, community, and the technological imperative to name the self. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 22*(3), 313-328.
c) LaRochelle, L. (2021). Queering the Map: On designing digital queer space. In R. Ramos and S. Mowlabocus (Eds.), *Queer sites in Global Contexts.* Routledge.
d) Dhoest, A. & Szulc, L. (2016). Navigating online selves: Social, cultural, and material contexts of social media use by diasporic gay men. *Social Media + Society, 2*(4), 1-10.

Easter break April 2 – 5

WEEK 11: April 6 – The digital landscape of pornography and sex work
Panic about pornography and calls for the prohibition of sex work are nothing new, as illustrated by the feminist sex wars of the 1980s and 1990s, but today regulation takes new forms as digital platforms and governments establish technological means of influencing pornography consumption. Further, digital technologies shape the working conditions for pornography performers as well as sex workers with the increasing uptake of camming platforms. Popular discourse to examine: "These measures are to protect people."

Required reading:
Henry, M. V. & Farvid, P. (2017). 'Always hot, always live': Computer-mediated sex work in the era of 'camming'. *Women's Studies Journal, 31*(2), 113-128.

Additional reading:
a) Ruberg, B. (2016). Doing it for free: Digital labour and the fantasy of amateur online pornography. *Porn Studies, 3*(2), 147-159.
b) Liu, J. (2021). The carceral feminism of SESTA-FOSTA: Reproducing spaces of exclusion from IRL to URL. In R. Ramos and S. Mowlabocus (Eds.), *Queer sites in Global Contexts.* Routledge.
c) Hernández, A. (2019). "There's something compelling about real life": Technologies of security and acceleration on Chaturbate. *Social Media + Society, Oct-Dec,* 1-9.
d) Holt, R. (2020). Pornifying the network. *APRJA, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.7146/aprja.v9i1.121494

Background reading:
a) Smith, M. & Mac, J. (2018). *Revolting prostitutes: The fight for sex workers' rights.* London and New York: Verso.
   Introduction pp. 1-21
b) Chancer, L. S. (2000). From pornography to sadomasochism: Reconciling feminist differences. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 571*(1), 77-88.
c) Paasonen, S. (2016). Pornification and the mainstreaming of sex. *Oxford Research Encyclopedias.* Retrieved from https://oxfordre.com/criminology/criminology/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264079-e-159
d) Picard, A. (2018). Canada's new prostitution laws may not make sex work safer: research. *The Globe and Mail.* Retrieved from https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-canadas-new-prostitution-laws-may-not-make-sex-work-safer-research/

Final Project due in Moodle on Thursday, April 8 by 9:00pm

WEEK 12: April 13 – Project Fair and Discussion
We will have a session to share your final project and celebrate your work. Come to the weekly Zoom session prepared to speak about your project and how it relates to the course. Take the time when you would normally read and watch lecture videos to instead view your classmates' projects.

Final Project Reflection due in Moodle on Sunday, April 18 by 9:00pm

WEEK 13: April 20 – Technologies, spaces, sex, and relationships in pandemic times + Course wrap-up
The pandemic seems to have intensified particular cultural, social, and economic arrangements while changing, demolishing, and opening up opportunities with regard to others. This week, we'll think about what may be lost, such as community spaces or embodied closeness, what endures, and what may unfold – from the commercialization of self-care to networks of solidarity and mutual aid. Discourse to examine: "Individuals have to take care of themselves during the pandemic."

Required reading:
> Duguay, S. (2020). More than you bargained for: Care, community, and sexual expression through queer women's dating apps during the COVID-19 pandemic. In P.D. Keidl, L. Melamed, V. Hediger, and A. Somaini (Eds.), *Pandemic Media: Preliminary Notes Toward and Inventory.* Meson Press. https://pandemicmedia.meson.press/chapters/activism-sociability/more-than-you-bargained-for-care-community-and-sexual-expression-through-queer-womens-dating-apps-during-the-covid-19-pandemic/

Additional reading:
a) Anderson, A.R. & Knee, E. (2020). Queer isolation or queering isolation? Reflecting upon the ramifications of COVID-19 on the future of queer leisure spaces. *Leisure Sciences.* 1-8.
b) Döring, N. (2020). How is the COVID-19 pandemic affecting our sexualities? An overview of the current media narratives and research hypotheses. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 49,* 2765-2778.
c) Kouri-Towe, N. (2020). Solidarity at a time of risk: Vulnerability and the turn to mutual aid. *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies, 41*, 190-198.