



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

QUEER INTIMACIES
PSYC 159S
Summer 2023

GENERAL COURSE INFORMATION

Meeting Time and Place	Tuesdays & Thursdays, 1:00-4:30pm Natural Sciences Annex, Room 103
Instructor	Phillip L. Hammack, Ph.D. (he/him/his) Professor of Psychology Director of the Sexual & Gender Diversity Laboratory Office hours: By appointment
Communication	<p>Email: hammack@ucsc.edu (typical response time 24-48 hours, no email on evenings after 5pm, weekends, or holidays)</p> <p>Instagram: @phil_hammack (here I post information about my research and share queer-related events on campus and in Santa Cruz)</p> <p>Twitter: @philhammack (here I post information about my research and share research of others doing work on sexual and gender diversity)</p> <p>Website: www.philhammack.com (here I have information about my training and background and access to most of my publications)</p> <p>Blog: https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/identity-politics (here I am working on a blog with short articles about issues in sexual and gender diversity)</p>

Course Description

The twenty-first century is a time of expansion in cultural and scientific understandings of gender, sexuality, and relationships. This course examines the new science of intimate diversity through the lens of queer theory and empirical social science research (primarily in psychology and sociology). We critically interrogate normative assumptions about intimacy grounded in cultural myths about gender and sexuality that privileged institutions such as heterosexuality and monogamy in the prior century. We review research on polyamory and other forms of consensual nonmonogamy, kink/fetish/BDSM relationships, sex work, digital intimacy, casual intimacy, chosen families, flexibility and fluidity in intimate desire, and intimate experiences of those who identify as lesbian, gay, transgender, genderqueer/nonbinary, asexual, pansexual, bisexual, and queer.

Pedagogy & Learning Objectives

The seminar format is interactive and semi-structured. The objectives of the course are for students to develop skills in the following domains:

- (1) **Close reading and textual interpretation.** Seminar discussions will focus on the texts we read. Students are encouraged to bring specific reactions and questions to the discussion. For more complex theoretical readings and empirical studies, we will focus on interpreting the texts. (Evaluation method: Reading Analysis Memos)
- (2) **Linking academic ideas and research to personal narrative.** Students are encouraged to make links between texts and personal narratives (*either* of the student or someone known to them) and are encouraged to express these links in both seminar discussion and essays. (Evaluation method: Reading Analysis Memos and Personal Narrative Essays)
- (3) **Communication skills in academic argumentation and discussion.** Students are encouraged to actively participate in seminar discussion. The seminar format is semi-structured and relies upon students' own interests related to the texts. (Evaluation method: Engagement Assessment)
- (4) **Writing for critical analysis, reflection, and synthesis.** Students will develop writing skills in critical analysis, reflection, and synthesis through the required essay assignments. (Evaluation method: Personal Narrative Essays)

See the Appendix for information about evaluation and assessment methods for the course learning objectives.

The Seminar Space

The seminar space is intended to be a safe, judgment-free zone in which students feel empowered to share their ideas and experiences related to intimate diversity. Though there may be configurations of relationships that you do not understand or that disrupt your preconceived notions of intimacy, the goal of the seminar is to learn about the diverse ways in which humans construct intimate relationships. I ask that you be open to this challenge and avoid making moral judgments of this diversity. I ask that you approach new ideas, concepts, and experiences with curiosity and an open mind. To ensure a space that feels safe for all students, I ask that you respect the privacy of your colleagues by not discussing the views or experiences of specific students outside the seminar space without their consent. We will form a community agreement the first week of meeting and revisit it throughout the quarter as needed.

Please note that it is not possible to record any aspect of the seminar discussion to ensure privacy, respect confidentiality, and implement the course pedagogy. For the same reasons, it is also not possible to audit the course. All seminar participants must be enrolled in the course for credit.

