

## CHAPTER ONE

---

### RED CARPET RADICALS

#### *Public Feminist Scholarship and the Sexism|Cinema Film Series*

By Michael Borshuk, Don E. Lavigne,  
Elizabeth A. Sharp, Jessica E. Smith,  
Dana A. Weiser, and Allison Whitney

In 2015, two years before Hollywood A-listers exposed widespread sexual harassment and violence in the film industry and as the Black Lives Matter movement continued to gain momentum, a group of interdisciplinary feminist scholars at Texas Tech University created a community-based film series entitled “Sexism|Cinema” in partnership with a local movie theater, The Alamo Drafthouse, Lubbock. Since the series’ inception, the programming team has grown to include the six co-authors, all current faculty members, although Smith was a doctoral student for the first three years of her participation. The purpose of Sexism|Cinema was to carve out a public space in which to engage in meaningful discussions about

sexist, racist, classist, heterosexist, and other representations, attitudes, and behaviors that stand in opposition to social justice in our conservative city in West Texas. The particular impetus for the series was a nationally and internationally newsworthy sexist incident at an off-campus white fraternity party at our university.<sup>1</sup> The series was originally conceptualized as a single, semester-long event, but the response from the community was so enthusiastic, and the quality of our discussions so high, Sexism|Cinema became an established community touchstone. In February 2020, we marked our fifth anniversary, and not only do we expect to continue for the foreseeable future, but our model is also being adopted at other institutions.<sup>2</sup>

Flowing from bell hooks' and others' work,<sup>3</sup> the idea for the series emerged from a desire to make activism and pedagogy about draining and upsetting topics fun and engaging. Viewing a film collectively and discussing the work immediately afterwards offers opportunity for entertainment while also recognizing that the media plays a significant role in shaping cultural attitudes, beliefs, and social scripts with regard to gender, sexuality, race/ethnicity, nationalities, and socioeconomic class.<sup>4</sup> In the general set-up of our series, the film is introduced along with a brief rationale for the series, the film is shown, and a discussion follows the film. In our experience, a large portion of the audience (~ 75%) typically stays for the discussion, and of them, there is a roughly equal number of university-affiliated people (including faculty and staff but mostly students) and community members. Our promotional strategies include posters on campus and at community venues like coffee shops (designed by Sharp's former graduate student John Purcell), email notifications through campus systems, social media postings (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter), in-class announcements to students, advertising on the cinema's website, and occasional interviews and features on local television news as part of their arts programming. In order to prime audience members for the type of discussion we would like to stage, we provide attendees with a

handout that provides information about the speaker, potential questions to ponder during the film, suggested readings, and a film fact, often pertaining to on- and off-screen inequities. Speakers are encouraged to share their work in the suggested readings of the handouts and the programming team have also included their academic work in the handouts. After each film the invited speaker offers brief remarks (five to seven minutes) and is tasked with offering an accessible and engaging entrée into selected feminist issues raised in the film. The speaker then leads the discussion, with occasional input from the series organizers. We have found this multi-pronged, graduated strategy to be quite successful in keeping the audience in the theater for an engaged discussion.

Multiple feminist frameworks inform the direction of the film series.<sup>5</sup> We draw on postmodern feminism and critical race feminism, emphasizing the racist, classist, and sexist conditions of wider social structures in which the films are embedded.<sup>6</sup> We also draw on post structural feminisms and queer feminist thought in order to trouble gender, racial, and sexual binaries.<sup>7</sup> We carefully integrate these theoretical concerns into our methodology by avoiding jargon and keeping the discussion approachable for a non-academic audience. When selecting films, we have one primary rule: the film must feature a woman-identified protagonist. We deploy a variety of strategies to ensure that the films we choose appeal to a broad constituency, making the series an attractive entertainment option for all members of our community. While we often present films that consciously challenge gender hegemony and employ progressive thematic and formal strategies, we also present problematic, even anti-feminist films, as a means of optimizing our opportunity for critical analysis.

