

Sex and the Academy

two-day workshop of the
International Network for Sexual Ethics and Politics

Organised & Hosted by
**Centre for Ethics and Value Inquiry – CEVI
Ghent University**

22-23 February, 2016
Ghent, Belgium

Timetables and Abstracts

INSEP

Sexual ethics and politics lie at the core of how we understand and practice our sexual lives. They form the basis from which we understand and engage with diverse and different sexualities. Our explicit as well as implicit ethical thinking and feeling about sexuality is a significant way of understanding, analysing, evaluating and judging sexuality as a personal, public and social construct, exploring ascriptions of both positive and negative values to sexual practices that have impacts on those who do them and on societies in which they are done. Sexual ethics provides a means of reasoning about what is pathologised, prejudiced against and discriminated against and what is held up as healthy, virtuous and legitimate. Sexual ethics seeks to cut through discursive silences, aesthetic impressions, poorly reasoned judgments and illegitimate and oppressive state and public responses to erotic pleasures and desires. It forms the basis not simply for analyses of the vagaries and ills of contemporary moral values, legal rules and political and cultural discourse on sexuality; it allows us to explore and creatively imagine better values, discourse and rules in more enlightened societies. And this is, by its very nature, a political process. The sexual is political and just as sexual politics could be enriched by emancipatory ethical thinking, sexual ethics should connect with contemporary sexual activism, politics and practices aiming at the realisation of sexual equality and justice.

Conceived in this way, sexual ethics and politics are a way of grappling with and critically thinking through the problems and possibilities of our sexual lives – with the many and diverse ways we think and respond to our and other people's sexualities and the context of sexual rights and justice, and key developments such as sexual commerce and work, sexual health and illness, sexual liberty and repression.

We see sexual ethics as a critical and discursive enterprise, informed by transdisciplinary approaches but characterised by the application of reasoned deliberation and judgement and ethical thinking in sexual scholarship. Ethical discourse on sexuality is enriched by the insights brought by both empirical and theoretical work, and by concrete legal, cultural, social, social psychological and political analyses as well as philosophical engagement.

INSEP sees the value in the fullest range of approaches to the study of sexual ethics and politics, including: gendered and feminist perspectives; distinctive lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and transsexual perspectives; queer perspectives; and approaches from more general positions such as liberalism, Marxism and democratic theory. The 2015 conference seeks to be an inclusive space of debate, welcoming dialogue and vigorous debate, but not sectarianism.

For more information please visit the INSEP website: <http://www.insep.ugent.be/>

Journal: *Sexual Ethics and Politics*

Sexual Ethics and Politics: Journal of the International Network for Sexual Ethics and Politics is a trans-disciplinary journal for the publication of critical research work on any aspect of sexual ethics and politics as it pertains to sexual identities, practices, behaviours, relations, orientations, desires and pleasures, geographies, histories, national and transnational politics and policy, theories and ideas. It provides a space where academics and practitioner/activists can debate key and contemporary issues, debates and disagreements on all aspects of sexual ethics and politics.

The journal's mission is that of the network that underpins it, the ***International Network for Sexual Ethics and Politics***. The journal seeks to promote:

- Critical understandings of the ethical problems and possibilities for diverse sexualities;
- Critical understandings of the discourses, vocabularies and bodies of knowledge by which sexuality is conceived, understood and articulated in contemporary societies, and their historical lineages;
- Critical awareness and evaluations of the beneficence or malfeasance of particular articulations of sexuality, strengths or deficiencies of different sexual cultures and discourses, their historical antecedents and their contemporary patterns of prejudice, pathology and discrimination or practice and advocacy, as well as emergent sexual politics aiming at emancipation and liberation;
- Critical understandings of the role of law, politics and culture in the prohibition, permission or regulation of sexualities, both in its oppressive deployment and possibly liberating possibilities in contemporary societies;
- And, finally, critical and constructive engagements with sexual ethics itself, thinking through its forms, role and meanings, and its history, present and future.

For more information, please visit the website:

INSEP: <http://www.insep.ugent.be/j-insep/>

Barbara Budrich Publishers: <http://budrich-journals.de/index.php/insep>



INSEP will also publish a book series with Budrich.

General Workshop Theme – Sex and the Academy

Earlier this year Laura Kipnis caused a controversy with her article on 'sexual paranoia' in the academy in which she commented on university policies regulating student-faculty sexual relationships. Some called her intervention a melodrama – melodramatic or not, ensuing events did take on epic proportions. She met with vehement opposition and was even under investigation from her own university. Discussions on social media quickly widened to encompass feminism/postfeminism controversies. Sex *in* the academy has always been a controversial issue – not only between faculty and students, but within the student population as well. Plenty are the studies documenting the alleged rise of a student hook-up culture and the highly sexualized liminal zone of student life.

Sex *and* the academy is not without controversies either. Researching and teaching sex has often generated heated debate. To name but a few examples: from Kinsey's research and 'marriage course' in the forties and fifties; over the impact of the 'second sexual revolution' in the sixties and seventies; the rise of gender studies, women's studies and feminist research, lesbian and gay studies and programs in the late seventies and eighties; the burgeoning of queer & LGBTI studies in the nineties; to more recent controversies concerning agency, choice and empowerment in the feminism/postfeminism debates, porn studies and work on sex work/prostitution/trafficking – the 'powers of desire' and the sexual politics of higher education have always caused tensions, controversies and opportunities.

Higher education is shaped by wider social and cultural sexual politics and dynamics. The masculine and gendered character of the institution, e.g., is still holding back the career development of women in academia. More recently, the neoliberalisation of higher education has had an enduring impact on class, gender and sexuality structurings, subjectivities and normativities in academia.