Academic Integrity

Violations of academic integrity include plagiarism (“the action or practice of taking someone else’s work, idea, etc., and passing it off as one’s own”; *Oxford English Dictionary*) and the submission of work authored by another person or a machine (i.e., artificial intelligence). Violations of academic integrity will result in immediate expulsion from the course and a grade of F.

Students are expected to work on all assignments independently. Evidence that students have worked on assignments collaboratively will be considered a violation of academic integrity. Students may work with professional staff such as Learning Support Services (<https://lss.ucsc.edu/>) or professional translation services when English is not the first language. However, the use of such services must be documented in advance by a written statement from support services explaining the nature of their services. Such documentation must be emailed to the instructor (hammack@ucsc.edu). Collaboration with professional support in this context is not considered a violation of academic integrity.

Please note that students may be disciplined for selling, preparing, or distributing course notes for any commercial purpose, whether or not the student took the notes. The unauthorized sale of course notes (and handouts, readers or other course materials) is a violation of campus policies and state law, and it may also constitute copyright infringement subject to legal action.

Course Policy on Use of Technology

Consistent with professional settings, mobile phones should not be used during seminar meetings. Laptops or tablet devices may be used for access to readings or note-taking during seminar meetings. Students who use electronic devices for non-seminar related purposes (e.g., messaging, social media, email, etc.) will be asked to discontinue use. Please silence notifications on electronic devices during seminar meetings so as to respect your colleagues and ensure full engagement in discussion.

Disability Information

Any student who thinks she/he/they may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact the instructor privately to submit an Accommodation Authorization and discuss specific needs, preferably within the first two weeks of the quarter. Please contact the Disability Resource Center (DRC) at 831-459-2089 in room 146 Hahn Student Services or by e-mail at drc@ucsc.edu to coordinate those accommodations.

Please note that the accommodation to record seminar discussions cannot be made due to the course design and the need to maintain confidentiality.

Access to Course Readings

Articles and book excerpts are posted on the Canvas website for the course.

SCHEDULE OF SEMINAR MEETINGS & READINGS

Week 1A. Introduction to the Course

- 8/1 (Tuesday) Barker, M., & Scheele, J. (2016). *Queer: A graphic history*. Icon. (Selections available as PDF on Canvas.)
- Hammack, P. L., Frost, D.M., & Hughes, S.D. (2019). Queer intimacies: A new paradigm for the study of relationship diversity. *Journal of Sex Research*, 56, 556-592.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2018.1531281>

Week 1B. Gay & Lesbian Intimacies in the 21st Century

- 8/3 (Thursday) Moore, M. R. (2006). Lipstick or Timberlands? Meanings of gender presentation in Black lesbian communities. *Signs*, 32(1), 113-139. <https://doi.org/10.1086/505269>
- Diamond, L. M. (2017). Three critical questions for future research on lesbian relationships. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 21(1), 106-119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10894160.2016.1143756>
- Duran, A., Rodriguez, F., & Patrón, O. E. (2020). Queer love in the lives of gay Latino men in college. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 33(9), 905-920.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1687957>
- Stacey, L., & Forbes, T. D. (2022). Feeling like a fetish: Racialized feelings, fetishization, and the contours of sexual racism on gay dating apps. *Journal of Sex Research*, 59(3), 372-384.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2021.1979455>
- 8/6 (Sunday) Reading Analysis Memo 1: Due by 11:59pm.

Week 2A. Transgender & Genderqueer Intimacies

- 8/8 (Tuesday) Gunby, N., & Butler, C. (2023). What are the relationship experiences of in which one member identifies as transgender? A systematic review and meta-ethnography. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 45, 167-196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12409>
- Buggs, S. G. (2020). (Dis)owning exotic: Navigating race, intimacy, and trans identity. *Sociological Inquiry*, 90(2), 249-270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12348>
- Zamantakis, A. (2022). Queering intimate emotions: Trans/nonbinary people negotiating emotional expectations in intimate relationships. *Sexualities*, 25(5-6), 581-597.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460720979307>
- Galupo, M. P., Pulice-Farrow, L., Clements, Z.A., & Morris, E.R. (2019). "I love you as both and I love you as neither": Romantic partners' affirmations of nonbinary transgender individuals. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 20, 315-327.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2018.1496867>