One of the benefits of engaging with public feminism is that the theoretical and historical frameworks we develop in the academy can become immediately tangible when we try to put them into practice. In the case of Sexism|Cinema, our job as programmers is to identify appropriate films and consider how they will inspire

and frame public discussions, but the practicalities of commercial exhibition often make the inequities of the media industry, and of society in general, highly visible. We are mindful to select films which feature protagonists with diverse sexualities, races/ethnicities, socioeconomic statuses, and nationalities. Among the top 100 domestic grossing films in 2019, 40% of films featured a female protagonist. However, of the top 100 films, 70% of major women characters were White, 18% were Black, 6% were Latina, and 5% were Asian.<sup>8</sup> Thus, while the number of women-identified protagonists hit a historic high, stark racial inequities persisted on-screen. With this disparity in mind, and the intersectional theoretical grounding of the series, we are intentional in showcasing and celebrating the art created by and featuring individuals with diverse identities. We also are intentional in choosing varied types of films, and have screened blockbusters (e.g., *Mad Max: Fury Road*, *Clueless*, *Easy A*), independent films (e.g., *Support the Girls*, *The Fits*, *Tangerine*), foreign-language films (e.g., *A Girl Walks Home Alone at Night*, *Blue is the Warmest Color*), and repertory titles (e.g., *Foxy Brown*, *Fame*, *Adam's Rib*). A full list of our past screenings and repository of handouts are available at [sexismcinema.com](http://sexismcinema.com). We select expert speakers from expansive disciplinary backgrounds and have featured faculty from the humanities, social sciences, legal studies, visual and performing arts, as well as staff from the LGBTQIA office, Student Counseling, and the Center for Campus Life. Author Becky Aikman and film directors Sean Baker, Andrew Bujalski, Julie Cohen, and Brigitta Wagner, have also participated in the series.

A strength of our interdisciplinary collaboration is that it synthesizes our diverse theoretical, methodological, and historical perspectives, while also energizing and informing our pedagogy. Allison Whitney brings her scholarship in feminist film history, genre, and exhibition studies to contextualize the norms of production, reception, and representation at the time of each film's production. Meanwhile, mediating public discussions has informed

her teaching on film reception and audience studies. Dana Weiser was trained in Social Psychology and Human Development and Family Sciences, and as a social scientist, Sexism|Cinema has allowed her to see film as a site of analysis for sexuality and gender research. Further, it has allowed her to better utilize film in the classroom to discuss portrayals of gender and sexualities through the lens of social science research as well as the far-reaching influence of media for reinforcing gendered sexual scripts. As a literature professor, Michael Borshuk brings his critical reading practice to the film screenings, asking audience members to think past surface-level messaging. The series has had reciprocal benefits for his teaching, reminding him to engage students on the open-ended ways that culture and society interact, and the ideological stakes of textual interpretation. As a Classicist, Don Lavigne's work generally encompasses dusty old texts from the earliest period of ancient Greece, but he has found that his students are much more likely to understand critical gender theory when applying it to films, which in turn equips them for complex and careful textual analysis. Elizabeth Sharp, director of Women's and Gender Studies and professor in Human Development and Family Sciences, integrates her research on gendered family roles with her Sexism|Cinema programming. The film series has expanded her knowledge of the humanities, enhanced her activism and public feminist scholarship, deepened her relationships with colleagues from multiple disciplines, and encouraged other scholars and students within her program to engage critically with film. As a writer, Jess Smith's work explores gendered power dynamics and, more specifically, representations of intimate partner violence in popular media. Working on Sexism|Cinema has given her deeper insight into the way film in particular shapes attitudes toward gendered stereotypes. In her work as a professor of literature, she has been able to integrate film and scripts more readily into her classroom work based on the knowledge she's gained as a member of Sexism|Cinema.

We believe that this series has helped to create a sustained critical dialogue about gender, race/ethnicity, and sexuality in our conservative, small city, providing an engaging and open community space for feminist conversation. Below we describe in further detail our process in selecting three films and the critical feminist dialogues in which we engaged during the screenings. While space prohibits us from discussing each of the nearly fifty films we have screened, we chose to unpack these specific films in order to highlight three contrasting types of movies and the resultant discussions.

