SEXING THE SCHOOL:

CONSTITUTING GENDER, ETHNICITY AND CLASS THROUGH DISCOURSES OF SEXUALITY IN A HUNGARIAN SECONDARY SCHOOL

DOROTTYA RÉDAI

Dissertation

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Gender Studies

Supervisor: Éva Fodor

Budapest, Hungary
2015

To Antonia

DECLARATIONS

I hereby declare that this dissertation contains no materials previously accepted for any other degree in any other institution and no materials previously written and/or published by another person, except where the appropriate acknowledgement is made in the form of bibliographical reference.

Dorottya Rédai

CEU eTD Collection

ABSTRACT

My dissertation seeks answers to the following broad research question: "What is the role of sexuality in shaping social inequalities in a secondary school?" It is based on a school ethnography which I conducted between 2009 and 2011 in *Marzipan Baker and Cakemaker School*, a combined secondary vocational-technical-grammar school in a large town in Hungary. My fieldwork consisted of observing sex education and other lessons, semi-structured small-group interviews with cc. 90 students and individual interviews with the school nurse, five teachers and the school director. I analyse topics related to sexuality, including virginity, marriage, hygiene, pleasure, and ways of talking about them, through which my respondents constitute gendered, classed and raced/ethnic subjectivities. I highlight a hitherto neglected use of sexuality in this context. Several researchers have pointed out that schools themselves reproduce gendered, raced and classed inequalities within their walls. I argue that discourses on sexuality in this school constitute binary categories of gender, race/ethnicity and class, and contribute to the formation of students' subjectivities based on these categories. In other words, sexuality is not only one of the axes of social inequality, it is also constitutive of these axes. The sexuality discourses and practices I have identified and the subjectivities they constitute simultaneously create categories of exclusion and allocate people within and outside, leading to a re-inscription of social inequalities in schooling. My study addresses three interrelated fields of scholarship: schooling and young people's sexuality; the discursive constitution of gendered, ethnic and classed subjectivities; and the re/production of social inequalities in education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

This dissertation is about sexuality in a school. Sexuality and school may sound like strange bedfellows at first, but sexuality is in us and all around us, in every aspect of life, so why would school be an exception? Several scholars have ascertained sexuality's presence in schooling, and in fact, it was present in *Marzipan Baker and Cakemaker School* in many many ways, including the baking practice lesson I had the opportunity to observe. What does baking have to do with sexuality, especially in the middle of a lesson, one may ask. Well, no, it was not just that kneading dough reminded me of a certain sexual experience I had had. It was part of vocational instruction, it was part of learning how to handle dough and how to form nice pastries. Students were forming sexual organ-shaped pastries to entertain each other, they were performing sexual acts between pieces of freshly baked pastries, and the baking technology teacher instructed a student to handle the dough as gently as he would his girlfriend.[1] This was one particularly illustrative example of the presence of sexuality in school, and many others will follow in this dissertation.

I spent nearly two full school years in Marzipan between 2009 and 2011 and conducted a school ethnography. Marzipan is a school where students learn food industry professions, they will become confectioners, bakers or sweets factory workers. There was also a small grammar school stream, which was closed down after I finished my fieldwork. I conducted interviews with groups of students, I interviewed the school nurse, observed many of her sex education lessons and also some other lessons of other teachers, and conducted individual interviews with the school director, four form tutors and one vocational teacher. From these an enormous amount of rich field material came together, in which I have attempted to find answers to my

---

[1] See Chapter 3, Section 2.2. for an analysis of this scene.

research question: **What is the role of sexuality in shaping social inequalities in a secondary school?**

Sexuality is in my focus because it is important for adolescents in many ways. Although people are sexual beings from birth, contemporary discourses of life stage categorisation highlight adolescence as a special period when many young people 'become sexual'. That means they encounter and experience ways of doing sex that are typically considered 'adult', 'adult' emotions, sexual feelings, desires and pleasures, they confront issues of sexual orientation, learn about biological and medical aspects of sexuality and reproduction, face specific forms of sexualisation and sexual violence, make decisions about their sexual body. What is not commonly conceived as part of adolescents' 'becoming sexual' is how sexuality is not only part of but also constitutive of one's whole subjectivity. School is a highly important location in young people's lives, and sexuality is not left outside the school gates in the morning of every schoolday. Sexuality is part of schooling, despite all efforts of making this fact invisible. Therefore at the design stage of my research I considered school a relevant location for inquiring into the role of sexuality in young people's lives.

My commitment to and involvement in dealing with social inequalities was an additional motivation for researching sexuality in schooling. School is an institution where social inequalities are re/produced, both within its walls and outside in society. It is a hierarchical institution where individual subjectivities are positioned in hierarchical patterns in a network of power relations, within a broader social framework where distinction between social groups means subordination, discrimination, oppression and exclusion of one group by another. Therefore my analysis of subjectivity constitution also reveals social inequalities, and thus, it has a political motivation, besides an academic one.

What does it mean that sexuality is constitutive of subjectivities in discourses and practices? It means that there are ways of talking about sexuality that create gendered, classed and ethnic distinctions between people and allocate group positionings with different power for people; it means that one of the ways differentiation between groups of people works is through sexuality. For example, ways young people talk about losing their virginity or about other people losing theirs constitute a specific ethnic subjectivity for them and inscribe ethnic identity as binary and important. Or the ways young people talk about having sex and about their sex partners create dichotomous gendered positions for them. Or the ways teachers talk about the sexual behaviour of students allocates different classed positions for both the students they talk about and for themselves.

And what does it mean that sexuality is implicated in re/producing social inequalities in schools? It means, for example, that the way teachers talk about Gypsy girls' reproductive patterns may determine how much effort they invest in educating them, which, in turn, is likely to reproduce Gypsy girls' disadvantaged social positioning. Or when a teacher sexually harasses a student, her reaction to it may influence her classed positioning in the vocational streaming structure of the school, which in turn may determine her future work career and socio-economic situation. In this dissertation I analyse such and other similar subjectivity-constitutive sexuality discourses and practices.

In *Chapter 1* I outline the theoretical underpinnings of my dissertation. My study addresses three interrelated fields of scholarship: schooling and young people's sexuality; the discursive constitution of gendered, ethnic and classed subjectivities; and the re/production of social inequalities in education. In the first part of the chapter I briefly introduce these fields and outline my contributions to each. In the second part of the chapter I discuss concepts that the

3

theorization of my findings is based on, such as sexuality; adolescence; power, knowledge and discourse; gender, race and class performativity; whiteness; and cultural capital.

In *Chapter 2* I discuss the methodology I used for collecting materials, for processing the collected materials (coding, writing up fieldnotes), and for analysing discourses and discursive practices. I reflect on my positioning as a researcher of sexuality in this particular educational institution and how my subjectivity may have influenced my respondents' discourses. I also discuss some difficulties and unexpected situations I encountered in the field, and ethical issues such as gaining consent from respondents and dilemmas and choices for a feminist researcher when encountering sexist, racist, classist, homophobic and abusive discourses and situations.

In *Chapter 3* I inquire into the intersection of schooling and sexuality, with the aim of situating my research in the field. First I provide national and local data on sexual practices among students, including the age they started having sex, their approaches to and experiences with contraceptive and STI prevention devices and their experience with sexual violence. Then I discuss how the school is a sexualised space; and finally I describe how sex education is done in Marzipan, how it is situated in the school as a sexualised space, and discuss some of the methodological issues of sex education which are implicated in sexualising the school space. By discussing these three topics I provide a contextual framework for my arguments and findings in the following chapters and situate the research in the field of schooling and sexuality.

In *Chapter 4* I provide insights into how power relations and the hierarchical structure of *Marzipan* are implicated in producing raced, classed and gendered subjectivities of students and teachers, discursively and via institutional practices, and how the production of these subjectivities perpetuates social inequalities on various levels of the institutional structure.

4

First I introduce the educational profile and the student and teacher population of Marzipan. Then I analyse discourses and practices which construct hierarchy among teachers and between students and teachers. In the last part of the chapter I offer examples of how other axes of inequality get constituted intersectionally, and especially how ethnicity, gender, sexuality and class converge to create student and teacher subjectivities.

In *Chapter 5* I examine how and what kind of pleasure discourses are used in Marzipan. In the first section I define what pleasure means for my respondents. In the second section I analyse three dominant pleasure discourses which are significant in creating distinctions between male and female genders: the 'natural' vs. 'learnt' character of experiencing sexual pleasure; discourses of sexual objectification and self-objectification in talking about sexual activity and ways of pleasuring; and the access to pleasure – the sexual double standard and the girlfriend/slut and virgin/whore dichotomy. These discourses are embedded in a neoliberal-postfeminist framework which positions girls as sexually empowered and agentic, constantly having to work on themselves to achieve more sexual pleasure and power. At the same time, male sexual licence and dominance, sexual expressions of hegemonic masculinity are left unquestioned. The prevalence of such hegemonic discourses contributes to restricting girls' sexual agency and empowerment and to reinforcing gendered dichotomies based on sexuality. Talking openly about pleasure in sex education in such a discursive framework does not necessarily contribute to the sexual empowerment of girls; such discourses of pleasure rather reproduce oppressive gender dichotomies.

In *Chapter 6* I analyse how ethnicity gets constituted through discourses of sexuality. I focus on two discursive sites of sexuality where ethnic subjectivity constitution can be captured in my respondents' discourses and practices: 'virginity' and 'marriage'. First I reflect on how the ethnic subjectivities of my respondents are constructed, how they draw group boundaries and

personal ethnic identities discursively by setting up a "hierarchy within the Other" and positioning themselves in relation to 'other kinds of Gypsy people'. Then I inquire into the discursive sites of virginity and marriage. I look at both how Gypsy ethnicity becomes constituted by Gypsies and Hungarians and how Gypsies differentiate among themselves, creating an inter-group ethnic hierarchy through discourses of virginity and marriage. I also reflect on how virginity and marriage are discursive sites for majority Hungarian ethnicity constitution, as well. In discourses of virginity and marriage there is also an underlying theme of 'choice' and 'agency'. In my discussion I reflect on how neoliberal/postfeminist discourses on women's choice and sexual agency influence my Gypsy respondents' discourses and practices of trading their virginity to 'the right boy' at the chosen time.

Finally, in the *Conclusion* I summarise my main findings and arguments and explain the contributions my dissertation makes to the fields of scholarship it addresses. I also discuss some shortcomings and limitations of my work and future directions of analysis I would be interested in pursuing.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Backgrounds

Introduction

The main research question for this dissertation was the following: *What is the role of sexuality in shaping social inequalities in a secondary school?* In this chapter I outline the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of my dissertation. My study addresses three interrelated fields of scholarship: schooling and young people's sexuality; the discursive constitution of gendered, ethnic and classed subjectivities; and the re/production of social inequalities in education. I briefly introduce these fields and present my contributions to each. Then I discuss concepts that are relevant for my analysis, including sexuality; adolescence; power, knowledge and discourse; gender, race and class performativity; whiteness; and cultural capital. This is a broad theoretical framework, more specific theoretical reflections can be found in the following chapters.

1. Fields of scholarship and my contributions

1.1. Schooling and young people's sexuality

Sexuality is important in specific ways for young people. In many people's lives adolescence is the age when they become familiarised with ways of doing sex which are considered 'adult', when expressing sexual desires becomes intelligible and legitimate (as opposed to young children whose expressions of sexuality are ignored, discouraged or punished, or treated as a taboo). Many young people undergo their first sexual experiences and many encounter heteronormative and queer desires and forms of sexuality for the first time during this period.

School is a highly significant institution in young people's life – and not only because of receiving an official education. The concept of the hidden curriculum is well-known in the sociology of education (see: e.g. Ballantine 2001; Giroux 2001; Apple 1990). From Bourdieu through Foucault to feminist education sociologists, scholars have shown how school re/produces social inequalities and subjectivities. Young people spend half of every schoolday in school, and, just like outside school, sexuality is present in their lives while they are in school. Although sexuality is 'officially' non-existent in schools (apart from the biology curriculum and sex education – if there is any), 'unofficially' schools have their 'sexual culture' (Allen 2007; Kehily 2002); the individuals populating schools as students and teachers have their embodied sexuality which they perform in many ways in schools.

Common approaches to schooling and sexuality include ignoring the presence of sexuality in schools, the biologizing discourse of 'adolescence as a messy, stormy difficult phase', the Foucauldian discourse of disciplining bodies, and analyses of how school is gendered and sexualised. While I rely on the latter two approaches to conceptualise my research, I focus on sexuality beyond itself and examine how sexuality in school serves the role of class, ethnicity and gender constitution. School is a site for the constitution of sexualised, gendered, classed and raced/ethnicized subjectivities. Sexual subjectivity constitution happens through curricular and non-curricular activities in schools, through discourses and institutional practices, through sex education and other educational activities and through the formal and informal interactions among students, among teachers and school officials, and between students and teachers and school officials. School also provides a physical space for the constitution of sexual subjectivities. Sexualities are not only constituted in school but also constitutive of other aspects of subjectivities, such as gender, class and ethnicity, and these constitution processes are the ones I inquire into in this study.

Researchers of gender and sexuality in education argue that sexuality is officially silenced but pervasively present in school (e.g. Pascoe 2007; Epstein, O'Flynn, & Telford 2003), and authors of studies on sexuality and schooling agree that school is a heteronormative institution. As Epstein et al. point out, "where sexuality is permitted, sometimes even encouraged, the form of sexuality allowed is the straightest of straight versions" (2003: 3). Kehily claims that "[s]chool relations are organised around the assumption that heterosexuality is the 'natural order of things'" (2002: 57). Allen (2007) argues that "despite appearing to formally acknowledge and accommodate student sexuality (through, for example, sexuality education), schools are heavily invested in a particular sort of student that is 'ideally' non-sexual" (2007: 222). These authors use the concepts of "official and unofficial school cultures" or "student sexual culture" (Kehily 2002), out of which "official school culture" denies or problematizes the existence of adolescent sexuality (Allen 2007: 223). Later Allen challenges this division and calls it a false binary which cannot capture their entanglements, as "there is a diversity of sexual cultures operating within schools that are contextually contingent, whose coordinates fluctuate and whose boundaries are porous" (2013: 63). Because of the vagueness of what Kehily and Allen call 'sexual culture', I prefer to use the term 'sexuality', which also encompasses what these authors refer to as 'sexual culture'.

Alldred and David (2007) and Allen (2007) discuss how the institution of formal education is constructed around the idea of educating the 'minds' of children, with the school being the location for developing the intellect, not for dealing with emotions, desires and sexual practices. As Allen puts it, "[a] dominant view of the function of schooling in anglophone countries is that education of the mind is a priority and that issues of sexuality and the body are a distraction to be managed" (2007: 223). This leads to the problematisation and/or denial of the existence of sexuality in school (ibid). Despite the silences, schools have spaces where

9

sexualities are even required and where performances of heterosexuality are seen as part of 'normal' gender development, for example the 'prom' or school disco (Epstein et al. 2003: 6). Pascoe (2007) describes school rituals and pedagogical practices as regulating normative sexuality and gender identities, and argues that an "informal sexuality curriculum" exists (2007: 27), based on the assumption of "shared understandings of heterosexuality" (2007: 35). There are also physical and discursive sites of resistance (Temple 2005; Rasmussen et al. 2004; Youdell 2005) where protest in the form of non-heteronormative performances of sexualities is allowed but contained (Epstein, O'Flynn, & Telford 2001). Like elsewhere, there is resistance and protest to dominant discourses and practices in Marzipan, some examples of which I also discuss, but dominant discourses and practices of sexuality are my main focus, because I am interested in how dominant subjectivity constitution is implicated in re/producing social inequalities.

1.2. The discursive constitution of gendered, ethnic and classed subjectivities

The guiding question of my dissertation is how subjectivities are constituted through discourses. This question is based on a Foucauldian understanding of the subject/subjectivities as constituted through the productive power of discourses. Following Butler, I understand the constitution of gendered, raced and classed subjectivities as performative. My primary focus during fieldwork was discourses and institutional practices, therefore I paid less attention to bodily aspects of the performatives I recorded.[2] However, this does not mean that I separate body and mind in the same old way the modern school attempts to do.[3] My understanding is that subjectivities are embodied and bodies are not located outside discourse, the body is not

---

[2] This choice is partly a question of methodology. My choice to base my analysis on sound recordings and my limited individual capacity to observe and capture bodily presentations have resulted in a large amount of material consisting of verbatim transcripts of talk and a much smaller amount of descriptions of visual bodily representations and actions.
[3] See: Chapter 3, Section 2.3.

intelligible prior to discourse (Butler 1993). Discursively constituted subjectivity categories such as woman/man or Gypsy/Hungarian are embodied, their meaning is constructed partly through readings of bodily representations.

In the course of analysing my material I have found certain topics related to sexuality which function to discursively constitute gendered, raced/ethnic and classed subjectivities. I have also found that these subjectivity categories do not get constituted in quite the same way through talking about sexuality. The performative constitution of gendered subjectivities can be understood by examining how gendered differences between women and men are constructed. A major topic of sexuality where this can be captured is 'sexual pleasure'. My respondents' discourses of sexual pleasure, of access to it, experiencing and policing it, produce strictly dichotomous gender binaries between women and men, and also a dichotomous division between differently accessible women (e.g. girlfriends or sluts). My analysis shows how these strict dichotomies are reproduced in a neoliberal/postfeminist discursive environment which seemingly encourages women's sexual empowerment but does not question gender binaries and male dominance.

That sexuality is very important in the construction of gender dichotomies is well-known. Regarding ethnicity constitution, especially in the specific discursive and socio-political environment of the Gypsy/Hungarian divide, the role of sexuality is undertheorized. Ethnicity itself – in the case of Gypsy/Hungarian ethnicity – is a dichotomous subjectivity category, but, as I discuss in Chapter 6, there is more space to move between the two end points of the binary and hybrid or in-between self-identifications are possible and intelligible, unlike in the case of gender. In my material there are two major discourses through which my respondents create the ethnic division. One is the 'good/bad' (i.e. decent vs. criminal) dichotomy, which often manifests in Hungarians' discourses in the notion that Hungarians are 'good' and

Gypsies are 'bad'. In the case of Gypsy respondents the 'good/bad' distinction creates an inter-ethnic division, according to which there are 'good Gypsies' and 'bad Gypsies'. In this dissertation I do not focus on the 'good/bad' dichotomy but on the other major discourse that produces an ethnic binary: that of sexualised ethnic 'traditions'. Such sexualised ethnic 'traditions' include those related to the loss of virginity and marriage. Hungarian respondents consider 'outdated, backward' traditions, such as virgin marriages, arranged marriages and marrying off young girls, to be characteristic of all Gypsies. My Gypsy respondents divide Gypsies into two categories, 'Romungro' and 'Vlach', identify themselves as Romungro and attribute the same 'outdated, backward' traditions to Vlach Gypsies, discursively creating an inter-ethnic dichotomy. As for the notion of losing virginity, the Gypsy/Hungarian division is not openly articulated, it is present in how Gypsy and Hungarian girls talk about how they lost or are planning to lose their virginity. By analysing these discourses I offer a contribution to scholarship on how raced/ethnic dichotomy and subjectivities are constituted and demonstrate concrete ways of discursive subjectivity constitution through sexuality instead of general theorizing about ethnic differentiation or describing ethnicized sexual traditions or approaches to sexuality and pointing out gendered differences in them, which is characteristic of anthropological literature on Gypsies (see: e.g. Engebrigsten 2007; Stewart 1997).

The classed subjectivity constitution of secondary school students is not quite the same as ethnicity and gender constitution in the given environment, as they operate at different locations in the power network of the school and through different discourses and practices. Both gender and ethnicity constitution happens explicitly, subjects are interpellated as women/men, Gypsies/Hungarians. Classed subjectivity constitution, however, happens rather implicitly; subjects are not interpellated as 'working class' or 'middle class'. Whereas in the school gender and ethnicity constitution can be most clearly captured in discourses and practices among peers, and much of it happens through sexuality, class constitution primarily

happens through the hierarchical teacher-student power relations, in which teachers' class position is taken for granted, invisible, like their whiteness, and students are categorized according to their position in the hierarchical structure of the school. Teachers do most of the class production, and not only through sexuality discourses but also through institutional means such as streaming. However, sexuality is present in discourses and practices that are class-constitutive, and certain sexuality discourses and practices, such as talking about students' sexual behaviour, knowledge and hygiene, or talking about Gypsy girls' reproductive patterns, or sexually harassing students, are classed. I have embedded my analysis of class constitution through sexuality in a broader framework of social hierarchy and inequality constitution in the school, and with this analysis I contribute to scarce literature on the concrete class-constitutive power of sexuality in schooling.

1.3. The reproduction of social inequalities in education

Classed, ethnic, gendered and sexual inequalities are re/produced in education, as the vast body of literature in the sociology of education reveals (e.g. Apple, Ball, & Gandin 2010; Aronowitz & Giroux 1991; Apple 1990). In a social system structured by power inequalities between social groups the distinction between social categories (such as woman/man, Gypsy/Hungarian) is at the same time the hierarchical ordering of these social categories where one group is subordinated to the other. Thus, subjectivity constitution is consequential to social inequalities, in and out of school. As I noted earlier, school is a central institution in young people's life and both as an institution and a space where groups of people spend a lot of time together and performatively constitute themselves on an ongoing basis, it has an inestimable role in the re/production of social inequalities within and outside the walls of the institution.

13

There is a large body of (mostly quantitative) research on social inequalities in education and a large body of (mostly qualitative) literature on the constitution of young people's subjectivities in educational institutions. However, the two fields are weakly connected. This is why it is important to keep analysing how the re/production of social inequalities happens in education, and not only by measuring them quantitatively (which is one of the largest fields of the sociology of education),[4] but also by offering qualitative insight into the daily manifestations of these processes in particular schools. My study enriches this latter literature by adding sexuality to the picture and demonstrating that sexuality is not just something that is present in school but it plays a significant and direct role in the re/production of social inequalities in an institution which supposedly has not much to do with sexuality. In my analysis I show how a range of discourses and practices, some directly connected to the institutional regulation and division of students (such as streaming and vocational training), and some seemingly not related to the subject-matter of education (such as hygiene, sexual behaviour or sexual harassment) can be directly implicated in producing raced, classed, gendered subjectivities and at the same time in perpetuating social hierarchies within an institution and social inequalities within and outside the educational institution.

2. Concepts

2.1. Sexuality

In my work I use a broad definition of sexuality. Sexuality is more than sexual orientation, identity, desire, behaviour or practices or some combination of these. It also has biological, psychological, material, social and relational aspects, and I refer to all of these when I talk about sexuality. I do not consider sexuality to be a possession of the individual but individual

---

[4] For Hungarian quantitative studies on social inequalities in education, see: e.g. Kertesi & Kézdi (2009); Liskó (2008; 2005); Havas & Liskó (2006).

14

sexual subjectivity is also part of my definition of sexuality. 'Sexuality' is the central concept in my dissertation through which I analyse the constitution of gendered, classed and ethnic subjectivities of young people in an educational institution.

In my interviews I inquired about many of the above-mentioned aspects of sexuality, in the hope to find out about how young people's sexuality was constructed and what it encompassed. Besides encountering concrete manifestations of sexuality in respondents' talk (e.g. narrating experiences of having sex), I also captured processes of subjectivity constitution, and not just that of sexual subjectivities but other subjectivities (e.g. gender, ethnicity, class) through sexuality, as well. Therefore, sexuality is conceptualised in this work as an axis of subjectivity which is constitutive of other axes of subjectivity.

Sexuality is constituted through discourses and is discursively constitutive. As Epstein et al. argue, "sexual cultures and sexual meanings are constructed through a range of discursive practices across social institutions including schools" (2003: 3). School is the location of my analysis of young people's sexuality, therefore I am also interested in the role school and teachers play in the discursive construction of "sexual cultures and sexual meanings". In my analysis I treat a variety of notions such as 'virginity', 'marriage', 'pleasure' or 'hygiene' as discursive sites where significant aspects of young people's sexuality, as manifested in a particular (school) environment, can be captured. These discursive sites are also ones where other aspects of subjectivity, such as gender, ethnicity and class, get constituted.

New materialist theorists question the post-structuralist 'textualisation' of bodies and suggest a focus on the "interactions between material forces" (Alldred & Fox 2015a: 3). Most recently Fox & Alldred (2013) have introduced the term 'sexuality-assemblage'. They argue that sexuality is not an individualized thing, not merely personal and internal to the individual body (Alldred & Fox 2015b). Instead, they re-theorise sexuality as "an impersonal affective

15

flow within assemblages of bodies, things, ideas and social institutions, which produces sexual (and other) capacities in bodies" (2013: 769). Sexuality-assemblage "is productive of all phenomena associated with the physical and social manifestations of sex and sexuality" (Alldred & Fox 2015a: 4). As an example for a sexual-assemblage accruing, they bring the event of an erotic kiss, "which comprises not just two pairs of lips but also physiological processes, personal and cultural contexts, aspects of the setting, memories and experiences, sexual codes and norms of conduct, and potentially many other relations particular to that event" (2015a: 4). I find this approach very significant because of its potential to broaden the concept of sexuality both in analytical thinking and in overcoming narrowly defined sexuality and its constraints on individuals and turning towards a "new politics of sexualities, in which the aggregative actions of power can be challenged and the dis-aggregating possibilities of resistance to power fostered" (Alldred & Fox 2015b). My work, although conceptualised before I got acquainted with this new materialist concept of sexuality, is an attempt to broaden the notion of sexuality by demonstrating how it is at the core of subjectivity constitution.

2.2. Adolescence and sexual innocence in childhood

The students in Marzipan belong to the age group typically referred to as 'teenagers' or 'adolescents'. Adolescent sexuality is often the subject of a sexual 'moral panic' around the sexualisation of young people (see: Coy & Garner 2012). This contemporary moral panic is based on the notion of 'sexual innocence in childhood' and its corruption by 'sexualisation' (Kehily 2012).

In *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1,* Foucault (1990) discusses the discursive construction of sexuality, the regulation of childhood sexuality by the institutional powers of school, and the multiplication of discourses around childhood sexuality, in the context of historical

changes. He argues that in the 18th century a new technology of sex emerged, part of which was the pedagogisation and regulation of child sexuality, based on the double assumption that children are 'naturally' sexual beings, and that their 'natural' sexual behaviour is harmful and dangerous and has to be controlled. He claims that in the Victorian era the language used to talk about sexuality became restricted, refined and not explicit, sex became something to be regulated, the discourses through which power was exercised to control the sexuality of the population multiplied, and one of the areas where sexuality became discursively controlled was child sexuality. Waites (2005) points out that whereas earlier socialisation and psychological stage theories considered children to be at various stages of development towards the final, fully rational and developed state of adulthood, contemporary sociological theories treat childhood as historically, culturally variable and relational, and children as actors with agency. However, it seems that in educational discourse children are more commonly treated as 'innocent', asexual or pre-sexual (Epstein et al. 2003). And when child sexuality *is* acknowledged – which is another discourse parallel with the discourse of childhood sexual innocence – it is institutionally regulated and discouraged (Waites 2005). In yet another discourse, childhood innocence is eroticised and used in the discursive construction of child sexual abuse (Epstein et al. 2003).

Several authors analysing educational discourses talk about silenced sexuality and discursively constructed and controlled (hetero)sexuality in schools (e.g. Pascoe 2007; Epstein et al. 2003; Kehily 2002). Silencing or not using language to discuss sexuality and discursively constructing/problematising/medicalising child and adolescent sexualities apparently run parallel in educational discourses, and this is especially true about non-heteronormative sexualities (e.g. Corteen 2006; Fine & McClelland 2006; Temple 2005). Epstein et al. (2001) note that in the primary/elementary phase of education adults' sexuality discourse is characterized by fear that children will receive sexual knowledge when they are

'not ready' yet (see also: Alldred & David 2007), and argue that discourses of innocence are damaging to children and that the claim that sexual knowledge corrupts children is anti-educational. In fact, schools are saturated with sexuality, and elementary school children are already knowledgeable and interested in it. They use discourses of heterosexuality as a resource for building relationships with peers and adults; they do not have the same understanding of sexuality as older people but they play and talk in profoundly heterosexualized ways. There are differently classed, cultural and ethnic femininities and masculinities available to children in different social positions but all of them carry "an expectation of a heterosexual future", which is "routinely confirmed by teachers" (Epstein et al. 2001: 138).

The concept of 'adolescence' was invented at the turn of the 20th century. As Moran argues, it was seen as the "period of chastity between puberty, or sexual awakening, and marriage, when the young man or woman's sexual impulses could finally be expressed" (2000: 15). Conservative approaches to adolescent sexuality still apply the same conception a century later. An example is the "Abstinence Only Until Marriage" sex education programs in the USA, which treat adolescent sex as something dangerous, immoral and to be avoided (Fine & McClelland 2006). In educational contexts, including school-based sex education, the concept of 'adolescence' is extensively used in general to describe the age group between the onset of puberty and official adulthood. Moran (2000) questions the temporary usefulness of the concept of adolescence, arguing that there is no sharp line separating adolescent and adult sexual behaviour, and that adult sexuality constantly intrudes into adolescent sexuality. Adolescence is a medicalised and pathologised concept, this period is seen as stormy and difficult, a phase of psychological and biological transition towards 'stable' adulthood (Waites 2005; Talburt 2004). These developmental approaches stress the importance of adult monitoring and guidance of adolescents for the sake of individual and social development

(Talburt 2004). Adolescent sexuality – as part of this 'difficult phase' – is also treated as troublesome, in need of being controlled and regulated by adults. Notions of adolescent 'sexual development' are thoroughly gendered and heterosexualized, and school is a central site for the gendering and heterosexualisation of adolescents, through multiple ways, means and dimensions, including sex education (see: Allen 2007; Waites 2005; Epstein et al. 2001; Fine 1988). According to Rasmussen, Rofes, and Talburt (2004), contemporary understandings of youth make it impossible for young people to embrace non-normative identities and exercise agency over their sexuality (see also: Allen 2007; Fine & McClelland 2006; Fine 1988).

Although I share the problematisation of the concept, in my analysis I also use the word 'adolescent', either as a shorthand to refer collectively to the age group of my student respondents or to highlight discursive expressions of this pathologised approach. I have to note, though, that the sexuality discourses used by my adolescent respondents are familiar from discourses of older age groups and other social contexts. I certainly cannot pinpoint any of the analysed discourses as 'typically used by adolescents'. This supports the problematisation of drawing a strong line between adolescent and adult sexuality and treating adolescent sexuality as a 'phase'.

2.3. Discourse, power, knowledge

I analyse discourses and social and educational practices shaped by discourses in this dissertation, relying on a Foucauldian post-structuralist conception of discourse. According to Foucault, discourse produces knowledges which are taken as 'truth', and knowledge has the power to make itself true (Foucault 1994). Truth, Foucault argues, "induces regular effects of power. Each society has its régime of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and

makes function as true" (1980: 131). As Butler explains, a régime of truth "decides what will and will not be a recognizable form of being" (2005: 22). Power is exercised through discourse, as Foucault explains: "in a society (…) there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (Foucault 1980: 93). "Nothing has any meaning outside of discourse" (Foucault 1972: 32), which means that what is outside discourses is unintelligible, it has no intelligible subjectivity (Youdell 2006: 44-45).

Modern power is conceptualized by Foucault as both repressive and productive. Power operates not simply in a top-down oppressive fashion, but also in a network-like, circular fashion; "it is the moving substrate of force relations which, by virtue of their inequality, constantly engender states of power, but the latter are always local and unstable" (1990: 93). Individuals or groups are not only targets of power but also participate in its circulation and articulation (Foucault 1980: 98). This does not mean, however that power is equally distributed (Foucault 1980: 99); "[it] is 'held' by no one; but people and groups *are* positioned differently within it" (Bordo 1993b: 191; emphasis in original). Resistance to power is embedded in power relations; "resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (Foucault 1990: 95). Power is productive in a sense that it is constitutive of subjectivities and these constitutive processes are discursive (Butler 1997b). I understand the participants in my research as discursively constituted subjects and school as an institution that deploys technologies of subjectivation. According to Foucault, "the subject is constituted through the productive power of discursive practices" (Youdell 2006: 41).

2.4. Gender performativity

In her theorisation of performativity, Judith Butler (1990, 1993) deconstructs the assumption that sex, gender and sexuality are in a linear relationship in a heteronormative matrix. She argues that "(…) gender is not a performance that a prior subject elects to do, but gender is *performative* in the sense that it constitutes as an effect the very subject it appears to express" (1991: 24). Gender is constituted through a "stylized repetition of acts" (1990: 140). Based on Derrida's concept of citationality in the discursive constitution of gender, Butler also argues that gender comes to exist through the iteration of former citations of gender performatives, and this citational chain produces an illusion that there is an 'original' gender (1993). Butler claims that continuous reiteration opens up spaces for subversion; because of its repetitive nature, there is always a possibility that the interpellation misfires, and this way the interpellated subjectivity can be reinscribed (1997b). Butler uses Foucault's notion of discursive power and claims that as the subject comes to exist through citation, it simultaneously gets positioned in discursive relations of power (Butler 1997b). She broadens the notion of discourse to include Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus' to argue that performativity works not exclusively through language (as according to Derrida) but is embodied, it is performed through routine, unconscious bodily actions, "embodied rituals of everydayness" (Butler 1997a: 152). Habitus expresses social belonging in a way that is readable by others, it distinguishes between individuals' positions in social hierarchy (Bourdieu 1984). Butler also integrates Althusser's concept of 'interpellation' into her performativity theory. Althusser claims that the subject gets produced through a process of interpellation, i.e. addressing (hailing) someone, and the interpellation always constructs both the interpellated subject and the one who interpellates (Loxley 2006: 130).

21

Youdell argues that school is a major site for reinscribing the linear relationship between sex, gender and sexuality (2005). In their ethnography of four English schools, Nayak and Kehily (2006) analyse how gender and sexual identities come to be performatively constituted through acts of subversion, regulation and embodiment. They argue that "(…) the processes of schooling assume the presence of sex categories as known and knowable, the immutable basis of gendered subjectivity. Teachers and students both contribute to and sustain the fiction of gender identity as real and significant in foundational terms" (2006: 470). They claim that "[w]ithin schools gendered performances are commonly treated as adolescent rehearsals for the main show to be staged with the onset of adulthood" (2006: 471). They view these stylised performances not as rehearsals for adulthood but as "parodies of gender" and suggest that "[i]n this respect young people are not subjects-in-the-making, but rather the making or 'doing' provides the fiction that there is a subject to be had" (2006: 471). With this claim they not only question the constructivist approach to gender identity, but also offer a critique to the approach that adolescence is a transitional phase between childhood and adulthood, and adulthood is the completed state of self, towards which education helps the adolescent to progress.

2.5. The performative constitution of race and ethnicity

Gender performativity as a model can be applied to analyse how raced/ethnic, classed and sexualised subjectivities get constituted. In the context of my research, the performativity of ethnicity, passing, the ethnic binary vs. continuum and ethnic differentiation are a conceptual framework for the performative constitution of 'Gypsies' and 'Hungarians'.

Joane Nagel (2003, 2000) theorizes the performative constitution of race/ethnicity and sexuality through each other, based on Butler's concept of gender performativity. As she

explains: "[e]thnicity is both performed – where individuals and groups engage in ethnic 'presentation of self', and 'performative' – where ethnic boundaries are constituted by day-to-day affirmations, reinforcements, and enactments of ethnic differences" (2000: 111). She adds that "[t]he relative power of various actors in ethnic transactions can determine an individual's ethnic classification as well as the content and worth of the individual's ethnicity" (2000: 111).

Mirón and Inda also claim that race is performatively constituted, arguing that the racial subject is constituted by reiterative practice and continued interpellation (2000: 99). Rottenberg problematizes "the simple transposition of Butler's notion of gender performativity onto race" (2003: 437) by Mirón and Inda, and warns that "critics must be careful not to ignore the specificities of race norms. Otherwise we run the risk of eliding the particular mechanisms through which the subject comes to be 'raced'" (2003: 438). She argues that "race norms work through assumptions of whiteness", i.e. – paraphrasing Ahmed – "one is assumed to be white unless one looks black" (2003: 438). This assumption shows the difference between gender and race norms: whereas "in heteronormative regimes, one is assumed to be either a woman or a man", and the lack of visual markers of genders is destabilizing, in White racist regimes the lack of visual markers is not destabilizing but "subjects are immediately assumed to be white in the absence of any telling marks of 'color' (Rottenberg 2003: 439). Though in both frameworks subjects are compelled to be either one of the two dichotomous categories (man/woman or Black/White), women are forced or encouraged and rewarded to identify as women and not at all encouraged to pass as men, whereas blacks are forced to identify as black but at the same time – depending on the situation and power relations, I would add – encouraged to aspire to be White, and successful passing gets rewarded by access to certain white powers and privileges (Rottenberg 2003: 442). Women's desire to perform femininity is usually coded positively, Blacks' desire to

perform blackness is coded rather negatively (2003: 439-444). Rottenberg concludes that "the raced subject, in order to remain *viable* and to *not be completely marginalized* in a white supremacist power regime, must constantly and perpetually attempt to embody norms that have historically been associated and concatenated with whiteness" (2003: 446; emphasis in original).

To illustrate how race gets constituted differently from gender in the framework of performativity, Rottenberg uses the notion of 'passing'. Sarah Ahmed claims that political discourse on passing "tends to position 'passing' as a radical and transgressive practice that serves to destabilize and traverse the system of knowledge and vision upon which subjectivity and identity precariously rests" (1999: 88). However, she claims that "there is a failure to theorize (…) the means by which relations of power are secured, paradoxically, *through this very process of destabilization*" (1999: 89; emphasis in original). She also argues that there are no absolute criteria for passing from Black to White and that passing "involve[s] encounters between others whose boundaries are not fixed" (1999: 94). Passing is not arriving from somewhere to somewhere, it is movement, and the passing subject does not become the desired 'other' (Ahmed 1999: 92-96).

I argue that there is another difference between gendered and raced dichotomies: while gender is seen in normative discourses as a total binary, race/ethnicity performatives can be better described along a continuum. Even though 'Black' and 'White' are ultimate power positions where 'Black' is the subdued and 'White' is the dominant subjectivity, there is more play in between than between 'woman' and 'man', i.e. there is a variety of performatively constituted hybrid subjectivities. Obviously, not everybody has equal chances of racial passing: the more 'whitish' looks one has, the easier it is for her to pass. In the case of my Gypsy respondents, looks, demeanour, behaviour, social relations, life-style, are all tools to use in passing, and so

24

are discursive constructions of hybrid ethnic subjectivities such as half-Gypsy, quarter-Gypsy, Hungarian with one Gypsy parent, and so on.[5] I argue that the discursive claiming of such hybrid identities are attempts to remain viable, to reduce being marginalised and to position oneself as close to being White as possible while still retaining some portion of 'Gypsiness' as a meaningful part of one's subjectivity. Raced/ethnic passing can be successful and rewarding in certain situations, within certain settings of power relations, whereas in others passing is not successful, not rewarded or not encouraged. Race/ethnicity is performatively constituted not only through passing, but also through explicitly performing certain kinds of racial/ethnic belongings, especially through discourses of sexuality.

In her essay titled "Gypsy Differentiation", Kata Horváth (2008) applies Butler's theory of performativity to analyse how 'Gypsiness' becomes discursively constituted. She argues that 'Gypsy' is not a pre-existing category but becomes constituted through the operation of a differentiation process between Gypsies and Hungarians. She considers the construction of "the Gypsy" as a process, not a product of the process; in other words, 'Gypsy' is constructed through the repetitive citation of differences between 'Gypsies' and 'Hungarians'. Gypsy differentiation not only happens through the act of calling oneself or someone a Gypsy, but also through referring to 'welfare queens', 'deep poverty', 'pupils with special needs', 'minority'[6] or 'skin colour', for example, without uttering the word 'Gypsy' (2008). "Gypsy differentiation" also operates through special topics and discursive formulations, such as the topic of purity/cleanliness/hygiene.[7] Horváth does not analyse in depth the particular discourses through which the differentiation is enacted. In my study, however, I take specific sexuality discourses, namely those of 'virginity' and 'marriage', to analyse the

---

[5] I discuss this in Chapter 6, Section 1.1.

[6] It is quite common that in everyday speech Hungarians sarcastically refer to "the minority" instead of saying 'Gypsies'. When someone says "the minority" in a certain tone, the other people in the conversation are supposed to know that Gypsies are being referred to.

[7] Note that the discourse of 'hygiene' is a very common marker of 'Gypsiness', but in my research material it primarily functions as a class marker (see: Chapter 4, Section 3.3.3).

Gypsy/Hungarian distinction and the performative constitution of Gypsiness and Hungarianness, with which I contribute to the literature on discursive racial/ethnic subjectivity constitution.

2.6. Whiteness

McWhorter argues that race is a "sliding signifier", which "cannot be pinned down to a precise meaning or even to an imprecise one. Its meaning shifts whenever it is called upon to perform a different one of its many functions in the systems of power and knowledge of which it is a part" (2004: 52). So is ethnicity, at least in the specific context of Gypsy vs. White Hungarian people in Hungary. Hungarian Gypsies are officially considered to be an 'ethnicity' but 'Gypsiness' also bears the marks of 'race' as understood in US sociology and popular thought when referring to Black Americans. This means that Gypsies are considered to be both a group with a distinct culture and a group with distinct physiological and character traits. While many concepts used in US sociology are useful for the discussion of race/ethnicity and whiteness in Hungary, it must be noted that race/ethnicity and whiteness have specific social characteristics in an ethnically monolithic post-socialist Central Eastern European society with one White majority ethnicity and one significant ethnic minority. Unfortunately there are no available studies of whiteness in CEE, therefore I rely on a North American and British conceptual framework to understand how White Hungarianness gets constituted through sexuality discourses (see: Chapter 6).

Wander, Martin and Nakayama argue that the conceptual shift from race to whiteness within critical race studies is very important because it has exposed the invisibility of whiteness (1999: 22-23). Frankenberg (2001; 1993), Martin, Krizek, Nakayama and Bradford (1999) and Brekhus (1998) highlight the invisibility and unmarkedness of whiteness. Brekhus points

out the importance of studying previously unmarked social categories, arguing that "the study of whiteness makes visible the nonsalient racial structuring of white experience" (1998: 45). According to Martin et al., 'White' as an absent referent "demonstrates the ideological masks that hide the powerful functionings of white" (1999: 44).

In its invisibility, whiteness is the norm "from which Others are marked" (Nakayama & Krizek 1999: 91). Whiteness itself "is only marked in reverse", which is "a characteristic of domination" (Nakayama & Krizek 1999: 98). As they argue, "[w]ithin a discursive system of naming oppression, but never the oppressive class, white can never be other than a negative, an invisible entity. This characteristic of whiteness is unique to its discursive construction and must be part of its power and force" (Nakayama & Krizek 1999: 98). This is a very significant point for my analysis, as it practically summarises why it was difficult for me to pinpoint sexuality discourses that would mark White Hungarian ethnicity (see: Chapter 6). My Hungarian respondents frequently constructed their ethnicity through comparing themselves to Gypsies and declaring that they were not like Gypsies or not having the sexual traditions (of virginity and marriage) that Gypsies had. Frankenberg notes that whiteness is only invisible to Whites (2001: 81). Wondering what this may mean in the case of Hungarian Gypsies, I have realised that whiteness *is* visible and expressed in Romani language because the word *gadjo* (male) / *gadji* (female) means 'non-Roma person', thus, there is a 'non-' word which in the Hungarian context with two ethnicities equals 'White (Hungarian)'.

Mary C. Waters (1990) argues that in the USA picking and choosing an ethnicity is a symbolic, optional and flexible social practice, but only for Whites, because for Blacks "their ascribed race trumps any ethnic status" (Khanna 2011: 1051). In addition, in a multi-ethnic society like the USA, Whites who have multiethnic ancestry can select their preferred ethnicity, and they do so (see: Waters 1990). In Hungary the situation is different. As I have

27

mentioned, Gypsies are both treated as a race and an ethnicity, in their case the two categories merge. Mixed ancestry practically means that one either has various types of Gypsies among her/his ancestors (for example Vlach, Boyash and/or Romungro) or has both Gypsies and Hungarians among her/his ancestors. In the former case Gypsies choose their ethnicity rather on the basis of cultural heritage, traditions they choose to follow or not (see: Chapter 6). In the latter case Gypsies rely more on physical features in their self-definition: if they can pass as Whites they tend to define themselves as Hungarian or half-Gypsy. Their choices are limited, however, by the perception of their ethnicity by White Hungarians and the situation and power relations in which they are performing their ethnicity (see: Chapter 6).

What I contribute to the literature of ethnicity and whiteness construction is an analysis of how it is done by young people through sexuality discourses. This intersection is undertheorized, especially in a Central European context with a monolithic ethnic minority vs. majority setting. Although a lot has been written about Hungarian Gypsies as an ethnic minority (e.g. Pálos 2010; Tóth 2007; Kállai & Törzsök 2006), about Gypsy women (e.g. Bakó 2009; Janky 2005; Durst 2002) and about Gypsy 'traditions', including sexual 'traditions' (e.g. Tesfay 2005; Neményi 1999; Stewart 1997), the discursive construction of these 'traditions' and their ethnicity-constitutive function, to my knowledge, has not been analysed. My analysis offers an insight on how young people make sense of their ethnic belonging through relating to ethnicized 'traditions' around virginity and marriage and how they adapt these 'traditions' to be congruous with their sense of ethnic belonging.

2.7. The performative constitution of class

Social class can be framed as a socio-economic or a cultural concept. Quantitative sociologists usually use measures of socio-economic status when analysing class differences

28

(see: Lareau & Conley 2008). In cultural studies class is understood as a cultural concept. As Skeggs argues, "what we learn to recognize as categorizations of race and class are not just classification or social positions but an amalgam of features of a culture that are read onto bodies as personal dispositions – which themselves have been generated through systems of inscription in the first place" (2004: 1). Skeggs understands class as a symbolic system and points out that class and other symbolic systems inscribe bodies simultaneously (2004: 3). She shows in her analysis that class has its history of being read onto bodies through moral discourses of sexuality (2004: 3, 85-90).

I did not consistently collect and process data on the socio-economic status of my respondents but approached class from a cultural perspective, because I considered that to be more fruitful from the perspective of sexual subjectivity constitution. I did ask students about their parents' profession and employment status, where they live, whether they have siblings. However, apart from a few examples I discuss, I did not foreground these data in my analysis, because in many cases socio-economic status was not consistent with the school strand students were attending, even though, of course, school is, by and large, indicative of social status and it reproduces class divisions.

Class is performative, like gender and ethnicity. However, in Marzipan the performative constitution of class was not as explicit as that of gender and ethnicity. Class was unnamed, students were not interpellated as working- or middle-class. Their class constitution happened informally and indirectly, through teachers calling them unhygienic, ignorant (about high culture), having excessive or inappropriate sexual behaviour, and formally, through educational practices such as streaming.

Literature on the performativity of class and on the intersections of class, sexuality and education is scarce, therefore my analysis about classed subjectivity constitution through

sexuality discourses (besides other discourses and institutional practices) in Chapter 4 is a significant contribution to this infant field. Besides Skeggs' work (2004), some of the few pieces of research about sexuality and class are to be found in a 2011 issue of the journal *Sexualities*.[8] Most of the articles, however, focus on the sexual orientation aspect of sexuality: the classed aspects of gay, lesbian and queer lives. Although this is a very important field of scholarship, it does not encompass the broader understanding of sexualities that I have outlined in Section 2.1. The qualitative studying of intersections of class, sexuality and education in particular educational institutions is important because it offers insights on how the re/production of classed inequalities in schooling happens through discourses and practices that would not necessarily be directly associated with class (for example sexual hygiene or sexual harassment).

2.8. Education and cultural capital

Bourdieu (1984) introduced the concept of *cultural capital* as a critique of human capital theory and of theories that claim that educational achievement is the direct result of innate academic abilities and talents only. The economic and cultural investment in the child's accumulation of cultural capital depends on the cultural capital owned by the family. Bourdieu argues that cultural capital, similarly to economic capital, is scarce and unequally distributed, as families of different classes cannot provide the same amount of resources to acquire the same amount of cultural capital beyond the necessary minimum. Bourdieu and Passeron (1992: 10-11) claim that cultural capital differences and classed inequalities are reproduced by the educational system. The cultural capital of the school is only transmittable to those already equipped with the linguistic and cultural capital necessary for decoding the contents which implicitly reflect the values, ideological and economic commitments,

---

[8] *Sexualities, 14*(1), February 2011.

perspectives and beliefs of the dominant classes. Thus, through offering 'neutral' knowledge transmission 'equally' to 'all' in principle, the education system contributes to the reproduction of the classed distribution of cultural capital and the conservation of the established social hierarchy (Bourdieu and Passeron 1992).

Lareau and Weininger (2003) argue that interpretations of cultural capital among the majority of English-speaking sociologists have narrowed down Bourdieu's original concept of cultural capital, by equating cultural capital with "knowledge of or competence with 'highbrow' aesthetic culture", and by analytically distinguishing the effects of cultural capital from educational skills, ability or achievement (2003: 568). They argue for a broader conception of cultural capital, which they claim to be more in proximity to Bourdieu's original concept and to have a greater potential for education research. They define cultural capital as "micro-interactional processes whereby individuals' strategic use of knowledge, skills, and competence comes into contact with institutionalized standards of evaluation. These specialised skills are transmissible across generations, are subject to monopoly, and may yield advantages or 'profits'" (2003: 569). They cite Bourdieu who claims that "the educational system's ability to reproduce the social distribution of cultural capital results from 'the educational norms of those social classes capable of imposing the … criteria of evaluation which are the most favourable to their products' (Bourdieu, 1977: 495)" (2003: 578-579). I take up this broader conception of cultural capital because it accurately describes what happens in Marzipan by way of class reproduction: middle-class teachers have the power to impose the institutionalized standards of education on middle-class and working-class students and evaluate them according to the criteria favourable for them, teachers, in order to maintain class distinction and reproduce a classed hierarchy. The technical and especially the vocational students are treated by teachers as low class, low culture, bad taste. One way for teachers to make a class distinction between themselves and working class students is to

31

express dissatisfaction with students' hygienic and cultural standards, which are both manifestations of the dominance of middle-class taste (Skeggs 2004; McClintock 1995). Marzipan is an institution aiming at (mostly) working-class reproduction, therefore, from the perspective of the distribution of cultural capital, I argue that class reproduction happens through imposing such middle-class cultural values and applying such evaluation criteria that working-class students will fail to come up to, therefore the cultural distinction applied by teachers between themselves and their students becomes a classed distinction, reaffirmed by students' failure to perform satisfactorily as measured by these criteria. Such a distinction is very important for teachers, who also define their (superior but fragile) class position through deeming students low-cultured, excessive and unhygienic.

Chapter 2: Methodology and Research Ethics

Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the methods I used for collecting materials, for processing the collected materials (coding, writing up fieldnotes), and for analysing discourses and discursive practices. I reflect on my positioning as a researcher of sexuality in this particular educational institution and how my subjectivity may have influenced my respondents' discourses. I also discuss some difficulties and unexpected situations I encountered in the field, and ethical issues such as gaining consent from respondents and dilemmas and choices for a feminist researcher when encountering sexist, racist, classist, homophobic or abusive discourses and situations. The focus is on methodological issues but methodology cannot be separated from theory and ethical questions. The theoretical backgrounds of my study are elaborated in Chapter 1, and I discuss ethical issues in this chapter.

I conducted fieldwork between 2009 and 2011 in a Hungarian secondary school with a vocational, a technical and a grammar school stream and a post-secondary chemical technician training stream, where most students were of working class background. In the technical and vocational streams students receive training in food industry professions, they will become confectioners, bakers or sweets factory workers. I conducted interviews in groups of three or four with 87 students, aged 15-21, and two individual interviews with students, one of them was a mildly mentally disabled boy who was subjected to bullying, the other a gay boy. I interviewed the school nurse responsible for delivering sex education, observed many of her sex education lessons and also some other lessons, and conducted individual interviews with the school director, four form tutors and one vocational teacher. About 20% of the respondents identified as Gypsy or of mixed Gypsy-Hungarian background. There was one boy who identified as gay, two lesbians, two bisexual girls and two girls who

were a couple but they identified as straight. One of the bisexual girls identified as 'third gender'. There were some boys who were believed to be gay by their classmates but did not identify as such. The teachers were all White Hungarians, the school director was male, the other teachers I interviewed were female, of various ages from twenties to fifties. One teacher identified as a lesbian. Further data on students and teachers are available in Chapter 4, Section 1. My fieldwork material consists of transcripts of group and individual semi-structured interviews with students, individual semi-structured interviews with teachers, the school nurse and the school director, transcripts of sex education lessons and observation fieldnotes. Throughout the dissertation I refer to the school by the pseudonym *Marzipan Baker and Cakemaker School.*

1. Data generation

As for methodological and theoretical background, my research follows the lines of the critical sociology of education,[9] which has made use of post-structuralist theories, including Foucault's work on disciplinary power and discourse to inquire into how schools produce particular sorts of raced, classed and gendered school subjects, into the relationship between student subjectivities and schooling, and more recently into sexuality and schooling (Youdell 2006). As Youdell notes, ethnography is not only a method, but a "useful vehicle for testing and developing theory", and the question is "how far its theoretical framework is made explicit and worked through research questions, data generation, analysis and writing" (2006: 60). School ethnography was the most suitable method for finding answers to my research question, the best one for engaging with post-structuralist theories of power and sexual subjectivities in a scene that is central to young people's life, and the one whose methods I was most familiar with from my previous training and research experience.

---

[9] See Youdell (2006) for a review.

School ethnography is a widely used research method in the field of gender and education. Whereas I could rely on such studies (e.g. Pascoe 2007; Alldred & David 2007; Youdell 2006; Kehily 2002) for theoretical and methodological approaches, in Hungary this method is not commonly used in educational research. Mészáros (2014), who conducted a school ethnography of a secondary grammar school in Budapest on the role of youth subcultures in pedagogical processes, argues that his school ethnography has no predecessors in Hungarian pedagogy research (2014: 95). Even observation-based qualitative research methods are relatively new in Hungarian educational research (Mészáros 2014), and I am familiar with only one other study by Újváriné Handó (2009) which is a large-scale research project using ethnographic and qualitative methods to study the social relations of Roma and non-Roma children in a primary-school environment. This study, however, lacks the post-structuralist theoretical framework and reflexive self-positioning of Mészáros' and my work.

My focus is young people's sexualities, whom I consider "social agents who are active meaning makers in their own lives" (Allen 2009: 396), therefore I engaged with students more than with teachers throughout my fieldwork. However, I was also interested in the relations between sexuality and school as an institution, therefore I did observe and interview teachers, the school nurse and the school director, who were also important actors in the construction of the school as a sexualised institution and in constructing sexualised social hierarchies.

In the course of my fieldwork I used five methods of data collection: classroom observation during lessons, school space observation and informal conversations in breaks, small group interviews, individual interviews, and data collection from school officials, the school nurse and from the website of the school. I recorded and transcribed verbatim all the sex education lessons and all the interviews. During the classroom observations I took fieldnotes in a notebook. I did not take fieldnotes during school space observations and informal

conversations in breaks and interviews, but I did immediately after the observation/interview. During interviews I occasionally wrote down short comments in my notebook, for example words or topics respondents mentioned which I wanted to go back to later. Taking fieldnotes during interviewing would have diverted my attention from what respondents were saying, therefore I chose not to do so.[10]

1.1. Classroom observation during lessons

I observed 34 sex education lessons in eight different forms: four year-9 forms, one year-10 form, two year-11 forms and one year-13 form. The forms to observe were the ones where Vera the school nurse was invited to deliver health education lessons in the given term. The reason why four out of the eight observed forms were year-9 is that form tutors invited her most frequently to year-9 forms. Two of the sex education lessons I observed were not held by Vera but the form tutor of a year-11 form. During the sex education lessons I was sitting in the front part of the classroom in a corner from where I could see everyone and the whole classroom but I was not in the centre. I did not participate in the classroom discussions. I recorded all lessons, took fieldnotes and notes of the most significant dialogues, as classroom recordings were difficult to transcribe and often unclear or inaudible. I also observed six personality development lessons in the catch-up form[11] and some other lessons in other forms, but I was not allowed to record them, so I only took fieldnotes. At the one baking practice I could observe it was technically unfeasible to record because of the size of the room and because the activities of the students were scattered in space, so I also took only fieldnotes there.

---

[10] For issues to consider when deciding about note-taking and recording, see: Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw (1995); Weiss (1994).

[11] For an explanation of what this form was, see: Chapter 4, Section 2.3.1.

The aim of classroom observation was to see how sex education was done and whether sexuality discourses came up in other lessons. I observed what language, discourses and ideologies teachers were using, how they interacted with students, and how students interacted with one another. It was important to observe peer relations because students are active participants in their education and actively construct gendered, classed, raced subjectivities and sexualities among themselves (Youdell, 2005; Thorne, 1993).

The first time I met the students of each form was their first sex education lesson. At the beginning of these lessons I introduced myself and told them that I was doing research on sex education. I informed them that I would record the lessons, take notes and use pseudonyms in my analysis. I asked them to ignore me and behave as usual. I also asked if anyone had any objection to my recording, but no one did in any of the forms. I noticed that some students who were sitting near me first kept an eye on me, but they soon got used to my presence and it seemed to me that my recording did not influence their behaviour. In a school where the supervision of students by adults is a regular activity, classroom observation by another adult who was not a teacher therefore she was assumed to have no influence on their assessment did not appear to concern students too much.

As for Vera the school nurse, we developed a friendly working relationship during my fieldwork, she was interested in my research and soon relaxed in my presence. We often had discussions after the lessons and I gave her feedback on the lesson when she asked for it. I took notes of these discussions after leaving the school for the day. Other teachers whose lessons I observed were probably more sensitive to my 'surveillance', as they did not allow me to record the lessons. I did not have the impression that they changed their lesson plan or pedagogies when I was observing them, but they asked more questions about what I was researching, and I felt that I had to reassure them that it was students' classroom behaviour,

not their teaching methods that I was interested in. My general observation was that the teachers I observed (and interviewed) were so much unaware or unreflexive of their sexist, classist and/or racist utterances towards students or so firmly convinced that they were not sexist, classist and/or racist that they did not perceive their classroom behaviour as something that would cast a negative light on them for an outsider observant, therefore I assume they were behaving quite as they usually would. This was not exactly the same when I was interviewing them individually, on which I will reflect below, and also in Chapter 4.

1.2. School space observation and informal conversations

During breaks between lessons I spent time hanging out on corridors, as the classrooms were closed for breaks and the students had to stay out on the corridors which were patrolled by teachers. This type of observation was not very revealing in itself and made me feel uncomfortable. I was an observer, my respondents felt observed, and I felt observed, as well. I did attempt to chat with students a few times on the corridor but these attempts were not really successful, I was looked on as an outsider and I felt awkward walking up to students trying to find some topic that might interest them. Most of the time they were using the short time in between lessons for talking to their friends or smoking in the toilet, anyway. The corridor was the space where I most strongly felt my 'otherness', in terms of age, education, non-affiliation with the school and reasons for being there. I often felt that students 'looked through' me, did not recognize me from their sex education lessons which I had observed – which, on the other hand, implied that I had managed to stay almost invisible during classroom observation. After I conducted interviews with some students, this awkwardness eased somewhat, at least there were some students who recognised me and were willing to chat a bit in the breaks.

I did not spend much time in the staffrooms. I only went there when I had nowhere to go in breaks or I was looking for one of the teachers. I took fieldnotes after these brief visits, I did capture some conversations that were interesting for me. I did visit the history *szertár* (smaller staffroom for teachers of the same discipline and storage space for teaching materials) quite often though and had many informal conversations (and also the interview) with Anna, the form tutor of the 'catch-up' form. She was my major ally among teachers. She was supportive and interested in my research and helped me contact other teachers.

The baking practice halls were not easy to access, mainly because of organising suitable times but I also felt I was not so welcome in that space. It was a pity because it turned out to be a significant school space in terms of sexuality constitution. I managed to observe one extended baking practice though, which I discuss from the perspective of sexualisation in Chapter 3, Section 2.2.

The space where I spent most of my time apart from classroom observation and interviewing was the school doctor's room where Vera and the doctor were working. This was a whitewashed, shabby room with old furniture: a double desk, a bed, cupboards, a sink with a mirror above and a small bookshelf. There were some panorama photos of nature on the wall, cut out from a calendar, and a scale to measure height next to the door. The room did not suggest anything at all about sexuality.

1.3. Small group interviews

The first few months spent with classroom observation familiarised me with students and discourses about sexuality, which helped me frame my interview topics and questions. It also familiarised the students with me. I decided to conduct semi-structured qualitative interviews with same-sex groups of 3-4 students. I expected that group interviews would give me an

insight on how subjectivity constitution happens in peer interactions. Because of the intimate nature of several topics (e.g. relationships, sexual experiences) I presumed that a small group was suitable for eliciting information and views which students may feel more relaxed to discuss in small groups but may feel uncomfortable discussing with me alone or in larger groups. Recruitment for the interviews happened on a voluntary basis in most cases. I previously agreed with form tutors about which lessons I could take away students from and at the beginning of such lessons I asked who would like to come for interviews. In many cases friends volunteered, which also made talking about intimate topics easier.

I attempted to make sure that everyone in the groups had the chance to talk. Some people were more vocal or more dominant than others, had more experience or felt more confident to talk, and not everyone was equally interested in discussing the themes of my interest, some were only motivated to participate so that they could miss a lesson. For that purpose, some even volunteered to be interviewed several times. I did not aim to disrupt existing power relations within the groups, except in cases when I individually interviewed students in order to avoid verbal harassment by their peers. There was one group interview though where racist harassment was poured on one Gypsy girl by three White girls who were simultaneously telling her that they were not talking about her, as she was a 'good' Gypsy, but about 'bad' Gypsies in general. I saw that the Gypsy girl was offended and was trying to protect herself. I tried to stop the other girls, telling them that what they were saying may have been offensive to her. As it happened at the end of a very long interview when I had already asked all questions, I ended the interview at this point, because the three girls worked themselves up and I could not stop the offense otherwise.

All group interviews except one were conducted during school time and in the school, either in an empty classroom or a small unused office room. At the beginning I briefly explained the

students why I would like to interview them, where I was coming from, and assured them of confidentiality. With most groups I managed to establish rapport and a relatively informal atmosphere. I conducted 24 group interviews, there were 13 girl groups, 10 boy groups and one mixed. The interviews lasted between 60 and 120 minutes, with two exceptions (both were girl groups), which were two and a half and three hours. It was teachers who advised me that I interview students during school time, arguing that students would not agree on staying in the school after lessons were over. I interviewed each respondent once, except for one lesbian girl who was first interviewed in a group with three straight girls, and then in another group with another lesbian.

