SOCIOLOGY OF SEXUALITIES

ASSESSING THE STATE OF THE FIELD

Produced by Crossing Boundaries, Workshopping Sexualities
ASA Sexualities Section, Preconference Workshop
Denver, CO, Aug 20-21, 2012

LETTER FROM **THE CHAIR**

In August 2012, the Sociology of Sexualities section held its first ever stand-alone mini-conference. Each participant was assigned to a workgroup and each workgroup was asked to write a brief working paper laying out the key theoretical questions in these areas and assessing the most significant areas for future research. We asked each workgroup to focus on methodological concerns and ways to negotiate these issues. We hope that hese working papers will provide a resource for graduate students as well as faculty working in the field.

Crossing Boundaries, Workshopping Sexualities is supported by a grant from the American Sociological Association's Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline Award supported by the American Sociological Association and the National Science Foundation. We would also like to thank our generous co-sponsors, the ASA Section on Sexualities, the ASA Section on Sex and Gender, the Caucus on Transnational Approaches to Gender & Sexuality, the University of Colorado-Denver, the University of Denver, and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York.

Sincerely,

Mary Bernstein, University of Connecticut
Chair, Steering Committee,
Crossing Boundaries, Workshopping Sexualities

TABLE OF **CONTENTS**

WORKING PAPER ON **HIV/AIDS**

Coordinator: Héctor Carillo

I.   INTRODUCTION

During our meeting at the "Crossing Boundaries, Workshopping Sexualities" conference organized by the ASA Sexualities Section, workgroup members examined the current state of the fields of HIV/AIDS prevention and care. A central concern was how to reincorporate sociological research on sexualities—and more broadly on the social dimensions of HIV/AIDS—into the increasingly medicalized field of HIV/AIDS prevention and care. Workgroup members identified possible ways in which sociology of sexualities research may continue to significantly contribute to the field of HIV/AIDS and the fight against the global pandemic. Below we provide a summary of the issues, concerns, and recommendations discussed by our workgroup.

II.   HIV PREVENTION STRATEGIES

Over the past 30 years, the emphasis has shifted back and forth between tailored and "one-size-fits-all" prevention strategies. A recent trend is the growing dominance of high impact medically-based, generic interventions (from adult male circumcision to pre-exposure prophylaxis, or PREP), and an emphasis on the "scaling up" of such interventions. Specifically in relation to the sexual transmission of HIV, biotechnologies and biomedical interventions are often perceived as being freer of stigma and of the behavioral "messiness" involved in condom promotion and safer sex negotiation. In recent critiques of behavioral interventions, social, cultural, and political/structural barriers toward condom use and safer sex, as well as the power inequalities that are common in sexual encounters, have been cited as producing a generalized "failure" of those behavioral strategies.

Rather than discounting the value of sexuality-based HIV prevention programs, it is imperative to investigate how sexuality- and behaviorally-based programs can work in tandem with biomedical technologies as part of comprehensive HIV prevention strategies. This is especially crucial since: (1) the medical strategies mentioned above all have important behavioral, social, cultural, and political components that may reduce their long-term effectiveness when implemented on the ground, and (2) ultimately, one of the goals of sexuality-based HIV

prevention programs has been the promotion of broader community-wide sexual well-being within which HIV prevention strategies (whether behavioral or medical) can be more easily incorporated. In other words, the long-term effectiveness of biomedical HIV prevention interventions depends to a large degree on sexuality-related community norms and on appropriate assessments of HIV risk on the part of individuals and their sexual partners. They also require individuals and communities to be able to combine biomedical interventions with other behavioral or culturally-based alternatives.

Sociologists of sexuality are well positioned to investigate the meanings of biomedical interventions, HIV medications, and monitoring tests (such as viral load and CD4 cell counts) within broader interpretations of sexuality, sexual roles, and sexual behavior. Sociological approaches are also well suited to studying the impact of biomedical interventions on HIV risk assessment and partner selection, and to understanding the shifting meanings of HIV and their influence on people's identities, sexualities, sexual behaviors, and HIV prevention strategies.

III. HARM REDUCTION, SEXUAL CULTURES, AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Within the framework described above, the workgroup identified the need to further investigate the effectiveness of harm reduction strategies, particularly those that help communities define which strategies may be most effective within their local social, political, and cultural landscapes. A better understanding of the processes that allow communities to select the right strategies seems crucial, including the creation of so-called intraventions—strategies that emerge from within the communities for which they are intended.

Questions remain about how best to balance the goals of harm reduction, cultural specificity, and the pursuit of social and cultural changes that may be enormously beneficial in terms of HIV prevention. Similarly, questions remain about the links between sexual cultures and social structures, and how best to consider the effects of both in designing shorter and longer-term goals for HIV prevention programs.

Sociological methods, particularly ethnographic and qualitative research methods, are well suited to studying these issues and to analyzing what communities are doing that is effective, as well as how communities can simultaneously pursue desirable social and cultural changes that are conducive to more effective HIV prevention and care.

IV. SEXUALITIES AND SEXUAL CULTURES

In the context of rapidly changing social and cultural conditions, the field still faces unanswered questions about basic aspects of the sexualities of groups and populations that have been deeply affected by HIV/AIDS. Important questions also remain also about how the field of HIV/AIDS itself has influenced people's sexualities over the past three decades.

More research is needed on the emergence of new sexual categories and identities, including those that have been prompted by professionals and by the field of HIV itself (such as the now ubiquitous category of "MSM") or by popular discourses and the media (such as the widespread popularization of the "down low" as a sexual category). Questions thus persist about the mutually-constitutive relationship between HIV-related categorization and sexual identities, as well as about the continued association of HIV with only certain sexual groups deemed to be at greater risk. What groups are effectively excluded? And what groups—such as trans women—become blended with others and thus also excluded?

Broader questions about cultural practices and adaptations to the presence of HIV in communities also remain understudied. For example, what role does the strategy of "serosorting" play in the construction of specific sexual subgroups and forms of sexual interaction? How may the introduction of pre-exposure prophylaxis alter sexual meanings and categories? How are Internet-based social networks, and practices such as "sexting," altering existing patterns of sexual interaction?

Consideration of the fact that sexual cultures do not just pop out of nowhere, and developing a deeper understanding of what informs cultural sexual practices, what shapes diversity within specific cultural groups, and how boundaries between sexual categories are generated, remain especially relevant for the field of HIV/AIDS. Similarly, research on the topics of sexual and romantic intimacy and the dynamics of different kinds of relationships remains immensely important.

Finally, there is a need to recognize that people often inhabit multiple cultures, participate in multiple cultural and social contexts, and adapt HIV prevention strategies to different and specific situations, often in a manner consistent with harm reduction. Sociologists of sexuality

are particularly well equipped to investigate the construction of meanings that are crucial to understanding how people organize their sexual lives and participate in intimate relations.

V.   THE PERSISTENCE OF HIV STIGMA

HIV-related stigma continues to affect individuals and communities and impedes the implementation of fully effective programs against HIV. Investigating the social causes and consequences of HIV stigma, as well as the association between HIV stigma and socially-marginalized sexualities, identities, and behaviors (including drug use) should continue to be a priority. Even now, more than thirty years into the global epidemic, the social stigmatization of HIV pervasively prevents groups and communities from addressing the epidemic more openly, and also negatively influences the ability of individuals to discuss HIV-risk reduction measures with their sexual partners.

VI.   INSTITUTIONS, ORGANIZATIONS, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, AND POLICY

Over the past thirty years, the global response to HIV/AIDS has created a complex network of relations among activists, community-based organizations, state institutions, the medical establishment, international organizations, and funding agencies. There is a need to analyze the current overall institutional structure that surrounds the creation and implementation of HIV-related programs at different levels, from the local, to the national, to the international. How do organizations change and adapt as funding streams change? How do those changes affect the implementation of efforts to curb the epidemic on the ground? How do large institutions relate to activists and smaller grassroots groups? Which voices get to be articulated and heard within the global fights against HIV/AIDS? What roles do activists, pharmaceutical companies, and intellectual property regimes play in the efforts to achieve global access to HIV/AIDS treatments?

Workgroup members noted the important role of policy and the law in fostering or possibly stifling efforts against HIV/AIDS, and in particular the growing role of the criminalization of HIV, which competes with the implementation of HIV antidiscrimination policies. Questions about the influence of incarceration on the epidemic, about the connections between the legal aspects of AIDS and HIV stigma, about the criminalization of substance use, and about the overall effects of these various policies on communities affected by HIV/AIDS were also raised.

Workgroup members also highlighted the lack of attention given to the sociological aspects of HIV in the legal literature.

Also noted was the decreasing understanding of the current role of social movements and activism in the global fight against HIV/AIDS. Workgroup members recognized that over time it has become harder to define the boundaries between activists/social movements and institutions, and expressed concern about a perceived growing co-optation of grassroots efforts within the institutional makeup of the response to the global epidemic. The absence of strong activist responses from new groups that are increasingly and disproportionately affected by HIV/AIDS was also of concern.

VII. THE SOCIAL EFFECTS OF HIV/AIDS AND SOCIAL INEQUALITY

During the past few years there has been growing interest on the structural aspects of HIV/AIDS, particularly on the effects of social inequality and poverty on the spread of the virus and the unequal access to HIV/AIDS care. What are the structures that keep groups at a disadvantage, and in a position where they continue to be at risk for HIV or vulnerable to disease progression? More research is also needed on the effects of AIDS on social life, for example on the effects of the epidemic on the family structure, and on family and community life.

Given that structural inequalities are often experienced through culture (in the forms of racism, homophobia, and gender discrimination), there is a need to further examine the relationship between structural and cultural aspects of HIV/AIDS. Such linkages would reduce the common separation of cultural and structural factors in analyses of HIV risk and care. Sociologists of sexuality are in a particularly good position to help facilitate such pursuits. Additionally, it is crucial to further understand the relationship between structural issues and the formation of sexual networks, as well as how those connections may foster protection against the virus or hinder it.

VIII. LINKAGES BETWEEN HIV PREVENTION AND CARE

The growing conception of a continuum of HIV prevention and care needs further investigation from a sociological perspective, in particular in relation to the place of sexuality within such a

continuum. The workgroup raised questions about the shifting relationships between HIV testing and sexuality: Who is at risk for HIV and when should individuals be considered candidates to enter the HIV prevention and care continuum? What criteria should determine priorities in terms of who should be tested? What groups tend to be excluded and why? To what degree is the notion of sexuality-based or behavior-based "risk groups" still relevant? Workgroup members emphasized the need for further research about several related topics, including the consequences of the growing criminalization of HIV on testing; the social consequences of mandatory testing; the sociology of "treat and care" models, and the sociological aspects of HIV home testing.

IX. HIV/AIDS AND GLOBAL PROCESSES

Adequate analyses of the various issues discussed throughout require consideration of sociopolitical and cultural forces that operate at the local, national, transnational, and global levels. With HIV/AIDS now affecting every corner of the globe, HIV/AIDS related outcomes are influenced both by local and global processes, including the effects of international funding mechanisms; programs and recommendations created by global organizations and pharmaceutical corporations; trading agreements and patents; and international research projects. Those processes also include the effects of population movement—in the forms of tourism and migration—across international borders.

WORKING PAPER ON **CRITICAL HETEROSEXUALITIES**

Coordinator: Melanie Heath

with: Travis Beaver, Nancy Fisher, Bruce Nordstrom-Loeb, and Brandy Simula

Does the term heterosexuality assume that only one form of sexuality is legitimate, acceptable, and privileged, while others are deviant and stigmatized? Is heterosexuality "compulsory" in the sense that resistance to heterosexual identity, behavior, and cultural images is rare, costly, and perhaps often virtually unthinkable? Seeking to answer such questions, critical heterosexuality scholarship problematizes commonsense understandings of heterosexuality as a dominant norm to investigate the diversity of meanings, social arrangements, and hierarchies within this category.