Higher education has often played a crucial role in shaping sexual politics as well. By their very nature universities and colleges are highly sexualized and gendered places and spaces. Teaching, according to some, has an intimate link with desire and generates tensions and intimacies between teachers and students. The curriculum is not detached from the wider social context and is as such gendered and sexualized. Higher education also provides a liminal zone and timeframe which enables young people to discover, develop and experiment with sexual relationships, identities and repertoires. As places of scholarship and research, universities shape knowledges and future research and pedagogical agendas.

In this two-day workshop we would like to bring together researchers, teachers and students to reflect on the sexual politics of higher education. It is a first instalment of a series of meetings in which the wide array of issues related to the sexualized and gendered nature of higher education will be explored.

Proposals were invited for papers and pre-organized panels addressing historical and contemporary aspects of the following themes:

HE as Gendered and Sexualized Institutions

- Political/Sexual/Gender correctness on campus, in teaching and research
- Sexual harassment and assault - rape & date/acquaintance-rape
- Sexual correctness, harassment and assault regulations and policies
- Student reproductive and sexual health issues and promotion, facilities & access
- Campus tolerance, solidarity & sexual identity and orientation
- Cultural and sexual diversities
- HE institutions as loci and agents of change – sexual revolutions & backlashes
- Women, careers and the academy - gender mainstreaming policies & challenges
- HE and masculinity
- The sexual politics of the neoliberal university

Researching & Teaching Sexuality

- Researching and teaching sexuality studies & sexuality-related topics
- Gendered curricula & research agendas
- HE as a critical/disciplinary space and regime
- Feminist, queer and critical pedagogies
- Sexual identities, orientations and academic careers
- Libraries, erotica & pornography
- Researching student sexualities
- Research ethics and sexuality research
- Women's, feminist and (post)gender studies and their relation with sexuality studies
- Feminism(s)/Postfeminism(s) and the agency & empowerment debates in HE

- The place of queer studies in HE
- Sexology and its place in HE
- Freedom of speech, academic freedom and censorship
- The erotics of teaching and education

Student Sexual Relations and Explorations in HE

- Liminality - student life as a liminal zone of sexual opportunities, discovery & experimentation
- Student-Faculty Sexual Relations - Authority & Power (im)balances; consent, choice, responsibilities, vulnerabilities & harm
- The sexual imperative and peer conformity pressures
- Hook-up Culture, Friends with benefits & Casual Sex
- Technologies of dating & sexualised social media
- Hetero & homonormativities - Inclusions and exclusions
- Student gender identities, ambiguities and sexual orientations
- Sexual reputations and double standards
- (International) Student mobility: opportunities and challenges
- Student unions as sexualised and/or sexuality/identity-based organisations
- Student events - parties, upper dare's, ...
- Student sex work
- Sexual activism & feminist mobilisation on and off campus

Venue & Internet

Venue

Het Pand
Onderbergen 1
9000 GENT

Website: <http://www.ugent.be/het-pand/en>

Room Oude Infirmierie

The conference room is located on the *second* floor.



Internet

Free Wi-Fi network is available in the whole conference building.

You can also connect to the Internet via Eduroam

S&A 2016 DELEGATES

Tom Bamford

University of Sussex,
Brighton, UK

Bob Brecher

University of Brighton
Brighton, UK

Victoria Brooks

University of Westminster
London, UK

Christine Campbell

St Mary's University
London, UK

Sharon Caringal

University of the Philippines
Manila, the Philippines

Thongmuang Chaturawit

Goldsmith's, University of London
London, UK

Tom Claes

Ghent University
Ghent, Belgium

Valerie De Craene

University of Leuven
Leuven, Belgium

Caroline F. DeCunzo

University of Vermont
Vermont, USA

Jonathan Lahey Dronsfield

Forum for European Philosophy
London, UK

Karen Gabriel

Delhi University,
Delhi, India

Sam Geuens

PXL University College
Hasselt, Belgium

Naoki Kambe

Rikkyo University
Tokyo, Japan

Frank G. Karioris

Central European University
Budapest, Hungary

Emmy Kipsoi

Moi University
Eldoret, Kenya

Nicoletta Landi

University of Bologna
Bologna, Italy

Thierry Leterre
Miami University, Ohio, USA
John E. Dolibois European Center Luxembourg

Paul Reynolds
Edge Hill University
Ormskirk, UK

Esther Saxey
London School of Economics
London, UK

Piotr Sobolczyk
Polish Academy of Sciences and Humanities
Warsaw, Poland

Petra Van Brabandt
St Lucas School of Arts
Antwerp, Belgium

Anaïs Van Ertvelde
Sophia
Brussel, Belgium

Judith Van Schuylenberg
Ghent University
Ghent, Belgium

Jolien Voorspoels
Universiteit Antwerpen
Antwerpen, Belgium

Alexander Zimulov
Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf
Dusseldorf, Germany

General Overview & Timetable

Monday 22 February 2016

09:00 - 09:30 Registration
09:30 - 10:00 Welcome & Intro to the project
10:00 - 11:00 Session 1: ***The University and Hetero-Masculinity***
11:00 - 11:30 Coffee Break
11:30 - 13:00 Session 2: ***Representations and Violence***
13:00 - 14:00 Lunch Break
14:00 - 15:30 Session 3: ***Student Sex Work***
15:30 - 16:00 Coffee Break
16:00 - 18:00 Session 4: ***The Academy and Consent***

Tuesday 13 February 2016

10:00 - 11:00 Session 5: ***The Politics of Sex in the Academy***
11:00 - 11:30 Coffee Break
11:30 - 13:00 Session 6: ***Teaching Sexuality***
13:00 - 14:00 Lunch Break
14:00 - 15:30 Session 7: ***Researching Sexuality***
15:30 - 16:00 Coffee Break
16:00 - 17:00 Session 8: ***Closing Session***

Monday 22 February 2016 - Overview

09:00 – 09:30 REGISTRATION

- Registration: room 'Oude Infirmierie'