Both the individual and the group interviews were semi-structured and I used an interview guide in which a number of questions were grouped under topics such as family, gender roles and subjectivities, relationships and sexual experiences, sex education in the school, other sources to learn about sex, homosexuality and heteronormativity, and sexual rights.[12] When I was interviewing non-heterosexual students alone or in smaller groups I used a slightly modified guide which included the same topics but also asked about their specific experiences with coming out, homophobia, bullying and their social relations in the school. The scale of topics was intentionally broad, I tried to encompass all areas that may be relevant with regard to the sexualities of young people. In most cases I managed to create an atmosphere in which the interview was an open discussion rather than a question-and-answer session. I gave space to diverging from the questions when I saw that students had something important to discuss that was not directly related to my questions. This is how I gained more information, for instance, about teacher-student hierarchies, which originally I had not intended to focus on. In the individual interviews with teachers, the topics were similar, but I did not ask them about their personal sexual and relationship experiences but their views about those of their

CEU eTD Collection

---

[12] For a guide on preparing interview guides, see: Weiss (1994).

students. I also asked specific questions about their forms and how they saw the presence of student sexuality in the school. In the interview with Vera I included questions about her working experience as a sex educator, and in the one with the school director (who was the last person I interviewed) I asked questions about the school structure (as I needed clarification on some issues), his work as a director and about other potential ways and possibilities for sexuality education and counselling in the school.

I did not ask every question in my guide, I used them as possible questions guiding me in getting around the given topic. I aimed to have comparable interviews but, of course, not all topics were explored with equal weight in each interview. Representing nearly a hundred respondents' voices equally would be impossible in this dissertation. Through the coding of the transcripts certain discursive patterns emerged, and as I had decided to focus on dominant discourses primarily, I present such patterns in the analysis more emphatically than non-mainstream, alternative discourses. I have tried to select quotes which best exemplify my arguments, which have emerged from carefully analysing discourses on the given topic.

One of the 24 interviews was conducted with two lesbian girls, outside the school in a nearby bar frequented by students and some teachers. These two girls did not attend the same form and it was difficult to find a common time slot and room in the school for the interview, therefore we arranged to meet in this bar, after school. They had invited two other lesbians from the school for the interview but they did not show up. Another interview was made with two girls who identified as heterosexual but had an intimate love relationship with each other. I wanted to interview students with non-heterosexual identification or sexual practices separately, as I was interested in their specific experiences about sexuality in a strongly heteronormative school environment. There was a group with two heterosexual and two bisexual girls, and I agreed with the two bisexual girls to interview them separately later, but

they cancelled several times and then the school year ended, so that interview did not materialize.

Once I decided to experiment with a mixed group of two girls and two boys. A very interesting dynamics developed, in which the two boys who were friends pretended to be a gay couple and took turns uttering homophobic remarks, talking about heterosexual experiences and acting out flirting with each other and teasing each other sexually. It was interesting how they dared to do this in front of two girls and me; I am convinced that such teasing and play would not have happened in an all-male group. In fact, this was the only group with male participants where the boys joked about homosexuality. Such jokes would be sanctioned in a male group, they would immediately be called faggots, whereas the girls did not call them faggots. The jokes may have disguised real sexual desires, and this group was a safe space to express them, if only in joking. It is also possible that the boys were simply homophobic and tried to confuse me because they may have heard from their peers I had interviewed earlier that I was asking questions about homosexuality. While this was a very interesting phenomenon to observe, on the flip side, the two boys did not give enough space for the two girls to talk, the girls were visibly inhibited to talk about sexuality, and as the boys made a joke of every topic, I did not gain any usable data apart from this play. For this reason I decided that I would not have mixed groups in the future but continue with same-sex groups where participants felt more confident and relaxed to talk about sexuality.

1.4. Individual interviews

I conducted individual interviews with the school nurse, four form tutors, one vocational trainer, the school director, and two students. Teachers were not my main focus but I considered it important to gain an insight into how they were constructing students'

subjectivities. Teachers were commonly positioning themselves as non-sexual in the school, but occasional, unintended utterances about their own sexuality did occur in the interviews. I did not wish to follow up on those because I had the impression that asking teachers intimate questions about their sexuality would not be welcome and may threaten my researcher positioning in Marzipan. Vera and Anita the vocational instructor shared more about their sexuality with me, the former because we were having continual informal conversations about sexuality throughout the fieldwork, the latter because we were remotely acquainted in a local lesbian community, therefore for her I was not a complete outsider and was known to have the same sexual orientation as her.

Reflecting retrospectively, after analysing the construction of school hierarchy, I realise that inadvertently, by asking questions of both students and teachers about students' sexuality, I contributed to maintaining the hierarchy between teachers and students, as I gave teachers the opportunity to talk about students' sexuality, and very commonly they did so in ways that discursively constructed hierarchical positions for themselves and the students, often in classed, raced and gendered ways.[13] Typically, students did not discuss the sexuality of their teachers, they considered them non-sexual, except for Vera and Anita. The two of them occupied a position in a number of students' sexual subjectivity, Vera in especially that of straight boys, Anita in that of lesbians.

There were two boys with whom I conducted an individual interview. One of them was a sexually inexperienced boy with a learning disability in the catch-up class who was subjected to recurring sexual teasing and bullying by his male classmates. I wanted to ask him about a concrete act of bullying which happened right before I was going to interview a group including him. The boy who did the bullying act was interviewed in another group where I

---

[13] See Chapter 4 for examples of such constructions.

asked him what happened, as well. He had the support of his fellow students in the interview group, therefore I decided to interview the victim individually, not in a group, so as to protect him from further potential bullying.

The other boy I interviewed individually was Frici, a gay boy. He was the only boy I found in Marzipan who was identifying as gay and was out. I made an effort to find non-heterosexually identifying students and students having non-heterosexual sexual practices. The reason for finding six such girls and only one boy must have been due to the ongoing homophobic bullying in the school. While boys were calling everyone a 'faggot' for whatever minor transgression of heteronormativity (so everyone had the chance to receive the label at some point – see: Pascoe 2007), such name-calling affects gays and straights differently and instils a fear of being outed in boys who are really 'faggots'. As asking about sexual orientations in group interviews would have been dangerous for such boys, I accepted their self-identification in front of their male classmates and did not question anyone's proclaimed heterosexuality. Thus, I had to find other ways to get non-heterosexual boys to interview. The safest method seemed to be to ask Vera and those girls who claimed they had gay friends or that they knew some gay boys in the school to ask discreetly the boys they knew whether I could interview them. All the responses I received were negative, no gay boy wanted to be interviewed, with the exception of Frici, who was out in front of his classmates and some of his teachers and was visiting Vera regularly to seek counselling for his relationship problems.

Besides having a number of informal conversations, I conducted an interview with Vera, as well. Due to practical reasons, it took place in summer, in an inner city daycare camp for primary school students where Vera was a supervisor. I think the external location did not influence the interview in any significant way. I also interviewed Anita outside the school, in a nearby café at the beginning of the same summer, when she had a few hours break from

work. Our previous acquaintance lent a more confidential tone to our interview than with the other teachers. I interviewed the four form tutors in the school building. The interviews ran in one session, except with Anna, who had to leave unexpectedly, therefore a few days later we continued the interview where we had stopped. The school director was the last to interview, at the very end of my fieldwork, in his office, after negotiating an appointment via his secretary. That was the most formal interview. I wanted to interview another male teacher, the form tutor of the year-10 form I was observing, but he had the idea that we did not need to agree on a date but when I was around in the school I could interview him if I managed to catch him when he happened to be free for an hour or two. Because of the part-time nature and busy scheduling of my fieldwork I soon gave up trying to catch him.

1.5. Data collection from school officials, the school nurse and from the website of the school

For collecting quantitative data and official documents on students, teachers and the school, I relied on the website of Marzipan, the student database of Vera and data collected by the school secretariat. I cannot publicise the url address of the website because of the anonymity protection of the school. On this website I found the school program and official data about students and teachers, some of which I include in Chapter 4, Section 1. From Vera I gained data on the number of male and female students in each strand in 2010. I have decided to use data from 2010 because that was the year when I spent the most time in Marzipan. I also gained data on respondents during the interviews (such as age, ethnicity, family, parents' occupation, certain sexual experiences, etc.), which I inserted in an excel data file. This file also contains the pseudonyms of the respondents.

2. Fieldnotes, transcribing and coding

I made handwritten notes while observing lessons, which I wrote up into typed fieldnotes immediately after leaving the school for the day. The fieldnotes expanded on my observation notes, I contextualised the notes scribbled during observation and highlighted certain observations and questions that were raised for further consideration or observation. I also wrote fieldnotes about interviews and observations of other school spaces. I transcribed the interviews and the recorded lessons verbatim, but I did not include pauses and hesitations. I have approximately 60 hours of recorded interviews, 24 hours of recorded lessons, 1500 pages of interview and lesson recording transcripts and 100 pages of fieldnotes. I chose to code the transcripts by hand because going through each transcript several times helped me identify and develop themes from which I would select some for analysis later. First I read each printed transcript and fieldnote, then I made brief summaries of what they were saying on the left side of the page in Hungarian (as all transcripts were in Hungarian), then I wrote keywords (underlined) and topics (circled) on the right side of the page in English and also inserted more specific subcodes under larger topics. After the completion of the open coding (see: Emerson et al. 1995), I wrote a few keywords and topics that were the most characteristic of the given transcript on the top of the first page of the transcript. Later, in the course of the analysis I could easily find the clearly marked topics and keywords I was looking for in the transcripts and check the relevant text parts. After completing the coding, I wrote initial theoretical memos about topics and themes that emerged and seemed significant for later analysis (see: Emerson et al. 1995), then I collected all the quotes for the given topic or theme from the fieldnotes and transcripts. In the course of the analysis I selected quotes from these collections, always going back to the fieldnote/transcript to check the context. I translated the excerpts selected for the analysis into English, then edited most of them so that only the parts relevant to the point I was making remained. I took great care to edit the

excerpts in a way that the point the respondent was making was not changed. Some of the excerpts contain vulgar words, which I have left unchanged in the text, because talking about sex in a vulgar way is part of gender constitution through sexuality discourses.

3. Analysis

In her paper on visual research on school sexual culture, Allen argues that "a school's sexual culture is produced within daily schooling practices in which young people actively participate" (2009: 396). She conceptualizes these daily schooling practices and their meanings as discursive and explains that "[e]xamining the 'sexual culture of schools' involves discerning those discursive practices which constitute and demarcate the sexual in educational settings" (2009: 396). My analysis is also based on this understanding of sexuality as discourses and discursive practices, therefore I apply discourse analysis to identify the sexual discourses implicated in subjectivity constitution.

Critical discourse analysis takes discourse as a social practice and it is a suitable method for analysing texts such as my fieldnotes and interview transcripts because it takes the social-political-cultural context of the text into consideration, it highlights the discursive nature of power relations, discourse's contribution to re/producing or transforming power relations, and the ideological work it does in representing and constructing power relations (Fairclough & Wodak 1997). Fairclough and Wodak argue that critical discourse analysis is a form of social action (1997: 279-280), which is another reason why I apply it for the analysis of my research materials. The aim of my critical approach to analysing sexuality discourses in school is not only the production of academic analysis but I also aim to encourage critical thinking about educational discourses re/producing social inequalities and to inspire future practical application of my analysis, for example in the form of producing non-heteronormative, inclusive sex education tools and materials.

48

4. Self-positioning in research

Reflection on my subjectivities and positioning in the field is an essential part of feminist research (Sarikakis 2003). I am aware that as a researcher I was not invisible in the field, and my presence had an impact on the observed and recorded interactions, though the nature and degree of the impact is difficult to estimate. Also, as an observer, I was not neutral and impartial. Fieldnotes are not 'objective data'; what I noted down as observation was inevitably influenced by my subjectivity, my position as a researcher, my observing and recording style and methods. The fieldnotes contain the documentation of and reflections on not only the people and spaces I observed but on my own activities as well, my states and emotional responses, which shaped the process of observing and recording (Emerson et.al. 1995). Data was generated, not by an essential self of the researcher but by both the researching and researched subjects perpetually constituted through discourse (Youdell 2005). In this approach, "(…) research practice is wholly implicated in processes of ongoing subjectivation (of both the researcher and the researched) even as these subjectivities form the objects of study" (Youdell 2005: 254). As Youdell notes, during observation one is never "either non-participant or fully participant" (2006: 68). The observer is always simultaneously observed, and observation is always already interpretation, "it is a representation that is itself wholly mediated by the discursive frames brought by the observer and constitutive of the setting it observes and so represents" (2006: 68).

The aspects of my subjectivity that were certainly of relevance in the field included my age (36-38 at the time of the fieldwork – much older than the students); my gender (cis-woman), my sexual orientation (lesbian but mostly closeted in Marzipan); my education (higher than all my respondents', including teachers, except one who had a doctoral degree) and doctoral student status; my race/ethnicity (White Hungarian); my looks (large messy curly long hair,

no fashion-consciousness and no attributes of stereotypical ideal femininity but no conspicuous gender ambivalence); my researcher status; my being an outsider in a closed mini-society where outsiders are treated with suspicion. Each of these aspects were subject to performative constitution (Youdell 2006: 65), to constant negotiation, decision-making about disclosing/closeting, balancing, emphasizing or downgrading depending on who I was interacting with.

I told students at the beginning of our interviews that it is meant to be an open discussion, not me asking questions and them answering, so they should feel free to ask questions, as well. Some of them did, especially girls, and some of these questions were about my 'private life' (e.g. do I have a boyfriend?). In these situations I always had to decide on the spot what and how much to reveal about myself. As Pascoe argues, sexuality was not only something she was studying but was part of the research process, "in that it mediated, complicated, and illuminated researcher-respondent interactions" (2007: 176). As I was discussing matters of sexuality with students and occasionally answered questions about my own sexuality, sexuality did exactly that and it was constituted in ways, both by my respondents and myself, that did not necessarily feel congruous with my sexuality performed in other social circumstances.

Some of my adolescent respondents who asked my age were surprised that I was much older than they thought. I believe that looking younger helped in the interviews because they were more confident and relaxed to talk about sexuality with someone who did not look so much older than them. Teachers were also treating me as 'young'. This may have made them see me as not so 'threatening', so perhaps they spoke more openly, although I noticed they were careful about how they were talking about certain topics, especially Gypsies, which I discuss in Chapter 4. As a researcher I felt that some older teachers treated me as a 'beginner'

researcher due to my assumed young age, and as someone with no (or 'not enough') experience in the world of schooling from teachers' perspective. Similarly to Pascoe, I tried to maintain a "least-adult" position both with adolescent and adult respondents (2007: 178), which enabled me to be positioned somewhere in-between the student-teacher generation gap, which was also a power gap between them. This in-between position also corresponded with my power position in general: I had more power than students but less than teachers.

Being a (cis-)woman certainly made a difference with the male and female respondents. In general, I managed to establish better rapport with the girls I interviewed than with the boys. Most girls seemed to like the idea of talking about sexuality with an older woman. There were a few occasions when girls actually asked me for advice on some relationship issue. As in these cases the other girls in the group were friends of the one who asked for advice, we could discuss the given issue together. No boy asked for advice on anything related to sexuality during interviews. With boys it is likely that the interviews would have turned out quite differently if they had been conducted by a young man, they would probably have performed their masculinity differently in front of another man than a woman. Whether I was a woman in front of whom the boys, especially the sexually experienced once, were performing an exaggerated masculinity or I was an older woman in front of whom they restrained their masculinity performance, or a mixture of both, remains a question.

Pascoe discusses how she used the strategy of performing a "least-gendered" subjectivity to establish rapport with the boys and in response to the sexualisation and objectification her male respondents subjected her to. This included a certain non-stereotypically feminine, rather 'boyish' dressing style, comportment, ways of talking and forefronting her athletic interests and abilities (2007: 180-183). I was also performing a "least-gendered" subjectivity, not by picking up a "soft-butch" demeanour like Pascoe but through my usual non-conforming to

51

stereotypical femininity. Along with a "least-gendered" self-presentation, I also performed what Pascoe does not reflect on: a 'least-sexual' one. This may seem odd considering that I was researching sexuality and may put me in a 'scientist mode', in which I look like a 'detached observer' of some 'external phenomenon'. However, it was important for me, especially among boys, to avoid potential sexual objectification and feel as comfortable as possible in interactions which were often offensive or difficult. My 'least-sexual' self-presentation was successful in this sense, I did not receive unwanted sexual comments, invitations or intrusive questions from boys (or from girls), no verbal or physical intimidation or direct crossing my (sexual) boundaries such as Pascoe describes (2007: 183-187).

My sexual orientation remained undisclosed for most of my respondents. The reasons for that were twofold: on the one hand, I did not wish to be subjected to the rampant homophobia in Marzipan. On the other hand, school is a very heteronormative and closed environment, where I appeared as an outsider. I did not wish respondents to be preoccupied with my sexuality, because of unforeseeable ways it may influence the research process. Therefore I took advantage of the heteronormative approach that as long as I am not out as a lesbian I will be considered heterosexual (Youdell 2006: 65). With some straight girls this implied that I lied when they asked if I had a boyfriend. I was in a long-term relationship with a woman at the time and I answered yes to this question and simply provided some information about her if there were any further questions about "him". In Hungarian this is easy to do because the language does not have separate third person singular pronouns for 'her' and 'him', so one is able to talk at length about people without mentioning their gender. Talking about my "boyfriend" increased the curious girls' confidence and ease with me, it established a sort of shared ground with them. Boys and teachers did not ask me such questions.

One of the two lesbians and the two straight girls who were a couple asked me directly whether I was a lesbian; they said they had guessed. The other lesbian was surprised, and so was the gay boy, to whom I also came out during the interview, which suggests that my 'least-sexual' self-presentation worked well, even with some of them. Coming out to the two lesbians at the beginning of the interview established rapport with them. With the two straight girls, one of them asked right after the interview was over, and the question turned into another, informal, unrecorded discussion, because they started to ask questions about living like a lesbian and what label I thought was available for their sexual-emotional experience with each other. I came out to Vera towards the end of the fieldwork, as we were chatting about our relationships in a break spent in the school doctor's room, and she casually said she had guessed I was a lesbian long before. I had observed earlier that at some point during the sex education lessons she started to make references to homosexual sex in a more inclusive way than before (e.g. she said things like "it doesn't matter whether you are having an opposite-sex or same-sex partner as long as appropriate protection is used"). I wondered whether she had started to do that after she guessed my sexual orientation. If that was the case my (assumed) sexuality implicitly impacted the sexuality discourse used by the sex educator.

Telling students, especially those coming from working-class background, that I was writing a doctoral dissertation was not such a brilliant idea, as I soon realised, because they did not know what that meant. Therefore I took to telling them at the introduction that I was writing a book about teenage sexuality, which made some respondents very enthusiastic. In one group two boys told me that they would prefer me to use their real name, not pseudonyms in the book. Some were flattered that I was so interested in them. Vera, who had college education and was about ten years younger than me, was keen on hearing my opinions, as she considered me an expert on sexuality (education). Some teachers were puzzled or cynical about my research topic (which I tried to explain as briefly as possible) and made some

53

degrading comments on adolescent sexual behaviour. One teacher directly asked me whether I was working or how my studies were funded. She also wanted to know the amount of my stipend, which I declined to tell her, as I knew it was about as much or somewhat higher than her senior teacher salary, and I felt the potential frustration or sense of unfairness the information may trigger in her.

Because of being White, my ethnicity was unmarked. I had the feeling that teachers, even though they tried to sound 'politically correct' when talking about Gypsy students, took my whiteness as a characteristic which ensured that I would understand and share their covert racism, about which I present examples in Chapter 4. If I had had visible bodily features characteristic of Gypsies, they may have restrained themselves more, or they may have said the same things with the amendment that of course, educated Gypsies, like me, were exceptions. The White students did not try to be 'politically correct' when talking about Gypsy people, many expressed racist views openly. I wonder whether, had I been a Gypsy, they would have been more careful. As I discuss in Chapter 6, Section 1, many Gypsy students also expressed internalised racism, they constructed hierarchies of Gypsy people and hated those whom they put in a lower position than themselves in the hierarchy. I was wondering whether these performances of internalised racism were addressed to their White peers in mixed interviews, but the same 'good Gypsies vs. bad Gypsies' discourse emerged in the group where there were three Gypsy girls and no Hungarian, and in the group with three (half-)Gypsy boys and one Hungarian boy who was positioned low in the peer hierarchy. In these two groups (the rest of the groups were more mixed or there were more Hungarians than Gypsies in them) Gypsy-hatred by Gypsies was probably performed for me as a White person, but it is also possible that my researcher position was more important than my whiteness and if I had been a researcher with a visible Gypsy background, they would have produced the same discourse for the record.

54

At the beginning of my fieldwork I took great pains to decide what clothes to wear and how to do my hair for my school visits. I wanted to look "cool" for the students, but I soon realised that I did not possess any clothes items that would be considered "cool" by adolescents, so I gave up and relaxed back into just wearing my usual 'untrendy' clothes casually. Pascoe also writes about such precalculations of what clothes to wear (2007: 181; see also: Sarikakis 2003: 432), but, unlike me, she chose and adhered to a certain dressing style to fit best her intended positionality.

As a doctoral student who was researching a taboo topic in a school, I was treated by teachers with a mixture of respect (for my high education), disrespect or not being taken seriously (for being seen as 'young' and a student, and for researching such a topic), discomfort (for the topic), suspicion (for recording what they say and for being an outsider to the school), curiosity (again, for the topic and what I may find), support (it's great that somebody is interested in the daily drag of school life, finally someone is listening to them), generosity (they would give me some of their time even though they did not see any benefit of it for themselves) and indifference (research doesn't make any difference in the daily operation of the school, it does not help their work). I constantly had to intuitively navigate through these feelings and attitudes which I sensed when communicating with teachers. I often felt powerless with teachers, they could have easily denied me access to respondents and spaces to observe. I was also completely dependent on their schedules, and the difficult arrangement and constant rearrangement of dates for interviewing and classroom observation was an integral part of fieldwork. I tried to express respect for their work, compassion for their feelings and gratitude for giving me their time. I tried to be smooth, kind and easy-going with them. At the beginning of interviews I always told them that I used to teach in a secondary school too, which seemed to establish rapport and position me as less of an outsider. This

shows that the power of the researcher in the field is relative, especially in a setting where there is a complex power hierarchy in place (see: Sarikakis 2003).

I also experienced suspicion and distrust from some students, but most of them were either indifferent or friendly towards me. In one case I was interviewing a group of boys from the 'catch-up' form, one of whom had police prosecution going on against him. He asked me a couple of times during the interview whether I was really not from the police, and he kept quiet, saying very little. He consented to the recording of the interview but asked me to put away the recorder so that he would not see it, because it bothered him. The other boys also asked me a few times if I was going to hand over the interview to their form tutor and after I repeatedly said no, they became more relaxed to talk about everything, including sexuality. At one point one of the boys started to say something about his experiences with drugs but checked himself. I was interested in what he wanted to say, so I told him that I had also tried smoking marijuana a few times when I was younger, and he laughed and said that if what I said was also recorded, then he could feel free to talk about drugs and he did. In the end he even offered to get me drugs if I wanted any. I politely declined this offer, but this encounter was an example of how unexpected chances come up sometimes for establishing rapport through briefly mentioning a personal experience shared with the respondents. This tactic worked in other interviews, as well.

There was one act by students which I interpreted as bullying, even though I suppose for them it was 'just' a mischievous joke. I was in the building where the baking practice was situated and there was less supervision of student activities in breaks than in the main building where the academic subjects were taught. I went to use the teachers' toilet in one break. Four or five boys were standing near the toilet, from a form I did not know, I did not recognize their faces. When I went in the toilet and locked the door one boy banged on the door, which felt

threatening. Then I heard the sound of dragging furniture, and when I tried to open the door, it was stuck. They had pushed a desk in front of the toilet door. I pushed the door with strength, the desk toppled over and gave a loud noise as it fell, and I could finally come out. There was nobody around. A few minutes later the desk was set back in its place on the corridor. I was upset, I felt bullied and wondered why they did it. Perhaps it was an aggressive male reaction to facing a female stranger who was using the teachers' toilet but was not a teacher, so she had no power to punish. Perhaps they had known that I was researching in the school and locking me up was an attempt at silencing. Perhaps my presence bothered them because by looking at me it was difficult to read who I was, in what power position. Looking young, not dressed like teachers or students typically were, also not looking like a parent, but at the same time having a key to the teachers' toilet. Such a mysterious creature is better locked up, not to disturb the closed space of the school, not to disrupt existing power relations. Or perhaps it was a reaction to my non-stereotypical femininity in a space where stereotypical mainstream femininity prevailed. It was rare to see girls in Marzipan who did not have well-tended long hair and tight, revealing clothes following the class-specific versions of the latest fashion trend.

Throughout my fieldwork I was constantly balancing and negotiating my position with students and teachers (see also: Pascoe 2007: 177). I had to be allied with both students and teachers and this required a balancing of different self-presentations. With students I tried to be more relaxed and made efforts to get them to understand that I was not a teacher, in order to avoid potential antagonism and distrust that was accompanying student-teacher relations. Unlike at the beginning of interviews with teachers, to whom I told that I used to be a teacher myself, to students I told at the introduction that I was not a teacher. Both were true, both were slices of my occupational history. When students were complaining about teachers and power abuse during the interviews I expressed empathy, which made them more trustful

towards me. Trust was very important because of the intimate nature of the topics I was asking them about. When I managed to sufficiently reassure them that I was not a teacher and that I would treat the recordings confidentially and not show them to any teacher in Marzipan, they became quite relaxed to talk. Humour was also important in establishing rapport; I noticed, for example, that when I was observing lessons, students in the first rows, who were sitting nearest to me, especially the boys, kept checking whether I was laughing at their jokes.

Simultaneously, I tried to create alliance with teachers. Whereas they exhibited the above-mentioned mixed attitudes towards me when alone, in front of students they treated me as a colleague or special respected guest. Anna, the tutor of the 'catch-up' form sometimes attempted to use me as an aide. Once, for example, she told me at the end of a break between lessons that she needed to finish something and asked me to look after the students for the first ten minutes of the next lesson. By that time I was familiar to the students and they knew that I was not a teacher and was not going to discipline them, so they felt free to behave 'unruly' (e.g. playing music from their phones loudly) while I was sitting in front of them at the teacher's desk. Eventually Anna appeared, announced that 'Miss Dori' (me) was going to take away some boys for interviewing, and selected the boys. This was against the practice of voluntary interviewing, but it was a tool for her to re-establish her authority after giving it up for ten minutes by installing me in her place. This scene bothered me, I felt used and misrepresented, and it happened right before the interview with the boys I mentioned above, one of whom suspected I was from the police. Perhaps the scene added to the distrust of the boys, the situation that Anna created may have made them confused about who I was in what power position.

My given subjectivity and positionality certainly influenced what my respondents said to me and how they said it. Discourses are inconsistent, incongruous, constitutive of and constituted

by the social environment and power relations they are embedded in. I told my respondents at the beginning of the interviews that there were no 'good' or 'bad' answers to my questions, I was interested in whatever they had to say about the given topic and was not judgemental about what they would say. Still, I had the feeling with many respondents, both with students and teachers, that about certain issues they tried to say what they thought I wanted to hear. For example, teachers tried to use what they assumed was a politically correct way of talking about Gypsy people, but – as my analysis shows in Chapter 4 – their discourses barely disguised their racially biased thinking. Or, many male students, for example, insisted that for casual sexual encounters they were always wearing a condom. This is what they heard they should do at sex education lessons and they probably thought this was the 'right' answer to my question about the usage of contraceptive and STI preventive methods. If condom use were as common among young people as my respondents suggested, STI and teen pregnancy statistics would look different, I suppose. However, my aim was not to find out 'the truth' but to map discourses, therefore such statements are valuable data even if they do not consistently represent actual practices.

5. Access to the field and respondents

Schools operate like small societies within society. Because of this and my topic, I expected to experience some difficulties in gaining access to the field and respondents. Before entering the field I had direct contact with only one teacher, Anita, who had suggested to me during an informal conversation at a community event that I could do my fieldwork in Marzipan. However, gaining access to the school did not turn out to be difficult, Anita introduced me to Vera who was very cooperative and committed to her job and helped me establish contact with teachers. Only the school director, whose permission I had to ask before starting the fieldwork, proved to be somewhat difficult to convince. First I sent him a letter introducing

myself and my research and asking for his permission. Then I phoned him to follow up and despite what I wrote about my research methods, he told me bluntly that there had been so many surveys done in the school that he was not going to allow me to have students fill in another questionnaire during lessons. When I reassured him that I did not intend to do a questionnaire-based survey but quietly observe lessons and make interviews, he relented. Back then I did not know that I would be able to interview students only during lessons, but all teachers allowed me to take away some students from some lessons, so I did not go back to the school director to ask for permission for this. He did not show any sign of interest in my research, and retired at the end of the 2009 school year. I informed the new director about my ongoing research, also on the phone, and he had no objection. It was the tutors of the forms whose sex education lessons I was observing who had the final say about interviewing students.

It is a problem that there are very few Gypsy boys in my sample, only 6 boys out of 42 identified himself as Gypsy or half-Gypsy. Among girls the proportion was higher: 13 out of 45 girls identified themselves as Gypsy or half-Gypsy, and there were 8 girls who had some Gypsy family relations but did not identify themselves clearly as Gypsies or Hungarians. I had the impression that the proportion of Gypsy boys in Marzipan was lower than that of Gypsy girls – although Gypsy ethnic belonging is not always recognizable by looks and is not always based on biological family background, as I discuss in Chapter 6. Besides, I did not have respondents from all forms and participating in the interviews was voluntary in general, therefore representative respondent selection was not granted.

6. Roma, Non-Roma, Gypsy, Hungarian, Gadjo, White – Issues of naming

In the course of my analysis it came up as an issue how I should refer to my respondents' ethnicity. The words *Romani* (group name, adjective) and *Rom/a* (person/s, noun)[14] are used as collective names for Gypsy groups and persons, as an alternative to *Gypsy*, which has often been used pejoratively, similarly as *Negro* for African Americans. In Hungarian the word *Roma/roma* is used both for Roma individuals and for groups, as a sort of "politically correct" naming. In the literature it is common, especially in ethnographic works, that the authors call their research subjects the name they call themselves, mostly *Gypsy*, rather than *Roma* (e.g. Durst 2011). Other authors prefer to use *Roma*, to avoid the negative connotations of *Gypsy* (e.g. Kóczé 2011).[15]

The use of *Hungarian* to refer to people of Hungarian ethnic origin vs. people of Hungarian nationality/citizenship, is much less reflected upon in sociology than the question of Roma vs. Gypsy, and *White* is uncommon in the context of discussing Hungarian population groups. They are usually named *Hungarians* or *non-Romas/non-Gypsies*, without reflection, or less frequently *Gadjo*, which is a Romani word used by Gypsies to refer to non-Gypsy people. In everyday talk the Gypsy vs. Gadjo, i.e. Roma vs. non-Roma distinction is commonly used by Gypsy people, but scholars could reflect more on this dichotomisation and Othering by using a 'non-' term, defining ethnicities other than Roma by calling them what they are not.

My respondents who identified as *Hungarian*, used this label for themselves or for one another, they never used *White*. *White* would perhaps be more appropriate to use in some contexts, but I only use that term when discussing theoretical issues of whiteness. *Hungarian* is understood here as a marker of ethnicity, not of nationality or citizenship. As one Gypsy

---

[14] This collective naming was accepted at the First Roma World Congress in 1971 (Fraser 1992).
[15] There are also regional varieties in naming, see: Bakó 2006; Pálos 2006; Durst 2002. Others use *Roma* and *non-Roma* (e.g. Neményi 2007; Kligman 2001)

girl noted, "we are also Hungarian citizens." Also, if I call respondents identifying as Hungarian *White*, should I call Gypsies *non-Whites* or *Blacks*? Referring to someone as a 'non-something' makes the person invisible, so I avoid that. Should I use *Gypsy* vs. *White*? Creating another dichotomy, where *White* is the constant, to which, instead of *Black*, now *Gypsy* is assigned as an opposite, is problematic. At the same time, I use critical whiteness and critical race theories in my analysis, therefore *White* is an appropriate term to use. Or would it be better to use expressions such as *White Hungarian* and *Roma/Gypsy Hungarian*? Most of my Gypsy respondents consider themselves an ethnic variety of White, so this distinction is not accurate.

From a theoretical perspective, the Hungarian population as a whole bears the sociological character of a White majority. Hungary is a monolithic nation with one ethnic majority (Hungarians) and one significant ethnic minority (Gypsies) – estimated to be 2-10% of the population, depending on the calculation method.[16] In such an environment, carrying the national ethnicity has a specific significance in terms of constructing normative ethnic subjectivities and othering or ethnicizing groups. In nationalist discourse (which many of my Hungarian respondents use), Hungary is commonly constructed as an isolated country, whose 'pure body' is intruded upon, or even invaded by non-Hungarians, foreigners, etc. It is very common, for example, to hear from people with nationalist and racist sentiments that Gypsies should 'leave the country to Hungarians' and 'go back to India'.

Eventually, I decided to refer to my respondents' ethnic subjectivities as *Gypsy* and *Hungarian*, albeit being well aware of the ambiguity and loadedness of these terms of reference. By calling my respondents Gypsies and Hungarians, I follow the categorization practice of Hungarian sociological literature, which most commonly refers to these two

---

[16] See Chapter 6, Section 1.1.

groups as Gypsies and Hungarians. This literature refers to Gypsies as 'ethnicity' or 'ethnic minority'. Calling Gypsies a 'race' is not accepted in mainstream sociological discourse, and the Hungarian equivalent of 'race' (*faj*) is not used. By calling some of my respondents Hungarians and others Gypsies I indicate that I accept their self-definitions, with an understanding of their specific geopolitical-social-historical positioning. Concerning *Hungarian* vs. *White*, I think it is best to use both categories, *Hungarian* in the cases when referring to respondents who identify themselves as Hungarians, and *White* when I am making analytical reflections on their positionality as Whites.

My Gypsy respondents never used *Roma* to refer to themselves, they always say *Gypsy* (*cigány*). The word *cigány* has been reclaimed by Gypsy people and many now prefer it to *Roma(ni),* as a rejection of the hypocrisy of 'politically correct' official naming and discriminatory treatment at the same time. However, this reinscription seems to be only partially successful, because for Hungarians, *cigány* has almost exclusively negative connotations, and this does not seem to be changing too much in public discourse. The negative connotations are also very visible in my interviews. My choice of using *Gypsy*, instead of *Roma* for my respondents in an analytical text – besides following their self-naming practice – is partly politically motivated: I use the word in order to interpellate Gypsy subjectivity in ways that offer the chance to "misfire", to contribute to the performative reinscription process of the word (see: Butler 1997b).

7. Ethical questions

7.1. Gaining consent from respondents

Gaining consent for interviewing young people was a complex issue in a hierarchical institution, and I tried to follow ethical standards which enabled generating the required data

and handling the data respectfully and confidentially but did not impede the research process. I was interviewing young people, all of whom were over 14 but many of whom were under 18, about the sensitive topic of sexuality. Asking for written consent from parents would very likely have severely impeded the research process. On the one hand, asking students to bring home a piece of paper, have it signed by their parents and bring it back for me to collect seemed like mission impossible. Probably a low number of students would have done that, due to general adolescent disinterest in non-compulsory school tasks, strained relations with parents, or general forgetfulness. Besides, some of the students were not living with their parents but in state care homes. On the other hand, some parents would surely have not given permission for interviewing their children about sexuality matters, especially parents in 'traditional' Gypsy families where talking about sex is a taboo, religious parents, or parents whose children had not been sexually active (or their parents thought they were not). This would have reduced the number and diversity of students I could have interviewed. Besides, it would have raised the question whether parents also would have to consent to the classroom observation of their children as that also included recording, which would have made observation impossible.

Apart from the issue of parents, I reasoned that if the legal age of consent for sexual activity was 14, then young people over 14 could also be considered mature enough to consent to *talking* about sex. Besides, I interviewed them during schooltime (apart from the previously mentioned exceptions), when teachers had responsibility for them, therefore I assumed that in addition to the school director's preliminary permission, it was sufficient to ask permission from form tutors for interviewing students. I did not have the respondents sign consent forms, I considered this superfluous documentation after the respondents agreed to be interviewed and gave oral consent at the beginning of the interview.

7.2. Securing anonymity and sharing information

The issue of gaining consent also brings up the subject of how to handle information, both about the school and the respondents and about me and my research. Marzipan is a specific school because of its location, structure and the types of vocations it offers; the number of similar schools in the country is limited. Therefore it is a school easy to identify if I reveal too much data about it. On the other hand, if I do not provide details about the vocational specificities, it is difficult if not impossible to provide a sound analysis of the hierarchical power structures and their construction and of the sexualisation of school space through vocational practice. Therefore I refer to the school by a pseudonym, do not reveal its location and not include the school website among my references, even though it is an important source of data. In my Hungarian publications (Rédai 2015, 2012, 2011) I do not even reveal the vocations taught in the school and the exact structure of the school, as for a Hungarian speaker it would be very easy to find out from these pieces of information which school I am writing about, and once the school is found out, it would be easy to identify the teachers I interviewed. Unfortunately this means I cannot publish certain parts of my analysis in Hungarian. However, complying with the rules of anonymity raises another ethical question for me: by not revealing the name of the school and respondents I may protect some respondents but at the same time I contribute to keeping silence about power abuse (some cases of which I will discuss in the following section), which is against my political convictions. This is a clash between my personal feminist ethics and the standardised ethics of research.

In the other direction, I constantly had to make decisions about what to say to respondents about myself and my research. I tried to keep both to a minimum and be ready for further questions if asked. Before I started the fieldwork, I wrote down differently worded

explanations of what I was researching for teachers, the school nurse and students. Classroom observation seemed the most stressful for teachers, therefore when I was doing that I told teachers that it was primarily the students' interactions I was interested in, not in what and how they were teaching. Teachers were not particularly enthusiastic about my research, but they were friendly. Occasionally they asked questions about my findings and about certain students but I declined to share with them what those students said. However, I did ask teachers sometimes about certain students, to add more information to some unclear issue that emerged from an interview. Similarly, I asked students sometimes about certain teachers but kept all information confidential.

I use pseudonyms for all respondents, including those students who wanted to appear with their real name in my "book". I mark their age but I do not reveal which form they were in, just the strand when it is relevant. I only name the 'catch-up' form because it is relevant in the analysis that it is a special form. I make reference to the sexual orientation of one teacher because it is also relevant in the discussion. As I completed my fieldwork four years before writing up the dissertation, all the students I interviewed will have graduated already, which fact adds to the protection of students' anonymity. I hope that I managed to secure teachers' anonymity as well (despite my above mentioned ethical dilemma), but I consider that of secondary importance compared to the anonymity of students, because the teachers were consenting adults who have power positions and responsibility in the school, therefore what they say to me in an interview regarding their work and the people they work with and how they do their work in the school should not be considered a private thing to conceal.

7.3. Ethical dilemmas and choices for a feminist researcher

Pascoe (2007: 192) discusses the challenges she as a feminist was facing during her fieldwork in a high school in the US. One of her concerns was that for the purpose of maintaining rapport with her male respondents, she often left homophobic and sexist behaviours of boys unchallenged, and she felt that by doing so she was helping to preserve gender inequalities in the school. I repeatedly faced similar problems during my fieldwork, and here I discuss one of the problematic situations I encountered.

Like Pascoe, I heard and saw many instances of sexist, homophobic, racist and xenophobic speech and behaviour during interviewing and observation. This was research material for me; apart from noting and commenting them in my fieldnotes, most of the time I did not intervene. In many cases I kept a straight face when I heard offensive statements about discriminated groups or individuals belonging to those groups. It was sexist, homophobic, racist and xenophobic "jokes" where I drew the line, I did not laugh at them. When I did intervene, mostly in interviews, I responded to sexist, homophobic, racist and xenophobic utterances with pointing out the perspective of "the other side", with providing information to counter misbeliefs, with questions to challenge or clarify, or with fake-naïve comments like "I have never met a Gypsy person like the one you describe" (to comments like "all Gypsies cheat, steal and lie") or "I have never seen gay people having sex right in front of people in the street, have you?" (to comments like "I can tolerate gay people as long as they don't do it in front of my nose"). This sometimes initiated reflection on what the person had just said, but sometimes the response was an even firmer repetition of the statement I was trying to challenge. I made all these interventions in a low key, non-confrontative manner. I did have experience in discussing homophobia and heterosexism with adolescents from my activist

work,[17] which helped me handle such communication and not take hateful comments personally, but when one is doing research in such an environment about such topics, she still must be ready to face offenses. And offense must not be shown, because the news of having offended the interviewer will spread fast, and that will probably influence how the next group will talk. It is very difficult to decide on the spot every time whether and how to respond, taking into consideration personal ethics, personal sensitivities, political convictions and the aims and interests of the research and navigate a delicate balance.

I write about the sexual abuse of a female student by a male teacher in Chapter 4, Section 3.3. The abused girl told me the story and asked me if I could help, and I was faced with a feminist ethical dilemma. As a feminist I should not leave sexual abuse happen without interference, especially as I was asked to help. At the same time, as a researcher, I should not interfere too much in my 'field'. And as a researcher I was also entangled in the school's power relations: I had to maintain rapport with teachers, as well as students. I would have been exposed to the potential backlash of teachers or school management if I had raised the issue, as they could have easily sent me away from Marzipan, and I could not have afforded to stop and start the fieldwork in another school at that point, when I was at a very advanced stage of it. Even more importantly, I probably would have exposed the girls to risks and retaliation as well, I might even have induced placing them into the lowest stream. As an outsider, I certainly did not have the power and tools to deal with that. I did ask a colleague working in an NGO supporting survivors of violence against women what she thought I could do. She thought that from outside the school I did not have the means to interfere, and if the girls made the decision (however coerced it was) not to report the case to the police, they could not be given legal support. I went back to the girl and told her what my colleague had said, and that was all

---

[17] I have been working as a facilitator since 2004 and as a facilitator trainer since 2012 in the school program called "Getting to Know LGBT People", run by Labrisz Lesbian Association and Szimpozion Association since 2000. http://www.labrisz.hu/school-programme

I could do. Recording and telling the story brings it out to daylight but does not give it due justice, because of the research ethics of anonymity, and also because several years have passed since the abuse happened.

7.4. Returning favours and giving feedback to respondents

It is another important issue in research ethics how to deal with the power position of the researcher, the one who "collects" data and then leaves the field and writes it up for her own academic benefit. Judith Stacey argues that "elements of inequality, exploitation, and even betrayal are endemic to ethnography" (1988: 23). I acknowledge that such elements were present in my fieldwork. However, as I argue in Section 4, in a hierarchical institution, such as a school, power relations between researcher and researched are relative. Also, Stacey's reflection was motivated by fieldwork where the researcher and the researched developed close emotional relationships. In my case this did not happen, therefore my respondents probably did not have strong feelings of exploitation, betrayal and abandonment after I left the field.

For most students it was fun to be taken away from lessons and talk about sexuality instead, so for them it was not an extra effort that I felt I should somehow reciprocate, besides writing about what they said. With teachers, however, it was different, they were giving me extra time often beyond their teaching hours, and I unintentionally gave them stress by observing their work. This was especially an issue with Vera whose work I most closely followed. The dilemma of securing anonymity vs. the feminist ethics of not silencing (verbal) violence and power abuse becomes even more complicated by the fact that I write very critically about what these teachers were saying whereas they gave me their contributions with best intention and out of generosity – because the general attitude was that they were 'helping' me,

patronizing the 'young' researcher, firmly indicating their power position as higher than mine. If they are reading my Hungarian publications, it is likely that they can recognize themselves, their colleagues and their (former) students, despite pseudonyms. I suppose that the likelihood of their reading my texts years later is very low and the likelihood that any of them would read my English dissertation is even lower. In case they did, I would find it difficult to make them understand that I am analysing discourses, not their character or professional expertise. Although it may be unethical, I eventually decided not to give them feedback or reciprocation unless they asked for it.

They never asked, except once. As it would have been complicated to explain that I was in gender studies (because the concept of gender is not familiar to most people in Hungary), I usually introduced myself as a sociologist or anthropologist. Anna the form tutor approached me once, thinking that if I was a sociologist I could help her and unspokenly implying that she could expect help from me in return for her help. She told me that one of her students wanted to prepare a sociogram of friendships in the school and he needed some literature on how to do it. Could I suggest something? I told her I could not instantly but I would look it up and get back to her. I had to ask some 'real' sociologists about the issue so that I could respond to the request. I sent her links which she could easily have found herself, but she positioned me as the expert and as someone who is expected to reciprocate help.

The greatest issue was what feedback to give to Vera. She is central in my analysis, and some of the things I have published are critical about her sexuality discourses and teaching methods. I am not aware whether she has read them, I have not sent them to her. It seemed to be a more useful means of reciprocation to give her feedback and reflect together on her work. She was interested in feedback and many times we discussed the lesson she had just had, especially when some difficulty or problem emerged. This was rather ventilation for her but

70

sometimes I offered her some insights or methodological suggestions. We discussed how difficult it was to do sex education 'well' in the given circumstances and started to develop the idea of having special small-group sessions together for interested students. I offered her my methodological expertise and theoretical knowledge of sex education issues, which she did not have. We did not get far because she went on maternity leave soon after I finished my fieldwork, but recently she contacted me again and we started to talk about working together again. I believe that my cooperation with her in such a project would be a due reciprocation of the time and efforts she gave me throughout my fieldwork and a productive development of the critical insights I have gained through the research.

Chapter 3: Sex in the School – Student Sexuality, Sexual Space and Sex Education in Marzipan Baker and Cakemaker School

Introduction

In this chapter I inquire into the intersection of schooling and sexuality, with the aim of situating my research in the field. I provide national and local data on sexual practices among students, including the age they started having sex, their approaches to and experiences with contraceptive and STI prevention devices and their experience with sexual violence; discuss how the school is a sexualised space; and describe how sex education is done in Marzipan, how it is situated in the school as a sexualised space, and discuss some of the methodological issues of sex education which are implicated in sexualising the school space and in reproducing inequalities. By discussing these three topics I provide a contextual framework for my arguments and findings in the following chapters and situate the research in the field of schooling and sexuality.

The reason why studying the intersection of schooling and sexuality is important is that, as O'Flynn and Epstein argue, "students embody identities both as learners and as sexual subjects. Sexuality and education, therefore, come together in embodied ways" (2005: 188). This, as they continue, becomes a problem both for schools and students. For schools, because they are modernist institutions privileging "rationality and the mind"; for students, because of experiencing the tensions of the body/mind split in education and of having to handle both their student and sexual subjectivities (2005: 188-189).

I have observed this ambivalence about sexuality in Marzipan myself. Sexuality was indeed pervasively present in the school, in physical spaces, practices and discourses, as I will demonstrate in this chapter and the following ones. Teachers did acknowledge students'

sexuality both informally and in certain formal ways (especially through the provision of sex education and installing a condom vending machine in one of the male student toilets), but there were discursive and practical attempts to contain student sexuality, making it, if not completely invisible, as normative and as limited as possible. The maintenance of the binary status quo of the non-sexual teacher and the ideally non-sexually behaving (hetero)sexual student was also supported by students, who usually treated teachers (especially older ones) as non-sexual, with the exception of the sex education teacher, who was sexualised by the students, and the one female teacher who was kind of semi-open about her lesbianness.

1. Sexual practices among students

In this section I describe the data gained from my student respondents regarding the age of starting having sex and methods they use for contraception and STI prevention, and compare it with available data from a Hungarian representative survey from 2010. Then I briefly discuss my respondents' experiences of sexual abuse and the lack of Hungarian representative data on this. These data provide an insight into the sexual practices of adolescents and some important issues they face at the beginning of their active sex life. Whereas the start of sexual activity and preventive methods are a major focus of sex education at Marzipan, sexual abuse is not addressed, despite the frequency with which girls experience it.

1.1. The start of sexual activity

In *Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC): A WHO-collaborative Cross-National Study National Report, 2010,*[18] a representative survey with a subsample of 4552 children in year 9 and 11 (first and third years of secondary school) in the Hungarian sample, young people were asked – among other topics – about their sexual behaviour and experiences.

---

[18] Németh & Költő (Eds.) (2011). http://www.ogyei.hu/anyagok/HBSC_2010.pdf

Following one of the most common discourses about adolescent sex, that of 'risk' (see e.g.: Jackson & Weatherall 2010; Alldred & David 2007; Allen 2007),[19] the data on sexual experiences and behaviour are discussed in the chapter called "Risky behaviour", among these topics: "Smoking habits", "Alcohol consumption habits", "Consumption of illegal substances and other drugs", "Injuries and accidents" (2010: 35-64). The "Sexual behaviour" section (2010: 55-58) is in between the sections on drugs and injuries. The survey unspokenly assumes that all the respondents are heterosexual and cisgender. I compare the HBSC survey with my data in order to see how my sample is situated in comparison with the national average.

According to this survey, by year 9 (average age: 15.5) 32.8% of boys and 22.2% of girls, by year 11 (average age: 17.5) 51.4% of boys and 54.9% of girls (claimed to) have had sex (2010: 54). The proportion of boys who have had sexual relations in year 9 is about 10% higher than girls', whereas in year 11 there is no significant difference between boys and girls. Among my 17-year-old respondents 41% of both boys and girls claimed to have had sex.

In Marzipan I did not particularly ask students about when they started their sex life, but 50 out of the 70 respondents who had had sex told me when they first did. I do not distinguish between the respondents as grammar and technical school students vs. vocational school students, like the HBSC survey does, because it would not be very meaningful with such a small sample. If I made a distinction, it would be between students who are being trained for a blue-collar profession, whether they are in technical or vocational school, and those who will not graduate with a professional qualification (grammar school students). In *Table 1* I provide data on the age and gender distribution of my respondents.

---

[19] I discuss the 'risk' discourse in Section 3.

Table 1: My student respondents by gender and age

Age of respondents	Girls	Boys	Total
15	3	6	9
16	9	10	19
17	17	17	34
18	7	7	14
19	8	2	10
20	0	0	0
21	1	0	1
Total	**45**	**42**	**87**

Seventy (81.4%) out of my 87 respondents (36 girls and 34 boys; 80% and 80.9%, respectively) told me they have had sexual experiences. This does not necessarily reflect a general proportion of students with sexual experiences in the school, because I suspect that students who have had sexual experiences were more likely to volunteer for interviewing than those who have not.[20] In *Table 2* I provide data on the age and gender distribution of my respondents who have had sexual experiences. I felt during the interviews that I managed to establish rapport with most respondents and they were talking about their sexual experiences or the lack of them honestly, but there is a greater likelihood with boys than girls that they were less sexually experienced than they claimed. Pascoe claims that boys typically engage in compulsive heteromasculine bragging about sexual experiences only when they are in groups, and many boys dismissed such public behaviour when they were interviewed in private (2007: 107-109). Probably the group setting influenced my male respondents' narratives as well, but it was not my aim to figure out whether they were telling 'the truth' or not.

CEU eTD Collection

---

[20] There were other reasons (not related to sexuality) for volunteering to attend the interview (see: Chapter 2), therefore it is hard to establish whether my sample is representative of the school or not. However, as this is a school ethnography, representativity is not of primary importance.

Table 2: The number of my respondents who have had sex, by gender and age.

Age of respondents	Girls who have had sex	Boys who have had sex	Total have had sex
15	1	4	5
16	5	9	14
17	15	14	29
18	6	5	11
19	8	2	10
20	-	-	-
21	1	-	1
Total	**36**	**34**	**70**

Table 3 presents the age of my respondents at the time they lost their virginity. By losing virginity they all meant a penetrative sexual encounter with someone from the opposite sex. In the heteronormative context which I discuss here and in Chapter 5, this is the only data that is comparable among students, and also with the HBSC 2010 survey, where respondents were asked these questions: "Have you ever had sexual relations? (Have you ever slept with a girl or boy?)" and "How old were you when you first slept with a boy/girl?" (2010: 55). It is not specified what "sleeping with" means, but I can safely assume that it is used to refer to "having penetrative sex with", and this is how respondents most likely understood it.

Table 3: Age of losing virginity among my respondents, in numbers (N=50)

Age of losing virginity	Girls	Boys	Total
12	0	4	4
13	3	6	9
14	6	5	11
15	8	2	10
16	10	2	12
17	2	1	3
18	1	0	1
Total	**30**	**20**	**50**

According to the HBSC 2010 survey, among the year 11 students who have had sexual relations, 20.8% started their sexual life at age 14 or earlier, 59.1% between age 14 and 16, and 20.1% at 17 or later (2010: 56). Grammar school and technical school students (those who will graduate with a 'maturation exam') started sexual relations later than vocational school students. The majority of vocational students (66.4%) started their sex life between age 13 and 15, and the majority of technical and grammar school students (78.1%) started their sex life between age 14 and 16. In both groups the highest number of people (27.8% and 29.6%, respectively) had sex first at age 15 (2010: 57).

Among the 30 girls in my sample who responded to this question, age 14-16 is the most common time for the first penetrative sexual encounter, and among the 20 boys who responded, it is age 12-14. In the HBSC survey the year of starting sex (having the first penetrative sexual experience) for the majority of both girls and boys seems to be one year later than in my sample, which difference may be explained by the different methodologies of the HBSC survey and my research (anonymous representative survey vs. semi-structured

group interviews with non-representative sample) and by the likelihood of proportionally more sexually active than inactive young people volunteering for interviews, as I mentioned above.

1.2. Contraceptives and STI prevention

At the sex education lessons I observed that contraception and STI prevention were a major issue to be discussed, Vera was preoccupied with teaching about preventive methods, stressing that condom use is the best option for adolescent sex. As I learnt from my interviews, many students had heard presentations about condom use several times in both primary and secondary school, and they found the repetitive provision of such limited scope of information about sex boring or unnecessary.

As for the usage of contraceptive and STI prevention devices, the HBSC survey is also preoccupied with condom use. It claims that condom is the most commonly used method, the proportion of those year-9 and year-11 students who used a condom during their latest sexual encounter was 56.2% (2010: 57-58). The survey distinguishes between "condoms" and "other methods", but it does not specify those "other methods", therefore this set of data is not very informative, we cannot find out whether the respondents were using the pill, coitus interruptus, or vaginal devices such as vaginal ring or spermatocidal cream, and there is no information about emergency contraception (the morning after pill) usage and abortion. Among boys in year 11, 13.3% used condom *and* some other method, 10.5% used some method but not condom. Among girls in year 11, 18% used condom *and* some other method, 26.3% used some method but not condom. The difference between girls and boys probably suggests the usage of contraceptive pill. Nine percent of the respondents did not use any method, with no significant difference between boys and girls. The survey also does not

distinguish between the types of sexual relation, i.e. between sex with a casual vs. stable sex partner, which, in the case of boys in my sample, makes a significant difference, not only in terms of gendered subjectivity constitution but also in contraception method use.[21]

Here again the survey distinguishes between the two types of secondary education, pointing out that the usage of condom is higher (59.7%) among technical and grammar school students than among vocational school students (47.5%). The usage of condom plus other method and some method but no condom did not differ significantly between boys of the two types of school, but it did between girls: about 9% fewer girls in vocational school used condom and other method than in the other two school types, and about 6% more girls in vocational school used some other method than in the other school types, which probably suggests that the pill is a more frequent contraceptive method among vocational school girls than among technical and grammar school girls. The proportion of those who did not use any method was significantly higher (20.6%) in vocational school than in technical and grammar school (6%), and there was no big difference between girls and boys in either school type in this respect (2010: 57-58).

In my research I gained more information about the various preventive methods, and also about attitudes to and experiences with those methods. Sixty-three out of the seventy sexually active respondents shared their experiences and convictions about contraception and STI prevention methods and practices. These methods and practices included condom; the pill; using condom with one-night stands and pill with steady partner; condom and pill at the same time; condom and pill at the beginning of relationship and pill later; coitus interruptus; condom or coitus interruptus; and either condom or no prevention, depending on whether either partner had condoms on him/her.

---

[21] I discuss in Chapter 5 how boys construct gendered dichotomy by distinguishing between sex with casual and stable partners.

Among heterosexual students condom was not so unequivocally the most popular method as in the HBSC survey; 9 girls (25%) and 13 (38%) boys said they were using it with their partner, which is 31% of my sample. Twelve girls (33%) reported using the pill, but only 3 boys said their partners were using it. Three of these girls and one boy said that at the beginning of a steady relationship both the pill and condoms should be used. None of them mentioned the fact that the pill is ineffective in the first month of taking it, which is a good enough reason to combine it with condom usage, all four of them were talking about building up mutual "trust". There were 8 boys who made the distinction between casual and steady sex partners (girlfriends) regarding prevention, and emphasized that with one-night stands they would certainly use condoms, because they could not trust girls who had sex with multiple partners and were afraid they would catch some STI from the girl. However, these boys argued that in steady relationships the girl should take the pill. [22] Girls did not make such an open distinction, even though I got the impression from the discussions that most of those girls who were getting engaged in one-night stands probably used condoms, as well.

There were many reasons for preferring the pill or condoms. Some of the girls reported skin irritation or lack of sensation if their partner was wearing a condom, and one said it created a physical and emotional distance between them. Others said the pill was good for stabilizing their menstrual cycle and reducing menstrual pain and the amount of menstrual blood. One girl said her libido was "dangerously high" and the pill somewhat reduced it. Some of the girls who preferred condoms over the pill argued that the side-effects of the pill were not so well-known, and they would be afraid it would harm their body. Some girls criticised boys who were insisting that their girlfriends should take the pill and argued that it was women who should decide about their own body. One girl said it was men's duty to prevent pregnancy and STIs, and taking the pill was "unnatural", and one said she would rather not

---

[22] About boys' distinction between girls suitable for one-night stands and girlfriends, see: Chapter 5.

have sex if she had to take the pill. Other reasons included worrying about weight gain as a side effect and about forgetting to take the pill regularly. Two girls wanted to take the pill but they were under 16, therefore they would have needed parental permission to have the pill prescribed, but they did not want their parents to know they were sexually active.

Boys had somewhat different reasons for preferring the condom over pills or vica versa. The famous "having sex in condom is like bathing in socks" adage was repeated many times by my respondents, mostly by boys, but also by some girls. Besides the distinction between casual sex and sex with a stable partner and related safety concerns,[23] the fear of becoming a father came up a few times. One boy argued that women had more options for contraception, for men only the condom was available, so it was easier for women, they had choices. Some boys noted that condoms were not safe because they could easily get torn. There were boys whose girlfriends decided to take the pill without discussing it with them, and two boys had girlfriends who did not want to take the pill.

Some of the girls' and boys' discourses about condom use resonate with Braun's study (2013), in which she argues that the majority of her respondents (both female and male) positioned condoms negatively, as something 'unnatural' that interrupts the 'natural' flow of coital heterosex, an agent that kills the momentum of passionate sex or as a barrier against intimacy and trust. My respondents' approach to condoms was more varied and more girls used the discourse of personal choice and agency in deciding over one's body, which often meant demanding the male partner to use condoms.

The six non-heterosexual respondents who were having sexual relations with a same-sex partner at the time of the interview were not using any preventive method. The one gay respondent said that at the beginning of his relationship with his current partner they both

---

[23] See: Chapter 5, Section 2.3.

went for STI screening, and as they were both negative, they decided not to use condoms. He also referred to non-prevention as an issue of trust. Among the five girls who have had sex with women,[24] one had only had sex with women and she said that washing herself before sex was enough prevention. The other four girls had had sex both with men and women, and they all said that with men they did and would wear condoms, and with women there was no need for preventive methods. The girls were likely not aware of the fact that even though lesbian sex is safe from the perspective of pregnancy, the risk of the transmission of sexual infections, although lower than in male homosexual and heterosexual sex, is not zero and there are certain kinds of infections that lesbians are especially liable to (see e.g. Gorgos & Marrazzo 2011; Hughes & Evans 2003). This was not mentioned at any of the sex education lessons I observed.

Vera said that among girls in years 11-12 approximately 10-15% were taking the pill – this was recorded in the students' medical files because it belongs under the category of regular medicine consumption. She had no data on other preventive methods; she gained information on what methods students used in the course of the sex education lessons and personal counselling. According to her estimation based on students' communication, the pill was the most frequent method, then condoms, then coitus interruptus complemented with the calendar method. This is interesting because none of my respondents mentioned the calendar method, the majority of boys reported condom usage, and the girls were more or less equally divided between condoms and the pill in their prevention preference. This difference may be due to various reasons, and it is a question whether the students were more honest with Vera, who represented school authority, or with me, whom they did not know and, especially the boys, did not always trust.[25]

---

[24] The sixth non-heterosexually identifying girl said she was bisexual but she had not had sex with women.
[25] See Chapter 2 for a discussion of this.

Because of the different approach of the HBSC survey to the issue and the different questions asked (used only condom / used condom and other method / used other method, no condom, did not use any method at his/her latest sexual encounter) it is not possible to provide a meaningful comparison between that sample and my sample. Also, surveys are usually not designed to explore the varieties of individuals' habits, for which semi-structured interviewing is a more suitable method. What can be concluded from my data is that the variety of approaches, preferences, practices and reasons for using or not using various contraceptive and STI prevention methods supports the necessity of a more personalized approach to sex education. The varied concerns of girls and boys about certain forms of contraception and prevention and the decisions they were making, whether on their own or with their partner underlines the need for learning about sexual communication, not only technologies. As I discuss in Section 3, this is very difficult in the given circumstances and certainly requires a different attitude to sex education on behalf of the institution, and more methodological knowledge by the school nurse. Beyond the school, it also requires a discursive shift in talking about adolescent sexuality, towards treating adolescent sexuality in its own right and adolescents as sexual beings with agency, instead of as (corrupted) children who are going through a 'difficult phase'.

1.3. Sexual abuse

Sexual abuse is highly prevalent in the sexual lives of young people and so it was among my female respondents, 20% of whom related experiences of sexual abuse in their intimate relationships, therefore I would expect it to be an important issue to discuss in the course of sex education. According to the large-scale EU-wide survey on violence against women

published by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) in 2014,[26] "out of all women who have a (current or previous) partner, 22% have experienced physical and/or sexual violence by a partner since the age of 15" (2014: 21), one in every twenty women (5%) has been raped since age 15, either by their partner or someone else, and 11% have experienced some form of sexual violence (2014: 41). Between one fourth and one third of these women have been subjected to repeated victimization (2014: 43-44). Twelve percent of women in the EU countries were subjected to sexual violence before age 15 (2014: 130). The Hungarian data shows that 28% of women have suffered physical and/or sexual violence since age 15 and 21% from their current or previous partner (2014: 28).

Anastasia Powell (2010), in her study of negotiating sexual consent among young women in Australia, applies Liz Kelly's concept of the "sexual violence continuum" (Kelly 1988) to underline that the experience of sexual violence not only entails rape but should rather be positioned along a continuum from consensual sex to rape, with various degrees of physical and/or psychological coercion. She argues that young women have specific difficulties with refusing unwanted sex during the time of their first sexual encounters, in the period of gradually learning sexual negotiation and saying 'no' to sexual coercion during adolescence (2010: 18-20). This learning process could be supported by sex education, but in Marzipan it was not. Cameron-Lewis and Allen argue for the importance of dealing with both the positive and negative aspects of intimacy in sex education, so that young people can explore the "interrelatedness of pleasure and danger in sexual intimacy" and "learn to navigate the complexities of sexually intimate relationships, particularly issues of sexual negotiation and consent" (2013: 123). Some girls in Marzipan started their sex life as a submission to peer pressure or the pressure of their partner. Not starting sex life despite peer pressure implied the risk of losing position in the peer group. Direct pressure from the partner included the boy's

---

[26] http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results-apr14_en.pdf

demand that the girl proves that she loves him by having sex with him, blackmailing that he would leave her if she did not have sex with him, or making her feel that it was such an unbearable torment for him to abstain from sex that the girl would eventually feel obliged to relieve the boy from such a burden, even if she was not feeling desire for sex yet.