The intellectual roots of the critical study of heterosexuality can be traced back to Sigmund Freud's theory of sexuality in the early 20th century. Freud argued that heterosexuality is not inherent but is instead produced through a complex and difficult process of psychosocial development. His theory broke with earlier theoretical accounts of sexologists who viewed sexuality as a natural instinct stemming from a reproductive imperative (Weeks 1985, Katz 1995). Despite the subversive potential of this denaturalizing of heterosexuality, however, Freud maintained that "normal" development resulted in desire for the "opposite" sex and that homosexuality was a sign of an immature or arrested development. In contrast to Freud, Alfred Kinsey's Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, published in 1948, challenged the labeling of some forms of sexuality as "normal" and others as "abnormal." Kinsey argued that the discrete categories of "heterosexual" and "homosexual" are a social construction, marking a continuum between the poles of exclusive heterosexuality and exclusive homosexuality.

While Kinsey's work contested the naturalness and even the reality of exclusive heterosexuality, his research lacked a critique of heterosexuality as an institution. This more recent emphasis arose out of the gay liberation, radical feminist, and lesbian feminist movements in the 1970s prior to its emergence in the academy (Katz 1995). Within the academy, Gayle Rubin's (1975) essay "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex" argued that the social division of labor by sex produced gender differences, made particular forms of heterosexuality "obligatory," and resulted in women's oppression. Monica Wittig's

(1992) essays in the mid-1970s also provided early examples of an explicit naming of heterosexuality as an institution and a "political regime" that produces the distinction between the sexes while leading to men's dominance over and exploitation of women. Similarly, Adrienne Rich's (1980) classic essay "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence" argued that heterosexuality must be studied as a political institution based on the coercion of women into exploitative relationships that benefit men physically, economically, and emotionally, while at the same time prevents women from developing alliances and intimate relationships with one another. Taken together, this early work exemplifies key aspects of the critical study of heterosexuality: first, that heterosexuality is an institution that requires explicit study and naming and second, that unequal power relations between men and women are embedded within and produced by this institution.

Studying heterosexuality as a social institution means that heterosexuality operates as a highly structured social arrangement; it is an organized set of social practices that guide the behavior of large numbers of people through norms, rules and rituals (Ingraham 2002). Because institutionalized heterosexuality is highly norm- and rule-bound, it must be learned through socialization. Mothers talk to their children in ways that romanticize opposite-sex relationships, while making same-sex relationships invisible (Martin 2009), while fathers raise their sons to perform masculinity in ways that are "as heterosexual as possible" (Solebello and Elliott 2011). This illustrates how heterosexuality is institutionalized in ways that reflect distinct power relations between men and women, and between heterosexuals and homosexuals (and any non-straight identities that fall between). Moreover, institutionalized heterosexuality creates hierarchies amongst heterosexuals themselves, according to those who fall closest to a coupled, monogamous ideal (Seidman 2005).

There is a close conceptual relationship between institutionalized heterosexuality and heteronormativity. Heteronormativity serves as the organizing principle of institutionalized heterosexuality. Also known as "normative heterosexuality," this concept captures the privileging of heterosexuality throughout social life. Heterosexuality is often regarded as naturally occurring, normal and not in need of explanation. For example, many bureaucratic forms ask citizens to supply information about their marital status, even when such information - married, divorced, widowed, never married - is not relevant or particularly useful (Ingraham 2002). Yet these mundane social practices communicate that heterosexual coupling (and coupling generally) is the norm and that all other relationships either do not count (a gay couple

of 20 years is simply two individuals who are classified as "never married") or that they garner lesser social status and respect. While the two concepts are closely related, institutionalized heterosexuality is not reducible to heteronormativity since not all of the ways that institutional regulation takes place can be explained in terms of normative heterosexuality (Jackson 2006a). There are multiple sites where institutionalized heterosexuality is visible, including the family (Martin 2009; Solebello and Elliott 2011); popular culture (Ingraham 2008); schools (Myers and Raymond 2010) and the state, which is particularly significant.

In this regard, critical heterosexual scholars examine how the reproduction of normative heterosexuality structures law and social life. In particular, social policy is seen as an important site where 'truths' about sexuality are contested, challenged, and transformed. This scholarship questions the universal acceptance in social policy and law of sexuality as heterosexual, 'normal', 'natural' and fixed, an assumption that reinforces heterosexual norms and relations. It further critiques mainstream work on the family which often ignores non-nuclear family forms and fails to take into account service and welfare provision based on non-universalistic family forms.

Important scholarship in this area includes Ingraham (1999), who theorizes "the wedding industrial complex" as a structure that sits at the nexus of associations among weddings, marriage, the state, religion, media, and popular culture. Theorizing from a critical heterosexuality perspective, Heath (2009, 2012) studied marriage promotion politics in the United States as a case where federal and state actors enact policies to reinstate the heterosexual, nuclear family in American culture. Canaday (2009) offers another example of scholarship in considering the relationship of the state to producing homosexual identities. She sheds light on the importance of state-building processes, specifically arguing that the relatively late growth of the American state, coinciding with the emergence of new homosexual identities, explains why "the American bureaucracy was so much more homophobic than its [longer established] corollaries in western Europe" (p. 258). This scholarship attests to the ways that sexuality is intimately connected with state practices and social policy.

Critical heterosexuality studies emphasize that heterosexuality is not a monolithic category and seeks to examine the diversity of practices and identities associated with it (Hockey, et al. 2007; Richardson 1996a). Scholarship that investigates the diversity of heterosexual identities and practices often intersects with studies of the diversity of gender identifications and

performances (Ingraham 1994; Jackson 1999; Jackson 2006a; Jackson 2006b; Richardson 1996b; Wiegman 2006). While critical studies of heterosexuality, rooted in feminist theory, have long examined the ways that women who identify as heterosexual experience heterosexuality, more recent work has focused on the diversity of men's heterosexual identification and practices. Dean (2007), for example, examines the diversity of ways that straight-identified men perform gender and sexuality and finds that for some men, explicitly rejecting homophobia and the conflation of gender and sexuality is a part of their heterosexual identities. Scholars working within critical heterosexuality studies have also examined the possibilities of constructing and inhabiting non-oppressive heterosexualities (Hollway 1996; Jackson 1996a). Some have argued that anti-heteronormative identities, including critical heterosexual identities, can be understood as queer identities (Smith 2000) or that individuals who occupy those positions might be understood as "straight queers" (Thomas 2000). In so doing, this scholarship critiques and expands both "queer" and "heterosexual" as conceptual tools and identity categories, pointing to the diversity of meanings within as well as across those categories.

REFERENCES

Canaday, Margot. 2009. The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dean, James. 2007. Straight men. In Introducing the New Sexuality Studies, edited by S. Seidman, N. Fischer and C. Meeks. New York: Routledge.

Heath, Melanie. 2009. State of our Unions: Marriage Promotion and the Contested Power of Heterosexuality." Gender & Society 23 (1): 27-48.

-------. 2012. One Marriage Under God: The Campaign to Promote Marriage in America. New York: New York University Press.

Hockey, Jenny, Angela Meah, and Victoria Robinson. 2007. Mundane Heterosexualities: From Theory to Practices. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hollway, Wendy. 1996. "Recognition and Heterosexual Desire." In Theorising Heterosexuality, edited by D. Richardson. Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

Ingraham, Chrys. 1994. "The Heterosexual Imaginary: Feminist Sociology and Theories of Gender." Sociological Theory 12: 203-19.

-------. 2002. "Heterosexuality: It's Just Not Natural!" in S. Seidman and D. Richardson, eds. Handbook of Gay and Lesbian Studies, Sage Publications.

-------. 2008. 2nd ed. White Weddings: Romancing Heterosexuality in Popular Culture. New York: Routledge.

Jackson, Stevi. 1996. "Heterosexuality and Feminist Theory." In Theorising Heterosexuality: Telling it Straight, edited by D. Richardson. Buckingham: Open University.

-------. 1999. Heterosexuality in Question. London: Sage.

-------. 2006a. "Interchanges: Gender, Sexuality and Heterosexuality: The Complexity (and Limits) of Heteronormativity." Feminist Theory, 2006 7: 105-121.

-------. 2006b. "Heterosexuality, Sexuality, and Gender: Re-thinking the Intersections." In Intersections Between Feminist and Queer Theory, edited by D. Richardson, J. McLaughlin and M. E. Casey. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Katz, Jonathan Ned. 1995. The Invention of Heterosexuality. New York: Plume.

Martin, Karin. 2009. "Normalizing Heterosexuality: Mothers' Assumptions, Talk, and Strategies with Young Children." American Sociological Review, 74:2: 190-207.

Myers, Kristin and Laura Raymond. 2010. "Elementary School Girls and Heteronormativity: The Girl Project. Gender & Society 24: 167-188.

Rich, Adrienne. 1980. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." Signs 5(4):631-60.

Richardson, Diane. 1996a. "Heterosexuality and Social Theory." In Theorising Heterosexuality, edited by D. Richardson. London: Open University Press.

Richardson, Diane, ed. 1996b. Theorising Heterosexuality. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Rubin, Gayle. 1975. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." Pp. 157-210 in Toward an Anthropology of Women, edited by R. Reiter. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Seidman, Steven. 2005. "From the Polluted Homosexual to the Normal Gay: Changing Patterns of Sexual Regulation in America" in C. Ingraham, ed. Thinking Straight: New Work in Critical Heterosexuality Studies, pp. 39-62. New York: Routledge.

Smith, Clyde. 2000. "How I Became a Queer Heterosexual." In Straight with a Twist: Queer Theory and the Subject of Heterosexuality, edited by C. Thomas. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Solebello, Nicholas and Sinikka Elliott. 2011. "'We Want Them to Be as Heterosexual as Possible' Fathers Talk about Their Teen Children's Sexuality." Gender & Society 25:3:293-315.

Thomas, Calvin. 2000. ed. Straight with a Twist: Queer Theory and the Subject of Heterosexuality. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Weeks, Jeffrey. 1985. Sexuality and Its Discontents: Meanings, Myths, and Modern Sexualities. New York: Routledge.

Wiegman, Robyn. 2006. "Heteronormativity and the Desire for Gender." Feminist Theory 7: 89-103.

Wittig, Monica. 1992. The Straight Mind and Other Essays. Boston: Beacon Press.

WORKING PAPER ON **ETHNOGRAPHIC & INTERVIEW METHODS**

Coordinator: CJ Pascoe

I. INTRODUCTION

The key questions and challenges confronting those who conduct qualitative research on sexuality involve issues of mentorship, institutional review boards, the positionality of the researcher and the integration of mediated communication and cultures. To address these challenges we suggest that this subfield is in need of a queer research method that speaks specifically to issues of qualitative social science research.

II. MENTORSHIP

The key theme that this work group repeatedly returned was the issue of mentorship. In our discussions it became increasingly clear that many of us who do this sort of research suffer from a lack of mentorship. This sense was shared by those of us in graduate school as well as those who are working in tenure track positions. Our discussions revealed that many of us who research sexuality are mentored by those whose primary focus is gender. Additionally, because sexuality (especially when it is researched using qualitative methods) is a marginal topic, it may be that those who research this topic end up not at research universities mentoring graduate students, but at liberal arts colleges. Interestingly, one of the members of our group did not even research sexuality, but came to the conference to develop tools such that she could better mentor her students who did focus on sexuality. This lack of mentorship is especially noticeable in terms of qualitative research on sexuality, because, while a faculty member who has not been well versed in the topic can read texts related to the topic, actually having done the research and experienced the pitfalls that are a part of it is essential to effective mentoring relationships.

We anticipate that this will be a theme that may cross workgroups. As such we propose that some sort of institutional mentoring system be set up. Whether it be lunches that pair junior and senior scholars at yearly meetings or facilitating an online space like a discussion board or email list, such a system is necessary because of the institutional and professional barriers that stand in the way of connecting senior scholars and junior scholars who research sexuality.

III. THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

Some of the issues raised in qualitative inquiries into the subject of sexuality are not so different that the questions raised by qualitative research into other topics – the role of the research as a fraught one for instance. Sexuality researchers investigate intimate and often private, practices and identities. Thus they are in a particularly interesting place in which their own sexual identities, practices and performances are read by those they are researching in a variety of ways. These components of sexuality are often read through gendered performances that may effect the research in ways that are not always predictable.

It seems that some aspects of the researcher's own identity may be salient in this type of research in a way it is not in other projects. Issues of touch and physical and emotional boundaries may, for instance, be especially fraught when research sexuality. That is, we may be researching incredibly intimate portions of our subjects' lives, but, at the same time, researchers draw particular boundaries between themselves and their subjects. The question becomes, when, how, and why do researchers draw particular boundaries when researching these types of intimate topics. Similarly, to what extent is the researcher a resource for populations with limited access to other information and expertise? That is, at the same time that sexuality researchers are gathering information, their subjects often look to them as experts, looking for resources about particular identities, orientations, practices and beliefs.

IV. NAVIGATING INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARDS

Related to the issue of mentorship is the more specific issue of how one navigates institutional review boards when researching a "suspect" area such as sexuality that may involve observing or asking questions about areas that such boards may consider "off limits." This challenge is compounded when, as is often the case, there are no qualitative researchers on a given school's institutional review board. In those cases it seems that certain words or phrases (sexuality, observation etc.) can act as triggers for institutional review boards to deny a project approve. This challenge again speaks to the need for a more formal mentorship mechanism by which sexualities scholars can share "tricks of the trade," a la Becker, about how to explain their efforts at qualitative inquiry in ways that institutional review boards can understand.

V. MEDIATED CULTURES

With the rise of mediated communication and culture comes a reconfiguring of public and private spaces that historically may have characterized specific information preserves. This has particular implications for researching something typically considered to belong to the realm of the private, like sexuality. Thus, we ask, how does the rise of mediated cultures require a rethinking of qualitative methods in terms of privacy, confidentiality, the use of image, replicability, the ability to reach marginalized populations and range of information that counts as "data?" Institutional review boards are woefully unprepared to deal with mediated environments, information and communities. Given these challenges, those who research sexuality and those who research new media may have something to say to one another. To that end, we include here the address for the site for best research practices from the Association of Internet Researchers. As of right now the list of best practices is still being developed by AoIR members, but we anticipate that it will serve as a useful resource for sexuality researchers in the future.

VI. A QUEER RESEARCH ETHIC

Given these methodological challenges, we suggest that it might be time to think about developing a queer research ethics. Much like feminist methods has critiqued positivist and seemingly objective research methods, to what extent might a queer research method be a useful concept? What might it include? How might it critique, build upon, draw from or contradict feminist methods? Given our discussions, the development of such a method seems to be the next necessary development in this subfield.

WORKING PAPER ON **SEXUALITY, LAW & CITIZENSHIP**

Coordinator: David Paternotte

with: Mary Bernstein, Ann Horwitz, Crystal Jackson, Emily Kazyak, Stefan Lucke, Jessica Penwell, Demetrios Psihopaidas, Bridgett Royer, Heidy Sarabia, Mary Neil Trautner, Anna Van der Vleuten, and Jill Weinberg.

I.   INTRODUCTION

During the conference "Crossing Boundaries, Workshopping Sexualities", organized in August 2012 in Denver by the ASA Sexualities Section, scholars gathered in the work group "Sexuality, Law, Citizenship" identified the following theoretical and methodological challenges, as well as promising areas for future research. This report is structured in five thematic sections: law, citizenship, state, methodological challenges, and future research. In each section, central questions have been identified.

II.   LAW & SEXUALITY

a.   *How does the law construct sexuality?*

As illustrated by current debates about same-sex marriage, this question relates to the influence of the law on people's lives. For instance, does legal equality foster a major acceptance of same-sex relations? Does it promote the normalization of queer lives? It also raises the following questions: is there a disjunction between court decisions and people's experiences? How do legal texts interact with cultural and social understandings of the law?

b.   *Can sociology bring something new to the study of the law?*

Participants insist on the need to historicize and "sociologize" legal studies. The gap between the social and legal study of deviance shows for instance the difference sociology can bring. It is also crucial to understand why a law/court decision is proposed or adopted, why and how its interpretation and its application evolve through time and across social spheres.

c. *How does the law construct personality?*

Legal studies often rely on a poor and formal understanding of the person. In the same vein, the law tends to turn personal and intimate debates into abstract and/or principled discussions, as shown by controversies over privacy.

d. *What are the relations and the intersections between the law and other sets of rules and norms?*

This question unveils the complex relationship between the law and moral ideas.

e. *How does the law construct deviants through criminalization and victimization?*

This is a classic sociological point, which has been developed for instance in the study of homosexuality. It also relevant to other sexual categories, such as sex workers or barebackers.

f. *How different legal structures and legal systems interact and influence social movements' strategies?*

The study of same-sex marriage advocacy strategies reveals that activists build their strategies in accordance with the legal system of their own country (existence of a bill of rights, legal federalism, etc). Legal structures also influence movement successes. This insight applies to other struggles.

g. *What is the influence of legal professionals (judges, lawyers, etc.) in making and interpreting the law?*

This emphasizes the importance of legal actors, and underlines the need to study their social background, trajectory, etc. Research has revealed the key part of sympathetic judges or cause lawyers.

III. CITIZENSHIP & SEXUALITY

a. *What is the relation between citizenship rights and human rights?*

This is a canonical distinction in citizenship studies, which relies on the relation between rights and the state. We think it should be studied in more sociological terms. Current debates about transnational or supranational citizenship show that this distinction is currently under challenge. This should therefore become a central area of future research.

b. *What are the interactions between different levels of citizenship, particularly within federal state structures?*

> The increasing number of power levels impacts citizenship. Indeed, we can identify different sets of rights, which relate to specific institutional settings. This observation is not new in federal systems. However, it also applies beyond the state, as shown by the development of a European citizenship. Research should pay more attention to these multilevel interactions.

c. *How should we define the notion of citizenship?*

> Two issues have been discussed. First, can we go beyond a legal frame to think in sociological terms? Second, citizenship is a multidimensional concept. At least four dimensions may be identified: access (citizenship refers to access to rights and the ability to use them); obligations (there is a balance between rights and obligations, which is often forgotten is sociological research); identities (there is a model of the ideal citizen); a form of belonging (this is about who is a citizen and who is not).

d. *Do equal rights change the meaning of citizenship or the model of the ideal citizen?*

> This question is debated in the frame of current same-sex marriage discussions, but could be applied to other issues. It wonders whether legal equality changes the meaning of marriage and/or citizenship. A sociologist may not overlook the gap between legal and social equality. Similarly, he/she can neither isolate the law from the rest of society nor overlook structural constraints and impediments.

e. *What is the relation between citizenship and its (everyday life) experiences?*

> This question highlights areas of concern such as the commodification of sex or the relations between citizenship and consumption/consumerism.

IV. STATE(S) & SEXUALITY

Mirroring the discussion about the difference between human and citizenship rights, participants remind that both the law and citizenship cannot be understood without paying attention to the state.

a. *Does citizenship always rely on the state?*

Participants highlight that both decentralization and federalization processes and the development of multilevel forms of citizenship (such as the European citizenship) challenge the centrality of the state.

b. *What are the relations between the state and the public/private boundary?*

We need to explore the ways the state is shaped by this boundary, and how it simultaneously contributes to the definition of the public/private boundary.

c. *Does the understanding of the state vary spatially and historically?*

Research has shown that the LGBT movement, like other sexual social movements, has shifted from fighting the state because to claiming protection from the state. It has also revealed cross-national variations.

d. *What is the importance of welfare and social provisions to citizenship (including sexual citizenship)?*

This is often a key difference between the US and Europe, as shown both in the issues of same-sex marriage (and same-sex benefits) and prostitution.

V. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

a. *Ethnographic studies are needed.*

We need to explore people's legal experiences and understandings.

b. *We need to be cautious about potential ideological bias.*

Biases are often explained by the researcher's relation to specific laws and regulations, which must be unpacked. Similarly, researchers need to reflect on their relations to movement's and political agendas.

c. *How do we investigate and write about people we strongly like or dislike?*

Again, this problem is often linked to some kind of closeness to the actors or issues under study. This can lead researchers to depict actors as good or the evil ones.

d. *How can we write about illegal topics?*

This problem can be encountered both at a legal and a social level. It is for instance illustrated by research on youth and sexuality, pedophilia or prostitution.

e. *How can we deal with potential IRB obstacles?*

IRB can block research because of moral concerns, legal obstacles or misunderstandings. We need to think about ways to overcome such blockages.

f. *Is it possible to develop quantitative studies about citizenship and sexuality?*

We need to find ways to operationalize models, which are often drawn from political and social theory and therefore rather abstract.

g. *We need to think about the social and political impact of research.*

For instance, research can contribute to the way the history of sexual struggles is remembered and written about.

h. *How can we do research on elites and sexuality?*

This question mirrors difficulties to study elite circles in sociology, especially in the case of ethnographic research. It is for instance harder to get access to legal and political institutions or actors as well as to political parties, although it is often crucial to research about sexual citizenship.

i. *Language can be a problem*

There is a gap between legal, sociological and social understandings, which requires us to deconstruct concepts. In addition, our language needs to be understood by the people we want to investigate.

VI. FUTURE RESEARCH

a. *More intersectional research is needed, particularly about gender, race and class.*

b. *We need to improve our conceptualization of citizenship.*

We need to find ways to think about citizenship beyond a legal frame and beyond the state, as well as beyond an egalitarian frame (freedom, autonomy)

c. *The rationale beyond rights claims should be investigated, particularly biological accounts of sexual diversity.*

The strength of biological arguments can be seen as the failure of social constructionists to spread their understanding of sexuality beyond academic circles. It must be said that this biological understanding of sexuality is often encouraged by specific social and

institutional systems. This is particularly true in the US because of the legacy of the civil rights movement and the judicial system.

d. *More comparative and transnational research is needed to unveil what is specific to the US and what is shared with other countries*

WORKING PAPER ON **LGBTQ HISTORIES**

Coordinator: Amy Stone

The key theoretical questions that inform the sociological study of LGBTQ histories include broad questions about how LGBTQ life was constituted in the past. These include attempts to understand how LGBTQ communities, identities, social networks, sexual practices, and movement may differ from contemporary forms. Part of this investigation is dispelling heteronormative assumptions about past communities, individuals, and sexual practices.

The methodological concerns raised by working group members included poorly-maintained archives and negotiating oral histories with closeted LGBTQ individuals. Many group members discussed the need to collect their own archival materials or the necessity of working with local gay archivists who were "hoarders" or unprofessional. Much research is done in sexuality archives like the GLBT History Museum in San Francisco, CA, and the Cornell University Human Sexuality Collection. However, researching sexuality at non-sexuality archives was fraught with complications, as materials were at times buried, obscured, or otherwise unavailable. In the absence of written documents, oral histories are a critical method of collecting queer historical information. However, the challenges to oral history collection include working with older LGBTQ individuals who may be closeted, suffer from memory problems, or be unwilling to discuss taboo or unflattering subjects like racism, sex, and community divisions. Getting oral history narrators to discuss sex that happened before 1982 was especially challenging, due to changing sexual norms as a consequence of HIV/AIDS. Workgroup members shared strategies to deal with these methodological concerns, including working closely with local archivists, having confidential oral histories, and negotiating personal connections across generational divides.

Other methodological concerns included issues with analysis of documents and oral histories, particularly the tendency to read contemporary understandings of LGBTQ life, community and identity onto the past. For example, we risk being anachronistic when we project contemporary understanding of what it means to be transgender onto the experiences of women who lived as soldiers during the Civil War. Yet a complete denial of the potential similarities in the subject position of both contemporary transgender individuals and women who lived as soldiers may render history more heteronormative than it actually is. Remedies for this analytical issue

included deep contextualization of sexual lives, communities and identities in the broader social, cultural and political context of the time period.

