

Also by Christopher Pullen

*Documenting Gay Men: Identity and Performance within Reality Television  
and Documentary Film*

*LGBT Transnational Identity and the Media*

*LGBT Identity and Online New Media* (ed. with Margaret Cooper)

*Gay Identity, New Storytelling and the Media*

# QUEER LOVE IN FILM AND TELEVISION

## CRITICAL ESSAYS

Edited by Pamela Demory and  
Christopher Pullen

palgrave  
macmillan

## CHAPTER 16

# QUEER NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN LOVE AND WORK: A CRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY OF A GAY PORN STAR

*Michael Johnson, Jr.*

### INTRODUCTION

Pornography takes the most intimate, most private spaces of our lives, our connections to other human beings at the most basic level—our sexual experiences—and sells them to us. In the United States alone it generates an estimated \$10–14 billion annually, exceeding the NFL, NBA, and Major League Baseball revenue combined (*Price*). While approximately 70 percent of pornography's audience is straight men watching alone, the proliferation of pornography in general has had a concomitant effect on mainstream popular culture. One need only look to music videos to find an example: Gregory Dark is a director of extreme pornographic movies who has since gone on to direct music videos for pop singers Mandy Moore and Britney Spears. Also, porn actors are increasingly cast as central characters or background dancers in music videos and in hip-hop; artists like Snoop Dogg are even producing their own hardcore pornographic films (*Price*).

An often ignored segment of the porn industry is gay porn<sup>1</sup> and its extensive network of actors,<sup>2</sup> production studios, management, and audiences. This research analyzes the political economic consequences, the disciplining forces of the industry, and the always tenuous balance between sex acts, fame, privacy, love, monogamy, and financial profit for actors and movie studios alike. This research specifically attempts to answer the following questions: (1) What are the material and discursive conditions in which gay pornography is produced, distributed, obtained, and consumed? (2) How is gay pornography “linked to the production of knowledge about sex and sexuality . . . [and]

the ways in which these are spoken about, seen and experienced in everyday life" (Attwood, "Reading Porn" 103)?

I argue that our popular constructions of what "love" and affection mean are always tentatively related to our relationship with and exposure to pornography. Indeed, our popular understanding of sexual desire, lust, and love are in constant states of flux because sex is commodified and sold to us in a proliferating daily diet within a media-saturated culture. I further argue that our culture, therefore, both creates and reflects the consumption of sexual desire and sex acts through pornography, that this is one method by which we meaningfully reproduce the boundaries between and definitions of love, lust, sex, and desire, and that this process thus imbues these concepts with value. For gay men, these definitions become constituted and cemented in the popular consciousness explicitly through the influential discourses of same-sex desire and sexuality depicted in gay pornography. Thus, this discussion focuses on the personal narrative of an adult film star's experiences as an "independent contractor" of sorts, whose "inside" knowledge can shed light on the methods by which these discourses come to fruition.<sup>3</sup> Although this ethnographic study of a single performer necessarily limits the conclusions we can draw, his observations can provide a useful vehicle by which scholars, consumers, and audiences can understand their roles within a model of consumption—both of film and of the meanings embedded in those films.<sup>4</sup>

I met J.D.<sup>5</sup> approximately 11 years ago, in a small college town, through a mutual acquaintance. We quickly became friends, and that friendship developed over the years into a close kinship primarily because we are so different. He is a short, well-built Caucasian guy with an open and genuinely kind and giving disposition, whereas I am a thin, myopic, intellectually arrogant young man of Latino descent with jet black hair and an attitude to match. Over the years, we both frequented the local gay clubs and soon he found himself work as a dancer at a variety of venues. Over the years, he continued to develop his physique while I focused on academics. Eventually, unbeknownst to me, J.D. entered the realm of adult film, while I moved away to pursue an advanced degree. When I learned about his experiences, I contacted him and he agreed to share those experiences with me for this study.