Sexual abuse among young people is an area where Hungarian research is greatly lacking. According to the 2014 FRA Report, Hungary is one of 5 EU countries where no national survey on violence against women has ever been conducted (2014: 169-170).[27] There is one study by E.S.Z.T.E.R. Foundation (2010),[28] which focuses on online sexual abuse, in a representative sample of 15-16 year old (year 9 and 10) secondary school students in Budapest. The sampling categories in the survey are only age and school type; data are mostly not gender-disaggregated, ethnicity, class or sexual orientation do not appear even in the description of the sample, let alone in the analysis, and authors do not reflect on gender-specific features of sexual violence and the phenomenon of online homophobic harassment, therefore the findings are difficult to interpret.

In my sample of 45 girls there were eight who had suffered violence in their relationships and one who had been sexually abused by her stepfather. In one case I found out only after the interview that the girl's boyfriend was abusive and when she broke up with him, he began to stalk her. It was not revealed what kind of violence he subjected her to during their relationship. In that interview (which was my very first group interview) I did not ask specifically about relationship and domestic violence, but in the other eight cases I did. Two of these included physical and sexual violence, two boyfriends were excessively possessive and emotionally violent, in one case the boyfriend was possessive, jealous, controlling and becoming physically violent as well. In one case the girl did not say how the boyfriend abused

---

[27] The other four countries are Bulgaria, Luxembourg, Latvia and Slovenia.
[28] http://www.budapestedu.hu/data/cms101384/Kutatasi_jelentes_OSA_Mereis.pdf

85

her, just described her suffering and how he and his family stalked her after she broke up with him. In one case the boyfriend was emotionally and physically violent, threatening and stalked her after the break-up. In the case of the stepfather he molested her at age 11. There were further cases of domestic violence not directly targeting my respondents but they were witnessing them. Boys did not talk about domestic violence. I am not sure all the girls who have experienced sexual, physical and/or emotional violence with their partners or family member talked about it in the interview, but 20% of female respondents related such experiences, which corresponds to the data in the above-mentioned FRA survey (2014). None of the girls mentioned experiences of sexual violence committed against them by non-partners or non-family members, although based on the FRA data there is a likelihood of the prevalence of such experiences among them. Despite the prevalence of intimate violence against girls, sexual violence was not among the topics discussed at sex education lessons in Marzipan. Vera was not trained to engage with the issue and external programs were not invited.[29]

2. School as a sexualised space

In this section I discuss how school is a sexualised space. The sexualisation of the officially non-sexual institution happens both in formal and informal ways. In the four following sections I reflect on how sexuality actually occupies the physical space of the school; how the vocational training becomes sexualised both by students and one vocational instructor; how 'sex in the toilet' becomes a discursive tool to sexualise school space and subvert the idea or normative sexual practices; and how the sex educator became sexualised. My discussion

---

[29] Such as NANE Women's Rights Association's program "Heartbeat", which offers facilitated sessions about adolescent relationship violence to groups of adolescents within and outside schools. http://www.nane.hu/egyesulet/tevekenysegek/szivdobbanas.html. NANE also offers an accredited in-service training program for teachers on the topic. http://www.bszf.hu/index.php. NANE's other youth program "Talk to me" addresses domestic violence in young people's families. http://www.empowering-youth.de/magyar/produkte.html

contributes specific empirical data to the theorisation of school as a sexualised space and presents actual practices that sexualise the school space.

2.1. School as a physical space for sexual activities

In her study of the sexual geography of schooling, Allen (2013) points out that gender and sexuality researchers' interest so far has rather focused on the temporal and neglected the spatial aspects of subjectivity constitution through education. She argues that "the traditional conceptualisation of space as taken for granted means the ways schools are spatially constituted often appear imperceptible and innocuous. It is precisely this 'blindness' to space that enables its configuration as a practice which maintains unequal and enduring power relations" (2013: 60-61). Through the example of gay pride marches on heteronormatively conceptualised streets, Allen argues that space and sexuality are mutually constitutive. In her study she sought to figure out what school spaces can mean for sexual identities and understandings by asking students to take photographs of school spaces where "they saw something 'sexual'" (2013: 64). Neither she, nor the students participating in the research project laid much emphasis on presenting sexual *practices* as they were happening, for which the photographing method would obviously not be very suitable.

I conducted my fieldwork some years before Allen's 2013 article was published, and while being on the field and when transcribing, organising and analysing my materials, I realised how school space in its materiality was sexualised. Here I am interested in how the school space is used for sexual practices, not meanings and identities, like Allen (2013). By observation I also could not capture sexual practices beyond seeing students walking hand-in-hand, hugging or kissing, but the student and teacher talk I recorded reveals more about actively sexualising the physical space of the school than observation would.

During my fieldwork I came to understand that 'sex in one's bedroom' is a privileged middle-class adult notion of having sex. It is not a given for poor and/or working-class families that everyone can have sex in their own bedroom. Also, sex in one's bedroom is one sexual practice through which social status can be moved upward indirectly by having a partner: if at least one member of the couple has his/her own bedroom, there is a possibility to do the middle-class sexual practice of having sex in one's bedroom, and alternative places (other than the bedroom) for sex can become a way to spice up sex life, instead of a necessity. However, many of the students in Marzipan did not have their own bedroom at all, they shared bedrooms with other family members, like Nati:

> (...) there are six of us, and we live in a two-bedroom apartment. Two of the rooms have loft-spaces, but I'm sharing a room with my younger sister, and if my boyfriend slept over – and this is why he doesn't sleep over any more – then we had to throw the poor girl out, even if we weren't doing anything. It was no fun for her, or for us either, as we could never even snuggle together (...). *(Nati 18, girl, group interview)*

Nati and some other students from poor families have a partner who has his/her own bedroom, and this solves the problem. However, even some of those who do have their own bedroom may feel embarrassed or uncomfortable to have sex there when their parents are at home. Moreover, quite a few respondents said their parents thought they were still virgins, and they were afraid of punishment if it turned out that they were sexually active, so sex at home was out of the question for them. Therefore, for these young people having sex outside one's bedroom is not always a way to make one's sex life more varied or exciting but it is often a necessity, and they commonly choose public or semi-public spaces for having sex, including parks, forests, saunas, suburb trains, shopping malls or staircases.

School is one of the spaces where adolescents do sexual activities.[30] Where and what kind of sexual activities are acceptable and not acceptable in school depends on the boundary drawn between sexualised and non-sexualised spaces within the officially non-sexual space of the school. This boundary between sexual and non-sexual spaces, or rather spaces acceptable and not acceptable for doing sexual activities, is important for both teachers and students, but the boundary is often not located at the same place for them. As far as students are concerned, the boundary between spaces which are acceptable and not acceptable for doing sexual activities does not necessarily correspond with the commonly assumed boundary of *public* and *private* spaces (Berlant and Warner 1998), spaces are rather divided into *available* and *unavailable* ones. School, where young people spend half of their day every schoolday, is an available space for sexuality. However, school is supposed to be a non-sexual institution, where a limited scope of heteronormative sexual/erotic activities is allowed/tolerated, including kissing, caressing, embracing and sexual teasing and joking, but not including having sexual intercourse. These sexual activities are tolerated if done in the breaks between lessons, do not obstruct teachers' activities and are done with a degree of self-restraint, not in a manner which would be considered 'oversexualised' by the teachers policing the school corridors in the breaks. If the couple doing the sexual activity in the public space of the school is stable and straight, they may even receive encouragement. Lesbian couples are also tolerated but gay boys simply do not do sexual activities openly, obviously for fear of harassment, especially by male peers (see: Pascoe 2007).

Physical spaces in the school where sexuality was manifested in some form included classrooms during sex education lessons, corridors and other common parts of the building, toilets, and the bakery workshop. Teachers, of course, disapprove of sexual activity which,

---

[30] Like elsewhere in my text, this means sexual activity in the broadest sense. For my definition of sexuality, see: Chapter 1.

according to their standards, goes beyond the acceptable within the school walls. School is treated by teachers as a non-sexual space, or one where sexuality has to be very strictly regulated and where only assigned locations are available for a limited scope of sexual activity. Sexual practices in teachers' discourses are often framed as inappropriate school behaviour, as in the following excerpt by the school director:

> SD: (…) They don't understand the appropriate time and place for things.
>
> DR: So this wasn't the same in the past?
>
> SD: No. They knew, for example, that they should go under the staircase if they wanted to make out. Now it doesn't bother them at all, they stand in the doorway, and you have to apologise (…) for disturbing them if you want to pass, because they're enjoying themselves. (*School director, interview*)

In his opinion, students do not know how to behave decently, they do not understand what is appropriate sexual behaviour when and where. By suggesting that hiding under the staircase to kiss is acceptable but doing it standing in the doorway is not, the school director acknowledges that there are sexualised and non-sexualised locations in the school building. He tolerates sexuality if it is done discretely hiding under the staircase, marking out a space, which, according to his middle-class ideas of public and private, can be seen as private or at least semi-private. His comment that he has to say 'excuse me' in order to be able to pass the couple kissing in the doorway suggests that the doorway is a public space where sexuality is not allowed, where he, in his non-sexual position, does not want to be drawn into a sexual activity by having to watch it while passing. The kissing students, however, do not consider the doorway to be a non-sexual space, even though they may not consider it a 'private' space. As I have argued above, for students, private and acceptable spaces for sexual activity do not necessarily overlap.

Allen (2007) argues that schools constitute students' sexuality in contradictory ways. On the one hand, student sexuality is formally acknowledged by offering sex education, on the other

hand, the school is invested in producing ideally non-sexual students. In Allen's research this contradictory approach is manifested in the fact that the main message of sex education is that young people should use condoms when having sex, but at the same time most schools were reluctant to hand out condoms or install condom vending machines. She argues that this practice undermines students' sexual agency that the recognition of their sexual subjectivity would give them, and this approach, albeit contradictory, is consistent with the concept of school as an institution concerned with academic matters and the promotion of the non-sexual student as ideal (2007: 229-230).

This is an example of regulating school as a sexual space. Allen does not suggest this, but the idea behind not distributing condoms in the school may be the assumption that if students received condoms in the school, they would have sex in the school. In this light, it is interesting that in Marzipan there was a condom vending machine in one of the male toilets. This way, that male toilet – despite punishment if one was caught having sex there – became an officially sexualised space, and students' sexuality was institutionally acknowledged, on the highest level of school management. During her sex education lessons Vera encouraged students to use the machine, and she would have been happy to provide students who went to see her in her office with condoms, which they often asked for, if only the school had funding to provide them for free.[31] Despite official acknowledgement of student sexuality, there were individual attempts at de-sexualisation, for example by a teacher, who – as some students related at a sex education lesson – told his/her students not to use the condoms in the vending machine, claiming they were "unreliable" because "who knows who fills them up?" *(sex education lesson, year 9)*. Vera explained the students that the condoms were provided by the National Health Improvement Institute and that she personally knew the two women who were responsible for refilling these machines in a number of secondary schools. The fact that

---

[31] Vera complained about this to me in the interview.

the initiation came from this health institution illustrates the dominance of the 'health' discourse about adolescent sexuality and sex education, which I will return to in Section 3. These examples show that school is a physically sexualised space, but there is no consensus over which locations are acceptable for sexual activities, what kind of sexual activities are acceptable in those locations and who defines these.

2.2. Sexualizing vocational training

Students not only behaved sexually with one another during vocational practice, they also sexualized the baking activities themselves. In the following excerpts from my fieldnotes I present examples of the shifting boundary between sexualised and non-sexualised school spaces. I argue that this boundary is not firm, it is flexible and may get temporarily suspended or transgressed, for example during the baking practice, by sexualising the dough and bakery products.

It was difficult to organize for me to attend such practices but once I managed to observe the practice workshop of one form. There I saw how activities like kneading dough and forming shapes from pastry became eroticized, and how Anita, the technical teacher of this form, picked up on the sexual connotations of working with dough to teach them how to make proper bakery products. The following excerpt from my fieldnotes is an example for such educational attempts:

> Anita tells Robi to knead the dough softer, "as if you were caressing your girlfriend". As a response, Robi deliberately rubs the dough roughly onto the board and Anita tells him that she wouldn't want to be his girlfriend. (*baking practice fieldnotes, year 9*)

Here Anita simultaneously instructed Robi to handle the dough more gently (technical instruction) and hinted at how Robi should treat her girlfriend (relationship education). This way she used sexuality to educate the students vocationally, by which she transgressed the

boundary between (non-sexual) education and sexuality. Pascoe also notes that teachers in the school she was studying used sexual metaphors as a pedagogical tool, with which they sought to hold students' attention (2007: 33).

In the following two excerpts from my fieldnotes it is the shape of the pastry that becomes sexualised:

> At the beginning of the lesson Anita brings out a basket of '*kiflis*'[32] for them to eat, and Ignác immediately makes use of the phallic potential of the *kifli*'s shape and starts making sexual jokes. He puts two in his mouth, then wants to feed Regina with one, and then with half of a *kifli* he screws two *kiflis* that are stuck together, explaining that they have the shape of an ass. (*baking practice fieldnotes, year 9*)
>
> *
>
> I think kneading dough is a rather erotic activity. (…) Regina also sees the sexuality in it, at least she makes a row of plaited pastries which look like penises. At least Anita thinks so; when she asks Regina, "what are these?", it is obvious [from her tone] that she means penises. (*baking practice fieldnotes, year 9*)

The sexual activities involving dough and pastry seem to have a gendered pattern. Ignác actively performs sexual rituals with pieces of *kiflis*, and involves Regina,[33] then performs anal sex with three pieces of *kifli*. Regina also utilizes the sexual potential of dough kneading: she forms penis-shaped pastries. Ignác *does* "sex" with the pastry, Regina *handles* penises, she forms the penis shape but does not *do* anything with it afterwards. This gendered difference in handling penis-shaped objects corresponds with the gendered difference in talking about sexual activities, which I elaborate in Chapter 5.

The vocational part of education appears to be the most sexualised, I did not observe so much sexualized behaviour and talk at other lessons, except, of course, during sex education lessons. Perhaps the body/mind divide does not prevail so strongly in vocational learning

---

[32] *Kifli* is a crescent moon-shaped bread roll, similar to croissants but – besides the difference in texture – it is more phallic-looking.
[33] This act was also an expression of Ignác's sexual attraction towards Regina; they became lovers later in the year.

93

where the body is used more than in academic subjects where supposedly only the mind is employed, therefore sexuality is more allowed or tolerated at vocational lessons. At a machinery lesson in a year-11 technical form Anita was explaining about the parts of some baking machine:

> She is asking one of the girls about the parts of some machine. One part is called a vibrator. Slight giggling, but not from everyone. Probably not everyone knows what a vibrator is. Szandra knows.
>
> Adél: "Should we, like, use this word to Mr X [the male teacher], too?"
>
> Anita: "Of course. What is the task of a vibrator? It produces a vibration." She doesn't get embarrassed while explaining. (*machinery lesson fieldnotes, year 11*)

As I noted, mentioning the component of the machine called 'vibrator' made some people but not all in the class giggle, including Szandra, the lesbian girl. Adél asked if they should use the same word at the mechanics practice with a male teacher, indicating that such sexualisation may be not permitted or is out of place with another teacher who is male. Amusingly, Anita defined the vibrator with poker face, without losing her bearings. This time she chose not to make a joke and to ignore the giggling, that is, she chose not to transgress the sexual/non-sexual boundary and not to turn the class into a sexualised space for vocational education.

2.3. Sex in the toilet

Feminist and queer theory authors, including those researching education, are preoccupied with analysing the toilet as a space for constituting and policing gendered and sexual *identities* (see e.g. Rasmussen 2009; Halberstam 1998). They focus on how gender and sexuality is constituted through the expression of femininities and masculinities by choosing the male or female toilet or by girls using female toilets for applying make-up. The school toilet is not considered by these authors as a space where the sexualisation of school happens,

and neither is the constitution of gendered and classed subjectivities through actual sexual practices in the toilet. When sexual *practices* in public toilets are discussed, the focus is on gay male sex and school is not mentioned (see e.g. Jeyasingham 2010; Biber & Dalton 2009; Johnson 2007).

However, the school toilet – among its other functions – is a place where sexual activities are done. One respondent mentioned that a student was fired from the school for being caught having sex in the toilet, which indicates that for teachers it is an unacceptable space for sexual activity, a boundary whose transgression elicits severe punishment. In this section I argue that 'sex in the toilet' is a significant act of sexualising the school space, both discursively and in practice. Toilet serves as a shifting boundary between public and private, and also between acceptable and unacceptable spaces for sexuality in the school. As I discussed in Section 2.1, whereas for teachers private/public and acceptable/non-acceptable spaces for sex are synonymous, for students acceptable and non-acceptable spaces for sex are rather related to the availability/unavailability for spaces. Using acceptable and unacceptable spaces in the school for sex also functions as a marker of social positioning among students. From this perspective, students who have sex in the toilet are lower positioned in the social hierarchy than those who do not, both by students and by teachers.

Sex in the toilet is a more 'radical' way of sexualising the officially non-sexual school space than walking hand in hand or kissing on the corridor – which is tolerated as long as it is done 'discreetly' and by heterosexual or lesbian couples. In this sense it can be read as an act of resistance to or disruption of school regulations and the notion of school being the place to cultivate the mind but not the body (Alldred & David 2007; Epstein et al. 2003). It also disrupts the divide of 'public' and 'private' spaces because even though toilets are used by everyone and therefore are considered to be public spaces, a locked toilet box is a secluded

'private' space within the 'public' space of the restroom, but it is not really that private, because the people waiting outside will guess what those inside are doing, therefore their privacy is not granted, even if they lock the door (which, in many cases, according to some students, is not possible because the locks are broken). Thus, the toilet, when used for sex, is located on a moving boundary between public and private, and it is within the boundary of acceptable spaces for sex for some students and it is not for other students and for teachers. Private enough for some, not private enough for others, in the end having sex there is considered to be a public sexual act and a sexual act at an unacceptable space, therefore it is a condemned or sanctioned boundary transgression.

Not having to resort to sex in the toilet is also a marker of social status: those who have their own bedroom where they can have sex are from better-off families, therefore they are in a higher social position. However, when there is no space in one's home for sex, the school toilet may be seen in a different light.

> Lőrinc: It's impossible [to have sex in the toilet].
> Robi: But really, you can't, it's not possible to do it there. Everybody smokes there and stuff. They are in the cubicles as well. [And the locks are broken.] You are getting it on and [the door] opens. *(Robi 15, Lőrinc 17, interview)*

According to Robi and Lőrinc, toilet would be a suitable space for sex, if only it was not impossible because of the smokers who occupy the toilet and because of the unfitting locks. Carving out a private space in a public space is impossible because of the dysfunctional locks, and being alone with one's sex partner in a public space is impossible because of the smokers. Lőrinc was living in a foster home at the time of the interview, therefore he did not have his own private space for having sex. Robi did not reveal how he and his mother were living, but he said he found it very embarrassing to bring a girl home to have sex when her mother was around. In case it is also problematic for the girl to bring him home, other spaces must be

96

found for sex, and one of those may be a toilet – at least it is hypothetically considered to be so by the two boys.

Sex in the toilet is always talked about as something other people do; nobody ever admitted they had done it themselves. Even those respondents who have reported having sex in more unhygienic (or more rarely cleaned) spaces than toilets (for example, trains or staircases in apartment blocks) would not choose or would not admit to having had sex in the school toilet. Therefore the significance of the act of having sex in the toilet lies in its being an element of the construction of the public/private divide within the school. Having had sex in the toilet or admitting to have done so would place the doers in a lower position in the school hierarchy; presenting sex in the toilet as a taboo and themselves as not breaking the taboo and pointing out that others do it seems to function as a marker of social positioning for the respondents.

Some students claim that some girls have sex in the toilet with boys for money, and one respondent mentions that it is drug user girls who do it, because they need the money for drugs. Whether the money is spent on drugs or not, sex in the toilet from this perspective is gendered and classed simultaneously. It is never boys who are said to do it for the money but girls. Such girls may have poor parents, they may not receive (enough) pocket money from their parents or cannot earn their own, like many of the boys do, with part-time student jobs or illegal work. Therefore having sex in the toilet is also about money and poverty and lack of space for privacy.

Girls who have sex in the toilet are considered 'sluts'.[34] There is no mention of the boys who they have sex with. Sluts, i.e. girls who have casual sex with multiple partners, instead of with a steady partner in a monogamous relationship, are at the bottom of the social hierarchy

---

[34] I discuss the girlfriend/slut dichotomy in Chapter 5, Section 2.3.

among peers. The following conversation is between two girls, both having a stable and sexually fulfilling relationship; Eszter is straight, Szandra is a lesbian:

> Szandra: (…) [Y]ou know, doing it in a public toilet, you get it.
>
> Eszter: No, that's out of the question. That's a bacteria place.
>
> (…)
>
> Szandra: Do you know who do this, in my opinion? These young girls, who are already wasted, and I dunno, they're high, or I don't know what they do. But I think they're the ones who do this. That it doesn't matter where you are just do me. Because they'll be really big girls, if they do them.
>
> (…)
>
> Eszter: But I don't know, one should really have at least a minimal sense of hygiene, so you just don't have sex in the toilet, right? *(Szandra 17, Eszter 17, interview)*

In the above discussion age is also a social marker: it is suggested that it is younger girls who have sex in the toilet, in order to feel older or more sexually mature. Eszter also brings in the 'hygiene' discourse, which, as I discuss in Chapter 4, is constitutive of hierarchical social positioning in the school. Desire fulfilled in such an unhygienic way becomes a force that lowers the social position of these young girls in the eyes of older girls who are higher in the social hierarchy, not only because they present themselves as ones with higher hygienic standards, but also because they have a stable partner, with whom there is no need to resort to such practices as sex in the toilet. That is, they are not 'sluts'. Interestingly, in this conversation it does not seem to matter that Szandra's stable partner is a woman. A long-term monogamous relationship positions her higher (see also: Powell 2010; Allen 2004), regardless her non-heteronormative sexual orientation, and the young girls who have sex in the toilet become lower positioned in the hierarchy through their age, relationship status and sexual practice.

Lujza, the literature teacher whom we have met in Chapter 4, expresses her disgust with students having sex in the toilet thus:

> Excuse me, when a boy and a girl would go to a toilet here [to have sex]! (…) They can be tragic. But who goes in? With what education? What are they studying? I'm telling you, the lower we go, the less… Somehow (…) their norms are worse and worse. And I also say that the girl provokes it, not the boy, although I'm a woman myself, but I have to say it's the girl who provokes it, not the boy. *(Lujza, form tutor, interview)*

She claims that the lower educated a student is, i.e. where s/he belongs in the grammar school / technical school / vocational school or the cakemaker / baker / sweets-factory worker hierarchies,[35] the more likely s/he will have sex in the toilet. This way she associates sexual behaviour with educational level and claims that those students who are in the lowest position in the educational hierarchy have subnormative sexual behaviour.[36] By this association she uses sexuality to define class positioning (see: Skeggs 2004: 37). Besides making classed hierarchical distinctions between herself and students, and also among students, through using the sexual norms discourse, she also sets up a gender hierarchy, as she claims that it is girls who initiate the practice of sex in the toilet by provoking boys to do it. Therefore these 'low' girls are even lower in the hierarchy than the 'low' boys who get seduced into toilets by them, they are intersectionally positioned at the bottom of the social hierarchy of the school.

Interestingly, while having sex in the toilet is not acceptable for most respondents, many report having had sex in places such as in a bush, on the staircase of an apartment block or on a suburb train, which are not exactly the most hygienic places, either, and neither they are private, or even less private than a toilet. Still, sex in the toilet is treated as a separate category, more unacceptable than having sex at other unhygienic places. Perhaps because of its function as a place for getting rid of one's bodily waste. Also, in a public building like a school, it is used by many people, one after the other, for a short time. This could be also said about the suburb train, but there people travel dressed up and do not normally release substances from their body which other people would recoil contacting. Because of the

---

[35] See more about this hierarchy in Chapter 4.

[36] I discuss two more examples of teachers associating sexual behaviour and education level in Chapter 4.

association with excrement and excretion activities, toilet is the least respectable space in human space arrangement (in an apartment or public institution). By association, using a public toilet is like sex with 'sluts': quick action, anonymity, one after the other, questionable hygiene. In fact, toilet is the slut in the room hierarchy. And by extension, this explains why it is 'sluts' who have sex in the toilet: the lowest positioned girls in the social hierarchy have sex in the lowest positioned space in the room hierarchy.

2.4. Sexualising the school nurse

Sex education is the only school subject that explicitly deals with sexuality. The school nurse, who delivers sex education, is not a teacher or a doctor by profession, and stands lower in the hierarchy than teachers and the school doctor. However, she is considered to be *the* authority on adolescent sexuality. In addition, Vera was a young, easy-going, good-humoured attractive woman, practically the only adult in the school who was willing to talk about sex with students and consciously not aspiring to be in a teacher's position. Thus, she was specially positioned in the school hierarchy and functioned as a sort of bridge between teachers and students, official non-sexuality and sexual activity, high and low power positions.

It was not only Vera's sex education lessons that were part of sexualising school space but her body became sexualised by students as well.[37] She was a subject of adolescent male sexual desires. In fact, she and Anita the lesbian technical instructor were the only teachers who were sexualised by the students, the rest of the teachers were referred to by students only in non-sexual terms, especially older teachers. In the process of teaching about sex, Vera also exposed her body to be sexualised; she incorporated sexuality discourses and embodied

---

[37] See: Lahelma, Palmu, & Gordon (2000) about secondary school teachers' experiences of being sexualised by students.

sexuality. The following quote is an example of expressing the fantasy of having sex with Vera, which I heard from several boys' mouth in one way or another:

> Imi: Well I'd fuck her, what am I supposed to say about this? Jesus!
> Levi: Knock it off!
> Imi: Fuck you, you're thinking the same, why should I knock it off?
> Nándi: Thinking but not saying, okay?
> (…)
> Imi: Fuck you, half of the form wants to [fuck her]. *(Imi 16, Levi 17, Nándi 15, interview)*

Here Imi not only expresses his own desire (in a rather vulgar way, which I discuss in Chapter 5, Section 2.2.), but also claims that many other boys in his form want to have sex with Vera. Talking about sex made her look more sexually 'available' than teachers would be. She was often objectified by boys' way of speaking, just like adolescent girls were (for a discussion, see Chapter 5, Section 2.2). It often happened when I was accompanying her to deliver sex education lessons that one of the boys told her with a lecherous look how pretty she was looking that day. Every time when she brought a wooden penis to the lesson to demonstrate how to put on a condom, some boy suggested that she demonstrates it by putting it on with her mouth. She usually responded to such advances with a mixture of good humour, firm rejection and a bit of mocking, putting the young men's ego back into place. With her age, looks, and ways of talking about sex, she was suggesting that she was having an active sexual life, so she was treated both as a desired sexual object and an authority on sex. As Emese, one of the students said, they would not have taken it seriously if their form tutor, divorced, authoritative Ms. Anna in her 50s had offered sex education lessons for them:

> Well, if Ms. Anna were to give a lecture about it, I'm not sure I would listen, because I wouldn't care what she had to say, because I don't think she could say anything important. (…) [Vera] is almost the same age as us, and at least she knows, like, what's up at this age, not like, as if Ms. Anna was giving us a lecture and talking about the past... (*Emese 17, interview*)

101

Anna would be "talking about the past" – it is unimaginable for teenagers that someone of their form tutor's age would be sexually active or would have relevant information about adolescent sex issues. By stating this, Emese reinforced the 'non-sexual teacher vs. sexual students' dichotomy of the school population, and positioned Vera in the space between teachers and students. Thus, Vera was constituted by students as sexual, she unwillingly became the embodiment of 'adult' sexuality in the school.

3. Sex education in Marzipan

Sex education is the most important form of official acknowledgement of sexuality in schooling, it is the curricular meeting point of sexuality and education. In this last section I overview the Hungarian educational policy framework for sex education and describe how sex education was done in Marzipan at the time of my fieldwork. I consider sex education from a methodological point of view, because the way sex education was delivered is also part of the institutional regulation of student sexuality. Finally, I reflect on how sex education, the way it was delivered, was contributing to the reinscription of social inequalities.

School-based sex education plays an important role in young people's sexuality constitution. Sex education lessons are the only official site where sexuality and education meet, where certain – though quite limited – aspects of sexuality are openly discussed in school, with an educational aim. For this reason, sex education is a special and in a sense subversive space for sexuality in school.

The first significant and widely referenced feminist study about discourses of adolescent sexualities in sex education was Michelle Fine's (1988) paper "Sexuality, Schooling, and Adolescent Females: The Missing Discourse of Desire". Fine identified four prevailing official discourses of female sexuality in schools: (hetero)sexuality as violence, sexuality as

victimization, sexuality as individual morality, and the discourse of desire, which was missing or if present, was "tagged with reminders of 'consequences'" (1988: 35). She notes that the discourses of sexual victimization and desire coexist in young women's discourse and points out that sex education's concern for female victimization is false, because real victims of violence are discredited, and non-victimising pleasures are silenced.

If adolescent sex is conceptualised mainly as dangerous, violent and immoral, no wonder that the most dominant discourse in sex education, as many authors claim (e.g. Jackson & Weatherall 2010; Allen 2007; Alldred & David 2007), is that of 'risk'. As Allen argues, the 'risk' discourse suggests that young people have to be protected from the potential negative consequences of having sex. "Such a discourse draws on essentialist ideas about sexuality as biologically determined and hormonally driven, with student sexuality constituted as dangerous because it can propel young people to act in ways that are detrimental to their health" (2007: 225). The 'risk discourse' is the product of a medicalised approach to sexuality, which, along with the moral approach, is the most common in sex education (see: e.g. Alldred & David 2007; Youdell 2005; Lewis & Knijn 2003). There is plenty of literature on the 'risk' discourse and the medical and moral approaches to sex education and also on the lack of pleasure and desire discourses. Therefore I have decided to leave the 'risk' discourse out of my analytical scope and focus on pleasure discourses, which are also significant – and problematic – in sex education in Marzipan.

Alldred and David's work (2007) is a thorough exploration of the multiple aspects of policies and practices of sex education in secondary schools in the UK from the perspectives of adolescents, teachers, school nurses, young mothers and young men not attending school. They discuss the politics and discourses of sex education, the discourses of childhood and adolescence, the status of sex education in the achievement agenda in education, the dominant

cultural discourses of gender in sex education, teachers' problems with sex education, and students' attitudes to sex education. They conclude that sex education as it is currently done is subjugated to the contemporary neoliberal achievement agenda of education policy and it does not really correspond to young people's needs and wants from sex education.

Powell (2010), Epstein et al. (2003) and Kehily (2002) also devote a chapter to teachers' attitudes to sex education. Epstein et al. find that the given governmental policy frame of sexual health and morality, coupled with teachers' anxiety and feeling of incompetence about teaching sex education, makes it poor and ineffective (2003: 33-50). Kehily argues that the sex education provided by teachers she interviewed in her study was influenced by the teachers' personal history as students and as gendered sexual subjects. The teacher-pupil binary also affects the success of educational initiations, and so does the credibility and popularity of the teacher (2002: 164-199). Powell calls for sex education that addresses the prevention of sexual pressure and coercion through alternative gender discourses which challenge heteronormative gendered views about sexuality and give young people more sexual agency (2010: 140-147). These studies highlight the complexities of doing sex education in the institutional framework of schooling.

Sex education is the only school subject explicitly dealing with adolescent sexuality. However, as studies show (see: e.g. Allen 2007; Fine & McClelland 2006; Corteen 2006; Temple 2005; Lewis & Knijn 2003; Epstein et.al. 2001; Fine 1988), adolescent sexuality is treated as a very narrow kind of heterosexuality in the official school discourses and culture. Allen (2007) argues that the official culture of schools marks out certain student sexual positionings, and sex education constitutes young people as children, denying them agency to look after their sexual well-being. The constitution of young people as childlike, in need of

protection, as subjects lacking agency is in fact counter-productive, as it goes against sex education's aim to teach safe responsible sex.

Contrary to anglophone countries, sexual education, adolescent sexuality and sexuality and schooling have not been an interest in Hungarian educational research. In the recent representative survey (Simich & Fábián, 2010), titled "School – health education – sex education", conducted by the National Health Improvement Institute,[38] the authors focus on adolescents' knowledge about sexuality, and they include plenty of data on what type of school, in which region, which year the respondents were attending, but there is no data provided about how sex education was done (if done at all) in the surveyed schools or how sex education may have influenced the respondents' knowledge about sexuality. In this survey gender, class or ethnicity are not analytical categories, the sample of over 5000 young people is treated as a monolith. Apart from this survey, to my knowledge, no academic study is available on the topic of sex education or sexuality and schooling in contemporary Hungary. This is why, whereas my study is embedded in the international critical literature on sex education and sexual subjectivities in schooling, it is a novel piece of research in Hungary.

US literature on sex education clearly distinguishes between a liberal and a conservative approach to sex education, manifested in 'comprehensive sex education' and 'abstinence only until marriage education' (e.g. Luker 2006; Moran 2000). In short, the core belief of the liberal approach is that if teenagers are given sufficient information about sex and authority to decide for themselves, they will be able to make responsible decisions about sex. The conservative approach claims that it is best not to talk about sex with teenagers at all, because if they have information they will want to try sex and consequently that will lead to the spreading of sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted teenage pregnancy. Fine and

---

[38] The same institute which provided the condom vending machine for Marzipan, see: Section 2.1.

McClelland's (2006) study was written in the Bush era when 'abstinence only until marriage' (AOUM) programs received increased federal political and financial support.[39] They argue that such programs most gravely affect schools in the poorest communities with high rates of teen sexual activity and teen pregnancy by imposing "religious and moralizing curricula more strongly on youth who have already been sexual and who most need information about how to avoid pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases" (2006: 307). They cite research attesting to the high-rate failure of 'virginity pledges' and consequently the high rates of young people becoming sexually active without having received any information about sex, mistrusting condoms and contraceptives, feeling ashamed and remaining silent about their sexuality. In comparison, those young people who participate in comprehensive sex education (CSE) programs, do not become sexually active earlier and do not have sex more frequently, but they use contraception and safe sex techniques more consistently than those participating in AOUM programs (2006: 311-312; see also: Trenholm, Devaney, Fortson, Clark, Bridgespan & Wheeler 2008). Research also shows that AOUM sex education is correlated with higher teen pregnancy rates (Stanger-Hall & Hall 2011).

Whereas this conservative vs. progressive distinction in sex education is significant in the US context, in the Hungarian context there is no such distinction in the discourse and there are much more overlaps than clear lines of distinction among the locally used variations of these ideologies in terms of their approaches to issues of sexuality. Kehily also points out that the three political stances towards sex education, liberal, conservative and feminist, which Lees (1993) identifies in her study of gender and schooling in the UK, did not materialise so distinctly in the schools she studied. The contents and approach to sex education rather depended on the individual teacher, teachers adopted various aspects of these models and did

---

[39] For more details about AOUM sex education programs, the abstinence movement that has grown out of it, see Williams (2011).

106

not identify with any of them (2002: 169-170). Vera was of the opinion that students had to be informed about the negative consequences of unsafe sex, but also about the positive aspects of sexuality, and she did not consider 'threatening with consequences' an appropriate method for education. Two of the form tutors emphasized that it was very important to figure out what students were interested in concerning sexuality and to educate about the emotional and ethical aspects of sex. None of the interviewed teachers in Marzipan had a clear conservative, liberal or feminist view of sex education and none of them ignored the fact that many students were sexually active.

In Europe there has been a variety of approaches, policies and practices regarding sex education. Ketting and Winkelmann claim that there are three conceptual approaches to sex education, "abstinence-only", "comprehensive" and "holistic" sex education (2013: 250). Holistic sex education is a human-rights-based approach, recently recommended by the European Region of the WHO and the German Federal Centre for Health Education. While the primary emphasis of comprehensive sex education is on sexual public health benefits, that of the holistic approach is human rights, especially the right to know. The latter also emphasises that sexuality is a "positive human potential" (2013: 251). Parker, Wellings and Lazarus (2009) provide a comprehensive list of summaries of the implementation of sex education in 26 European countries (the then 25 EU countries and Norway), and national data on the demographic, legislative, sexual and reproductive health-related and educational aspects of sex education provision. There is some sort of sex education in each of the 26 countries, in some countries it has been mandatory, in other countries not, and in many countries it is integrated into other school subjects including biology. The age group in which sex education is first introduced ranges between 5 (Portugal, UK) and 14 (Cyprus, Italy, Spain) (Parker et al. 2009). In Hungary it usually starts in the second half of primary education, in year 5 (age 10-11). The subject is named sex/sexual/sexuality education, sex and

107

relationship education, education for family life, life skills education or health education in the different countries (Parker et al. 2009: 230). In Hungary it is called 'sexual education', and it is part of 'health education'.[40]

Sweden was the first country to introduce mandatory sex education in Europe, as early as in 1955. In most western and northern European countries sex education was introduced in the 1970s-1980s. In Ireland it became mandatory in 2003. In CEE countries there were some initiatives during state-socialist times, under the name of 'family life education', which did not acknowledge young people's pre-marital sexuality. In most CEE countries sex education started after the fall of state-socialism (Ketting & Winkelmann 2013). Literature on sex education in the former socialist countries, including Hungary, is very scarce. Parker et al. claim that in European sex education "[h]ealth professionals are rarely involved, with the exception of some countries that rely on nurses (e.g. Hungary)" (2009: 240). Indeed, as Vera also confirmed, it is typically the school health worker/nurse who runs sex education – if there is any sex education at all in the given school.

3.1. Policy and curriculum – who is supposed to teach sex education in schools?

The way sex education is mentioned in Hungarian educational policy documents reflects the ambivalence and unease about dealing with sexuality in schools. In the main document of educational policy, the National Core Curriculum, sex education is mentioned in one sentence in the section called "prioritised tasks of development", under the task called "physical and mental health". 'Healthy' sexuality is framed as part of a healthy lifestyle. The vague sentence reads: "It is the unavoidable task of the school to deal with the issues of sexual culture and

---

[40] After I finished my fieldwork, the right-wing government renamed sex education to 'education for family life', reflecting its familist political discourse.

108

behaviour, with preparation for family life, responsible, joyful relationships" (2007: 16).[41] This implies on the one hand that it would be great if schools could avoid dealing with sexuality but they cannot, and on the other hand that sexuality is culture and behaviour (and not subjectivity or orientation), imagined as part of family life and relationships. Having to deal with sexual culture and behaviour is an acknowledgement of the existence of child and adolescent sexuality, but at the same time sexuality is delegated into the future, as suggested by using the 'preparation for family life' framework. Although the sentence is in the 'health' section, 'responsible relationship' belongs rather to the moral discourse. In the "areas of education" the word 'sexuality' is mentioned once among the developmental tasks of the "People and society" area (comprising history, anthropology and sociology), and once among those of the Sciences area (called "Humans in nature", comprising biology, physics and chemistry).

In the 2008 Frame Curriculum[42] for biology the same sentence appears, as part of a longer sentence also defining the prevention of addictive habits (smoking, drinking, drugs, unhealthy nutrition) as a developmental task.[43] Sexuality is mentioned again in the section of learning tasks for year 11, and among the topics of the electable subject psychology (only in grammar schools). In all instances "responsible sexuality" is emphasized; the biology curriculum also

---

[41] In the revised NCC of 2012, reference to sex education is in the section "Areas of development – educational goals", under the goal "Education for family life". The next section is "Physical and mental health", but, unlike in the earlier NCC, sexuality is not mentioned there. The document claims that education for family life helps young people form responsible relationships, and then the last sentence of this section is: "School has to deal with the issues of sexual culture as well." Relationships are only responsible, not joyful, and sexuality is only culture, not behaviour. This textual change reflects the conservative turn in educational discourse. In the "areas of education", besides biology, sexuality appears in the new school subjects 'moral studies' (primary school) and 'ethics' (secondary school).

[42] The National Core Curriculum contains general guidelines and targets for primary and secondary education. The Frame Curricula regulate the contents and measurable inputs and outputs within subject areas for each year of education. Schools have to design their Local Curricula, which is mostly based on the Frame Curricula.

[43] The sentence reads: "Attention has to be paid to prevention of habits leading to harmful addictions (e.g. smoking, alcohol and drug consumption, improper nutrition), issues of sexual culture and behaviour, preparation for family life and responsible, joyful relationships."

affirms that sexuality is not only a biological drive. There are no detailed prescriptions of content in these curricula, those are defined in the local curricula that schools have to develop.

Thus, sexual education is not a distinct school subject, it seen within the framework of 'health education'. The *Public Health Act of 1997* prescribes that schools are to provide health education (1997: §38.1, §38.2). The Ministry of Education published a guideline for schools for the preparation of health education programmes in 2004.[44] The guideline declares that "traditionally" it is the task of the school doctor and the school health worker (nurse) to "participate" in health education (2004: 16). In the lack of precise regulation, it is up to each school to decide how to provide sex education, and there is no data available about the number or type of schools or the number of hours per week dedicated to sex education.

Health workers/visiting nurses (*védőnők*) are divided into four categories: area, hospital, family protection and school health workers. Area health workers are the ones who visit families with babies and small children in their home. Hospital health workers assist mothers who have just given birth and support the adaptation of babies into their family. Family protection health workers work in family protection counselling services and run the compulsory counselling before abortion.[45] School health workers (or school nurses) receive full-time status if they work with over 800 children. It depends on the number of students in the given school how many hours they are required to work. Vera said that in her job description offering sex education lessons is not prescribed, she is only required to *participate* in sex education lessons – in accordance with the above cited Health Act. However, it is

---

[44] Guideline for schools for the preparation of health education programmes].
http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/kozoktatas/egeszsegfejlesztes/segedlet-iskolai
[45] See Rédai and Szabó's study (2013) for current practices of abortion counselling.

generally assumed by the school staff that it will be the school nurse who deals with this kind of non-academic and non-vocational type of education.[46]

3.2. Doing sex education in Marzipan

Sex education is most often discursively situated within a 'moral' or a 'health' framework, both in educational practice and in sex education research (Rasmussen 2012). Fine and McClelland point out that whereas in the US a moral discourse prevails about adolescent sexuality – which supports AOUM programs – in some European countries (specifically Germany, France and the Netherlands) the health discourse gives the framework for sex education (2007: 1000). They argue that when adolescent sexuality is not framed as a political, religious issue (like in the US), but as a health issue, young people receive more positive information about sexuality issues, which, among others, impacts teenage pregnancy rates (9 times higher in the US than in the Netherlands, according to one study they cite (2007: 1000)). Although I have anecdotal information about Christian private schools in Hungary offering sex education which is more the AOUM type, in state schools it is difficult to imagine that AOUM sex education would be a widespread practice. This may be due to a more general public acknowledgement that most young people are sexually active before getting married and a less moralising attitude about it, and to the institutional positioning of sex education as the duty of health workers (nurses and doctors), framing adolescent sex as a health-related matter.

Rasmussen (2012) questions whether it is necessary to oppose the morality and health frameworks. She argues that the health framework – as opposed to moral frameworks which are sex-negative – usually implies that sexual pleasure and desire are positive things and their fulfilment will contribute to young people's health as long as medically accurate information

───────────────

[46] The information in this paragraph was provided by Vera.

is provided about it (2012: 478). She is concerned that such an opposition ignores how other aspects of young people's lives, such as "kinship networks, culture and religion, spirituality and ethics" may influence "young people's sexual decision making" (2012: 477). She claims that "culture, religion and morality are often constructed as somehow outside reason and, therefore, always something which diffuses rather than reinforces young people's capacity to act as agentic subjects" (2012: 477). She concludes that all forms of sex education, including those in a 'health' framework are moral, in the sense that focusing on sexual autonomy and pleasure is also a moral issue.

Alldred and David discuss another dichotomy: whether sex education (called sex and relationship education – SRE – in the UK) is discursively framed as a *health* or an *education* matter (2007: 118-120). In the UK school nurses and teachers are both implicated in sex education, and they often deploy these two discourses, respectively. Alldred and David argue that the two discourses provide different pedagogies and different constructions of adolescents as sexual subjects. In the health discourse adolescent sex is viewed positively and sex education is seen as the provision of scientific information, 'facts', based on which young people will make rational decisions. "Assumptions of rationality take sexual decision-making out of context – of desire and of complex social dynamics, views and relationships within which, in practice, it is embedded" (2007: 118). The 'education' discourse is moral, adolescent sex is viewed negatively, young people are ideally non-sexual 'pupils', their sexuality delegated to the future and seen as problematic in the present and "framed as a child-protection issue" (2007: 118). However, they point out that the two discourses are not rigidly separated. "Indeed, the discourse of health is today powerful through the moral imperatives it creates as individual responsibilities. It also functions to secure the moral claim that young people are entitled to knowledge that helps them protect their health or to health care services" (2007: 119).

In Marzipan, sex education was carried out in the 'health' framework. At the time of my fieldwork sex education was part of a health education module, whose curriculum was developed by Vera. At the beginning of every school year she approached form tutors and offered them the health education module. She delivered the 10-hour module in forms whose form tutors invited her to do so, therefore she did not run health education lessons in every form of the school. The ten-hour module usually included 5-6 hours of sex education, the topics of the remaining 4-5 hours were substance abuse and addictions (drugs, smoking, alcohol) and healthy lifestyle (sports, nutrition, body care). Sexual education usually covered the following areas: the process of biological maturation and psychosexual development; the starting of sexual life; adolescent relationships and monogamous, long-term adult relationships; starting a family; contraception and STI prevention; pregnancy, giving birth, caring for infants. It sometimes happened that some form tutors delivered lessons about such topics, but the ones I interviewed preferred to invite Vera to do it. One of the form tutors, Ilona, added two more lessons to the module, in which she was teaching about dating and relationships.

As for teaching materials, Vera repeatedly complained about the lack of handbooks and other available teaching materials. She was using a set of visual materials compiled by one of her colleagues, and the audio-visual materials of A-HA, a "country-wide sexual and mental hygiene education program".[47] She was also relying on her own secondary-school experiences of sex education and what adolescents would be interested in, and every year she was trying to update the materials she was using based on her teaching experiences. Nobody in the school ever checked what she was teaching and what materials she was using. In 2010 the school director retired, and the new one (the one I interviewed) invited her to continue as

---

[47] http://www.a-ha.hu/ This is a heteronormative program with a medical approach. The hygiene approach is reflected in the title. Some years before my fieldwork facilitators of this program were visiting schools to offer sex education. All in all, it is not very common in Hungary that external programs – run mostly by NGOs – are invited to schools on a regular basis to run sex education.

before, "because there is a great need for it" *(Vera, interview).* As I learned from Vera, school health workers did not receive methodological training in college, at least at the time she was studying. Thus, it was entirely up to her what she taught, but she was at a loss about what pedagogies and teaching resources she could use. She told me at a later discussion in 2014 that she had applied twice for a specialisation training course in youth health work, but both times the training was cancelled because there were not enough applicants.

In the UK school nurses have the opposite problem. Alldred and David's school nurse respondents complained that although they did receive training on sex education in college, teachers did not acknowledge their expertise, perhaps because they were not aware of their knowledge (2007: 57). What British schools and Marzipan shared was that sex education was a low status subject, constantly subjected to a battle of time and subordinated to academic priorities in a neoliberal achievement agenda (Alldred and David 2007: 65-66; Radó 2008). However, unlike in Hungary, in the UK there is a range of teachers' projects and available sex education resources to work with, published by government and health authorities, teachers' forums and NGOs.[48]

Alldred and David (2007) discuss teachers' anxieties about sex education, including the fear that parents would withdraw their children from sex education. In Marzipan parents did not have much say about education contents, only one of the teachers mentioned one child during her teaching career who was withdrawn from sex education by her parents. There was another case, which students mentioned, when one of their female classmates was withdrawn from sex education, the parents arguing that it is too early for their 'innocent' daughter, and they were

---

[48] To mention a few:
The e-magazine *The Sex Education Supplement* by Sex Education Forum:
http://www.sexeducationforum.org.uk/sex-educational-supplement
The Guardian blog of the Teacher Network called *How to teach… sex education*:
http://www.theguardian.com/education/teacher-blog/2013/jun/10/sex-education-teaching-resources
TES online network of teachers: https://www.tes.co.uk/teaching-resources/search/personal-social-and-health-education/sex-and-relationships/
Family Planning Association: http://www.fpa.org.uk/shop/78/product-list

not aware that the daughter was already having an active sexual life, according to her classmates. Another anxiety on behalf of teachers was mentioned by Buston, Wight and Scott, in their study of delivering sex education in 25 Scottish secondary schools. There some teachers were worried that they would impose their own values and views of sexuality on students (2001: 358). As for Marzipan, I can safely claim that this would be very unlikely to cause anxiety to a teacher there. Both in the interviews with teachers and at their lessons I observed that teachers were imposing value-laden discourses on students without reflection, as if teachers actually considered it their task to transmit their values and views as part of the material they taught.

3.3. Methodological issues of sex education

In Marzipan – and probably in most other schools where there is any sex education at all – the format of sex education is one 45-minute long lesson weekly or by-weekly, usually in the last teaching hour (around 2-3 pm, when students are tired and want to get out of school as soon as possible). Forms consist of about 30 students, mixed gender. The lesson goes on frontally, Vera talks and sometimes uses media tools, the students either ask or do not ask questions. Also, as this subject was not very prestigious and Vera was not a strict disciplining person and not highly positioned in the school hierarchy, the lessons often ended up in anarchy, especially in the classes where students were aged 15-16 and the majority were boys – or at least they seemed like a majority because they were so loud and disinterested in sex education that even a few of them could disrupt lessons.

The frontal, whole-form setting is not only a methodological issue in delivering sex education but also part of the institutional regulation of student sexuality. Sex education, already an 'uncomfortable' subject for a school to embrace because of the body/mind split as a basic

principle in education (Alldred & David 2007; Epstein et al. 2003), has to be kept within certain boundaries, under control, just as students' sexuality has to be kept under control in school in general. As I discussed in Section 1, official heteronormative asexuality and vivid adolescent sexuality have to be maintained in one space.

I point out in Chapter 5 that while students, and girls in particular, were encouraged to explore their own and their partner's body, in order to find out what is pleasurable for them, they were not offered education on how to do it. The institutional setting of the non-sexual/contained heterosexual school and the sex education lessons were certainly not a setting where it would be comfortable to talk about the practical intimacies of sexual pleasure. It was not part of the lessons to practice how to communicate about desires and pleasures with partners. Pleasure often came up in these lessons in the form of declaring that mutually giving pleasure is the most important aim of sex. This statement was usually left in the abstract, instructions or suggestions about how to give or learn to give pleasure were not part of the lessons. Thus, the discourse of desire and pleasure was not missing (cf: Fine & McClelland 2006; Fine 1988) but was not present on a practical level.

I asked students in the interviews about whether they would like to talk about desires and intimacy in the sex education lesson. As far as concrete technical questions of how to give and receive pleasure were concerned, respondents in most of my interviews declared that they did not want to talk about pleasure and desire in class. Some did, though, and there were a number of reasons why they would or would not want to discuss such topics in the company of their peers. Some said sexual pleasure was a private matter, it was embarrassing or it was too private a subject to talk about in the classroom. Some argued that some of their classmates were too shy to talk about pleasure in front of the whole class, or would even get upset about it. Some did not want to talk about such matters in front of classmates they did not like. Some

were afraid of receiving verbal harassment from some peers if they talked about practicalities of pleasure-giving. These were the most common arguments against talking about pleasure in the sex education class. There was one girl group though, where respondents – based on bad sexual experiences – thought that it would be worth talking in class about giving pleasure, especially for boys, because then sex "wouldn't hurt so much" (*Evelin, 19*) and girls "wouldn't have to explain so many things" to boys (*Nóri, 19*). There was also one group of boys who admitted that they had no clue what was pleasurable for women and that they would be interested to hear about that.

These responses indicate that there is a need to talk about desire, pleasure and intimacy, but the sex education class setting is not suitable for that. Vera said in the interview that besides sex education lessons she had counselling hours for the students, but they could go any time to visit her during her working hours. 5-10 students per week went to see her for counselling, girls and boys equally. They consulted her about a variety of topics, including family problems, diets and contraception. There were students who went regularly, and there were students who went occasionally, just for a chat. So it seems that a major benefit of the sex education lessons was that she gained the trust of many of the students and those who needed some sort of help could go and talk with her. In this sense individual counselling appears to be a more beneficial method, because it is confidential and addresses personal problems related to sexuality. The problem is that capacities are limited, one school health worker does not have the time besides her other working duties to provide individual counselling for over 800 students.

3.4. Reproducing social inequalities through sex education

Sexual education did play its role in the reproduction of social inequalities, especially by ignoring or not giving voice to non-normative sexual experiences. The projected image of becoming an adult whose sexuality is based on a narrow heteronormative, middle-class norm of one type of relationship and family model did not equally address all adolescents. Those who did not come from a middle-class and/or majority ethnic background, were not heterosexual or did not identify with traditional gender roles, or their experiences did not correspond with the strictly prescribed sexual, relationship and family models and cultural expectations, remained invisible to the sex educator with their experiences, problems and questions.

As for the starting of sex life, Vera projected an idealised, normative vision of the adolescent who first has to get to know his/her own body and acquire information about sexuality. Then s/he would get acquainted with a person of the opposite sex, with whom a physical-emotional attraction would develop and turn into romantic love. They would discuss contraceptive options, and when the time arrives – preferably no earlier than age 16-17 – they should choose a quiet place where no one would bother them, and after agreeing on the appropriate method of contraception, the sexual act could be performed. However, as I have pointed out in Section 2.1, many students in Marzipan were living in circumstances where this was not an option, as they did not have their own bedroom or had to hide from parents who thought that their child was not up to sex yet. Thus, respondents' sexual experiences were often far from this middle-class adult notion of having sex, either because of socio-economic reasons or simply because of their age and/or parent-child relations.

Non-heterosexual students were also not addressed by sex education in Marzipan. At the lessons I observed non-heteronormative sexuality was only mentioned a couple of times and

118

none of its aspects were thoroughly discussed. Vera was not homophobic but she had heteronormative notions of sexuality, and also, as she said in the interview, she did not feel prepared to talk about homosexuality. Talking about homosexuality would have meant not only gaining information but also a public recognition for my non-heterosexual respondents' sexuality, all of whom emphasized that those who were isolated, lonely and could not or dared not come out had a very hard time in school.

Several scholars argue that sexual education is not only heteronormative but also raced and classed and reinforces social inequalities. García argues in her study of heterosexual and lesbian Latina girls' experiences of sex education that the concept of 'heterosexual' in sex education actually means 'White middle to upper class heterosexual' and that youth of colour are constructed either as 'at risk' or a source of danger (2009: 521). She found that sex education "entailed the incorporation of racialized gender stereotypes to produce specific lessons to Latina Youth" (2009: 528). Latina girls were perceived as sexually active, and on the bad side of the good girl/bad girl dichotomy. Sex educators' beliefs about Latina girls' high risk of pregnancy were based on stereotypical assumptions about "Latino culture" (2009: 531), i.e. Latino machismo. Lesbian desires, practices and identities were unacknowledged, because of the assumption of Latino culture's rootedness in heterosexuality.

In Marzipan there were examples of racist views about students' sexuality, some of which I discuss in Chapter 4, Section 3.2. In such discourses Gypsy girls were not constructed as 'at risk' or 'hypersexual' or 'sluts' and boys as 'hypersexual machos' but girls were rather depicted as 'welfare queens', 'teen mothers' for whom their ethnic traditions and class belonging defined their reproduction patterns. Gypsy boys were not mentioned in these discussions. Vera was not differentiating between students based on their ethnicity, but she related that she talked about sexuality differently in the Gypsy ethnic private school where she

119

was also working (see: Chapter 6, Section 2.4). However, her ethnically neutral approach, coupled with her liberal stance on adolescent sexual relationships (i.e. it is alright to experiment sexually with many partners during adolescence, as long as contraception and STI prevention was taken care of) implied that Roma girls in whose community marrying as a virgin or committing to the first boyfriend for a life-long partnership is expected were not addressed. For these girls virginity is of a great value, virginity has to be given to someone who deserves it and compensates for gaining this treasure by giving the girl a stable relationship.[49] This is not compatible with the idea of free sexual experimentation and having multiple sex partners at the age of adolescence. In order to provide social recognition for such girls and acknowledge their sexual agency in the decisions they make, it would be more relevant to discuss issues of early commitment, becoming young mothers, or what can be the consequences if the family chooses their spouse, or what options they have if they do or do not want to live this way. This is an example for Rasmussen's argument that focusing on pleasure and desire in sexual education tends to ignore young people's culture, religion, kinship networks and ethics as aspects of their lives that influence their sexual decision-making (2012: 477).

To sum up, despite all the good efforts of the school nurse, sex education was not suitable for the students of Marzipan from a methodological perspective, and it did not provide recognition to the variety of students' subjectivities and social situation and did not give too much relevant knowledge to the students. It was also inadequate because it was male-biased and did not deal with girls' sexual problems, such as sexual violence or sexual pressure from male partners or peers, and it ignored non-heteronormative sexualities. Thus, sex education inadvertently contributed to differentiation and the reinscription of inequalities between students.

---

[49] See Chapter 6 for a discussion of this.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have looked into the intersection of schooling and sexuality with the aim to situate my research in the field and to provide an insight into how the sexualisation of an actual school can be conceived. I have provided national and local data on sexual practices among students, including the age they started having sex, their approaches to and experiences with contraceptive and STI prevention devices and their experience with sexual violence, in order to situate the student population of Marzipan in a comparison with relevant representative data. I found that on average my respondents started their sex life somewhat earlier than the students in the HBSC survey; that they reported more varied usage of contraceptive and STI preventive methods; and that the percentage of girls in my sample who reported experiences with relationship violence approximated the proportion (cc. 20%) in the 2014 FRA representative survey on violence against women in the EU. In the second part of the chapter I have discussed how the school is a sexualised space. I was interested in how the school space in its materiality is used for sexual practices in the broadest sense, including the vocational training practice and the school toilet. I have argued that the divide between public and private is not necessarily located at the same places for students and teachers and that for students spaces for sexual practices were not necessarily divided along the public/private line but along the available/unavailable line. School space was certainly an available space and whether it was used for sexual activities or not had class-related aspects (for example, the lack of a private bedroom at home). Sex education lessons were one space which was 'officially' sexualised, where sexuality and education met curricularly. Obviously, the classrooms where the sex education lessons were held became discursively sexualised spaces, but also the sex education instructor's body became sexualised by heterosexual male students. In the last section I have provided a brief overview of the policy framework of sex education in Hungary and discussed some aspects of how sex education was done in Marzipan, including its

121

contents and methodology, because that is significant in the regulation of student sexuality and school space. The curricular positioning, contents and methodology of sex education, as it is practiced in Marzipan, reflects the unease and ambivalence about the acknowledgement of the presence of sexuality and the wish to control it in school, both on the national policy level and the local school level. Besides, such sex education reproduces social inequalities through keeping ethnic, classed, gendered and sexual orientation-based specific sexual knowledges, experiences and needs invisible.

Chapter 4: Hierarchy and the Re/Production of Social Inequalities in Marzipan

Introduction

In this chapter I provide insights into how power relations and the hierarchical structure of Marzipan is implicated in producing raced, classed, sexualised and gendered subjectivities, both of students and teachers, both discursively and via institutional practices, and how the production of these subjectivities perpetuates social inequalities on various levels of the institutional structure. First I introduce the educational profile and the student and teacher population of Marzipan. Then I analyse discourses and practices which construct hierarchy among teachers and between students and teachers. In the third part I offer examples of how other axes of inequality get constituted intersectionally, and especially how ethnicity, gender, sexuality and class converge to create student and teacher subjectivities. Although in this chapter I examine not only sexuality discourses, I demonstrate that through talking about students' sexuality, teachers reproduce the hierarchy among the different school strands and the students attending these strands. This differentiation highlights a so far overlooked aspect of the relations of schooling and sexuality: a direct connection between selective education and sexual knowledge, behaviour and communication. I argue that sexuality is one of the major discourses through which social inequalities are re/produced in Marzipan.

1. The educational structure and the population of Marzipan

In this section I provide an overview of the hierarchical education system, describe the educational profile of Marzipan and introduce the student and teacher population. My data show that despite equal access to secondary education in theory, school re/produces classed, gendered and ethnic inequalities. How such re/production happens discursively and through

educational practices is elaborated in further sections. In Section 1.2 I argue that the pedagogical program of the school demonstrates that the school management has a middle-class elitist intellectual perspective on education and prejudices against low-educated people.

In CEE countries during state socialism primary education was mandatory up to year 8 (age 14), and secondary education had a tripartite system, grammar schools, technical schools and vocational schools. After the collapse of the state socialist regime the same system remained. The technical and vocational strands provide training for blue-collar work, whereas the grammar school prepares students for white-collar work and higher education. In Hungary the completion of the technical or the grammar school strand (4 years, or 5 years with one year of intensive language learning in year 9)[50] allows for continuing studies either in adult technical training or in higher education, whereas the vocational strand (3 years) does not, as it does not end in acquiring a 'maturation exam' (*érettségi*). Vocational education was popular during state-socialism because of the high industrialisation of these countries (Kogan, Gebel & Noelke 2012). In the process of the capitalist transition, both in Hungary and in other CEE countries, grammar school and technical school became more prestigious and popular forms of secondary education for the middle and upper classes, because the labour market value of such qualifications have increased. Vocational schools, at the same time, lost their popularity, due to privatisation, which had the consequence that many privatized companies stopped providing practicing places for vocational school students (Kogan et al. 2012). This is also connected to a general devaluation of the working class as opposed to state socialism, when (at least rhetorically) it was valued. De-industrialisation (Urban 1999) and the expansion of higher education has also played an important role (Kogan et al. 2012). Within a highly selective schooling climate and the raising of mandatory schooling age from 16 to 18 (then

---

[50] Primary and secondary education in Hungary runs from age 6 to age 18 or 19 and the year of study is indicated by year 1-13. Secondary education in most schools starts in year 9, except for the so-called "elite grammar schools" (*gimnázium*) where secondary education starts in year 5.

reduced to 16 again in 2012) the proportion of youth coming from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds doubled in vocational schools. Two thirds of Roma youth attend vocational schools (Liskó 2008). Liskó claims that the Hungarian secondary education system is rigidly hierarchical and reflects social stratification (2008: 96). Policies supporting the middle class have been reflected in education: grammar school and technical school education has received huge funds and professional support for development, while the development of vocational education has been neglected. As a result, the quality of vocational education has worsened, and this crisis has become chronic, accompanied by the constant devaluation of the teacher profession (Fónai & Dusa 2014). Vocational students' achievement rates are much lower and their dropout rates are much higher (about 30%) than in technical (9%) and grammar (4%) schools (Liskó 2008: 101-102).

