

**School for New Learning
DePaul University**

**Course Syllabus: HC 322 *The Institutionalization of Human Sexuality*
Autumn 2009
IN 307-717 (16895)
IN 307-718 (16896)**

1. General Information

Faculty: Kevin Brandyon Quinn ABD/PhD.
5915 North Magnolia Avenue
Chicago Illinois 60660
kquinn@depaul.edu
217-637-9357

Location: O'Hare Campus

Dates/Time: Thursdays, 6:30 pm -9:30 pm

Credit Hours: 2 or 4

2. Course Description and Faculty Biographical Sketch

- Institutions such as, but not limited to the State, the Courts Religion, Marriage and the Family, the Military and the business and industrial complex (es) have used and oftentimes misappropriated human sexuality as a means of hegemony, power and control. With the use of lecture, texts to include articles film, discussion and student presentations this course will depict variant sexualities while deconstructing and demystifying many of the long-held traditional values, ideals and customs that many in society accept as the norm.

- Kevin Brandyon Quinn ABD/PhD. is a former student of the SNL program (2001) where he graduated with honors. Deciding to continue his education he was accepted to five graduate programs to include the University of Illinois at Urbana – Champaign where he will receive his PhD. in Sociology with a concentration in the intersections of Race, Class, Gender and Sexuality in May 2010. Kevin has won many awards for his teaching during

his tenure at UIUC and has been voted one of the top 100 instructors each semester by his students. He is thrilled to be back at the School for New Learning.

3. Competencies

E-1 – Understands and will be able to discuss the role that institutions play in regulating human sexuality. (Prerequisite: *Research Seminar*)

E-2 – Can utilize one's own research skills to complete an advance research project.

1. Identifies a phenomenon, problem, or event of personal significance.
2. Identifies at least 2 approaches to the creation of knowledge that can appropriately be applied to institutions and human sexuality.
3. Evaluates the limitations and possibilities of these approaches to the creation of knowledge.
4. Articulates a perspective in relation to institutions and its effect on human sexuality that integrates aspects of these approaches.

In *Advanced Elective* experiences, students explore the value and practice of being an integrating thinker in today's increasingly complex world. The competencies here draw connections among the categories and disciplines of liberal learning. Students will demonstrate this competence by considering one phenomenon, problem; *the institutionalization of human sexuality* through the lenses of at least two different approaches to creating and expressing knowledge. They will ask questions such as; What is knowledge? How is knowledge created? What are its sources? How can it be expressed? How is knowledge accorded value or privilege in a particular culture or society?

Students will examine different sources of knowledge, such as inspiration, deductive reasoning, or revelation. They will explore how different sources of knowledge lead to different ways of knowing, and to different forms of expressing knowledge. For instance, an artist's expression of a phenomenon, such as human sexuality is a form of knowledge, and so is a scientist's examination of the same phenomenon.

By choosing two approaches to exploring an event or a phenomenon, students will discuss how different sources and expressions of knowledge are accorded different kinds of value and privilege depending on the cultural context. This will also help students to understand how their own values and assumptions influence the way they experience or understand an event or a phenomenon.

4. Learning Experience

Course Requirements:

Depending on enrollment, students may be divided into research groups based on a topic or institution of human sexuality. "Readings to be discussed" are to be completed previous to the discussion period. Based on the readings from each module the week's class discussion will then be led by one individual or one of the groups. In addition students will be required to submit a one to two-page reaction paper (preferably in "Word") for each week's readings discussed. This will help you facilitate and focus your arguments and ideas for the discussion.

The Institutionalization of Human Sexuality Reading List:

Beasley, Chris. 2006. **Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers.** Sage Publications: Thousand, Oaks CA.

Foucault, Michel. 1978. **The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1.** Vintage Books; New York.