Gay pornography constructs persuasive depictions of hypermasculinity within socioeconomic and racial structures that exist across American culture. By exploring media depictions of a fictional porn character, we may gain a deeper understanding of what it means to be a gay male consumer, employee, and lover in gay sociocultural settings. Thus this research intends to inform and expand the scholarly discussion about pornography (and gay pornography in particular) and its cultural importance within the United States.

## PORNOGRAPHY IN CULTURE

As Laura Kipnis, author of *Bound and Gagged: Pornography and the Politics of Fantasy in America*, observes, "pornography is a business—as is all

our entertainment—which has attained popularity because it finds ways of articulating things its audiences care about. . . . It speaks to its audience because it's thoroughly astute about who we are underneath the social veneer, astute about the costs of cultural conformity and the discontent at the core of routinized lives and normative sexuality" (xii). Porn—including gay porn—has entered mainstream culture and the everyday social life of large parts of society. J. C. Adams, editor of *The Gay Porn Times*, notes that porn is an "interesting reflection of what goes on in our culture," and he goes on to diagram how the popularity of *Falcon Studio's* most famous star's physical appearance ultimately bled into a masculine ideal that photographers and advertisers used to "cast a type of man for their campaigns—the Calvin Klein underwear models of the era. And all of a sudden straight men tried to imitate that look, which became known as metrosexual. It's a great example of how porn spilled over into mainstream culture" (qtd. in Clark 33–5).

Within the wider cultural framework, mainstream gay pornography has a special relationship with the subculture to which it caters. Because of advances in technology (as Sharif Mowlabocus notes), "today there is more pornography, made more readily accessible, to an ever-increasing demographic, than ever before" (63–4). The production and consumption of this pornography has become increasingly integral to self-representation for many gay men and is predicated on particular gay archetypes. The commercial archetypal persona that is marketed for consumption promotes, as Mowlabocus notes, an "All-American ideology of hegemonic masculinity which serves to reinscribe the gender binary onto homosexual practices" (62).

Necessarily, then, this research also examines the relationship between the successful creation of a gay porn persona and the porn star's intrapsychic construction of identity. As Escoffier points out, the persona a porn performer develops serves as a valuable tool to distinguish between his professional and personal lives. This persona includes a pseudonym or stage name that helps to insulate and protect his privacy despite what is often a very visible public presence. As sexual verisimilitude on screen is such an important criterion for the performer's longevity and professional success, the persona also serves as a "career script that functions as a sexual resume which establishes . . . the repertoire of sex acts they will perform, and the image they wish to project as sexual performers" (Escoffier 540). For J.D., Escoffier's assertion that an "actor's persona is both a marketing strategy and a personal statement about his relationship to gay pornography" (545) proves to be accurate. It is certainly one component of an identity he has created that helps him "do his job and [that] acts as a 'contract' with the social expectations of his significant others" (Escoffier 545). But as J.D. points out, developing that persona is not easy. J.D. has performed in 17 films (one scene each) with major studios and prominent directors in the gay porn industry, and he is popular with both directors and audiences. A prominent director noted that J.D.'s performance had improved over time and that he "definitely developed into [his] character and loosened up." Yet J.D. has expressed frustration with the disparity between his own sense of identity and that of the persona he projects: "People have tried to portray me as a bottom, but that's not me." He says that he

feels “so much more comfortable in the scenes where I’m the top—it’s like I’m free to be more of who I am.” But his popularity with audiences is tied to his performance as a bottom. He is successful because he is able to perform that role (very convincingly), despite his discomfort with the dictates of the consumers.