### BRIDESMAIDS

The decision to screen 2011's *Bridesmaids* was driven by our desire to attract a broad audience. In addition, as the last film in the Spring 2016 season, we anticipated that there would be a fair amount of interest from students seeking extra-credit at the end of the semester. The film's mainstream success and popularity made it an excellent choice for filling the theater with audience members drawn from both our campus and civic communities (our screening sold out the 120-seat theater and several people had to be turned away). This screening was so successful, in fact, that when we embarked upon a collaboration with the University of Texas at Austin to help scholars there establish a Sexism|Cinema program, we chose this film as the pilot (again, it was very well attended).

At first blush, it may seem odd that a feminist film series would choose to screen a film produced and directed by men; however, the film was written by two women, Kristen Wiig (who also has the leading role) and Annie Mumolo. Our key criteria in choosing films is that they feature a woman-identified protagonist, so the film fit our baseline criterion. That it was written by women was also desirable, especially given the dearth of female voices in contemporary comedy and film, in general.<sup>9</sup> Nonetheless, a film featuring a largely female cast does not in and of itself imply a

feminist message, much less a feminist ideology. Critics have been mixed in their assessment of the film on these grounds. As Ruth Franklin argued, the film offered an important intervention in the male-dominated world of Hollywood and simply seeing a comedy written by and starring women could be a political act showcasing audiences' desires for more women-driven productions. However, as Franklin points out, the film's basic narrative and characterization hew closely to patriarchal conceptions of femininity.<sup>10</sup> Rather than discount such ambiguities, we embraced them in order to generate a conversation about the issues raised, including discussions about social roles in contemporary America, the idea of internalized sexism, the role of women in comedy, and the role of women as writers, producers, and directors, among other pertinent issues.

The buzz generated by the film and its wide popularity make it an excellent vehicle for attracting audience members who might not otherwise attend screenings within a feminist film series, a fact that motivated our decision to feature it. By choosing a film so prominent in the public consciousness, we were able to engage our audience in a fairly sophisticated investigation of the controversial issues that swirled around the release of the film. We say "fairly sophisticated" because we are sensitive to the disparate levels of engagement with criticism (filmic, feminist, sociological, etc.) that members of our audience bring to the theater.

In the particular case of *Bridesmaids*, at our initial screening in the Spring of 2016, our featured speaker was one of our co-organizers, Elizabeth Sharp, who, among other things, researches single women, weddings, and new wives. To lighten the mood and integrate some fun into the serious business of analyzing the film, Sharp wore her wedding dress and invited several other colleagues to help her lead the discussion, all of whom were dressed in bridesmaid's gowns. This disarming move both relaxed the audience, who were not inclined to see this as an angry feminist intervention (a trope all too common in popular culture), and made the discussion an event to be anticipated. One of the attractions

of the Alamo Drafthouse is that they often feature “movie parties” where patrons are encouraged to dress in costume and otherwise engage with the film, so it was both in keeping with the culture of the cinema to have a “wedding party” leading the event, while also framing a discussion grounded in feminist scholarship in an accessible way. The discussion addressed themes ranging from cultural variations in wedding rituals, the racial and class dynamics in the film, particularly regarding Maya Rudolph’s casting as the bride, the wealth disparities among the main characters and how this influenced their experiences as members of the wedding party, and the social pressures on women to conform to heteronormative expectations. Given that one of the main goals of the series is to facilitate public discussions which model reasoned, critical, feminist analysis, the screening of *Bridesmaids* was a huge success, as it reached a very large and less ideologically aligned audience. Therefore, we see this screening as not only a model for using mainstream films to reach audiences who might not otherwise come to a feminist film series, but also a key aspect of our approach to accessibility and public engagement.