09:30 – 10:00 WELCOME & INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT

- Welcome to the workshop (Tom Claes and Paul Reynolds)
- Academic program for the workshop and possible outputs (Paul Reynolds)
- Conference activities and Housekeeping (Tom Claes)

10:00 – 11:00 SESSION 1: THE UNIVERSITY AND HETERO-MASCULINITY

- **Educating for marriage: the university's heteronormative programming**
Frank G. Karioris
- **Implementing gender quotas in the academia: staff attitudes at a mid-range Belgian university**
Jolien Voorspoels

11:00 – 11:30 COFFEE BREAK

11:30 – 13:00 SESSION 2: QUEER PEDAGOGY

- **"Something that they've been taught is not allowed": Sexual liberation and critical pedagogy in harmony and in conflict in the seminar room**
Esther Saxey
- **Teaching queer / Queer teaching in Poland**
Piotr Sobolczyk
- **Transgression and trigger warnings: Bataille and the challenges for a feminist pedagogy**
Tom Bamford

13:00 – 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 – 15:30 SESSION 3: STUDENT SEX WORK

- **Identity and image management strategies of student sex workers**
Judith Van Schuylenberg
- **Insights into the phenomenon of student sex work: activities and motivations of UK student sex workers**
Sam Geuens
- **The paradoxes of student sex work**
Tom Claes

15:30 – 16:00 COFFEE BREAK

16:00 – 18:00 SESSION 4: THE ACADEMY AND CONSENT

- **Technologizing consent: reframing campus sexual assault as an ongoing catastrophe**
Caroline F. DeCunzo
- **Infantilising the university: the "Consensual Relationships Policy" of a British institution of Higher Education**
Bob Brecher
- **Some Thoughts on the Ethics of Lecturer-Student Sexual Relationships**
Paul Reynolds
- **On the use and the abuse of an 'Absolute'**
Jonathan Lahey Dronsfield

Tuesday 23 February 2016 - Overview

10:00 – 11:00 SESSION 5: THE POLITICS OF SEX IN THE ACADEMY

- **The *Oblation Run*: obscene or political?**
Sharon Caringal
- **The loud silence on anti-sexual harassment policy in Kenyan public universities: conceptualization and challenges**
Emmy Kipsoi

11:00 – 11:30 COFFEE BREAK

11:30 – 13:00 SESSION 6: TEACHING SEXUALITY

- **Higher education as a vehicle for attitude change**
Christine Campbell
- **Reflecting on my/his feminist pedagogy: a case of “Gendered nonverbal communication” Course in Japan**
Naoki Kambe
- **Starting out with 'that porn course': an academia novice's sketch on difficulties teaching the libertine canon**
Alexander Zimulov

13:00 – 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 – 15:30 SESSION 7: RESEARCHING SEXUALITY

- **Entanglements and folds: researching law and sexuality at the Coast**
Victoria Brooks
- **Some key issues in researching pornography**
Karen Gabriel
- **Sex and the anthropologist: embodying and sharing knowledge inside, outside and a-side the Academy**
Nicoletta Landi & Valerie De Craene

15:30 – 16:00 COFFEE BREAK

16:00 – 17:00 SESSION 8: CLOSING SESSION

MONDAY 22 February 2016 – Abstracts

09:00 – 09:30 REGISTRATION

09:30 – 10:00 WELCOME & INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT

- Welcome to the workshop (Tom Claes and Paul Reynolds)
- Academic program for the workshop and possible outputs (Paul Reynolds)
- Conference activities and Housekeeping (Tom Claes)

10:00 – 11:00 **SESSION 1: THE UNIVERSITY AND HETERO-MASCULINITY**

Educating for marriage: the university's heteronormative programming

Frank G. Karioris

Department of Gender Studies
Central European University
Budapest, Hungary

The university has long served – especially in the US - as a place to meet 'like-minded' individuals, and has, in this way, served as an assortative marrying pool – perpetuating particularly class and racial divisions. With the widening of attendance in higher education, this has changed dramatically. Sexual narratives about university life currently revolve around 'hook-up' culture or campus violence. This contribution aims to recenter the university's role as ascriber, transcriber, and creator of sexual scripts, while acknowledging and discussing students' resistance and challenges to these scripts.

Based on extensive ethnographic fieldwork at the University of St. Jerome – a private, Catholic university in the Midwest of the US – this contribution will focus on the experiences of students in Regan Hall, an all-male residence hall. The contribution will look at the Orientation event called the Mash-up, an event where students are told people meet their future husbands and wives. Continuing, I will analyze three events between Regan and Kemp Hall (the all-female hall), and the way they position residents towards marital relationships. The events are: 'Speed Friending', 'Rave in the Cave', and 'Spring Formal'. They form a progression from friendship to flirtation and ending in a formal relationship.

These events will be analyzed through an understanding of institutions and institutional sexualities. I will draw upon, in particular, Kimmel's *Guyland* (2008), Armstrong & Hamilton's *Paying for the Party* (2013), and Warner & Berlant's *Sex in Public* (2005). Analyzing these events, the contribution will showcase the ways that the university sets up and allows specific formations of sexual relations – premised upon fixed social relations – which are heteronormative and that perpetuate a vision of sexuality rooted in marriage. While students are pushing back against this, it is crucial to maintain a view on the ways that universities are seeking to reaffirm particular heteronormative relations.