Physically, J.D. resembles many gay porn stars of this era in that his body conforms to the well-muscled, hypermasculinized appearance that many gay men might find especially attractive and appealing, and that are actively recruited by and typically find work with commercial, mainstream gay porn studios. He is a good example, in other words, of a type that Mowlabocus notes helps to “[secure] the parameters of gay identity, forming ever more impenetrable boundaries and validating a set of identifications and practices at the expense of all others. If the potential of homosexual pornography is to *queer* reality, then the reality of gay porn serves to confine homosexuality into a single overarching identity; one that does little to challenge hegemonic norms or liberate sexuality” (71). And yet, although as a performer J.D. works implicitly to promote this narrow conception of gay male sexuality, as an individual and consumer, his preferences suggest a wider scope. The men he finds physically attractive and sexually exciting

range from lean stud pup to gym-pumped manly muscle to hairy bellied daddy bears. Personally, I like muscular men who train their bodies hard. Although it is not an absolute requirement, a thick, muscular body is an incredible turn-on to me. Basically I like any man who is innately masculine and relaxed with himself and others no matter his build, background, ethnicity, or age.

J.D. expresses a normative appreciation of dominant archetypes of masculinity in his description of sexually exciting male bodies; however, the description also conspicuously includes an important caveat: “no matter his build, background, ethnicity, or age.” The general objectification of racial types and the ageism that are so pervasive in the gay porn industry are noticeably absent in J.D.’s personal preferences. I interpret these observations not as evasive, self-serving statements but as factual realities that transcend the gay porn industry standards, thus illustrating the complicated negotiations that J.D. must endure to navigate between his personal and professional lives.

### THE WORK OF PORNOGRAPHY

John Rutherford (currently the owner and operator of *Colt Studio Group* and former president and director for *Falcon Studios*) notes that porn is both culturally and socially relevant because “many men in small towns and rural areas look to our movies as models of how gay men interact sexually and they identify with them. As a producer I have always created content with this in mind: I never show guns, killing, drug abuse or bare backing. It’s very important to depict safer, sexy and fun sex in many different ways, so that viewers know

there are different strokes for different folks so to speak” (qtd. in Clark 180). Rutherford’s assertions about the social value of gay porn notwithstanding, there is substantial research that concludes that the value associated with gay porn also comes with some complex costs for both its practitioners and consumers. The least of these is that the legal distinction between prostitution and pornography is not always entirely clear. The legal arguments which characterize and establish a hierarchy of sex acts between male sex workers cannot be ignored or minimized by the utopic rhetoric offered by some industry management insiders. What is certain is that a dialectical relationship between pornography and sex work exists, as is illustrated by the historic *People vs. Freeman* California Supreme Court case in 1988. That case and the subsequent case law made clear that “When filmed, pornography becomes a reenactment of the type of sexual activities in which prostitutes typically engage, with ‘actors’ playing the roles of prostitutes. These actors are not themselves prostitutes, any more than an actor playing the role of a lawyer on TV is really a lawyer” (Almodovar 151). For the legal community in most states, whereas the goal of the prostitute is to excite their clients, the goal of the paid porn actor is to excite and give pleasure to *both* their costar and the consumer for whom their satisfaction is paramount, thus resulting in a perverse relationship in which “the porn actor ‘out prostitutes’ the prostitute because the porn actor is responsible for the sexual gratification of more persons for the same pay” (Almodovar 159). The lines between sex work, prostitution, and pornography are blurry, though their commonalities appear evident insofar as sex acts reap financial rewards. The larger question, however, of whether those financial benefits influence or diminish the emotional and personal lives of the individuals involved in the adult film industry has yet to be explored.<sup>6</sup>

The working conditions commonly found in the adult porn industry inevitably influence the decisions of actors like J.D., and these off-stage conditions are not as desirable as the final video products might assert. Indeed, unlike their Hollywood counterparts, these actors are not protected by unions; they receive no pensions, 401k investment opportunities, health insurance benefits, or percentages of their film’s net profits; they generally do not receive any compensation from the distribution of their content in online venues and rarely reap financial rewards from marketed commodities like sex dolls, dildos or other merchandise unless covered in exclusive contracts with certain studios. And while the work is lucrative in the short term, it may prohibit actors from working for other entities later in their adult film career that would offer more attractive terms.