Smith, Ralph R. & Russel R. Windes. 2000. **Progay/Antigay: The Rhetorical War Over Sexuality.** Rhetoric & Society, Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Books are available for purchase on Amazon.com or in the DePaul Bookstore. In addition there is a complete set on "RESERVE" in both the Undergraduate Library and in my office. The DePaul Library and the Inter-Library Loan system maintains multiple copies of each of the books required for this course.

Journal articles and book chapters required for the course can be found on E-Reserve, alphabetized by author. A hard copy is also available in my office should you wish to make your own photocopies.

Attendance and participation are essential. In the event of an absence it is imperative that you (1) let me know ahead of time, and (2) contact a classmate ahead of time to be your "tutor" for the missed session. Always consult our Blackboard for handouts and assignments

*Students missing more than two class sessions of our ten-week course will **not** have met the requirements for a passing grade.*

5. Outcomes

E-1 - Can articulate theoretical discourses for or against society's appropriation of human sexuality at an advanced level.

E-2 - Can frame advanced research skills to substantiate one's own theoretical argument.

6. Evidence the Students will Submit:

- The semester's readings and research will culminate into an individually authored literature review and group presentations (approximately 15-page review plus citations).

* **See Competence statements above.** Each paper is an argument and will require a hypothesis statement. This hypothesis statement will be developed in advance of the final paper and will serve as your **Mid-term**.

* **Final Papers** – Are due as an email attachment no later than **Midnight December 1, 2009**. Hard copies will not be accepted nor will late papers unless previously negotiated under *DePaul University School for New Learning's Incomplete Policy*.

* **See Grading and Incomplete Policy below under "Criteria for Assessment"**.

The DePaul Student Handbook defines plagiarism as follows: "Plagiarism includes but is not limited to the following: (a) The direct copying of any source, such as written and verbal material, computer files, audio disks, video programs or musical scores, whether published or unpublished, in whole or in part, without proper acknowledgement that it is someone else's. (b) Copying of any source in whole or in part with only minor changes in wording or syntax even with acknowledgement.

(c) Submitting as one's own work a report, examination paper, computer file, lab report or other assignment which has been prepared by someone else. This includes research papers purchased from any other person or agency. (d) "The paraphrasing of another's work or ideas without proper acknowledgement." Plagiarism will result in a failure of the assignment or possibly of the course. If you are unsure of how to cite a source, ask!

7. Criteria for Assessment

All Work will be Evaluated As Follows:

A= designates work of high quality; reflects thorough and comprehensive understanding of the issues at hand; reflects a clearly identifiable thesis and argument that demonstrates cogent and creative development and support of idea.

B= designates work of good quality; reflects clearly organized and comprehensive understanding of issues at hand; presents substantive thesis and argument with evident development and support of ideas.

C= designates work which minimally meets requirements set forward in assignment; reflects some organization and development of ideas but develops argument in superficial or simplistic manner; may only address part of the assignment or be otherwise incomplete.

D= designates work of poor quality which does not meet minimum requirements set forth in the assignment; demonstrates poor organization of ideas and/or inattention to development of ideas, grammar, and spelling; treatment of material is superficial and/or simplistic; may indicate that student has not done reading assignments thoroughly.

Unfinished work or work requiring revision will be given an Incomplete (IN) grade. In order to qualify for the IN, students must have regularly attended class, and must have completed two thirds of assignments. Work not submitted by the due date must be submitted within 2 weeks, and will be assessed on a P/F basis only.

8. Class Schedule

Date	In-Class	Readings for Next Week
Thursday, September 10, 2009	1) Introduction and Syllabus 2) Assign Groups	Beasley, Chris. 2006. <u>Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers.</u> Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks. Part 1.
Thursday, September 17, 2009 Theory	1) Discussion of Beasley A _____ B _____	Beasley, Chris. 2006. <u>Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers.</u> Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks. Part 2.
Thursday, September 24, 2009 Theory (cont.)	1) Discussion of Beasley	Beasley, Chris. 2006. <u>Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers.</u> Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks. Part 3. <i>E-Reserves:</i> 1. Vance, Carol S. 1990. "Negotiating Sex and Gender in the Attorney General's Commission on Pornography." In <u>The Gender & Sexuality Reader</u> . Lancaster & di Leonardo eds. Routledge: New York Pp. 440-52 2. Hagel, Timothy M. 1991. "But Do They Have to See It to Know It? The Supreme Court's Obscenity and Pornography Decisions." In <u>The Western Journal Political Journal</u> . 44 (4).