Working group members identified several significant areas for future research. Much of the existing literature on LGBTQ histories is the history of white, middle class gay men (and occasionally lesbians) in Northern urban spaces. The working group identified the necessity of studying regions other than Northern metro areas like New York City, San Francisco and Los Angeles. These other regions included urban and rural life in other parts of the United States. There is also a lack of LGBTQ history written in English about other parts of the world, particularly the global South. In addition, working group members identified the need to analyze more seriously working class history and the history of African American, Latino, Native American, and Asian American LGBTQ communities in the United States.

WORKING PAPER ON **MEDIA & SEXUALITIES**

Coordinator: Mary L. Gray

with: Kate Averett (UT Austin), Katrina Bloch (Kent State) , Carlos Camacho (CUNY),
Carly Chillmon (UCSB), Sarah Crawley (Tampa), Patrick Grzanka (Arizona State),
Joy Hightower (UC Berkeley), Dana Kaplan, Matthew Morrison (UVA), Kerry Mulligan (UC Riverside),
Marshall Smith (UC Boulder), & Kara Takasaki

I. KEY CONCEPTS

A. *Spatial dimensions of sexualities and the shaping of sexualities through online and offline experiences*

1. A need to theorize online experiences: are they public vs private vs semi-public (how is privilege defined in these different spaces?); how might ranking tiers of media (e.g. big media as conservative and social media as third or second tier) change how we theorize sexualities in relation to these media contexts?

2. How to best address (and disrupt) the "online/offline" binary. What use is there in conceptualizing internet use as a practice (rather than the Internet as a thing, or alongside the Internet as space) might have in disrupting dichotomies such as online/offline, public/private, mainstream/peer-to-peer media?

B. *Community online*

1. Reckoning with community-building happening online and the shift from place to virtual community

2. How media practices inform/transform sexual expression and identity practices— how media practices inform/impinge upon existing social structure

C. *Commodification of sexualities vis-à-vis media*

1. (re)Conceptualizing media influence - moving beyond discussion of media imitating lived experience, lived experience imitating media to grapple with how media increasing integrated with life

2. Mapping and analyzing the creeping commodification of sexuality in media – approaching impossibility of privacy or control of online/digital self

3. The limits of sharing/sociology of "oversharing"

    a. online dating/online cruising – is it amplifying, preserving, or challenging racial, class, and sexual inequality (i.e., for the latter, is it deepening the closet? Helping people come out of the closet? Under what conditions?)

D. Representation

1. Who is represented, how authentic are the portrayals, and what does authenticity mean in a deeply mediated social world?

2. How do mainstream representations of sexualities have an effect on social attitudes?

3. How do depictions of sexuality in media relate to depictions of sexuality in other arenas of life? Media is more inclusive of diverse sexualities in that there are more routes for representation, but the legitimation of some media source over others still allows for homogeneity in the most frequent representations of sexuality (such as TV shows or news stories).

4. How do media representations and interactions affect the relationships between sexual minorities and racial minorities?

E. Conceptualizing media as a research context/institution

1. Is it useful to conceptualize the media as a conservative institution; if we're looking outside the mainstream, is it merely reflective vs. productive?

2. What differences are there in relation to media "platforms"—comparing TV, internet, etc.—and how should we address the social meaning of media convergence?

3. How best can we account for the historical context of media and its relationship to sexualities? For example, how might we compare classified ads, Craigslist, and Grindr and their comparative roles in cruising?

F. Media and social movement

1. What are the relationships between sexuality-based social movements and media?

II. MOST SIGNIFICANT AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A. What counts as data?

1. How do we assess boundaries of "authentic" data in the digital age?

B. Differences between face-to-face interactions and online interactions to collect data

1. How can face-to-face ethnographic interviews from prior eras be compared to virtual communities today? How do we trace community histories over time after the development of virtual community?

2. How does consumption of online media impact offline sexual behavior? What motivates individuals to produce sexual media content for online distribution and consumption?

C. Relationship between historical and contemporary research

1. Historical research, arguably, relies on the privileged archives of discursive construction (written texts). How do you get outside of these archives? How do we sort through the messages there and the claims that we can address?

D. How do media impact personal identity and social development

1. How do online media hinder/contribute to sexual development (or lack of, or even negative) self-esteem. For example, Instragram offers a first hand pictorial (e.g visual culture) account into how people see themselves. Digital media like these lend themselves to studying impression management in interactional/collaborative spaces.

2. How does the internet operate as a mobilizing tool (who has access and who doesn't) and how does this use intersect other key identities, like race, SES, etc.

E. Relationship between understandings of identities and their mediation (production, circulation, consumption) in mainstream and digital contexts

1. How are mass-mediated discourses about sexuality shaping, being co-opted -- or, even more radically, becoming -- neoliberal discourses on civil rights in the U.S.?

2. How can queer media scholars bridge/undermine/disrupt the (modernist) divide between representations of equality and those structures of inequality themselves, which implies a linear trajectory from "reality" to "media" and back again (or vice versa).

F. Access to "vulnerable" populations and ethical concerns

1. New media give us unprecedented access to user generated content. How do we access this content respectfully and where/when do we need to seek consent to access this information?

2. New media also give us access to marginalized groups' content. Do we need different sets of guidelines and practices around analyzing and accessing this kind of data?

3. How do we contend with the filtering and corporate (other institutional) control of media? How do we account for the institutional capability to exclude/limit particular sexual content?

4. How do we address the privacy/surveillance concerns of more vulnerable communities that might be raised by our research of them online, especially given a sex negative culture?

G. Dating and cruising/sexual practices

1. How might we understand people's experiences with online dating/online cruising, especially in terms of class, race, and the closet?

2. Is online dating amplifying, preserving or challenging sexual, racial, other inequality?

3. How do we think about the complicated role media play in strengthening or weakening ties (how does intimacy works in relation to media). How do we measure that?

H. How does place figure into our research

1. Place is important (if overlooked in research) for sexuality and should be an important area for future research on digital media/sexuality

2. How might we think differently about the digital divide beyond a frame of is it "present or absent"

3. What are the critical differences for those "plugged in" and different ways of being plugged in that circulate among sexual subcultures/communities?

4. How do visual cultures of sexuality norms and queer representations of possibilities—audience and sexualities—construct a self with a broader audience in mind and a self that is more viewable/distributed across space and time?

5. What are the relationships between digital media producers and digital media consumers, and how do digital media practices (e.g. blogging) shape counter discourses and new norms around sexuality?

6. Has privacy become a new privilege and what is its relationship to sexual practices and identities?

A. Qualitative research ethics

1. How do we conduct qualitative, particularly ethnographic, rigorous work in an institutional setting that is increasingly hostile to qualitative research (the IRB process!)

2. How do we improve our methods in queer media studies while attending to the sometimes contradictory interests of empirical rigor and analytic complexity?

3. How do we address the attendant political issues that are always implicated in questions of risk, security, public/private, privilege, etc. when developing and executing queer media projects?

B. Publication and dissemination

1. How do we engage in dialogue with non-academics so that our research reaches a broader audience?

2. How do we properly anonymize, cite, or give proper attribution to media texts (i.e., blogs, discussion boards, Facebook pages) and user generated content as primary rather than secondary sources?

3. How do we expand the presence of peer reviewed, open access journals to distribute sexuality studies beyond sociology?

C. Navigating the IRB and ethics of access:

1. How do we tackle taboo topics, youth sexualities, and illegality and successfully navigate the IRB process at the same time?

2. How do we make sure that IRB processes around sexuality studies are standardized across all institutions so that all researchers have an equal opportunity to do this research?

3. How do we help IRBs reimagine what constitutes "public" vs. "private"

4. How do we practice transparency as researchers in an online space (what does positionality mean when you're online?)

5. What are best practices around longitudinal studies of mediated spaces and how would these compare to face-to-face interviews?

6. What are the limits of ethnography conducted solely online (is rigorous net-nography possible?)

7. What difference does the media make to the interview process?

8. How to document adolescent consumption of porn—how is that impacting maturity?
9. How to bring class and SES to the forefront in queer media studies?

WORKING PAPER ON **QUEER OF COLOR APPROACHES**

Coordinator: Roderick Ferguson

The conversation with the queer of color working group touched on the following themes: 1) intersectionality and its relationship to sociological investigation, 2) the epistemological pressures that the study of sexuality puts on the field of sociology, 3) sociology as an expression of power/knowledge, 4) sociology and quantitative methodologies, and 5) institutionalizing an "open" sociology.

When the question of interpretive frameworks and theory was posed, there was immediately a discussion about theorizations of intersectionality. That discussion was organized around needing work that grapples with the "life-span" and "migration" of the category, particularly for the discipline of sociology. To this extent, the working group asked the following questions: Where has the discipline been with the category? Where are we now with it? Where should the category go next in an effort to advance the sociology of sexuality? This question also evolved into a conversation about clarifying the sociological locations (classes, journal issues, books, etc.) that can observe the life of the category within and outside the field of sociology.

The conversation also turned to the epistemological pressures that the study of sexuality might place on sociology. To this end, the group cited sexuality as a mode of intellection that could cause aesthetic and media culture to be taken more seriously. Several members noted what they perceived to be sociologists' inability to talk about the social nature of aesthetic production (i.e. cultural texts, films, art) and how that inability produces distances between sociology and what interdisciplinary fields are able to do with the study of sexuality as a cultural and aesthetic formation. Members thought this kind of pressure would not only be for the good of the subfield of the sociology of sexuality but for the good of sociology in general.

There was also lively conversation about using the sociology of sexuality studies to interrogate the power/knowledge configurations within the discipline of sociology. In this way, members saw sexuality as not only an interest that can direct scholarly attention to social practices and identities but as a provocation for the discipline to engage in a rigorous self-reflection about how its history and articulations are founded on discourses of sexuality. In this way, members believed that sexuality could be a model for how sociology might engage in immanent critique.

The question of methodology also invited reflection on ways to produce a critical regard for methodology, one that critiques objectivity and rigor without throwing out the usefulness of methodologies. One of the participants noted that queer of color approaches seem to prod us to think more expansively about methodology. This observation moved into a discussion about putting quantitative methods and queer theory together. Part of that conversation rebutted the notion that the quantitative methods and queer theory are irreconcilably different. Some of the questions that came out of that conversation related to quantitative methods specifically. Those questions revolved around the larger question of how do we inflect quantitative measures so that they are in conversation with work on the intersections of race, gender, and sexuality?

The group was most united around the fact that queer of color approaches have to be about protecting the broadest, most democratic and open definitions of sociology, noting the ways in which restrictive definitions of sociology have been tools for regulating sociological work on sexuality. The group recommended that the Sociology of Sexuality Section assume greater accountability in protecting the openness of sociology, that is, it's interest in other disciplines and fields, its experimentation with prose-styles and idioms. The group ended by considering what might be institutional embodiments of that openness. As a result, the group recommended that the section consider starting a journal to develop the sociology of sexuality as a model for the most democratic, interdisciplinary, and open sociology out there. The group also recommended that the section begin a syllabus database that would collect and collate syllabi from around the country that addressed sociology's relationship to sexuality, in general, and intersectional work, in particular.

WORKING PAPER ON **SEX WORK / TRAFFICKING**

Coordinator: Barb Brents

with: Elizabeth Bernstein (Barnard), Hae Yeon Choo (U of Toronto), Denise Cook (UNLV),

Kimberly Hoang (Rice U), Lauren Joseph (Penn State), Kari Lerum (UW-Bothell) , Chaitanya

Lakkimseti (USC), Greggor Mattson (Oberlin), Maren Scull (IU) Sarah Beer (U of Windsor),

& Tina Wu (UPenn)

I.   INTRODUCTION

This position paper is a primer on research trends and tensions in the study of sex work and human trafficking. Our intent is not to provide an exhaustive review but rather an overview of the current state of the field based on the authors' expertise. This paper is divided into four sections: First we introduce the cultural and political roots of the study of sex work and trafficking. Next we define terms and identify key theoretical issues and debates. Third, we point to methodological needs and challenges to studies of sex work and human trafficking. Finally, we point to several areas in need of more research.