Indeed, J.D.’s employment is located within an industry well known for its exploitative practices that can reduce actors to mere tools, lacking any agency, subject to the whims and desires of the directors, producers, studios, and audiences to whom such actors are presumably responsible. And the fungibility of young, gay men willing to exchange sex acts for cash payments inevitably lends itself to the development of a system of oppressive tactics that negate the experience and feelings of the very demographic of gay men

most likely to pursue such work. As Raja Halwani notes, the exploitation of these men is primarily economic:

The pornographer positions his models so that they are presented as sexual objects to the viewer, but it is unclear that in doing so the pornographer actually objectifies them. He may not view them sexually at all, but only “artistically” or with an eye toward selling the final product. Although this may preclude some types of objectifying treatment on the part of the pornographer, such as his own personal sexual purposes, it does not preclude others such as his financial purposes (187).

However, the dominance of the gay porn industry’s highly developed infrastructure of production companies and distribution networks demands a closely controlled need for highly stylized fictional characters who are marketable to a wide audience and whose characteristics reproduce the sexual excitement that consumers come to expect in their sexual fantasies. And as one reviewer writes, “ultimately what viewers want to see is guys *having* sex, not actors *pretending* to have sex” (Burger 90).

The commonsensical belief that porn actors’ work can’t possibly be difficult considering that they are paid a wage to engage in sex acts (which are universally constructed as always and inevitably enjoyable) belie the truth that such sex acts are (1) performances that require diligent effort and concentration (particularly in gay male porn, which necessitates a constantly reliable erection), and (2) that such performances are not always fulfilling either emotionally or psychologically, despite the actor’s dialogue, facial expressions, and behavior conveying the opposite message of heightened emotional desire and sexual excitement. Indeed, I would argue that this dichotomy only illustrates the highly adept abilities of the actors involved in constructing a scene of sexual excitement that may in fact be completely devoid of emotional or psychological excitement or enjoyment. As Jeffrey Escoffier notes, “all sexual conduct in the video porn industry is to one degree or another an example of situational sexuality inasmuch as the performers are often required to engage in sexual acts for monetary compensation that they would not otherwise choose to perform and with partners for whom they feel no desire” (“Gay for Pay” 534).

The sexual objectification of J.D.’s character is directly related to his financial profitability, centered on a single aspect of his sexual performance to the exclusion of his actual, real-world sexual preferences, thereby concisely illustrating the complicated personal sacrifices that he’s had to endure as a consequence of his employment, and *apparently* supporting Escoffier’s argument that adult film stars possess no agency with which they can exercise any degree of independence while maintaining “professional” success within the adult film industry (“Gay-for-Pay” 540). Of course J.D.’s ability to work is equally constrained by his appearance and youthfulness. As John Burger makes clear, because a large volume of gay pornography is viewed by older men who want to look at younger men, few porn actors work beyond their mid-twenties, thus effectively equating youth with beauty (57–8). He also

notes that these films are “not immune to the deeply embedded [age] prejudices this country practices” (59), suggesting that the ageism within the gay male consumer culture reflects that of the culture as a whole, which is in turn continually reproduced through queer commodities like pornography, a process that ultimately limits the economic shelf-life of the porn performer. Indeed, J.D. makes clear that (as the porn website FurryGirl argues) performers are not portrayed “as multidimensional beings, with interests other than sex” (qtd. in Attwood, “No Money” 450). The one-dimensional presentation of their fictionalized selves may explain why some costars, directors, and producers ultimately fail to recognize the possibility of a life outside of the adult film industry.