## SAVING FACE

In Fall 2017, we screened *Saving Face*, a 2004 romantic comedy written and directed by Alice Wu, featuring a Chinese-American protagonist in a lesbian relationship. This choice reflects a number of the priorities in our programming, where we ensure that each season features women of color and LGBTQIA2S+ characters. We also draw upon a wide range of film genres, both to attract audiences with variable tastes, and because so many genre conventions and tropes are rooted in gender dynamics. During our planning meetings for Fall 2017 we noted that we had yet to feature an Asian-American protagonist, and while we were aware of their significant underrepresentation in American cinema, the consequences of that deficit became evident as we tried to identify



an appropriate film. *The Joy Luck Club* (Wayne Wang, 1993) seemed an obvious choice, allowing us to address both an immigrant and multi-generational narrative, but it was not available for theatrical distribution. Problems with exhibition rights and print availability come with the territory in film programming, but in this case, nearly all the films we considered were unavailable. This logistical barrier demonstrated in vivid terms the implications of underrepresentation—when there are so few films featuring Asian-American women as main characters, the normal contingencies of exhibition help to perpetuate the problem. We were very glad to learn that *Saving Face* was available, but while the film had a glowing reception from critics and festival audiences during its initial release, it was now only accessible as a 35mm film print. Fortunately, due to the Alamo Drafthouse’s emphasis on cinephilia, nostalgia, repertory titles, and cult movies, the cinema is both equipped and staffed for 35mm projection, but the fact that we needed to overcome so many industrial and technological hurdles to show such a film demonstrated the practical barriers to diversity in film culture.

In many respects, *Saving Face* is the kind of film one might expect to find in a feminist film series: an independent production written and directed by a Chinese-American woman, drawing upon the familiar tropes of romantic comedy but with the twist of a queer couple, extensive Chinese-language dialogue with subtitles, emphasis on an immigrant community, and produced as a result of Wu’s winning a screenwriting award from the Coalition of Asian Pacifics in Entertainment. We quite deliberately program independent and less-seen films alongside their mainstream counterparts both to give those films more exposure and to draw upon audience expectations to cultivate discussion. *Saving Face*’s generic properties as a romantic comedy—the “meet cute,” the sassy best friend, the humorous but poignant family relationships—each provided an opportunity to talk about gender, race, and sexuality in terms that were at once familiar and

novel to our audiences. For example, the film's sub-plot where the main character Wil (Michelle Krusiec) learns that her widowed forty-eight-year-old mother (Joan Chen) is pregnant, only to then discover that the father is a much younger man (Brian Yang), allowed for a conversation about how women's desire is (or isn't) represented in mainstream culture, particularly for women over forty. On our handout, we primed our audience to think about how the film frames female sexuality in the video store scene, where the mother accesses two genres offering narratives of desire: Chinese soap operas and pornography.

One of the things that became evident during our screening of *Saving Face* is that it is a crowd-pleaser. Comedies are usually funnier with an audience as one benefits from the contagion of laughter, and much of the film's charm depends on that collective experience. Indeed, one of the benefits of using public screenings as a venue for discussion is that the experience of watching with an audience highlights not only collective pleasure, but also audience discomfort, and in many cases moments of crowd resistance inspire the most productive conversations. While *Saving Face* is in many ways a progressive text, our screening it thirteen years after its initial release created enough historical distance to highlight how much the discourses on gender, race, and sexuality have shifted in the last decade. For example, our audience raised questions about the representation of Wil's friend and neighbor Jay (Atoh Essandoh), a Black man who fulfills the "sassy best friend" role one expects of a romantic comedy, but who also becomes a foil for Wil's mother's racist attitudes. Audiences noted the awkwardness of these scenes, and pursued a conversation about the complexities of race and representations, in that the film both calls out racism within the Chinese-American community, but at the same time doesn't entirely undermine it. Meanwhile, as our handout question on heteronormativity suggested, the film's end-credits scene, where the lesbian couple are celebrating their forthcoming marriage, and where the final joke is a question about when they will be having

a baby, offers what appeared to a 2017 audience as an affirmation of heteronormative relationship models. The ensuing discussion was emblematic of a useful function of showing films from varied historical periods, for even though it was just over a decade from the film's production, there had been significant social and legal changes concerning marriage equality, as well as queer critiques of traditional family structures. At the same time, it is fair to note that as a 2004 film, *Saving Face* was released in the midst of the legal and cultural struggle for marriage equality in the United States, so its allusion to marriage as a relationship goal was more radical in its time.