Implementing gender quotas in the academia: staff attitudes at a mid-range Belgian university

Jolien Voorspoels

Department of Political Science
Citizenship, Equality and Diversity
Universiteit Antwerpen
Antwerpen, Belgium

Within Europe, Belgium has been a forerunner in adopting and implementing gender quotas and by now applies gender quotas for all levels of electoral politics, advisory committees at the federal and regional level, and the boards of listed and public companies. More recently, gender quotas were also imposed upon a number of universities, more precisely all of the decision-making bodies within these universities need to comprise at least 1/3 members of each sex. These gender quotas fit in the broader discussion on the persisting vertical sex segregation in the (Belgian) academia. In this paper we investigate the implementation of these gender quotas in the case of the University of Antwerp, a mid-range university in the Belgian academic landscape. We study more particularly how important staff consider gender quotas as a policy measure and how this resonates with their experiences of organizational climate and attitudes towards (gender) equality and diversity at work more broadly. The analysis is based on two surveys on the university as a working environment conducted among the academic and administrative-technical staff of the University of Antwerp. The first survey took place a number of years prior to the gender quotas (2009), the second one a number of years after their implementation (2014). This double set of data will allow us to understand how gender quotas resonate with attitudes towards equality and diversity among the university's staff, also in

relation to the norms and values supposed to be put center stage in the academia, such as merit and excellence. Consequently, this paper will contribute to our understanding of the perception and acceptance of these gender quotas, and thus possible thresholds in their implementation

11:00 – 11:30 COFFEE BREAK

11:30 – 13:00 **SESSION 2: QUEER PEDAGOGY**

“Something that they’ve been taught is not allowed”: Sexual liberation and critical pedagogy in harmony and in conflict in the seminar room

Esther Saxey

Teaching and Learning Centre
London School of Economics
London, UK

Liberation politics around sexual identities, and critical pedagogy (inspired by writers such as Paolo Freire and bell hooks), arise in the same historical and political moment. Both recognise the expertise of non-experts, advocate for the redistribution of authority, and emphasise the role of speech (by the disempowered) in seizing power.

This paper shows how liberation politics and critical pedagogy have been mutually supportive, with non-heterosexual academics drawing on both to develop their teaching practice. First-person accounts from teachers and lecturers demonstrate how they conceptualise homophobia in ways which support their preferred understanding of pedagogy: homophobia is rote-learned (from parents and churches) and thus allied with older, discredited ways of teaching. Critical debate will reveal the holes in homophobic 'knowledge'.

But this paper also explores how teaching-while-queer may not benefit from these models. Can a non-heterosexual academic or teacher risk redistributing authority, when their authority may already be reduced in the eyes of students? Does a queer teacher's 'knowledge' of their own sexuality throw into question their disciplinary expert knowledge? I draw on Foucault's critique of speech as liberation, and Fisher's observations on students holding multiple subject positions, to re-examine student speech: as potentially liberatory, but also able to replicate and reinforce existing power relations.

Fisher, B. M. (2001) *No Angel in the Seminar room: Teaching through feminist discourse* (Rowman and Littlefield).

Jackson, J.M. (2007) *Unmasking Identities: An Exploration of the Lives of Gay and Lesbian Teachers* (Lexington Books).

Jennings, K. (ed) (1994) *One Teacher in Ten: Gay and Lesbian Educators Tell Their Stories* (Alyson Press).

Khayatt, M.D. (1992) *Lesbian Teachers: An Invisible Presence* (State University of New York Press).

Silin, J. G. (1999) Teaching as a Gay Man: Pedagogical Resistance or Public Spectacle? *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 5(1): pp 95-106.

Skelton, A. (2000) '“Camping it Up to Make Them Laugh?” Gay Men Teaching in Higher Education' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5:2, pp 181-197.

Teaching queer / Queer teaching in Poland

Piotr Sobolczyk

Institute of Literary Research
Polish Academy of Sciences and Humanities
Warsaw, Poland

The paper is supposed to be a cross-genre experimental writing, combining academic essay and autobiographical notes of a queer teacher of queer studies in Poland. I have been teaching Polish and international students in Poland. I have been also doing queer theory writing in Poland for some 10 years. I want to discuss the idea of “queer pedagogy”, following Robyn Wiegman’s idea of “queering the academy”, and re-reading Edward Carpenter’s essays on “homogenic attachments” in pedagogy. In my case the idea of queer teaching has had a more “surface” (allegedly) aspect, i.e. of not following unwritten rules on how an academic teacher in a certain age (i.e., her or his 30s) should dress. My teaching “Polish Gay Literature and Social Change” or queer studies and men’s studies broke also other “rules” on a “deeper” level, such as taking students to gay clubs or to the theatre or movies (and then having a discussion over a drink). I have been running a kind of a diary entitled “Notes of a Young Scholar”, published as a cycle in literary press in Poland, where I gave testimony to my new ideas in teaching and my breaking the distance between students and their professor. As far as my academic writing is concerned (numerous articles and two monographs on

queer literature by now, one international in English), I have experienced all the “silencing” or “straightening” arguments issued by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick in one of the passages in her *Epistemology of the Closet*, starting with my first openly queer project (now a classic, constantly reprinted) being called “the end of science” on a conference. Nonetheless, during these last 10 years in Poland, queer theory has guarded its place in the academy and in fact the academy seems one of the least risky professions where queer subjects might come out.

Transgression and trigger warnings: Bataille and the challenges for a feminist pedagogy

Tom Bamford

English Department
University of Sussex
Brighton, UK

My paper will explore ways in which Georges Bataille’s work on transgression and the critiques and controversies around its legacy may be useful for a feminist-informed exploration of challenges presented by the academic teaching of literary material considered sexually violent or traumatic.

Recent interventions, such as that by Rani Neutill, regarding controversy around the use of trigger warnings in seminars raise complex questions regarding the limits of what students consider acceptable and the ways in which these limits change in different contexts. Bataille’s emphasis on the intimate connection between transgression and limit provides a framework for thinking about the porous nature of the boundary between that which we do and do not wish to be exposed to, one that has informed the work of feminist writers such as Kathy Acker. At the same time the arguably misogynistic nature of aspects of Bataille’s work and legacy has justifiably led many to see an association between transgression and male privilege; see for example the criticism of Peter Dinklage’s *We’re Fucked* (2014).

Transgression thus provides a useful schema through which to consider contemporary debates around privilege, censorship and trigger warnings in a teaching context. Such consideration is crucial for a pedagogy that wishes to engage with transgressive material while also recognising the sexual problematics of transgression and the feminist resonances of the argument that students should be able to exercise control over their exposure to sexually traumatic material.