		<p>Pp. 1039-54.</p> <p>3. Weitzer, Ronald. 1999. “Prostitution Control in America: Rethinking Public Policy.” In <u>Crime, Law and Social Change</u>. 32 Pp. 83-102.</p> <p>4. Davidson, Julia O’Connell. 2002. “The Rights and Wrongs of Prostitution.” In <u>Hypatia</u>. 17 (2) 84-98.</p> <p>5. Eigenberg, H. M. 2000. “Correctional Officers and Their Perceptions of Homosexuality, Rape and Prostitution.” In <u>The Prison Journal</u>. 80 Pp. 415-33</p>
<p>Thursday, October 1, 2008 The State as an Institution</p>	<p>1) Discussion of Beasley 2) Discussion of E-Reserves</p> <p>A _____</p> <p>B _____</p>	<p>E-Reserves:</p> <p>1. Bell, David and Jon Bennie. 2000. The Sexual Citizen. Polity Press: Oxford. Chapters 1 & 2.</p> <p>2. Schwartz, Pepper. 2000. “Creating Sexual Pleasure and Sexual Justice in the Twenty-First Century”. In <u>Contemporary Sociology</u>. Pp. 213-19.</p> <p>3. Martin et al. 2002. “Gender Bias and Feminist Consciousness Among Judges and Attorneys: A Standpoint Theory Analysis. In <u>Signs</u>. 27 (3) Pp. 665-701.</p> <p>4. Loving ET UX v. Virginia. 388 U.S. Ct. 1817; 18L Ed. 2d 1010; 1967. <u>The University of California at Davis Law Review</u>. Pp. 1-11.</p> <p>5. Roe v. Wade. 1973. http://www.tourolaw.edu/Patch/Roe/. Pp. 1-29.</p> <p>6. Halley, Janet E. 1993. “Reasoning About Sodomy: Act and Identity in and after ‘Bowers v. Hardwick.’” In <u>Queering the Renaissance</u>, Jonathan Goldberg ed. <u>The Virginia Law Review</u>. 79 Pp. 1721-80.</p> <p>7. Lawrence et al. v. Texas. (0-102) 539 U.S. 558 (2003), 41 S.W. 3d. Reserved and Remanded. http://www.cornell.edu/supct/html/02-102ZS.html</p>
<p>Thursday, October 8, 2009 The State as an Institution (cont.)</p>	<p>1) In Class Reading: Struening, Karen. 1995. “Privacy and Sexuality in a Society Divided Over Moral Culture”.</p> <p>2) Discussion <i>E-Reserves</i></p>	<p>E-Reserves:</p> <p>1. Stein, Arlene. 1989. “Three Models of Sexuality: Drives, Identities and Practice”. In <u>Social Theory</u>. (7) 1 Pp. 1-13.</p>