## SIXTEEN CANDLES

The Alamo Drafthouse brand is committed to screening independent and foreign-language, or just generally more obscure, films that otherwise might not make their way to a mainstream cineplex, or in our case, to West Texas. The Alamo also regularly hosts movie parties, including sing-alongs, quote-alongs, and other similarly nostalgia-driven events. When we screened the 1984 John Hughes megahit *Sixteen Candles*, some attendees arrived assuming our event would be in this vein. At times, the tension was palpable between our intended feminist critique of the film and the benevolent place the movie still maintains in many viewers' memories.

One of the reasons we selected this film to screen was to interrogate the nostalgic glow *Sixteen Candles* entices. For what, exactly, are audiences nostalgic when we watch this film? How does it play racism, sexual violence, and toxic masculinity for laughs, and how might we have let these elements go unquestioned in the service of "humor" in years past, particularly within the coming-of-age teen comedy genre for which Hughes has long been so revered?

In a 2018 *New Yorker* article, Molly Ringwald reassessed her relationship to the three Hughes films she starred in—including

*Sixteen Candles*—in light of the #MeToo Movement. “Back then, I was only vaguely aware of how inappropriate much of John’s writing was,” she writes. “I was well into my thirties before I stopped considering verbally abusive men more interesting than the nice ones. I’m a little embarrassed to say that it took even longer for me to fully comprehend the scene ... when the dreamboat, Jake, essentially trades his drunk girlfriend, Caroline, to the Geek, to satisfy the latter’s sexual urges.”<sup>11</sup>

She refers here to a series of events at the end of the film, when the object of her character’s affection, Jake (Michael Schoeffling), passes off his incapacitated girlfriend to a libidinous and awkward freshman, Farmer Ted (Anthony Michael Hall) (Indeed, Hall’s character is so far from the film’s social center, he is referred to only as “The Geek” by other characters in the film.) Let loose with a blackout-drunk senior, Ted shows her off to friends as a trophy, and photographs her body as a sexual memento. In the film’s morning-after resolution, we are led to believe the two have had sex sometime in the night. Though she has little to no memory, Caroline (Haviland Morris) says to Ted that she has a “weird feeling” she enjoyed their sexual encounter. The entire sequence is meant to joke away the ethical implications of her absolute inability to consent.

In our discussion, we emphasized the transgression the film asks us to laugh at here: the school’s most desirable woman stripped of the power to consent, and made sexually submissive to the whims of the most ungainly male representative. And yet, while the filmmakers ostensibly endorse the sexual assault, they also seem critically aware of Ted’s questionable ethics, which they joke away with the tacked-on punchline about Caroline’s purported “enjoyment.” This film is merely one among many teen comedies from the 1980s that delight in toeing the moral line between male sexual entitlement and female vulnerability. We referenced, in our discussion, the boys-will-be-boys voyeurism of the “shower scene” in *Porky’s* (Bob Clark, 1981), or a similar violation of consent

in *Revenge of the Nerds* (Jeff Kanew, 1984), when the film's geeky protagonist seduces his dream girl while wearing a mask and fooling her into thinking she's partnered with her boyfriend. And did these permissive comedies of raucous male misbehavior have repercussions well beyond their own morally ambivalent representations? We screened *Sixteen Candles*, for instance, just six months after Brett Kavanaugh's confirmation hearings for the Supreme Court. We asked our audience to consider the question: How was the sexual violence of which Christine Blasey Ford accused Kavanaugh from the summer of 1982 related to the persistent rape scenarios that American filmmakers played for laughs around that same time? Indeed, Kavanaugh mentioned 1980s teen comedies in his testimony to contextualize his behavior—a rhetorical choice that itself motivated a public debate on the significance of these films.<sup>12</sup> How does our laughing at, or our waxing nostalgic for, these films contribute to a culture that laughs off violence against women?