13:00 – 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 – 15:30 **SESSION 3: STUDENT SEX WORK**

Identity and image management strategies of student sex workers

Judith Van Schuylenberg

CEVI
Ghent University
Ghent, Belgium

With the sex industry expanding and becoming more mainstream, more and more highly educated middle class people engage in sex work, and research shows that students also increasingly see the sex industry as a viable option to make ends meet. This article sheds light on image and identity management in Flemish students working in the sex industry. Data result from 6 in-depth interviews, 3 open questionnaires and 68 ads taken from an erotic advertisement site. Students distance themselves in several ways from the stereotypical sex worker image, shown in the ads as well as during the interviews. This could be seen as a strategy to select their desired clientele, and can function as a protection mechanism to avoid unwanted situations. The interviews also show that students do not construct a second, manufactured identity to use in their work, but rather use elements from their own identity to offer an authentic ‘girlfriend experience’. However, they also cover their identity in some way to protect their privacy, making this authenticity bounded. To avoid spill over from work into private life, some students divide their social world in groups, who differ in disclosure concerning their sex work. Central to all these processes is the still enduring stigmatisation of sex work, still seen as deviant until today.

Insights into the phenomenon of student sex work: activities and motivations of UK student sex workers

Sam Geuens

Department of Healthcare
PXL University College
Hasselt, Belgium

Tracey Sagar & Debbie Jones

Centre for Criminal Justice and Criminology - Consortium for Sexuality Studies
Department of Law and Criminology
Swansea University
Swansea, Wales

The Student Sex Work Project was set up in 2012 in the United Kingdom (UK) to locate students who are involved in the sex industry, discover their motivations and needs, and provide an evidence base to consider the development of policy and practice within Higher Education. Early on, a large student survey was undertaken throughout the UK.

This contribution aims to give an impression of the nature of student involvement in the sex industry and their motivations to take up sex work. The data the student sex work project provides can finally offer the essential empirical foundation needed in the ongoing academic debates on the phenomenon of student sex work. The results show that there can be little doubt of student involvement in the sex industry in the UK. The insights presented into student sex worker will address elements such as agency, choice, exploitation, life/work balance, etc.

The paradoxes of student sex work

Tom Claes

CEVI
Ghent University
Ghent, Belgium

Commercial sex work, and in particular prostitution, is a divisive social issue. Public and policy-related discussions are caught up in a paralyzing dichotomy between interpretations of commercial sex as forced/exploitative on the one hand and as free/agentive on the other hand. Both perspectives suffer from methodological deficiencies in that they are *selective* by prioritizing specific groups of sex workers and clients and types of sex work, *ideologically laden* by starting out from opposing viewpoints on the very intelligibility of sex as a type of work, and *hyperbolic* in their interpretation of the quality of the choices involved. The dichotomy is also present in scientific research on sex work. Despite the broad availability of empirical research on commercial sex work, including prostitution, there is no scientific agreement on the extent to which a genuine choice for sex work is possible, and on which factors hamper or hinder this choice (such as force, coercion, lack of alternatives, etc). The scientific research about 'choice' in the context of commercial sex work has been suffering strongly from built-in normative (researcher) biases and even partisan normative perspectives and evaluative frameworks.

Student involvement in commercial sex is academically under researched, although highly present in the media and non-academic writings. Students, however, seem to constitute a highly interesting population for researching the role of 'choice' in sex work because (1) students sex workers will neither typically be situated on the extreme ends of the choice continuum: they are neither the typical 'trafficking victims', nor the paradigmatical (voluntary) 'high-class escorts'; (2) students constitute a population in which a high level of self-determination and agency might be expected compared to other (working) youths, allowing for meaningfully studying agency and choice related issues; (3) students are sexually active in a liminal zone between childhood and adulthood, offering them a wide range of sexual opportunities; (4) sexual consent is an important marker of agency and choice and this has extensively been researched in student populations; (5) students are mobile, including through exchange programs; (6) there is a wealth of research on student attitudes to sexuality broadly construed and sex work; and finally (7) they are highly susceptible to the so-called 'sexualisation of society' growing up in a culture in which sexuality is being mainstreamed.

So what then can and could we learn from recent research done on student sex work? Does it reproduce the existing frontlines or does it shed new light on the very possibility of a genuine choice for sex work? Or is the focus on 'choice' a red herring, drawing away attention from the real issues involved like socio-economic contexts and the neoliberal construction of the choosing subject?

15:30 – 16:00 COFFEE BREAK

Technologizing consent: reframing campus sexual assault as an ongoing catastrophe

Caroline F. DeCunzo
Jack N. Braunstein
Department of Geography
University of Vermont
Vermont, USA

Institutions of higher education have long tried to make themselves into ideal spaces, in image and in practice. Rape and sexual assault are prevalent on college campuses, and students are continually dissatisfied by the university's inability to address this violence in meaningful or effective ways. Why does this image of ideal university space prove so deeply inadequate in its capacity to address both the harm to campus bodies from sexual assault and the deeper systems that produce the conditions for its possibility? There is a disconnect present between a critical analysis of the production of rape culture on a systemic scale and the manifestation of this system in the construction of assault and consent on campus. In this paper, we draw on critical perspectives on ecological catastrophe, environmental justice and geographies of process in an attempt to locate an epistemology of campus rape capable of addressing this disconnect between the system and the event. These literatures provide a framework through which we can jump scales between the complex systems that produce the conditions for the uneven emergence of these events and their impacts on different bodies. Developing an adequate understanding of sexual assault requires us to move past seeing violations of consent as just time-bounded events, and to go further than implicating 'rape culture' at an aspatial scale. We argue that a new articulation of consent as a continuous process embedded in complex relations of power is necessary to move toward addressing the crisis of sexual assault on the college campus in a meaningful way.