In Europe, streaming[51] is systemic in countries following the so-called 'German-type' schooling system (Germany, Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Hungary), while in Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian countries it is much less present, and the Southern European countries are mixed in this respect (Robert 2010: 113-114). Both Hungarian and international literature on streaming in secondary education shows that streaming "increases inequality in educational outcomes and aggravates the effects of students' socio-economic status" (Robert 2010: 435). Pfeffer (2008) found that educational mobility in countries with a highly stratified educational system, including Hungary, is low.

Studies also show that parents' educational level influences school choice: parents with higher education tend to send their children to grammar schools, and vocational school students tend to have parents with low education and low social status (Kogan et al. 2012; Robert 2010; Horn, Balázsi, Takács & Zhang 2006). Highly educated parents can apply their cultural

---

[51] 'Streaming' is the term used in the UK and 'tracking' is used in the US for separating students within and between educational institutions (Gamoran 2010: 213).

capital in different ways to assist with their children's school achievements: they can deploy both their "content knowledge" and their "strategic knowledge", i.e. their knowledge of the education system and competence to assist the child in navigating the system (Pfeffer 2008: 545-546; Lareau & Weininger 2003). Pfeffer argues that "the association of parents' and their children's educational status is higher in highly stratified systems" (2010: 546). As he explains, "this relationship presumes an active role of parents in managing, guiding, and advising their children in their educational careers. The degree of stratification of the education system determines the level to which such parental assistance becomes a crucial resource for children confronted with difficult educational choices" (2010: 556).

1.1. The educational profile of Marzipan

Marzipan is a multilateral vocational (*szakiskola*),[52] technical (*szakközépiskola*) and grammar school (*gimnázium*) in a large town in Hungary, in which qualifications for food industry professions such as baker, cakemaker, sweets factory worker, baker/cakemaker-technician, food industry technician and food analyst technician can be acquired, except in the grammar school strand, where students do not acquire a profession. As *Table 1* shows, two thirds of the students attend the vocational school strand, so that form of training is the major profile of Marzipan. The last grammar school year graduated in 2012 (a year after the completion of my fieldwork), this type of secondary education is not continued in Marzipan anymore.[53] Also, adult technical training is available, in which those who have graduated from the grammar school or the technical school strands can participate. This is a hybrid form of education, which does not offer a university or college degree but provides professional training above secondary school level. In the course of this adult technical training, one can acquire a

---

[52] *Szakiskola* is the equivalent of *szakmunkásképző* as it used to be called.
[53] The reason for this was probably that this was not a prestigious grammar school, fewer and fewer students applied, therefore the school – in a system of head quotas – could not afford to continue running this school strand.

qualification of food-industry analytical technician or baker-cakemaker technician. In theory, vocational students can continue after 3 years of vocational training to do two years of further training in technical school and acquire a 'maturation exam' and a food industry technical qualification. According to Liskó, in recent years the trend has been that nearly half of students graduating from vocational training continue studies to acquire a maturation exam. This is due to the bad labour-market perspective of low qualified young people (2008: 105). According to the economic management of Marzipan, approximately 20% of students who acquire a vocational qualification continue their studies to acquire a maturation exam. This proportion, which is much lower than the national average, may be due to the fact that food industry qualifications stand in a relatively good position on the labour market, as Anita, a vocational teacher and the school director informed me.

Table 1: Distribution of secondary students in Marzipan in 2010.[54]

School type	Number	Percentage
Vocational school	665	67%
Technical school	224	23%
Grammar school	97	10%
Total	**986**	**100%**

The number of students in Marzipan is approximately 1000,[55] there are about 30 students in each form, except for the so-called 'catch-up' (*felzárkóztató*) form, where there are 15-20 students, and the grammar school forms and sweets factory forms, where the student number is cc. 20.[56] The number of students per form may decrease over the years due to dropouts (cc. 15% of students drop out during the 3-5 years of training; in 2010 this proportion was

[54] Source: Database of the school nurse.
[55] Source: data on the school website, from year 2004/2005 to 2010/2011.
[56] Source: data on the school website, from year 2010/2011.

127

12.5%[57]). According to Vera, every year 3 to 10 students per form are transferred to another form or another school or repeat the year; the number of such students is lower in the grammar and technical school strands and higher in the vocational school strand.

1.2. The students of Marzipan

As Reay (2006) notes, there has been a widespread media, political and even academic discourse of "blame culture", which views "the working classes in terms of a range of cultural deficits that are then portrayed as the reasons for working-class underachievement. Most position the working classes as either victims or deficient in one way or another, and nearly all focus on the home as the locus of class practices" (2006: 397). According to the 2008 pedagogical program of Marzipan, which was in use at the time of my fieldwork, "the student population of the school is very heterogeneous. Approximately half of the students come from broken families;[58] it is common especially among the vocational school students that they have one caretaker parent and in some cases not even that one parent takes real care of the child."[59] The document claims there are many Roma students and students from poor families.[60] "The socialisation level of the vocational students is generally low, in accordance with the educational level of the parents," which gets lower as we go down on the school hierarchy scale, i.e. vocational students have the lowest educated parents, grammar school students the highest, and the technical school students' parents are in between, usually with secondary education, according to the pedagogical program. The document claims that "the

---

[57] Source: the 2008 pedagogical program of Marzipan and institutional data from 2010, publicly available on the website of the school.
[58] 'Broken' or 'mutilated' family is a very commonly used Hungarian expression for one-parent families, reflecting popular heteronormative family ideology.
[59] The quotes in this paragraph are my translation, they are from the 2008 pedagogical program of Marzipan, for which I do not provide a reference, for the sake of the school's anonymity.
[60] The school does not record such data, the pedagogical program does not include numbers, only this statement.

learning motivation of technical and vocational students is not satisfactory, they are more interested in acquiring practical knowledge than in academic subjects."[61]

Although the picture presented about vocational schooling, family background and socio-economic status corresponds with the national trends, the 2008 pedagogical program of Marzipan also reveals something else: the school management's middle-class elitist intellectual perspective and prejudices against low-educated people. It is also obvious that the authors identify with a heteronormative idea of what a 'proper family' is. As we will see, the discursive re/production of social inequalities is done on many levels, including this pedagogical program, in which the authors (the school management) simply doom students with low-educated parents to remain low educated. "Socialisation level" is a polite phrase for describing the degree of being 'sophisticated' or 'uncultured'/'ignorant', and implies that teachers label students on the basis of the educational level of their parents. I have observed that "socialisation level" is a preferred phrase among teachers, and they always use it to refer to socialisation within the family, as if they, as teachers, did not actively participate in the socialisation of children themselves.[62] The statement on the unsatisfactory learning motivation of technical and vocational students again reflects a middle-class intellectual approach: all students are supposed to be interested in academic school subjects, including literature, history, mathematics, and so on. The document complains that behind the low learning motivation stands a greater interest in practical knowledge than academic subjects. Complaining about the lack of interest in academic subjects in a school where the great majority of students is trained for blue-collar vocations again reflects the middle-class educational values teachers are trying to impose on working-class students. In the course of

---

[61] See: Stevens & Vermeersch (2010) for a similar evaluation of pupils from working class families in Flemish schools.
[62] I also discuss teachers' parent-blaming attitude and not taking responsibility for the educational achievement of disadvantaged children in Section 3.2.

interviewing I met many technical and vocational students who were very motivated to learn the trade well and become good professionals.

The 2008 pedagogical program does not contain data about the gender and ethnic proportion of the students. As for gender proportions, the school director cannot say exact percentages, but he assesses the proportion of girls to be 65%. He claims that in all strands there are more girls than boys, and that in general more women than men work in or study food industry. As he explains,

> No matter that baking is said to be hard work, and it used to be an exclusively male profession, since the introduction of kneading machines and proper technical assistance, the majority are girls. In those bakeries at underground stations it is rare to see a man if you look around. And those are either semi-skilled workers or skilled workers.[63] Semi-skilled workers can be paid lower, and even a good housewife can defrost a deep-frozen product and bake anything in a bakery. *(School director, interview)*

Thus, he practically claims that since baking became industrialised and requires less physical strength and technical expertise, it has been feminised. Being "a good housewife" equals semi-skilled work, which has low value on the labour market and is low-paid. In a study about the feminisation of the baker profession in the US between 1950 and 1980, Reskin and Roos (1990) arrive at the same conclusion: technological changes in the baking industry and the increase of "bake-off" bakeries (those in supermarkets and retail stores), where pre-made frozen goods are baked on the spot, has resulted in the increase of women's proportion in the baking industry (from 11% in 1950 to 40% in 1980 in the US). However, they claim, the traditional sexual division of labour within baking has remained, and women are employed to do the kinds of work which "requires less skill and is often less physically demanding; it is more likely to be part time and pays less" (1990: 269). The school director uses the 'feminization threat' discourse (Reskin 1988): if a significant amount of women appears in a

---

[63] Skilled workers are people with secondary vocational qualification.

field which had formerly been exclusively male, they are estimated to be a majority (whether they are a majority or still a minority), which is due to a perceived threat of men losing their hegemonic positions and privileges in the given professional area. This overestimation phenomenon is observable in connection with other minorities, as well, as I am going to explain in the following paragraphs.[64]

According to the school nurse's data, in 2010 there were 986 students attending the school, 514 girls (52%) and 472 boys (48%), so the school director apparently overestimated the proportion of girls in Marzipan. The vocational and technical forms I observed were not overwhelmingly female. In the one grammar school form I observed there were 17 girls and 3 boys. The 'catch-up' form[65] was overwhelmingly male, with 3 girls and 14 boys, in the rest of the forms the gender proportion was approximately 40% girls, 60% boys.[66] According to data from the National Statistics Bureau, in 2010 the gender proportion of people working in the food industry was 58.2% men and 41.8% women.[67] Neither these data, nor the student data confirms the school director's claim that food industry is becoming feminised.

According to a representative survey conducted by the Social Sciences Faculty of ELTE University in 2011, only 9 percent of respondents assessed the proportion of the Roma population in Hungary correctly (1-9%) and one in four respondents thought the proportion of Roma people in Hungary is 40 percent or more.[68] The ethnicity of students is "sensitive data", meaning it is illegal to record, so I asked some students, teachers and the school director to

---

[64] See: Nadeau, Niemi & Levin (1993) for ethnicity/race-based overestimation of minority populations, Martinez, Wald and Craig (2008), and Overby and Barth (2006) for the overestimation of LGBT populations.
[65] I explain what this 'catch-up' form is in Section 2.3.1.
[66] As I did not observe every form, there may be a variety, but I did see forms from every year and every strand. The turnover of students in each form I observed at the sex education lessons was varying, therefore my numbers are estimations.
[67] Data provided by the National Statistics Bureau. Unfortunately there was no data available about the proportion of women and men in the baking industry specifically.
[68] *Kitől tartunk jobban: a romáktól vagy az adóhatóságtól?* [Who are we more afraid of: Roma or the tax authority?] Az ELTE Társadalomtudományi Karának közleménye, 2011. május 10. [Announcement of the Social Sciences Faculty of ELTE University, 10 May 2011.] *Currently not available, website under construction.*

estimate the percentage of Roma students[69] in the school. According to one student, "there are more [Gypsies in the school] than Whites". One teacher estimated the proportion of Roma students at 40%, another teacher at 50%. Here again, we can see the phenomenon of overestimating the proportion of the disliked/discriminated minority. According to the school director's estimation, the proportion of Roma students in the school is about 20% or less, which is closer to my observation than the other estimations. He says that ethnic proportions differ by strand; in forms with approximately 30 students, "in vocational training there are six or seven [Roma students] per form. In the technical strand either zero, or perhaps one or two. Many of them drop out from technical school." I asked him what the reason for such a difference between the vocational and the technical strands may be, and he expressed his belief that

> It's likely that they enter with such background knowledge that they have no chance to get into technical school. I am convinced that they attend even the vocational school– with rare exceptions – not because they are so eager to learn but because education is mandatory and they have to go to school. (*School director, interview*)

What he says highlights a difference in education and further employment chances between Gypsies and Hungarians (see: Hajdú, Kertesi & Kézdi 2014; Kertesi 2005), but also between youth coming from different socio-economic backgrounds. Students coming from (multiply) disadvantaged family backgrounds are likely not to have received the best primary education, due to poverty, bad access to education, unsupportive family background (Csapó, Molnár & Kinyó 2009; Liskó 2008), and a high degree of school segregation in the case of Gypsies (Kertesi & Kézdi 2009). The majority of Roma youth (58%) enrol in vocational schools, 26% in technical schools and 8% in grammar schools (Kertesi & Kézdi 2008: 251). Although 99% of Hungarian students who completed primary education enrol in secondary school, and 95%

---

[69] This estimation necessarily oversimplifies the complexities of identifying as Roma. See Chapter 6 for an analysis of that.

of Roma students do so, the dropout rates in secondary school show a huge difference: whereas the dropout rate among Hungarians is 9%, it is 48% in the case of Roma secondary school students (Hajdú et al. 2014: 27). Thus, the gap between students in primary education is carried on to secondary education, where it widens even further (Hajdú et al. 2014: 13-14).

The overestimation phenomenon applies to sexual minorities, as well (see: Martinez, Wald & Craig 2008; Overby & Barth 2006). When I asked students about their estimation of the proportion of gay people in society, some said they were all over the place, and one – who was rather homophobic – said that 60% of the population was gay. Nearly all my respondents knew someone who 'was gay' but they often disagreed on who exactly their gay peers were. This was interesting, because in general, a low percentage of people in Hungary claim they know homosexual people.[70] Teachers were trying not to notice LGBT students, one even questioned the orientation of her out lesbian student, saying the girl just "couldn't decide yet". Several female form tutors commented that they have had gay boys in their forms, and "they were so cute", as if trying to convince me that they had no problem with gay students. In my sample of 87 students there were 7 who identified as something else than heterosexual. Only one of the seven was a boy, which was probably due to the fact that because of boys' performances of compulsive heterosexuality through gendered homophobic acts (Pascoe 2007) they were more closeted than girls.[71]

Most vocational and technical school students were aiming to learn the profession and get a job. A few wanted another profession, and some of these students were studying in Marzipan because they were not accepted in the school of their choice. There were a few who wanted to

---

[70] See: European Commission: Discrimination in the EU in 2012.
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_393_en.pdf. According to this report, 8% of Hungarians said they had friends or acquaintances how were gay, lesbian or bisexual, and 3% said they had friends or acquaintances who were transgender or transsexual, as opposed to the EU27 average of 55% and 8%, respectively.
[71] I discuss this in more detail in Chapter 2.

become technicians or go to college. Some girls wanted to be homemakers, arguing that having a job, doing the housework and taking care of children were too much work to do simultaneously. Two girls wanted to work on a cruiser for a few years to save up for a house. Two boys in the same form in year 9, who were coming from better-off families, said they were going to have their own bakery shop. One of them said his father promised to buy him a bakery after he graduated, the other said his two older brothers were interested in opening a bakery with him. Both boys were Hungarians. As a contrast, a Hungarian girl in the same form, who was one of the best achieving students in her year, coming from a rather poor family headed by a single mother, commented that being a baker was a good profession because people would always eat bread, and that there were various job opportunities, because one could always go to work in the bakery of any supermarket chain. This example shows how gendered and classed inequalities which get reproduced in the labour market are not attenuated by equal access to secondary professional education.

1.3. The teachers of Marzipan

According to a document on the website of the school, in 2010 there were 76 tenured teachers and 14 lecturers employed in the school. Teachers' data is presented in *Table 2*.

Table 2. The number of male and female teachers according to subject area in Marzipan in 2010.

Subject area	Tenured female	Tenured male	Tenured total	Lecturer female	Lecturer male	Lecturer total	Total
Academic subjects	29	8	37	6	1	7	**44**
Profession-al subjects	24	12	36	2	2	4	**40**
Other	2	1	3	2	1	3	**6**
Total	**55**	**21**	**76**	**10**	**4**	**14**	**90**

Women were a majority in the teaching staff. Seventy-eight percent of the tenured teachers teaching academic subjects and two thirds of the tenured teachers teaching professional subjects were female. Eighty percent of the teachers teaching academic subjects (both tenured and lecturer positions) were female, and 65% of those teaching professional subjects were female. Four out of the six staff members teaching other subjects, including the gym teachers (tenured), and the speech practice, creative games and movement practice lecturers were female. Altogether, 72% of the teaching staff were female in 2010.

Women were underrepresented in the school management, compared to their proportion in the teaching staff. The school management consisted of nine members, five out of which (56%) were female. The school director and the economic manager were male, there were three female deputy directors (general deputy director, educational deputy director, HR deputy director) and one male deputy director, the technical one. The vocational education director was male, the deputy vocational education director was female. The ninth member of the management was the president of the trade union committee, also a female.[72] Thus, the three top management positions were occupied by men, and except for the trade union committee president, the women were in deputy positions.

2. The complexity of hierarchy in Marzipan

Marzipan (probably like any other school) is like a mini society, and it systemically reproduces social patterns. As Bourdieu points out, the educational system is "an institutionalized classifier which is itself an objectified system of classification reproducing the hierarchies of the social world in a transformed form, (…) transforms social classifications into academic classifications, with every appearance of neutrality, and establishes (…) total hierarchies (…)" (1984: 387). Marzipan has a complex hierarchical institutional structure,

---

[72] Data available on the website of the school.

which defines the relative power position of the individuals populating it. This hierarchy is not a monolithic structure, there are interrelated complex structures in between and within the levels of the hierarchy, and there is ongoing performative constitution and disruption of the hierarchy. What makes Marzipan's hierarchical structure especially complex is the fact that it is a combined vocational, technical and grammar school in one, with a vocational streaming of students. Besides the most obvious hierarchy of students / teachers / school management / headmaster, there are hierarchies on every level and in every micro-community in the school: hierarchy among students, and students and teachers within each form; among the different vocations, and among the vocational, technical and grammar school strands; among teachers teaching various subjects and professions and in various streams. In the following sections I provide examples of how these power relations and hierarchies are constructed both discursively and through practices, along the axes of gender, class, ethnicity and sexuality.

Class belonging is a complex notion. Different school strands are implicated in the reproduction of class distinctions, but in a multilateral school such as Marzipan, it is challenging to decide which class attributes signify certain class belongings. In the one graduating grammar school form where I conducted interviews, about half of the students applied to college or university, the other half to post-secondary professional trainings, and some of them had no plans to continue their education. Considering their cultural capital, these students were higher classed than their technical school and vocational school peers, but the family backgrounds of many of them were similar, mostly working-class, as far as the parents' profession, education and/or the family's living circumstances (e.g. size of apartment) was concerned. Teachers, however, treated these aspiring middle-class young people differently, based on the cultural capital they were accumulating through grammar school education. There was also a distinction between technical and vocational students with respect to cultural capital and intra-class positioning: whereas vocational school students were

treated as working-class, the technical school students had more cultural capital as they were receiving a longer, more theoretical training in addition to the practical one, and through being eligible for a maturation exam and consequently for higher education, they had more class mobility than the vocational school students.

2.1. The re/production of hierarchy among students by teachers through discussing sexuality

Teachers' attitudes, as expressed in their discourses, reflect the "rigid structural hierarchy of secondary education" (Liskó 2008: 95) and may contribute to conserving social inequalities. I present many examples of such discourses in the rest of the chapter. In the following two examples we can see how the school nurse and the school director perpetuate this hierarchy among school strands and students based on their perception of how students talk about sexuality in the sex education class and of their sexual behaviour in the school. These discourses create distinctions among students and reproduce the hierarchy among the different school strands and the students attending these strands. This differentiation demonstrates a direct connection between selective education and sexual knowledge, behaviour and communication.

Both Vera and the director claim that differences among students in how they talk about sexuality and/or behave sexually in the school correspond with their educational background. In the following excerpt Vera explains that the difference she finds between students is related to which type of school strand they are attending:

Vera: (…) well, obviously what type of kids they are (…), within the school itself, that there is a grammar school form, a technical school form, a vocational school form...

DR: Do you see differences between them? What kind of differences are there?

Vera: Well, yes, of course. For example, the kind of questions they can ask, or whether they immediately understand what I'm saying. I think that a lesson needs to be planned in a way so that I can talk on their level of intellect. (…)

DR: Can you give some examples of how they ask things differently or how you need to plan a lesson differently?

Vera: Well, I think the main difference is that they already come from primary schools that perhaps have higher standards, and their basic knowledge is bigger than that of a child who comes from a primary school where they did not put so much emphasis on [sex education]. Or (…) their family backgrounds, how much they can talk about this with their parents. In a grammar school form they often say that they can talk a lot about this with their parents, or I ask them with whom they can talk about this, who they can turn to for advice, and then they say that, for example, to their mothers. In a (…) vocational form I feel that they get information from each other at best, but very false information. (…) The conversations are completely different as well. (…) [Grammar school students] are used to this, that we sit down and the conversation is much more interactive (…). (Y)ou can have conversations more easily there. (*Vera, school nurse, interview*)

Vera assumes that better quality primary schools have better quality sex education, therefore children who come from better quality primary schools will have more knowledge about sexuality when they start sex education in secondary school. Children attending better quality primary schools are expected to go to secondary grammar schools, whereas children attending low-quality primary schools are more likely to go to technical or vocational secondary schools. As research shows, attending different quality and/or segregated primary schools results in a growing knowledge gap among primary school children (Csapó et al. 2009; Csapó 2003; Vári 2000), which then increases further among secondary school children (Csapó 2003). The PISA survey conducted in OECD countries in 2000 found that the gap between children's school achievement is greatly related to the selectivity of the Hungarian school system (Csapó 2003; see also: Berényi, Berkovits & Erőss 2008; Vári, Auxné Bánfi, Felvégi, Rózsa, & Szalay 2002), and to children's socio-economic background. Both factors influence achievement results to a much higher extent than in other OECD countries (Vári et al.

2002).[73] International comparative studies[74] mostly measure the differences in children's literary and math skills and knowledge but Vera's argument points at a gap between children in other kinds of knowledge and skills as well, such as knowledge about sexuality and communication skills.

Parents' education and their support of their children's education is also related to the quality of primary school children attend. According to the PISA 2000 survey, in Hungary parents' educational level influences the educational achievement of children almost three times more than the OECD average (Vári 2000). Vera also brings up the matter of parental knowledge and support in relation to the child's knowledge of sexuality. She projects a uniform, ideal parental behaviour of children receiving better primary education: these children supposedly have parents with whom they can discuss sexual matters better. In her experience, students in vocational forms receive information about sex from one another, not their parents, and such information is often inaccurate or false. Thus, Vera constructs not only students' positioning in the school hierarchy through what kind of knowledge they have about sex and how they talk about it, but also that of their parents and peers.

Vera also refers to differences in teaching methodologies by suggesting that in grammar school education students are more used to group discussions and interactive learning methods than in vocational schools. This suggests a qualitative difference in teaching methods and teachers' pedagogical approaches in 'better' and 'worse' primary schools and in the grammar, technical and vocational strands of the school Vera works in. Lupton and Hempel-Jorgensen (2012) found similar pedagogical differences between working-class and middle-class schools on primary school level. They cite Thrupp's (1998) comparative research on school pedagogies in advantaged and disadvantaged schools in New Zealand, who found that

---

[73] The authors do not provide an explanation of why this may be so.
[74] Such as the PISA reports. See: http://www.oecd.org/pisa/

"[t]o maintain control and achieve curriculum progress, teachers in the disadvantaged schools engaged in less questioning and set more whole-class tasks, which were tightly prescribed, allowing little student agency and involving little individual student/teacher interaction" (Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen 2012: 609-610). What Vera refers to is exactly this difference in pedagogy. As Thrupp's and Lupton and Hempel-Jorgensen's studies underline, so-called 'good schools' and 'bad schools' are likely to have children with better or worse socio-economic backgrounds, which affects what kind of expectations and assessment teachers have of them and the pedagogical practices they apply on them, which, in turn, influences their test results and their secondary school choice, and also what teaching methods their secondary teachers will use with them.

By differentiating between students' performance at the sex education lessons on the basis of attending different quality primary schools and different strands of secondary schools, Vera highlights another issue, indirectly and complexly related to the ambivalent relationship between schooling and sexuality: family background and the quality of primary education affects secondary school choice, and the knowledge and skills acquired through differentiated education are also reflected in students' sexuality-related knowledge and skills of communicating about them. By choosing the pedagogical method she finds appropriate and manageable for lessons in the different school strands, she – like other teachers using selective pedagogy – perpetuates educational inequalities, in her case through educating about sexuality.

Another example of the complex relations of schooling and sexuality is the following one. In the excerpt below the school director argues that those students who attend vocational training do not have the same 'sexual culture' as students attending elite grammar schools.

140

> Well, they mature faster, and probably nowadays the kids that come to vocational schools, well, we can say, it's not a great joy, but it's a fact that they are not the most sophisticated kids. This brings along a kind of culture, and I am not talking about the Roma here, but in general. (…) Because it's possible that if this were an élite grammar school they would treat the issue completely differently. (*School director, interview*)

According to him, using the school space for sexuality is related to 'maturing faster' and coming from "not the most sophisticated" background. By saying that students "mature faster" he means that they become sexually active at an earlier age. According to Liskó, the educational level of parents and the socio-economic family background of children directly influence which school-type they choose – if they have a choice at all: children from the most disadvantaged families go to vocational schools in the greatest proportion (2008: 96-97). The school director connects family and educational background with sexual behaviour and draws a distinction between students in the vocational school strand and imaginary students in an elite grammar school. In his view, students participating in technical/vocational education have the kind of sexual 'culture' that is not acceptable in an institution based on middle-class values (see: Lupton & Hempel-Jorgensen 2012; Reay 2006), i.e. the distance of their culture from "legitimate culture" is large (see: Bourdieu 1984). As Lupton and Hempel-Jorgensen argue, "(…) schools are designed and resourced according to a set of assumptions about the school social relations and processes informed by middle-class norms" (2012: 610). Such middle-class norms are supposedly represented by students in the elite grammar school he refers to, as opposed to technical/vocational students in Marzipan, who bring in a different kind of 'culture'.

Not an ethnic culture, he quickly adds. As I observed in all the interviews I conducted with teachers, ethnic differentiation in official teacher talk is a taboo. Several teachers took care to reassure me that they do not see differences between Roma and non-Roma students, it is rather the school strand they attend that characterizes their behaviour, that is, their class

141

belonging. Not quite accidentally, though, the proportion of Roma students is the highest in vocational schools, as I mentioned earlier. Lawler discusses the current trend of positioning the working class as White (although not all working-class people are White, of course), and argues that as opposed to the 19th century when working-class people were not "white enough", "[n]ow that there is at least lip-service paid to racial 'diversity', (…) the working class becomes *too white*, embodying a racism that is officially condemned" (2005: 437; emphasis in original). By implying that he does not mean that it is the Roma students who bring this different sexual 'culture', but vocational students in general, the director 'whitewashes' Roma students, hides racism under the blanket of 'working-class culture'.[75] At the same time he makes a distinction between what Skeggs calls "pure white and dirty white" (2004: 91). These white(washed) vocational students represent a different type of whiteness than (elite) grammar school students, because of their working-class 'culture', which includes sexually excessive behaviour and vulgarity (see Skeggs 2004: 100-102), conflicting with the middle-class norms of respectable behaviour in the school. As Skeggs argues, "[w]hen whiteness becomes a marker of excess (…), the working-class become offensively and embarrassingly racially marked as white" (2004: 91). Thus, in an attempt to deracialize the students in question and group them according to their 'culture' and type of education, the school director constructs two different groups of Whites who are in a classed hierarchy looking like raced hierarchy.

The merging of race and class has its historical roots. Skeggs argues that in the 19th century the term "race was used (in the same way as culture is today) as a kind of summation of historically accumulated moral differences" (2004: 37). She cites McClintock (1995) who "suggests that the concept of class has a wider link to more generalizable 'others', who were known through the concept of degeneracy, a term applied as much to classifying racial 'types'

---

[75] I discuss 'culture' as a replacement for 'race' in Section 3.2.

as to the urban poor" (2004: 37). As she continues, "[g]ender, sexuality, and degeneracy were central to all class definitions. (…) So sexuality, or more precisely, heterosexuality, can be added to the means by which class difference could be known and understood" (2004: 37). Despite the historical context of Skeggs' argument, it resonates with Vera and the school director's relating class position to sexuality, and also the latter's merging of class and ethnicity, to which I will return in Section 4.2. They, middle-class teachers, implicitly define vocational school students as lower class, due to their sexual "degeneracy", that is, the deviation of their sexual knowledge and behaviour from middle-class norms. Thus, students' positioning in the classed hierarchy of the school can be done through sexuality, as well.

2.2. Discourses and practices reproducing hierarchy among teachers

Hierarchy does not only entail inequalities in teacher-student relations, but also teachers have their own hierarchy among themselves. In this section I present three examples of how teachers attempt to negotiate their position in the teacher hierarchy. There is a hierarchy of those who hold and do not hold a management position (director, deputy directors, etc., see: Section 1.3), and also among teachers teaching academic subjects (they have a teaching degree), other subjects of lower prestige, such as gym or music (they also have a teaching degree) and the vocational instructors (they do not have a teaching degree). In the first story the negotiation is done between two teachers of equal position and in the second one the positioning is done with the help of students resisting the power of one teacher. In the third example one teacher strongly marks her position within the teaching staff.

Both teachers in the first story are vocational instructors, they are located at the same place in the teacher hierarchy, but one of them, Anita, is younger and has been working in Marzipan for a longer time and is popular among students. The other one, Piroska, came to work in

143

Marzipan recently, she is much older than Anita, and has not established a firm positioning for herself yet. The negotiation of positions happens through the application of gendered norms of clothing and looks. Not surprisingly, in a strictly heteronormative institution, the target of the positioning attempt, among all vocational instructors, is Anita, who is not heteronormative, either in her sexual orientation or in her appearance.

I did not witness the negotiating incident itself but I was observing the teachers in the staffroom that day, and I noted:

> Anita sticks out from the staff because of her appearance. She has short hair, she is wearing a T-shirt and a pair of three-quarters jeans, she is pretty floppy, and she is wearing a leather bracelet with a studded peace sign. (*staff room, fieldnotes*)

I was talking to Anita later that day, and she told me that earlier she had been approached by Piroska, who told her that her hair was too short and she, as a teacher and a woman, should wear skirts more often. Anita was very surprised, as she narrated, "I looked at her with widened eyes and asked why", and Piroska said, "because that's the proper way" (*fieldnotes*). Piroska practically demanded that Anita dress like a (presumably heterosexual) middle-class, adult woman, that is, distance herself from the students in sexuality, class and age. Not only did she demand that Anita distance herself from her students, but also by establishing her own dress norm as the one for her colleague to follow, she attempted to position herself higher than Anita.

The following is an example of the circular operation of power and resistance and the network-like distribution of power in the school (see: Foucault 1990; 1980). In this case students' resistance of one teacher's power serves as a tool for another teacher to reassert her superior position in the teacher-teacher hierarchy. In the following excerpt, Iván, Zsombor and Jakab are talking about the gym teacher whom they deem irrationally strict and even

144

cruel. The students – especially the girls – are resisting her dominance; the power struggle takes the shape of fighting about wearing jewellery, including piercing, during gym classes:

> Iván: And this, that you have to take your necklace off. The last time she tore my necklace off. (…)
>
> DR: By accident or on purpose?
>
> Iván: No. If you don't take it off, she goes like, she goes up to you and then forcefully pff [*imitating tearing off a necklace*].
>
> Jakab: And the piercing, if someone has one.
>
> Zsombor: The girls had to fight for it with the help of the deputy director (…) and now it's enough if they cover it with a plaster. (*Iván 16, Jakab 15, Zsombor 16, interview*)

In resisting the gym teacher's power, the students found an ally, the deputy school director and German teacher, who interfered in their interest. She was in a higher position in the teacher hierarchy than the gym teacher, both for her subject area and her administrative position. Therefore, the students' victory (they can keep their piercings on if they tape them with plaster) was not only a disruption of teacher-student power relations, but also a reinforcement of teacher-teacher power relations, because by supporting the students against the gym teacher, she reinforced her higher position in the hierarchy against the gym teacher, who was in a lower position.

Lujza, a teacher of the high-prestige subject of Hungarian language and literature is very vocal about distancing herself from and looking down both on students and colleagues. I discuss her attitude towards her colleagues here, and return to her distinguishing herself from the students in Section 2.3.3. Lujza, with two or three colleagues who shared her view, isolated herself from the rest of the teaching staff by not sharing the common staffroom but staying in the "szertár" for literature teachers, which is one of those smaller rooms where the teachers of a given discipline have desks and store books and equipment for their lessons.

145

> To be honest, I have to tell you that I have a good reason to stay in the *szertár*. So I don't really talk to anyone. (…) I can't stand this gossip atmosphere that there is in the staffroom. (…) I'm not sure I want to listen to all this. And then here I strongly filter things. *(Lujza, form tutor, interview)*

By announcing that she cannot stand the gossiping atmosphere in the staffroom, the literature teacher downgrades or devalues gossip, as a communication form of lower value. As we can see in Section 2.3.3, 'hygiene' is very significant in Lujza's classed discourse about students. By "strongly filtering" what kind of communications reach her she tries to preserve what I would call her 'intellectual hygiene'. She positions herself, along with those few colleagues she shares the literature "szertár" with, on the top of the teacher hierarchy in the school. Not accidentally, Lujza is one of the few teachers who have a doctoral degree, which further justifies her self-positioning on the top of the pyramid. Apparently, being on the top of the professional-intellectual hierarchy is very important for her. The professional-intellectual part may not be perceivable to the students, but they are certainly aware that Lujza wants to maintain a very strong class distinction, as one of her student Márti's comment on her shows:

> She's conservative or I don't know (…) and she comes from like, a noble family and looks down on everyone and would like to get back her rank and everything. (*Márti 19, interview*)

Whether Lujza would like to reclaim her noble rank if it was legally feasible[76] remains her secret, but Márti's insight confirms that for Lujza it is very important to maintain her high classed positioning in the school hierarchy and distinguish herself both from her students and her colleagues. In Section 2.3.2 I offer more examples of teachers 'looking down on' students as a way to maintain classed distance and positions in the hierarchy.

---

[76] Nobility ranks were revoked in 1947 in Hungary.

2.3. Discourses and practices reproducing hierarchy between teachers and students

In the following three sections I present examples of the practical and discursive ways of teachers constructing and maintaining hierarchy between students through the practice of vocational streaming and discourses of 'cultural distancing', 'looking down on students' and 'hygiene'. I argue that because of their vulnerable social position as low-paid intellectuals with a profession of low social prestige, it is very important for teachers to maintain boundaries and distinctions between themselves and students.

2.3.1. Vocational streaming

The most tangible way school hierarchy – and beyond that, class status – is constructed in Marzipan through teachers' exercise of disciplinary power is vocational streaming. Gamoran points out that despite the intention that streaming would "create conditions in which teachers can efficiently target instruction to students' needs", it reproduces social inequalities because "measures of school performance commonly used to assign students to tracks typically coincide with the broader bases of social disadvantage such as race/ethnicity and social class, leading to economically and/or ethnically segregated classrooms" (2010: 213).

I have explained in Section 1.1 that Hungarian secondary education is a highly selective system with three school streams: grammar, technical and vocational schools, and that such a system strongly reproduces socioeconomic inequalities. Here I focus on a further layer of selective education: vocational streaming, which the technical and vocational students are subjected to.

Vocational streaming goes the following way: in the first two years (year 9 and 10) general subjects are taught with a somewhat different content for the technical and vocational students. As Anita explained, there is not much of a professional training in the first two years, because working in the practice workshops would count as child labour, which is illegal under age 16. Some simpler tasks are practiced though, based on which – in addition to study results and behaviour – the vocational and non-vocational teachers stream the students into *cakemaker*, *baker* and *sweets factory worker* groups, the latter being the lowest in the professional hierarchy. In principle, sweets factory workers, cakemakers and bakers can all choose to continue either in the technical or in the vocational strand from year 11, depending on whether they want to acquire a maturation exam, which would enable them to continue further (post-secondary technician or tertiary) education. According to the economic management of the school, vocational students graduating in the sweets factory worker stream are more likely to continue studying to acquire a maturation exam, because their profession is of the lowest prestige, they work in the worst labour conditions and they have the worst employment chances among the three, whereas a baker-cakemaker, even with a vocational qualification, has better labour opportunities. Still, no more than 20% of vocational students, even among sweets factory workers, continue their studies. Cakemaker is the top of the hierarchy, for which profession, as Anita explains, only about 25-30 students per year are selected to be trained, while the majority of students become bakers. Thus there are two parallel hierarchies in professional training: technical vs. vocational school, and cakemaker vs. baker vs. sweets factory worker.

Students are invested in trying to ensure the highest possible position for themselves in this vocational hierarchy. Teachers are well aware of their power over the prospective working career of their students: I heard several times during my fieldwork teachers disciplining students by threatening them with streaming, saying they will end up being sweets factory

workers if they do not behave or study well. Students complain about this in the interviews, feeling the threat of potential power abuse and the weight of teachers' decisions on their working and financial prospects – and class status.

Many of the students I interviewed came from families that live in poverty, with low educated, often unemployed parents,[77] with domestic violence and/or substance abuse problems. It turned out in the interviews that most teachers did their best to ignore these family circumstances despite the fact that they have the potential to cause learning difficulties and/or behavioural problems.[78] Such students were more likely to end up in the lowest strand, with the lowest qualification and lowest career chances, or drop out of school. Thus, these middle-class teachers actively participated in the reproduction of the 'underclass', by ignoring the specific circumstances and needs of students. This phenomenon is not specific to Marzipan, it is a general problem in vocational education. According to Liskó, in vocational schools the dropout rate is about 30% and nearly half of disadvantaged students entering vocational training leave without acquiring a vocational qualification. Such young people have practically no chances to find jobs (Liskó 2008: 101).

There is a special 'catch-up' (*felzárkóztató*) form in year 9, for students coming from multiply disadvantaged backgrounds and/or very low educational achievements and/or learning difficulties and/or behavioural problems, many of them overage, some raised in state childcare homes, some having police records. The aim is to keep them in the education system as long as possible and give them a vocation as quickly as possible, since they tend not to stay long in the system, as their form tutor, Anna, informed me. Some of these students have not

---

[77] There were a few respondents in the vocational strand who proudly told me that they were the highest educated in their family.

[78] In their study on British primary schools in poor areas with a high proportion of disadvantaged children, Lupton and Thrupp (2013) describe a different approach of form tutors: although they also compared these children and their parents to an assumed middle-class norm, they were aware of and paid attention to the social circumstances of disadvantaged children, and attempted to cooperate with parents.

completed their primary education, so they have to pass an exam during year 9 to accomplish the primary level. The students of this class skip the second year (year 10) of general secondary education, and after the first 'catch-up' year, they are immediately streamed into the baker or sweets factory worker strand (year 11). As one of them sadly noted, they cannot become cakemakers, as that would require completing both years 9 and 10. They are the most unlikely to continue education to reach a maturation exam, and many of them drop out. As their form tutor said, "they are like drug addicts. If we save one, that's already a good thing" (*Anna, form tutor, fieldnotes*).

Obviously, teachers have great authority in deciding about the professional fate of their students. This way, streaming is a highly significant factor in the reproduction of classed hierarchy inside and outside the school.

2.3.2. The discourse of cultural distancing and looking down on students and teachers

Bourdieu (1984) claims that aspects of lifestyle (e.g. what kind of food one eats, clothes one wears, furniture one has in his/her home, etc.) are hierarchically related and socially ranked. How a lifestyle element is ranked is a marker of where it stands in relation to "legitimate culture". What counts as legitimate culture is an issue of constant classification struggle between the dominant and the dominated classes (or class fractions). "Struggles over the appropriation of economic or cultural goods are, simultaneously, symbolic struggles to appropriate distinctive signs in the form of classified, classifying goods or practices, or to conserve or subvert the principles of classification of these distinctive properties" (1984: 249). "What is at stake in the struggles about the meaning of the social world is power over the classificatory schemes and systems which are the basis of the representations of the groups and therefore of their mobilization and demobilization (…)" (1984: 479).

The ongoing classificatory struggle in the school is about drawing a clear line of distinction between students and teachers, working class and middle class, low and high education, low and high culture. Teachers have the privilege to define what counts as legitimate culture, what is of good and bad taste, and they draw distinctions between themselves and the students based on their distance from/proximity to legitimate culture. Besides the tangible impact of vocational streaming on students' intra-class position, there are discursive ways to construct classed inequality in Marzipan. This means that teachers performatively reproduce hierarchies through the ways they talk about students. As Skeggs argues, "classifications are forms of inscription that are performative; they bring the perspective of the classifier into effect in two ways: first, to confirm the perspective of the classifier and, second, to capture the classified within discourse" (2004: 18).

A study by Stevens and Vermeersch (2010) examining teachers' attitudes to students in different streams in Flanders, which has a similar secondary education system to Hungary, found that teachers, students and parents perceive the stratified school system as strongly hierarchical. Teachers perceive students in vocational schools as lacking ability and/or lowly motivated, having anti-school attitudes. "Vocational education is perceived as the 'dustbin' of the educational process; the final stop for those who cannot be or are not motivated to pursue valued educational goals" (2010: 271). Stevens and Vermeersch claim that in Flemish schools the streams' social composition overlaps with social class belonging. Teachers were found adapting not only the contents of what they taught and the pedagogies used, but also their social interaction styles in the different streams. They perceived vocational students to be "less interested in school, less able, and lacking basic knowledge in the teacher's subject" (2010: 274) and "less teachable" (278).

151

As the following examples show, one way teachers maintain their power position is comparing to and distancing themselves from students in terms of education, culture and sophistication, in an attempt to draw and keep up firm class boundaries and reassure their higher position in the school hierarchy.

Several times while I was in the staffroom, and also in interviews, teachers complained in scornful tones about students' lack of knowledge and interest in 'high culture', especially regarding literature and history. As I reflected in one fieldnote,

> We go up to the staffroom in the break. (…) Some teachers are having a conversation about how they can't get anywhere with their students, and what idiots, how uncultured they are. This seems to be a constant topic, and it never leads anywhere, because the final conclusion is always that the youth of today are such ignoramuses. (*staff room, fieldnotes*)

What was completely lacking in these conversations was a reflection on their classed position from which they considered 'high culture' figures important for one's education, and a lack of reflection on their inadequate pedagogical approaches and tools with which they are supposed to teach about 'high culture' to working-class children, whose cultural icons are mostly those of popular culture and who do not find it relevant for their lives to know the most important figures in the history of Hungarian literature, for example.

Frici, a technical student in year 11, talks about class distancing and looking down on students thus:

> A lot of [teachers] (…) compare everyone to themselves (…). [They say,] look at me, I (…) have this to my name, but you will not have anything to yours in life. And we get this from a lot of teachers. (…) And they press it on the [students] that I achieved this, and I have this to my name, and that you will have nothing, and you will be nothing in life. You don't know anything and you will not be able to find a job. You will not even become a toilet cleaner, or you will be begging on the streets. They say stuff like that to the kids. (*Frici 17, interview*)

Frici's narrative shows how teachers use the tool of comparing themselves and their educational-professional achievements to what they assume to be the educational-professional potential of their students. The working-class student respondents in Reay's study describe in similar terms how their teachers viewed them as inadequate learners, "looked down on for their 'stupidity' and (…) positioned as less than human" (2006: 297-298). The teachers' communication in Reay's study, as one student describes it (for example, using a 'posh' English accent and correcting students' accents) suggests an implicit comparison of teachers and students, with teachers positioning themselves higher. In Frici's example, however, the comparison – apparently made with a 'pedagogical' aim – is explicit, offensive and highly degrading towards the students. In a comparison which teachers do from the position of older, higher educated and higher classed people with a relatively stable, albeit underpaid job and a lot of power over their students, they will obviously come out as higher positioned. Thus, complaining about the 'low culture' of students and comparing them to themselves in an unfavourable light for the students are easy ways to maintain classed boundaries and high positioning in the school hierarchy.

2.3.3. The discourse of hygiene

Besides the 'distancing' and 'looking down on students' discourse, another significant hierarchy-constructing discourse is that of 'hygiene'. Hygiene is understood by teachers and students to be bodily cleanliness and using the environment in a cleanly way, keeping oneself and one's surroundings clean, non-contaminated and non-contagious. In fact, the concept of hygiene stands out as a major organizing and evaluating principle in Marzipan. In a school where food is produced, hygiene is certainly a central safety issue, and it is also important in discursively constructing students' and teachers' positioning in the school hierarchy.

153

In *Class, Self, Culture*, Skeggs shows "how particular discourses and technologies make classed selves, not just through productive constitution (…) but also through *processes of exclusion*, by establishing constitutive limits and by fixing attributes to particular bodies" (2004: 6; emphasis in original). In the following examples we can see how hygiene or the lack of it is fixed as an attribute by teachers to the bodies of particular students. By claiming that their hygienic standards are below the norm, teachers are in fact constituting these students as lower-class. Referring to McClintock's (1995) work on the issue of hygiene in the colonial context, Skeggs argues that "[d]irt and waste, sexuality and contagion, danger and disorder, degeneracy and pathology, became the moral evaluations by which the working-class were coded and became known and are still reproduced today" (2004: 4). Hygiene brings together the idea of physical cleanliness and morality, historically perceived as attributes of the middle class as opposed to the working class and of white people as opposed to 'coloured' people (Skeggs 2004; McClintock 1995). Skeggs claims that moral criteria have been as important in the definition of class as economic ones (2004: 29).

Students and teachers often talk about work hygiene and bodily and sexual hygiene. The school has a shop where products made during baking practice are sold for the school population at reduced prices. In the following example of the work hygiene discourse Lujza, the literature teacher reveals her attitude to the bakery products students make during their practice lessons:

> I tell you honestly that I don't buy bread and stuff here, because I know these children, so I say, I won't eat a bite of bread here. I only buy rolls or something if one of them says that they were made by the (…) vocational instructors. (…) Well, I see what they are doing! I see it! They are doing it in front of my nose! How disgusting it is. If I think that they touched the food I [eat], then I should never in my life eat bread or rolls! Never! If I think about it. (…) If you look at a hand, how their hands look, for example, how dirty, how disgusting, how they are spitting around and blowing their nose, how… well, not to mention other hygiene. How they stink, what odours, what excrement odours they have, and these are the ones who make bread! *(Lujza, form tutor, interview)*

Lujza expresses utter contempt and disgust at the work of students, she finds them filthy, unhygienic. Expressing disgust is a distancing act, the sensation of disgust is "the experience of a nearness that is not wanted", "a state of alarm and emergency, an acute crisis of self-preservation in the face of an unassimilable otherness" (Menninghaus 2003: 1, quoted in Vatan 2013: 28). Although disgust is a strong personal physical feeling, it is not just an individual strategy of boundary management, it is used to create class distinction, not only to describe the working class as 'disgusting', but at the same time to produce "*middle-classed* identities that rely on *not* being the repellent and disgusting 'other'" (Lawler 2005: 431, emphasis in original). Lujza describes the students as vulgar (spitting around, blowing their nose, having odours), and vulgarity is "frequently associated with disgust" (Skeggs 2004: 102). As Kristeva (1982) suggests, disgust is an attempt at distancing oneself "from what is felt to be improper or unclean in order to establish and strengthen his or her own subjectivity and retain a self that is 'propre' or clean" (Rizq 2013: 1280). Lawler argues that the disgust of the middle classes at working-class existence "is at the very core of their subjectivity: their very selves are produced in opposition to 'the low' and the low cannot do anything but repulse them" (2005: 430). Lujza's proximity to the working-class students, and the threat of contamination and boundary-crossing by eating the bread they make with their dirty hands makes her use this very strong tool of distinction. As Probyn (2000) argues, public acknowledgement is also necessary for maintaining distance: by expressing her disgust to me, Lujza attempts to establish a common ground, gain reassurance that she is not alone in her judgement, generate comfort "in the recognition that what offends me also offends you" (Skeggs 2004: 103; see also: Lawler 2005: 438).[79] Her urge to draw a distinction between herself and the students is so strong that she fails to acknowledge that bread she may buy elsewhere is also prepared by people having been trained in Marzipan and other similar

---

[79] As a doctoral student and researcher, I was treated by Lujza as sharing her class position, therefore she must have hoped to be on common ground with me.

schools. Perhaps the reason for this slippage is that whereas in a bakery or supermarket she does not have to encounter the bakers, in the school she has to spend her working days with the working-class students, so the proximity and risk of contamination is much higher. Since it is the lack of personal and working hygiene that provokes her disgust, which is class constitutive, I argue that the discourse of 'hygiene' is constitutive of classed hierarchy in Marzipan.

Some of the vocational instructors do not have a teaching degree, therefore they are lower in the teacher hierarchy than the teachers with a college/university degree. When Lujza acknowledges the qualitative and hygienic difference between bakery products made by the baking instructors and the students, and expresses more trust in the products whose preparation is supervised by the professionals, she sets up a three-layer hierarchy: students (low educated, unhygienic) / vocational instructors, without a teaching degree (less highly educated but hygienic) / teachers with a teaching degree, teaching academic subjects (most highly educated, hygienic). Vocational teachers are responsible for teaching the trade and ensuring the appropriate hygienic circumstances in the baking workshop. Although they are lower positioned than Lujza, they are still in the same league, and Lujza does not hold them accountable for students' hygienic conditions. This is also an example of teachers' strategy of fending off responsibility, to which I return in Section 3.2.

Teachers' discourses imply that personal hygiene standards may be related to professional and study achievement. In the following excerpt the school director talks about one boy whom I was observing in the 'catch-up' form in the previous school year. Back when he was in year 9, he was constantly teased by his classmates about not washing frequently enough, and they often sprayed him with deodorants. According to the school director, his vocational

156

achievements may have been enhanced by the chance that he could take a shower every day in the dressing room of the baking workshop:

> SD: (…) There's that boy, Béla, who has many-many sisters and brothers. He has turned out quite a decent guy. (…) I'm not saying he'll become the best baker in the world, but he's able to work normally. And he sometimes even shows a sense of responsibility. I think that having many sisters and brothers is not bad in this respect.
>
> DR: I think they are very poor, as well.
>
> SD: I don't know. I know from Anna that they are poor, indeed, but nothing more.
>
> DR: I don't know what kind of place they were living in, because I remember that everyone was teasing him in year 9 about not bathing regularly. And perhaps this had some sort of social background.
>
> SD: Then perhaps the bakery did him good because there are showers in the dressing room. He can take a shower here every day after baking practice. *(School director, interview)*

As he goes on, he points out that not all students take this advantage, and that there is a tendency of using less and less hot water for showering by the students over the past years, which is suggestive of dropping hygienic standards. This observation is in line with the commonplace observation by teachers that students are less and less 'good quality'. Assessing the 'quality' of students is teachers' power privilege. They can set the standard of the normative student. It is not mandatory for students to have a shower before or after the baking practice, so instead of reassuring the idealized hygienic standards, teachers expect students to voluntarily come up to these standards. Most students do not come up to this expectation, and this is true in general: most students in Marzipan fall short of the image of the idealised student by default, because of their social background, their skills and abilities, their 'sophistication', their values and behaviours, their ethnicity, or a specific combination of these, depending on the given teacher's values, attitudes and world views.

International research supports my observation: both social class and race/ethnicity are factors in teachers' assessment of students. Besides the earlier cited findings of Stevens and

Vermeersch (2010), Lupton and Hempel-Jorgensen (2012) find a similar pattern in their comparative study of two middle-class and two working-class[80] primary schools in the UK: whereas in the two middle-class schools pupils, especially boys "felt more able to embody the characteristics which made up the ideal pupil", in the two working-class schools "almost no pupils (if any at all) felt able to meet their teacher's expectations" (2012: 609).

The issue of sexual hygiene, just as that of work hygiene, is also significant in constructing school hierarchy. In fact, through the way teachers talk about students' sexual hygiene, they create well-defined positions for themselves and students in the school hierarchy. I observed that there was proportionately more talk about sexual and physical hygiene in sex education classes in the vocational strand than in the technical strand, and hygiene was the least often mentioned during sex education lessons in the grammar school strand. This way students were positioned in the school hierarchy through the discourse of sexual hygiene and the practice of selective sex education: the lower the students were in the classed hierarchy of the school, the more they were educated about sexual (and more broadly, bodily) hygiene. This was a way to control lower positioned students' sexuality more, to provide prevention from the potential consequences of 'unhygienic' sex.

Anna, the form tutor of the 'catch-up' form, connected students' social background and cultural capital with sexual hygiene and used this connection for constituting classed positions in the school hierarchy:

---

[80] The authors used the Goldthorpe-Hope social class classification scale for determining the class belonging of the pupils. In this scale "parental occupation is the main indicator of a child's social class" (2012: 604).

158

I think that first of all we should teach social behaviour and communication skills, not the part of ethics about what Aristotle did or didn't think, which is not relevant nowadays for these vocational school children. They can't comprehend those texts, which are difficult even for the grammar school students. For them we should teach some sort of social skills, which are missing from the knowledge-base they bring from home. And this could well include [ideas] about sexuality, physical hygiene… that's also a very serious problem. I'm sick of their spraying that junk on themselves, but then I don't know… somebody gets up and leaves for school ten minutes later, how can s/he wash in ten minutes? So I think, these things are all connected. Their whole system of behaviour, hygiene, sexuality, respect for each other. How much do they respect the partner with whom they spend ten minutes, then one goes one way, the other goes the other way? I often say that the cultural level of animals living around us is higher, because the male cat goes courting for several days. (*Anna, form tutor, interview)*

Anna believes that whereas it may be worth teaching Ancient Greek philosophers to grammar school students, because they have more cultural capital to rely on for studying them (although they may also have comprehension problems), vocational students should rather be educated about 'proper' sexual behaviour (i.e. proper sexual conduct, physical and sexual hygiene and respect for their partner), which, in her view, such children do not receive from their (lower-class) family. According to her, 'sexual culture' is part of students' cultural capital, and she argues that fast casual sex is a sign of possessing low cultural capital. Thus – similarly to the school director quoted in Section 2.1 – she creates a classed distinction between grammar school and vocational school students based on their assumed sexual habits. Furthermore, she inserts a curious new actor in this hierarchy: companion animals, specifically male cats, who are said to spend days "courting" the females they have chosen for mating. Thus, animals have higher standards of 'sexual culture' than the vocational school students. Given the common attitude to animals as a group of living creatures below the level of humans, falling lower in the comparison with animals is a very strong marker of classed position and a very firm distinction between teachers and vocational students.

3. Convergence and hierarchical constitutions of gender, sexuality, class and ethnicity in teacher-student interactions

So far I have focused mainly on the classed aspects of social inequality and school hierarchy reproduction. In this section I look at how class converges with ethnicity and/or gender and/or sexuality in the constitution of student and teacher subjectivities by teachers. In Section 3.1 I present attempts to uplift 'underclass' students' class position through educating about 'proper' gendered and sexualised behaviour. In Section 3.2 I demonstrate how race, gender and class converge and mark the positioning of Gypsy girls in the school hierarchy by teachers' discourses about 'cultural values'. In Section 3.3 I discuss two cases of sexual harassment of students by teachers and argue that sexual harassment and students' responses to it can directly influence their class positioning, and also that the harassing teachers' gender and sexuality positions them differently in the teacher hierarchy, therefore the visibility of the sexual harassment and the threat students feel in case they would disclose the harassment is imposed differently in the case of a heterosexual male teacher and a lesbian female teacher.

3.1. Educating 'special students' about 'proper' gender performance

The 'catch-up' form had been launched in Marzipan two years before I started my fieldwork; the form I observed was the third one, and Anna had been the form tutor of all three, she had received special training in the education of 'catch-up' students. She was a middle-aged history, ethics and personality development teacher (the 'personality development' subject was specially designed for the 'catch-up' forms). She seemed to have strong disciplinary authority over the 'special' students, and was quite highly positioned in the teacher hierarchy. As I mentioned earlier in this chapter, she considered it her mission to "save" at least some of these children. "Saving", in fact, seems to have meant uplifting these young people from an underclass existence (no education, no profession, unemployment, poverty). The idea of the

'catch-up' form suggests that there are students in disadvantaged socio-economic situations who are even lower positioned in social hierarchy than the vocational students, and they should be educated in order to catch up to the vocational student level, which is still low but above the level of the underclass catch-up students. Thus, acting as the tutor of such a form can be interpreted as an attempt to disrupt classed hierarchy positions and uplift the position of those on the lowest level.

I observed that part of her "saving", i.e. 'normalising' project was "saving" students from 'improper' expressions of gender and sexuality by educating them about 'properly' gendered looks and behaviour. The following two excerpts from two different 'personality development' lessons I observed[81] illustrate this effort.

> Ignác: Please, allow us to skip the last lesson and go home.
> Anna: You'll surely be staying here till the end [of the last lesson]. Those who are nagging don't deserve to be treated like real men. (*Ignác 17, Anna, form tutor, personality development lesson, fieldnotes*)

In my fieldnotes I wonder what being a 'real man' may mean for Anna, and how allowing Ignác skip the last lesson equals not treating him like a 'real man'. Wanting to skip the last lesson is not 'proper' school behaviour, not something a 'good student'/'acceptable learner' (Youdell 2006: 96-101) would do. With a quick association, Anna connects being a 'bad' student with not being a 'real man', pointing out that 'real men' – and 'good students' – do not nag about wanting to go home, and foreboding the 'punishment' of Ignác having to stay till the end of the last lesson (even if she allows others to go home) for not being a 'real man'/'good student'. Perhaps she associates being a 'good student' and a 'real man' because she is aware that being a 'good student' is not something valuable for these boys, but being a 'real man' is. Acknowledging and strengthening their heteromasculinity is a major project for

---

[81] She did not allow me to record these lessons, so I am relying on fieldnotes here.

them, while being a proper student is a nag, it is compulsion, and it certainly does not elevate one's status in the hierarchy among peers (Pascoe 2007; Youdell 2006). Ignác, a handsome, attractive boy, who was having two girlfriends simultaneously at the time, had a high masculinity status among his peers, so questioning that status by an authority figure is more likely to him stop nagging about wanting to go home than reminding him that he should behave like a good student.

Replacing 'good student' subjectivity with 'real man' subjectivity (i.e. adult, confident masculinity) and challenging such masculinity in order to discipline Ignác and make him behave like a good student stands in contrast to Youdell's observation and analysis of a scene where a male student, Steve "cites and constitutes himself simultaneously as bad student *and* confident, anti-authoritarian, adult masculine man" by resisting disciplinary authority with his behaviour and body language (2006: 104-105; emphasis in original). Youdell claims that adult masculinity and being a good student was incommensurable in the school situations she observed (2006: 105). However, in the case of Ignác, whose masculinity can be described in the same terms as that of Steve, Anna, the disciplining authority, constructs adult masculinity and being a good student as commensurable.

Robi is a small, thin boy of 15 with short blond hair and has the delicate, 'girlish' features of lately maturing adolescent boys; he is the youngest in the class and one of those who seems to have better chances of "being saved". The following encounter between him and Anna happened during a double personality development lesson:

162

Robi is wearing a blue bandanna with white marijuana leaves on his head.

Anna to Robi: "That girlish hairband doesn't suit you."

Robi: "I would like to feel like a woman today." (He says it in an ironic tone, he is joking.)

(…)

Anna: (she doesn't know what to say, she is literally gasping for breath) "It's everyone's private matter what they feel like."

(…)

Later Robi puts all his caps and hoods on his head. Anna sends him out of the classroom.

In the break Anna says to me: "Now tell me, what can you say to this that he wants to feel like a woman? I have been teaching for 30 years but I have never heard anything like this!"

She is very upset by this gender transgression. I don't say anything, just murmur inaudibly, pretending to empathize with her concern.

In the first minutes of the next lesson, Anna summons Robi to her desk: "Headscarves are worn by *girls* on their head. In the rest of the lesson try to behave decently." (*Robi, 15, Anna, form tutor, personality development lesson, fieldnotes*)

Again, being a 'good student' (who behaves 'decently') and being a 'real man' is connected. After the encounter that was so shocking for Anna, she disciplines Robi, instructs him to "behave decently", which is in fact an instruction for him to behave like a "real man". Anna did not know how to respond to Robi's gender performance, so she said it is everybody's private matter whether they feel like a woman or a man. This sounded like the typical response to homosexuality in current public discourse in Hungary: "It is everybody's private business whether they are gay or straight. It is okay to be gay as long as they do 'it' within four walls."[82] It is a common stereotype that men who feel like or behave like a woman, i.e. they are 'too feminine' according to heteronormative standards of masculinity, are gay. I assume that Anna was probably not aware of the existence of transgender people, so for her,

---

[82] According to Takács, Dombos, Mészáros and P. Tóth, in a representative survey conducted in 2010, heterosexual respondents most agreed with the statement that homosexuality is everybody's private matter. Interestingly, agreement with this statement among homosexual respondents was similarly high (2012: 80-81). This attitude was prevalent among my respondents, as well. This is an ambiguous statement, as it can also signal a certain level of tolerance towards homosexuality, but in the case of my heterosexual respondents it more commonly indicated what I call "conditional tolerance", which means that they were willing to 'tolerate' gay people as long as they were not visible for them (Rédai 2011: 142).

Robi's statement that he wanted to feel like a woman that day probably suggested that he was gay or he was 'at risk of becoming gay'. Being homosexual for such 'delinquent' young people would clearly be a disaster from Anna's perspective of the education of multiply disadvantaged students, one more 'disadvantage' to take care of, therefore she is (unconsciously) doing her best to prevent such development. For Anna, Robi is at risk of becoming homosexual, because, as I described him, he has 'girlish' features. Wearing a bandanna is read as a warning sign, and his response confirms the existence of this 'risk'.

3.2. Gypsy girls and schooling – gendered and classed ethnic hierarchy reproduction through discourses and practices

The following three excerpts are examples of intersectional hierarchy reproduction, through discourses of Gypsy girls and schooling. In the first example ethnicity intersects with gender, and in the second and third it is class and ethnicity that converge to constitute Gypsy girl subjectivity in a White educational institution. I argue that in White middle-class discourses of teachers, raced and classed discourses converge, raced 'cultural' values and behaviours attributed to Roma students by White teachers are at the same time constitutive of the class positions of both students and teachers.

As we could see, Anna is keen on educating her 'catch-up' students for what she considers 'proper' gendered behaviour. In the following excerpt she relates a conflict she had the previous year with two of her students. In this case 'improperly gendered' behaviour for her means a Roma girl waiting on her boyfriend in an undignified manner, with the boyfriend being the 'master', taking advantage of the servility of the girl, and both claiming that 'this is how it is with Roma people'. This example is a site where, to rephrase Butler, class and ethnicity not only meet but cannot be conceived without one another (1993: 168).