However, while the labor is insecure and time-limited for gay porn stars, it also has work practices that are flexible, autonomous, and that can be individually fulfilling. Describing how he began his career in the gay porn industry, J.D. explains, “I first started out doing it to just pay my way through medical school, and it seems that even after graduation there is still money to be had... I am considering continuing a little bit further until my new career... takes off or I find that special person in my life. Even if I decide to go back to school, porn will continue a little bit longer...” What is notable about J.D.’s career is that while the financial incentive was the impetus for his interest in pornography, he also takes his time to emphasize the exchange value that is implied in the economics of making films to advance his personal educational agenda. Moreover, he explains that his continued participation in the adult film industry is equally dependent upon the availability of a long-term relationship and the demands of his educational and medical career.

J.D. thus makes it unambiguously clear that his adult film work is situated within a highly restricted hierarchy of personal needs and preferences that *is not* reflective of the powerful financial incentive that brought this work to his attention initially. Thus, appearances can be deceiving; and contrary to Escoffier’s assertions about adult film stars’ lack of agency (in “Gay-for-Pay” 534), J.D. actively exercises his own agency as an informed worker who makes decisions in his own best interest and on his own terms. Escoffier’s position belies the complexity of the lives of porn professionals, who increasingly occupy a wide range of occupations outside of their pornography work, and for whom pornography is but one facet of their lives. As Attwood makes clear,

although new porn professionals have attracted a great deal of attention, relatively little interest has been paid to what they do as a form of labor. Stereotypically, porn labor has been understood in terms of legitimate industries, exploitation, and dirty money, although this view has increasingly been challenged by sex work activists who have argued that sex work should be recognized as “a job not wholly unlike other jobs,” and that the diversity of sex workers’ experiences and conditions are often ignored.

(Attwood, *Porn.com* 88)

J.D.'s noteworthy record of repeated invitations for work, over a three-year period of time, speaks volumes about his performative abilities and the respective value of his work as judged by leading industry executives. While J.D.'s responses as a whole indicate that sexual objectification remains part and parcel of the economics of the industry, they also show that such objectification can be successfully challenged through conscious and self-reflexive decisions about the costars, directors, and studios with whom one chooses to work, the types of films in which one performs, and the messages that such performances communicate.

## LOVE

Little information about J.D.'s beliefs in regard to romantic love and affections can be gleaned from his film work. Inasmuch as an orgasm symbolically represents the visual "evidence of the mechanical 'truth' of bodily pleasure" (Williams, *Hard Core* 101), it does little to expose anything beyond the merely physiological reaction to sexual stimulation. When asked what his dream boyfriend would be like, J.D. responded, "I believe in Monogamy . . . I am very much LTR [long term relationship] oriented. I have experienced what it's like to love fully and unconditionally and want to find and share that again." Here J.D. unequivocally describes a preference for romantic love, which Halwani defines as being constituted by eight crucial features:

(1) It has the desire to have sex with the beloved (a desire that might not remain throughout a long-lasting love relationship); (2) it is exclusive; (3) when reciprocated, it exists between only two people; (4) when reciprocated, it pushes the lovers toward marriage (legal or substantive); (5) when reciprocated over a long period, its emotional intensity and dependence are more intense and thorough than what we find among friends and different in kind than what we find between parents and children; (6) there are social expectations that the lovers are the primary recipients of each other's time, attention, energy and affection; (7) when reciprocated it limits the autonomy of the lovers; (8) it has jealousy as one of its main accompanying emotions (27–8).

When asked if he would ever get married or have kids, he responded, "If I can marry, sure I would love to take an oath for the one I love . . . and no kids." Here J.D. expresses an interest in taking "an oath for the one I love," thus symbolically representing a personal willingness to participate in a recognized (at least intra-psychically, if not legally), exclusive commitment to another person, reflecting his personal values of monogamy as sexual fidelity to another through the institution of "marriage." This expression flies in the face of criticism by some scholars like Andrew Sullivan, who argues that marriage is a useful tool to domesticate gay couples (thereby legitimating their unions), or Michael Warner, who argues that marriage merely adopts a heterosexual institution as a means of homonormative assimilation, ultimately eroding the same-sex couple's unique identity and unwittingly undermining

any goals to transform dominant society (Halwani 288–9, 306–9). But J.D.'s comments do not engage in this politicization; if anything, by expressing his preference for "no kids" he purposefully articulates the queer notion of constructing a "family" that is *not defined* by homonormative characteristics, especially in light of J.D.'s work both within and outside of the adult film industry.