Infantilising the university: the "Consensual Relationships Policy" of a British institution of Higher Education

Bob Brecher
CAPPE
University of Brighton
Brighton, UK

I propose, first, to analyse the mercifully brief content of a so-called policy document agreed in 2014 between a UK university and its unions in order to bring to light its main assumptions, confusions and non-sequiturs. Second, I shall suggest that the temptation merely to ridicule the many absurdities of such a document needs to be resisted: rather, we need to ask how it is that a university is able in all seriousness to issue such a ludicrous policy; and, perhaps even more importantly, to ask why it is met with no objection, let alone resistance. Finally, I shall offer some speculative remarks about the ways in which the infantilism of such a "policy" is symptomatic of a wider ideological malaise: a neo-liberal fear of knowledge.

Some Thoughts on the Ethics of Lecturer-Student Sexual Relationships

Paul Reynolds
Department of social Sciences
Edge Hill University
Ormskirk, UK

Lecturer-student sexual relationships sit uneasily within the bounds of ethical and social legitimacy. Critics point to exploitation and power relationships, professionalism and transgression, corruption and intergenerational inequality. Those who are more liberal on the subject point to the absence of sustainability in prohibitions, the efficacy of adult relationships, the problem of making this specific relationship immoral when the same features of the relationship might be discerned elsewhere and the possible positives in such relationships. They are compared yet incomparable with teacher pupil relationships, subject to cultural and social conventions that both sustain pathology and prejudice and encourage transgression, and often the rationale for prohibition does not come from the relationships themselves as much as a broader institutional representational politics.

In this paper I want to provide a focused discussion that explores the ethical underpinning to the debates about lecturer-student relationships. I will argue there is no particular and persuasive situational argument for

prohibition, that the important interventions to be made are the enhancement of sexual ethics in relationships, particularly the young or vulnerable, and that these arguments do not preclude the need to recognise exploitative relationships but also recognise positivity in the productive relationships.

On the use and the abuse of an 'Absolute'

Jonathan Lahey Dronsfield

Forum for European Philosophy
London, UK

If the 'Guidelines' regarding personal relationships between academic and student state that the academic "must" report a sexual relationship with a student he or she is involved in assessing, does such a 'guideline' constitute an 'absolute obligation'? If it does, is the corollary that, regardless of any mitigating circumstance or finding in a disciplinary investigation, breaching it just is good cause for dismissal? If it does not, is the breaching of it nonetheless good cause for dismissal?

Is an academic institution at liberty to stipulate that it is an 'absolute obligation' for an academic to report? Should it be? And if the duty to report is indeed an absolute obligation, must this not be stated as such in the Guidelines? If it is not, does that imply that, rather than an absolute, the duty to report can only be seen to be articulated in qualified language?

If the duty to report is stated as an 'absolute obligation', does this remove any leeway for interpretation or scope for reasonable disagreement on the part of the person upon whom the decision falls to sanction the academic in breach of the duty?

If the duty to report is not stated as an absolute obligation, is the person upon whom it falls to adjudicate at liberty to interpret it as such? If unstated as an absolute, can reading it as implying an absolute only be an act of interpretation? And if the duty to report is interpreted by the adjudicator as an absolute, is this not in fact i) a contradiction in terms; and b) a derogation of responsibility to adjudicate and the abrogation of the duty to come to a decision which must be seen to be fair and for which he or she is obliged to provide reasons?

And were, let us say (for the sake of argument), a disciplinary investigation into the behaviour of an academic to find that there is no evidence to suggest that he or she, in not reporting, is culpable of actions which should lead to his or her dismissal, is this not at least prima facie evidence that the guidelines given to that member of staff by the institution in question are reasonably interpretable in non-absolutist ways? Under such circumstances, is dismissal a reasonable and just decision?

In addressing these questions it is incumbent to consider the matter of 'conflict of interest'. 'Guidelines' to academic staff purport to be written for the purpose of avoiding potential conflict of interest, and in the interests of both academic and student. It is a consideration of this paper that one of the consequences of construing the duty to report as an 'absolute' obligation is that potential conflict of interest overrides and takes precedence over actual non-conflict of interest, and that this leads to an abuse of the institution's power over the interests of both academic and student.

The *Oblation Run*: obscene or political?

Sharon Caringal

Department of Social Sciences
University of the Philippines
Manila, the Philippines

The University of the Philippines (UP) is the premier and only national university in the Philippines producing majority of the country's leaders and prime movers. UP is the bastion of student activism and progressive thinking. It was and still is instrumental in pushing for societal change and was part of each and every important struggle of the Filipino people. Political activism is part and parcel of UP life. Students are given the opportunity not only to understand the different theories pertaining to political activism but are also given the mechanism to put this into practice (praxis).

The oblation run is a much awaited event that is being conducted on a regular basis to popularize and laymanize relevant social issues. During oblation run, male students run stark naked inside the campus premises to convey bold political statements using the nude male body. The oblation run was inspired by the 'oblation', a statue sculpted by the National Artist Guillermo Tolentino of a naked man offering himself to the nation, which is the state university's symbol. UP is governed by its own charter and now has a long tradition of upholding free expression.

A form of sexual political activism, the oblation run is a venue for the students to convey their political statements and magnify their advocacies. The themes ranged from political to economic and later on to environmental issues. It even condemned the culture of impunity that violates international human rights law, (citing the case of slain transgender Jennifer Laude and the grisly Maguindanao massacre), social justice, agrarian reform, clean elections and right to education. Aside from being a form of protest, the Oblation Run is also intended to remind the students of the symbolism of the Oblation Statue, which is "a selfless offering of one's self to the country."

This paper presents the nature and history of the oblation run as a form of political/sexual activism. The researcher will probe deeper into the effects and impact of such an exercise to the target audience, the students and to the bigger Philippine society which by and large still continues to frown on nudity.