	<p>A _____</p> <p>B _____</p>	<p>2. Wilkinson, Sue and Celia Kitzinger. 1994. “The Social Construction of Heterosexuality”. In <u>Journal of Gender Studies</u>. Volume 3 (3) Pp 307-18.</p> <p>3. Phillips, Sarah Rengel. 2001. “The Hegemony of Heterosexuality: A Study of Introductory Texts”. In <u>Teaching Sociology</u>. Vol. 19. Pp 454-63.</p> <p>4. Konik, Julie and Abigail Stewart. 2004. “Sexual Identity Development in the Context of Compulsory Heterosexuality”. <u>Journal of Personality</u>. 7 (24) Pp 815-41.</p> <p>5. Butler, Judith. 1993. “Imitation and Gender Insubordination”. <u>The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader</u>. Pp.307-20. Routledge: New York</p> <p>6. Butler, Judith. 2001. “Doing Justice to Someone: Sex Reassignment and Allegories of Trans-sexuality”. <u>GLO: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies</u> - Volume 7, Number 4, 2001, pp. 621-636</p>
<p>Thursday, October 15, 2009 Heterosexuality as an Institution</p>	<p>1) Discussion of <i>E-Reserves</i></p> <p>A _____</p> <p>B _____</p>	<p>Smith, Ralph R. and Russell R. Windes. 2000. <u>Progay/Antigay: The Rhetorical War Over Sexuality</u>. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks.</p>
<p>Thursday, October 22, 2009 Variant Sexualities</p>	<p>1) Discussion of Smith & Windes</p> <p>A _____</p> <p>B _____</p>	<p><i>E-Reserves:</i></p> <p>1. Collier, Jane et al. 1997. “Is There Really a Family?” In <u>The Gender & Sexuality Reader</u>. Lancaster & di Leonardo eds. Routledge: New York. Pp 71-81</p> <p>2. Christopher, F. Scott and Susan Sprecher. 2000. “Sexuality in Marriage, Dating and Other Relationships: A Decade Review”. In <u>The Journal of Marriage and Family</u>. 62 (4) Pp. 999-1017.</p> <p>3. Enid, Kathryn. 2000. “Few Good Men: Why Poor Mothers Stay Single”. In <u>Families in Society</u>. Pp 497-506</p> <p>4. Stacey, Judith. 1997. “The Neo-Family Values Campaign”. In <u>The Gender & Sexuality Reader</u>. Lancaster & di Leonardo eds. Routledge: New York. Pp 453—70.</p> <p>5. McCluskey, Tom. 2003. “Thirty Years of Marriage on Trial”. In <u>Insight</u>. The Family Research Council: Washington DC.</p>

		<p>6. Stacey, Judith and Timothy J. Biblarz. 2001. “(How) Does the Sexual Orientation of Parents Matter?” In the <u>American Sociological Review</u>. 66. Pp. 159-83.</p> <p>7. Knight, Robert H. and Daniel S. Garcia. 1994. “Homosexual Parenting: Bad for Children, Bad for Society.” In <u>Insight</u>. The Family Research Council: Washington DC.</p> <p>8. Silverstein, Louise and Carl F. Auerbach. 1999. “Deconstructing the Essential Father.” In the <u>American Journal of Psychology</u>. 54 (6) Pp 397-407.</p> <p>9. Patterson, Charlette J. 2000. “Family Relationships of Lesbian and Gay Men.” In the <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>. 62 (4) Pp. 1052-69</p>
<p>Thursday, October 29, 2009 Marriage & Families as Institutions</p>	<p>1) Discussion of <i>E-Reserves</i> 2) Discussion of Foucault</p> <p>A _____</p> <p>B _____</p>	<p>Michel Foucault. 1978. <u>The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. Volume 1.</u> Vintage Books: New York Part 1.</p> <p><i>E-Reserves:</i></p> <p>1. Greenberg, David F. and Marcia H. Bystryn. 1982. “Christian Intolerance of Homosexuality.” In the <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>. 88 (3) Pp. 515-48.</p> <p>2. D’Antonio, William V. et al. 1982. “Religion and Family Life: How Social Scientists View the Relationship.” In the <u>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</u>. 21 (3) Pp. 218-25.</p> <p>3. Sawin, Margaret M. 1981. “Family Life Education in Religious Institutions: Catholic, Jewish and Protestant.” In <u>Family Life Education</u>. 30 (4) Pp. 527-35</p>
<p>Thursday, November 5, 2009 Religion as an Institution</p>	<p>1) Film: <u>The Two Marys.</u> 2) Film Discussion 3) Readings Discussion</p> <p>A. _____</p> <p>B. _____</p>	<p><i>E-Reserves</i></p> <p>1. Belkin, Aaron. 2003. “Don’t Ask. Don’t Tell: Is the Ban Based on Military Necessity?” In <u>Parameters: The Journal of the U.S. War College</u>. 33 (2) Pp. 108-19.</p> <p>2. Barwaki, Tarak el al. 1999. “Rights and Fights: Sexual Orientation and Military Effectiveness.” In <u>International Security</u>. 24 (1) Pp. 181-201.</p> <p>3. Abrams, Kathryn. 1993. “Gender in the Military: Androcentrism and Institutional Reform.” In <u>Law and Contemporary Problems</u>.</p>