Expanding on his preferences, J.D. advocates a nuanced approach to distinguishing between physical and emotional attraction and personal compatibility:

Beyond the physical superficial attraction, how a man thinks of, cares for and treats others is very telling and important to me. A hot body is great, but a healthy self-confidence, integrity, thoughtfulness, intelligence, manners, and a sense of humor/humility—that makes a man truly sexy in my mind. (These are qualities I strive for in myself as well). I'm looking for that man who not only inspires me, but also challenges me to be better in every way possible. With romance, compassion, and an open exploration of interests, like any great relationship it's always based off trust. Ultimately, it's an open and thinking mind that I find most stimulating about a man. I like a man who is an individual and self assured. A genuine smile and an engaged sincerity in the eyes goes miles!

Here J.D. draws some important distinctions about not only the qualities that he finds attractive in a potential partner, but also how those qualities reflect his own value system and the hierarchy of traits that figure into that value system. In specifying what he finds attractive, "beyond the physical superficial attraction," he differentiates between the sexual and the emotional. The former signifies for him a "professional tool" for assessing someone's attractiveness; the other qualities, like "romance, compassion, and an open exploration of interests," signify "the personal." Due to this compartmentalization of his intrapsychic schema, J.D. is able to separate his sexual performances on film, which are based on a sliding scale of physical sexual attraction, from his personal, emotional desires off-film. This negotiation between publicized sex acts on film and private emotional and sexual life is fraught with larger, complex discursive meanings about sex itself. If, as we have heard here, J.D.'s public and private life is carefully separated by complex barriers erected by professional working conditions, popularity and audience demand, and the imposition of personal decisions over private belief systems, we must also look at how sex *itself* works in tandem with and occasionally operates in opposition to these discourses.

## CONCLUSION

While sexual desire and romantic love are related, their relationship is a dynamic one in which sexual desire can give rise to romantic love but sometimes does not; sharing deeply intimate sexual experiences does not always give rise to romantic attraction, particularly among gay men whose

sociocultural history—years of social marginalization and ostracization—has exercised an enormous influence on casual sexual encounters. And while fulfilling sexual desire may cement romantic love, sexually satisfying acts through pornography do not universally equate to sexual pleasure.

Gay porn films deconstruct highly privatized (and marginalized) sex acts, and as such bring with them the potential for politicized meaning, thereby actively abetting the deconstruction of heterosexist social norms. As Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner make clear, “a complex cluster of sexual practices gets confused, in heterosexual culture, with the love plot of intimacy and familialism that signifies belonging to a society in a deep and normal way” (359). They go on to argue that “making a queer world . . . has required the development of kinds of intimacy that bear no necessary relation to domestic space, to kinship, to the couple form, to property or to the nation” (358). The study of gay pornography enables and encourages a more profound and meaningful appreciation for the myriad sexual, sociocultural, and intrapsychic actuality of gay communities, both past and present. As John Burger writes, “If it is understood and embraced that gay porn serves as popular memory, then every porn-induced queer orgasm is a political act, no matter how private. Each is a hot juicy wad metaphorically flying in the collective face of those who would attempt to further oppress the advancing gay communities” (105). According to one major gay porn studio’s mission statement, its aim is to “enrich the lives of others by producing high quality adult entertainment safely and sanely with men who desire an opportunity to express their sexuality in a positive manner” (Scarborough). If the objective of this research has been to explode the stultifying categories in which love, sex, desire, money, identity, sexual pleasure, monogamy, and relationship have been constructed, then I believe that, at least in the example of this one gay porn star, that objective has been successfully fulfilled. At least in his case, “*Filthy Never Looked So Good.*”