Week 2B. Bisexual & Pansexual Intimacies

8/10 (Thursday) Hayfield, N., Campbell, C., & Reed, E. (2018). Misrecognition and managing marginalisation: Bisexual people's experiences of bisexuality and relationships. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 9(3), 221-236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2018.1470106>

Maliepaard, E. (2021). Bisexuality/plurisexuality in romantic relationships: Making space for bisexuality/plurisexuality? *Journal of Bisexuality*, 21(4), 560-580. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2022.2031369>

Hayfield, N., & Křížová, K. (2021). It's like bisexuality, but it isn't: Pansexual and panromantic people's understandings of their identities and experiences of becoming educated about gender and sexuality. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 21(2), 167-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2021.1911015>

8/13 (Sunday) Reading Analysis Memo 2: Due by 11:59pm.

Week 3A. Flexibility & Fluidity in Intimate Desire

8/15 (Tuesday) Hoy, A., & London, A. S. (2018). The experience and meaning of same-sex sexuality among heterosexually identified men and women: An analytic review. *Sociology Compass*, 12, e12596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12596>

Silva, T. J. (2018). "Helpin' a buddy out": Perceptions of identity and behaviour among rural straight men that have sex with each other. *Sexualities*, 21, 68-89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716678564>

Diamond, L. M. (2008). *Sexual fluidity: Understanding women's love and desire*. Harvard University Press. (Chapter 3 available as PDF on Canvas.)

Rupp, L. J., Taylor, V., & Miller, S. D. (2022). Learning to be queer: College women's sexual fluidity. In *Introducing the new sexuality studies* (pp. 579-590). Routledge.

Week 3B. Polyamory & Consensual Nonmonogamies

8/17 (Thursday) Sheff, E. (2020). Polyamory is deviant—but not for the reasons you may think. *Deviant Behavior*, 41(7), 882-892. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2020.1737353>

O'Byrne, P., & Haines, M. (2021). A qualitative exploratory study of consensual non-monogamy: Sexual scripts, stratifications and charmed circles. *Social Theory & Health*, 19(2), 137-154. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41285-019-00120-1>

Flicker, S. M., Sancier-Barbosa, F., Moors, A. C., & Browne, L. (2021). A closer look at relationship structures: Relationship satisfaction and attachment among people who practice hierarchical and non-hierarchical polyamory. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 50, 1401-1417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-020-01875-9>

Sandbakken, E. M., Skrautvol, A., & Madsen, O. J. (2022). "It's my definition of a relationship, even though it doesn't fit yours": Living in polyamorous relationships in a mononormative culture. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 13(4), 1054-1067. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2021.1982755>

- 8/18 (Friday) Essay 1: Due by 11:59pm.
- 8/20 (Sunday) Reading Analysis Memo 3: Due by 11:59pm.
-

Week 4A. Kink/Fetish/BDSM & Asexual Intimacies

- 8/22 (Tuesday) Bauer, R. (2018). Bois and grrrls meet their daddies and mommies on gender playgrounds: Gendered age play in the les-bi-trans-queer BDSM communities. *Sexualities*, 21, 139-155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716676987>
- Cascalheira, C. J., Thomson, A., & Wignall, L. (2022). "A certain evolution": A phenomenological study of 24/7 BDSM and negotiating consent. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 13(3), 628-639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2021.1901771>
- Dawson, M., McDonnell, L., & Scott, S. (2016). Negotiating the boundaries of intimacy: The personal lives of asexual people. *The Sociological Review*, 64(2), 349-365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.12362>
- Vares, T. (2022). Asexuals negotiate the "onslaught of the heteronormative." *Sexualities*, 25(5-6), 767-784. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460721993389>
-