(…) Feri, he was a Roma boy, a very handsome, very amicable child, but quite a rowdy chap. At the second week, they got together with Ági, who was also a very pretty, shapely Roma girl. They were very much together, they moved in together during the year. Feri's mother took responsibility for the girl. (…) I had to accept that they were together. And there were situations which were completely unacceptable for me. The school day was over, and Feri walked out of the classroom with his hands in his pockets, and Ági was carrying his bag after him. "Because this is how it is with the Roma, Miss." When Feri dropped something and both were sitting, Ági had to stand up to pick it up. (…) We argued a lot about it, and the problem was not that I couldn't make Feri give up the habit, but that I couldn't make the girl give it up. She insisted that this is how things were done, and it was me who didn't know it right! (…) I tried to explain to her that she is not his servant, just because they live together, she doesn't have to serve him. However, the original setup remained. *(Anna, form tutor, interview)*

Here the couple seems to be in agreement on what the roles of a Roma girl and boy are in a relationship. In this situation Anna appears as an older White woman, against whose authority resistance takes the shape of playing out the 'ethnicity card': she is assumed not to know 'how it really is' with the Roma. Obviously, Feri enjoys the advantages, and Ági resists the older woman's intervention, despite the fact that Anna is trying to use her authority to help her achieve a more equitable position in the relationship. Anna seems to have firm ideas about gender roles: they are heteronormative, strictly divided but equitable. She finds Ági's servility and Feri's dominance excessive, Feri's behaviour disrespectful, Ági's disrespectable. Lawler argues that excess and being disrespectable are characteristics attributed to the working class by the middle class, respectability is a key feature of middle-class femininity (2005: 435). Also, today the working class is perceived by the middle class as "embracing archaic and overly rigid gender relations" (Lawler 2005: 437) and the middle class "is positioned at the vanguard of 'the modern'" (Skeggs 2004: 92). In the above example Anna is trying to do exactly that: act as the vanguard of the modern, which implies White middle-class values. Being 'modern' here also means that Anna was aiming to 'emancipate' the girl, instead of challenging the boy's hegemonic masculinity sold as 'traditional ethnic' behaviour. As I argue in Chapter 5, supporting girls' empowerment and agency but leaving hegemonic masculine

165

behaviour unchallenged results in the domination of the latter over the former and in girls' complicity to it.

In the next excerpt Anna talks about Gypsy girls and their reproductive patterns:

> (…) [Gypsy] girls consummate very early. Technically speaking, they somehow make these girls come of age by this, and (…) quite obviously the number one task of these girls is not going to be working in a bakery, but to give birth to children for a long-long time. This is what the family prepares them for (…) and that is what their immediate surroundings expect from them. Well, until [the parents] get the family allowance after them they go to school, but from then on school is not [a priority]. (…) [T]his is (…) a form of livelihood, to give birth to as many children as they can, because the more chidlren they have the bigger the support, and on the other hand, well, (…) on this cultural level it is a biological expectation and a biological system. (…) If we look around among highly qualified young people with university degrees, then a European or North American person who has spent a lot of years in school, has read a lot and has a great insight into things will not give birth at the age of fifteen, because she expects it from herself that she would only give birth if the child can have its own room, if she can take the child to the doctor in her own car and if she can pay five hundred thousand Forints[83] for a pram. (…) And how old is she then? At the age of 27, 28, 30-35 it is not such a big deal to have a child. [Gypsies] don't have such (…) social expectations. With a whi... sorry, so a non-Roma person, if a family has a third child, people wonder, "Where will they get the money to raise them?" "They are pretty well-off to take on a third one!" [Gypsies] don't make an issue out of it. (*Anna, form tutor, interview*)

Girls are positioned here as the bearers of their 'culture' (Yuval-Davies 1997) and as being on a lower 'cultural' level than White middle-class women. This is manifested in their assumed attitude to work, reproductive patterns and education levels. Anna practically questions the worth of educating Gypsy girls for a profession by saying that on their 'cultural level' the aim is not to work but to have children. Echoing common public discourses, she positions White people as highly educated and middle-class and having few children, and Gypsy people as low educated, low class, having too many children, arguing that on Gypsies' "cultural level" it is a "biological expectation and system" that they have many children. Excess (in this case excessive reproduction) is also a characteristic projected on the working class (Skeggs 2004). Anna contrasts a vision of a monolithic Gypsy existence with that of a monolithic White

---

[83] Cc. 1700 Euro.

middle-class "European or North American" existence. In this comparison Gypsiness becomes a classed category as well, not only an ethnic one, contrasted with a classed category of whiteness. At the end of the excerpt she starts to say 'white' but stops and corrects herself to say 'non-Roma'. This suggests that she is using the word 'white' in a colonial sense, and she is aware that it is considered racist to use it that way, it is not accepted today. She is not aware of critical theory and discourses about whiteness, but she tries to make sure she uses 'politically correct' language in the interview.

Anna uses the discourse of 'cultural difference' a lot when talking about Roma students. While she takes great care not to appear racist in the interview, it is implied all along that for her 'cultural difference' is in fact a difference in hierarchical 'cultural levels' between Hungarian and Roma families, with the latter being on a lower level. Skeggs argues that in recent discourse 'race' has been exchanged by 'culture', which is a shift from biological essentialism to cultural essentialism. "Whereas nature was used to legitimate racism, now cultural *(sic!)* performs this role" (2004: 138). The discourse of 'culture' comes in handy for Anna and other teachers, who are only aware that racist discourses on Roma are a taboo, but they are not aware that they use the concept of culture in a way that rearticulates race/ethnicity-based distinctions, therefore their 'cultural' discourse is disguised racism.

The reference to 'lower and higher cultural levels' also appears as a tool of class hierarchy construction in Marzipan, as we could also see in the school director's discourse about the culture of vocational students in Section 2.1. In the above-cited narrative of Anna, as I have argued, class and race/ethnicity converge and are mutually constitutive. Skeggs points out that there is an important difference in the discursive construction of class and race/ethnicity and also gender. As opposed to race and gender, nature was never used to construct class categories. Working-class females did get essentialised, but by gender, not class, "the division

167

of labour was much more crucial to establishing and legitimating class inequality than biology" (2004: 138). Nevertheless, eventually classed and raced discourses which reproduce social inequalities and also hierarchical distinctions in positioning in the school, converge in the discourse of 'culture' and 'cultural level' or 'cultural difference'. In her explanation about the different cultural levels of Roma and White people, Anna actually couples the cultural and the biological discourses by saying that "on this cultural level it is a biological expectation and a biological system". In my reading, she suggests that on different cultural levels there are different biological systems, that is, culture determines biological functioning, i.e. reproductive patterns. The logic of her argument is intriguing: does culture determine Roma reproduction, and education and financial status determine White reproduction? If so, do Roma have a 'culture' and Whites an 'education'?

If 'culture' and 'education' as Anna means them are so distinguished from each other, this may explain (at least in her thinking) why it is 'not worth' educating Roma girls. The educational institution stands for profession, work, income, high culture and whiteness, and Anna suggests that most Gypsy girls will stay below the 'cultural level' of secondary professional education and all that it can bring in one's life, because of dropping out, not learning a profession, giving birth early and many times, and living on childcare benefits. As I have discussed earlier, educational level and achievement strongly correlate with socio-economic and family background. However, the correlation is two-dimensional: students from disadvantaged and lower educated backgrounds are likely to attend streams that grant lower qualifications and spend less time in education. Therefore they remain low educated and the pattern is reproduced. Schools have a great stake in the reproduction of educational and, consecutively, socio-economic inequalities. Despite this commonplace fact from the sociology of education (see e.g. Ball 1993; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1992), Anna talks about education as if it had no responsibility in the perpetuation of low qualification, low socio-

economic status, narrow life prospects. As if the family was solely responsible, as if family background overwrote everything education does. This is a common discourse among teachers: by claiming that their job is 'teaching only', they fend off responsibility for the reproduction of social inequalities.

In the following excerpt Lujza contributes to the reproduction of ethnicity-based distinctions in education, intersecting with class and also with gender and sexuality. I ask her whether she has Gypsy students in her current form, and she explains that she has had two, one of them moved to England with her family, the other one is still there in the form:[84]

> Lujza: I had a [Gypsy] girl, but they went to England. (…) Her mother, wow, what's the name of... no... Gypsies also have this memorial house, that also has a name, and she was a someone there, so she was someone with a higher education, and the father was in antiquity and had this shop. (…) This other girl, this one's mother is at home, they present a completely typical picture, they are this very closed [family]. (…) So, that is one of the girls who I would say is completely innocent, because they are really so well situated, rich, they bring her here and take her home by car, so she is not really accessible. (…) They only allowed her to go anywhere after the father specifically made me promise that I would almost hold her hand, so that I would not let her go anywhere, and if we went on form trips she would sleep in my room (…). [S]he is a very sweet, a bit dumb girl, but very sweet, nice little thing (…), but they are very well situated, and the mother has her own chauffeur and what not, so they are rich. But well, I think this is multiple transposal, I mean they haven't come out of the ghetto just now, but they, I think, have come out of there a long time ago, so you can see it on both sides, on the mother and the father as well. (*Lujza, form tutor, interview*)

It is important for Lujza that she is a grammar school form tutor, so in her form even the Gypsy students are on a higher "cultural level", as her colleague, Anna, would say. The first girl she mentions has an intellectual mother, but Lujza does not know the name of the institution where she worked or her position there – curiously, as a White literature teacher with a doctoral degree she does not feel the need to know about Gypsy cultural institutions.

---

[84] I interviewed 13 out of the 17 girls in that form, and it seems that the second Gypsy girl Lujza mentions in the excerpt was not one of them, unfortunately.

The story of the second girl has a 'traditional' patriarchal setting (see: Pateman 1988): the Gypsy father exercises his paternal right over her daughter's sexuality and entrusts her to the White form tutor to take care of her virginity while at school or out at school programs – two powerful persons take turns to preserve her 'treasure'. By cooperating to preserve the girl's virginity, the two adults constitute the girl's ethnicity through sexuality.[85] With the father entrusting the teacher to be the girl's 'caretaker', Lujza, the White teacher becomes positioned as the gatekeeper of ethnicized social hierarchy in the school and also an honorary member of a family that is so rich (obviously incomparably richer than Lujza) that it makes their Gypsiness acceptable. In fact, they are not really 'that Gypsy' anymore, because they have gone through "multiple transposal", as she puts it. By characterizing the girl as "a bit dumb but a very sweet and kind little girl" and one with preserved virginity, Lujza projects the image of a good future Gypsy wife – probably what the father also thinks a good wife is. As the mother, she will be a homemaker, as well. Their high socio-economic status, in Lujza's eyes, creates a hierarchical distinction between the girl coming from this particular Gypsy family and other Gypsy girls. This girl is positioned above Gypsy girls who, as Lujza argues in an earlier part of the interview, are oversexualised, vulgar, behave in a lewd way, and come from family backgrounds where it is accepted that girls get married at age 14-15-16 and have children. As I pointed out earlier, vulgarity and excessive sexuality is a marker of both the working class and ethnic minority groups, it is a feature of their perceived 'culture' in which class and ethnicity converge.

3.3. Classed hierarchy construction through sexual abuse

In this last section I present two examples where the positioning of students in the school hierarchy by teachers is directly done through sexuality. Based on these examples I argue that

---

[85] See Chapter 6 about protecting a girl's virginity until the appropriate partner appears as a site where ethnicity is constituted through a sexuality discourse.

sexual abuse is a means by which teacher power is deployed to construct teacher-student hierarchy. Sexual abuse and students' response to it may also influence their future (intra-)class positioning. I also argue that the sexuality of the abuser (heterosexual male vs. lesbian female) may also influence the teacher's positioning in the teacher hierarchy of the school. In both stories students were invested in securing the best possible intra-class positioning for themselves and in resisting the abuse they were conscious of the precariousness of their social positioning.

The 2011 Report of the American Association of University Women (AAUW) on sexual harassment in schools defines sexual harassment as including "sexual behavior that interferes with a student's educational opportunities" (Hill 2011: 6). This definition highlights a very important aspect of unwanted sexual behaviour, namely the impact it may have on the harassed person's education. The representative survey report claims that about half of students in secondary schools have experienced some form of sexual harassment (2011: 11), but it does not include teacher to student sexual harassment, which may have specific consequences regarding the harassed student's educational opportunities, as the following two cases show. An earlier AAUW survey report (Harris Interactive 2001), however, claims that although the vast majority of sexual harassment (85%) in schools is done by students to other students, 38% of students have experienced some form of sexual harassment from teachers and other school employees. It has to be added that 36% of teachers reported having been sexually harassed by students. Whereas studies about male students sexually harassing female teachers are available (e.g. Keddie 2009; Lahelma et al. 2000, Robinson 2000), academic literature on teachers sexually harassing students is scarce. This suggests that this is a particularly difficult issue to research, especially in primary and secondary schools, with their specific power relations. However, the following stories came up during my fieldwork without asking, and I find it important to include them here, not only because I do not wish to

participate in keeping silent about the issue, but also because of what they highlight about school power relations and the reproduction of social inequalities.

One Gypsy girl, Imola, asked me in the interview what to do about a male teacher who had been sexually harassing her. She expressed her fear that if she complained she would be streamed into the sweets factory worker vocational strand. She wanted to get a qualification as a baker or cakemaker, acquire a 'maturation exam' and go to college. Harassment sometimes happened in the presence of Imola's friend, Detti (also a Gypsy girl), but both girls felt that this fact did not help her prove her case:

> Right, he always did it where there was no camera. And then what if Detti stands up and says, yes, I saw it? He will say she's my friend, and that's it. I have nothing. But if they put me next year into [the sweets factory worker stream], that will be a bit sticky. (…)When we were at his lessons, he was always fondling me, hugging me, I don't know, it felt so unpleasant, I felt bad, like… he always said, aren't you staying in after the baking practice? (…) I was getting afraid of him, afraid of entering the room alone. If he was in there alone, with nobody else, I was always calling on the others to come. (…) Well, his practice lessons were not so good, either. Because [Detti and I] really tried our best, we only went out to smoke if he allowed us, the others were laughing, they were eating more than working. (…) We [worked hard], we got 3 and 4, the others got 5.[86] *(Imola, 17, interview)*

This narrative shows clearly how this teacher used his power position to construct the vocational hierarchy in the school through abusive sexuality, and by extension, how he could influence the future class position of his student. Sexual harassment is a violation of personal rights and dignity in itself, but what makes it even worse is that this instance of power abuse is likely to determine the professional future of Imola either way: if she puts up with the abuse and lets it continue, she may get into the baker-cakemaker technical stream and later perhaps into higher education; if she reports it, she may get into the vocational sweets factory stream. Or, as it turns out from the teacher's grading practice they describe, even passive resistance may put her into the danger of ending up in the sweets factory worker stream. Thus, her intra-

---

[86] Grades are from 1 to 5, 1 is fail, 5 is the best.

class position and potential class mobility will be influenced by how she responds to the sexual harassment by her teacher.

Imola, besides passive resistance and trying to avoid the teacher, made attempts to actively stand up against this power abuse. She asked one teacher what to do, and the response she got was "oh leave it, he won't do that anymore, you want to go to the police, it takes a lot of time, lot of fuss (…)" *(Imola, interview).* She and Detti were also wondering whether to complain to the school director but Detti argued that it would be pointless because the latest incident happened a month before, and she assumed that the director would turn them away by telling them they should have reported it next day, not a month later. Then Imola asked me what to do, which may have been partly due to my being an outsider to the school hierarchy, so perhaps she saw me as someone who could help without negative consequences to her position in the school. In fact, I believe she was testing how far she could go resisting: whether external help could be a way to handle the abuse. It was very important to know how far she could go: she seemed to understand that to some extent she had to comply and accept the abuse for risking becoming lower positioned in the vocational hierarchy. What she was trying – with her friend's support – was to resist as much as she could and stop the abuse without risking her positioning. She knew, although she did not say this, that as a Roma girl who was right before teachers' decision-making on streaming at the end of year 10, she was acting from the lowest possible power position, and her ethnicity would have likely contributed to her lower positioning in the school hierarchy and consequential severing of her chances of class mobility through higher education. The fact that her friend was also a Roma girl probably did not help her, either. In case of complaints it was likely they would have had to face charges that they were lying, which is one of the negative stereotypical behaviours routinely attributed to Roma people (see e.g. Bakó 2006; Ligeti 2006) and to women in general who are reporting sexual abuse (Lawton 2007). The fact that she failed to resist the

sexual abuse completely also shows how impossible it is for those in lower positions to transgress the boundaries of the school hierarchy.

The other sexual harassment story I heard from students involved a lesbian teacher and two lesbian students. Their sexual orientation is relevant because the teacher's lesbianness put her in a more vulnerable position in a heteronormative institution than her above-mentioned heterosexual male colleague. This fact gave more power to resist the power abuse for the two students, even though they received threats from the teacher to undermine their educational achievements.

The story is about Anita, the lesbian food technology teacher, and two out lesbian students, Szandra (17) and Móni (21). Anita was not 'officially' out in the school, but, unlike other non-heterosexual members in the teaching staff, she was not completely closeted, either. The two students have different positions in the school hierarchy compared to each other and in relation to the teacher. Móni is an adult, completing post-secondary technician training, so in education she is close to Anita who has a college degree in food engineering but she does not have a teacher's degree, so she belongs to the group of teachers positioned lower in the teacher-teacher hierarchy. Szandra is not an adult yet, she is a technical school student, who will have Anita as a teacher in the following school year.

To summarise the story related at length by Szandra and Móni, in the previous summer Anita was simultaneously flirting with Szandra in email and trying to have a love affair with Móni in a school camp. Móni kept rejecting Anita's advances, who eventually got offended, and as the new school year came, she started to ignore Móni, while being increasingly attentive to Szandra. After Anita decided to stop pursuing Szandra, Szandra started to spread the gossip, which she claimed she had heard from Anita, that one of the male deputy school directors was

gay. When eventually Móni and Szandra confronted Anita, she threatened both girls with retaliation if they did not stop spreading gossip about the deputy director and herself.

At the end of the school year Móni still had her technician exam to pass. When Anita threatened Móni in the spring in order to stop her spreading gossip, she told her she "shouldn't mess around too much before [her] exam" *(Móni, interview)*. Her threat was not only an instance of power abuse but also a threat to cut Móni's class mobility, as failing her exam would have meant graduating with secondary, not post-secondary qualification, which is a significant difference in further professional career possibilities. Similarly, she told Szandra that "she casts a long shadow", and "she has such connections in the school that she can get anyone fired any time". This was also a threat to cut class mobility, as firing someone from a technical school in her third year of study would clearly undermine her chances to complete secondary education and acquire a vocation.

Although both stories say practically the same about sexual power abuse by teachers, I have chosen to present both, because there is a difference between them in terms of power positions. The difference is that the heterosexual male teacher has the backup of institutional heteronormativity, which strengthens his superior position. He has a wife, a normative sexuality. Older men's sexual attraction to much younger women is socially accepted. Thus, even if his abuse was revealed, he would not have to be worried about outing his sexual orientation. He may feel entitled to and can afford to abuse a female student sexually, because he knows that it is unlikely he would have to suffer the consequences. He is supported by another colleague, who dissuades the harassed girl from filing official complaints. According to the girls' assumption, he would probably also be supported by the male school director who would question the credibility of their story. He and the lesbian teacher have the same tools: the threat of undermining the students' positioning in the educational hierarchy by

175

grading/streaming in case of resistance to the abuse. However, the male teacher does not need to threaten the student openly, from his power position he can safely assume that she understands very well the consequences of resisting him too much. The lesbian teacher, however, does not have such institutional backup. If her abuse was revealed, her non-normative sexual orientation would be revealed, as well. As non-normative sexuality is widely seen as a problem in itself, and often as a threat of 'contamination' of students by the homosexual teacher, she may assume that her behaviour would be judged more strictly than that of a heterosexual teacher abusing students sexually. Thus, her sexuality makes her more vulnerable to the loss of her power position. Even outing someone else with a non-normative sexual orientation would risk her power position: she knew that the male deputy school director was gay, and she told Szandra, but this had to remain a secret, she could get into trouble if she turned out to be the source of the gossip about a male who is positioned higher in the school hierarchy. Therefore the threatening with failing final exams and firing from the school had to be made openly, so that the resistant lesbian students understand clearly how their rebellion could affect their intra-class positioning and chances of class mobility.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented the rigid and hierarchical secondary education system in Hungary and discussed how power relations and the hierarchical structure of Marzipan is implicated in producing raced, classed and gendered subjectivities, both of students and teachers, both discursively and via institutional practices, and how the production of these subjectivities perpetuates social inequalities on various levels of the institutional structure. I pointed out that students' sexuality was used by teachers to constitute an educational hierarchy among young people. I argued that it was very important for teachers to maintain clear (intra-)class boundaries between themselves and students, and also between themselves

and colleagues, as this affected their positioning in the school hierarchy. The maintenance of boundaries and social positioning was done performatively via various discourses and practices, including hygiene, distancing, looking down on students, and vocational streaming. In the last section I demonstrated how class, gender, ethnicity and sexuality can converge and create well-defined power positions in the school, and how sexuality, in the form of sexual abuse by teachers, can directly affect the (intra-)class positioning of students.

Although there is a large body of (mostly quantitative) research on social inequalities between students and a large body of (mostly qualitative) literature on the constitution of young people's subjectivities in educational institutions, the two fields are weakly connected. I have demonstrated in this chapter how a broad range of discourses and practices, some directly connected to the institutional regulation and division of students (such as streaming), and some seemingly not so related to the subject-matter of education (such as hygiene, sexual behaviour or sexual harassment) can be directly implicated in producing raced, classed, gendered subjectivities and at the same time in perpetuating social hierarchies in school and social inequalities within and outside the school.

Chapter 5: Constituting Gender Dichotomies through Discourses of Sexual Pleasure

Introduction

Pleasure is central in late modern and postmodern discourses of sexuality. In this chapter I examine how and what kind of pleasure discourses are used in Marzipan. Sexuality has a principal role in creating gendered distinctions and through the discourse of sexual pleasure we can understand how gendered difference between women and men gets discursively constituted through sexuality. The discourses I analyse are embedded in a neoliberal-postfeminist framework which positions girls as sexually empowered and agentic, constantly having to work on themselves to achieve more sexual pleasure and power. At the same time, male sexual licence and dominance, sexual expressions of hegemonic masculinity are left unquestioned. The prevalence of such hegemonic discourses restricts girls' sexual agency and empowerment and reinforces gendered dichotomies based on sexuality.

In the first part of the chapter I define what pleasure means for my respondents. In the second part I discuss three dominant pleasure discourses which I have found to be significant in creating dichotomies between male and female genders: the 'natural' vs. 'learnt' character of experiencing sexual pleasure; discourses of sexual objectification and self-objectification in talking about sexual activity and ways of pleasuring; and the access to pleasure – the sexual double standard and the girlfriend/slut and virgin/whore dichotomy. 'Pleasure and risk' is also a dominant discourse in talking about adolescent sexuality, but I do not discuss it here, because boys' and girls' attitudes to safe sex and protection from pregnancy and STIs are so varied and overlapping in many cases that they do not discursively constitute a gendered

distinction. Similarly, analysing heterosexual attitudes to homosexual sex looked promising at first sight but eventually I did not find this a gender distinctive element, either.

1. What is sexual pleasure?

In this section I inquire into what 'sexual pleasure' means for my respondents and how it is talked about in sex education. In the literature there is a consensus that it is important to talk about pleasure and desire in sex education. However, some scholars have recently raised some important questions about the ways the notion of sexual pleasure is included in sex education. I argue that in Marzipan pleasure is conceived in a very narrow heteronormative framework, and that talking about it in such a frame contributes not to the increase of sexual agency and autonomy for young people (especially girls) but the reinforcement and reproduction of gendered inequalities, male domination and girls' re/objectification. This is done in a neoliberal-postfeminist framework, in which girls are presented as sexually empowered and agentic, but this discourse should be considered critically because it does not question heterosexist male dominance in sex and reproduces gender dichotomy.

Giddens claims that "there is a general preoccupation with sexuality in modern culture" (1992: 176). He argues that a basic element of the transformation of love, relationships and intimacy in modernity has been the "claiming of female sexual pleasure" (1992: 178). In this process sexuality has become autonomous, detached from reproduction, the property of the individual. According to Attwood, "a whole series of signifiers are linked to connote a new, liberated, contemporary sexuality for women; sex is stylish, a source of physical pleasure, a means of creating identity, a form of body work, self-expression, a quest for individual fulfilment" (2006: 80). The process of democratisation, commodification and pornographication can be contextualised within the shift of "the boundaries of public and private discourse in late modern western culture" (Attwood 2006: 82). Although the

'sexualisation of culture' is celebrated by some theorists (e.g. McNair 2002), Attwood points out that presenting women as active sexual subjects offers them only a "limited and commodified version of active female sexuality", in which women become re-objectified (2006: 83).

Gill (2007) analyses how femininity is constructed in a postfeminist sensibility which is intertwined with contemporary neoliberalism. She argues that the elements of postfeminist sensibility are "the notion that femininity is a bodily property; the shift from objectification to subjectification; an emphasis upon self-surveillance, monitoring and self-discipline; a focus on individualism, choice and empowerment; the dominance of a makeover paradigm; and a resurgence of ideas about natural sexual difference" (2007: 147). In this cultural context, "[g]irls and women are interpellated as the monitors of all sexual and emotional relationships, responsible for producing themselves as desirable heterosexual subjects as well as pleasing men sexually, protecting against pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, defending their own sexual reputations, and taking care of men's self-esteem" (2007: 151). She argues that in post-feminist media culture this self-surveillance, self-monitoring and self-disciplining, presented as acts of personal choice, has dramatically increased and spread over new areas of personal life (2007: 155).

Michelle Fine (1988) points out in her study that although officially silenced, the discourse of desire "does occur in less structured school situations" (1988: 36). In the follow-up study written with Sara I. McClelland (2006) almost 20 years later, with a focus on the impact of state laws, public policy and educational practice on differentially situated young bodies, they conclude that the discourse of desire is still missing in sex education and that these political and institutional interventions place the bodies and the sexual agency of adolescents, particularly girls (especially from lower-income background), youth of colour, teens with

disabilities and non-heterosexual youth at risk. In a more recent study Lamb, Lustig and Graling (2013) found that the discourse of pleasure was present in sex education in the US but it was mostly discussed in medicalised ways and was linked with messages of risk and danger. Allen (2007) and Fine and McClelland (2006) found that the discourse of sexual desire and pleasure is not only silenced by teachers and official school discourse, but also by female students, who actively participate in the construction of their and their peers' heterosexual femininities by policing the boundaries of acceptable sexual activities, setting up morally based hierarchies among themselves along the lines of the "virgin/whore dichotomy" (Youdell 2005). In my analysis I show that in Marzipan 'pleasure' is present and important in sexuality discourses and that the 'virgin/whore' dichotomy and its version, the 'girlfriend/slut' dichotomy is primarily constructed and also policed by boys, not only girls, who are rather critical but to some extent compliant with this categorisation.

While there has been a feminist consensus that pleasure should be talked about in sex education, recently some authors (Allen 2012, Rasmussen 2012, Lamb 2010) started to question the unreflected equation of desire and pleasure with sexual agency and autonomy and the uncritical promotion of the 'pleasure' discourse in sex education. Allen argues that it is "too simplistic to equate sexual pleasure with an exercise of agency or as proof of empowerment" (2012: 457). Rasmussen (2012) similarly questions whether the 'pleasure and desire' discourse necessarily grants sexual agency and autonomy to young people and argues that the ideals of autonomy, sexual pleasure and sexual freedom have been uncritically prioritised in feminist thinking about the inclusion of discourses of pleasure in sex education and talking about young people's sexuality. Lamb (2010) critically interrogates feminist ideas about sex education in her paper, and points out that feminists "[a]dvocating a sexuality based on desire, subjectivity, and pleasure appears to be a response to three historically problematic areas for women and girls: objectification; abuse and victimization; and stereotypes of female

passivity" (2010: 294). While the problems this approach responds to are real and important, she argues that there are five problems with this pleasure approach. First, in the cultural era of "supergirl" and "girlpower", the search for better and better sex gives yet another task to girls to work on themselves. Second, in encouraging girls to be more active than passive, more subject than object, these dichotomies become reified, not challenged. Third, equalling good sex with pleasurable sex is problematic, because on the one hand all sorts of unethical but pleasurable sex will be considered good sex, on the other hand girls' satisfaction with their bodies will be dependent on whether they experience sexual pleasure. Fourth, idealized teen sexuality is depicted in popular media as White, middle-class and heterosexual. Fifth, third wave ideas about young women's sexuality (empowered, autonomous, sexy) conflate sexual empowerment with making choices to act in stereotypically feminine ways closely associated with the pornographic. My observations on the field have prompted me to problematize pleasure discourses, as well. In this chapter I demonstrate how pleasure discourses can also draw on the idea of sexuality as biologically determined and hormonally driven, and how they are not a guarantee of granting sexual agency and autonomy equally to young women and men.

Allen (2012) introduces the term "pleasure imperative", in the context of which pleasure is not seen as a "legitimate possibility" but as an "expected component of sexual activity" (2012: 462). The neo-liberal discourse of the pleasure imperative suggests that sex *should be* pleasurable and if it is not, there is something wrong with the individual who is not experiencing pleasure. This way, young people may be compelled to measure themselves and their relationships against how much sexual pleasure they are experiencing (2012: 463). Allen suggests that in the discursive framework of heteronormativity, the pleasure imperative "has the potential to reinscribe rather than unlatch normative versions of masculinities and femininities" (2012: 463). Besides being gate-keepers of heterosexual male desire, young

women are now also supposed to be the gate-keepers of their own desire and pleasure (2012: 463). The pleasure discourse used by the school nurse in Marzipan suggests reciprocity and offers agency and empowerment to young people, especially girls. However, the same pleasure discourse and the ones used by students in Marzipan impose a 'pleasure imperative' and a 'coital imperative' (Allen 2012; Braun, Gavey & McPhillips 2003) and reinforce heteronormativity and dichotomous gender constructions.

Another problem with the pleasure imperative, according to Allen, is that it "ignores the complexities of sexual activity and paradoxically accords young people a restricted exercise of agency. Sexual activity is often actively and purposively engaged in for reasons other than personal pleasure (2012: 464)." This way the pleasure imperative discourse invalidates and morally judges other motivations for sexual activity. As I show in Chapters 4 and 6, 'pleasure' is not necessarily the most important element of sexuality for all kinds of young people, there are various other reasons for girls in Marzipan to engage in sex, and these reasons play a significant part not only in sexual subjectivity constitution but also in classed and ethnic subjectivity constitution.

Based on the literature about adolescent male sexual talk and behaviour and masculinity construction (see: e.g. Pascoe 2007; Nayak & Kehily 1996; Mac an Ghaill 1994), one might argue that the 'pleasure imperative' is a pressure on young men, as well. Allen argues so, pointing out that heteronormative discourses of pleasure constitute hegemonic masculinities, which render young men as "perpetually desiring and always, unproblematically able to achieve sexual pleasure" (2012: 461). This restricts possibilities for young men to experience their sexuality. However, I would like to make a distinction here. In the 'learnt vs. natural' discourse (which I discuss in Section 2.1) pleasure is seen as a given for males, they do not have to learn how to feel it, whereas girls do. In this sense boys do not seem to be subjected to

the discourse of learning and self-improvement the same way girls are. As I will argue later, in boys' talk about sex it is not 'pleasure' that is emphasized (as it is supposed to be a given) but the act of 'doing it'. Therefore the pressure boys receive (especially from their male peers) is also gender-specific. To distinguish between the gendered forms of sexual peer pressure, in the case of boys, I would not call it 'pleasure imperative' but rather 'sex imperative' – the imperative of having as much sex as possible. Having had (or claiming to have had) a lot of sexual experiences is part of the construction of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995). I observed that boys who had not had sexual experiences were also not in dominant positions within the gendered hierarchy in their form, as opposed to boys who did.

So how do respondents talk about pleasure in Marzipan and what does this say about their understanding of gender (what it means to be a woman/man)? In Marzipan pleasure is one of the major discourses of sexuality used by Vera and the students. In the case of the students, pleasure is often referred to implicitly. Vera, however, explicitly argues for the central importance of pleasure during her lessons and in the interview, and she emphasizes reciprocity, i.e. that the main purpose of sexual activity should be giving pleasure to each other mutually. Her discourse of pleasure is reflected in the ways students talk about sex in and out of the sex education classroom. In most cases, discussing anything related to sexuality happens in a completely heteronormative and gender dichotomous way (i.e. there are boys and girls/men and women, and everybody is heterosexual by default, although there are some 'deviations'), regardless of the genders and sexual orientations of the participants in the given discussion.

Vera: (…) The first goal of sexuality is not creating new life any more. Why do we have a sex life then?

Kornél: Because it's an exciting and good thing.

Juli: Firstly, it's to procreate.

Vera: Primarily that was its function, yes. Because that is why it was invented.

Juli: Was. It only was.

Vera: Because in the old days… although I think that three fourths of people only didn't admit that they had sex not only to make children. In the past it was like this, it was considered sinful. Nowadays there's no such thing, in fact, nowadays the most important reason for having sex is not procreating but?

Juli: It's a source of pleasure.

Vera: This is a very important source of pleasure for people. (…) I think the most important part of this is that you have to be emotionally prepared to pleasure the other person. (…) if we look at how many sexual encounters result in having children, and how many sexual encounters there are, we can clearly draw the conclusion that the most important goal of having sex is getting and giving pleasure and giving ourselves pleasure too, and being intimately together with someone. *(Vera, school nurse; Juli, 16, Kornél 18, sex education lesson, year 10)*

Vera reflects on the historical separation of sex for procreation and for pleasure (see: Giddens 1992) and makes the point that the most important aim of sex is not procreation but pleasure. She emphasizes that pleasure-giving should be mutual. This excerpt illustrates her approach to sex education: teenagers should have sex just for pleasure, thinking about sex for procreation is not age-appropriate, there is nothing wrong with having sex just for pleasure, as long as pleasuring the other is mutual and safety from pregnancy and STIs is ensured. Her approach reflects the idea of "life-stage appropriate sexual experimentation", in which self-protection is central (Hamilton & Armstrong 2009: 594).

Vera's discourse is embedded in a neoliberal framework. In this framework individuals, as Wendy Brown puts it, are "calculating creatures whose moral autonomy is measured by their capacity for 'self-care' (…)" who bear "full responsibility for the consequences of his or her action no matter how severe the constraints on this action (…)" (2005: 42). For the neoliberal sexual subject, free choice, personal responsibility and self-determination are core values

185

(Bay-Cheng & Eliseo-Arras 2008). Gill (2007) connects neoliberalism and postfeminism in the context of media culture, which is important because media is a primary reference point for young people about sexual subjectivity constitution (Buckingham & Bragg 2003). Gill points out that the two discursive frameworks resonate on three levels: first, both are structured by a strong notion of individualism in which external social and political pressures, influences, constraints on the individual are not acknowledged (2007: 164). Second, "the autonomous, calculating, self-regulating subject of neoliberalism bears a strong resemblance to the active, freely choosing, self-reinventing subject of postfeminism" (2007: 164). Third, the ideal subject of neoliberalism seems to be young women (2007: 164). Charles, studying young femininities in elite high schools arrives at the same conclusion, arguing that "particular versions of young heterosexual femininity are becoming tied to the ideal vision of neoliberal subjectivity" (2010: 44). My findings on the constitution of gender distinctions through sexuality discourses show that autonomous, self-responsible, self-regulating, freely choosing and self-reinventing female subjects are subjected to heterosexist and heteronormative understandings of sexuality which work strongly to define their gender, and these gender definitions do not challenge male-dominant gender patterns in sexuality.

According to Vera, sex is both a source of pleasure and is about giving pleasure, and, as she argues, the sexual activity should be reciprocal, in order to experience pleasure mutually:

> We have discussed that the source of pleasure, one of the determining parts [of sex] is to give pleasure to the other, and (…) that it's not selfish (…). That's great, because if the other has the same goal, you'll obviously enjoy it too. (*Vera, school nurse; sex education lesson, year 10*)

This is a discourse of mutual giving, with both persons involved being equals. Reciprocity is much emphasized in Vera's discourse, she never refers explicitly to women as passive and

men as active in sex. Nevertheless, we will see in this chapter how gendered distinctions are embedded in her sexual discourse, and even more so in young people's discourses.

So, pleasure is the reason to have sex, but what is pleasure? In my respondents' talk sexual pleasure is equated with orgasm; non-genital sexual pleasures are hardly ever mentioned, and orgasm is meant to be the result of a penetrative act. On asking Vera about whether pleasure should be discussed more in the sex education class, she says:

> I think it should be really talked about. Because I don't know how to honestly survey this, so that you receive honest answers. Obviously, if it's anonymous it's all the same what they respond, but how many students having an active sex life would declare that they enjoy the… and it's not that they enjoy it, because of course there are some who say that they really enjoy being together but they don't have orgasms. So how many actually experience [orgasm]. (*Vera, school nurse; interview*)

Vera's idea that students' sexual experiences should be surveyed by an anonymous questionnaire, because it may not be so easy to get honest responses to this question suggests that pleasure is something that must be experienced, and if it is not, students are likely to lie about it, feeling the pressure of the 'pleasure imperative'. Vera clarifies that what she is actually curious about is how many students have orgasms, implying that 'the real' pleasure in sex is orgasm. The conflation of the two is also common in students' discourses, as the following excerpts exemplify:

> Eszter: (…) It's usually always good with him, because I always have an orgasm. I pity those who don't.
> Szandra: Oh, that sucks. *(Eszter 17, Szandra 17, interview)*
> *
> I always say that the bedrock of a good relationship is good sex, so if one cannot satisfy the other… (…) because it's very determinant. So if he can't give or I can't satisfy him, that's bad, and I think it immensely determines the relationship. *(Nati 18, interview)*

187

Thus, sexual pleasure equals orgasm, good sex equals orgasm, and it is not only that the most important aim of sex is pleasure, i.e. orgasm, but also that in order to have a good relationship it is necessary to have good sex, that is, orgasms; orgasm is the ultimate pleasure (see: Opperman, Braun, Clarke & Rogers 2014). Such conflation of these concepts is not that surprising, given the existing sex education and media discourses about heterosexual penetrative sex and orgasm (Powell 2010: 129; Farvid & Braun 2006). What is curious is how it stands in relation to girls' real life experiences about sex, pleasure, orgasm and relationships. In my interviews there were many examples of relationships where the girl did not have orgasms; the boyfriend was emotionally or sexually violent or inexperienced or careless; the girl experienced pressure to start having sex, either from the boyfriend or from peers (so the aim of sex was not pleasure but to please/keep the boy or keep membership in the peer group); some girls were reported to have sex for money, and so on. These data support Allen's (2012) claim that the complexity of relations between sex, pleasure, orgasm and relationships requires a more thorough look into the pleasure discourse deployed in sex education and discussions about sex, otherwise 'the most important aim of sex is pleasure' discourse may invalidate and morally judge other motivations for sexual activity and non-pleasurable experiences of sex.

More specifically, in straight girls' and boys' discourses, orgasm equals vaginal penetration with a penis, and in some cases oral sex is also referred to as a way to give pleasure (=orgasm). Opperman et al. refer to this as the "coital imperative" and note that the coital imperative is connected with the "orgasm imperative" (2014: 504). The two together means that penis-in-vagina coitus is "the real sex" and it ends in orgasm, and the male orgasm means the end of the sexual act (2014: 504). Certainly, in pleasure discourses in Marzipan, sex is concentrated on the genital area, and as the name (both in English and Hungarian) suggests, 'foreplay' is not considered to be part of the sexual intercourse but something before it, a

preparation for 'the main act'. As Vera defines: "foreplay includes everything before the penis of the man is inserted into the vagina. That is, foreplay can be anything, stroking, kissing, petting each other, stimulating those body parts which get the other sexually aroused" *(sex education lesson, year 9).*

In my respondents' discourses sex is lacking if the woman experiences no orgasm (it is understood that the man always does, by default). In the following discussion Szandra, a lesbian, and her straight friend, Eszter, talk about the lack of orgasm:

> Eszter: (…) A friend of mine told me that she had a serious relationship, the man was 10 years older than her, and she didn't have orgasms. I couldn't believe it.
>
> Szandra: Okay, but there are women who can only have orgasms by oral or, well, you see, so not when he's inside, but I don't know, with hands or orally. So there are women like that.
>
> DR: Well, yeah. And maybe that's why she doesn't have any, because if she's with a man, maybe the man doesn't know this. Or maybe she herself doesn't know because...
>
> Eszter: But no. I often think it's because they don't spend enough time on foreplay. *(Eszter 17, Szandra 17, interview)*

Eszter (who has claimed earlier that her sex life is pleasurable *because* she always has an orgasm) finds it hard to imagine how one can have sex with a long-term partner and still not experience orgasm. She does not buy either Szandra's argument that vaginal penetration is not the only way to reach orgasm, neither my suggestion that some men and women may not have knowledge about non-vaginal orgasm. Instead, she argues that the cause for the lack of orgasm may be too little foreplay. In her discourse, foreplay is the preparation for penetration, so this is an example of equating sex with vaginal penetration and pleasure with orgasm.

In their study about notions of 'reciprocity' in heterosex, Braun et al. (2003) found that in heterosexual couples' discourses simultaneous orgasm was the gold standard and if one partner (the woman mostly) did not have orgasm the sex act was seen as non-reciprocal. In this discourse of reciprocity both partners were expected to give and receive pleasure

(orgasm) but women's orgasm was of a different status: if the man had his orgasm first, the woman had to claim her own, and female orgasm was not so essential as the male one. However, if women could not have an orgasm, it had to be accounted for. The woman was seen as 'abnormal' or letting down her partner if she did not orgasm, thus the discourse of reciprocity in fact implied obligations. The above dialogue of Szandra and Eszter underlines the idea that it has to be explained somehow if the woman cannot have orgasms with her steady partner and that it is not quite 'normal' that the woman she mentioned could not have orgasms.

In Opperman et al.'s study of the complex sociocultural meanings of orgasm, many female respondents claimed that it was the male partner's responsibility to assist the female partner to reach orgasm and make sure that the woman had her orgasm first, because the male orgasm signalled the end of the sexual act (2014: 508). There was no explicit talk among my respondents about responsibility in this respect, but it was implicitly implied several times, as we will see in the following examples, that it was rather women's responsibility to make sure they reached orgasm, and also, like the women in Bryant's study, that it was also women's responsibility to ensure their male partner's pleasure (2006: 281).

In this sense the heterosexual girls in my sample internalised the neoliberal discourse of the individual bearing responsibility for everything more than the male students did and thus were closer to the 'ideal subject' of neoliberalism. More specifically, it was mostly Hungarian-identified, i.e. White girls who typically used discourses characteristic of a neoliberal-postfeminist understanding of sexual subjectivity and subjected themselves to the 'pleasure imperative', in which feeling pleasure was mandatory, and if a girl did not feel enough pleasure (i.e. did not have orgasm) there was something wrong with her and she had to improve herself. Most Gypsy girls did not talk about pleasure when talking about sex, but

CEU eTD Collection

190

those who did were using the neoliberal-postfeminist discourse, as well.[87] Many boys expressed responsibility for themselves (especially by insisting on condom use with casual sex partners) and some boys also expressed responsibility for their partner. However, as excerpts in this chapter (and many others that I am not citing) show, boys (especially sexually experienced ones) tend to talk about sex on the basis of unreflected male privileges and a kind of 'old-fashioned' patriarchal attitude to girls and women where 'responsibility for the partner's pleasure', if mentioned at all, is rather framed in terms of male sexual performance.

In the discourses of lesbian and bisexual girls,[88] penetrative sex also plays an important part, but it is not seen as the only way to give pleasure and reach orgasm. In the following excerpt two lesbians, Móni and Szandra, are discussing a certain cream to be applied in the vagina for the purpose of arousal:

> Móni: There are various arousing creams, all edible, like the one you've tried already, the one I have is called Nimfo Niagara *(laughs)*.
>
> Szandra: I tried it. Like, you put it on yourself, (…) and your hole will have a hard-on like hell. And you'll be really horny, and she brought it to school for me to try it, and I put it in myself during Anita's class. *(laughs)* And I was sitting in her class in the first row. So I was sitting like this, and then – well, how do they say it, I was having pins and needles, right? And then the girl next to me says, "oh, I'm having pins and needles in my leg". Well, I had pins and needles somewhere else. *(laughs) (Móni 21, Szandra 17, interview)*

The cream in question is used as an alternative way to pleasure oneself or one's partner. Non-penetrative, non-heteronormative sexual practices, such as oral and manual genital stimulation were included among the ways to pleasure a lesbian in the two girls' discourses but Móni had a preference for non-genital pleasure:

---

[87] For sexual discourses that constitute (gendered) ethnicity, see: Chapter 6.

[88] My only gay respondent did not openly talk about sex and pleasure, so unfortunately I cannot analyse his contribution to this topic.

Móni: (…) For example, I don't like to be eaten out.

(…)

Szandra: But if she does something else, if she does it with her hand, you don't like that, either?

Móni: I don't dig it for some reason. (…) I don't know, I don't really have the urge to come.

(…)

DR: Well, it's different for everybody. And what is good for you? Sorry for asking so directly. *(laughs)*

Móni: If it's good for the partner. So that's enough for me. If she tears the sheets to pieces. If she can't control herself. *(laughs) (Móni 21, Szandra 17, interview)*

Such pleasure is inconceivable in the discourses of my straight respondents. Móni was the only one among my respondents who did not equate pleasure with orgasm, at least not for herself.

2. Pleasure as a discourse constituting gendered dichotomies

Sexuality plays a central role in creating gender dichotomy, therefore I have looked for sexuality discourses that are implicated in constructing gendered distinctions. I have tried to find out how distinctions between girls and boys / women and men emerge, what makes female and male subjectivities intelligible, i.e. what does it mean for my respondents to be a girl or a boy. I have found that 'sexual pleasure' is one such major discourse and I have identified three main discursive patterns through which gendered difference is constituted in talking about pleasure. I discuss these three patterns in the rest of the chapter, in three sections. The first one is about male pleasure being conceived as something 'naturally' occurring whereas female pleasure as something which women have to learn to experience. The second one can be captured in how males and females talk about the sexual act itself: whether in an objectifying or self-objectifying way, whether the person is seen as the doer, the subject of the sex act or the receiver, the object of it. The third pattern is about the double standards of access to sexual pleasure, that is, gendered attitudes to having sex in

192

monogamous relationships vs. one-night stands. I argue that all these patterns are strongly dichotomizing ones and they function to constitute gendered difference and to reproduce heteronormative conceptions of genders.

Among the three dominant discourses of pleasure, the '(re)objectification of girls' body by boys' and 'the sexual double standard' are familiar from earlier feminist studies on sexuality (see: e.g. Nussbaum 1995). However, because of the postfeminist notion that such 'gender problems' have now been solved and girls have full freedom and agency over their sexuality, I find it important to show that dichotomizing, male-dominant sexuality discourses are still prevalent among young people. The third discourse, the 'pleasure as learnt vs. natural' one is also an 'old' discourse, but to my knowledge it is not discussed in the constellation of young people, sex education and sexual pleasure. All three discourses are embedded in a neoliberal-postfeminist cultural context, in which discourses of subjectification, re-emerging ideas of natural differences between the sexes and the surveillance and disciplining of girls' sexual behaviour prevail. These cultural features manifest in biologizing, (re-)objectification of girls' bodies and sexual double standards.

2.1. The 'natural vs. learnt' character of experiencing sexual pleasure

'Natural vs. learnt' is one of the major discourses deployed in constituting gender difference through sexuality in Marzipan. It is present both in Vera's and the students' talk about experiencing and giving sexual pleasure. In this discourse women are positioned as complicated creatures who have to learn about their body, about how their body can experience pleasure, whereas men can 'naturally' and in all circumstances experience sexual pleasure (which, as was discussed in Section 1, means having orgasm), without learning about their body.

Gill argues that since the 1990s, partly because of a growing interest in evolutionary psychology, the development of genetics and the flourishing of self-help literature, there has been a resurgence of discourses that naturalize differences between women and men. Emphasizing 'fundamental' differences between the sexes serves to "(re-)eroticize power relations between men and women (2007: 158-159). The 'natural vs. learnt' discourse of pleasure reflects this notion of naturalized sex/gender difference and shows how a discourse of pleasure which is seemingly supportive of girls' sexual agency and autonomy reinforces gender distinctions and a heterosexist understanding of what it means to be a woman or a man.

According to Vera, being able to give and experience pleasure does not automatically develop with physical maturation. She deploys the neoliberal discourse of individual learning and self-improvement (see: Bradbury 2013) when she explains that one has to learn how to give pleasure to oneself and partner. This is not only a technical question but also that of being emotionally ready and prepared to give pleasure, being self-transforming, self-scrutinizing, self-aware (Bradbury 2013; Walkerdine 2003), becoming familiar with one's body and pleasures and knowing when one is 'ready' to become familiar with someone else's body and pleasures:

> This (…) is a very important part of development, of sexual development, that you first have to know how you can experience sexual pleasure, that you know which parts of your body are pleasurable to be touched by someone, and when you know this, then you can turn to the other person. (*Vera, school nurse; sex education lesson, year 10*)

This self-transformation is one of the tasks of adolescence. When Vera talks about adolescence she uses the discourse of 'developmental phases', in which adolescence is seen as a stage of development between childhood and adulthood, where adulthood is a synonym for

194

fully developed personality and sexuality (Waites 2005; Talburt 2004; Moran 2000).[89]

Masturbation is encouraged by Vera as an important tool for learning about one's body and

about how to experience pleasure.[90] So far, it seems that both girls and boys are encouraged to

learn about and self-experiment with their body. However, the following excerpts will

demonstrate that Vera's messages about giving and receiving pleasure do constitute gendered

distinctions, that is, young women and men are not sent the same message about sexual

behaviour and the gendered embodiment of pleasure.

One girl in a sex education class asked how it was possible that a woman she knew has had a

4-5 years long relationship and she has never had an orgasm. Vera suggested that the reason

may be that the woman did not know her own body. As she argued, women have to learn how

to experience orgasm:

> Vera: Then we can consciously use [masturbation] to get to know our own bodies, and
> to experience sexual pleasure. And this is where it comes in that the girl you were
> talking about, she might not yet know her own body, and maybe the partner who she is
> with is not fit to explore her body with her and to learn how it's good for them both,
> and it's not that she's frigid but that she doesn't know this yet... every woman can
> experience sexual pleasure but she has to learn it for herself. It's much more
> complicated for women than for men.
>
> Regina: But if they can't do it in any way, then what happens? Should they break up?
>
> Vera: Well, if the partner is persistent enough and is willing to experiment and try
> things that... well, the girl has to know what she really wants. And she has to be able to
> tell this to her partner, and from then on it will probably work. *(Regina 17, Vera,
> school nurse, sex education lesson, year 9*)

Regina was asking about orgasm, and Vera responded by talking about sexual pleasure and

learning about one's body. This is another example for the equation of pleasure and orgasm.

Also, Regina wonders whether not being able to reach orgasm should be a reason to end the

---

[89] I discuss the problematisation of the concept of adolescence in Chapter 1.
[90] I found in an earlier stage of this research that in Hungarian sex education handbooks it is very common to position masturbation as the first stage of 'psychosexual development', which culminates in heterosexual penetrative sex with a stable partner of the opposite sex in early adulthood. It is implied that masturbation is an early stage of development to be overcome by early adulthood (see: Rédai 2010).

relationship. As we could see earlier, good sex means orgasm and is the foundation of a good relationship. Along this line, not only pleasure is the responsibility of the girl (as the boy does not need to learn how to have pleasure), but also, by extension, the maintenance of a good relationship. Vera uses the learning discourse, she presents a self-improvement project for girls, starting with masturbation as a learning tool. If a girl has learnt to be able to pleasure herself, she can pleasure others and others can pleasure her. She mentions that women are complicated, to which I will return soon. It is her responsibility to figure out what she wants sexually, the boy has no obligation but it helps if he cooperates. The boy's learning is also mentioned in this context, but it is optional and not necessary for his own pleasure. Maybe he is not up for 'exploration' and learning, but ultimately *she* has to be, if she wants pleasure. And it is not only her body and sexual wants that she has to learn but also how to communicate about them with her partner. By suggesting this, Vera evades dealing with her responsibility as an educator: it is actually her who could teach students about how to communicate about sexual desires. Instead, she positions the girl as the ideal neoliberal subject who is invested in self-improvement and is solely responsible for herself. As Lamb points out, in this context, "[s]ex and relationships are projects and the teen girl is brought into the culture of adult sexuality with a project to work on: herself; her subjectivity; her pleasure" (2010: 299).

In this sense, the 'pleasure imperative' is a call exclusively to women: it is always women who *have to* learn about their body and pleasure. As I noted earlier, for boys the imperative is to have sex, not to learn about how to have sex. During my observation it never happened that Vera was talking about how men should get to know their own body and how to give pleasure to themselves and their female partner. It was also not part of the lessons to practice how to communicate about desires and pleasures with partners. As one of the girls explains with

some self-irony, if the boy does not know how to do it, and the girl does not know how to talk about it, the sexual experience will not be pleasurable:

> No, I think in the first place, for example if they're really in love (…) and obviously they want to give pleasure, but at first they don't know how, and then if the girl is like me for example, I won't say a damn word, so no. That's what would embarrass me. And then she doesn't say anything to him, and then it's all lost, and then we should just forget about the whole thing because nothing good will come out of it, I think. (*Nóri 19, interview*)

Here, as in the previous quote, the issue of communication about what feels pleasurable comes up. If she cannot communicate her desires it is a problem, especially if the boy is not experienced sexually. In that case sex will not be pleasurable, and it is ultimately the girl's responsibility, as if being able to talk about it could somehow compensate for the boy's lack of competence. She is talking about a situation where both young lovers are sexually inexperienced, but it is the girl's task to instruct the boy. She ironically refers to her own experience, as she is someone who finds it embarrassing to tell her partner what she would enjoy and seems to shoulder the responsibility for the failure to pleasure each other.

We are told at sex education lessons that women are more 'complicated' creatures than men:

> Vera: I don't know really why nature made it this way but really girls need a little more time...
>
> Máté: A little? Twice as much!
>
> Vera: Or, sometimes even three times as much, because they say that girls usually need 20 minutes to reach orgasm. There are some who can get there more quickly, in 3 or 4 minutes even, because their body is capable of it. They learn it really, this is something they can learn, it can be reached like that too, I didn't talk about masturbation by accident. But for boys it can be between one second and half an hour, depends on how much they can take. I usually say that women are much more complex creatures than boys, their emotions, everything is much more complicated. And probably this is why it takes longer for them. (Máté 15, Vera, school nurse; sex education lesson, year 9)

197

Not only 'nature' has made women's physiology more complicated but they are also more complex emotionally, and this makes reaching orgasm a longer process. As for women it takes longer to reach orgasm than for men, men have to hold it back till women reach it. Therefore it is, again, women's responsibility, women's project to learn and improve themselves, not only for the sake of their own pleasure but also in order to better adjust to men's 'natural' sexual capacities and rhythm. In this discourse men are positioned as 'biological creatures' who always have orgasms, so their pleasure does not have to be dealt with. By mentioning women's emotions as one of the things that is more complicated, Vera is also referring to another dichotomy: for women orgasm is emotional, while for men it is rather a physical sensation (see: Farvid & Braun 2006).

It is suggested in an earlier quote that it is good to have a male partner who is willing to experiment, so that they explore the woman's pleasure together. Whereas in the interviews some boys talk about how they gradually learnt through experience how to give sexual pleasure to women, men's own pleasure is never brought up in the same way:

> Misi: I found out because (…) I had a girlfriend and we found out, more or less. That's a stupid word.
>
> Pali: You discovered it.
>
> Misi: Yes, thanks. We discovered it, or I discovered what she likes, and because of this I got this picture of what is good. And then it was better with the next girl. And then even better. So from experiences. I built from experiences.
>
> RD: And for you?
>
> Pali: (…) I was lucky, because I picked up on it. And then practice makes perfect. *(laughs) (Misi 19, Pali 19, interview)*
>
> *
>
> Levi: I think it's [a matter of] experience. And anyway, every woman has different needs. And you need to find those out, that's what makes it exciting... *(Levi 17, interview)*

In these two examples the young men have appropriated the discourse of learning and self-improvement – they have learned how to pleasure women and then gradually improved their own sexual performance. In Vera's and these boys' discourses the female body is presented as complicated but 'masterable' through exploration, experimentation, learning, improvement. The ability to handle the complex female body, which they have 'explored' strengthens the heteromasculinity of these young men (Kehily 2002: 141). None of the boys said anything about learning about their own pleasure, so despite deploying the 'learning to pleasure' discourse, which we have so far seen applied only to women, they still maintain the gendered dichotomy constituted by positioning girls as the ones whose pleasure has to be figured out vs. boys who experience pleasure 'naturally'. This discourse has another element, which I am going to discuss in Section 2.2, which is that boys position themselves as the actors in the sexual activity, and they objectify girls' bodies, in this case by exploring them, experimenting with them, figuring out what these bodies enjoy.

The discourse that positions female sexuality as a "problem" has its history. As Foucault theorizes it in *The History of Sexuality, Volume I* (1990), women's body became thoroughly medicalised in the 19th century, "in the name of the *responsibility* they owed to the health of their children, the solidity of the family institution, and the safeguarding of society" (1990: 146-147; my emphasis). Women's body and sexuality was a 'problem' to be solved by medical (including psychiatric) experts, so that they could shoulder their various responsibilities. In the current discourses I am discussing here, women's body and sexuality is still a 'problem', but their responsibility as neoliberal sexual subjects is to solve the problem for themselves – although there are all sorts of help available, they are 'free to choose' from self-help books, women's magazines, relationship counselling, sex therapy, orgasm workshops, plastic surgery, the list is infinite (Gill 2007; McRobbie 2004). Women are called on to be their own "explorers", they are granted enough agency and expertise over their body

199

to be able to figure out what is pleasurable for them. Men are also encouraged to participate in the exploration of women's bodies, not their own. Dominant discourses change over time but the gender distinction remains clear and firm, and, as in all gendered dichotomies, it is women who are 'the problem' and it is them who have to solve it.

2.2. Discourses of sexual objectification and self-objectification – gendered differences in talking about sexual activity and ways of pleasuring

In this section I look at how respondents talk about sexual acts, their experiences of having sex and ways of pleasuring. I demonstrate that there are distinctively male and female ways of talking about having sex and argue that such discourses create gendered dichotomies. Many of the sexually experienced boys talk in a way that objectifies girls and is centered on themselves as actors in sex, whereas most sexually experienced girls tend to talk in ways that express the relational character of having sex with a partner, and they sometimes objectify themselves for the sake of pleasing boys. (Self-)objectification occurs both on the grammatical and semantic levels of speech. This is important because, as Fairclough and Wodak point out, "grammar works ideologically", that is, the grammatical choices one makes in her/his speech "contribute to reproducing relations of domination" (1997: 263-264).

In my respondents' discourses adolescent heterosexual acts cannot be described simply by the 'active/passive' dichotomy, in the sense that the girl behaves passively during sex while the boy does things to her actively. There are instances where boys talk about themselves as active and girls as passive, but a subject/object distinction is more accurate to use than an active/passive distinction. In the neoliberal era of the sexually empowered young woman (Charles 2010; Gill 2007), girls are expected to be physically active in sex and they are. However, the same sexually active, empowered women are (re-)objectified both by the media

(Halliwell, Malson & Tischner 2011; Gill 2007), and by their male sexual partners. I see objectification as a direction in sexual activity and in talking about it, in which the boy discursively positions himself as the subject, who does things to a girl, so the girl is the object, the receiver of the things the boy does to him, the activity proceeds in one direction. In this setup, even though the girl may be physically active in sex, her activity is subordinated to the boy's activity, her pleasure is subordinated to his.

The theory of sexual objectification was introduced by Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) and is mostly researched in psychology (e.g. Szymanski, Moffitt & Carr 2011; Calogero, Pina, Park & Rahemtulla 2010; Steer & Tiggemann 2008). They argue that "when objectified, women are treated *as bodies* – and in particular, as bodies that exist for the use and pleasure of others" (1997: 175; emphasis in original). In the speech of my male respondents the sexual objectification of women manifests on both the grammatical and the semantic level and can be demonstrated by the statement '*I* (the subject) screwed *her* (the object)', instead of 'We screwed' or 'She screwed me'. On the semantic level, 'I screwed her' is objectifying, because of the verb usage: screwing means the fastening of a screw. 'Screwing' and similar verbs refer to women as if they were inanimate objects. This way of talking about sex creates a gender dichotomy.

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) also argue that women internalize objectification, adopt the observer's view and treat their bodies as the object for others to look at. This self-objectification theory explains much of why women invest so much in their physical attractiveness and in constantly monitoring themselves (1997: 177-180). The habitual self-scrutinizing of women is strongly linked with exposure to sexually objectifying media (Szymanski et al. 2011), which promotes the neoliberal ideal of the sexually active and empowered heterosexual woman who is responsible for her pleasure and can constantly

improve her body if she keeps monitoring it (Evans, Riley & Shankar 2010; Gill 2007). As Gill points out, in the neoliberal media representation of women, objectification appears "not as something done to women by some men, but as the freely chosen wish of active, confident, assertive female subjects" (2007: 151). Given the exposure to forms of globalized mass media (television, internet, social network sites, public advertising etc.) in the global north, the young people in Marzipan do receive the kind of sexual messages the above-discussed authors on neoliberal media talk about, and their impact is clearly visible in their discourses and embodied gendered and sexual practices.

When it comes to my respondents' talk about sex, women's self-objectification can be captured in the way they expect men to behave in certain ways in sex and subordinate their pleasure to the man's sexual behaviour, that is, his ways of pleasuring her. In my understanding, expecting the boy to pay attention to the girl's pleasure is an expectation to treat the girl as an autonomous subject, not an inert object in sex. At the same time this is also an expectation for the boy to treat the girl in a certain way, therefore female pleasure is dependent on male sexual activity. This way, in a seemingly contradictory manner, girls simultaneously construct themselves as sexual subjects who demand reciprocity and sexual objects whose pleasure depends on whether their male partner fulfils their desires.

As we could see in Section 2.1., girls are supposed to learn about their body and how to experience pleasure. However, it became clear in the group interviews with girls that adolescent heterosexual males (seen as inexperienced and/or self-centered) were not considered to be the best partners for such learning. Girls expect boys to give them pleasure, to actively participate in assisting the girl to reach orgasm. As girls' pleasure depends on boys' pleasure and sexual behaviour, many of the girls have quite a low opinion about adolescent male sexual performance, and many of them express resentment at boys of their

age who often do not care about their partner's pleasure, and end the sexual act and fall asleep the moment after they reached orgasm, leaving the girl unsatisfied. This is one of the most common contexts in which male pleasure is explicitly discussed, especially by girls. And in this context male pleasure becomes something that deprives the girl from her own pleasure, as an encumbrance on female pleasure.

The girls did not tend to refer to this behaviour in a biologizing discourse of 'premature ejaculation' or the 'male sex drive', but saw it as a behaviour problem and called it a 'lack of care or attention'. In the following quote I suggest this discursive frame, but in many interviews girls talk about the lack of attention or caring without my prompting.

> DR: How much attention do teenage boys (…) pay to their partners?
> All at once: Well, they don't care at all!
> Juli: Not at all! They don't give a shit. For them the important thing is that it should be good for them. (*Juli 16, Klári 18, Brigi 17, Blanka 17, interview*)
> *
> Márti: Yes, and they believe, by the way, that it's natural that if it was good for them it must have been good for the girl, too. (*Márti 19, interview*)

In the second quote Márti uses the 'natural' discourse to sarcastically suggest that boys so much 'don't care' about the girl's pleasure, that they assume that what is pleasurable for them is 'naturally' pleasurable for the girl too.[91] In my view this attitude is also about boys assuming that their sexual performance is by default 'good' and always the same quality, and if the woman does not enjoy it, it is her fault or problem, boys do not question their own sexual performance. Besides being an example of the discourse on boys' self-centeredness in sex, Márti's opinion also supports what I pointed out in Section 2.1., namely that it is always

---

[91] When the phrase "it was good for him/her" is used in the context of the sexual act, it often refers to having had an orgasm.

girls' responsibility to deal with their own pleasure, while the boys just have their pleasure 'naturally', without any previous work to explore their own body.