		<p>56 (4) Pp. 217-41.</p> <p>4. Kummel, Gerhard. 2002. "When Boy meets Girl: The 'Feminization' of the Military." In <u>Current Sociology</u>. 50 (5) Pp. 615-39.</p> <p>5. Corber, Robert J. 1993. "Reconstructing Homosexuality: Hitchcock and the Homoerotics of Spectatorial Pleasure." In <u>The Name of National Security</u>. Duke University Press: Durham. Pp. 56-82.</p> <p>6. "Constitutional Law. Equal Protection. D C Circuit Court Upholds Military Discharge Based on a Statement of Homosexual Orientation." Steffan v. Perry, 41 F3D 667 (DC Circuit . 1994). In the <u>Harvard Law Review</u>. 108 (7) Pp. 1779-84.</p>
<p>Tuesday, November 13, 2009 National Security and the Military as Institutions</p>	<p>1) Discussion of <i>E-Reserves</i></p> <p>A _____</p> <p>B _____</p>	
<p>Thursday, November 19, 2009</p>	<p>Group Presentations</p>	<p>Final Papers are due via email attachment no later than Tuesday, December 1, 2009</p>

Addenda:

DePaul University Academic Integrity Policy

DePaul University is a learning community that fosters the pursuit of knowledge and the transmission of ideas within a context that emphasizes a sense of responsibility for oneself, for others and for society at large. Violations of academic integrity, in any of their forms, are, therefore, detrimental to the values of DePaul, to the students' own development as responsible members of society, and to the pursuit of knowledge and the transmission of ideas. Violations include but are not limited to the following categories: cheating; plagiarism; fabrication; falsification or sabotage of research data; destruction or misuse of the university's academic resources; alteration or falsification of academic records; and academic misconduct. Conduct that is punishable under the Academic Integrity Policy could result in additional disciplinary actions by other university officials and possible civil or criminal prosecution. Please refer to your Student Handbook or visit <http://studentaffairs.depaul.edu/homehandbook.html> for further details.

DePaul University Incomplete Policy

Undergraduate and graduate students have two quarters to complete an incomplete. At the end of the second quarter (excluding summer) following the term in which the incomplete grade was assigned, remaining incompletes will automatically convert to "F" grades. In the case of the Law School incompletes must be completed by the end of the semester following the one in which the incomplete was assigned. Ordinarily no incomplete grade may be completed after the grace period has expired. Instructors may not change incomplete grades after the end of the grace period without the permission of a college-based Exceptions Committee. This policy applies to undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. NOTE: In the case of a student who has applied for graduation and who has been approved for an Incomplete in his or her final term, the incomplete must be resolved within the four week grace period before final degree certification.

The SNL student who wishes to receive the grade of an IN must formally request, in writing that the instructor issue this grade. This request must be made before the end of the quarter in which the student is enrolled in a course.

Students who feel they may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact the instructor privately to discuss their specific needs. All discussions will remain confidential.

To ensure that you receive the most appropriate accommodation based on your needs, contact the instructor as early as possible in the quarter, preferably within the first week of class, and make sure you have contacted:

- PLS Program (for LD, AD/HD) at 773-325-4239 in the Schmidt Academic Center, room 220 or;
- The Office for Students with Disabilities (for all other disabilities) at 773-325-7290, DePaul University Student Center, room 307.