Week 4B. Sex Work & Digital Intimacy

- 8/24 (Thursday) Stewart, T. J. (2023). "Dear higher education, there are sex workers on your campus": Rendering visible the realities of U.S. college students engaged in sex work. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 16(4), 397-409. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000351>
- Morris, M. (2021). The limits of labelling: Incidental sex work among gay, bisexual, and queer young men on social media. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 18, 855-868. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-021-00603-9>
- Goldberg, S., Yeshua-Katz, D., & Marciano, A. (2022). Online construction of romantic relationships on social media. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 39(6), 1839-1862. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211067814>
- Sobieraj, S., & Humphreys, L. (2021). Forced empowerment and the paradox of mobile dating apps. *Social Media + Society*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051211068130>
- 8/27 (Sunday) Reading Analysis Memo 4: Due by 11:59pm.
-

Week 5A. Casual Intimacies

- 8/29 (Tuesday) Anders, K. M., Goodcase, E., Yazedjian, A., & Toews, M. L. (2020). "Sex is easier to get and love is harder to find": Costs and rewards of hooking up among first-year college students. *Journal of Sex Research*, 57(2), 247-259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1667946>
- Wade, L. (2021). Doing casual sex: A sexual fields approach to the emotional force of hookup culture. *Social Problems*, 68(1), 185-201. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spz054>
- Segovia, A. N., Maxwell, J. A., DiLorenzo, M. G., & MacDonald, G. (2019). No strings attached? How attachment orientation relates to the varieties of casual sexual relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 151, 109455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.05.061>

Jovanovic, J., & Williams, J. C. (2018). Gender, sexual agency, and friends with benefits relationships. *Sexuality & Culture*, 22(2), 555-576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-017-9483-1>

Week 5B. Chosen Families

FILM CONTENT ADVISORY:
Homophobia, transphobia
& transphobic violence,
derogatory language

8/31 (Thursday) Film Screening: *Paris is Burning* (1990, Director: Jennie Livingston, 1hr 18min)

Hull, K. E., & Ortyl, T. A. (2019). Conventional and cutting-edge: Definitions of family in LGBT communities. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 16(1), 31-43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-018-0324-2>

Hailey, J., Burton, W., & Arscott, J. (2020). We are family: Chosen and created families as a protective factor against racialized trauma and anti-LGBTQ oppression among African American sexual and gender minority youth. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 16(2), 176-191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2020.1724133>

Andreassen, R. (2023). From the families we choose to the families we find online: Media technology and queer family making. *Feminist Theory*, 24(1), 12-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14647001211059517>

9/1 (Friday) Essay 2: Due by 11:59pm.

APPENDIX: Evaluation Information

Evaluation for the course will be based on three factors which correspond to the course learning objectives:

- (1) **Evidence of close reading and textual interpretation** (20% of final letter grade). Approximately every week, students will submit a Reading Analysis Memo (4 memos total) in which they select one reading from the prior 1-week period and complete a memo describing its key content. (A sample is posted on the Canvas site for the course.) The memo has three components:
- **Statement of the main point or key findings:** In 1-2 sentences, describe the central argument, main point, or key findings discussed in the reading.
 - **Topical index:** In alphabetical order/index format, list all topics of interest covered in the reading and indicate on what pages the topics are discussed.
 - **Link to personal narrative:** In no more than 3 sentences, describe how this reading connects to a personal narrative—*either* your own or to someone known to you. (Omit any identifying information by using pseudonyms.)