This is not the only egregious and dangerous narrative choice in *Sixteen Candles*. We went on to discuss the notoriously racist representation of foreign exchange student Long Duk Dong (Gedde Watanabe), whose entrance into every scene is accompanied by a gong sound. He becomes sexually involved with a physically larger woman and the gender-role swapping is not only meant to play his femininity for laughs, but also makes it clear that the gender-role swapping is weird and othered. Any non-white characters in *Sixteen Candles* are othered, as with the “oily bohunk” Eastern European whom Ringwald's character's sister is marrying. Whiteness is centered, the default, and we asked our audience to consider this before the screening even began with a question on our handout, pointing out the frequent use of ethnic and racial stereotypes and jokes, including comments on whiteness. During our post-screening discussion, some members of the audience expressed feelings of tension, having expected a lighter experience attuned to sentimental attachment to the

1980s, and remarking on how seeing the film in the context of Sexism|Cinema made them revisit their past acceptance of racist and sexist humor. This conversation was generative and useful, as it gave our expert speakers even more opportunity to explore what, exactly, moviegoers feel attached to in this film, and what that feeling of attachment obscures.

#### FILM PUBLICS AND PUBLIC FEMINISMS

As our discussion of these three films shows, our goals for the Sexism|Cinema series are grounded in our intersectional feminist perspective. Through this methodology of embedding theory (through our handouts, speakers, as well as our choice of films) in organic and audience-centered discussions, we have been very successful in modeling respectful, critical explorations of issues of gender, race/ethnicity, class, and sexuality, among others. Our ongoing conversations with community members, colleagues, and students who have attended these events demonstrate that they are having an impact on their understanding of the range of social issues evoked in the films and our discussions. Furthermore, by having these public conversations, we have learned more about the issues themselves and how to create the kind of environments conducive to critical, public intellectual exchange.

As we were preparing this essay in the summer of 2020, a *New York Times* opinion piece by Racquel Gates entitled “The Problem With ‘Anti-Racist’ Movie Lists”<sup>13</sup> led us to reflect on our series and, in particular, on our commitment to fostering critical analysis of the depiction of gender, race/ethnicity, class, and sexuality in film. Gates suggests that the social awakening on racial injustice sweeping the nation and, indeed, the world has given rise to a series of ineffective interventions in the world of film. As groups and individuals try to engage with the Black Lives Matter and related movements, lists of “anti-racist” films have

proliferated, reducing, in Gates' view, Black filmic achievement to a pedagogical exercise, especially for white people. While Black artists' work can be a vital component of social change, simply diversifying one's media consumption habits is not enough to effect cultural and political transformation. One of the things we believe is most successful about our series is that, while there is a prominent pedagogical aim, we do not simply provide a commodified package of films that gives the ticket holder unexamined access to the experience of "the oppressed." Of course, our series, as its title indicates, has at its center the critical assessment of the depiction of sexism and an analysis of the ways in which those representations interact with the socio-political sphere. However, the series is also, and has been from its inception, dedicated to showing how sexism is bound up with all other power structures and, therefore, cannot be adequately critiqued without a simultaneous critique of representations (or lack of representations) of other marginalized groups. In fact, the essence of an intersectional feminist commitment entails this very idea—all oppression is bound together in service to power. In attempting to both illustrate and critique this idea through the public and inclusive analytic discussion of a series of films whose single unifying factor is the existence of a main woman-identified protagonist, we have tried to create the kind of space wherein audience members can come to terms with the way gender, race/ethnicity, class, and sexuality contribute to our reality. We want our audiences to feel discomfort at the history of oppression and their roles in its propagation, while also understanding and appreciating the artistry and intellectual contributions of the films, to learn to use film to access the experience of others. Moreover, we want our audiences to develop a habit of critique that foregrounds the way those in power use gender, race/ethnicity, class, and sexuality to maintain their positions. Finally, we also want our audiences to learn that challenging these systems of oppression can be done in an accessible and engaging manner.