II.   OVERVIEW OF THE FIELD

Scholarly studies of sex work have exploded since the 1990s, moving far beyond a simplistic radical feminist 'women as victim/men as exploiters' paradigm that framed early work. Contemporary sociological studies of sex work have moved toward intersectional analyses (race, class, sexualities and gendered systems); these studies as a whole also emphasize inductive understandings of gender and sexuality paired with new theoretical understandings of desire, discourse, institutions and inequalities. Concurrent with a shift in theoretical frameworks many scholars have moved away from solely individual level questions that interrogate psychological motivations (e.g. why do people become prostitutes?) to questions that engage organizational and structural levels of analysis (e.g. what is the organization of sex work in this setting? How is the organization of sex work impacted by globalization? How are global economies impacted by sexual commerce? How is sex work similar to and different from other kinds of service, body or emotion work? How and why have political discourses of sex work shifted?). While the

questions are different in the fields of public and global health, researchers in these fields have as well begun to move toward contextual and structural units of analysis. In general we see researchers in sociology drawing on a much wider variety of subfields to understand sex work; we also see sexual commerce as important to understanding larger social and cultural trends.

III. KEY THEORETICAL QUESTIONS

Defining sex work: While sex work is often equated with prostitution, sex work includes many kinds of work, a variety of commercial exchanges, and involves a wide array of institutions. Sex work scholars refer to sex work as sexual products, sexual services, sexual fantasies and/or sexual contact produced in exchange for financial or material goods. Sex work includes a variety of forms including: pornography, sex chat lines, sexually explicit live internet video, exotic dance, erotic massage, BDSM, and survival sex work (exchanging services for food, clothing, or other goods). Scholars note great diversity in sexual commerce, especially the wide range of individuals, identities and practices involved. Importantly, the study of sexual commerce implicates the doing of sex work, but also the culture, politics, institutions, values and markets that frame and define the intersection of intimacy and markets.

Political and theoretical context: The Sex Wars between anti-pornography/prostitution feminists and pro-sex feminists in the late 1970s and early 1980s figure into contemporary debates around the issue of sex trafficking. Since the early 2000s the issue of human trafficking has captivated governments, NGOs, researchers, and activists around the world. Images of women in handcuffs and chains circulate through print, television, and online news outlets, portraying trafficked women as victims of Third World poverty who are kidnapped, sold, or forced into sex work. Anti-prostitution activists (who have recently renamed themselves "new Abolitionists") have deployed these images to underscore that most or all sex work is inherently degrading and is a result of coercion and sexual exploitation of women and girls. The remedy from the abolitionists' perspective is to increase criminal penalties of clients and traffickers (pimps, employers), and to engage in aggressive "end the demand" (criminalization and shaming) campaigns to curb men's desire for purchasing sexual services from women.

In contrast, sex worker advocates caution against sweeping generalizations of human trafficking. They assert that not all sex workers are women and girls, not all clients are men, and that not all sex workers are trafficked or forced into sex work. In fact, many individuals

enter the sex trade because it provides them with more opportunities for mobility and income than other types of work. Sex worker advocates and scholars argue that abolitionist solutions and policies are misinformed by unreliable statistics, sensationalism, and binary gender assumptions. Advocates for sex workers also critique abolitionist and state sponsored efforts for: a lack of attention to human, labor, and immigrants rights; a lack of evidence-based interventions including harm reduction approaches advocated in public health; and the virtual exclusion of input from those affected by policies about trafficking and sex work: most notably trafficked persons and adult sex workers.

In sum, deep misunderstandings, tensions, and outright political battles have occurred between and amongst scholars and activists around the issues of sex work and human trafficking. As a result, perhaps more now than in the past several decades, contemporary researchers of sex work and human trafficking must be prepared to become embroiled in highly political debates. For those coming from sociological perspectives (e.g. those which emphasize how the meaning of sex work must be understood within particular institutional, political, and cultural contexts), this politicization may come with the politically expedient need for researchers to defend an absolute separation between the issues of sex work and trafficking. However just as social and political forces have created conflation between sex work and trafficking, so too have distinct boundaries between these categories been socially constructed. For social scientists it is empirically warranted to theorize all working conditions – including those for sex workers – as a complicated and contextualized continuum with may contain various aspects of privilege, agency, coercion, and structural constraint.

Sexual commerce as part of larger social processes: From our perspective the most exciting theoretical work in studies of sex work and trafficking are those which do not simply query "why" people engage in sexual commerce, but rather advances our understanding of how sexual commerce can be understood as a key part of larger historical and institutional trends and social processes. This includes theorizing how sex work is part of larger projects that both reproduces and subverts narratives of sexuality, gender, race and consumption in contemporary culture.

Several subfields of sociology and sexuality studies both can inform and be informed by this broader approach to studying sex work and trafficking. These include: 1) work and occupations including emotional and bodily labor 2) sexuality and queer theories of identity and desire, 3)

political discourse and moral panics, 4) globalization and political economy, 5) migration/immigration, 6) institutional and organizational processes, 7) social movements, 8) poverty and inequality, 9) criminal justice systems and ideology, 10) structural violence, 11) culture, religion, values and attitudes, and 12) policy, politics, and citizenship.

IV. METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Scholarly studies of sex work and human trafficking vary in focus, scope and methodology, within sociology and well as across other disciplines, and commonly include interview, ethnographic, and archival research methods. However, researchers studying sex work and sexual commerce face problems similar to those who study sexuality generally. Both researchers and those researched face severe stigma. There are challenges of access, problems with IRB, sexual harassment of researchers, and concerns with legitimacy. Also, importantly, the field is highly political and scholars must reconcile needs for advocacy with needs for systematic and reliable empirical research. While most sex work research has necessarily been qualitative (given the realities of hidden, stigmatized, and criminalized populations), many of the assertions from the abolitionist and anti-trafficking camps rely on quantitative claims, which have been critiqued as unreliable and feeding political "hype." Given the politicized nature of sex work and trafficking studies, it is critical for researchers to stay steady on several points including: being rigorous in all of our methods, striving for both validity and reliability of data; grounding all claims in sound empirical evidence and logic; striving for depth (understanding on context, process, and meaning) as well as breadth (quantitative generalizations), being transparent about our own positionalities, and intentional and transparent about our political alliances and community partners.

V. AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

While there is already a rich history of empirically sound and theoretically informed research on sex work, especially in the qualitative realm, including research which gestures to and has implications for trafficking policies, there is a dire need for even more research on sex work and human trafficking, particularly quantitative research. In addition, studies of program and policy practices are needed, including tracing the funding streams for corporate philanthropy, microfinance, moves to privatize aid, corporate models in funding, NGO uses of funding, street level outreach programs. Studies that situate sex work, sexual commerce and trafficking in

broad social contexts will continue to be important. Sex work scholarship is highly political and researchers face a number of challenges. Most importantly, studies need to point to practical ways to use existing funding and frames for action and research that will enhance workers rights and human rights.

WORKING PAPER ON **SEXUAL COMMUNITIES**

Coordinator: Eve Shapiro

The sexual communities working group sees the current field as driven by six overarching theoretical questions and attendant methodological challenges.

1. What are sexual communities and how do they fit in the context of other types of communities? As part of this question we ask, whether solidarity is a key component of a sexual community. What kinds of practices identify and distinguish different sexual communities? Methodologically scholars must address how to operationalize community, how to account for time, changes over time, and the impact of memory, and how to "see" absences in our conceptualization of community as well as in the make-up of sexual communities.

2. What are different types of sexual communities? Can a typology be developed? Methodologically we must examine how to capture sexual communities at local, regional, national and international levels as well as how to capture the overlap between communities.

3. What makes for a sexual community vs. other forms of social groups? What are the necessary constituent parts of a sexual community? Methodologically this raises questions about how to "see" community, and how to define community boundaries.

4. How are sexual communities organized? How does organization differ for face-to-face and online elements of a community? For scholars this raises questions about how to draw boundaries and identify membership in communities, how to get at hierarchies and their criteria (ideological, practical, etc.), and how to study online and face-to-face community elements and their relationship. We also draw focus to questions about how to draw on existing datasets (census data, membership rosters, etc.) and integrate these with observed community boundaries and constituents.

5. How are sexual communities negotiated internally and externally? How are legitimization processes internally and externally developed? Methodologically we must

address how to "see" diversity/tensions within communities as well as how to capture legitimization processes, researcher presence, standpoint, and intervention.

6. How do individuals, sexual communities and institutions shape each other? Scholars must also attend to the place of the researcher, and how to manage bias in who speaks with researchers. In addition to these methodological challenges we must develop new techniques to account for collective and individual memory as well as new ways of observing each level of analysis within communities.

In addition to these six key questions and methodological challenges we assert that the field must examine what shared assumptions are embedded in sexual communities research within sociology.

Future research in the field should:
1. Focus on how to broaden the methodological tools brought to bear on sexual communities.
2. Speak to other areas of sociology and bring scholarship on communities into conversation with each other more robustly.
3. Examine normative communities (e.g. heterosexual communities) as well as marginalized communities.
4. Interrogate both temporary and persistent sexual communities.
5. Develop more robust methodological approaches to manage researcher/community intersections.
6. Study power and privilege in relation to sexual communities, both internally and externally.

WORKING PAPER ON **SEXUAL HEALTH AND SCIENCE**

Coordinators: Laura Carpenter & Steven Epstein

I. INTRODUCTION

At our meetings during the "Crossing Boundaries, Workshopping Sexualities" conference sponsored by the ASA Sexualities Section, the members of the workgroup on sexual health and science sought to put forward a broad research agenda that would link sexuality studies, medical sociology, public health, and science and technology studies. We identified five significant clusters of research that together suggest a distinctive research agenda. In addition, we discussed three cross-cutting concerns: theoretical framing, methodological issues, and the politics and ethics of engagement. We summarize the research agenda and the cross-cutting concerns below.

RESEARCH AGENDA

II. EXPLORING THE CONCEPT OF SEXUAL HEALTH

The term "sexual health" begs definition and sociological scrutiny. What is sexual health? Who defines it? Are sexual health and reproductive health the same thing, or are they different? How should sociologists of sexuality position themselves in relation to the term sexual health? For example, it is up for discussion whether sociologists should seek to do sexual health research or study the ways various social actors make claims about sexual health—or both.

It is also important to understand how the discourses and practices of sexual health relate to those in other health domains. Do social actors view sexual health as similar to or different from other kinds of health? Does the meaning of sexual health change depending on whether we adopt concepts of health drawn from the field of public health or more individualistic notions of health?

In addition, we must examine the politics surrounding sexual health promotion and sexual health research. How does the availability (or absence) of funding shape research agendas

around sexual health? Does the "chilling effect" that often inhibits sexuality studies affect the study of sexual health? How do IRBs influence sexual health research?

III. SEXUALITY, SCIENCE, AND POLICY

Bringing together the study of sexuality, science, and policy allows us to ask important questions about the uses of science in public policymaking. What is the real-world impact of scientific claims about sexuality? Who are the "experts" in relation to sexuality? What constitutes expertise in this domain? What kinds of evidence are employed in the promotion of various agendas concerning sexual matters? What does it mean for policy regarding sexual health to be "evidence based"?

Pursuing research in this area implies close consideration of the consequences when experts become involved as policymakers, or when policymakers set themselves up as experts. Moreover, much remains to be learned about whether, how, and when the experiences of laypeople become validated knowledge in relation to sexual matters. Debates over sex education in public schools, access to and funding for birth control, and the treatment of sexually-transmitted infections are key sites for examining these dynamics.

IV. CHALLENGING "SEXUAL SCIENCE" AND ITS NATURALIZATION OF SEXUALITY

In An important topic for sociological investigation and critique is the power of the biological, biomedical, and sexological sciences to define and categorize sexuality in ways that are often reductionist, essentialist, and scientistic, leaving little room for more contextual and historicist understandings of sexuality. Sociologists should study such definitional and classificatory work, and try to challenge essentialism and notions of the "naturalness" of sexuality.