## NOTES

1. For the purposes of this discussion I use the term “gay porn(ography)” interchangeably with “gay (adult) film” as a means of identifying and referring to commercial, mass-distributed content produced by professional adult entertainment studios for consumption by queer men, versus the emerging trend of “alt porn,” which subsumes the increasingly popular voyeuristic amateur-produced content typically found only on the Internet.
2. For the purposes of this discussion, I use the terms “performer” and “actor” interchangeably with “porn star” and “adult film star,” without taking a position on the politicized nature of the language argued by some scholars. Although not synonymous, the terms are equivalent colloquially.
3. Because this study aims to explore the construction of a gay adult film star’s identity through a mixed methodological approach that includes ethnography and textual analysis, I employ a case study. While case studies are not broadly representative, they do allow for a more in-depth examination of particular circumstances, and when merged with another methodology, like textual analysis,

they allow for a richer reading of specific instances and can highlight culturally constructed narratives that, in turn, can illuminate patterns audiences use to construct their own personal narratives.

4. To compile the study, I employed the *Patton Model*, which develops questions across seven discrete categories: (1) Behavior or Experience, (2) Opinion or Value, (3) Feeling, (4) Knowledge, (5) Sensory, (6) Background (Foddy). I used over 100 *Patton Model* questions in a semi-structured interviewing process (Kvale).
5. “J.D.” is a pseudonym created to provide the participant with anonymity in exchange for his participation in this study.
6. This research does not attempt to examine these legal complexities; these issues are mentioned only to illuminate the larger contexts through which one person’s participation in sex work/pornography is situated.

## WORKS CITED

- Almodovar, Norma Jean. “Porn Stars, Radical Feminists, Cops and Outlaw Whores: The Battle Between Feminist Theory and Reality, Free Speech and Free Spirits.” *Prostitution and Pornography: Philosophical Debate About the Sex Industry*. Ed. Jessica Spector. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2006. 149–74. Print.
- Attwood, Feona. “No Money Shot? Commerce, Pornography and New Sex Taste Cultures.” *Sexualities* 10.4 (2007): 441–56. Print.
- . “Reading Porn: The Paradigm Shift in Pornography Research.” *Sexualities* 5.1 (2002): 91–105. Print.
- . *Porn.com*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009. Print.
- Berlant, Lauren, and Michael Warner. “Sex In Public.” *The Cultural Studies Reader*. Ed. Simon During. London: Routledge, 1999. 354–70. Print.
- Burger, John R. *One Handed Histories: The Erotology of Gay Male Video Pornography*. New York: Harrington Park P, 1995. Print.
- Clark, Kevin. *PORN: From Andy Warhol to X-Tube*. Bruno Gmunder, 2011. Print.
- Escoffier, Jeffrey. “Gay-for-Pay: Straight Men and the Making of Gay Pornography.” *Qualitative Sociology* 26.4 (2003): 531–55. Print.
- Foddy, William. *Constructing Questions for Interviews*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
- Halwani, Raja. *Philosophy of Love, Sex and Marriage*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- Kipnis, Laura. *Bound and Gagged: Pornography and the Politics of Fantasy in America*. New York: Grove, 1996.
- Kvale, Steinar. *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Sage, 1996. Print.
- Mowlabocus, Sharif. “Gay Men and the Pornification of Everyday life.” *Pornification and the Education of Desire*. Ed. Susanna Paasonen. New York: Berg, 2007. 61–72. Print.
- The Price of Pleasure: Pornography, Sexuality & Relationships*. Dir. Miguel Picker and Chyng Sun. Media Education Foundation. 2008. Film.
- Scarborough, Steven Royce. “Company Info.” Hot House Press Room. Hot House Entertainment, 2012. Web. 16 Sept. 2012.
- Williams, Linda. *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure, and the “Frenzy of the Visible.”* Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.
- . *Porn Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2004. Print.