The memo will receive one of four possible narratives and be assigned a letter grade accordingly:

Narrative	Letter Grade	Numeric Equivalent
The memo reveals an outstanding level of engagement with the reading. It accurately summarizes the main point or key findings, provides a comprehensive topical index, and offers a coherent connection to personal narrative.	A	95
The memo reveals a good level of engagement with the reading. There are problems with 1 of the following: the main point or key findings, the topical index, or the connection to personal narrative.	B	85
The memo reveals an acceptable level of engagement with the reading. There are problems with 2 of the following: the main point or key findings, the topical index, or the connection to personal narrative.	C	75
The memo does not reveal an acceptable level of engagement with the reading. It does not summarize the main point or key findings accurately, fails to provide an acceptable topical index, and does not offer an acceptable level of connection to personal narrative.	F	65
The memo was not submitted.	F	0

- (2) **Evidence of engagement** with the texts and ideas in the seminar (20% of final letter grade). The following narratives will be applied to this assessment:

NOTE ABOUT SEMINAR ATTENDANCE: Expectations for attendance may be reduced if you are sick or experience an illness or injury. Please submit written documentation from a medical authority via email to the instructor in such instances. Students may then provide written responses to discussion questions to receive credit for engagement for any meetings they miss due to illness or injury.

Narrative	Letter Grade	Numeric Equivalent
The student attended all 10 seminar meetings and revealed a close engagement with the texts and ideas from the course. Participation was very active.	A+	100
The student attended 9 out of 10 seminar meetings and revealed a close engagement with the texts and ideas from the course. Participation was very active.	A	95
The student attended 8 out of 10 seminar meetings and revealed engagement with the texts and ideas from the course in seminar discussions. Participation was consistent.	B	85
The student attended 7 out of 10 seminar meetings and revealed engagement with the texts and ideas from the course in seminar discussions. Participation was consistent.	C	75
The student attended fewer than 7 seminar meetings.	F	65
The student did not attend any seminar meetings.	F	0

- (3) **Evidence of critical analysis, reflection, and synthesis** (60% of final letter grade). Students will complete two essays in which concepts from the course are applied to a presentation and analysis of a personal narrative, *either* one's own narrative or the narrative of someone known to the student (e.g., a friend or family member). Essay 1 may range from 3-5 double-spaced pages (excluding title and reference pages), and Essay 2 may range from 5-7 double-spaced pages (excluding title and reference pages). Both essays should follow basic conventions of APA formatting. See the sample essay on the course Canvas site.

No outside materials beyond course readings or materials presented in seminar meetings may be used (i.e., no references to other texts or to websites or films not screened in the course). Students are expected to use relevant readings from the first half of the course in Essay 1 and relevant readings from across the entire course for Essay 2. Essay 2 constitutes the final exam for the course.

All essays must be submitted through the Canvas course website.

Narrative	Letter Grade	Numeric Equivalent
The essay reveals excellent mastery of key ideas from the readings and seminar discussions and the student's ability to apply these ideas to personal narrative. The essay possesses a clear organizational structure and effectively uses textual evidence from the readings to support its claims. Errors in basic writing composition are extremely rare.	A	95
The essay reveals adequate mastery of key ideas from the readings and seminar discussions and the student's ability to apply these ideas to personal narrative. The effectiveness of the essay is undermined by problems with one of the following: (1) organizational structure, (2) use of textual evidence, or (3) errors in basic writing composition.	B	85
The essay reveals engagement with ideas from readings and seminar discussions. The effectiveness of the essay is undermined by problems with two of the following: (1) organizational structure, (2) use of textual evidence, or (3) errors in basic writing composition.	C	75
The essay reveals little or no evidence of engagement with ideas from readings and seminar discussions. The essay suffers from problems with organizational structure, the use of textual evidence, and errors in basic writing composition.	F	65
The essay was not submitted.	F	0

Final Grade Calculation

Final grade equation

Final grade = $.2 * (\text{AVG}[\text{reading memo}]) + .2 * (\text{AVG}[\text{engagement}]) + .6 * (\text{AVG}[\text{essay1, essay 2}])$

Letter grade numeric equivalents for final grades

A+	97-100
A	93-96
A-	90-92
B+	87-89
B	83-86
B-	80-82
C+	77-79
C	73-76
C-	70-72
D+	67-69
D	63-66
D-	60-62
F	<60