We encourage sociologists of sexuality to study the "looping effects" whereby individuals take up scientifically derived sexual categories; the processes of "biosociality" by which individuals form new social identities in relation to sexual illness categories; and the political utility of different claims made about sexual orientation (for example, whether such orientations are considered malleable or fixed).

We also need to think about our own relationship to biological research on sexuality. How should sociologists positions themselves in relation to research that locates sexuality in brain structures or in genetic markers? Should sociologists of sexuality embrace social scientific or epidemiological research that includes biomarkers such as testosterone levels? What is our approach to research such as phallometry that uses formal technologies to measure sexual desire?

At the same time, sociologists of sexuality need to think about the status of our own claims to scientific rigor. What kind of science of sexuality do we purport to practice? What data provide a reliable basis for our claims? What is our object of study? Do we seek to analyze behavior? Reports of behavior? Social practice? Desires?

V.   IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGICAL AND PHARMACEUTICAL INNOVATION

Sociologists can contribute to the study of sexuality through close attention to the impact of scientific research and technological development on sexual practice, experience, and identity. What effects do new information and communication technologies such as the internet have on the organization of sexual lives and the embodied experiences of sexual pleasure? How do pharmaceuticals contribute to changes in the experience and management of sexuality? What are the effects of medical technologies on notions of sexual health, disease, and normalcy?

Sociologists can shed light on these questions while also considering the impact of technologies on processes of medicalization of sex, notions of sexual "addiction," and possibilities for talking about sexual pleasure.

VI. RISK AND REGULATION

In many societies, sex is often construed as dangerous, and the language of sexual health is often a language of sexual risk. The challenge for sociologists of sexuality is to take a critical approach to the use of risk discourse. Questions include: How and why do certain populations become designated as being "at risk"? What puts other groups on a path toward wellness? When does risk become stigmatizing and why? Are there important cross-national or historical differences in notions of sexual health and sexual risk?

Sociologists can also study the phenomenology of sexual risk and sexual stigma: How is risk experienced? How does stigma affect access to healthcare? How does it affect scientists' willingness to pursue sexuality-related research questions? In addition, sociologists can examine the pervasive problem of "profiling" when it comes to sexual risk: What are the consequences of treating all individual members of a "risk group" as if they automatically bear the risk that accrues statistically to the group as a whole?

Risk is the flip side of regulation. Sociologists need to investigate the politics and practices of the regulation of sexuality, including the scientific, policy, and moral discourses by which such regulation is orchestrated. Sociologists also should analyze the processes by which individuals are called upon to self-regulate their sexuality and manage their sexual risk in accordance with social norms.

CROSS CUTTING CONCERNS

I. THEORETICAL FRAMING

The sociology of sexuality appears to be more porous and open to theoretical innovation from elsewhere than many other sociological subfields. This openness may both reflect and further the marginalization of sexuality research within sociology. It also presupposes or calls for an interdisciplinary education that may sometimes be hard to achieve in practice. Given this theoretical eclecticism, it becomes difficult to say whether there is anything distinctive about sociologists' theorization of sexuality. Are we just borrowing tools from elsewhere? If so, is this a problem?

All that said, we believe that a particular focus on the social production of diverse kinds of knowledge about sexuality results in a relatively unique theoretical engagement, one that brings together tools from sexuality studies, the sociology of knowledge, and science and technology studies. These theoretical commitments distinguish our approach from biomedical perspectives on sexuality and help us to address the silences in biomedical discourses. At the same time, sociologists interested in sexual health and science must be conversant with biomedical and scientific topics, which poses an additional intellectual burden and responsibility.

II. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Studying sexual health and science presupposes a careful consideration of the units and levels of analysis. What exactly do we seek to understand: Perceptions? Identities? Practices? Bodies? Is it possible to focus on all of these at once?

One important methodological contribution might be a thoroughgoing commitment to intersectionality that would challenge the absence of intersectional analyses in other discourses about sexual health. For example, notions of sexual risk group construction used in biomedical and public health domains are often insensitive to the issue of intersectionality. Work in this area could also benefit considerably from cross-national comparisons as well as attention to transnational flows.

III. POLITICS AND ETHICS OF ENGAGEMENT

Taking up questions of sexual health and science inevitably raises dilemmas related to the practical effects of our work, including issues of dissemination and audience, ethical obligations, and policy implications. For example, addressing multiple and highly diverse audiences may require "code-switching" in order to communicate our work to specialists in different fields. Yet adopting the language of others may run the risk of our own cooptation. What sort of competencies are required of us? How much epidemiology or genetics (for example) do we need to know in order to be taken seriously? These considerations also have relevance in the classroom, where we may find ourselves teaching diverse groups of undergraduates, including students in the natural sciences and engineering.

Researchers in this area need to be cognizant of the stigma that surrounds sexuality research and must consider how to overcome it, particularly in negotiations with potential funders and IRBs.

Research on sexual health also raises many ethical issues to which researchers must attend, including the risk that our data might be used in ways that harm the interests of communities we study. Finally, we should consider the potential "looping effects" of our own research. To the extent that people accept our findings and adopt our arguments about sexual health and

science, they may change their sexual beliefs and practices, which may affect our own subsequent research in turn.

WORKING PAPER ON **SOCIAL MOVEMENTS & SEXUALITIES**

Coordinators: Tina Fetner

I. NEW IDEAS

A. Non-state activism

B. Cultural activism

C. Channeling toward state-centered activism

D. Marriage-related activism

E. Connections to "other" movements, e.g. immigration

F. Trans-national connections, regulation of goals

G. Comparative research

H. Opposing movements beyond organizations - activism outside SMOs

I. Audience for activism

J. Boundaries of formal activism

K. LGBT vs. Progressive movements

II. ISSUES FOR SEXUALITIES ACTIVISM

A. The LGBT & Q

B. Marriage

C. Reproduction

D. Parenting

E. Anti-Discrimination

F. Anti-Sexual Violence

G. Sexual dynamics within movements

H. Sex work

I. Conservative, traditional sexuality

J. Health

K. Gender/feminism

L. Trans

M. Intersex

N. Movement success

0. Ends of orgs/movements

III. KEY THEORETICAL QUESTIONS IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND SEXUALITIES

A. Bringing What Sexualities Brings to Social Movements Research
   a. Challenge boundaries of public/private, individual/collective
   b. Embodied experience in SMS
   c. Intimacy of grievances
   d. What is defined as political?
   e. Challenge SM focus on state

B. What Social Movements Brings to Sexualities Research
   a. Negotiations of meaning
   b. Movement impact on understanding of sexual identity
   c. Role of in movements
   d. Role of funding in strategic choices of movements and direction of research
   e. Importance of comparative research re: role of the state for funding

C. Methodological Concerns
   a. Access to sexual contact networks
   b. Ethics of research
   c. Sampling - SMOs vs. unconnected/informal activists
   d. The closet
   e. Invisible groups (LGBT)
   f. Online activism/participation
   g. Who is an activist?
   h. Researcher identity
   i. Everyday lives in sexuality and activism
   j. Multi-method approaches

D. Professional Concerns
   a. Feel positive about discipline and subfield social movements
   b. Discomfort with talk about sexuality

WORKING PAPER ON **TRANSGENDER / GENDER QUEER**

Coordinators: Kristen Schilt & Tey Meadow

What is the past, present and future of trans research in sociology? Historically, medico-psychological studies have pathologized trans people. Sociological studies have used trans people as objects of research to build foundational gender theory, often with little concern for trans participants' life experiences. In this historical context, the future of research about trans people in sociology must proceed with special care. Researchers should consider how the knowledge they produce impacts trans people. Our discussion in this work group focused on the ethics of studying trans populations, with particular attention to the ways researchers work with gender variant children. We identified some problems surrounding the topical area in the discipline as well as possible directions for sociological research about trans people and issues. Studies that treat trans people as subjects, rather than objects, that investigate the particular inequalities and injustices transgender people encounter, and that attend to ethical questions are becoming more numerous. However, researchers continue to encounter difficulties in expanding the field of trans studies.

Currently, there is a structural inequality within the discipline that negatively affects both trans sociologists and cisgender (non-trans) scholars who work in the area of trans research. Anecdotal evidence points to stigma surrounding the topic, which impedes trans sociologists and sociologists who study trans issues from obtaining tenure-track jobs. Studies on trans people are frequently dismissed and placed in the already marginalized area of sexualities research, though trans research spans a vast array of other topics, many of which do not involve issues of sexuality. Trans research has broad implications and offers important sociological insights into how institutions and processes such as the family, race, education, and gender operate. Furthermore, trans research has the potential to inform policy and foster meaningful social change for both trans and cisgender people. We are thus calling for explicit attention to these issues and formal support from ASA. We recommend: a) An ASA-sponsored workshop on how to market one's work when it encompasses trans issues, or b) ASA-sponsored mentorship and networking support for trans scholars and scholars doing research on trans issues.

WORKING PAPER ON **TRANSNATIONAL SEXUALITIES**

Coordinators: Jyoti Puri

with: Niharika Banerjea, Leta Hong Fincher, Daniela Jauk, Kristen Leng, Nancy Naples, Christina Owens, Jyoti Puri, & Evren Savci

Transnational sexualities is a critical approach that focuses on the circulations of and connections between sexual discourses, practices, and subjectivities among and across national contexts. While the term transnational is frequently used to describe movement across national borders, we understand it primarily as a conceptual and methodological tool through which to engage sexual formations. What sets it apart from other approaches to sexuality is attention to transnational/global and national settings in which sexuality becomes imbued with meaning. Equally foundational to this approach is the view that sexuality is the terrain through which transnational/global hegemonies and national politics frequently take shape.

Transnational sexualities highlights questions of nationalisms, culture, capital, and globalization in producing sexuality, while seeking to dissolve existing boundaries and differences—between nations or religions, notions of modernity and tradition, hierarchies of progress and development, among others. It takes histories of colonialism, imperialism, and racialization as points of departure to trouble the persistence of legacies of sexual difference (for example, the dubious views that sexual rights are imperiled in countries like China, India and Turkey, but not in the US and Western Europe). It is alert to how sexual discourses were and are the vehicles through which colonial and imperial rule, colonial and postcolonial epistemologies and governance practices, and perhaps most egregiously, cultural and national differences could become normalized and naturalized.

Sustained attention to the imperatives of history and culture, in effect, attunes this approach to the pluralities and complexities of sexualities, sovereignties, and capital. It seeks to discern the dynamics of cultural meaning, cultural hybridities, national politics, circuits of transnational mobility, relationships between bodies and spaces, practices and behaviors, among other sites of sexuality that may simultaneously implicate hegemonies as well as forms of resistance.

Methodologically, a transnational sexualities' approach is empirically located while being informed by broader historical, cultural, and political contexts. What distinguishes it is attention to connections across cultural settings. These connections may be implicit—for example, a project located in the present that is attentive to the impact of the past—or, more explicit— a project that brings two national contexts within the same analytical field. Such a transnational methodological approach differs from comparative sociology (for example, comparing sexual politics across two or more countries) due to a commitment to denaturalizing nationalisms and nations rather than reifying them (for example, highlighting the mutuality of sexualities and nationalisms across two or more contexts). Thus a transnational sexualities project may be empirically located in the specific setting of, say, the U.S. or Turkey, or in more than one place.

Transnational sexualities seeks to be epistemologically and ethically self-reflexive. Attention to what is authorized as knowledge, what counts as theory, the wisdom of conventional categories, and established methods of research are offset by a praxis of including diverse citations, decentering received categories, and striving toward collaboration with those who are the focus of research by seeing them as co-producers of knowledge and theory. It seeks to not only include those who are largely viewed as marginal as a result of their sexual, racial, gender, national, or class affiliations, for example, working class queer sexualities, but to "queer" the process of knowledge production by questioning the very categories, practices, and politics that produce these marginalities to begin with. As a result, transnational sexualities also remains vigilant toward academic practices that reproduce exclusions under the guise of rigor, the sociological canon, or institutional requirements.