## NOTES

1. Tyler Kingkade, "Texas Tech Investigating Frat For 'No Means Yes, Yes Means Anal' Sign," *The Huffington Post*, September 23, 2014; Elizabeth A. Sharp et al., "From Furious to Fearless: Faculty Action and Feminist Praxis in Response to Rape Culture on College Campuses," *Family Relations* 66, no. 1 (2017): 75–88.
2. In March 2020 our university and the Alamo Drafthouse closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We canceled screenings for April and May 2020 and hosted Sexism|Cinema virtually throughout the 2020–2021 academic year. We asked attendees to view the selected film on their own and then we conducted the conversation live on Zoom. While we were saddened to be apart, two positives came out of this transition to a virtual format. First, we were able to screen films we were unable to exhibit in the theater, including *The Joy Luck Club* and Disney's *The Princess and the Frog*. Second, in the virtual format we were able to invite more non-local speakers and broadened our community audience; indeed, family, friends, and colleagues from across the country were now able to join our lively Sexism|Cinema discussions.
3. bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress* (New York: Routledge, 1994); bell hooks, *Reel to Real: Race, Class, and Sex at the Movies* (New York: Routledge, 1996).
4. hooks, *Reel to Real*.
5. John BK Purcell et al., "Lights, Camera, Activism: Using a Film Series to Generate Feminist Dialogue about Campus Sexual Violence," *Family Relations* 66, no. 1 (2017): 139–153.
6. Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (New York: Routledge, 1990).
7. Ramona Faith Oswald, Katherine A. Kovalanka, Libby Balter Blume, and Dana Berkowitz, "Queering 'the Family,'" in *Handbook of Feminist Family Studies*, eds. Sally A. Lloyd, April L. Few, and Katherine R. Allen (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009), 43–55.
8. Martha M. Lauzen, "The Celluloid Ceiling: Behind-the-Scenes Employment of Women on the Top 100, 250, and 500 Films of 2019," Center for the Study of Women in Television and Film, San Diego State University, 2020, [https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019\\_Celluloid\\_Ceiling\\_Report.pdf](https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019_Celluloid_Ceiling_Report.pdf).
9. Martha M. Lauzen. "It's a Man's (Celluloid) World: Portrayals of Female Characters in the Top Grossing Films of 2019," *Center for the Study of Women in Television and Film*, San Diego State University, 2020, [https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019\\_Its\\_a\\_Mans\\_Celluloid\\_World\\_Report\\_REV.pdf](https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019_Its_a_Mans_Celluloid_World_Report_REV.pdf).



10. Ruth Franklin, "You'll Laugh, You'll Cry, You'll Hurl," *The New Republic*, May 17, 2011, <https://newrepublic.com/article/88547/bridesmaids-movie-judd-apatow-kristen-wiig-feminism>.
11. Molly Ringwald "What about 'The Breakfast Club'? Revisiting the Movies of My Youth in the Age of #MeToo," *The New Yorker*, April 6, 2018, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/personal-history/what-about-the-breakfast-club-molly-ringwald-metoo-john-hughes-pretty-in-pink>.
12. Wesley Morris, "In 80s Comedies, Boys Had it Made. Girls Were the Joke," *New York Times*, October 4, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/04/movies/brett-kavanaugh-80s-teen-comedies.html>.
13. Racquel Gates, "The Problem With 'Anti-Racist' Movie Lists: Black Films Should Be Valued for More than What They Can Teach White Viewers about Race," *New York Times*, July 17, 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/17/opinion/sunday/black-film-movies-racism.html>.