One girl shares her problem that she has not been able to reach orgasm with either of her two boyfriends:

> Vali: My problem is that I've never been able to come with either boy. And this upsets me so much. Is it me who is bad? Or is it him? But I know it's not him, it's me. And I talked about this with my current boyfriend, and he said that I took his masculinity away because he cannot satisfy me properly. But I know it's my problem, not his. (…)
>
> Adél: My boyfriend pays a lot of attention to this. Well, he's going to be twenty, and he's like, he doesn't come until I do too. I mean, he holds it...
>
> Vali: See, there are differences in age. Because Honey, he comes, and then that's it. And I'm like: 'Honey!'…
>
> DR: And then he doesn't care about you?
>
> Vali: No. *(Vali 17, Adél 17, interview)*

Though she admits that perhaps the boyfriend's age is the source of the problem, from the discussion afterwards it becomes quite obvious that her lack of orgasm may be related to the lack of attention from the boyfriend after he has reached orgasm. Still, she internalizes his accusation, she believes it is her fault. Similarly to Bay-Cheng and Eliseo-Arras' (2008) female respondents who took the blame completely on themselves for unwanted sexual encounters with men, Vali takes the blame on herself for not having orgasms. It is her body that is 'the problem'. It is her failure that she does not come up to the demands of the pleasure imperative, and she has also failed to secure the boyfriend's heteromasculinity with her orgasm.

Opperman et al. note that in sexology research the lack of orgasm has been pathologised and treated as a sexual dysfunction or disorder, for which solutions should be found (2014: 504). Examining the psychological, emotional aspects of orgasm, Opperman et al. found that their respondents often expressed a "sense of ownership over their partner's orgasm" – that they

were "giving" orgasms to their partners, and if the partner did not orgasm, they often felt disappointed, insecure, incompetent (2014: 508). Braun et al. found that in the discourse of sexual reciprocity, the male partners expected women to have orgasms (she should have one, too), and they argue that women's orgasm is "required both to establish her own sexual normality and to reinforce her partner's 'sexpertise'" (2003: 252). Indeed, Vali's lack of orgasm reflects both: if she could orgasm, she would not have a "problem", she would be 'normal' and her boyfriend would be reassured in his "sexpertise", his fragile heteromasculinity would not be threatened by her lack of orgasm. His frustration at the failure of her girlfriend's body to 'function properly' is an objectifying attitude.

Most heterosexual girls comply with heteronormative male sexual expectations to some extent. Vali's lack of orgasm not only threatens her partner's heteromasculinity but at the same time and related to this, sexual activity has produced a feeling of "insufficient" femininity for her, which, as it turns out later in the interview, she tries to compensate in other ways. She relates in one of the sex education classes that she regularly tries to reinvent herself sexually, so that she and their sexual activities do not become boring for her boyfriend. "Last time, for example, I bought a bunny dress, dressed up as a bunny, and I danced for him." This shows that she identifies with the female role of being sexy, desirable and exciting for the male partner – despite the fact that the boyfriend makes no attempt to reinvent himself and figure out how to pleasure her. Vali uses the discourse of continuous self-improvement and takes full responsibility for spicing up their sex life. Her attitude reflects Gupta, Zimmerman and Fruhauf's (2008) findings about the relationship and sex advice column of *Cosmopolitan*: women are primarily responsible for changing themselves and their partners, for maintaining and improving their romantic relationships, and also for the sexual pleasure of both their partners and themselves. Spalding, Zimmerman, Fruhauf, Banning and Pepin (2010) found that in the relationship and sex advice columns of magazines for men, the major message was

that sex is the most important thing in men's life and men are entitled to use power, manipulation and control over women to get the sex they want. As opposed to Gupta et al.'s (2008) findings, men in these columns were not seeking and advised to change themselves but to change their partners in order to have better relationships (Spalding et al. 2010).

Vali goes even further than entertaining the boyfriend sexually. She says in the interview that she is thinking of having breast enlargement surgery. In the following excerpt she simultaneously criticizes boys for being lookist, for having double standards for women and men in caring about their body, and argues that having bigger breasts would enhance her femininity:

> Vali: And you know what they look at? The tits! They only look at the breasts, that's what gets them going. *(they laugh)* Oh my God! I really get pissed about these, that only those women are perfect who have big boobs and big asses. And completely fake. And that's the hot woman. And if there's a little defect in someone she's not wanted. (…) They're not thinking right. Anyway, I'm starting to think that I should get my breasts done, as well.
>
> DR: But why?
>
> Vali: Well, because they're so small! And it bothers me! (…)
>
> DR: And why do you want to conform to this image of the ideal woman?
>
> Vali: I don't know, I don't feel good like this. So I've seen these cover-girls and I don't want to look like them, but I want something I can be proud of. (…) But that's what the boys like anyway. But why? (…) A girl spends much more time on herself than a boy. (…) By the way, the boys are so lame here… so if I was to say to [one of them], 'beef up because you are so skinny' (…), he wouldn't listen. Because they feel okay like that. But if they tell a girl that her breasts are too small, the girl falls into depression completely and feels bad. (*Vali 17, interview*)

She wants to have a desirable femininity and assumes that "if there's a little defect in someone she's not wanted". She is a beautiful, pretty girl who thinks that her only 'fault' in looks is her "too small" breasts. The 'failed/faulty femininity' logic is the same as with the lack of orgasm and the inventiveness about the sexual activities with the self-centered boyfriend. She cannot have orgasm –> she thinks it is her fault –> she threatens her boyfriend's masculinity –> she has failed as a 'normally functioning' woman. Her breasts are

too small $\rightarrow$ she thinks it is a lack $\rightarrow$ she will not receive masculine attention $\rightarrow$ she has failed as a desirable woman. She believes sex should be varied and creative $\rightarrow$ if it is not, it will be monotonous, she will not be desired $\rightarrow$ she (and not the uncaring boyfriend) makes efforts to refresh their sex life $\rightarrow$ she will not fail as a desirable woman. Despite being critical about male double standards and lookism, in order to be desired in this system, she complies with the expectations of 'ideal femininity'.

Cosmetic surgery, including breast augmentation, has grown into a huge industry in a neoliberal environment where women are called on to treat their body as a project of ongoing self-improvement and transformation. Breasts are a central aesthetic sign of femininity, they represent (heteronormative) sexuality and appearance (Gimlin 2013: 918). Calogero et al. (2014) have found that women who primed self-objectification had more body shame and more inclination to cosmetic surgery. Cosmetic surgery has been the subject of feminist debates about choice and agency. Davis argues that women who undergo cosmetic surgery act with agency and take control over their lives into their own hands. She claims that even though these women comply with "the cultural constraints of femininity, they do not necessarily agree with them" (1991: 35). This contradictory stance is visible in how Vali talks about men's preoccupation with breasts and her intention to have hers enlarged. Bordo argues that women's participation in such objectifying practices as body modification may enable them to obtain social power in some situations and therefore can be seen as subversive to oppressive norms. At the same time women are subjected to normative social pressure "through individual self-surveillance and self-correction to norms" (1993a: 191). Gillespie (1996) concludes that while on the individual level body-modification practices may be empowering for women, on a macro-social level the same practices may be disempowering as they are means for women to perpetuate their own oppression.

Vali mentioned "cover-girls" in the previous excerpt. Though she claims she does not want to look like them, media images of slim women with large breasts – what boys are obsessed with, according to her – are likely to influence her perception of ideal femininity. Didie and Sarwer point out that in the last decades "the average breast size of women considered the ideal in western cultures has increased relative to trimmer waist and hip dimensions" (2003: 250). They found that women who were pursuing breast enlargement surgery considered the ideal breast size significantly larger than women who were not interested in breast surgery. Just like Vali, these women were unsatisfied only with their breasts, not their whole body image. I asked my female respondents whether they were reading teen magazines to find information about sexual matters, and approximately one in four said they did. The majority said they were receiving information primarily from the internet and also from their peers, friends, mothers or sisters – who must be media consumers themselves. Although *Cosmopolitan* and other targeted magazines were not the main source of information for them, as Vali's case shows, these girls (and boys) were all the same subjected to sexualised images of the ideal female body pouring from the media.

In Vali's case we can also see how women participate in perpetuating their own oppression (Gillespie 1996; Bordo 1993a). Her boyfriend's mother, having had breast enlargement surgery herself, encourages Vali to "have her breasts made", but only after she has fulfilled her maternal duty, that is, giving birth. First the breasts have to serve their biological function (breast-feeding), and when that is completed, their aesthetic function can be prioritised.

Vali: My boyfriend's mum has fake boobs too, and hers are so nicely done! (…) And we talked about this, because I told her that I want to have them done as well, and she told me to do it only after having children, not like this. She told me that I could do it after giving birth to two or three kids. But she told me not to do it while I'm so young.

DR: (…) I always wonder whether the breast loses its sensitivity because of this and then you wouldn't feel anything during sex. (…)

Vali: Well, I have actually asked my mother-in-law if she feels anything and she says that she feels the same way, but not so intensely as before. So say, you pinch her or something and she feels it but not so much. And she said that she had to lie in bed for two months because she couldn't stand up. Because it hurt so much and because she didn't want the stitches to break. (*Vali 17, interview*)

The "mother-in-law" tells Vali that she has lost some of the intensity of sensation at touching her breasts, and she had to endure a lot of pain and complete inactivity (and dependency, obviously) while recovering from the surgery. Ironically, the decrease of the intensity of pleasure she would receive from breast stimulation during sex would be compensated by possessing the physical feature essential to 'successful' femininity. In this framework, breasts are not seen by Vali as an important body part in the context of feeling sexual pleasure, their function is to raise male attention, which attention, if all goes well, can bring sexual pleasure to the woman.

Through the previous quotes and discussion I have attempted to demonstrate how girls experience sexual (re-)objectification as neoliberal sexual subjects. Through Vali's discussion about breast enlargement I have also provided an example of self-objectification as an internalisation of the neoliberal image of ideal female sexual subjectivity. I continue with interrogating how boys talk about having sex.

When talking about having sex with a girl/woman, boys often use verbs that refer to inanimate objects in other contexts, and subject-verb-object grammar structures ('I did something to her'), in which he is always the subject and she is always the object, instead of 'we did something together' or 'she did something to me'. The objectifying verbs are often

slang and/or vulgar. For example, this is how Csanád describes his first sexual encounters:

"Well, for me it was like I finger-fucked a gadji when I was twelve, and I fucked her when I was thirteen."[92]

Age or the family status of the desired object does not make a difference for some boys, as Imi demonstrates, talking about how he would like to have sex with Vera:

> DR: Sometimes Vera brings in this (…) wooden penis on which it can be demonstrated how to [put on a condom].
>
> Imi: And does Vera do it? With her mouth? She could do it once, I'll ask her. *(To me:)* Get Vera to do it once. (…)
>
> Nándi: Imi, she's got a husband.
>
> Tibi: And kids too.
>
> Imi: So what? (…) I'll give her one more.
>
> Levi, Tibi, Nándi together: Ooooooooh!
>
> Tibi: What perverted thoughts you have about the school nurse!
>
> Imi: Well I'd fuck her, what can I say? Jesus!
>
> Levi: Cut it out!
>
> (…)
>
> Tibi: I mean, you're talking about her colleague. *(Levi 17, Tibi 16, Nándi 15, Imi 16, interview)*

The other boys, Levi, Tibi and Nándi, are embarrassed and try to stop him, not because of the vulgar, objectifying language he uses but because I am there: Tibi reminds Imi that he is talking about my colleague. What the three boys seem to police here is Imi's boundary crossing in the school hierarchy. It is also a taboo for the three of them to have sex with a married woman who has children, but not for Imi. Imi objectifies Vera by expressing his desire to see her perform oral sex with a demonstration tool, and he suggests that I − who is

---

[92] One of the slang words boys commonly use to refer to girls they had sex with is *gadji*, which means 'girl' or 'woman' in Romani language. Originally it meant 'girl/woman of non-Roma origin' but nowadays it is used in general for girls/young women, both by Gypsy- and Hungarian-identified boys, as a synonym for *csaj*, also of Romani origin, meaning 'girl/young woman'. There are plenty of slang words of Roman origin in Hungarian language.

considered to be in the same position in the hierarchy as Vera – also participate in her objectification by getting her to do it. He then expresses his desire to have sex with her in an objectifying structure (I'd fuck her) and by suggesting he would impregnate her. Whether Vera would want this or not is not a question for Imi and when the other boys protest they also do not argue that Vera would probably not want to have sex with Imi but that Vera has a husband and kids so she is not the kind of woman suitable for such an adventure.[93]

Having sex with two lesbians is not a taboo for most male respondents, who share the common heterosexual male fantasy that having sex with two women or watching two women having sex is a special pleasure. Whether the two women are interested in involving a man is not an issue for them to consider. This is a form of sexual objectification affecting a specific group of women (Szymanski et al. 2011: 10). In the following conversation I try to argue that when two lesbian women are having sex, there is no man involved, but for Csanád this is not a problem, as he claims he can still have sex with them – again, in an I-do-it-to-them fashion:

> DR: But if someone is a lesbian that doesn't mean that you are there too…
> Ricsi: There are no guys there, only two girls…
> Csanád: *(laughs)* I don't care.
> Ricsi: Will you rape them?
> Csanád: Or I'll eat them out or I don't know.
> DR: But you're not a woman so they might not enjoy it if you do that.
> Csanád: I can still eat them out. *(Ricsi 17, Csanád 17, interview)*

Ricsi also makes a contribution: after he explains my hint about lesbian sex to Csanád (two women and no man involved), he asks Csanád whether he wants to rape the two lesbians if they do not want to have sex with him. Thus, violence occurs as an option, and while Ricsi suggests that Csanád is not desirable for the two lesbian women, so he can only use violence

---

[93] See Section 2.3 for an analysis of rating women based on their sexual availability.

to satisfy his sexual desires, Csanád accepts this option but suggests that instead he may satisfy them orally. When I point out that the two women may not enjoy his oral advances, Csanád dismisses it by pointing out that *he* can still do the sex act to them, because *he* knows they would enjoy it. Csanád is a subject, the lesbians are objects who do not have their own will but are at the subject's disposal who knows what they enjoy.

Continuing the same conversation, Ricsi and Csanád discuss that two women having sex without a man is pointless, because a man can do everything a woman can do to a woman. This is a phallocentric and mechanical notion of sex, in which only the activity of the male is significant.

> Ricsi: I don't understand what lesbians want. A guy can suck and lick. (…) Why is it good [to do it] with each other? Girls can't do anything with each other.
> Csanád: They're just wriggling on top of each other. *(Ricsi 17, Csanád 17, interview)*

Ricsi expresses that he doesn't understand what lesbians desire. Not only can a man do anything a woman can do to another woman, but two women, i.e. two objects, cannot do anything without a subject – which can only be a man, because he has what women lack: a penis, which is seen as the ultimate actor. Csanád reinforces the point: two women just "wriggle" on top of each other – what else could they do without a penis?

Vulgar words for sexual acts include ones that are used in the context of mechanics: the most common one is *meghúzni*. The English equivalent is 'to screw', the two words have the same meaning: to "fasten or tighten with a screw or screws".[94]

> And there was this time when I went to a party high, picked up a chick and the stuff was still working and then I screwed her. *(Imi, 16, interview)*

---

[94] http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/screw?q=screw

Both the English and the Hungarian slang meaning of this word is used as a synonym for having intercourse with someone, and it reflects the objectifying slang discourse about male heterosexual penetrative sex, in which men 'do' things to women whom these words render inanimate objects, like car parts. Other common vulgar/slang words include *megcsinálni*, *megrakni*, *megpakolni*, *megdugni* (approximately: 'do', 'fuck', 'ram', 'bang', etc.).

The boys I cite in this chapter are (or claim to be) sexually experienced. The way they talk about (heterosexual) sex gives them a status of hegemonic masculinity, a position of male dominance over girls and non-hegemonic boys (Connell 1995). As I observed, sexual experience (and bragging about it) is an important ingredient in constituting hegemonic masculinity among the boys in Marzipan. The same boys who were using the most sexist, objectifying, at times violent sexuality discourses were also the boys behaving most dominantly in their form and standing highest in the peer hierarchy, while boys who had no or little sexual experience and were not necessarily talking about girls in similar objectifying terms were usually not in dominant positions in their form. Thus their sexuality and their sexual discourses were constitutive of their gender.

Talking about the sexual act is a significant way to constitute differences between girls and boys. As opposed to boys, who use an objectifying, often vulgar language to refer to having sex, most girls tend to use phrases that indicate mutuality, doing something together, or passivity, or being the receiving end of the sexual act. Girls' most commonly used phrases are 'sleep with him', 'make love', 'have sex', 'do it' (together). The most common one is 'sleep with him' (*lefeküdni vele*), which girls use for having sex either with a boyfriend or a casual sex partner. It is a verb that is not vulgar, not romantic, rather neutral, it is not the "I-did-it-to-her" but the "I-did-it-with-him" type, where there is a difference between 'to' and 'with', the latter indicating togetherness, and the whole verb phrase indicating agency and subjecthood, a

213

decision made by the girl. At the same time it has a euphemistic connotation: I observed that many girls were embarrassed to use the phrases 'have sex' and 'make love' openly, but 'sleep with' implies an 'innocent' leisure activity, which helps the girl avoid falling on the wrong side of the 'girlfriend/whore' dichotomy (see: Section 2.3).

'Having sex' (*szexelni*) is also a quite neutral term that girls use, but it is also a distancing one. It is usually used when talking in general, in the abstract, or with one-night stands. The phrase "make love", however, is only used when talking about sex with one's partner whom she loves. Jackson and Cram's respondents use these two phrases similarly: 'make love' for romantic sexual encounters and 'have sex' when it is rather physically driven or incidental (2003: 122).

> Szandra: [My first partner was] a boy. But then, after that was over, I had with these girls this, well, it wasn't a relationship, only, like, sex. Or how should I say it. (…) Like, one-night stands.
>
> Eszter: You only had sex?
>
> Szandra: So? How should I say it? That's how it is, isn't it?
>
> Eszter: More nicely: we made love.
>
> Szandra: But we didn't make love, because we can only make love, right, with (...) someone we love, right? *(Eszter 17, Szandra 17, interview)*

'Doing' (*csinálni*) is also used, but not the way boys use it, like 'doing the girl', 'I did her', but 'doing it', 'we do it' together: "We do it at home *(they laugh)*, exclusively at home *(Nóri 19, interview).*

If we put these quotes together, we can see that straight boys and girls position themselves completely differently in their discourse on sexual activity, as if the two groups were having completely different experiences. Boys position themselves directly as subjects and their female sex partner as object. Girls position themselves as subjects and expect to be treated like subjects but at the same time they subordinate their pleasure to their male partner's;

wanting to be 'treated' somehow is a self-objectifying position. It would have been interesting to see how the male and female member of a straight couple talk about their sexual experiences with each other, but unfortunately, at least at the time of conducting the interviews, there were no straight couples among my respondents.

The way Szandra, the lesbian respondent talks about sex is a combination of masculine, phallocentric words and the feminine notion of we-do-it-together. By using both discourses simultaneously she challenges the heteronormative male/female dichotomy in sex. When talking about the new dildo she and her partner had bought and how much she was looking forward to trying it, she says, "My dick was erect already." When she talks about the vaginal arousing cream (see: Section 2.1.), this is how she expresses its effect: "your hole will have a hard-on". Her 'masculine' language use can be explained by the fact that discourses in which women are positioned as active subjects are probably not available for her, therefore she deploys discourses typically used by men to express her own sexual desires and activities.

> We tried the strap-on on Sunday (…) and it was good because it's made like, have you seen one before? (…) the whole thing is made in a way that it also stimulates the one who puts it on and moves in it, makes that pushing movement. (…) And then she can, so it's not like only one of them comes, but both. And it was a great experience for me, and it was good. It was good, really, because you know, it's not like with the vibrator that she does it for you and then you come and that's it. But really, you come together and stuff, and that was an amazing experience for me. *(Szandra 17, interview)*

Although a penis-like object is also positioned here as necessary for simultaneous orgasm, the gold standard of sex, the roles are more flexible and not so heteronormative, because the dildo has two ends for stimulation, and it can be attached to either partner, so the "penis" does not automatically belong to one of the partners. Thus, the sexual activity is not one-dimensional and there is no permanent objectifying direction.

In this section I have analysed how discourses about sexual activity produce gendered distinctions. I have argued that in the heteronormative discourses of my respondents female sexual pleasure derives from male sexual pleasure, because in the sexual act the male is the acting subject, and the female is the receiving object. The subject-object positioning is not the same as the active (male) / passive (female) dichotomy, as the girls are also active in sex. However, despite being active, girls' sexual desires and pleasure get subordinated to male desires and pleasures and the male partner's sexual behaviour. Discursive sexual objectification, in my reading, works directionally: I refer by this term to the apparently permanent direction of sexual activity, the male subject doing something to the female object. Girls, however, also participate in objectification: they objectify themselves by modifying their body in order to be more sexually attractive to boys, by working to improve their sexual behaviour to please boys more, by defining themselves in terms of how sexually attractive to boys they are.

2.3. Access to pleasure – the sexual double standard and the girlfriend/slut and virgin/whore dichotomies

In this section I examine the third discursive tool to construct gender dichotomy among students in Marzipan, the sexual double standard (SDS), which is expressed in the girlfriend/slut and virgin/whore dichotomies. Such dichotomies are central to young people's sexuality (Fasula, Carry & Miller 2014). Unlike in some of the literature, which claim that it is primarily girls who are policing their female peers' sexuality and are the gatekeepers of the good girl/bad girl divide (e.g. Youdell 2005), in my interviews it was the boys who were applying the sexual double standard more powerfully, at least they were more articulate about it, and not critical at all. Many girls, however, expressed criticism and they rather emphasized the gender inequality, not their disrespect for women who have lots of casual sex. Boys acted

216

more as the gatekeepers of the SDS and it was them who drew the dividing lines, they did not question the SDS at all. The fact that boys were the gatekeepers of the good girl/bad girl dichotomy in my interviews does not mean that girls were not policing each other's sexuality. In fact, from personal communication with Vera it turned out that it was quite varied in the different forms whether boys or girls were labelling girls 'sluts' the most loudly. However, I find it important to demonstrate how boys define and apply double standards and label girls' sexuality, because it is part of the broader social inequality reproduction processes in school.

The terms 'slut' and 'whore' are used as synonyms here, with no reference to prostitution. They are both terms for female sexual behaviour in the framework of sexual double standards. 'Slut' or 'whore' (and also 'slag' is used in British slang) refers to girls who are sexually active outside a romantic relationship framework. I use both words because they are both used in the literature on SDS and heteronormative sexual subjectivity constitution among adolescents and young adults, and also to distinguish between two subtypes of SDS, the girlfriend/slut and the virgin/whore dichotomies, which are similar but not identical expressions of SDS. The girlfriend/slut division refers to boys' assessment of girls based on their sexual behaviour. Based on this assessment boys decide how to approach a girl sexually: for romantic relationship or for casual sex. Fasula et al. call the same division good girl/bad girl dichotomy (2014: 171), which I also use in general in the context of SDS. By the virgin/whore division I refer to the condition whether a girl is still a virgin, and if not, how she lost her virginity. According to many of my male respondents, if she lost it outside a romantic relationship she becomes a whore. Youdell (2005) found that a girl is expected to be a virgin as long as possible, and if not, she is supposed to be silent about it, except if she is having sex in a stable relationship. Those who are not virgins and are sexually active or express sexual desires are whores or slags.

The virgin/whore (Youdell 2005) or good girl/bad girl (Fasula et al. 2014) or clean/unclean woman (Flood 2013) dichotomy has long cultural-religious roots, it invokes the Virgin/Fallen Woman, Madonna/Whore, Virgin Mary/Maria Magdalena representation of women (see: Anzaldúa 1999). Youdell argues that this is a moral discourse which has become secularized and it entails the policing of this im/morality by girls, both for the sake of individual girls and girls as a group (2005: 260).

The sexual double standard is defined as "the acceptance of different criteria to assess the sexuality of men and women" by Bordini and Sperb (2013: 687), or "the differential judgement and treatment of women's and men's sexual behaviour by Flood (2013: 95). Crawford and Popp (2003), and Allison and Risman (2013) conclude in their review of studies on SDS that there is mixed evidence of the current existence of SDS. Whereas findings tend to be inconsistent in quantitative survey-based studies, qualitative studies, including school ethnographies (e.g. Eder, Evans & Parker 1997; Jackson & Cram 2003), confirm the existence of SDS among adolescents and young adults (Bordini & Sperb 2013). Bordini and Sperb comment that among quantitative studies, certain widely used scales do not differentiate between the societal perception of the existence of the SDS and the individual acceptance of certain sexual behaviours, which may be one cause for inconsistent research findings (2013: 691). Another possible reason for inconsistency in quantitative studies is the experimental vignette method, which means that participants have to evaluate fictive situations without social context. Lyons, Giordano, Manning and Longmore (2011), and Zaikman and Marks (2014) point out that there may be differences in how individuals evaluate real life situations and fictive situations in laboratory circumstances. Although the majority of studies have confirmed the existence of the SDS, the great majority of quantitative studies have been conducted on samples of US college students, mostly White middle-class (Bordini & Sperb 2013), therefore their findings are applicable to other social groups with

218

caution. Among qualitative studies, there are more with a focus on adolescents (e.g. Powell 2010; Jackson & Cram 2003). These studies report that the sexual double standard is strong among adolescents, which my findings confirm.

In her study of the 'hookup culture' of American college campuses Bogle (2008) argues that even though women actively participate in hooking up, a sexual double standard prevails on campuses. Men have no regulations to their sexual behaviour but women have to follow a lot of unwritten rules regarding the frequency of hookups, the number of guys or the kind of guys (e.g. not having sex with several men from the same fraternity, or with men who are friends). There are many pitfalls for women who hook up, which can lead to receiving the label of 'slut'. Women's sexual behaviour is policed by their male and female peers, and sexually highly active men would not get into a relationship with sexually highly active women. That is, they differentiate between 'sluts' and 'girlfriend material', just like many of the sexually active boys in Marzipan do.

According to Allison and Risman, "[t]he term 'hooking up' encompasses a wide range of sexual behaviours, from kissing to genital contact to sexual intercourse" (2013: 1193), and Bogle also describes a variety of definitions her respondents provided (2008: 25-29). I do not use the term 'hooking up' in discussing casual, non-romantic sexual activity, because my respondents did not use a similar term with a vague reference to what exactly happened. What I and my respondents both used in the interviews was 'one-night stand' (the equivalent Hungarian expression is 'one-night adventure'), which we all understood as a one-time non-romantic sexual encounter with someone. Many of the sexually active boys and some of the sexually active girls were participating in the weekend party-culture, therefore one-night stand usually implied picking up someone at a disco or a party and having sex with him/her that night.

The prevalence of the sexual double standard in Marzipan was tangible. It was most clearly articulated by my respondents when I asked them about their attitude to one-night stands. These conversations show how girls' and boys' access to sexual partners is a gender-distinctive feature, and how both girls and boys perpetuate this dichotomy by policing their own and their peers' sexual behaviour. They do the policing according to the standards defined primarily by boys, along the lines of relationship vs. casual sex – girlfriend vs. slut – virgin vs. whore, to which girls are often critical but mostly complicit.

The discourse of sexual pleasure and relationships vs. casual sex creates a gendered distinction, because for most girls in Marzipan sexual pleasure is closely connected to boyfriends and monogamous romantic relationships, whereas for most boys, this connection is not so strong or does not exist at all. Therefore girls and boys have different access to sexual partners. While for some girls, casual sex (when in or out of a relationship) was acceptable, for most girls it was morally or healthwise problematic or risky, and unacceptable when in a relationship. That in itself does not construct a gendered distinction, as many of the boys agreed that when one was having a girlfriend he would not want to or was not supposed to have one-night stands. What makes it a differentiating element is how girls and boys understand their access to casual sex partners. For most boys casual sex and access to girls while inside or outside a monogamous relationship was seen as a 'given', it was taken for granted, whereas for girls it was not. Many boys' approach was that when they had a girlfriend, they did not want one-night stands or they chose not to, while the question of wanting it or not, having a choice or not, did not even occur to the great majority of girls who had boyfriends.

Tibi: (…) when I was having a girlfriend I never cheated on her, like, during the weekend at parties.

DR: And you?

Nándi: I've never cheated on anyone, none of my girlfriends. Just like, well, I looked at the opportunities, so to say, and then there were jealous scenes because of it, even though I was only chatting with them and stuff, and there were quarrels because of this, but otherwise, no, nothing.

DR: And what do you think about one-night stands?

Nándi: They're okay. If one doesn't have a girlfriend they're okay.

Tibi: And when one doesn't want anything serious, so a serious relationship, only to relax. *(Nándi 15, Tibi 16, interview)*

In this group three out of the four boys (Levi, Tibi and Nándi) did not cheat on their girlfriends, while the fourth (Imi) did and admitted it in the group. It was their choice not to, and in the case of Imi, it was his choice, and it was also his decision not to tell her girlfriend about it, so that he would not offend her.

Boys not only differentiated between sexual behaviour when being in a relationship vs. being single, but also between two types of girls (see: Fasula 2014 et al.; Flood 2013), and the differentiation was made according to a sexual double standard. Boys distinguished between girls who are suitable to be girlfriends and those who are suitable for one-night stands, and when they got acquainted with a girl, they would assess which purpose she was suitable for. As Gergely put it plainly:

Well, I was drunk at the time. I said okay, and I started to pick up this girl. At first I wanted her to be my girlfriend but I realized she was a slut, and then I thought I'd try and see if I can [pick her up] and I did. *(Gergely 17, interview)*

Gergely feels entitled to decide whether he will have someone for a girlfriend or a one-night stand, and his decision depends on the girl's sexual behaviour. He started to chat up the girl, and she may have responded 'too willingly', 'too sexually', because he assessed her behaviour as 'sluttish', therefore she would be good for casual sex but not for a girlfriend. So

he changed his intentions and attempted to get her for a one-night stand. As he positions himself as the decision-maker about the form of sexual contact between the two of them, it does not occur to him that the girl may have her own desire or she may have a preference – maybe she had no intention whatsoever to get Gergely for a boyfriend, even when he was first considering that. While he had the agency to decide whether he would play the chatting-up or the wooing role, depending on his judgement of which of the two 'types' the girl was, the girl's desires and choices got subordinated to his and her choices got reduced to accepting being 'his' slut for the night or not. This example shows how the 'empowered', 'agentic' sexuality of girls gets subordinated to a corresponding form of hegemonic masculinity.

Among others, Lyons et al. (2011) found that the adolescent girls in their sample were aware of the existence of the sexual double standard, they understood that girls and boys were subjected to different sexual norms and that for the same sexual behaviour men were rewarded but women gained bad reputation. Although some girls found the SDS unfair, its existence was taken for granted. Jackson and Cram, trying to locate agency and resistance in adolescent girls' talk about the sexual double standard found that although the girls did position themselves as agentic in talking about their sexual activity, were aware of and addressed the inequity of the SDS, their resistance was "somewhat tenuous and fragile, (…) it was not strident voices of opposition to the sexual double standard that arose in the young women's talk but murmurs that denigrated male sexual promiscuity (…)" (2003: 123). Similarly, girls in Marzipan were aware that there is a gendered double standard concerning sexual behaviour expected from women and men but the voice of criticism against the SDS was more a complaint in a women-only conversation than an agentic act of resistance.

Vali: It's very different for a boy. (…) For a girl it's a shame and for a boy… (…) I have never understood why. Dad has always said it, too. (…) And my younger brother does this too, one girl, then another, he never commits himself (…). And I ask dad, doesn't it bother you that there's a different girl with him every week? It bothers me! And dad [says], 'well, he's a boy'. (…)

Adél: And it's like, a lot of boys do this, they switch between girls daily, weekly, and then they call the girls sluts because they sleep with everyone.

(…)

Vali: By the way, my dad said that for boys it's an honour to be with many girls, but for a girl it's a shame. *(Vali 17, Adél 17, interview)*

Vali is especially bothered and vocal about the SDS. This may be due to experiencing it in her immediate family environment. Her own brother and herself are being measured against very different standards and it is the father who measures them. Thus, she experiences the paternal right (Pateman 1988) to define who is worth how much in the family and who is entitled to what kind of sexuality. Despite their criticism, Vali and Adél internalize the SDS, they both explain in the interview that they would never have sex with an unknown man, someone they are not in relationship with. Vali declares that she has not been with many boys and she will not be, because she will "keep [her] honour". She will keep on the good side of the dichotomy, accept her father's criteria and avoid shame. What these girls criticise is the existence of the SDS and its unfairness. Their problem is not that they cannot sleep around as freely as boys can without getting a bad reputation, but that the boys who do it do not get a bad reputation. What they would find fair and equitable is if boys were judged by the same standard, what they demand is not more sexual freedom for women but equal judgement with men.

Its existence taken for granted, the SDS has to be negotiated somehow (Lyons et al. 2011; Jackson & Cram 2003). The above girls' negotiation strategy is to criticise it, question their unfairness and find boyfriends who are monogamous and therefore within their relationship they and their partners are equals in sexual activity (even though, as we could see earlier with

Vali, this does not necessarily mean that both partners will have equal access to sexual pleasure). Thus, having a steady boyfriend is a management technique of the slut/girlfriend dichotomy for girls. With a few exceptions, nearly all girls were into monogamous relationships and no sex outside the relationship, including those who voiced criticism against the SDS. They constructed a dichotomy of love relationship vs. casual sex (see also: Powell 2010: 42), and most of them positioned themselves as ones who would have sex only with men they loved and/or were in relationship with. Girls can express their sexual desire in a relationship, they perceive it as safer to have sex in a relationship, and quite many of them reported satisfactory, pleasurable sex life with their boyfriends. They negotiated the SDS by constituting the form of sexual activity acceptable for them and their social environment (sex within relationship, in love) as something precious, more valuable than the non-acceptable form (casual sex). Ironically, although adolescent heterosexual romantic relationships are often ripe with many forms of gendered and sexual inequality, oppression and violation (McCarry 2010; Hird 2000), it is still defined as an institution of girls' preference for sexual activity. They even constructed a positive identity out of girls' restrictions of sexual expressions, like Detti:

> I only sleep with someone I love. I don't know why, because I could have done it so many times, like, sleep with this one and that one too, but I'm not like that. *(Detti, 17, interview)*

By saying she is 'not that kind of person', Detti positions herself as one who is distinct from those girls who seek casual sexual pleasure. By claiming she would have had the chance to have casual sex on many occasions but she chose not to she suggests that she is attractive for boys wanting casual sex but she is not a slut. She has the sexual capital but she chooses not to spend it.

The moral double standard of 'honour for a boy vs. shame for a girl' is internalised by girls, they do not want to be ashamed by being labelled as 'sluts'. However, girls' management of the SDS by having a boyfriend not only gives them safety and saves them from shame, it also has a benefit in terms of social status. Complying with the SDS grants girls a 'boyfriend', and 'having a boyfriend' grants a higher social status in the gendered hierarchy of the school than they would have if they were single girls having casual sex with varied male partners (Fasula et al. 2014; Youdell 2005). As Allison and Risman argue, the endorsement of the SDS by women is "a strategy of differentiating the self from others used to elevate reputation and status among peers" (2013: 1192). However, it is a fine line to balance between being a good or a bad girl (Fasula et al. 2014; Powell 2010; Pascoe 2007), one that girls can easily fall on the wrong side of, and one that has to be constantly policed by peers (Youdell 2005) – in my sample especially by boys.

I observed that it was rare that the girls in the interviews referred to actual girls as 'sluts'. 'Slut' was a label that girls were keen to avoid for themselves, but they did not commonly participate in "slut shaming", "the practice of maligning women for presumed sexual activity" (Armstrong, Hamilton, Armstrong & Seely 2014: 100). Lyons et al. (2011) also argue that when it came to girls' assessing their own or their female friends or close circle of peers' sexual behaviour, they were more accepting and less judgemental than when talking in general. Although some scholars claim (e.g. Youdell 2005) that it is primarily girls who police girls' sexual behaviour, among my respondents it was more common that boys, not girls talked about actual girls as 'sluts', and it was boys who defined the dichotomous categories applied for girls. Girls who were complicit to SDS were judgemental about promiscuous behaviour, but rarely named concrete girls as 'sluts', at least in the interviews.

Despite the fact that girls do comment that some boys are just interested in sex, they do not differentiate between boys who are just suitable for casual sex and boys suitable for boyfriends, at least not in their discourse. Boys, however, do exactly that, they feel entitled to draw the line between 'sluts' and 'girlfriend material', and also to decide which side of the line they are positioning themselves in the given situation and how to approach the available girls. As Adél pointed out, many boys change their sexual partners on a daily basis, but it is only girls who are called 'whores' if they have similar sexual behaviour. The boys are not 'male sluts'; such an expression does not exist in the discourse of my respondents; even the girls who are critical about the SDS do not use a term to define boys who are into casual sex with multiple partners. Boys' sexual desire was taken to be so 'natural' and 'unrestrainable' that the equivalent of 'slut' did not apply to it. The existence of the word 'slut' for women and the lack of a similar word for men is in itself a linguistic manifestation of the SDS. Many authors writing about SDS confirm this (e.g. Armstrong et al. 2014; Jackson & Cram 2003), and there are some who report the existence of words for men who are into casual sex with multiple partners, such as 'stag', 'legend' and 'player' (e.g. Flood 2013; Powell 2010; Bogle 2008), but unlike 'slut', these words do not have a derogatory connotation.

Pascoe found that among her respondents 'male whore' was used for promiscuous boys, but this was a term that boys "proudly donned" (2007: 91). Flood, however, found that among his respondents (young men aged 18-24) the term 'male slut' was emerging, and it was a derogatory term for men who were "excessively" active sexually or were having sex "with the wrong women" (too young or sluts themselves) (2013: 98). Flood concludes that the emergence of the category of 'male slut' "represents a slight weakening, at most, of the sexual double standard and the ethos of male sexual licence, and perhaps an increased policing of male sexual behaviour, especially by women." However, the "reputation 'male slut' does not have the same moral and disciplinary weight of the term 'slut' when applied to women"

(2013: 105). Bogle also found that sometimes "male-slut" or "man-whore" were used for sexually highly active men, but rather as a joke, not in a derogatory sense (2008: 105).

The boys in Pascoe's (2007) research were high school students in the US, Bogle's (2008) respondents were American college students, and Flood's interviewees were recruited from colleges and a youth club in Australia, all aged 18-24. In all three works we can find some critical reflection on the SDS by men, even though they were clearly the beneficiaries of it. In Marzipan, however, there was not a single sexually active boy among my respondents who would reflect on the inequality or unfairness of the SDS. They took it for granted, some helpfully explained to me that this is how it is with boys and girls, and unlike the girls who provided reflection, criticism, rejection or strategic accommodation of the SDS and highlighted its complexity, the boys strictly divided girls into binary categories and assessed their sexual "value" for themselves.

Levi is in the position of "alpha male", a positive role model in his form, he is sexually experienced, confident, handsome and up-to-date in fashion, so much so that according to his girl classmates, many boys look up to him and ask him for guidance in fashion and hairdo issues. Interestingly, he is a dark-skinned Roma boy, and it seems that his ethnicity does not disturb his high position in the peer hierarchy. Ironically, because of his fashion awareness, he often gets the joke that he must be gay. While his ethnic 'otherness' is ignored, nobody seriously thinks he is gay. Being gay *and* Roma would certainly not allow him to be in a top position in the masculinity hierarchy.

He claims he used to have a lot of one-night stands before he started his relationship with his current girlfriend, but now he does not want any. He projects himself as so desirably heteromasculine that before he met his girlfriend and was partying a lot, he didn't even have to lift a finger, he was subjected to a multitude of girls' desires:

227

> Sometimes it happened that I barely entered the party place and we started dancing and the girls started coming up to me. And then I don't know, they made a pass at me, started caressing me and everything. And then they were coming all the time, even in the toilet, all over the place, they were totally up for everything. *(Levi 17, interview)*

It may be tempting to read this narrative as an active expression of female desire and using the boy for the girl's own pleasure. According to his narrative, the girls were sexually objectifying him, approached his body as a sex object without being explicitly invited to do so. However, I think that even if this is the case, he does not position himself as violated, as a helpless guy whom women tear apart but one who has the free will to ultimately decide whether he responds to such objectification. Thus he is free to 'subjectify himself back' any time and select among the girls who are trying to get his sexual attention, therefore the girls still remain in a subordinate, easily objectified position.

As in the monogamous relationship vs. one-night stand dichotomy, there is also a double standard in losing virginity: besides feeling entitled to decide which girls are suitable for which kind of sexual relations, boys also draw up a dichotomy of virgin girls and whores. As Levi explains,

> For men it's the sooner you lose it [the better] and for girls I think it's the later the better. (…) Because for men the sooner you lose it the cooler you are (…). Girls, I think, the sooner they lose it the bigger whores they are. *(Levi 17, interview)*

The double standard manifests in the word usage again: he is not talking about boys and girls or men and women, but men and girls. If a boy loses it at an early age, that's cool and he turns into a man overnight, if a girl does so, she is a whore and still a girl. The man is "cool", the woman is a 'whore', one has positive, the other negative meaning. In the same conversation Tibi specifies the circumstances of losing virginity and turning into a whore:

228

> [I]f she doesn't lose it in a disco or something but for example I've been together with her for I don't know how long and then, (…) if we get together when we're 12 and we've been together for a year, then why not? Because then I'd be like, I'd want her to lose it. *(Tibi 16, interview)*

According to Tibi, if it doesn't happen in a disco but they have been in a relationship for a long time, it is okay for a girl to lose virginity early – because he would want her to, as well. This implies that having a boyfriend and his desires overwrite the early age factor, so if a girl loses her virginity early with a boyfriend, she will not turn into a whore, but if she loses it in casual sex, she will.

This suggests that boys think 12-13-year-old boys are ready for having sex but girls are not – except if they are in a relationship and their 12-13-year old boyfriend wants it. When I asked them how it was possible then for 12-13-year-old boys to have sex if the girls of the same age were not supposed to have sex, they answered that in that case they would have to have sex with older girls or "the kind who is not reliable and is only good for a one-night stand". As far as boys' losing virginity as early as possible is concerned, the age of those girls who are "not reliable", "only good for a one-night stand", apparently does not matter. Thus, there is an age double standard constructed within the sexual double standard of boys and girls losing virginity: girls who lose virginity with their boyfriends are the right age, even if they are very young, and girls who do not lose it with their boyfriends but in casual sex are the wrong age when they lose it.

I was not the only one to wonder which older girl would have sex with a 12-13 year old boy, considering how girls complain about the sexual incompetence of boys of even their age, let alone younger ones:

> They think that a girl should be a virgin until the age of eighteen. Well, it's interesting if the boy can have sex at age fifteen and the girl can't, then how they would manage that. Everything for boys, nothing for girls. *(Evelin 19, interview)*

229

Evelin cynically comments on the double standard of losing virginity, and also on the double standard of sexual access for girls and boys, from which we can see again that girls are aware of it and are critical about it. However, we can also see from the analysed excerpts that it is straight boys who construct the discursive frames of access to sexual partners, and even though the majority of straight girls criticise this double standard, they still, to some extent, go into a "patriarchal bargain" (Kandiyoti 1988), they rather negotiate than resist the SDS, in order to strengthen their social positioning and avoid falling on the wrong side of the good girl/bad girl dichotomy.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed how gendered difference between women and men gets constituted in Marzipan through discourses of sexual pleasure in the school nurse's and students' talk about having sex. I have argued that despite a feminist consensus in the literature about the importance of discussing pleasure in sex education, these pleasure discourses should be interrogated critically. Critical scholars (Allen 2012, Rasmussen 2012, Lamb 2010) reveal how neoliberal-postfeminist pleasure discourses re-objectify women sexually and offer women restricted forms of sexual agency and empowerment. I have added boys' voice to these critiques (which mainly focus on girls and sex educators) and I claim that the problem lies not only in the neoliberal-postfeminist framework subjectifying young women in certain ways but also in not questioning 'old' hegemonic masculinist discourses of sexuality (including objectification and the sexual double standard) at the same time. This results in the reinforcement of such discourses, which in turn re/produce gender dichotomy and male dominance in heterosexuality. As Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue, hegemonic masculinity is a historically-socially changing phenomenon, adjusting to the given

230

social environment. If young women are now supposed to be sexually agentic and empowered, hegemonic masculinity finds the appropriate forms to reinstate its hegemony. For boys who were not in dominant positions in the peer hierarchy and were not experienced sexually (which usually stood together) only such dominant, heterosexist, hegemonic models were offered to follow by their sexually experienced male peers. Many sexually experienced heterosexual girls were claiming sexual autonomy and agency for themselves but only as much as it could be negotiated within a system where their sexual desires and pleasures were ultimately dependent on male desires and pleasures, only as much as it would not undermine their attractive femininity and their position on the right side of dichotomies defined through sexual double standards by boys. Unintentionally, discourses of pleasure in sex education contributed to the re/production of gendered distinctions, as they were calling on girls to explore their bodies and claim their pleasures, also calling on boys to explore girls' bodies and give them pleasures but not encouraging boys to explore their own bodies and pleasures. Therefore both for girls and boys only restricted sexual subjectivities were available and as sexuality is central in constituting gender dichotomies, also only restricted gendered subjectivities were available for them.

Chapter 6: Constituting Ethnicity through Discourses of Virginity and Marriage

Introduction

In this chapter I analyse how ethnicity gets constituted through discourses of sexuality. Joane Nagel (2003) argues that sexuality is ethnicized and ethnicity is sexualised, they are mutually constitutive of each other. Here I focus on two discursive sites of sexuality where ethnic subjectivity constitution can be captured in my respondents' discourses and practices: 'virginity' and 'marriage'. First I reflect on how the ethnic subjectivities of my respondents are constructed, how they draw group boundaries and personal ethnic identities discursively by setting up a "hierarchy within the Other" and positioning themselves in relation to 'other kinds of Roma people'. Then I inquire into the discursive sites of virginity and marriage. These two discourses are not separate, their overlapping is constitutive of Gypsy ethnicity in itself. I look at both how Gypsy ethnicity becomes constituted by Gypsies and Hungarians and how Gypsies differentiate among themselves, creating an inter-group ethnic hierarchy through discourses of virginity and marriage. I also try to find out how virginity and marriage are also discursive sites for majority Hungarian ethnicity constitution. I argue that the discursive frame of 'gift-giving' is not appropriate for describing how most Gypsy girls I interviewed deal with their virginity, it can be better described by the notion of 'trading'. In discourses of virginity and marriage there is also an underlying theme of 'choice' and 'agency'. In my discussion I reflect on how neoliberal/postfeminist discourses on women's choice and sexual agency influence my Gypsy respondents' discourses and practices of trading their virginity to 'the right boy' at the chosen time. I point out that trading virginity to the right boy in return for love, loyalty and a stable long-term relationship and possibly later marriage is a modernised version of traditional virgin-marriages, in which, instead of the parents choosing the husband

for the girl, girls have agency and choice in selecting the appropriate partner to trade their treasure with. I also argue that my Hungarian respondents, who lack the comparable ethnicized sexual traditions that Gypsies have negatively constitute their ethnicity through defining their sexual practices related to virginity and marriage as 'non-Gypsy'.

I discuss only female virginity here. The reason for this is that as far as virginity and marriage are concerned, among my respondents discourse on boys' sexuality does not appear to be constitutive of ethnicity, whereas for girls it is one of the most important sexual notions through which they construct their ethnicity or their ethnicity gets constructed by others. This is affirmed both by anthropological literature on Gypsies (e.g. Bosnjak & Acton 2013; Gay y Blasco 1999; Okely 1983), and by the discourses of both my female and male respondents.[95] When it comes to talking about virginity and marriage, the boys (with no difference with regard to their ethnicity) always switch fast to a discussion of girls' virginity loss and how (Vlach) Gypsy women get married very early. Neither can we learn much about ethnicized male sexuality from the girls. Whereas both boys and girls actively constitute female Gypsy ethnicity through sexuality, the ethnicity of the male partner does not get specifically marked. He is rather invisible in the given activity or visible as the receiver of the girl's gift and judged by the girl as either worthy or unworthy of it, but the discourse of a specific ethnicized male Gypsy sexuality does not emerge from the interviews. It is the woman on whose body ethnicized sexuality is inscribed (see also: Gay y Blasco 1999) by receiving the focus in losing virginity, getting married early, performing a virginity test on the wedding night, wearing long skirts from adolescence or a white dress for wedding, or giving birth to many children at an early age. We do not get a clear idea about what Gypsy men's sexuality is like from these discourses. The issue of boys' vs. girls' virginity and the related sexual double

---

[95] My analysis is limited because of the small number of Gypsy boy respondents (see: Chapter 2), but my limited findings are confirmed by the missing discourse of Gypsy male sexuality in the literature, especially on the issue of virginity and marriage.

standards are rather constitutive of gender than ethnicity, therefore I discuss this dichotomy in Chapter 5, Section 2.3. This is why this chapter is about the constitution of ethnicity through female sexuality only.

1. My respondents and their ethnicities

In this section I introduce Hungarian literature on race and ethnicity and discuss my Gypsy respondents' ethnic self-identification strategies and construction of intra-ethnic hierarchies based on sexual 'traditions' and bodily hygiene. I argue that the Romungro vs. Vlach Gypsy dichotomy constructed by Romungros functions similarly to the Hungarian vs. Gypsy dichotomy constructed by Hungarians.

In the Hungarian literature – unlike in the American one – the equivalent of 'race' is rarely used,[96] and there are no theoretical debates about whether Gypsies should be seen as a race or an ethnicity from a sociological-anthropological perspective. In the texts written in English (e.g. Durst 2011, 2002; Kóczé 2011, 2009; Kligman 2001; Emigh, Fodor & Szelényi 2001), both race and ethnicity are used. Durst states that she consistently uses "the term 'ethnic group', indicating that an approach which perceives race in an essentialist sense emphasising the biological differences among different people is unacceptable for [her]" (2011: 16). Race, however, is a valid category, especially in a political context, and in discussing the individual and institutional racism affecting Hungarian Gypsies, be they called 'ethnicity' or 'ethnic minority'. Kóczé (2011, 2009) uses both terms, not very consistently, and does not elaborate on her usage of the terms, but from her topic and approach it is clear that her use of 'race' serves the political purpose of highlighting racism against Roma. Kligman, coming from an American academic background, uses 'race' and 'racialisation' (of poverty) in her text (2001). Emigh, Fodor and Szelényi (2001), reflecting on how underclass formation becomes

---

[96] An exception is Ladányi and Szelényi (2000); they use 'race or ethnicity' several times in their text but do not reflect on this usage.

234

racialized/ethnicized, explain the differentiation thus: "We use the term 'racialization' in contrast to 'ethnicization'. (…) [W]e use 'race' to refer to social actors' cultural distinction based on physical and biological differences, and 'ethnicity' to their cultural distinctions based on social differences" (2001: 5). They use both, because they argue that "the process of turning cultural distinctions based on social differences into cultural distinctions based on physical differences may be the exclusionary classificatory process linked to underclass formation" (2001: 5).

Theoretical debates of ethnicity are not very extensive in the Hungarian literature. Here I do not wish to discuss demographical definitions of ethnicity, which is a major topic for discussion in the Hungarian literature on Gypsies, but rather focus on anthropological and sociological approaches. Most Hungarian authors, especially anthropologists (e.g. Durst 2011, 2006; Bakó 2002) use a concept of ethnicity as a social construction which is relational and situational. They question demographers' use of ethnic categories as fixed and exclusive (e.g. Kemény 2004; Ladányi & Szelényi 2004; Kertesi & Kézdi 1998) and are critical about the debate that the two Hungarian schools of demography sustain about how to identify and count Gypsies.[97] Most of the works which engage with international literature on ethnicity (e.g. Durst 2011, 2006; Tóth 2007) refer to Fredrik Barth's essay (1994 [1969]) as a foundation of their theoretical approach to ethnicity, in which Barth questions the assumption that in defining ethnic groups, sharing a common culture should be seen as a foundational characteristic of the group. Instead, he argues, sharing a common culture is rather an "implication or result" of group organization and boundary maintenance (1994: 11), and it is

---

[97] There has been an endless debate among Hungarian sociologists about "who is a Gypsy?" and how different quantitative and qualitative methods can be used to identify and count Gypsies (see: e.g. Havas, Kemény & Kertesi 2000; Ladányi & Szelényi 2000). One school claims that those people should be considered Gypsies who identify themselves as such (this method is most commonly used at censuses), the other school claims that the environment's assessment (by environment they either mean neighbours or local social, educational or government professionals) should be taken as a reliable source of data. The different methods result in very different estimations of the Gypsy population (2 vs. 8-10% of the Hungarian population), which can be a crucial difference with regard to policy-making.

the construction and maintenance of social boundaries that defines the ethnic group, the ethnic identities of group members and inter-ethnic relations (1994: 15-16). How fixed or flexible, relational these boundaries are defined and treated by these anthropologists varies. Stewart criticizes Barth's theory of ethnic boundaries, claiming that it constructs ethnic groups as stable and clearly definable groups (1997). In my reading, Barth does not speak about fixed boundaries but claims that the constant negotiation of boundaries has an ethnic identity and group-forming function. It is exactly the constant negotiation which makes boundaries, identities and groups fluid and ever-changing.

There is not much discussion in the Hungarian literature on Gypsies about any further development of ethnicity theories after Barth's text, first published in 1969. Those who do provide references to later literature are anthropologists who have realized in the field that the communities they were observing were not homogenous, internally bounded groups with clear boundaries of personal and group ethnic boundaries. To point this out, they most often refer to Eriksen (1993) and argue that ethnicity is relational and situational (see: e.g. Durst 2011: 14), and to Brubaker (2001), to claim that ethnic categories do not describe homogenous groups (see: e.g. Durst 2011: 14).

1.1. Ethnic self-identification

As a marker of my respondents' subjectivities, ethnicity can function as a dichotomous identity marker, a hybrid subjectivity marker, a fluid, relational and situational category, a continuum, a set of subjectivities related to one another through a net of power relations. These are not exclusive categories but ways of describing how ethnicity gets manifested and functions discursively. As I argue in Chapter 1, ethnicity, like gender and class, is

performatively constituted (see: Nagel 2003). By examining discursive constitutions of ethnicity through sexuality, I provide examples for the performativity of ethnicity.

When it comes to declarative self-identification, as for example to the question "What ethnicity do you belong to?", it seems that my respondents place themselves on a sort of continuum, not a horizontal but a vertical one, where 'full Hungarian' is at the top of the hierarchy, and 'full Gypsy' is at the bottom.[98] The interviewed teachers are all Hungarians; some students identify as Hungarians, some as Gypsies, half-Gypsies, quarter-Gypsies, Hungarians with Gypsies in the family, Hungarians who grew up among Gypsies, Hungarians with one Gypsy parent or unknown but suspectedly Gypsy parent (father). There is one girl who is said to be half-Gypsy by her friends but she does not define herself as such, and there are a few respondents who do not define their ethnicity. One Gypsy girl jokingly refers to herself as Italian, another girl with a traditionally Gypsy family name who identifies as Hungarian says she has Italian ancestors.[99] 'Half-Gypsy' (*félcigány*) identification is especially noteworthy because no one identifies as 'half-Hungarian' (*félmagyar*) if s/he has one Gypsy and one Hungarian parent, which shows that Hungarianness is understood as being at the top of the ethnic hierarchy and Gypsiness at the bottom. Therefore being 'only' 'half-Hungarian' would indicate a lower position in the hierarchy in comparison to being Hungarian, whereas being 'only' 'half-Gypsy' indicates a mobility potential from the bottom towards the top. Those respondents who identify as half-Gypsy usually talk about Gypsies in ways that indicate their belonging to a (Romungro) Gypsy community but also their self-distinction from Gypsies. This ambivalence can be captured especially in their discourses of female Gypsy sexuality.

---

[98] For a discussion of my usage of ethnic categories (Gypsy vs. Roma, Hungarian, White), see: Chapter 2.
[99] Claiming Italian ancestors is likely to be a strategy for handling the incongruity between Hungarian identity and Gypsy physical appearance (dark skin, black hair – stereotypical Italian physical features).

From the perspective of social interactions, ethnicity is relational and situational, i.e. it is fluid and it depends on the situation and the person's relative positioning in that situation what kind of ethnicity s/he will perform. Judit Durst (2011) argues that 'ethnicity' in itself is an empty category and a shorthand, mistakenly used by anthropologists and sociologists to describe people grouped together also by a variety of non-ethnic characteristics (e.g. low education or low income in Gypsy communities). She argues for viewing ethnicity as a "relational variable", "not only the sum total of a number of other factors (social status characteristics and cultural practices) but [one that] is at the same time embedded in the social context which determines the place of the examined ethnic group within the tissue of the interethnic relations of the surrounding society." It is through interethnic relations that 'Gypsiness' acquires its meaning (2011: 27). I argue that viewing ethnicity as a relational variable gains specific meanings not simply through the relationship with non-Gypsies but through sexualised subjectivities attributed to 'Gypsiness', both by 'Gypsies' and by 'Hungarians'.

Nagel argues that ethnic identification is situational and changeable, it involves "internal and external opinions and processes, as well as the individual's self-identification and outsiders' ethnic designations" (1994: 154; see also: Durst 2011: 14; Silverman 1988). This means that the self-definition of my respondents as Gypsy/Hungarian/half-Gypsy etc. depends on the situation, the discursive context and power relations in which the act of self-identification or self-positioning happens. For example, the same person can say she is a Gypsy and proud to be one in one situation, while she may identify or try to 'pass' as a Hungarian in another situation where claiming a Gypsy ethnicity seems to be irrelevant or risky. As I have observed, the same person claiming different ethnicities or being interpellated as belonging to different ethnicities by different people or in different situations is a common practice among my Gypsy respondents. Vasquez remarks that such situational identification has its limits imposed by the racialised perception of characteristics such as surname or phenotype (2010:

238

47). She introduces the term "flexible ethnicity" which indicates "the ability to deftly and effectively navigate different racial terrains and be considered an 'insider' in more than one racial or ethnic group" (2010: 46). She points out that despite the intention of the actor to assert a certain racial/ethnic identity in the given situation, those who perceive these assertions may not accept the intended identification and ascribe a different racial/ethnic identity to the given actor (2010: 46). Nagel also notes that "ethnic identity is both optional and mandatory, as individual choices are circumscribed by the ethnic categories available at a particular time and place" and individuals' choices of their ethnicity are "generally limited to socially and politically defined ethnic categories with varying degrees of stigma or advantage attached to them" (1994: 156).

Among my Gypsy respondents I witnessed instances of flexible ethnic identification, but sometimes the Roma person's White classmates identified the Gypsy person as Gypsy despite her/him defining herself/himself as White Hungarian. As Neményi and Vajda remark in their study about identity strategies among adolescents belonging to ethnic minorities, ethnic minority self-identifications "reflect (…) widespread practices of ethnic (religious, national and racial) labelling that are prevalent in the given country" (2014: 104); choices between the maintenance or trivialisation of ethnic identity are never completely voluntary but shaped by the social and political context (104-105). For example there was a girl among my respondents who identified herself as a Hungarian but admitted that her mother was of Gypsy origin. However, her Hungarian classmates, relying on the stereotype that Gypsies steal, identified her as a Gypsy because she had allegedly stolen one of her classmate's phone.

I often refer in this chapter to 'traditional' vs. 'modern' or 'modernized' Gypsy groups and customs, and sexualised ethnic traditions. I base this distinction on Hungarian literature on Gypsies and on my respondents' perceptions of 'traditions' and 'traditional'. Hungarian

ethnographic studies on Gypsies are mostly based on fieldwork in certain rural Gypsy communities, typically in a small town, village or settlement with 100% or a majority of Gypsy inhabitants. Urban Gypsies, who are assimilated into majority society to some extent, have not received much attention from Hungarian sociologists and anthropologists since the second part of the 1990s, although earlier a number of descriptive studies dealt with the topic of urban Gypsies, their lifestyles and assimilation strategies (see e.g. Niedermüller 1994; Ladányi 1989; Ambrus 1988). Horváth notes that most Hungarian anthropological studies focus on Vlach Gypsies, seeing them as more 'traditional' and making generalisations about 'Vlach culture' as 'traditional Gypsy culture'. This approach devalues or is disinterested in assimilated Romungros or Hungarian Gypsies, and considers Romungros as a group 'halfway between being Gypsy and Hungarian', going towards a 'cultural cul-de-sac' (2002: 247-248). The same distinction is made by my Gypsy respondents: as I discuss in the following section, they see Vlach Gypsies as traditional and Romungros as modern, assimilated, urbanized (although they do not use these terms). The means by which they make this intra-ethnic distinction is sexualised ethnic 'traditions'. Accordingly, I will also refer to these as 'traditions'. These sexual traditions prescribe "'[p]roper' gender roles and sexual behavior" which "are essential to ethnic group membership and ethnic boundaries" (Nagel 2003: 56).

1.2. Constructing a "hierarchy within the Other" through sexuality

I have pointed out that there is a continuum in Gypsy ethnic identification, with a degree of flexibility. However, when it comes to sexuality, ethnicity becomes dichotomous. It appears to be very important for those who identify with some degree of Gypsy ethnicity to establish a hierarchy within the diverse Gypsy community, a "hierarchy within the Other" (Youdell, 2003: 9). My Gypsy respondents are explicitly constructing such a hierarchy discursively, in which they position themselves above 'other kinds of Gypsies' by referring to certain

240

sexualised cultural traditions (such as marrying as a virgin, arranged marriages at a young age, virginity test at the wedding night, having children early) to claim a subjectivity and differentiate themselves from 'Others' whom they position lower in the hierarchy. Positioning themselves as not following such ethnic sexual traditions serves to constitute a certain sexualized ethnic subjectivity.

From the perspective of this chapter, it is the sexualized distinction between the Romungro and Vlach Gypsy groups that is of interest, but the respondents also use the notion of criminal or rude behaviour for the performative constitution of the intra-group hierarchy. I do not wish to elaborate the distinction between 'good' and 'bad' Gypsies, i.e. 'decent' and 'criminal' or 'rude' behaviour made by students, because it is outside of my focus. In her study, Horváth (2002) discusses the conditions of Gypsies considering themselves and each other 'good Gypsies', and how they use the notion of 'Vlach Gypsies' to other Gypsies from other families or other villages, with whom they do not want to be associated. Calling other Gypsies 'Vlach Gypsies' is a discursive tool that Gypsies use when talking with Hungarians, with the aim to demonstrate to the Hungarians that they are 'good Gypsies' and are not the lowest in the social hierarchy.