LIST OF RESOURCES

Agarwal, Bina. 1994. A Field of One's Own: Gender and Land Rights in South Asia. Cambridge University Press.

Amnesty International. 2011. "'Not an illness nor a crime' lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in Turkey demand equality." London, England: Amnesty International.

Andersson, Gunnar, Turid Noack, Ane Seierstad and Harald Weedon-Fekjær. 2006. "The Demographics of Same-Sex Marriages in Norway and Sweden." Demography 43(1):79

Badgett, M. V. L. 2011. "Separated and Not Equal: Binational Same-Sex Couples." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society 36(4):793-798

Bart E. and Paternotte D. 2011. "A paradise for LGBT rights? the paradox of Belgium."Journal of Homosexuality 58(8):1058-1084

Bell.M and Matteo B.B. 2008 "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Families and the Free Movement Directive: Implementation Guidelines," ILGA Europe, the European Region of the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex Association, Brussels.

Berger S.A. 2009. "Production and reproduction of gender and sexuality in legal discourses of asylum in the United States." Signs Signs 34(3):659-685.

Boellstorff, Tom. 2005. Gay Archipelago: Sexuality and Nation in Indonesia.   Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Briggs, Laura. Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico (University of California Press, 2003)

Briggs, Laura, Gladys McCormick and J.T. Way. "Transnationalism: A Category of Analysis," in American Quarterly Volume 60, Number 3 (September 2008) pp. 625-648

Browne, Kath and Catherine Nash ed. 2010. Queer methodologies: Intersecting theories and social science research. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Browne, Kath, Jason Lim and Gavin Brown ed. 2007. Geographies of sexualities: Theory, practices, and politics. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Carrillo, Héctor. 2002. The Night is Young: Sexuality in Mexico in the Time of Aids.   Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chow, Esther Ngan-ling, Marcia Texler Segal, and Lin Tan. 2011. Analyzing Gender, Intersectionality, and Multiple Inequalities : Global, Transnational and Local Contexts. Bingley: Emerald Group Pub.

Deere, Carmen D., and Cheryl R. Doss. 2007. Women and the Distribution of Wealth: Feminist Economics. New York: Routledge.

Donayre, Marta. 2002. "Binational Couples: Alliance of Fear." Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide 9(2):25.

Elliott, R. and Mary Bonauto. 2005. "Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in North America: Legal Trends, Legal Contrasts." Journal of homosexuality 48(3/4):91-106

Eskridge, William N. and Darren R. Spedale. 2006. Gay Marriage : For Better Or for Worse? : What we've Learned from the Evidence. Oxford [England]; New York: Oxford University Press

Fojtova, Simona. 2011. "Czech Lesbian Activism: Gay and Lesbian Parental Rights as a Challenge to Patriarchal Marriage." Journal of Lesbian Studies 15(3):356-383

"Forum: Transnational Sexualities," American Historical Review Vol. 114, no. 5 (December 2009), pp. 1250-1353

Gates, Gary J. and Williams Institute (University of California, Los Angeles School of Law) 2005. Binational, Same-sex Unmarried Partners in Census 2000: A Demographic Portrait. [Los Angeles, Calif.]: Williams Project.

Grewal, Inderpal and Kaplan, Caren (1994) 'Introduction: Transnational Feminist Practices and Questions of Postmodernity', in I. Grewal and C. Kaplan (eds) Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 1-33.

Howe, Cymene. 2007. "Sexual Borderlands: Lesbian and Gay Migration, Human Rights, and the Metropolitan Community Church." Sexuality Research & Social Policy: Journal of NSRC 4(2):88-106.

Johnson, Toni. 2011. "On Silence, Sexuality and Skeletons: Reconceptualizing Narrative in Asylum Hearings." Social & Legal Studies 20(1):57-78.

Kaplan, C. and Grewal, I. (1994) 'Transnational Feminist Cultural Studies: Beyond Marxism/Poststructuralism/Feminism Divides', positions, 2 (2): 430-445.

Kim-Puri, H. J. "Conceptualizing Gender-Sexuality-State-Nation: An Introduction" Gender & Society, 19 (2) April, 2005.

Kollman, Kelly and Matthew Waites. 2009. "The Global Politics of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Human Rights: An Introduction." Contemporary Politics 15:1-17.

Lewis, Rachel. 2010"Lesbians under Surveillance: Same-Sex Immigration Reform, Gay Rights, and the Problem of Queer Liberalism." Social justice : a journal of crime, conflict & world order. 37(1):90.

Long, Scott, Jessica Stern, Adam Francoeur, Human Rights Watch (Organization) and Immigration Equality (Organization). 2006. "Family, unvalued discrimination, denial, and the fate of binational same-sex couples under U.S. law." New York: Human Rights Watch : Immigration Equality.

Luibhéid, Eithne. 2002. Entry Denied : Controlling Sexuality at the Border.Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Loue,S. 1990. "Homosexuality and immigration law: A re-examination." Journal of Psychiatry and Law. 18:190-135.

Manalansan, Martin F. 2003. Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora. Durham: Duke University Press

Mertus, Julie. 2011 "LGBT Rights as Human Rights in the United States: Opportunities Lost" Pp. 274-290 in Human Rights in the United States: Beyond Exceptionalism, edited by Hertel, Shareen and Kathryn Libal; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Millbank, J. 2002. "Imagining Otherness: Refugee Claims on the Basis of Sexuality in Canada and Australia." Melbourne University law review. 26:144-177.

Miller, Alice M. 2005 "Gay Enough: Some Tensions in Seeking and Grant of Asylum and Protecting Global Sexual Diversity" Pp.137-187 in Passing Lines: Sexuality and Immigration, edited by Epps, Bradley S., Keja Valens and Bill Johnson González. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies: Distributed by Harvard University Press.

Puri, Jyoti. 1999. Woman, Body, Desire: Narratives on Gender and Sexuality in Post-colonial India. Routledge.

Rank, Lorrie. 2002. "Gays and Lesbians in the U.S. Immigration Process." Peace Review 14(4):373-377.

Nagar, Richa. 2006. Playing with fire: feminist thought and activism through seven lives in India. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pederson, Susan. "National Bodies, Unspeakable Acts: The Sexual Politics of Colonial Policy-making,"The Journal of Modern History Vol. 63, No. 4 (Dec., 1991), pp. 647-680

Povinelli, Elizabeth. The Empire of Love: Toward a Theory of Intimacy, Genealogy, and Carnality. Duke University Press, 2006

Rank, Lorrie. 2002. "Gays and Lesbians in the U.S. Immigration Process." Peace Review 14(4):373-377.

Ricci, Elizabeth. 2011. "Will Binational Same-Sex Couples Get Justice?" Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide 18(4):5-5.

Rodriguez, Juana Maria. Queer Latinidad: Identity Practices, Discursive Spaces. New York University Press, 2003.

Rodriguez, Juana M. 2003. "The Subject on Trial" Pp. 84-113 in Queer Latinidad : Identity Practices, Discursive Spaces. New York: New York University Press.

Rollins, Joe. 2009. "Embargoed Sexuality: Rape and the Gender of Citizenship in American Immigration Law." Politics & Gender 5(4):519-519-544.

Shah, Nayan. 2011. Stranger Intimacy: Contesting Race, Sexuality and the Law in the North American West. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Simmons T. 2008. "Sexuality and immigration: UK family reunion policy and the regulation of sexual citizens in the European Union." Political Geography 27(2):213-230.

Swarr, Amanda and Richa Nagar. 2010. Critical transnational feminist praxis. Albany: SUNY Press.

Tsing, Anna. Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection. Princeton University Press, 2005

Valentine, David. 2007. Imagining Transgender : An Ethnography of a Category. Durham: Duke University Press.

Yamasaki, Emily W. 1999. "No "Gold Mountain" for Chinese immigrants." Voices of Color:113 116.

Yi Lui, Mary Ting. 2009. "Saving Young Girls from Chinatown: White Slavery and Woman Suffrage, 1910-1920." Journal of the History of Sexuality 18(3):393-417.

Yue, Audrey. 2008. "Same-Sex Migration in Australia." GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian & Gay Studies.

WORKING PAPER ON **VIOLENCE AND SEXUALITIES**

Coordinator: Laurel Westrbrook

I. INTRODUCTION

Within sociology, the subfield of sexualities and violence is diverse and fragmented. There are no canonical texts, nor are there a set of central questions motivating research. The description of the subfield provided here should be read with that in mind.

II. TOPICS OF RESEARCH

A. Specific locations and settings that have been studied:
   a. Predominantly in the U.S.: The military (sanctioned and unsanctioned), sports, schools and campuses, workplaces, street, prisons
   b. Sexualities and violence during colonialism and "post-" colonialism.

B. Populations that have been studied (as perpetrators and/or victims/survivors) :
   a. Women (primarily sexual/intimate partner violence), men (violence perpetrated by other men), lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer people, trans people, sex workers, the elderly, persons with disabilities, children, youth and adolescents, college students, native populations in the U.S., rural populations, couples (married and dating)

C. Specific phenomena that have been studied (predominantly in the U.S.):
   a. Physical violence, sexual violence, intimate partner violence, social movements (e.g., anti-violence, bullying, anti-rape, feminist self-defense), trafficking, sex "scandals" (e.g., church, state, education, sports), institutional violence (e.g. prison rape), violence as a response to perceived sexual threats (e.g. homosexual panic defense), violence resulting from transgressing gender norms, sex segregated spaces as a site of perceived potential sexual threat (e.g. rape or any sexualized presence in bathrooms, locker rooms, etc.), symbolic or instrumental violence used to maintain norms (e.g., heteronormativity, homonormativity, mononormativity) and/or enforce oppression (heterosexism, homo-bi-transphobia), resistance as a site of potential violence, sexual violence as an act of war

A. How do you operationalize violence?

    a. Who has the power to say what "counts" as violence?

    b. Physical vs. emotional vs. economic vs. symbolic vs. political violence

    c. Rates of violence (self reports, counting acts, prevalence, frequency, severity, lethality, demography of victims and perpetrators) and the social construction of violence

    d. Debates over Conflict Tactics Scales and population research versus qualitative approaches emphasizing the complex and varied meanings of sex, sexual, or sexuality related violence

    e. Violence as a dependent variable, independent variable, or both

    f. Meanings and measures of consent and other issues of sexual ethics

B. IRB and access to research subjects – especially with "vulnerable populations" (which include both sexual minority and transgender populations, as well as victims/survivors of violence)

C. Dilemmas studying both desire and victimization (i.e., does recent research emphasizing women's sexual agency pose a threat to the construction and reality of gender-based sexual violence perpetrated against women? Can research attend to pleasure, danger and exploitation?)