The loud silence on anti-sexual harassment policy in Kenyan public universities: conceptualization and challenges

Emmy Kipsoi

Institute for Gender Equity Research and Development
Moi University
Eldoret, Kenya

The enactment of the Sexual Offences Act 2001 in Kenya has seen efforts to domesticate the legislation in public institutes. The effort of criminalization of sexual offence at the work place is a big leap in providing safe working environments for women particularly in the universities. The paper presents part of a study, which seeks to establish the conceptualization of sexual harassment by both staff and students in a university in Kenya. The study also sought to establish the awareness of the anti-sexual harassment policy and its adequacy in acting as a deterrent. The study presents qualitative data from selected staff and students of a public university. It is hoped that the findings from this study will ignite the discourse on sexual harassment in universities particularly as a way towards seeking a zero level of tolerance

Higher education as a vehicle for attitude change

Christine Campbell

School of Management & Social Sciences
St Mary's University
Twickenham, London

“Chris, when I started this module I was really worried that you were going to ask me to be OK with things I wouldn't be OK with. I'm from a religious background and I had quite set opinions about some issues. But then you brought the first speaker in and I realised she was just like me! She's just living her life, just like me! And then I felt so bad about judging these people who I don't even know. It's changed the way I look at the world.”

I am a senior lecturer in Psychology and currently teach a final year optional module at a UK university called The Psychology of Intimate Relationships. This module covers issues of gender, sexuality, sexual behaviour, relationship issues and related topics. This year, for the first time, I've brought in speakers to talk about their lived experiences of belonging to marginal populations, from people who identify as polyamorous to a person who was imprisoned in the 1950s for his homosexuality. This has been probably the most impactful thing I've ever done in the classroom in fifteen years of lecturing. In my presentation I'll talk about the reactions of my students, my speakers, and me, and how it's gone down in my university. It touches on issues of representativeness, tokenism, marginal identities, religion and politics.

Reflecting on my/his feminist pedagogy: a case of “Gendered nonverbal communication” Course in Japan

Naoki Kambe

College of Intercultural Communication
Rikkyo University
Tokyo, Japan

Although female education participation in higher education in Japan has increased rapidly in the last few decades, it has not yet led to gender equality in labor market and society (OECD, 2012). Having taught communication related courses at several universities since 2007, I came to realize that higher education in Japan including what I had taught could be one of the influential causes of gender inequality. This realization has encouraged me to offer a new course called “Gendered Nonverbal Communication” which attempts to interrogate the whole process of knowledge construction regarding nonverbal communication and bodies. Specifically, this course sets the following objectives: 1) to understand how gender identities are constructed, maintained, and challenged through nonverbal communication; 2) to interrogate the take-for-granted in our everyday nonverbal communication and understanding of femininity and masculinity.

In my presentation, I will discuss not only my feminist pedagogical approach including the course content and activities but also students' and my reflections on this course. In particular, I pose the following questions: How do my students reflect on their own gendered bodies (e.g., gesture, posture, skin, appearance, space, touch) after learning the concepts/theories such as docile bodies, gender performativity, sexual objectification, and male gaze? How do they reflect on the claim that their bodily performances could reinforce patriarchal culture and gender inequality in labor market and society? How do they reflect on their (potential) discriminatory views on subordinated masculinities including homosexuals, homeless, and otaku/geeks? How do I, a heterosexual male, reflect on my own teaching and struggles in this course? Through these questions, I aim at evaluating the impact of teaching new ways of seeing the world and articulating some possibilities of feminist pedagogy in higher education to lead to gender equality in Japan.

Starting out with 'that porn course': an academia novice's sketch on difficulties teaching the libertine canon

Alexander Zimulov

Modern English Literature
Heinrich Heine Universität Düsseldorf
Düsseldorf, Germany

This paper intends to systematise some mixed attempts at incorporating my PhD research into teaching undergraduate modules over the past seven semesters. The focus is on the specific difficulties to 'reach'

students and the arising issues of authority and gender, which under the marginalised conditions of my field can hinder rather than inspire meaningful insights.

Speaking in Foucault's terms one would have to characterise pornographic writing from Aretino to Sade as anything but 'liberating' the body from the forces of discourse which constitute it as a problem of knowledge and power. However, formations of the contemporaneous *scientia sexualis* – from metaphysics to medicine, politics, and economics – are accommodated not merely in order to 'think them through' (in more or less satirical and/or heterodox ways), but with the conceit of weaving an erotic experience into their very vocabulary. Exploring the libertine canon, in this sense, as a textual practise of "multiplication and intensification of pleasures connected to the production of the truth about sex", means exploring what the texts do with what they address (e.g. bodies, sexualities, contexts) instead of merely stating the latter.

I have taught three seminars approaching this agenda from different angles, each meeting with overwhelming demand. Yet after the initial enthusiasm subsided, maintaining regular participation and a scholarly relevant level of work proved discouragingly hard compared to other courses. On the one hand, the intellectual footnotes of the tradition (e.g. from Ovid to Lucretius, from Montaigne to Hobbes) were ostensibly resented for being too far off the topic. On the other hand, attempts at close-readings through the titillatingly disturbing (and/or disturbingly titillating) 'philosophies in the bedroom' habitually disintegrated into brainstormings on what sexuality 'actually' is or on how society should be more open-minded. A particularly difficult scenario would ensue with complacent giggles from male students – in a predominantly female class – which divided the course into students flaunting their confidence in sexual matters and those made to feel uncomfortable by this very display of (probably itself defensive) bravado. Responses would then invariably shift to personal views expressed between the lines or sometimes quite directly, at times followed by moments of awkwardness. Ultimately I even learned about two students looking for counselling with a senior lecturer about their anxieties whether an exam might entail opening up on their own experience.