This was a common discourse among my respondents as well: the Gypsy students mostly differentiated between Romungros (*romungrók* or *magyar cigányok*) and Vlach gypsies (*oláh cigányok*) – two major Gypsy ethnic groups in Hungary. The ethnic composition of the Gypsy population in Hungary is more complex than this (see, e.g. Kemény & Janky 2005), but my respondents differentiate only between these two groups and position themselves in one of them – the Romungro one.[100] This way the dichotomized division of Gypsies vs. Hungarians is discursively reproduced within the Gypsy community; the Vlach vs. Romungro division is

---

[100] Two respondents also mention Musician (*Muzsikus*) Gypsies as a group they identify themselves with, but they use it as a synonym for Romungro. Musicians have been a prestigious group among Gypsies, highly positioned in the intra-ethnic hierarchy (Kemény 2000).

in many ways analogous with the Gypsy vs. Hungarian division. Romungros are considered to be more modernized, assimilated, more urbanized, while Vlachs are considered to be very traditional, with 'outdated' customs, rural lifestyle and low education. All my respondents who claim some sort of Gypsy identity are quick to assert that they do not belong to a traditional community, they are not Vlach gypsies, that those traditional communities live in the countryside, as opposed to them, urban Gypsies, who are more 'developed', i.e. more assimilated. By claiming being modernized, urbanized, developed, assimilated as values, my respondents use and appropriate the discourse of 'development', according to which 'traditional', rural, non-assimilated (into the oppressive majority) means 'backward', and those social groups that are seen as 'backward', are in need of modernisation, in the name of 'development', which is viewed as a linear progress from lower to higher socio-economic status and a 'better quality of life' (Crush 1999; Spivak 1999). Serban-Temisan describes a similar phenomenon among different groups of Romanian Gypsies and between Romanians and Gypsies (2011: 17). The Vlach vs. Romungro ethnic categories function as a tool for constructing the hierarchy and positioning oneself in it, the ethnic categories are applied as a shorthand to correspond to the perceived socio-economic-cultural characteristics of the two groups. The Vlach-Romungro hierarchy functions only within the Gypsy community, the differentiation is made only by Gypsy respondents; Hungarians tend to use the same negative stereotypes about all Gypsies as the Romungro respondents use to describe Vlachs.

Some Romungro respondents explain what Vlach Gypsies are like:

> There are types among Gypsies, Musicians, Vlachs, all sorts. For example, Vlach Gypsies are like they have I don't know what kind of rules, like you have to marry at a certain age. There are some who sell their daughter at a young age to the child of another family, and then they will be obliged to marry, and stupid stuff like this. *(Levi, half-Gypsy boy, 17, interview)*
>
> *

242

> Vlach Gypsies (Szabi: those folks with big skirts) still strictly keep their traditions, nobody cares about rights there, they even marry a girl at age 13 there. They are like Arabs. *(Henrik, half-Gypsy boy, 18; Szabi, half-Gypsy boy, 16, interview)*

The three boys identify themselves as half-Gypsies. When I ask in Henrik's group who is Gypsy among them, he says he is but quickly adds that he is a 'Hungarian Gypsy', because one of his parents is Hungarian. They refer to sexual traditions when explaining the perceived difference between the two ethnic groups. Levi comments that arranged marriages between young people are "stupid stuff". Henrik refers back to my question about sexual rights earlier in the interview, such as the age of consent and legal marital age, when he claims that Vlach Gypsies do not care about the rights of young people. He contrasts strictly keeping traditions with respecting the rights of children. Both Levi's judgement that arranged marriages are "stupid" and Henrik's point that it is against the rights of children to marry them off at age 13 are constitutive of their ethnic difference: Vlachs are 'backward' with their traditions, Romungros are more advanced, and their backwardness is manifested in their sexual traditions, in marrying minor girls off. Szabi's comment is interesting because he offers "those folks with big skirts" as an explanation about Vlachs, identifying Vlachs with Vlach women, which implies that in his perception the women's embodied ethnicized practice (wearing a certain kind of skirt) represents Vlach ethnicity in its entirety. As Nagel argues, sexual representations of ethnicity serve to reinforce and strengthen ethnic group boundaries (2003: 55-56). In this case a strong ethnic boundary is drawn between two groups through referring to gendered sexual traditions, and this boundary indicates a hierarchy between the two groups.

In the above quote Henrik compares Vlach Gypsies to Arabs, pointing out that in both groups girls are married off at an early age. Then he finds a group that he can position even lower in the "hierarchy within the Other" than Vlach Gypsies (and Arabs):

243

Henrik: I don't judge people by their skin colour, but by what they are like. I only hate Romanians, but them I hate very much. They are dirty, they stink (…).

DR: Are all Romanians like that?

Henrik: Yes. All of them. *(Henrik, half-Gypsy boy, 18, interview)*

Vlach Gypsies originally come from Romania,[101] and it is quite common in Hungarian colloquial speech to call Hungarian Vlachs 'Romanian Gypsies' (*román cigányok*). It is not clear whether Henrik refers to 'Romanian Gypsies' and differentiates them from Vlachs, or to 'Romanian' migrant workers (who can be anyone with dark skin and hair who does not speak Hungarian). In the former case he creates a position in the ethnic hierarchy even lower than that of Vlachs: Romanian Gypsies. In the latter case he overturns the perceived ethnic hierarchy in the neighbouring country where there is also a significant Gypsy population: Romanian Gypsies (who are related to Vlachs or are Vlachs) are 'bad', but Romanians are 'even worse'. In either case, he readjusts the hierarchy and 'saves' Hungarian Vlachs from being at the very bottom, by adding a nationalist twist to the issue through hating Romanians.

The reason why Henrik hates 'Romanians' is the lack of personal hygiene ("they are dirty, they stink"). In this context 'hygiene' serves as a site where ethnic/national differentiation and performative ethnicity constitution take place. In other contexts, hygiene can be a site for sexuality and class constitution, which I discuss in Chapter 4. Whereas there are 'good' and 'bad' Gypsies, 'modernised' and 'backward' ones, *all* Romanians are labelled as dirty and stinking by him, therefore they can uniformly be placed at the bottom of the hierarchy without any further debate. This hierarchisation is very similar to the one I discuss in Chapter 4, Section 2, where one teacher, Lujza, sets up a hierarchy at the bottom of which there are vocational students who are also unhygienic, 'dirty' and 'stinking'.

---

[101] Anthropologically and linguistically, Romungros on the one hand and Vlachs and Boyash on the other are two different ethnic groups. Romungros speak Hungarian, Vlach speak dialects of Romani (Lovari or Kalderash) and Boyash speak an ancient version of Romanian as a native language. However, only about 10% of Roma people speak their native language nowadays (Kemény & Janky 2005).

2. Treasure or pleasure? Constituting adolescent Gypsy ethnicities through discourses of losing / giving away virginity and marriage

After a brief inquiry into the complexities of ethnic self-identification and self-positioning in ethnicized social hierarchy, in the rest of the chapter I discuss how ethnic self-identification and self-positioning happens through sexuality discourses. The discursive sites through which ethnic subjectivity constitution is best observable are virginity and marriage. I treat the discourses of both virginity and marriage as sexuality discourses; the former because losing virginity is understood to mean the starting of sexual activity, the latter because it is some of the sexual aspects of marriage, namely marrying as a virgin or marrying the boyfriend one gave her virginity to, and virginity test on the wedding night, that is constitutive of Gypsy ethnicity. In fact, the overlapping of the discursive sites of virginity and marriage are in themselves constitutive of Gypsy ethnicity (see e.g. Neményi 1999; Gay y Blasco 1997), at least in traditional communities where girls are expected to marry as virgins. Virginity and marriage appear to be central issues for my secondary-school-aged respondents: virginity because most adolescents acquire their first sexual experiences during this period, and marriage because lower educated people – especially those from Gypsy ethnic background – tend to marry at quite a young age, soon after, or even during the completion of compulsory education (see: e.g. Durst 2006). Durst argues against explaining this phenomenon as a feature of ethnicity or 'Gypsy culture', and claims that chances of economic and social mobility, poverty, familial and social attitudes to motherhood, work and education are the factors that influence reproduction patterns among the Roma (2011: 28).

The Gypsy and Hungarian girls in the interviews tend to have different approaches to female sexuality. It does not necessarily imply different sexual practices, but rather different values attributed to virginity, monogamy, marriage, and the woman's place in a heterosexual relationship. Both the girls and the boys of all ethnic subjectivities refer to gendered and

sexual traditions involving or affecting Gypsy *women* when positioning themselves in the Hungarian-Romungro-Vlach hierarchy; sexualized ethnicity construction appears to hinge on female, not male sexuality. During my research I encountered difficulties recruiting Gypsy male respondents,[102] and in the discourses of my respondents (both Gypsy and Hungarian, male and female) I did not find references to Gypsy male sexuality. In the context of sexuality Gypsy men were only mentioned by Gypsy girls as 'the right' or 'the wrong' men to give their virginity to, and in a few occasions as sexually violent. When respondents talk about (Vlach) Gypsies they cite female gendered and sexual practices and traditions. Discourses of virginity and marriage seem to be constitutive of the ethnicity of my female respondents only. When men are referred to in terms of virginity, the ethnic distinction disappears, and the gender distinction based on the sexual double standard of virginity loss[103] prevails, no matter what ethnic belonging they claim; for boys meanings attached to virginity were not constitutive of ethnicity but of competitive masculinity.

2.1. Definitions of virginity

In her study on gendered experiences of virginity loss among middle-class urban people of various sexual orientations, aged 18-35, Laura M. Carpenter (2002) discusses what kind of meanings people assign to virginity and its loss. She finds that in interpretations of virginity loss, virginity is seen as "a gift, a stigma or a step in the longer process of growing up" (351). These discursive frameworks are different from those of my respondents. My respondents did not say they considered virginity loss as part of a learning process. This may be explained by the fact that her respondents reconstructed their virginity loss experiences retrospectively, some of them from quite a long temporal distance, whereas my respondents either had not lost their virginity yet, or lost it recently, or if not so recently, then maximum 3-4 years before, so

---

[102] For a discussion of this, see: Chapter 2.
[103] See: Chapter 5, section 2.3.

they could not see their recent sexual encounters in a 'process' framework, especially in the process of 'growing up', as they were not 'grown-ups' yet. Carpenter found that gender differences "were least pronounced among people who interpreted virginity loss as a step in a process (2002: 359). In my sample a strongly gender-dichotomous pattern prevailed, in which losing virginity for girls was a disgrace if it happened not with 'the right man' and/or not 'at the right age' (i.e. too young), whereas for boys it was highly esteemed if they lost it at an early age. The girls who lost their virginity out of their own will tended to see virginity loss either as giving away one's treasure, or saving themselves till they felt ready and then lost it, or something that had just happened. Unlike men in Carpenter's study, none of my male respondents saw their own virginity as a gift. The boys who had not lost their virginity at the time of the interview did not talk about it as a stigma, either, although in some cases their non-virgin male peers teased them about it but not to an extent that I would call stigmatisation. For the non-virgin boys virginity loss, whether through casual sex or with their girlfriend, either 'just happened' or was actively sought to happen, as it would increase their masculinity status (see also: Gay y Blasco 1999).

Most of the girls in my sample have already been through their first sexual encounter.[104] All girls (and boys as well) use the term 'losing virginity'; this is the term most commonly used for referring to the event of the first penetrative sexual encounter. My respondents talk about virginity and its loss in a narrow heteronormative framework (see e.g. Medley-Rath 2007). A girl can only lose her virginity if a boy penetrates her vagina with his penis, and a boy can only lose his virginity by penetrating a girl's vagina with his penis. Carpenter's respondents also believed that virginity loss equalled vaginal penetration for straight people, but most of them believed virginity loss was possible with a same-sex partner, through other means than vagina-penis interaction (2002: 349). This was not an option for the three heterosexual girls in

_____

[104] For exact numbers, see: Chapter 3, Section 1.1.

the following conversation, where they talk about one of their male peers who they suspected to be gay or bisexual. The boy claims he has lost his virginity through oral sex, about which the girls express sarcasm, and Vica explains in no uncertain terms that losing virginity equals heterosexual vaginal penetration:

> Emma: Iván said he's not [a virgin] anymore, either.
>
> Vica: Oh, well!
>
> Emőke: From behind!
>
> Vica: You know what he said? 'He's not a virgin anymore'. 'Now. Why? Did you fuck?' 'No, I only got a blow job.' (…) I say, 'Then you're still a virgin, you idiot!' 'But only half-virgin.' Now, if I am eaten out, I'm only half-virgin, or what? Oh my god! Or if I get finger-fucked, 'Hey, I'm not a virgin anymore! Great!' Or I insert a tampon, like these fourteen-year-old little girls. 'If you insert a tampon, you lose your virginity…' It doesn't even go up there! (*Emma 16, Gypsy, Vica 16, Hungarian, Emőke 17, Hungarian, interview*)

Apparently, for Vica the emphasis is not on the technical aspects of breaching the hymen (which can also be done by fingers or tampons) or on experiencing pleasure, but on the act of penetration by a penis. As Emőke indicates jokingly, Iván may be gay and may have received anal penetration, but that does not mean he has lost his virginity, and neither does oral sex (whether by a woman or a man is not important in this instance). As a boy, he would only lose his virginity if he had penetrated a girl. We can see that even Iván is not sure whether he has lost his virginity, because, as Vica reports, after she tells him that if he received oral sex he is still a virgin, he tries to save face by saying that he is only 'half-virgin'. Iván may belong to a small group of respondents who have other ideas about virginity loss, but the mainstream discourse about having sex and losing virginity is narrowly heteronormative, and so are other discourses of sexuality, including 'pleasure', which is discussed in Chapter 5. In Averett, Moore and Price's study (2014) about the meanings of virginity for LGBT people, respondents interpreted virginity loss in varied ways, as a not-one-time event, as having multiple virginities for different sexual experiences (especially by gay men), as a less

248

important event than coming out, and they often used the term "the first time" instead of "losing virginity". Iván, however, whether he is gay or straight, has no other than the heteronormative discursive framework to rely on, so he tries to negotiate a position where his sexual experience is worth at least half of what he values it, but is refuted by one of the girls in his class who, as a heterosexual girl in a long-term relationship with an older (sexually experienced) man, positions herself as someone who can define what virginity loss entails. Thus, she is one of the 'carriers' of the meaning of heteronormative sexuality among her peers (see: Epstein et al. 2003: 27).

2.2. Trading the treasure to 'the right' man

Virginity has an especially high value for girls identifying as (to some extent) Gypsy. It is considered to be the main asset of a girl, and they find it very important to "give it to" the right man (see: Bosnjak & Acton 2013; Neményi 1999). In the following, I argue that for the Gypsy girls in my sample virginity and the circumstances of losing it is constitutive of their ethnicity in ways that it is not constitutive of Hungarian girls' whiteness.

In Carpenter's study some of her respondents frame virginity as a gift. The literature on the notion of 'gift' goes back to Marcel Mauss' pioneering anthropological work *The Gift* (1990 [1925]). Mauss argues that there is no such thing as a 'free gift'. He concludes from his ethnographic work in archaic tribes and societies that when a gift is given, an immediate reciprocation is expected. According to him, the act of giving creates an obligation, "[t]he unreciprocated gift (…) makes the person who has accepted it inferior, particularly when it has been accepted with no thought of returning it" (Mauss, 1990: 65).

The discourse of gift-giving is also deployed in relation to surrogate motherhood. It is one of the major discourses used both by surrogate mothers and institutions offering surrogacy

programs (see: Raphael-Leff 2010; Shaw 2008; Ragoné 1994). Both Ragoné and Shaw claim that women often report altruistic motivations behind becoming surrogate mothers or donating ovarian eggs; they claim they are giving the 'gift of love' or 'the ultimate gift of life'. Shaw and Raphael-Leff argue that surrogacy is not a "free gift", and Shaw points out that whereas giving a "free gift" is an act of altruism (defined as giving something to the other for the other's benefit, voluntarily, without expectations of reciprocity), surrogacy is a "gift-relationship" in Maussian terms, in which a chain of reciprocity is established (2008: 16-17). Shaw concludes that the gift-frame does not fully capture surrogate mothers' motivations, as she found that some women saw their acts rather as "projects of the self, or as events that served to mark out new beginnings in their lives, giving definition to their sense of self" (2008: 20).

It is also true in the case of losing virginity that it is not given "for free", reciprocation is expected, and the notion of gift-giving does not fully describe the act of giving virginity away. I find the notion of 'trading' more appropriate for describing this type of virginity loss experience than that of 'gift-giving', despite the fact that the verb 'give', not 'sell' or 'trade' is used when virginity-loss is discussed by my respondents. My Gypsy girl respondents never use the word 'gift' or 'present' when they talk about the conditions of giving it to their partner. This is not surprising, given that, regardless of gift-theories, in everyday language the word 'gift' (or 'present'; *ajándék*) implies altruistic giving without expectation of return. Instead, Gypsy girls call their virginity a 'treasure' or call it a girl's most important asset. Their discourse constructs virginity as a property and there are conditions to giving it away. The girls try their best to check in advance whether the boy will fulfil the conditions, 'pay the price', that is, reciprocate it with what the girl wants. This exchange is explicitly calculated, and in my view, this is what makes it different to 'gift-giving'. In gift-giving reciprocity is expected but not explicitly, and it is up to the receiver of the gift to decide what is of equal

material or symbolic value to give back. In the trading of virginity, reciprocation is explicitly expected, and it is the girl who defines what she wants as a compensation. Unlike in Mauss' theory, not reciprocating the offer of virginity with the expected love, loyalty and long-term relationship does not make the boy inferior at all, he does not lose his honour and status but leaves the girl cheated out of her most valuable property.

Virginity is not *explicitly* considered to be a property by the Gypsy girls. In the following excerpt Emese and Regina emphasize the emotional aspect of the damage if virginity is given away to the wrong boy. Nevertheless, notions of 'loss', 'damage', 'being cheated out of something', 'being ruined', 'abandonment without reciprocation' imply a sense of property and trading:

> Emese: If she [loses it] out of love, that's fine, but in a one-night-, or two-night-stand it will always be the girl who loses out, nobody else. Because it will be a bad experience for her.
>
> Regina: Yes. I think she would be emotionally ruined. Because I think if the girl is a virgin and she gets an older boy, especially if she fancies him, she'll sleep with him, and from then on she'll cling to that boy, and she'll want to be with him at all costs. And the boy, he's nineteen and has been with several [girls], and it doesn't matter for him, he gets her for one night and then he leaves her and ruins her emotionally… *(Emese 17, Regina 17, Gypsies, interview)*

Most of my Gypsy girl respondents mention the importance of losing one's virginity with 'the right' man and some narrate how they made or are going to make the boy wait for a long time in order to test him. Detti had her first sexual encounter with her former boyfriend at the age of 14. While her age may also have been a factor in making her boyfriend wait for one and a half years, she emphasizes that virginity is a treasure for a girl, so it is very important to be able to decide who to lose it with and when:

> My previous boyfriend waited one and a half years for me. I didn't give myself so easily. (…) The point is not how long he waits, but you can only lose it once, and they say that virginity is a girl's treasure. *(Detti 16, Gypsy, interview)*

251

Regina also talks about having made her boyfriend wait for her for a long time, and she also reflects on the double standards of girls' and boys' sexual availability:

> Well, it's not so important for guys, it's more important for girls, I think. She shouldn't be available to anyone who just looks at her. A girl's honour is lost if she's available and all men think, I guess, that she's an easy lay. A girl has to behave completely differently than a boy. It's good if the boy is running after her and begging her. (…) My boyfriend waited for me for 8 months, and he told me that this was what he liked about me. He was waiting and waiting, it irritated him a lot, but he still liked it. He knew that if he got me for one night, he'd leave me that night. But he managed to wait eight months for me, he fell in love with me, got to know me, and we have stayed together. *(Regina 17, Gypsy, interview)*

Regina describes a kind of dance of purchase, in which the boy is supposed to court the girl and the girl is supposed to resist for a while. She brings her own example to make the point that the resistance increases the girl's value, it ensures that the boy will not just take her virginity and leave, but stay with her. Virginity gains value from the waiting. It has to be seen as valuable by the boy as well, because he is expected to reciprocate by giving the girl what is valuable for her: love, loyalty, partnership. Gypsy girls' 'honour' lies in not being easily available sexually. Gypsy (and Hungarian) boys do not have honour in this sense, their male respectability comes from other performances of masculinity, including having sex with many girls.

Carpenter claims that when virginity is seen as a gift, losing it disempowers women (2002: 359). In my understanding, if virginity is given as a 'gift' it implies less agency over the woman's own sexuality at the moment of giving than 'trading' it and putting effort in advance into ensuring that the man chosen for the transaction will reciprocate it with what the woman, after losing a great deal of her sexual agency, needs: a steady, faithful partner who will not take advantage of her disempowered sexual state. 'Losing virginity' does not imply a passive sexual role, a submission to the boy's desire for these Gypsy girls. The use of a discourse of trading implies their agency in the activity. This is not simply giving up or handing over their

'real treasure', it is rather the result of conscious decision, a transaction. In this sense, virginity is not passivity or lack of sexuality, but an active, agentic sexual status – to decide and maintain virginity in the first phase of a relationship, then to decide when to give virginity away requires agency from these girls. As King argues, such "strategic and transitory abstinence (…) can be a way to reconcile sexual agency with other aspects of their identity" (2014: 323), in this case, their ethnicity. Even more than reconciling, I argue that this virginity discourse actually constitutes Gypsy girls' ethnicity.

Thus, virginity is not simply given but traded for the above-mentioned expectations for the future. As we could see from Vali's discourse, the boy has to deserve it, that is, he has to prove it in advance that he is worthy of receiving a girl's greatest treasure, by waiting, being patient, not being coercive, not imposing his desires on the girl. Below, Margit warns of guys who would take advantage of virgin girls and leave the girl after taking her virginity away:

> Margit: She should give her treasure to someone who deserves it. (…) And not to some ragtag, who says 'I love you' but there is nothing, 'I have just found out that you are a virgin, so come on, let me do you quickly'. No, such guys must be avoided.
>
> (…)
>
> DR: Do you have a plan about when you want to lose it?
>
> Margit: Of course. This boy now, I like him very much. Both inside and outside, and that's a big thing if I say that I like him in all respects. I didn't plan to lose it with him, but he has told me that he's waiting for me, he's not going to coerce me into anything. Now, if he waits, let's say for about 5-6-7 months, then I'll confirm that he really deserves it. *(Margit 17, Gypsy, interview)*

Margit has a plan about how and when to give her virginity to her current boyfriend, in case he proves that he deserves it. The boy indicates his interest in the exchange by promising her to wait and not coerce her to give her virginity to him. This excerpt and also the previous one by Regina show that boys are aware of being subjected to a long-term exchange and express their willingness to duly reciprocate the treasure. This underlines my argument that virginity

253

is better seen to be traded than given as a gift and it suggests that there are two equal trading partners involved in the narrated situations.

Trading virginity well is not only an ethnic but also a class issue. If virginity is the greatest treasure of a girl, and giving virginity is a moment of agency and power for the girls over their sexuality, after losing it they do not have much left. It is here that class and ethnicity converge. A high proportion of Gypsy women are working-class and/or poor (Tóth 2005); these girls often do not have any (or much) property to contribute to the marriage/partnership. More symbolically, the disempowerment by losing virginity reflects the social position of Gypsy women: they have no or little cultural, social or material capital that is considered to be valuable in a racist and sexist White majority society. This is why it is so important to give virginity to 'the right' boy. 'The wrong' boy just takes it away and leaves, which degrades the value of virginity and devalues the girl. Since virginity is the greatest, in fact the only 'tradeable' treasure of many Gypsy girls, giving it to the wrong boy means they have wasted their never-to-return moment of agency and power over their sexuality. "You can only lose it once," as Detti said. From this perspective, virginity is a symbolic capital for socio-economic investment: trading it well may grant a more secure social and economic status for a Gypsy girl.

2.3. Virginity and Hungarian ethnicity

Markers of White (Hungarian) sexuality are more difficult to find. Whiteness/Hungarianness is the unmarked category (Frankenberg 2001; 1993), White/Hungarian sexuality is often discursively constituted by my respondents as non-Gypsy sexuality, or, to say it differently, Hungarian ethnicity is also constituted through Gypsy sexuality in which Gypsies represent deviation from the norm and Hungarians represent the norm. That is, my White respondents'

whiteness, as Frankenberg argues, is marked "in terms of its not-Otherness" (2001: 75). This provides a rather dichotomous framework for the analysis of how Whiteness gets performatively constituted through sexuality. Frankenberg argues that Whiteness is only invisible to Whites, its "unselfconscious performances" (2001: 81) are either unnamed or seen as national or normative (2001: 76).

In the case of Hungarian-identified girls, some also use the trading discourse, especially when they are interviewed in one group with Gypsy girls, but it is more frequent that they talk about their first sexual encounter as something that just happened, either unplanned, or planned in a relationship, and their virginity as something that was 'lost' or 'taken away', as opposed to 'given away'. This is a clear difference between how Gypsy and Hungarian girls talk about virginity and their own experience of losing it, therefore the ways of talking about virginity loss are constitutive of both Gypsy and Hungarian ethnicity, even though the latter more indirectly, as there is no 'Hungarian' ethnicized way to lose virginity.

The reason for narrating virginity loss differently may be that virginity is not seen by the majority of Hungarian girls as a girl's greatest treasure, therefore 'losing it' is not as disempowering, either, or in many cases, it is rather empowering. The circumstances of losing virginity and the person it happens with are also very important for the Hungarian girls, and a desire for having some control over the event is visible in how they speak about it. They also find important the state they are in when it happens, i.e. being sober versus drunk or high, the timing, and the possible consequences, including pregnancy and STDs. But on the whole, losing virginity for most of them is not a conscious, planned *trading* process, as the following three quotes illustrate:

DR: How did you lose your virginity?

Szandra: I was high. *(laughs)* Well, I regret it, but I won't fret about it, I won't get all wound up about it. Well, I was stupid, but I can't turn back time, anyway. (...) All I know is his name. *(Szandra 17, Hungarian, interview)*

*

Emőke: It's important who you lose it with.

Zsófi: And whether you were drunk and you just lost it or something like that.

Vica: But really. And if he entered you, whether you know if you got pregnant or not. (Emőke 16, Vica 16, Zsófi 16, Hungarians, interview)

*

I think virginity is important for a girl. At least for me it was. Okay, I lost it a bit earlier than I wanted, well, not wanted but planned to, or how shall I say it? I didn't think it was moral to lose it so early but I lost it with my boyfriend, and I'm madly in love with him, and I did it only because I completely adore him and he's five years older than me, and he needed this, he expected it, and that's how I gave in. And I've never regretted it. *(Eszter 17, Hungarian, interview)*

Eszter had other plans but she submitted to her boyfriend who claimed that he needed sex. She says virginity is important for a girl but she does not say it is the most important, a treasure. She justifies her decision by loving him and by his older age, that is, having what are considered to be 'adult male' sexual needs. Here there is no pre-planned, calculated trading process with two equal partners and conditions for trading. Although Eszter made the ultimate decision to lose her virginity, the boyfriend exerted pressure. She did not regret it, but she had less sexual agency in her choice than the Gypsy girls cited earlier. The idea in many Gypsy girls' narratives is that 'I will give/gave him my virginity if he proves he loves me/because he proved that he loved me', and the idea in Eszter's and other Hungarian girls' narratives is that 'I gave him my virginity because I love(d) him'. Although Hungarian girls also expect love in return for their love and sexual involvement, this expectation is usually not as clearly articulated as with Gypsy girls.

Hungarian-identified girls tend to be more open about discussing their sexual experiences in the interview, so the girls quoted above turned out to have had pleasurable and active sexual

lives since they lost their virginity, which probably also influences how they look back on their first sexual encounter and how significant they consider it. In the case of Szandra the lack of significance of the event of virginity loss with an unknown boy can perhaps also be attributed to the fact that three years after the event, at the time of the interview, she was involved in a sexually pleasurable, steady lesbian relationship.

'Taking' someone's virginity away suggests even less agency over one's sexuality than 'losing' it. This term was used only once, and, interestingly, it actually referred to a positive experience, a kind of initiation ceremony, which became a moment of sexual empowerment for the girl. Vica (Hungarian girl, 16), after announcing, "Well, yes, he took my virginity, he was the first one," describes the careful, attentive, loving way her 10 years older, experienced boyfriend did it and how good their sex life has been ever since. It seems that 'taking away' is preconditioned by the girl's agency, she has to allow the boy to 'take it away'. Those girls who describe the experience as a coerced one, or a rape, use the term 'losing'. The discourse of 'giving away virginity' is typically indicative of power, agency and Gypsy ethnicity, whereas that of 'losing virginity' is not necessarily so. 'Losing virginity' is a common expression, its usage and implied meaning with reference to power, agency and ethnicity is varied, it does not always imply a lack of power or agency, or violence.

Allen notes that regretting performing the sexual act and a lack of pleasure are common experiences for young people, and that many of them wish "they knew more" about the practicalities of sex in order to experience more pleasure (Allen 2012: 460; see also: Alldred and David, 2007). Some of my Hungarian girl respondents also regretted having had their first sexual encounter with whom they had it, not because of losing sexual agency but rather because it was not pleasurable for them. In one group, Nóri and the other two Hungarian girls

257

all said they would undo it if they could and would rather lose their virginity with their current boyfriend:

> Well, it wasn't good, wasn't good at all. I had all sorts of problems. It wasn't good, I would have undone it. I would have undone it afterwards, and I would rather do it with my current partner. Much rather with him than with that idiot again. *(Nóri 19, Hungarian, interview)*

In their discourse the emphasis is on the physical painfulness or the inappropriate treatment by the boy. It is also important for Hungarian girls who to lose virginity with, but they tend to talk not about the loss of a treasure but the quality of the experience, how pleasurable it was. As Nati explains, the quality of the experience has a life-long effect: "It's important [who you lose it with] because if we have a positive experience, that's very good, and if it's negative, it affects our whole life" (Nati, Hungarian, interview). As Eszter says,

> Because it's important that if someone loses her virginity she should lose it with a person who makes it a lasting experience for her, not bad but good, and she won't think of it like "I lost it with that asshole" or something; she should choose the person (…). *(Eszter 17, Hungarian, interview)*

In Nóri's and Eszter's quotes we can see that the issue of losing it with 'the right guy' is important, but not because 'the wrong guy' will not reciprocate the treasure he receives but because he cannot give her sexual pleasure. Eszter also highlights the lasting quality of the experience and the importance of losing it with a person with whom the experience will be 'good', not 'bad'. As I discuss in the following section, it seems that the "pleasure imperative"[105] (Allen 2012) affects Hungarian girls more than Gypsy girls, at least in their discourse about sexual experiences.

---

[105] See: Chapter 5, Section 1.

2.4. 'Traditionalist' vs. 'modernist' approaches to sexuality

The various discourses of giving treasure vs. receiving pleasure are not simply ethnicity-based though. They are also examples of 'traditional' vs. 'modern' views of sexuality, which, in turn, tend to be understood as corresponding to 'Gypsy' vs. 'Hungarian' sexuality. As I discuss in Chapter 5, in neoliberal/postfeminist discourses on sexuality sexual pleasure is an imperative for the individual young woman (Allen 2012). The experiencing of sexual pleasure is seen as one of the cornerstones of women's 'emancipation' (see: Giddens 1992). My Hungarian respondents appear to live up to the neoliberal/postfeminist norm of the 'pleasure-seeking individual' more. On the one hand this is related to the fact that Hungarians, being members of the White ethnic majority, do not have the kind of constructed ethnic sexual traditions that Gypsies claim to have, in relation to which they position themselves in terms of ethnic belonging. On the other hand, neoliberal messages about women's sexuality that young people receive via the media target primarily White young, middle-class, heterosexual women, they represent idealised teen sexuality, therefore such young women identify with this idealised image more easily (see: Jackson & Westrupp 2010).

In this framework, being 'emancipated', 'pleasure-seeking', having sexual desires and active sexual agency becomes constitutive of 'Hungarianness'. However, as I argued earlier, deciding to remain a virgin and when to give virginity to whom also requires active sexual agency. If both pleasure-seeking active sexuality and preserving virginity up to a certain time, for a certain boy, are agentic choices, then it is not having sexual agency or not and actively making choices about sex or not that distinguishes between Gypsy and Hungarian girls' sexuality but the discursive presence or lack of 'pleasure' in talking about sexuality.

The Hungarian girls, when they talk about virginity and their experiences or ideas about losing it, often refer to the pleasure aspect of sex. In the discourses about Gypsy 'traditions',

sexuality is not talked about in the context of pleasure, but rather in the context of reproduction, family relations, marriage, dowry, the worth of a woman. The Gypsy girls who see their first sexual experience as giving their treasure to a boy – whether as an idea or an experience – tend not to speak about sexual pleasure, or positive or negative physical experiences of sex in any way.[106] The physical and emotional experiencing of sexual pleasure or displeasure itself obviously does not differ for Gypsy and Hungarian girls. Thus, discourses of losing virginity are used to create an ethnic distinction between Hungarians and Gypsies not only through a difference between the value of virginity and ways of losing it, but also through referring or not referring to sexual pleasure in virginity loss narratives.

In the following quote Vera, who also works in a Gypsy ethnic minority secondary school besides Marzipan, illuminates the difference between traditional and modernist discourses of sex, referring to ethnicity through virginity and sexual pleasure. She relates that in the ethnic school where she works she had to modify her modernist discourse on sexual pleasure in order to provide information for Gypsy girls, some of whom were pressured by their family to marry as virgins and have a virginity test on their wedding night:

> (…) In [the Gypsy ethnic minority school], for example, it's completely different. Many get married as virgins, for example. [Virginity] is a prerequisite there, so they want to marry the girl off at age 13, so that she's still a virgin. And there are horrible family scandals and fights because the sheet didn't get blood-stained. In that school, one of the Gypsy teachers, for example, explicitly asked me to tell the students about the fact that women don't always bleed when their hymen gets broken. So there we had a bit of a different approach to discussing the experiencing of sexual pleasure. *(Vera, school nurse, interview)*

In this Gypsy ethnic minority school it is very likely that most students come from families where Gypsiness is a positive identification and passing as a Hungarian and assimilation into

---

[106] We can read about very different attitudes to sexual pleasure in Gay y Blasco's (1999) ethnography about gender and sexuality in a Gitano (Spanish Gypsy) community on the outskirts of Madrid. With them, the experience of sexual pleasure is important both for women and men, and is openly discussed by the women Gay y Blasco interviewed.

majority society are not major life strategies. There ethnicized sexual traditions such as the virginity test are practiced, and one of the Gypsy teachers who seems to have found this tradition problematic asked Vera to interfere and 'educate' students about the physiological aspects of losing virginity.

Vera was aware of the traditionalist approach to girls' virginity loss and thought that introducing the modernist concept of sexual pleasure should be done carefully there. By being 'careful', she attempted to talk about sexuality, virginity and pleasure in a way that respected ethnic group boundaries. Her activity may be interpreted as deconstructing ethnicized sexual 'traditions' in the name of 'modernising' 'traditional' social groups and contributing to the emancipation of women in those groups. However, at the same time, she participated in the strengthening and reassurance of ethnic boundaries and ethnicized sexuality, because she did not question the 'tradition' of arranged marriages of young virgin girls itself, but offered some information on the physiological aspects of the first penetrative sexual encounter for girls, so that the 'tradition' can be continued to be practiced smoothly, without family conflicts, in case no bloodstains appear as proof of the girl's virginity.[107]

As opposed to this ethnic Gypsy school, in Marzipan, where the student population is ethnically mixed and diverse, the Gypsy students found such customs outdated, and positioned themselves in the 'modernist' camp by distancing themselves from the Vlach community, to which they attributed the custom of virginity test. As I discussed earlier, referring to ethnicized sexual traditions as only practiced by 'traditional', 'backward' communities is a way of constructing a "hierarchy within the Other". By considering virginity tests on wedding nights outdated but girls giving their virginity to the right boy at the right

---

[107] Though ambiguous from a deconstructive perspective, I believe this was a proper level of response by her to the request of the Gypsy teacher, because it would have been unrealistic to expect, both by her and by the teacher, that she, a white sex education teacher in a school, will be able to disrupt or influence directly in any way the custom practiced in traditional Gypsy families, in the name of 'modernising' or 'emancipating' these young women through sex education.

time, when they choose to as a positive Gypsy custom acceptable in a 'modern' framework, a preferred ethnicity (Romungro, modernist, urban, assimilationist) gets constituted.

2.5. Modernising virgin marriage

As we could see in the case of virginity, the notion of a sexual 'tradition' is used as a tool for constructing certain kinds of Gypsy ethnicities, thus 'tradition' is used and shaped flexibly to adapt it to the views and discursive self-positioning of the speaker. Some of the girls mention, for example, that in traditional Gypsy communities girls are supposed to marry as virgins and they can only wear a white dress at their wedding if they are virgins, otherwise they have to wear red:

> Kinga: There are many kinds of tradition. There is one that if you are not a virgin, you cannot wear a white dress for your wedding, only a red one.
>
> Rozi: If you're not a virgin, why would you wear a bride's dress at all?! Well, we don't keep this tradition. Anyway, it doesn't often happen [in our community] that a girl is not a virgin when she gets married. [In our community] girls get married as virgins. *(Kinga 17, Rozi 16, Gypsies, interview)*

White is the symbolic colour marking 'innocence', 'purity', 'virginity', while red marks the colour of blood and mature womanhood. For Rozi, being a bride and a virgin are synonymous, only a virgin can be a bride. Rozi is one of the few girls who talks about her Gypsy community as a 'traditional' one, where girls usually get married as virgins, even though they do not keep the tradition of having to wear red if the girl is not a virgin. What this implies is that probably girls who are not virgins at their wedding also wear white, therefore they retain their symbolic innocence. However, this does not mean that Rozi identifies herself or her family as a member of the Vlach community, and she cites another gendered tradition to clarify that. This is the tradition of women wearing long skirts from the onset of puberty:

262

In our family we don't keep the traditions. (...) Depends on which Gypsies we're talking about. (...) Because among Romungros, you don't have to wear skirts, but among Vlach gypsies, if they keep the traditions, it's mandatory. (…) Girls at my age wear those skirts. And they are virgins, they haven't been touched. And some already have kids at my age. *(Rozi 16, Gypsy, interview)*

For an urban adolescent virgin girl who is going to secondary school to learn a vocation, having to wear long, folk-style, floral-patterned skirts would be an irreconcilable requirement for 'proper' ethnic belonging, just like having a baby at her age would be. Getting married as a virgin, however, is acceptable for her, as we can see in the previous quote from her. Her sexual status (virgin) constitutes her ethnicity status: she is a member of a community where getting married as a virgin is normally practiced and imaginable for her, but long skirts and having a baby at age 16 is normally not practiced and not imaginable for her. This shows how ethnicity, in the process of constitution through sexuality is fluid and adaptable to the situation in which it is discursively performed. By clarifying which gendered sexual traditions are followed in Rozi's community and declaring which ones she identifies with, Rozi also clarifies where she belongs: to a Romungro Gypsy community, not a Vlach one. In her Romungro community, people keep certain traditions and not others.108 In this community it is valuable to marry as a virgin and she has high status as a virgin at age 16. At age 16 in a Vlach community, as she implies, she would probably be married and have kids already, and would have to wear long skirts. This would be irreconcilable with her educational goals and would put her in the lowest ethnic social position.

Unlike Rozi, most Gypsy girls emphasize that their family or community does not follow the tradition of marrying as a virgin anymore, or if the family does, they do not comply with it. In the following conversation between Emma (Gypsy girl) and Vica (Hungarian girl) about how she is claiming a different ethnic identity from her mother's, we can see that disagreement

---

108 See: Waters (1990) on what factors influence Americans' choosing an ethnic identification for themselves.

263

about marriage arrangements may result in performing an alternative Gypsy subjectivity, where sexuality-related issues are more determinant than the mother's ethnic belonging:

> Emma: We were watching a home video the other day, and my mother said I can only get married if I'm still a virgin. So I said, okay, then I'm not going to get married. (…) Look, if you only want to get married at 26, you're still going to be a virgin then? Or what? (…) My mother thinks she's a Vlach gypsy, that's why. Because with Vlach gypsies it's like you get married at age 16.
> Vica: And you're not a Vlach?
> Emma: I'm not a Vlach. (…) I'm a Musician. *(Emma 16, Gypsy, Vica 16, Hungarian, interview)*

In this excerpt, Emma's and her mother's ideas about marrying and virginity are confronted: for the mother, Emma's virgin status at marriage is important, for Emma, not marrying young, having an education first and gaining sexual experiences before marriage are important. If she can only get married as a virgin, her solution is not remaining a virgin till marriage but not getting married, because she wants to get married at age 26 but wants to start having sex earlier than that (she says in another part of the interview that she wants to lose her virginity at age 18-19). She associates the mother's wish to marry her as a virgin with being Vlach, and she, who does not want to get married as a virgin, identifies herself as a Romungro (Musician). This way she constructs her mother's and her ethnicity not through familial relations but through the sexual notions of virginity and marriage. She rejects Vlach identity because of its association with the tradition of virgin marriage, which she does not want to follow. She cannot say she is not a Gypsy, because the other three girls identify her as that, and she does have a Gypsy identity but not the one her mother represents. Therefore she chooses another Gypsy identity, one in which virgin marriage is not followed. It is not actually clear that her mother is really a Vlach by bloodline, because Emma says that "she thinks she is a Vlach". It may be the case that her mother is also a Romungro (Musician), but one who would like her daughter to marry as a virgin, therefore Emma defines her as a Vlach.

As the girls continue to discuss Vlach Gypsies' tradition to marry off girls at an early age, Zsófi, who identifies as Hungarian (and her looks make it easy for her to pass as Hungarian) articulates her knowledge about that tradition in an insider way, which prompts another Hungarian girl to ask:

> Vica: Why, are you a Gypsy as well?
> Zsófi: No, but my mother is. (*Vica 16; Zsófi 16, Hungarians, interview*)

This response suggests that, similarly to Emma, for Zsófi, Gypsiness is not a matter of bloodlines or family relations but that of sharing certain ethnicized sexual 'traditions' or not. Not identifying with the custom of arranged marriages underlies her attempt to pass as Hungarian instead of identifying as Gypsy – or even half-Gypsy – despite her mother's identification as Gypsy. We do not learn more about her mother's Gypsiness, so we do not know whether her mother was married off or not, or whether she considers that a Gypsy tradition, but from further conversation it is clear that she has no intention to marry Zsófi off. Still, it is significant for Zsófi to draw the line between being and not being a Gypsy at the point of arranged marriages and declare her belonging in the Hungarian camp.

Thus, except for Rozi, the tradition of marrying as a virgin is not one which these Gypsy girls claim for themselves to constitute their ethnicity. Nevertheless, the symbolic value of virginity as a sexualized aspect of belonging to a certain ethnicity, and as a marker of a Gypsy girl's social status has remained high, and nowadays, when most Gypsy girls do not marry as virgins, it gains special importance to give one's virginity to the 'right boy', who may eventually become her husband later. Many of the Gypsy girls who currently have boyfriends talk about them as the one they gave their virginity to – or if not, then as the one who is their first 'serious' boyfriend – and the one whom they think they will start a family with. Edina talks about planning her future with her first boyfriend:

265

I have a boyfriend and I think I'll stay with him. We've been together for a year, he's my first boyfriend. I would like two children, not now, later, at around 22. We're planning to move out to rent a flat when I turn 18. *(Edina 16, Gypsy, interview)*

Vali gave her virginity to the 'wrong' boy at age 15. Their relationship lasted for a year, and they lived together for 5 months, during which he, as she related, "completely cracked my nerves. And he was also drinking, I used to drag him home from the pub and stuff like that. (…) It was really brutal, he was reviling my own parents, too, and stuff like that". Clearly, she considered such a partner unworthy of having given her virginity to, and she said in the interview that she regretted it. She has her second boyfriend now, about whom she had many complaints during the interview, but all in all, she thought he was the 'right' boy for her, and she had decided that he would be the one to spend her life with:

Maybe we'll move in together when I've finished school, I've told him that. Because I don't want another one like my previous relationship, but I believe that it is him who I will really be able to spend my life with. He is silly but everyone has their faults. But I feel that it will be really him. In fact I haven't been with that many boys but I don't want to, either, because I'll keep my honour, so no twenty boys, but he will stay, he will remain. *(Vali 17, Gypsy, interview)*

Vali is making a compromise here: even though her boyfriend is "silly" and has other faults she tells about during the interview, he comes out fine from the comparison with the previous boyfriend, to whom she made the mistake of giving her virginity. She admits that she has not had a lot of sexual experiences but claims that she does not want to, because she wants to keep her honour. Keeping her honour means not having many sexual partners, being a girlfriend, not a 'slut', and for an ethnic implication, it also means that if she failed to give her virginity to the right boy, she should stick to the next one who seems to be right and plan a life together, even though they are both 17 years old only. In her case, although her virginity is lost already, she has other capital to bring into the partnership: her father told her that he was going to buy her an apartment when she finished secondary school. With the financial

CEU eTD Collection

support she receives from her father, she feels entitled to decide about their life together. In this context, the decision to start a family early is related to keeping one's honour. Although Hungarian girls also try to avoid falling on the wrong side of the girlfriend/slut dichotomy, for Gypsy girls it has a particular significance because of the notions of girls' honour and virginity as a girl's treasure.

My Gypsy respondents see virgin marriage as an outdated tradition practiced by Vlach Gypsies. In my reading, at such a 'traditional' Gypsy wedding, with virginity test performed during the wedding night, losing virginity is not a moment of sexual power and agency for the girl but rather a moment of sexual control for the boy and his family whose members (the older women) will check the bloodstains on the sheet (Serban-Temisan 2011). However, the significance of giving virginity to the right boy and trying to stay together with that boy, despite getting together at an early age (usually 14-17), can be understood as a 'modernised' version of the tradition of marrying young and as a virgin, but out of their free will, with the boy of their choice. I argue that in the 'modernized' version, where girls give their virginity to the boy who has proved to deserve it and can give what is required in return, the 'traditional' moment of lack of power and agency at the virginity test is transformed into a moment where the girl does have power and agency over her sexuality. Although I have argued earlier that neoliberal discourses of the pleasure imperative target White girls more, those of choice and agency appear in Gypsy girls' discourses and decision-making, as well. Gypsy girls' choice and agency in when and to whom to give their virginity and then in starting a family with the boy who they gave their virginity to (or if they gave their virginity to the 'wrong' boy, then with the next 'right' boy) becomes constitutive of a kind of neoliberal version of Gypsy ethnicity, which at the same time is not a sharp break with the tradition of virgin marriages but an 'updated' version of it. As such, it is an element of ethnic group belonging, a cultural

form or practice which is "refurbished and reintegrated into contemporary culture" (Nagel 1994: 162).

Another aspect of starting a family early is socio-economic. Many Roma girls, just like many of their non-Roma peers, start dating and sexual life during their adolescence. In Marzipan quite a few Gypsy and Hungarian girls who were in a stable relationship at the time of the interviews could imagine or were planning to move together and have children with their boyfriends soon after graduating from school. Others wanted to spend a few years either further studying or working and saving up before starting a family. This depended not so much on ethnicity or the school strand they were attending but on how they saw their further educational and/or employment chances. These were perceived chances, not always realistic, nevertheless they influenced girls' attitude to starting a family. As is well-known from the literature on teenage motherhood (see: Breheny & Stephens 2007) and from the relationship between Roma women's socio-economic status and fertility patterns (see e.g. Durst 2011, 2006), becoming a teenage mother is related to low socio-economic status, low education and poor employment chances; and at the same time motherhood often gives something meaningful, independence, agency, emotional intimacy to the lives of teen mothers. When a young woman does not want to or cannot pursue further education or career, why not have children?

The desire to start a family may or may not have been realised in these girls' lives after they graduated. Statistics show that on average Hungarian women tend to have fewer children and later than Roma women do (Durst 2006; Janky 2005). Statistics also show that a higher percentage of Roma than Hungarians live in poverty and isolation, have low education and low (or no) employment (Tóth 2005). This certainly explains a lot about differences between Roma and Hungarian fertility and marriage patterns. However, on average between the Roma

and Hungarian girls in Marzipan there were not so extreme socio-economic differences and they were receiving the same education (even if that did not grant them the same employment opportunities). Discriminative employment chances (i.e. that Roma girls would not get a job as easily as Hungarian girls) were not mentioned when talking about visions of family life in the future. I would like to argue that whereas socio-economic factors are likely to create an ethnic division between Roma and Hungarian girls' further life chances after secondary education and their ideas about starting a family were probably unconsciously influenced by these factors, in their discourses no such division was drawn. The distinction that *was* made discursively was based on sexualised ethnic subjectification: many Gypsy girls felt ready to commit to the first boyfriend whom they gave their virginity to, or the first 'right' man, because of keeping honour and following the modernised version of virgin marriage. Hungarian girls, however, had no such sexualised ethnic subjectivity to rely on, and those who felt ready to start a family usually explained their readiness by loving their partner or by the love of children, and those who did not feel ready explained it either by waiting for the right partner or wanting to have a working career first. I will discuss this difference further in Section 2.7.

2.6. Whose choice?

As I have argued, gendered and sexualised 'traditions', such as marrying as a virgin, arranged marriages at a girl's young age, virginity test on the wedding night, wearing traditional female clothes, having many children, are crucial in setting up the "hierarchy within the Other", in which different kinds of ethnicity are constituted. As a contrast to arranged marriages in traditional Gypsy communities, the interviewed girls claim that their parents have no say in choosing their partners. As Kinga says: "It's true that I have to introduce boyfriends to my dad, to see what he thinks about them, but he doesn't have a say in who I want to be with."

This freedom to choose also constitutes their Romungro ethnicity by distinguishing them from Vlachs, who are said to force girls to get married to a man chosen by the family, at a very young age:

> Mari: This happens with the Vlach gypsies. That a girl must marry and the husband is chosen by the family...
>
> Emese: At the age of thirteen…
>
> Mari: It doesn't matter if the girl doesn't want to marry him, she must. *(Mari 17, Emese 17, Gypsies, interview)*

According to these girls, arranged marriages and virginity tests only happen in the Vlach community. Regina draws a firm boundary between Vlach Gypsies and themselves Romungros by saying "They live in a completely different world than we do." These sexualised ethnic customs are incompatible with their modernized, urban lives. However, Mari and Regina both follow what I have called 'updated' versions of marrying as a virgin: at the time of the interview, Regina had been living together with her boyfriend in her parents' house for a year. He was the boy to whom she gave her virginity 3 years ago, after she had him wait for 8 months. Mari had been living together with her boyfriend in his parents' house, they had been together for a year. The relationships were not arranged by their parents, the boys were their choice, but practically they were living together as married couples. This is a good example of how new versions of ethnicized sexual traditions are constructed in order to make it possible for the subjects to claim a preferred ethnicity and ethnic belonging through them, and also to create their ethnic boundaries and distance themselves from the 'ethnic Other', in this case the Vlachs.

In the following excerpt the notion of choice appears here in the context of marriage as a transaction between families, not individuals. Regina claims that with Vlachs the girl has to prove that she deserves the boy of her choice, and the proof of virginity is set as the price:

270

> There's a thing that the girl has to be a virgin if she wants the boy she has chosen, that is, from that family. And they put a white sheet under the girl, and if she was bleeding, then she was a virgin, but if there is no blood, they won't allow her to get together with that boy at all. *(Regina 17, Gypsy, interview)*

Here it is the girl who has to prove she deserves the chosen boy by keeping her virginity for him. And it is not really the boy she has to provide the proof for, but the boy's family, so virginity serves as a proof that she is worthy of marrying into a certain family. If she cannot prove herself, she has to pay a high price: separation from the boy she wants, bad reputation, difficulty to marry someone else. Whereas this utterance seems to contradict the common discourse that it is the boy who has to prove he is worthy of being given the girl's virginity, from an economic perspective it makes sense that the girl has to prove her worth: the girl's only asset is her virginity, that is, the only 'property' she brings into the marriage, so she has to be foolproofed by the family that provides all the material property for the married couple in a traditional family. The excerpt contradicts another notion of arranged marriages: that of the parents choosing a partner for their child. Here the girl chooses the boy and it gives her agency but it can be taken away by the family in case the girl cannot prove her virginity.

The girls cited so far talk about giving away virginity, choosing partners, marrying who they want in a way that implies that it is their decision, their choice, and that they act with agency. While I do argue that giving away virginity is a high moment of exercising sexual agency for Gypsy girls, and that in the modernised version of 'Gypsy marriage' the girls have a choice, I would like to point out that female and male Gypsy sexuality is contextualised in a heteronormative framework, where girls' choice, power and agency do not fundamentally undermine or subvert structures of male dominance. In the case of giving away virginity, the waiting period also gives a chance for the boy to get reassured that the girl is girlfriend (or would-be-wife) material, not a 'slut'. I discuss the girlfriend/slut dichotomy Chapter 5 in more detail; here I would just like to query girls' assumption that it is them who pull all the strings

with full and exclusive agency, when it comes to decision-making about virginity loss. In a heteronormative context where male pleasure is the ultimate reference point in sexual activity,[109] such expressions of agency by girls should be read with taking gendered power relations into account. It is still in the power of the boy to play 'the wrong' boy if he pleases, and take sexual advantage of the virgin Gypsy girl, depriving her of her greatest treasure without negative consequences for him. And in the previous quote about the virginity test it is clear that no matter whether it was the girl who chose the boy for husband, it is the girl's body, that is, her physiological response to vaginal penetration, that is subordinated to the boy's, and by extension, his family's scrutiny and ultimate decision-making about whether the girl is 'worthy' of the boy and marrying into the family. Thus, I argue that although Gypsy girls' discourse of choice, power and agency can be read as subverting male power on one level, ultimately girls' decisions in relation to sexuality are made in the context of preserving one's honour in a social environment where the notion of 'honour' is defined by patriarchal values and power structures.

2.7. Marriage and Hungarian ethnicity construction

As I have explained in Section 2.2 a Gypsy girl with low socio-economic status loses her main treasure when losing her virginity, so marriage is important as a compensation and securing a better socio-economic position (at least in theory). However, Hungarians tend to read this phenomenon differently, in a way that indirectly constitutes their majority ethnicity as well, by claiming a negative interpretation of Gypsy sexual traditions (see: Neményi 1998) and thus positioning themselves as non-Gypsies. This way Hungarians externally define the content and meaning of Gypsy ethnic group belonging (see: Nagel 1994) and impose their

---

[109] See: Chapter 5.

272

normative views on the minority group in order to define the content and meaning of belonging to the majority group, as well.

What Gypsy girls emphasize about losing their virginity is that their boyfriends had to wait long for them to give it to them, and that it is important to give it to someone worthy of it, who may become a lifelong partner. What Hungarians (both boys and girls) stress about Gypsy girls losing virginity is that they do it early, and then get married early. Thus, in the eyes of Hungarians, the value of Gypsy girls' virginity is lowered by losing it *too* early, according to their standards. Age seems to be a more important factor for Hungarians than for Gypsies, that is, the age of Gypsies at marriage. On the issue of early marriage, the opinions of my Gypsy and non-Gypsy respondents collide: marrying off girls at an early age is wrong (according to modernist concepts of youth, education and lifestyle). The difference is which Gypsies are said to do that. Hungarians define the standards for the right age for marriage, and Gypsies turn out to be substandard. In turn, Romungros define the standards for the right age for marriage, and Vlachs turn out to be substandard. Hungarians usually do not differentiate between Vlachs and Romungros, so for many of them it is 'the Gypsies' who marry off their daughters at age 12-13, but for Romungros it is crucial to isolate and other a group within the group: my Gypsy respondents emphasize that it is Vlach Gypsies who follow this 'tradition', not them, Romungros.

Similarly to virginity discourses, Hungarians' marriage discourses mark Gypsy ethnicity and their own in a negative way, i.e. presenting Gypsy marriage customs as something that modern mainstream majority Hungarians *don't* do, defining their whiteness by 'not being the Other' (Frankenberg 2001). For most of my Hungarian respondents, virginity and marriage or lifelong partnership is not related in a way it is for Gypsy girls. They do not mention virginity and marriage together when they talk about themselves, they only link the two when talking

273

about Gypsy girls. As I argued earlier, the overlapping of virginity and marriage discourses is ethnicity-constitutive, both by Gypsy girls for themselves and by Hungarian girls (and boys) for Gypsy girls. At the same time, when Hungarian girls (and boys) talk about how virginity and marriage and the connection of the two characterize Gypsy 'traditions', they indirectly constitute their own ethnicity as well, by positioning themselves as not belonging to an ethnic group where virgin marriages and early marriages are practised.

There is also a difference in motivations for getting married and the meaning of marriage in life-perspectives. For many Hungarian girls marriage or long-term cohabitation with a partner is not seen as the only life option. For them – although they do not want to be seen as 'sluts' – 'honour' is not related to partner choice and opting for marriage. Similarly to narratives of virginity loss, circumstances are important in Hungarian girls' discourses of marriage. The right kind of man is also important for them but not in the same way as for Gypsy girls. Gypsy girls tend to be looking for 'the right' man because they want to get married; Hungarian girls tend to want to get married *if* they find 'the right' man:

> Well, as far as I'm concerned, I wouldn't like to have [a child] now. But later I would. As for marriage, if I find a normal man, perhaps with him. But also later. (…) If I (…) have been with him for a long time and we decide to (…). *(Brigi 17, Hungarian, interview)*

Brigi is not certain at all that she wants to get married. The conditions are finding a "normal" man and a joint decision after long cohabitation. Long cohabitation is also envisioned by Magdi, and also she is one of the Hungarian girls who wants to get married because she wants to have children:

274

> I hope I won't get divorced. That I manage to – well, I hope I won't rush the decision about whom I will marry. Though it's possible that I have been together with someone for a long time and then something happens. But I'd like to have children. (…) I'd like to do many things differently from my mother. And that's why I wouldn't want to rush marriage, I would rather live together with my boyfriend for a long time, because she jumped into both of her marriages, and then she jumped out. I wouldn't like to make that mistake. *(Magdi 19, Hungarian, interview)*

For Magdi long premarital cohabitation is also important because she does not want to commit the mistake she claims her mother made by jumping into two marriages too quickly and then divorcing and raising children alone. She consciously wants to have a different life than her mother, in which marriage and staying married is an ultimate aim and reaching it depends on a long premarital cohabitation with her partner so that she gets to know him.

Not everyone who wants to have children wants to get married, or even necessarily have a partner:

> Henriett: I would like to have a son at age 30 (…). I'd like to keep my independence, of course, I wouldn't like to marry, and I would like to live in a big family house with a garden, together with my mum and dad.
>
> DR: And would you like to have a partner or not? Or only a child?
>
> Henriett: Well, I haven't decided that yet. *(Henriett 19, Hungarian, interview)*

For Henriett getting married would mean giving up her independence. She apparently does not have the same issue with her parents, which is unusual, as it is typical for most young people to interpret independence as independence from parents. In the interview she later clarifies that she means financial independence, self-sustaining by paid work, not having to rely on a man financially, and she relates that she is having a possessive boyfriend who does not like her to spend her free time without him. She does not connect having a partner and having a child. Her vision of living with her parents and having a child but not necessarily a partner implies that she sees her current relationship as temporary, her boyfriend not as a future spouse.

275

Évi would like to get married but it has financial conditions:

> Évi: I would obviously like to have a husband, but this is only possible if I have the financial background. If not, I won't aim to have a family at any price, if I'm not able to provide for them.
>
> DR: And what would you like to do when you finish school?
>
> Évi: Well, I have applied to study to be a social worker, so that's what I'd like to be.
>
> DR: Well, that's not a very well-paying profession…
>
> Évi: Well, it isn't. You have to marry well, or I don't know. *(laughs)* No, I would obviously like to do other things besides. (…) I suppose it's possible to take second jobs, so it's possible to make as much as is enough, together with a husband, to support a family. *(Évi 19, Hungarian, interview)*

She sees herself as a breadwinner and subordinates her desire to have a family to her ability to provide for her family. She would like to be a social worker and she is aware that it is not a well-paying job, but she thinks that with second jobs and an employed husband a family is sustainable. Although she makes a joke about it ("you have to marry well"), she then clarifies that she does not position herself as dependent on her husband. She aims for professional fulfilment and considers how she would manage both doing the work she wants and sustain a family.

Not considering virginity to be their greatest treasure and not being restricted in their partner choices by whom they gave their virginity to, Hungarian girls appear to have more agency and more consciousness about planning their adult partnerships and future family. Conscious planning is characteristic of both groups: the Gypsy girls tend to plan who they give their virginity to, the Hungarian girls tend to plan whether to marry, whom, when and on what condition. Both Gypsy and Hungarian girls set up conditions for marrying, but Hungarian girls' decision does not seem to be closely related with the act of losing virginity (either with 'the right' or 'the wrong' boy). It is important to add that most of the young women cited above (Évi, Henriett and Magdi) are from the grammar school strand and older than the cited Gypsy girls, none of whom are in grammar school. They have more articulated ideas about

marriage than many of the younger girls do. I would like to argue that the type of education and the range of adolescent sexual experiences are related to attitudes to marriage, and through that, to ethnicity constitution as well. As for type of education, the Hungarian girls who attend grammar school see more options available for them: staying single, having children or not having children, cohabiting, marrying, but not necessarily, spending a long time together before marrying. The variety of options is related to a notion of economic self-sustainability, employability and independence, i.e. not feeling it is absolutely necessary to have a male partner in order to be sustained and not necessarily seeing the man as the (only) breadwinner. Gypsy girls' marriage discourse shows that they perceive themselves much more dependent on a male partner, which is related to lower educational level and lower chances of employability.

Thus, marriage is a discursive site of sexuality where the constitution of ethnic distinction happens through differentiating between marriage traditions to follow and notions of the place of marriage and a husband in one's life. On a material level, these ethnic distinctions are related to socio-economic differences, educational differences and perspectives of further life-chances.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have inquired into how Gypsy and Hungarian ethnicity gets constituted through discourses of virginity and marriage. Virginity and marriage discourses are ethnicized in a gendered way, as the loss of virginity and marriage traditions attributed to Gypsies by Gypsies and by Hungarians constitute ethnicity or ethnic distinction only in the case of girls, not boys. Thus, through the conceptualizing of the significance of how to lose/give away virginity and how to marry, women become the bearers of their collective ethnicity shared with men. I have found that parallelly to the constitution of social hierarchy between Gypsies

277

and Hungarians, my Gypsy respondents construct a hierarchy within the Gypsy minority, a "hierarchy within the Other", claiming they belong to the Romungro group, which stands for modernity, assimilation and better socio-economic position, as opposed to Vlach Gypsies who represent outdated, backward traditions and isolation. These traditions are gendered and sexualised, related to virginity, marriage and the passage of adolescent girls from childhood to womanhood. By claiming that they do not practice these traditions, my Gypsy respondents position themselves above traditional groups, and define which ethnic group they belong to not through bloodlines or family relations or historical origins but through specific sexual traditions, such as virgin marriage, arranged marriage, virginity test, and the wearing of traditional female clothes. Despite considering them outdated, these traditions still define ethnicity for my respondents, they are still a reference point for ethnic group belonging. I have argued that these traditions carry on, but in a modernised, updated form: most of my Gypsy girl respondents do not want to get married as virgins but they do want to give their virginity to someone who will reciprocate it by giving the girl love, loyalty, a long-term relationship, possibly marriage later. Virginity is still considered to be the main asset of a Gypsy girl, and giving it to the chosen boy is a planned process, with an open expectation of specified returns, therefore I have argued that instead of 'gift-giving', the act can be better interpreted as 'trading'. The trading of virginity involves the girl's choice and agency, which reframes the tradition in the neoliberal discourse of young women's sexual choice and agency.