## WORKS CITED

- Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Franklin, Ruth. "You'll Laugh, You'll Cry, You'll Hurl." *The New Republic*, May 17, 2011. <https://newrepublic.com/article/88547/bridesmaids-movie-judd-apatow-kristen-wiig-feminism>.
- Gates, Racquel. "The Problem With 'Anti-Racist' Movie Lists: Black Films Should Be Valued for More than What They Can Teach White Viewers about Race." *New York Times*, July 17, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/17/opinion/sunday/black-film-movies-racism.html>.
- hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- hooks, bell. *Reel to Real: Race, Class, and Sex at the Movies*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Kingkade, Tyler. "Texas Tech Investigating Frat For 'No Means Yes, Yes Means Anal' Sign." *The Huffington Post*, September 23, 2014. [https://www.huffpost.com/entry/texas-tech-no-means-yes-fraternity-phi-delt\\_n\\_5865606?gucounter=1&gucereferer=aHRochM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xLLmNvbS8&gucereferer\\_sig=AQAAAM3BCeuCSXoUCkyWDXsf12ALHoYmmmlD29oGA7R3Be6dTQZJxKoM\\_P-bvPptlE14VSvPJFBx-y9emloCM2ubipwXRZDQbKU5UXsx5YilNag-WiSGdeMbltOxBuk4kel3QJnIHCkrTA8UvArQCvYQ8yfkT7u3sCpoo2nYXClhMw8e](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/texas-tech-no-means-yes-fraternity-phi-delt_n_5865606?gucounter=1&gucereferer=aHRochM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xLLmNvbS8&gucereferer_sig=AQAAAM3BCeuCSXoUCkyWDXsf12ALHoYmmmlD29oGA7R3Be6dTQZJxKoM_P-bvPptlE14VSvPJFBx-y9emloCM2ubipwXRZDQbKU5UXsx5YilNag-WiSGdeMbltOxBuk4kel3QJnIHCkrTA8UvArQCvYQ8yfkT7u3sCpoo2nYXClhMw8e).
- Lauzen, Martha M. "The Celluloid Ceiling: Behind-the-Scenes Employment of Women on the Top 100, 250, and 500 Films of 2019." Center for the Study of Women in Television and Film. San Diego State University, 2020.

[https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019\\_Celluloid\\_Ceiling\\_Report.pdf](https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019_Celluloid_Ceiling_Report.pdf).

Lauzen, Martha M. "It's a Man's (Celluloid) World: Portrayals of Female Characters in the Top Grossing Films of 2019." Center for the Study of Women in Television and Film. San Diego State University, 2020. [https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019\\_Its\\_a\\_Mans\\_Celluloid\\_World\\_Report\\_REV.pdf](https://womenintvfilm.sdsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019_Its_a_Mans_Celluloid_World_Report_REV.pdf).

Morris, Wesley. "In 80s Comedies, Boys Had it Made. Girls Were the Joke." *New York Times*, October 4, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/04/movies/brett-kavanaugh-80s-teen-comedies.html>.

Oswald, Ramona Faith., Katherine A. Kivalanka, Libby Balter Blume, and Dana Berkowitz. "Queering 'the Family.'" In *Handbook of Feminist Family Studies*, edited by Sally. A. Lloyd, April. L. Few, and Katherine. R. Allen, 43-55. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009.

Purcell, John BK, C. Rebecca Oldham, Dana A. Weiser, and Elizabeth A. Sharp. "Lights, Camera, Activism: Using a Film Series to Generate Feminist Dialogue about Campus Sexual Violence." *Family Relations* 66, no. 1 (2017): 139-153.

Ringwald, Molly. "What about 'The Breakfast Club'? Revisiting the Movies of My Youth in the Age of #MeToo." *The New Yorker*, April 6, 2018. <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/personal-history/what-about-the-breakfast-club-molly-ringwald-metoo-john-hughes-pretty-in-pink>.

Sharp, Elizabeth A., Dana A. Weiser, Donald E. Lavigne, and R. Corby Kelly. "From Furious to Fearless: Faculty Action and Feminist Praxis in Response to Rape Culture on College Campuses." *Family Relations* 66, no. 1 (2017): 75-88.