Despite some magnificent sessions and, above all, a brilliantly researched BA dissertation by one of my first students, I no longer see myself able to teach the very material that has inspired me to stay in the academia. The nerve-racking doubts are obvious. If neither switching into 'lecture mode' nor extended office hours could effect a lasting shift in the discussion, did I fail at the most basic tasks – like setting the proper tone, picking the right material, asking the right questions? Most importantly: did I fail to protect the privacy of those students who saw no other way as to seek counselling elsewhere? Did I fail to communicate a culture of debate where we could address these issues in class and perhaps even incorporate them into our agenda? Other deeply unsettling issues are: what does it mean if, on the contrary, I had tried to be more assertive as a male lecturer in front of a predominantly female audience? Precisely what kind of right do I have to tell students how to 'talk' sex (or, in fact, how not to talk it) given that the texts of course do elicit strong personal responses? In how far are my allegedly 'neutral' scholarly ambitions gendered? And finally: is the university still the place where I can research these very issues?

13:00 – 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 – 15:30 **SESSION 7: RESEARCHING SEXUALITY**

Entanglements and folds: researching law and sexuality at the Coast

Victoria Brooks

School of Law
University of Westminster
London, UK

My PhD thesis to be submitted later this year is in law. But it has nothing to do with case law and statutes, rather it concerns the law which emerges between bodies while entangled within the mess of sexual encounters. My work is an ethnographic study of open yet transgressive sexual behaviour on the French nudist and libertine resort of Cap D'Agde in Southern France. In the course of charting the law which emerges here, I undertook 'non-participant' covert observations. As a methodology, this caused controversy at the ethical approval stage, from those concerned for my personal safety, and also implicitly that I would have sex while I was in the course of these observations. On a personal level, I also had my own reservations and fears, as well as concerns over infringed intimacy of my own personal relationships as a consequence of what I might do or see. It became apparent that there was a deep fear, both institutionally from the University and its ethics committee, and within myself of confronting the deeper and darker crevices of the fold of the material of sexuality. This material of sexuality extends and disintegrates, and unfurls from the deepest soul, enveloping the outside, only to flood back towards the self. My PhD thesis has therefore become increasingly about what it means to be 'researching' law and sexuality. It has also become about what sexuality means for me, and what it means to be confronting and speaking about sexual behaviours, and how important it is to do so from a deeply personal place. It is impossible to talk about sexuality without being personal, which points to a conception of sexuality, and law, as something which is radically personal and radically individual. My positioning as a young, heterosexual woman researching sexuality in this way has placed me in a precarious and confrontational, and sometimes tragic position between activism and

academic research. My paper therefore explores the deep entanglements emerging in my thesis, which are entanglements between my personal life, methodology, research ethics and Deleuzian theoretical conceptions of law and sexuality.

Some key issues in researching pornography

Karen Gabriel

International Institute of Social Studies, EUR (Erasmus University of Rotterdam)
The Hague, The Netherlands
&
Dept. of English
Centre for Gender, Culture and Social Processes
St. Stephen's College
Delhi University,
Delhi, India

The emergence of 'Porn Studies' as an academic discipline in recent years, particularly in 'the West', has been accompanied by a host of issues pertaining to studying pornography as a legitimate academic pursuit. Among these are (a) the continuing implicit and explicit social disapproval of the visibilization of sex and sexuality, and researchers (and teachers and students) need to negotiate these; (b) the consequent tendency to stigmatize the researcher (or teacher/student), the research (or course/program), and the institution that hosts them; and (c) the implications of these for the ethics of researching, teaching and studying porn.

This paper seeks to explore in particular the implications of these for researching pornography in general and, in the context of India. It will outline some of the strategies and methods available to the researcher, and the ethical implications of these for the work, as well as its findings. Specifically, the paper will focus on the ethical dilemmas of researching the illicit, the illegal, the 'immoral', and sometimes the criminal, while maintaining not only the confidentiality but also the trust of the researcher's respondents. The paper will outline some of the ways in which the overcoming of these dilemmas can affect the nature of the research, as well as run the danger of skewing its findings. Finally, the paper will open out the ways in which sex and sexuality are articulated in the academia, often in explicitly libertarian terms, in contrast to the ways in which it is engaged with as a subject of research on the one hand, and in terms of the lived reality of persons involved in the business of porn on the other. These acquire a particular resonance in the context of researching porn (for both researcher and site of research) in a country like India.

Sex and the anthropologist: embodying and sharing knowledge inside, outside and a-side the Academy

Nicoletta Landi

Department of Science, Cognition and Technology
University of Bologna
Bologna, Italy

Valerie De Craene

Department of Geography
University of Leuven
Leuven, Belgium

As a scholar working on sexualities and a sexualized human being, through this contribution I want to reflect on how the person often overlaps the scholar especially in the ways I relate – as a person and as an anthropologist --- to the Academy. It's a multidimensional and heterogeneous context, (also) made of sexual, gendered and power dynamics. How do we produce and share sex and sexualities---related knowledge inside, outside and a---side it? These three complementary dimensions represent physical and symbolic spaces where to discover, experiment and unpack (sexual) identities and relationships. In both institutional and more informal situations – such as the conversations among scholars taking place a---side academic settings – we embody and actively perform many of the critics and the potentials of researching sexualities.

Focusing on two researches I have been leading in Italy – one on BDSM (Bondage, Domination, Sado---Masochism) and the other on sex education for teenagers – I want to highlight the complexity of putting the researcher's sexual body at the core of methodological and epistemological choices. Through a brief presentation of the first case study I want to go into the depth of engaging erotic topics in first person and, through the second one – an action---research lead inside a Public Health System youth centre --- I want to focus on the intricacy of doing anthropology dealing with "the world outside" and the complexity of the relation between sexuality and education.

My aim is to stimulate a wider discussion on methodological, communicative and political strategies concerning researching sexualities in order to highlight the “dangers” and the potentialities of educating and researching in the fields of sex and sexualities.

15:30 – 16:00 COFFEE BREAK

16:00 – 17:00 **SESSION 8: CLOSING SESSION**