Hungarian girls lack ethnicized sexual traditions regarding virginity and marriage, and define their Hungarian ethnicity implicitly by "not being the Other", i.e. not being Gypsy. They do not consider virginity to be a girl's treasure, therefore losing it is not planned so carefully and is not necessarily determinant in future choices to be made about one's sexuality and family life. Consequently, Hungarian girls see more options related to marriage, in whether, when, whom, on what condition to marry. In virginity loss experiences for Gypsy girls the notion of

giving away one's treasure is emphasized, whereas in Hungarian girls' narratives it is the quality, the pleasurableness of the experience that is more significant. Distinctive notions of the value of virginity and marriage (or lifelong partnership) are also related to social positioning: Gypsy girls' position in the ethnicized, classed and gendered social hierarchy is low, they tend to remain lower educated, more discriminated in employment and more dependent on their male partner than Hungarian girls who see more educational and employment chances available for themselves and express themselves as more independent and agentic.

Conclusions

In this dissertation I have aimed to answer the research question: "What is the role of sexuality in shaping social inequalities in a secondary school? For this purpose I analysed research material collected in the course of a school ethnography I conducted in a combined secondary vocational-technical-grammar school in a large town in Hungary. I have argued that discourses on sexuality in this school constitute binary categories of gender, race/ethnicity and class, and students' subjectivities based on these categories. I have also argued that sexuality is not only one axis of social inequality, but is also constitutive of them, as the sexuality discourses and practices I have identified and the subjectivities they constitute contribute to the re-inscription of social inequalities in schooling. My work has addressed three interrelated fields of scholarship: schooling and young people's sexuality; the discursive constitution of gendered, ethnic and classed subjectivities; and the re/production of social inequalities in education.

My major contribution to scholarship in these fields is that I have shown the direct relevance of sexuality in young people's performative subjectivity constitution and its connection with their educational setting, which is a very important space in their lives. My dissertation demonstrates how the re/production of social distinctions and respective social hierarchies operate on the micro, mezo and macro levels in the context of an educational institution and how sexuality is implicated in these processes, through curricular and non-curricular activities, through discourses, physical spaces and institutional practices, through sex education and other educational activities and through the formal and informal interactions among students, among school staff, and between students and school staff. Whereas there is a rich literature on gendered and sexual subjectivity constitution in educational settings,

young people's ethnic and classed subjectivity constitution through sexuality discourses is a less developed area.

I have used a broad definition of sexuality in my analysis, which has allowed me to identify subjectivity-constitutive discourses and practices that are related to sexuality in one way or another and also allowed me to connect these discourses and practices with the re/production of social inequalities. I have considered school not only as an educational institution but also as an actual physical space for sexuality, with which I have contributed insights to the literature of sexuality in schooling, in which not much work has been done to date on sexual practices in the materiality of the school space.

To find out how gendered distinction is done through sexuality I looked into discourses of sexual pleasure, including the understanding of what sexual pleasure is, assumptions about the differences between women and men experiencing sexual pleasure, ways of talking about the sexual act, and access to sexual pleasure and sexual partners. The reasons why I have chosen the discourse of pleasure are that in current neoliberal discourse about having sex pleasure is of central importance, that pleasure was a significant topic in sex education and in my respondents' talk about having sex, and that earlier feminist arguments about the importance of including a discourse of pleasure in sex education have been recently problematized from feminist perspectives. My findings contribute to this critical literature (see: Allen 2012; Rasmussen 2012; Lamb 2010). My analysis of discourses of sexual pleasure have revealed that in the sex educator's discourse girls were encouraged to learn how to experience pleasure in a way that reproduced biologizing gender dichotomies. As for students, familiar discourses of sexually objectifying women, women objectifying themselves, and of sexual double standards were dominant. I have argued that no matter how girls are reassured of their agency over their bodies and encouraged to experience sexual pleasure and empowerment,

hegemonic masculine discourses will prevail in heterosexual relations if they are not critically addressed. Such discourses make only a limited range of sexual subjectivities available for girls and boys, and sexuality being central in constituting gender dichotomies, also only a limited range of gendered subjectivities are available for them.

In ethnicity constitution, discourses of virginity and marriage were central in my respondents' talk. Virginity loss discourses were ethnicized and also gendered. Boys did not attribute too much significance to the loss of their virginity, but they did to that of girls. So did girls, and narratives about the circumstances and conditions of virginity loss correlated with ethnic belonging. I have argued that Gypsy girls' notions about losing their virginity can be better described by the discourse of 'trading' instead of 'gift-giving', and that Hungarian girls' narratives of their virginity loss tended rather to focus on the quality and physical-emotional circumstances of the event. As for marriage, discourses reflected the social positioning of Gypsy and Hungarian girls. Gypsy girls, who tended to come from more disadvantaged family backgrounds and had lower educational and employment prospects were more invested in marrying the first suitable partner, preferably the one they traded their virginity to. Hungarian girls, however, talked about more options, independence and personal choices related to partnership and starting a family. I have also claimed that it was important for Gypsies to create a sense of intra-ethnic hierarchy, in which they positioned themselves above Gypsies who were assumed to follow sexual traditions that were disadvantageous to women. To correspond with this sense of being more 'civilised', 'modernised', assimilated into majority (white) society, the Gypsy girls adapted 'old' sexual traditions in a way that expressed more choice and agency. With my analysis I have stepped beyond descriptions of sexual traditions attributed to certain ethnic groups and merely claiming that such traditions characterize the given ethnic group. Instead, I have shown how such sexual traditions are actually used to discursively construct ethnic groups both by group members and non-

members, and how the adaptation of such sexual traditions serves to create preferred ethnic subjectivity positions.

In the chapter on the re/production of social hierarchy in Marzipan I have provided insight into the hierarchical structuring of secondary education and into the class-constitutive differentiation between students and teachers, among teachers and among students through various discourses and institutional practices. In some instances the differentiation was intersectional. Ongoing, repetitive performatives of distinction-making and position-negotiation in the hierarchy appeared to be especially important for teachers. This is the chapter that most clearly connects the different levels of social inequality re/production, with implications even beyond the school walls. I have analysed a number of discourses, not all of them sexuality-related, but many of them sexualised. I have pointed out that sexuality can function directly in social inequality re/production, as in the categorisation of students based on their sexual knowledge and behaviour, or in the sexual harassment of students by teachers. In other instances, for example in the course of vocational training, sexuality can be used as a tool for education for manual work.

My analysis reveals specific differences in gendered, ethnic and classed subjectivity constitution. Not only are the sexuality discourses and practices used different but so are the locations and power relations where such constitution happens. Gendered and ethnic dichotomies are constructed explicitly by students; the male-female dichotomy is clear-cut and much of it happens through talking about having sex. The Gypsy-Hungarian dichotomy is also clear-cut in Hungarians' talk, but in Gypsies' talk ethnic identification can be placed along a continuum with many kinds of hybrid identities on the one hand, and the Gypsy-Hungarian dichotomy gets reproduced in an internal dichotomy of Vlachs vs. Romungros, on the other hand. Teachers I interviewed tried to make sure they did not openly differentiate

283

between girls and boys and Gypsies and Hungarians, as they were aware that it was not 'politically correct'; they used more covert ways of dichotomising, especially in the case of Gypsies, where discourses of 'culture', reproduction patterns, family background and parental educational level – which are also classed attributes – were used to differentiate. In the case of class distinction, I could not find many instances where students were constituting classed distinctions among themselves. Teachers, however, were keen on maintaining discursive differentiation, besides the official institutional class-constitutive practice of streaming. The notion of class does not appear in public discourse as explicitly as that of gender or ethnicity. Instead, teachers use ideas about looks, sexual knowledge and behaviour, hygiene, (insufficient) knowledge about (high) culture, or childrearing practices as vehicles to express classed distinction between themselves and their colleagues, and between themselves and their students.

My study has some limitations. One of these is external and derives from the lack of scholarly involvement in studying gender and sexuality in education in Hungary. As there are no ethnographical studies similar to mine on sexuality and education in Hungary, it is difficult if not impossible to put my findings in a local context and to compare them with similar studies done in anglophone countries, of which there are plenty. Also, there is no theorization available on Central Eastern European specificities of the impacts of a globalized neoliberal era on education, therefore it is difficult if not impossible to say how the global becomes local. Analysis of gender and sexuality in education in the era of state-socialism is also missing, therefore it is also hardly possible to reflect on the legacy of state-socialism on gender and sexuality in schooling today. From my readings I have the impression that in the current globalized neoliberal era sexuality discourses and gendered issues in education in Hungary are rather similar in European and also North-American contexts. However, some

284

cross-national comparative studies could enrich the field of CEE gender, sexuality and education theories.

The lack of Hungarian academic contributions in my field means that my work – which is embedded in a rich anglophone field in the critical sociology of education – is a pioneering piece in Hungary, concerning the topic, the theoretical approaches and the methodology. Being a pioneer, besides its significance, also implies shortcomings and limitations in my work. One of these is that because of the above-mentioned lack of relevant Hungarian literature, I set out to do the research with feeling the need to familiarize myself with the whole field and wanting to get to know everything. Therefore, especially at the beginning, I asked questions of my respondents about everything I could think of as probably related to their sexualities. This is one ethnographical approach, and it has its advantages, namely that I have been able to draw a broad map of what adolescent sexualities encompass and select what has interested me for analysis from a broad range of data. On the other hand, if I had had selected a narrower range of topics to inquire about, perhaps I could have had more in-depth discussions. This does not relativize the worth and relevance of my research, but it is an important methodological issue to consider for future research.

Another, related limitation lies in the scope and focus choice of the dissertation. I could have selected only gendered, or only ethnic, or only classed subjectivity constitution to analyse through sexuality discourses. (Not to mention other possible combinations, like analysing class through ethnicity or gender through class, and so on.) There is enough material to write a dissertation on each of these axes. By deciding to focus on all three and some of their intersections (and at the same time neglecting other subjectivity axes, such as age, for example), I have simultaneously offered a broader picture and limited the extent of analysis of each aspect of subjectivity constitution.

285

As I have noted in Chapter 2, my sample is probably not representative of the school population. This is not a problem, as my study is an ethnography, not a statistical survey. However, it is a limitation that the small number of Gypsy boys among my respondents did not allow for a comparison between Gypsy and Hungarian boys' ethnicized sexuality. I did not find ethnic differences in virginity and marriage discourses among the participating Gypsy and Hungarian boys (and those with hybrid identities), but perhaps a larger number of Gypsy boys would have produced more varied discourses. If there were any, such findings would enrich the literature on Gypsy gender and sexuality, in which Gypsy male sexuality is not in focus. This fact suggests further research directions: ethnicized masculinity and male sexuality would be important to study in the future.

Comparison with other kinds of schools would be also interesting. Originally I had planned to do a comparative study of Marzipan and an élite grammar school, but after a few months of preparation for my fieldwork in one I was suddenly turned down and asked not to conduct research there. My fieldwork in Marzipan provided me with more than enough material to analyse but a comparison with an institution where middle-class members of the future intellectual élite were being educated would have certainly been very meaningful and revealing. Nevertheless, I am content with ending up doing the research in the type of school Marzipan is, because most qualitative research studies in secondary education, at least in Hungary, have been conducted in grammar schools, therefore their findings represent only a relatively small slice of society.

Despite having written a long dissertation, I have made use of only a fragment of the enormous material I collected. Thus, there are plenty of further questions to analyse. One area that I would be particularly interested in is analysing non-dominant sexuality discourses and their role in subjectivity constitution. I focused on dominant discourses in this dissertation,

because they were deployed by the majority of my respondents, and because it is dominant discourses that are implicated in the re/production of social inequalities. However, non-dominant, resistant discourses, and cases of misfiring in interpellating subjectivities would be important to study, because it is such discourses that carry the potential of social change, even if they are produced in individual, almost inaudible voices. In further research of the sexuality discourses I have collected in Marzipan I would make use of the latest new materialist theorisation of sexuality (See: Alldred and Fox 2015a; Fox and Alldred 2013), which broadens the concept of sexuality to encompass all "physical and social manifestations of sex and sexuality" (Alldred and Fox 2015a: 4). Throughout my research and analysis I was also using a broad concept of sexuality, but using a consistent theoretical framework for its definition would be able to offer even further insights into what sexuality does to young people's subjectivity in school.

Bibliography

Ahmed, S. (1999). 'She'll Wake Up One of These Days and Find She's Turned into a Nigger': Passing through Hybridity. *Theory Culture Society, 16*, 87-106. DOI: 10.1177/02632769922050566

Alldred, P., & David, M. E. (2007). *Get Real About Sex. The Politics and Practice of Sex Education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Alldred, P., & Fox, N. J. (2015a). The sexuality assemblages of young men: A new materialist analysis. *Sexualities, 0*(0), 1-16. DOI: 10.1177/1363460715579132

Alldred, P., & Fox, N. J. (2015b). From 'Lesbian and Gay Psychology' to a Critical Psychology of Sexualities. In Parker, I. (Ed.), *Handbook of Critical Psychology* (pp. 200-210). London: Routledge.

Allen, L. (2013). Behind the bike sheds: sexual geographies of schooling. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 34*(1), 56-75. DOI: 10.1080/01425692.1012.704719

Allen, L. (2012) Pleasure's perils? Critically reflecting on pleasure's inclusion in sexuality education. *Sexualities, 15*(3/4), 455-471.

Allen, L. (2009). 'Caught in the act': ethics committee review and researching the sexual culture of schools. *Qualitative Research, 9*(4) 395–410. DOI: 10.1177/1468794109337866

Allen, L. (2007). Denying the sexual subject: schools' regulation of student sexuality. *British Educational Research Journal, 33*(2), 221-234. DOI: 10.1080/01411920701208282

Allen, L. (2004). Beyond the birds and the bees: Constituting a discourse of erotics in sexuality education. *Gender and Education, 16*(2), 151-167.

Allison, R., Risman, B. J. (2013). A double standard for "Hooking Up": How far have we come toward gender equality? *Social Science Research 42*, 1191–1206. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.04.006

Ambrus, P. (1988). *A Dzsumbuj. Egy telep élete*. [The Ghetto. The Life of a Settlement.] Budapest: Magvető.

Anzaldúa, G. E. (1999). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L. T., Armstrong, E. M., & Seely, J. L. (2014). "Good Girls": Gender, Social Class, and Slut Discourse on Campus. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 77*(2), 100–122. DOI: 10.1177/0190272514521220

Apple, M. W., Ball, S. J., & Gandin, L. A. (Eds.) (2010). *The Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Education*. London; New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and Curriculum.* New York; London: Routledge.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1991). *Postmodern Education. Politics, Culture and Social Criticism.* Minneapolis, Oxford: University of Minnesota Press.

Attwood, F. (2006). Sexed Up: Theorizing the Sexualization of Culture. *Sexualities, 9*(1), 77-94. DOI: 10.1177/1363460706053336

Averett, P., Moore, A., & Price, L. (2014). Virginity Definitions and Meaning among the LGBT Community. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 26*(3), 259-278. DOI: 10.1080/10538720.2014.924802

Bakó, B. (2009). Romlott nők és tiszta lányok. Egy dél-erdélyi roma közösség női normái. [Tainted women and pure girls. Female norms of a Southern Transylvanian roma community.] *Rubicon, 2009/4.* http://www.rubicon.hu/magyar/oldalak/onlineplusz_2009_04_szam/16/4

Bakó, B. (2006). Cigány módra – magyar módra. Együttélési viszonyok egy mikroközösség sztereotípiatörténetein át. [In the Gypsy way – in the Hungarian way. Relations of cohabitation through the stereotype stories of a micro-community.] In *Mindennapi előítéletek. Társadalmi távolságok és etnikai sztereotípiák.* [Everyday prejudices. Social distances and ethnic stereotypes.] Budapest: MTA Társadalomtudományi Kutatóközpont, Kisebbségkutató Intézet. http://kisebbsegkutato.tk.mta.hu/mindennapi-eloiteletek-tarsadalmi-tavolsagok-es-etnikai

Bakó, B. (2002) Együttélési viszonyok és az etnikai identitás. [Relations of living together and ethnic identity.] In Kovács, N., Szarka, L. (Eds.), *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből* [Space and field. Studies on ethnicity and identity] (pp. 87-110). Budapest: Akedémiai Kiadó.

Ball, S. J. (1993). *Education.* London: Longman.

Ballantine, J. H. (2001). *The Sociology of Education. A Systematic Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barth, F. (Ed.) (1994 [1969]). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: the Social Organization of Culture Difference.* Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Bay-Cheng, L. Y., & Eliseo-Arras, R. K. (2008). The Making of Unwanted Sex: Gendered and Neoliberal Norms in College Women's Unwanted Sexual Experiences. *Journal of Sex Research, 45*(4), 386–397. DOI: 10.1080/00224490802398381

Berényi, E., Berkovits, B., & Erőss, G. (2008). Iskolarendszer és szabad választás – a jóindulatú szegregációról. [School system and free choice – about benevolent segregation]. In Berényi, E., Berkovits, B., & Erőss, G. *Az iskolába rendezett gyerek – kiváltság és különbségtétel a közoktatásban.* [The child organised into school – privilege and differentiation in public education], (pp. 11-22). Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.

Berlant, L., & Warner, M. (1998). Sex in Public. *Critical Inquiry 24*(2), 547-566.

Biber, K., & Dalton, D. (2009). Making art from evidence: Secret sex and police surveillance in the Tearoom. *Crime Media Culture, 5*(3), 243–267. DOI: 10.1177/1741659009346048

Bogle, K. A. (2008). *Hooking Up: Sex, Dating, and Relationships on Campus.* New York: New York University Press.

Bordini, G. S., & Sperb, T. M. (2013). Sexual Double Standard: A Review of the Literature Between 2001 and 2010. *Sexuality & Culture, 17*, 686-704. DOI: 10.1007/s12119-012-9163-0

Bordo, S. (1993a). *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bordo, S. (1993b). Feminism, Foucault and the politics of the body. In Ramazanoglu, C. (Ed.), *Up Against Foucault. Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism.* London; New York: Routledge.

Bosnjak, B., & Acton, T. (2013). Virginity and Early Marriage Customs in Relation to Children's Rights among Chergashe Roma from Serbia and Bosnia. *The International Journal of Human Rights, 17*, 646-667. DOI: 10.1080/13642987.2013.831697

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1992). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* London: SAGE.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural reproduction and social seproduction. In Karabel, J., & Halsey, A. H. (Eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education* (pp. 487-511). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bradbury, A. (2013). Education policy and the 'ideal learner': producing recognisable learner-subjects through early years assessment. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 34*(1), 1-19. DOI:10.1080/01425692.2012.692049

Braun, V. (2013). 'Proper sex without annoying things': Anti-condom discourse and the 'nature' of (hetero)sex. *Sexualities, 16*(3/4), 361-382. DOI: 10.1177/1363460713479752

Braun, V., Gavey, N., & McPhillips, K. (2003). The 'Fair Deal'? Unpacking Accounts of Reciprocity in Heterosex. *Sexualities, 6*(2): 237–261.

Breheny, M., & Stephens, C. (2007). Individual Responsibility and Social Constraint: The Construction of Adolescent Motherhood inSocial Scientific Research. *Culture, Health & Sexuality, 9*(4), 333-346. DOI: 10.1080/13691050600975454

Brekhus, W. (1998). A Sociology of the Unmarked: Redirecting Our Focus. *Sociological Theory, 16*(1), 34-51.

Brown, W. (2005). Neo-liberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy. In *Edgework. Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics* (pp. 37-59). Princeton, NJ; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Brubaker, R. (2001). Csoportok nélküli etnicitás [Ethnicity without groups]. *Beszélő, 7-8*, 60-66.

Bryant, J. (2006). Rights, responsibilities and citizenship in heterosexual women's talk about sex: promoting women's sexual health and safety. *Health Sociology Review, 15*, 277-286.

Buckingham, D., & Bragg, S. (2003). *Young People, Media and Personal Relationships*. London: The Independent Television Commission.

Buston, K., Wight, D. & Scott, S. (2001). Difficulty and Diversity: The Context and Practice of Sex Education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(3), 353-368. DOI: 10.1080/01425690120067971

Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an Account of Oneself.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Butler, J. (1997a). *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative.* New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1997b). *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories of Subjection*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1991). Imitation and Gender Insubordination. In Fuss, D. (Ed.), *Inside/Out: Lesbian Theories, Gay Theories* (pp. 13-31). New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Calogero, R. M., Pina, A., Park, L. E., & Rahemtulla, Z. (2010). Objectification Theory Predicts College Women's Attitudes Toward Cosmetic Surgery. *Sex Roles, 63*, 32-41. DOI 10.1007/s11199-010-9759-5

Cameron-Lewis, V., & Allen, L. (2013). Teaching pleasure *and* danger in sexuality education. *Sex Education, 13*(2), 121-132. DOI: 10.1080/14681811.2012.697440

Carpenter, L. M. (2002). Gender and the Meaning and Experience of Virginity Loss in the Contemporary United States. *Gender and Society, 16*(3), 345-365.

Charles, C. E. (2010). Complicating hetero-femininities: young women, sexualities and 'girl power' at school. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 23*, 33-47. DOI: 10.1080/09518390903447135

Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity. Rethinking the Concept. *Gender and Society, 19*(6), 829-859. DOI: 10.1177/0891243205278639

Corteen, K. M. (2006). Schools' fulfilment of sex and relationship education documentation: three school-based case studies. *Sex Education, 6*(1), 77-99. DOI: 10.1080/14681810500508741

Coy, M., Garner, M. (2012). Definitions, discourses and dilemmas: policy and academic engagement with the sexualisation of popular culture. *Gender and Education, 24*(3), 285-301. DOI: 10.1080/09540253.2012.667793

Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual Double Standards: A Review and Methodological Critique of Two Decades of Research. *The Journal of Sex Research, 40*(1), 13-26.

Crush, J. (Ed.) (1999). *Power of Development*. London: Routledge.

Csapó, B., Molnár, Gy., & Kinyó, L. (2009). A magyar oktatási rendszer szelektivitása a nemzetközi összehasonlító vizsgálatok eredményeinek tükrében. [The selectivity of the Hungarian education system in the light of the results of international comparative studies]. *Iskolakultúra 2009*(3-4), 3-13.

Csapó, B. (2003). Az iskolai osztályok közötti különbségek és az oktatási rendszer demokratizálása. [Differences between school forms and the democratisation of the education system]. *Iskolakultúra 2003*(8), 107-117.

Davis, K. (1991). Remaking the She-Devil: A Critical Look at Feminist Approaches to Beauty. *Hypatia, 6*(2), 21-43.

Didie, E. R., & Sarwer, D. B. (2003). Factors That Influence the Decision to Undergo Cosmetic Breast Augmentation Surgery. *Journal of Women's Health, 12*(3), 241-253.

Durst, J. (2011). "What makes us gypsies, who knows…?!": Ethnicity and Reproduction. In Stewart, M., & Rövid, M. (Eds.), *Multi-Disciplinary Approaches to Romany Studies* (pp. 13-34). Budapest: Central European University.

Durst, J. (2006). *Kirekesztettség és gyermekvállalás. A romák termékenységének változása néhány „gettósodó" aprófaluban (1970-2004)* [Social exclusion and reproduction. Changes in the fertility patterns of Roma people in some "ghettoising" small villages (1970-2004)]. PhD Dissertation, Manuscript. Budapest: Corvinus Egyetem, Szociológia és Szociálpolitika Tanszék. http://phd.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/24/1/durst_judit.pdf

Durst, J. (2002). Fertility and childbearing practices among poor Gypsy women in Hungary: the intersections of class, race and gender. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, *35*, 457-474.

Dyker, D. A., Radosevic, S. (Eds.), *Innovation and Structural Change in Post-Socialist Countries: A Quantitative Approach.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Eder, D., Evans, C. C., & Parker, S. (1997). *School Talk: Gender and Adolescent Culture.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Emigh, R. J., Fodor, É., & Szelényi, I. (2001). The Racialization and Feminization of Poverty? In Emigh, R. J., & Szelényi, I. (Eds.), *Powerty, Ethnicity, and Gender in Eastern Europe during the Market Transition* (pp. 1-32). Westport, CT; London: Praeger.

Engebrigsten, A. I. (2007). *Exploring Gypsiness. Power, Exchange and Interdependence in a Transylvanian Village.* New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S., & Telford, D. (2003). *Silenced Sexualities in Schools and Universities.* Stoke on Trent, UK; Sterling, USA: Trentham Books.

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S., & Telford, D. (2001). "Othering" Education: Sexualities, Silences, and Schooling. *Review of Research in Education, 25*, 127-179.

Eriksen, T. H. (1993). *Ethnicity and nationalism: anthropological perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.

E.S.Z.T.E.R. Foundation (2010). *Az „Online szexuális abúzus" című, budapesti 16 évesek tapasztalatain alapuló kutatás adatainak elsődleges elemzése* [Primary analysis of data from the research study "Online sexual abuse" based on the experiences of 16-year olds in Budapest.] http://www.budapestedu.hu/data/cms101384/Kutatasi_jelentes_OSA_Mereis.pdf

European Commission (2014). *Discrimination in the EU in 2012*. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_393_en.pdf

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) (2014). *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey.* Main results. http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results-apr14_en.pdf

Evans, A., Riley, S., Shankar, A. (2010). Technologies of Sexiness: Theorizing Women's Engagement in the Sexualization of Culture. *Feminism & Psychology, 20*(1), 114-131. DOI: 10.1177/0959353509351854

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.), *Discourse As Social Interaction* (pp. 271-280). London: SAGE.

Farvid, P., & Braun, V. (2006). 'Most of Us Guys are Raring to Go Anytime, Anyplace, Anywhere': Male and Female Sexuality in *Cleo* and *Cosmo. Sex Roles, 55*, 295-310. DOI 10.1007/s11199-006-9084-1

Fasula, A. M., Carry, M., & Miller, K. S. (2014). A Multidimensional Framework for the Meanings of the Sexual Double Standard and its Application for the Sexual Health of Young Black Women in the U.S. *Journal of Sex Research, 51*(2), 170-183. DOI: 10.1080/00224499.2012.716874

Fine, M. (1988). Sexuality, Schooling, and Adolescent Females: The Missing Discourse of Desire. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(1), 29-53.

Fine, M., & McClelland, S. I. (2007). The politics of teen women's sexuality: Public policy and the adolescent female body. *Emory Law Journal, 56*, 993-1038.

Fine, M., & McClelland, S. I. (2006). Sexuality Education and Desire: Still Missing after All These Years. *Harvard Educational Review, 76*(3), 297-338.

Flood, M. (2013). Male and Female Sluts. Shifts and Stabilities in the Regulation of Sexual Relations among Young Heterosexual Men. *Australian Feminist Studies, 28*(75), 95-107. DOI: 10.1080/08164649.2012.758024

Fónai, M., & Dusa, Á. R. (2014). A tanárok presztízsének és társadalmi státuszának változásai a kilencvenes és a kétezres években. [Changes in the prestige and social status of teachers in the 1990s and 2000s.] *Iskolakultúra, 24*(6), 41-49.

Foucault, M. (1994). Two lectures. In Kelly, M. (Ed.), *Critique and power: recasting the Foucault/Habermas* debate (pp. 17–46). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In Gordon, C. (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M., (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Fox, N.J., & Alldred, P. (2013). The sexuality-assemblage: desire, affect, anti-humanism. *The Sociological Review*, 1-21. DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.12075

Fraser, A. (1992). *The Gypsies*. Oxford; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Frankenberg, R. (2001). The Mirage of an Unmarked Whiteness. In Brander Rasmussen, B., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, I. J., & Wray, M. (Eds.), *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness* (pp. 72-96). Durham; London: Duke University Press.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White Women, Race Matters: the Social Construction of Whiteness.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T-A. (1997). Objectification Theory. Toward Understanding Women's Lived Experiences and Mental Health Risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173-206.

Gamoran, A. (2010). Tracking and inequality. New directions for research and practice. In Apple, M. W., Ball, S. J., & Gandin, L. A. (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 213-228). London; New York: Routledge.

García, L. (2009) Now Why do you Want to Know about That? Heteronormativity, Sexism, and Racism in the Sexual (Mis)Education of Latina Youth. *Gender and Society, 23*, 520-541. DOI: 10.1177/0891243209339498

Gay y Blasco, P. (1999). *Gypsies in Madrid: Sex, gender, and the performance of identity.* Oxford: Berg.

Gay y Blasco, P. (1997). A 'Different' Body? Desire and Virginity Among Gitanos. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 3*(3), 517-535.

Giddens, Anthony (1992). *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gill, R. (2007). Postfeminist media culture. Elements of a sensibility. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 10*(2), 147-166. DOI: 10.1177/1367549407075898

Gillespie (1996). Women, the Body and Brand Extension. *Medicine, Women & Health, 24*(4), 69-85. DOI: 10.1300/J013v24n04_04

Gimlin, D. L. (2013). "Too Good to be Real": The Obviously Augmented Breast in Women's Narratives of Cosmetic Surgery. *Gender and Society, 27*(6), 913-934. DOI: 10.1177/0891243213493001

Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Theory and Resistance in Education. Towards a Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Westport, CT; London: Bergin & Garvey.

Gorgos, L. M., & Marrazzo, J. M. (2011). Sexually Transmitted Infections Among Women Who Have Sex With Women. *Clinical Infectious Diseases, 53*, 84–91. DOI: 10.1093/cid/cir697

Gupta, A. E., Zimmerman, T. S., & Fruhauf, C. A. (2008). Relationship Advice in the Top Selling Women's Magazine, *Cosmopolitan*: A Content Analysis. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy, 7*(3), 248-266. DOI: 10.1080/15332690802237987

Hajdú, T., Kertesi, G., & Kézdi, G. (2014). *Roma fiatalok a középiskolában. Beszámoló a Tárki Életpálya-felvételének 2006 és 2012 közötti hullámaiból.* [Roma youth in secondary education. Report on the 2006 to 2012 waves of Tárki's lifecourse survey]. *Budapest Munkagazdaságtani Füzetek Budapest / Working Papers On The Labour Market, 2014/7*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Közgazdaság- és Regionális Tudományi Kutatóközpont, Közgazdaság-tudományi Intézet, Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, Emberi Erőforrások Tanszék.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Halliwell, E., Malson, H., & Tischner, I. (2011). Are Contemporary Media Images Which Seem to Display Women as Sexually Empowered Actually Harmful to Women? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35*(1), 38-45. DOI: 10.1177/0361684310385217

Hamilton, L., & Armstrong, E. A. (2009). Gendered Sexuality in Young Adulthood. Double Binds and Flawed Options. *Gender and Society, 23*(5), 589-616. DOI: 10.1177/0891243209345829

Harris Interactive (2001). *Hostile Hallways: Bullying, Teasing and Sexual Harassment at School.* Washington: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. http://history.aauw.org/files/2013/01/hostilehallways.pdf

Havas, G., & Liskó, I. (2006): *Óvodától a szakmáig*. [From kindergarten to profession.] Budapest: Oktatáskutató Intézet – Új Mandátum Kiadó.

Havas, G., Kemény, I., & Kertesi, G. (2000). A relatív cigány a klasszifikációs küzdőtéren. [The Relative Gypsy on the Classificatory Battlefield.] In Horváth, Á., Landau, E., & Szalai, J. (Eds.), *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [To be Born a

Gypsy. Studies and Documents] (pp. 193-201). Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum Kiadó.

Hird, M. J. (2000). An Empirical study of adolescent dating aggression in the U.K. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*, 69-78. DOI:10.1006/jado.1999.0292

Hill, C., & Kearl, H. (2011). *Crossing the Line. Sexual Harassment at School.* Washington: Americal Association of University Women. http://www.aauw.org/files/2013/02/Crossing-the-Line-Sexual-Harassment-at-School.pdf

Horn, D., Balázsi, I., Takács, Sz., & Zhang, Y. (2006). Tracking and Inequality of Learning Outcomes in Hungarian Secondary Schools. *Prospects, 36*(4), 433-446.

Horváth, K. (2002). "Gyertek ki nálunk, hogy jobban megismerjük egymást." [Come out to us so that we get to know each other better.] *Tér és terep. Tanulmányok az etnicitás és az identitás kérdésköréből* [Space and field. Studies on ethnicity and identity] (pp. 241-326). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Horváth, K. (2008). A cigány különbségtétel. [Gypsy Differentiation.] Available: http://cieh-programmes.univ-paris3.fr/modules.php?name=ContentMinoa&pid=10

Hughes, C., & Evans, A. (2003). Health Needs Of Women Who Have Sex With Women: Healthcare Workers Need To Be Aware Of Their Specific Needs. *British Medical Journal, 327*(7421), 939-940.

Jackson, S. M., & Cram, F. (2003). Disrupting the sexual double standard: Young women's talk about heterosexuality. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 113-127.

Jackson, S., & Weatherall, A. (2010). The (Im)possibilities of Feminist School Based Sexuality Education. *Feminism Psychology, 20*, 166-185. DOI: 10.1177/0959353509349603

Jackson, S., & Westrupp, E. (2010). Sex, Postfeminist Popular Culture and the Pre-Teen Girl. *Sexualities, 13*, 357-376. DOI: 10.1177/1363460709363135

Janky, B. (2005). A cigány nők társadalmi helyzete és termékenysége. [The social situation and fertility of gypsy women.] In Nagy, I., Pongrácz, T., Tóth, I. Gy. (Eds.), Szerepváltozások. Jelentés a nők és férfiak helyzetéről, 2005 [Role changes. Report on the situation of women and men, 2005] (pp. 136-148). Budapest: TÁRKI – Ifjúsági, Családügyi, Szociális és Esélyegyenlőségi Minisztérium.

Jeyasingham, D. (2010). Building heteronormativity: the social and material reconstruction of men's public toilets as spaces of heterosexuality. *Social & Cultural Geography, 11*(4), 307-325. DOI: 10.1080/14649361003787706

Johnson, P. (2007). Ordinary Folk and Cottaging: Law, Morality, and Public Sex. *Journal of Law and Society*, 34(4), 520-543.

Kállai, E, & Törzsök, E. (Eds.) (2006). *Átszervezések kora. Cigánynak lenni Magyarországon. Jelentés 2002-2006.* [The Era of Reorganisations. To Be a Gypsy in Hungary. Report 2002-2006.] Budapest: Európai Összehasonlító Kisebbségkutatások Közalapítvány.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender and Society, 2*(3), 274-290.

Keddie, A. (2009). 'Some of those girls can be real drama queens': issues of gender, sexual harassment and schooling. *Sex Education, 9*(1), 1–16. DOI: 10.1080/14681810802639863

Kehily, M. J. (2012). Contextualising the sexualisation of girls debate: innocence, experience and young female sexuality. *Gender and Education, 24*(3), 255-268. DOI: 10.1080/09540253.2012.670391

Kehily, M. J. (2002). *Sexuality, Gender and Schooling. Shifting Agendas in Social Learning.* London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kelly, L. (1988). *Surviving Sexual Violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kemény, I., & Janky, B. (2005). Roma Population of Hungary 1971-2003. In Kemény, I. (Ed.), *Roma of Hungary*. Boulder, CO: Atlantic Research and Publications.

Kemény, I. (Ed.) (2005). *Roma of Hungary*. Boulder, CO: Atlantic Research and Publications.

Kemény, I. (2004). A magyarországi cigány népesség demográfiája. [Demography of the Hungarian Gypsy population.] In *Demográfia, 3-4*, 335-346. Budapest: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal.

Kemény. I. (2000). A magyarországi Romák. [The Roma in Hungary.] *Változó Világ, 31*.

Kertesi, G., & Kézdi, G. (2009). Általános iskolai szegregáció Magyarországon az ezredforduló után. [Primary school segregation in Hungary after the Millenium]. *Közgazdasági Szemle, 56*, 959–1000.

Kertesi, G., & Kézdi, G. (2008). A roma és nem roma fiatalok középiskolai továbbtanulása. Első eredmények a TÁRKI–Educatio Életpálya-felmérése alapján [Secondary education of roma and non-roma youth. First results of the TÁRKI–Educatio lifecourse survey]. In Kolosi, T., & Tóth, I. Gy. (Eds.), *Társadalmi riport* [Social Report] (pp. 344-362). Budapest: TÁRKI.

Kertesi, G. (2005). *Roma foglalkoztatás az ezredfordulón. A rendszerváltás maradandó sokkja.* [Roma employment at the turn of the Millenium. The abiding shock of the change of regime]. *Budapesti Munkagazdaságtani Füzetek 2005/4*. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet, Munkapiaci Kutatások – Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, Emberi Erőforrások Tanszék.

Kertesi, G., & Kézdi, G. (1998). *A cigány népesség Magyarországon. Dokumentáció és adattár*. [Gypsy Population in Hungary. Documentation and Database.] Budapest: Socio-typo.

Ketting, E., & Winkelmann, C. (2013). New approaches to sexuality education and underlying paradigms. *Bundesgesundheitsbl, 56*, 250-255. DOI 10.1007/s00103-012-1599-8

Khanna, N. (2011). Ethnicity and race as 'symbolic': the use of ethnic and racial symbols in asserting a biracial identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 34*(6), 1049-1067. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2010.538421

King, B. W. (2014). Inverting virginity, abstinence, and conquest: Sexual agency and subjectivity in classroom conversation. *Sexualities, 17*(3), 310-328. DOI: 10.1177/1363460713516337

Kligman, G. (2001). On the Social Construction of "Otherness": Identifying "the Roma" in Post-socialist Communities. *Review of Sociology, 7*(2), 61-78.

Kóczé, A. (2011). *Gender, Ethnicity and Class: Romani Women's Political Activism and Social Struggles*. PhD Dissertation, Manuscript. Budapest: Central European University, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology.

Kóczé, A., with Popa, R. M. (2009). *Missing Intersectionality: Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Class in Current Research and Policies on Romani Women in Europe.* Policy Papers, CEU Center for Policy Studies. Budapest: CEU Press.

Kogan, I., Gebel, M., & Noelke, C. (2012). Educational Systems and Inequalities in Educational Attainment in Central and Eastern European Countries. *Studies of Transition States and Societies, 4*(1), 69-83.

Kristeva, J., (1982). *Powers of Horror: an Essay on Abjection*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ladányi, J. & Szelényi, I. (2004). *A kirekesztettség változó formái*. [Changing forms of exclusion.] Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó.

Ladányi, J., & Szelényi, I. (2000). Az etnikai besorolás objektivitásáról. [On the objectivity of ethnic classification.] In Horváth, Á., Landau, E., & Szalai, J. (Eds.), *Cigánynak születni. Tanulmányok, dokumentumok* [To be Born a Gypsy. Studies and Documents] (pp. 203-209). Budapest: Aktív Társadalom Alapítvány – Új Mandátum Kiadó.

Ladányi, J. (1989). A lakásrendszer változásai és a cigánynépesség térbeni elhelyezkedésének átalakulása Budapesten. [Changes in the apartment system and the spatial situatedness of the gypsy population in Budapest.] *Valóság, 8*, 73-89.

Lahelma, E., Palmu, T., & Gordon, T. (2000). Intersecting Power Relations in Teachers' Experiences of Being Sexualized or Harassed by Students. *Sexualities, 3*(4), 463-481.

Lamb, S., Lustig, K., & Graling, K. (2013). The use and misuse of pleasure in sex education curricula. *Sex Education, 13*(3), 305-318. DOI:10.1080/14681811.2012.738604

Lamb, S. (2010). Feminist Ideals for a Healthy Female Adolescent Sexuality: A Critique. *Sex Roles, 62*, 294-306. DOI 10.1007/s11199-009-9698-1

Lareau, A., & Conley, D. (2008). *Social Class. How Does It Work?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lareau, A., & Weininger, E. B. (2003). Cultural Capital in Educational Research: A Critical Assessment. *Theory and Society, 32*(5/6), 567-606.

Lawler, S. (2005). Disgusted subjects: the making of middle-class identities. *The Sociological Review, 53*(3), 429-446.

Lawton, A. (2007). Between Scylla and Charybdis: The Perils of Reporting Sexual Harassment. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Labor and Employment Law, 9*(3), 603-655.

Lees, S. (1993). *Sugar and Spice. Sexuality and Adolescent Girls*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Lewis, J., & Knijn, T. (2003). Sex Education Materials in The Netherlands and in England and Wales: a comparison of content, use and teaching practice. *Oxford Review of Education, 29*(1), 113-132. DOI: 10.1080/0305498032000045395

Ligeti, Gy. (2006). Sztereotípiák és előítéletek. [Stereotypes and prejudices.] In Kolosi, T., Tóth, I. Gy., Vukovich, Gy. (Eds.), *Társadalmi riport* [Social Report] (pp. 373-389). Budapest: TÁRKI.

Liskó, I. (2008). Szakképzés és lemorzsolódás. [Vocational training and dropping out.] In Fazekas, K., Köllő, J., Varga, J. (Eds.), *Zöld könyv a magyar közoktatás megújításáért* [Green Book for the renewal of Hungarian public education] (pp. 95-119). Budapest: ECOSTAT.

Liskó, I. (2005). *A roma tanulók középiskolai továbbtanulása*. [Secondary Education of Roma Students.] Kutatás Közben sorozat, 268. Budapest: Felsőoktatási Kutatóintézet.

Loxley, J. (2006). *Performativity*. Abingdon; New York: Routledge.

Luker, K. (2007). *When Sex Goes to School. Warring Views on Sex – and Sex Education since the Sixties.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Lupton, R., & Hempel-Jorgensen, A. (2012). The importance of teaching: pedagogical constraints and possibilities in working-class schools. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(5), 601-620. DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2012.710016

Lupton, R., & Thrupp, M. (2013). Headteachers' readings of and responses to disadvantaged contexts: evidence from English primary schools. *British Educational Research Journal, 39*(4), 769-788. DOI: 10.1080/01411926.2012.683771

Lyons, H., Giordano, P. C., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2011). Identity, Peer Relationships, and Adolescent Girls' Sexual Behavior: An Exploration of the Contemporary Double Standard. *Journal of Sex Research, 48*(5), 437-449. DOI: 10.1080/00224499.2010.506679

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and Schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Martin, J. N., Krizek, R. L., Nakayama, T. K., & Bradford, L. (1999). What Do White People Want to Be Called? A Study of Self-Labels for White Americans. In Nakayama, T. K., & Martin, J. N. (Eds.), *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity* (pp. 27-50). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Martinez, M. D., Wald, K. D., & Craig, S. C. (2008). Homophobic Innumeracy? Estimating the Size of the Gay and Lesbian Population. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 72*(4), 753-767. DOI: 10.1093/poq/nfn049

Mauss, M. (1990 [1925]). *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies.* London: Routledge.

McCarry, M. (2010). Becoming a 'proper man': young people's attitudes about interpersonal violence and perceptions of gender. *Gender and Education, 22*(1), 17-30. DOI: 10.1080/09540250902749083

McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial Leather. Race, Gender and sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. London; New York: Routledge.

McNair (2002). *Striptease Culture: Sex, Media and the Democratization of Desire*. London; New York: Routledge.

McRobbie, A. (2004). Post-feminism and popular culture. *Feminist Media Studies, 4*(3), 255-264. DOI: 10.1080/1468077042000309937

McWhorter, L. (2004). Sex, Race, and Biopower: A Foucauldian Genealogy. *Hypatia, 19*(3), 38-62.

Medley-Rath, S. R. (2007). "Am I Still a Virgin?": What Counts as Sex in 20 years of Seventeen. *Sex Cult, 11*, 24-38. DOI 10.1007/s12119-007-9002-x

Menninghaus, W. (2003) *Disgust. The Theory and History of a Strong Sensation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mészáros, Gy. (2014). *Szubkultúrák és iskolai nevelés. Narratív, kritikai pedagógiai etnográfia.* [Subcultures and School Education. A Narrative Critical Pedagogical

Ethnography.] Veszprém: Iskolakultúra-könyvek 48.
http://mek.oszk.hu/13400/13473/13473.pdf

Ministry of Education (2012). *A Nemzeti Alaptanterv* [National Core Curriculum].
http://www.budapestedu.hu/data/cms149320/MK_12_66_NAT.pdf

Ministry of Education (2008). *Kerettanterv a szakközépiskolák 9-12. évfolyama számára*
[Frame Curriculum for years 9-10 of technical schools].
http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/kozoktatas/tantervek/oktatasi-kulturalis

Ministry of Education (2007). *A Nemzeti Alaptanterv* [National Core Curriculum].
http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/kozoktatas/tantervek/nemzeti-alaptanterv-nat

Ministry of Education (2004). *Segédlet az iskolai egészségnevelési, egészségfejlesztési
program elkészítéséhez* [Guideline for schools for the preparation of health education
programmes]. http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/kozoktatas/egeszsegfejlesztes/segedlet-iskolai

Mirón, L. F., & Inda, J. X. (2000). Race As a Kind of Speech Act. *Cultural Studies: A
Research Annual, 5*, 85-107.

Moran, J. P. (2000). *Teaching Sex. The Shaping of Adolescence in the 20th Century*.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nadeau, R., Niemi, R. G., & Levine, J. (1993). Innumeracy about minority populations.
Public Opinion Quarterly, 57, 332-347.

Nagel, J. (2003). *Race, Ethnicity, and Sexuality: Intimate Intersections, Forbidden Frontiers.*
New York: Oxford University Press.

Nagel, J. (2000). Ethnicity and Sexuality. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 107-133.

Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture.
Social Problems, 41(1), 152-176.

Nakayama, T. K., & Krizek, R. L. (1999). Whiteness as a Strategic Rhetoric. In Nakayama, T.
K., & Martin, J. N. (Eds.), *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity* (pp. 87-
106). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Nakayama, T. K., & Martin, J. N. (Eds.) (1999). *Whiteness: The Communication of Social
Identity*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Nayak, A., & Kehily, M. J. (2006). Gender undone: subversion, regulation and embodiment in
the work of Judith Butler. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 27*(4), 459-472.
DOI: 10.1080/01425690600803038

Nayak, A., & Kehily, M. J. (1996). Playing it straight: masculinities, homophobias and
schooling. *Journal of Gender Studies, 5*(2), 211-230.

Neményi, M., Vajda, R. (2014). Dampened voices: a comparative look at Roma adolescents'
discourses on being 'othered' at school. In Szalai, J., & Schiff, C. (Eds.), *Migrant,
Roma and post-colonial youth in education across Europe: being visibly 'different'*.
Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Neményi, M. (2007). Serdülő roma gyerekek identitás-stratégiái. [Identity strategies of Roma
adolescents.] *Educatio, 2007/1*, 84-98.

Neményi, M. (1999). Biológia vagy kultúra? Termékenységgel kapcsolatos
szerepviselkedések a roma nők körében. [Biology or culture? Role behaviours related
to fertility among roma women.] In Kemény, I. (Ed.), A cigányok Magyarországon
[Gypsies in Hungary] (pp. 103-138). Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.

299

Neményi, M. (1998). *Cigány anyák az egészségügyben*. [Gypsy mothers in public healthcare] Budapest: Nemzeti és Etnikai Kisebbségi Hivatal.

Németh, Á., & Költő, A. (2011). *Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC): A WHO-collaborative Cross-National Study National Report 2010.* Budapest: Országos Gyermekegészségügyi Intézet. http://www.ogyei.hu/anyagok/HBSC_2010.pdf

Niedermüller, P. (1994). A város: kultúra, mítosz, imagináció. [The city: culture, myth, imagination.] *Mozgó Világ*, 5, 5-17.

Nirenberg, J. (Ed.) (2011). *Gypsy Sexuality: Romani and Outsider Perspectives on Intimacy*. LLC: Clambake Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1995). Objectification. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 24*(4), 249-291.

O'Flynn, S., & Epstein, D. (2005). Standardising Sexuality: Embodied Knowledge, "Achievement" and "Standards". *Social Semiotics, 15*(2), 185-210. DOI: 10.1080/10350330500154741

Okely, J. (1983). *The Traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Opperman, E., Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Rogers, C. (2014). "It Feels So Good It Almost Hurts": Young Adults' Experiences of Orgasm and Sexual Pleasure. *Journal of Sex Research*, *51*(5), 503-515. DOI: 10.1080/00224499.2012.753982

Overby, L. M., & Barth, J. (2006). Numeracy about Minority Populations: Americans' Estimations of Local Gay Population Size. *Polity, 38*(2), 194-210.

Pálos, D. (2010). "Cigány" identitások nehézségei. [Difficulties with "Gypsy" identities.] *Esély, 2010/2*.

Pálos, D. (2006). „Cseperedünk!" Egy beás cigány közösség önsztereotipizálási folyamatairól. ["We are growing up!" The process of self-stereotipization in a Boyash community.] In Bakó, B., & Papp, R. (Eds.), *Mindennapi előítéleteink. Társadalmi távolságok és etnikai sztereotípiák* [Our everyday prejudices. Social distances and ethnic stereotypes], (pp. 91-119). Budapest: Balassi Kiadó – MTA ENKI.

Parker, R., Wellings, K., & Lazarus, J. W. (2009). Sexuality education in Europe: an overview of current policies. *Sex Education, 9*(3), 227-242. DOI: 10.1080/14681810903059060

Pascoe, C. J., (2007). *Dude, you're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pateman, Carole (1988). *The Sexual Contract.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pfeffer, F. T. (2008). Persistent Inequality in Educational Attainment and its Institutional Context. *European Sociological Review*, *24*(5), 543–565. DOI:10.1093/esr/jcn026

Powell, A. (2010). *Sex, Power and Consent: Youth Culture and the Unwritten Rules.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Probyn, E. (2000). *Carnal Appetites: FoodSexIdentities*. London: Routledge.

Radó, P. (2008). *The Potential and Limitations of the Learning Outcomes Based Approach to Education in Promoting Equity. Central-European Comparative Overview.* Budapest: Policy making for equity in education in Austria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Ramazanoglu, C. (Ed.) (1993). *Up Against Foucault. Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism.* London; New York: Routledge.

Raphael-Leff, J. (2010). The gift of gametes — unconscious motivation, commodification and problematics of genealogy. *Feminist Review, 94*, 117-137.

Ragoné, H. (1994). *Surrogate Motherhood. Conception in the Heart.* Boulder; San Francisco; Oxford: Westview Press.

Rasmussen, M. L. (2012). Pleasure/desire, sexularism and sexuality education. *Sex Education, 12*(4), 469-481. DOI: 10.1080/14681811.2012.677204

Rasmussen, M. L. (2009). Beyond gender identity? *Gender and Education, 21*(4), 431-447. DOI: 10.1080/09540250802473958

Rasmussen, M. L., Rofes. E., & Talburt, S. (Eds.) (2004). *Youth and Sexualities. Pleasure, Subversion and Insubordination In and Out of Schools*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Reay, D. (2006). The zombie stalking English schools: social class and educational inequality. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 54*(3), 288-307. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8527.2006.00351.x

Rédai, D. (2015). Gender dichotómia a szexuális öröm diskurzusaiban. [Gender Dichotomy in Discourses of Sexual Pleasure.] *Socio.hu, 2015/1*. DOI: 10.18030/socio.hu.2015.1.188

Rédai, D. (2012). "Sok újat nem mondtak. Mi már mindent tudunk erről." Az iskolai szexuális nevelés és a középiskolás lányok szexualitása. ["They didn't say anything new. We already know all about it." Sex education in schools and sexualities of secondary-school girls.] In: Kozma, T., & Perjés, I. (Eds.), *Új Kutatások a Neveléstudományokban 2011*. [New Research Studies in Education Studies 2011.] Budapest: MTA Pedagógiai Tudományos Bizottsága, ELTE Eötvös Kiadó. http://www.nevelestudomany.hu/kiadvanyok/uj-kutatasok-a-nevelestudom.html

Rédai, D. (2011). "...én az olyanokat értem meg, akik nem tehetnek róla." Középiskolás heteroszexuális diákok diskurzusai a melegség kialakulásáról. ["…I understand those who cannot help it." Discourses of heterosexual secondary students about the emergence of homosexuality.] In Takács, J. (Ed.), *Homofóbia Magyarországon*. [Homophobia in Hungary.] (pp. 140-151). Budapest: L'Harmattan. http://mek.oszk.hu/10400/10446/10446.pdf

Rédai, D. (2010). Sex and Family in the School. Discourses on citizenship in sex and family education in Hungarian secondary schools from the 1960s till today. Conference paper presented at: *Beyond Citizenship. Feminism and the Transformation of Belonging.* Birckbeck, University of London, London, UK, 30 June – 2 July, 2010.

Rédai, D., & Szabó, G. (2013). *Finom manipuláció, kedves félreinformálás. A kötelező abortusz-tanácsadás gyakorlata Magyarországon.* [Gentle manipulation, kind misinformation. The practice of compulsory abortion counselling in Hungary.] Budapest: Patent Association. http://abortusz.info/doc/abortusz_tanacsadas_kutatas_tanulmany.pdf

Reskin, F. R., & Roos, P. A. (1990*). Job Queues, Gender Queues: explaining women's inroads into male occupations.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Reskin, F. R. (1988). Bringing the Men Back in: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work. *Gender and Society*, *2*(1), 58-81.

Rizq, R. (2013). States of Abjection. *Organization Studies, 34*(9), 1277-1297. DOI: 10.1177/0170840613477640

Robert, P. (2010). Social origin, school choice, and student performance. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *16*(2), 107-129. DOI: 10.1080/13803611.2010.484972

Robinson, K. (2000). 'Great Tits, Miss!' The silencing of male students' sexual harassment of female teachers in secondary schools: a focus on gendered authority. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 21*(1), 75-90. DOI: 10.1353/crt.2004.0025

Rottenberg, C. (2003). Passing: Race, Identification, and Desire. *Criticism, 45*(4), 435-452.

Sarikakis, K. (2003). A feminist in Brussels (and Glasgow, Berlin, Düsseldorf…) or Self-configuration in research into European Union politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies, 10*(4), 439-457. DOI: 10.1177/13505068030104005

Serban-Temisan, M. (2011). Romanian Roma women's narratives about their sense of self. In Nirenberg, J. (Ed.), *Gypsy Sexuality: Romani and Outsider Perspectives on Intimacy* (pp. 9-49). LLC: Clambake Press.

Shaw, R. (2008). Rethinking Reproductive Gifts as Body Projects. *Sociology, 42*(1), 11–28. DOI: 10.1177/0038038507084823

Silverman, C. (1988). Negotiating "Gypsiness": Strategy in Context. *The Journal of American Folklore, 101*(401), 261-275.

Simich, R., & Fábián R. (2010). *Iskola – egészségfejlesztés – szexedukáció. Veszélyeztetett korú diákok prevenciós igényei és szükségletei.* [School – health development – sex education. The prevention wants and needs of students of at-risk age]. Budapest: Országos Egészségfejlesztési Intézet. http://www.oefi.hu/tanulmany_szex.pdf

Skeggs, B. (2004). *Class, Self, Culture*. London; New York: Routledge.

Spalding R., Zimmerman, T. S., Fruhauf, C. A., Banning, J. H., & Pepin, J. (2010). Relationship Advice in Top-Selling Men's Magazines: A Qualitative Document Analysis. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 22*(3), 203-224. DOI: 10.1080/08952833.2010.503795

Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A Critique of Postcolonial reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.

Stacey, J. (1988). Can There Be a Feminist Ethnography? *Women's Studies International Forum, 11*(1) 21-27.

Stanger-Hall, K. F., & Hall, D. W. (2011). Abstinence-Only Education and Teen Pregnancy Rates: Why We Need Comprehensive Sex Education in the U.S. *PloS ONE 6*(10), 1-11. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0024658

Steer, A., & Tiggemann, M. (2008). The role of self-objectification in women's sexual functioning. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 27*(3), 205-225.

Stevens, A. J., & Vermeersch, H. (2010). Streaming in Flemish secondary schools: exploring teachers' perceptions of and adaptations to students in different streams. *Oxford Review of Education*, *36*(3), 267–284. DOI: 10.1080/03054981003629862

Stewart, M. (1997). *The Time of the Gypsies*. Boulder, CO; Oxford: Westview Press.

Szymanski, D. M., Moffitt, L. B., & Carr, E. R. (2011). Sexual Objectification of Women: Advances to Theory and Research. *The Counseling Psychologist 39*(1), 6-38. DOI: 10.1177/0011000010378402.

Takács, J., Dombos, T., Mészáros, Gy., & P. Tóth, T. (2012). Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Bother: Homophobia and the Heteronorm in Hungary. In Trappolin, L., Gasparini, A., Wintemute, R. (Eds.), *Confronting Homophobia in Europe. Social and Legal Perspectives* (pp. 79-105). Oxford: Hart Publishing. http://policy.hu/takacs/pdf-lib/dont_ask_dont_tell_dont_bother.pdf

Talburt, S. (2004). Intelligibility and Narrating Queer Youth. In Rasmussen, M. L., Rofes. E., Talburt, S. (Eds.), *Youth and Sexualities. Pleasure, Subversion and Insubordination In and Out of Schools* (pp. 17-40). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Temple, J. R. (2005). "People Who Are Different from You": Heterosexism in Quebec High School Textbooks. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(3), 271-294.

Tesfay, S. (2005). A kalap, az ezüstgombos lájbi és az ezüst zsebóra. A marosvásárhelyi gáborcigány viselet az identitás tükrében. [The hat, the silver-buttoned vest and the silver pocketwatch. Attire of Gábor gypsies in Tirgu Mures, as a reflection of identity.] *Világosság, 2005/7-8.*

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender Play. Girls and Boys in Schools.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Thrupp, M. (1998). The art of the possible: organizing and managing high and low socioeconomic schools. *Journal of Education Policy, 13*(2), 197-219.

Tóth, H. (2005). *Roma Women's Unemployment in Hungary*. Budapest: Central European University, Center for Policy Studies.

Tóth, K. D. (2007). A kisebbségi és a többségi identitás viszonyának lehetséges mintázatai. [Possible patterns of the relations of minority and majority identity.] *Századvég, 12*(43), 37-62.

Trenholm, C., Devaney, B., Fortson, K., Clark, M., Bridgespan, L. Q., & Wheeler, J. (2008). Impacts of Abstinence Education on Teen Sexual Activity, Risk of Pregnancy, and Risk of Sexually Transmitted Diseases. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 27*(2), 255-276. DOI: 10.1002/pam.20324

Újváriné Handó, M. (2009). Roma/cigány és nem Roma/cigány tanulók társas kapcsolatának vizsgálata iskolai környezetben. [An examination of social relations between Roma/gypsy and non-Roma/gypsy students in a school environment.] PhD Dissertation, Manuscript. Veszprém: Pannon Egyetem, Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola. http://konyvtar.uni-pannon.hu/doktori/2010/Ujvarine_Hando_Melinda_dissertation.pdf

Urban, W. (1999). Patterns of Structural Change in Manufacturing Industry in Central and Eastern Europe. In Dyker, D. A., Radosevic, S. (Eds.), *Innovation and Structural Change in Post-Socialist Countries: A Quantitative Approach.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vári, P., Auxné Bánfi, I., Felvégi, E., Rózsa, Cs., & Szalay, B. (2002). Gyorsjelentés a PISA 2000 vizsgálatról [Preliminary report about the PISA 2000 survey]. *Új Pedagógiai Szemle, January 2002*. http://epa.oszk.hu/00000/00035/00056/2002-01-ta-Tobbek-Gyorsjelentes.html

Vasquez, J. M. (2010). Blurred Borders for Some but not "Others": Racialization, "Flexible Ethnicity," Gender, and Third-Generation Mexican American Identity. *Sociological Perspectives, 53*(1), 45-72. DOI: 10.1525/sop.2010.53.1.45

Vatan, F. (2013). The Lure of Disgust: Musil and Kolnai. *The Germanic Review, 88*, 28–46. DOI: 10.1080/00168890.2013.756787

Waites, M. (2005). *The Age of Consent: Young People, Sexuality and Citizenship.* Houndmills; Basingstoke; Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Walkerdine, V. (2003). Reclassifying Upward Mobility: Femininity and the neo-liberal subject. *Gender and Education, 15*(3), 237-248. DOI: 10.1080/09540250303864

Wander, P. C., Martin, J. N., & Nakyama, T. K. (1999). Whiteness and Beyond: Sociohistorical Foundations of Whiteness and Contemporary Challenges. In Nakayama, T. K., & Martin, J. N. (Eds.), *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity* (pp. 13-26). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic options: choosing identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weiss, R. (1994). *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies.* New York: The Free Press.

Williams, J. C. (2011). Battling a 'sex-saturated society': The abstinence movement and the politics of sex education. *Sexualities, 14*(4), 416-443. DOI: 10.1177/1363460711406460

Youdell, D. (2006). *Impossible Bodies, Impossible Selves: Exclusions and Student Subjectivities.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Youdell, D. (2005). Sex-gender-sexuality: how sex, gender and sexuality constellations are constituted in secondary schools. *Gender and Education, 17*(3), 249-270.

Youdell, D. (2003). Identity Traps or How Black Students Fail: The Interactions between Biographical, Subcultural and Learner Identities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 24*(1), 3-20. DOI: 10.1080/0142569032000043579

Yuval-Davis, N. (1997). *Gender and Nation*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Zaikman, Y., & Marks, M. J. (2014). Ambivalent Sexism and the Sexual Double Standard. *Sex Roles, 71*, 333-344. DOI 10.1007/s11199-014-0417-1

Websites

A-HA: *Országos Szexuális és Mentálhigiénés Felvilágosító Program* [Nation-wide Sexual and Mental Health Educational Programme]. http://www.a-ha.hu/

Family Planning Association: *Sex Education, PSHE, SRE Resources*. http://www.fpa.org.uk/shop/78/product-list

Labrisz Lesbian Association: *"Getting to Know LGBT People." School programme*. http://www.labrisz.hu/school-programme

NANE Women's Rights Association: *"Heatbeat. Violence in Young People's Relationships." School programme*. http://www.nane.hu/egyesulet/tevekenysegek/szivdobbanas.html

NANE Women's Rights Association: *"Heatbeat. Relationship Violence in Young People's Lives." In-service training program for teachers*. http://www.bszf.hu/index.php

NANE Women's Rights Association: *"Talk to me" Domestic violence in young people's families. School programme*. http://www.empowering-youth.de/magyar/produkte.html

OECD (2000). *PISA 2000 Survey*. http://www.oecd.org/pisa/; http://pisa2000.acer.edu.au/index.php

Oxford Dictionary. http://www.oxforddictionaries.com

Public Health Act, 154/1997. http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=99700154.TV

Sex Education Forum: *The Sex Education Supplement*. http://www.sexeducationforum.org.uk/sex-educational-supplement

TES Online Network of Teachers: *Teaching resources for SRE.* https://www.tes.co.uk/teaching-resources/search/personal-social-and-health-education/sex-and-relationships/

The Guardian blog of the Teacher Network: *How to teach… sex education*. http://www.theguardian.com/education/teacher-blog/2013/jun/10/sex-education-teaching-resources