IV. TOPICS OF RESEARCH

A. Intersectionality: Gender, race, class, nation, sexuality, disability, age – deconstructing the categories and their social production and contestation, in addition to the ways they are mutually constitutive, potentially contradictory or complementary; attentive to the dangers of reification

B. Comparative studies

C. More emphasis on transnational/global issues

D. Policy oriented work aimed at interventions in violence

    a. This area is underdeveloped by sociology and without our input will be limited to public health or crime prevention models that often obscure or deny the role of sexuality as well as gender

E. Violence as productive power (violence does not just repress people, it also creates ideas, behaviors, and identities, particularly through the narratives we tell about violence)

F. Theorizing and studying both sexuality and violence as principles of social organization as well as phenomena constructed in terms of each other

G. Studying young adults who are not college students, as the vast majority of research on this age group is conducted with convenience samples on college campuses

H. Exploring how positive ways of engaging men in violence prevention work can reshape gendered cultural norms and practices interpersonally and more widely (e.g. the power of the international White Ribbon Foundation to engage corporate men and athletes as leaders and role models in non-violence)

I. Exploration of community-based (outside of the CJ system) approaches to violence prevention and correction, such as restorative justice models for sexual and gender-based forms of interpersonal violence

J. Studying how members of groups that have traditionally been seen as "victims" also perpetrate violence; conversely how perpetrators of violence may also be "victims" of violence

K. Interdisciplinary work that integrate insights, theoretical perspectives, and methodologies from the many fields that study sexualities and violence/victimization, but that are currently not in dialogue

WORKING PAPER ON **YOUTH AND SEXUALITIES**

Coordinator: Amy Schalet

I. TOPICS IN NEED OF FURTHER STUDY

A. There are several areas of research that are currently underdeveloped. One of those is the study of (young) men. We need to know more about how men think about women; how men occupy certain institutional spaces; how male socialization occurs within the family; how men transition across space and age categories; how age changes meanings of masculinity; about young people who are not in college; non-dominant college students; and on non-white men. Summing up more generally, we need to tell more stories about men. There is some work on Christianity, but we need more work on alternative spaces for men, in which men can create alternative definitions of masculinity—i.e. Pascoe's example of the theater in high school).

B. A second area is that of technology. We need more work on the role of new media in relationships; the negotiation of other people's space and information online; the use of new media and teen romance without moral panic overlay; parents' use of new media in regulating kids' (and other people's kids') behavior; new standards of regulation; facebook stalking—self-regulation from stalking—and whether this has a gendered dimension; more on which behaviors people keep public and private; how does technology change cheating – both in terms of making it possible and getting caught – and whether the boundaries and definitions of cheating changed with new media; more attention to the global face of technology and global relationships; more on examining preconceived notions about meeting people online—in romantic setting and the transitions from "online" space to physical space and the negotiation of that transition.

C. Across topic areas, there is a need for more attention to the major axes of difference (for instance, geography, class, and nation) that shape the experiences, including those of marginalization and empowerment, that young people have in relation to issues of sexuality.

II. THEORETICAL ADVANCES

We need to more empirical information about different spaces and cultural repertoires of men— but at the same time we need more theoretical development of girls/women/femininity; and an

expansion of hegemonic femininity. We need to tackle and go beyond the gendered component to current moral panics—we need to critique this and better highlight the ways in which this influences current feminist work (example: hook up culture). Related are the questions of girls and the relationship between power and desires for sexual activity, and how girls have to position themselves within particular narratives that are available about them. We need to understand how theories of masculinities and femininities fit together: how do they relate and how do the ways in which they relate contribute to our understandings of them? This may mean moving beyond "doing gender"—connecting spaces and transcending spaces in a way that "doing gender" framework does not—when appropriate, perhaps using multi-level theory.

III. METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

One of the challenges articulated by members of the working group is how to give people the opportunity to find new ways of understanding the self and giving voice in the area of sexuality— especially given the constraining frameworks that prevail in society at large. With regard to youth sexualities, there is the additional problem of imposing adult perspectives on the experiences of youth, which must be understood on their own terms. There is also the question of how to accurately portray people when for many reasons they don't always accurately portray themselves or their histories? On approach is longitudinal, qualitative, ethnographic work to triangulate and deal with these issues. Individuals who are studied over the long term reveal more about themselves: examples: women admitting hookups once they are in a relationship, men who pledged abstinence admitting pre-marital sex once married.

IV. POSITIONING THE STUDY OF YOUTH SEXUALITIES, CONCEPTUALLY AND POLITICALLY

A. Researchers who study sexuality face several misconceptions—on the one hand, the belief that this is a "post-sexuality" society—prejudice and discrimination are no longer issues— and on the other hand the tendencies toward moral panic around youth sexualities. Researchers of youth sexualities face the challenge of balancing attention to the vulnerabilities of children and youth, with the recognition that their experiences of sexuality are valid, normal, and potentially enriching. At the center of this challenge lies the normative question: "Are youth and children allowed to have a sexuality?" Answering this question requires redefining sexuality not in terms of prevailing adult definitions of sexuality, such as in terms of acts of intercourse or fixed identities and orientations. It also raises the question of what are children/youth, and what is the role of parents—and how

historical and cross-cultural research illuminates these socially constructed categories. It also requires researching youth sexualities from the perspective of youth themselves. Some larger frameworks that can address both "vulnerability," "emergence," "risk" and thriving are "human rights", "sexual citizenship" and "positive youth development."

B. Beyond constructing overarching conceptual frameworks that can supersede the "risk-based" framing of youth sexualities, researchers also face the challenge of creating a broader political climate in which better research and services to address the sexualities of youth are possible. In order to create a more favorable political climate for the research of youth sexualities, we must call on our discipline as a whole, and create coalitions with other professions, to promote a "paradigmatic" change. Many non-profits and professional groups active within sexual health and sex education are trying to expand the conversation, and collaborating with these groups should be a priority. We must also work on the "communications" that allows us to address questions such as "is sexuality a human right" without resorting to jargon. This conceptual and political work to articulate a conception of sexuality that empowers as well as protects youth, will help with the methodological challenges researchers face, e.g. in regard to IRB approval.

V. RESOURCES

Anderson, Eric. 2005. Orthodox and Inclusive Masculinity: Competing Masculinities among Heterosexual Men in a Feminized Terrain. Sociological Perspectives 48(3): 337-355.

Anderson, Eric. 2009. Inclusive Masculinity. NY: Routledge

Bernstein, Elizabeth, and Laurie Schaffner, eds. 2005. Regulating Sex: The Politics of Intimacy and Identity. New York: Routledge.

Chenier, Elise. 2012. "The Natural Order of Disorder: Pedophilia, Stranger Danger and the Normalising Family." Sexuality & Culture 16: 172-186.

Curtis, Ric, Karen Terry, Meredith Dank, Kirk Dombrowski, and Bilal Khan. 2008. "Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in New York City, Volume One: The CSEC Population in New York City: Size, Characteristics and Needs.

Bond Stockton, Katherine (2009) The Queer Child: Or Growing Up Sideways in the Twentieth Century. Duke UP, Durham, NC.

D'Augelli, A. R., & Grossman, A. H. (2006). Researching lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth: Conceptual, practical, and ethical issues. Journal of Lesbian and Gay Issues in Education 3 (213), 35-56.

Davis, James Earl. 2001. Black Boys at School: Negotiating Masculinities and Race, in Black Education Revolution, ed. Majors, 169-182. London: Taylor and Francis.

Dean, James Joseph. 2011. "The Cultural Construction of Heterosexualities." Sociology Compass 5(8): 679-687.

Dean, James Joseph. 2011. "Thinking Intersectionality: Sexualities and the Politics of Multiple Identities" in Theorising Intersections: Sexual Advances, edited by Yvette Taylor, Sally Hines, and Mark Casey, pp. 119-139, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dean, James Joseph. 2006. "Straight Men" in Introducing the New Sexuality Studies, pp. 135-142, edited by Steven Seidman, Nancy Fisher, and Chet Meeks, New York: Routledge.

Dennis, Jeffery P. 2008. "Women are Victims, Men Make Choices: The Invisibility of Men and Boys in the Global Sex Trade." Gender Issues 25:11-25.

Egan, R. Danielle. 2013. Becoming Sexual: A Critical Appraisal of the Sexualization of Girls. Polity Press.

Egan, R. Danielle and Gail Hawkes. 2010. Theorizing the Sexual Child in Modernity. Palgrave Macmillan.

Egan. R. Danielle and Gail Hawkes. 2012. "Sexuality, Youth and the Perils of Endangered Innocence: How History Can Help Us Get Past the Panic" Gender and Education: Special Issue Making Sense of The Sexualisation Debates: Schools and Beyond 24, 3 : 269-284

Egan, R. Danielle. 2012. "Sexualizing Girl Problems" Contexts 11, 2: 23-25

Egan, R.Danielle & Gail Hawkes. 2009. The problem with protection: Or, why we need to move towards recognition and the sexual agency of children. Continuum Journal of Media and Cultural Studies 23, 389-400.

Froyum, Carissa. 2007. "At Least I'm Not Gay": Heterosexual Identity Making among Poor Black Teens. Sexualities 10(5): 603-622.

Harper, Shaun R. 2004. The Measure of a Man: Conceptualizations of Masculinity among

High-Achieving African American Male College Students. Berkeley Journal of Sociology 48 (1): 89-107.

Hamilton, Laura. 2007. Trading on Heterosexuality: College Women's Gender Strategies and Homophobia. Gender & Society 21(2): 145-172.

Irvine, Janice. 2002. Talk About Sex: The Battles Over Sex Education in the United States. University of California Press

Irvine, Janice. 1995. Sexuality Education Across Cultures: Working with Differences Jossey-Bass

Irvine, Janice. 1994 Sexual Cultures and the Construction of Adolescent Identities. Temple University Press

Jackson, Sue and Tin Vares. 2011. Media sluts: Tween girls' negotiations of postfeminist sexual subjectivities in popular media in popular culture. In: Gill, R. & Scharff, C. (eds.) New Femininities: Postfeminism, Neoliberalism and Subjectivity. Palgrave, London, 134-146.

Kimmel, Michael. 2008. Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men. NY: Harper Collins.

McCormack, Mark. 2011. Hierarchy without Hegemony: Locating Boys in an Inclusive School Setting. Sociological Perspectives 54(1): 83-101.

McCormack, Mark and Eric Anderson. 2010. "It's Just Not Acceptable Any More": The Erosion of Homophobia and the Softening of Masculinity at an English Sixth Form. Sociology 44(5): 843-859.

Pascoe, CJ. 2007. Dude You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School. Berkeley: UC Press.

Renold, Emma. & Jessica Ringrose. 2008. Regulation and rupture: Mapping tween and teenage girls' resistance to the heterosexual matrix. Feminist Theory 9.3, 313-338.

Renold, Emma and JessicaRingrose. 2011. Schizoid subjectivities? : Re-theorizing teen girls' sexual cultures in an era of 'sexualisation'" Journal of Sociology 47.4, 389-409.

Robinson, Kerry. 2012. 'Difficult citizenship': The precarious relationships between childhood, sexuality and access to knowledge. Sexualities 15, 3, 257-276.

Robinson, Kerry & Crystyn Davies. 2008. Constructing the Australian child and regulating Australian children's sexual knowledge in schooling 1950's to late 1990's. Sexuality and Culture 12.4, 221-239.

Schalet, Amy T. 2012. "Caring, Romantic American Boys," New York Times, April 6.

Schalet, Amy T. 2011. Not Under My Roof: Parents, Teens, and the Culture of Sex. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schalet, Amy T. 2011. "Beyond Abstinence and Risk: A New Paradigm for Adolescent Sexual Health." Women's Health Issues 21 (3S); S5-S7.

Schalet, Amy. 2011. "The Sleepover Question." New York Times, July 23, SR9.

Schalet, Amy. 2009. "Subjectivity, Intimacy and the Empowerment Paradigm of Adolescent Sexuality: The Unexplored Room." Feminist Studies 35 (1): 133-160.

Wilkins, Amy C. 2012. "Becoming Black Women: Intimate Stories and Intersectional Identities." Social Psychology Quarterly. 75.2:173-196.

Wilkins, Amy C. 2012. "Stigma and Status: Interracial Intimacy and Intersectional Identities Among Black College Men." Gender & Society. 26:165-189.

Wilkins, Amy C. 2004. "Puerto Rican Wannabes: Sexual Spectacle and the Marking of Race, Class, and Gender Boundaries." Gender & Society 18.1: 103-21.

Wilkins, Amy C. 2009. "Masculinity Dilemmas: Sexuality and Intimacy Talk among Christians and Goths." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 34.2: 343-68.

Wilkins, Amy C. 2004. "So Full of Myself as a Chick: Goth Women, Sexual Independence, and Gender Egalitarianism." Gender & Society 18.3: 328-49.

Wilkins, Amy C. Wannabes, Goths, and Christians: The Boundaries of Sex, Style, and Status. 2008. Chicago.