The Everyday Feminist Politics of (in)Security: A Curious Inquiry into Staff-Student Sexual Violence in UK Universities

A thesis submitted to The University of Manchester for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the Faculty of Humanities

2023

Sofia M. Doyle

School of Social Sciences

Department of Politics

Table of Contents

Word count: 70,954

<u>Abstract</u>

This thesis makes an inquiry into everyday staff-student sexual violence and the everyday politics of (in)security it engenders in UK universities. Although there has been much research in feminist security studies that examines relations of everyday (in)security and sexual violence 'over there' in more dominant empirical contexts in security studies and international politics - such as conflict and post-conflict contexts, and within international institutions of (in)security such as the military and the United Nations - to date no research in security studies has interrogated relations of (in)security happening 'over here' in the UK university. My thesis addresses this lacuna. I argue in this thesis that there is a continued orientation to studying sexual violence 'over' and 'out there' in the field of security studies that reproduces racialised and colonial logics, and reaffirms dominant sites of inquiry in security studies. Responding to this, I turn to relations of staff-student sexual violence 'over here' in the UK university as means through which to both question, confront, and resist these problematics in security studies. In order to do so, I look to everyday stories of (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in order to unpack the politics of (in)security that is discernible through everyday practices in UK universities. Building on techniques of 'critical fabulation' developed by Saidiya Hartman, I fabulate three scenes of staff-student sexual violence in this thesis: The Classroom, the Conference, and the Hearing. Taking seriously the importance of stories of sexual violence within the everyday, in these scenes I work to excavate the everyday practices and negotiations of (in)security in the context of staff-student sexual violence. I pay particular attention to how these experiences of everyday (in)security are embedded within broader gendered and racialised practices in the UK university.

<u>Declaration</u>

No portion of the work referred to in this thesis has been submitted in support of another application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright Statement

i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the "Copyright") and they have given the University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.

ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made **only** in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issues under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.

iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the "Intellectual Property") and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables ("Reproductions"), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.

iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see https://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=24420), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, the University Library's regulations (see http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/about/regulations/) and in the University's policy on Presentation of Theses.

Thank you to everyone in feminist book club; it has been such a privilege to read feminist work with you. I am so glad that we kept our sessions running over Zoom during those long lockdowns, they were a monthly spark of (feminist) joy in what was a very bleak time. An extra special thank you to Jenn Hobbs, Elli Beyer and Magdalena Rodekirchen for all of your feminist love and support, and for always being there for me when things were hard. A thank you to Jess Waugh, who has supported so many friends and loved ones through their PhDs she should, at this point, really be given one in her own right. Thank you for listening to me endlessly describe the horrors of the process, and for always reminding me that everything will be okay. And lastly, thank you to Aaron Gabriel, for offering me so much encouragement throughout this process.

Of course, a massive thank you to my family. To my siblings: Liera, Phil, and Jo. Thank you for always reminding me how important it is to have fun, and that there is so much more to life than a dissertation. Thank you to my Mum, for everything, always. But more than anything, thank you for teaching me to never give up. I was knocked down so many times during this PhD, and it is because of you that every time this happened I knew how to pick myself up, dust myself off, and try again. Thank you.

Lastly, and most importantly, I'd like to say thank you to my participants. I am forever grateful you took the time to share your stories with me.

Introduction

In my thesis, I make a feminist inquiry into the everyday politics of (in)security in UK universities in the context of staff-student sexual violence. Building on feminist security studies scholarship on the everyday and sexual violence, I examine how staff-student sexual violence is pivotal to the production of a politics of (in)security in UK universities. As well as how this is embedded within wider practices of gendered and racialised practices of (in)security and violence. I examine relations of violence 'over here' in the UK university in response to what I argue is a continued orientation in security studies to relations of sexual violence and the everyday 'over there' in ways that reproduce racialised and colonial logics within the discipline, and 'out there' in dominant sites of inquiry in security studies. Turning to relations of staff-student sexual violence 'over here' in the UK university, then, is a means through which to both question, confront, and resist these problematics in security studies.

I take seriously the feminist notion that stories of sexual violence from the everyday are critical to "making feminist sense" (Enloe, 2000a: 29) of the politics of (in)security. In my thesis, I turn to everyday stories of (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in order to unpack the politics of (in)security that is discernable through everyday practices in UK universities. (in)Security and staff-student sexual violence are thus located through everyday experiences of staff-student sexual violence, everyday conversations on (in)security and staff-student sexual violence, and everyday encounters with university apparatuses of 'security'. I demonstrate that everyday staff-student sexual violence of (in)security has profound impacts on those who experience these forms of violence, and that UK universities are a site where relations of (in)security must be continually negotiated in everyday life. In order to do so, in this thesis I look to three everyday sites within the UK university: the classroom, the conference and the hearing of staff-student sexual violence.

In order to examine relations of staff-student sexual violence in everyday life in UK universities, I build upon Hartman's (1997, 2008, 2021, 2022) method of 'critical fabulation' as a theoretical and methodological practice. As my thesis is centered upon stories of violence from everyday life, these stories were often inflected by silences/absences/omissions. This is because these stories are situated within wider relations of power that impact the ability the

ability to share one's story of sexual violence and (in)security. As I examine in greater detail in Chapter three, these relations of power affected many of my participants. Engaging with critical fabulation, I fabulate two scenes of staff-student sexual violence in each empirical chapter of my thesis, the Classroom, the Conference and the Hearing. In these chapters, critical fabulation enables me to push against silences/absences inflected in stories of staff-student sexual violence in everyday life in UK universities. In doing so, I aim to "tell a story" (Hartman, 2008: 2) of how staff-student sexual violence and relations of (in)security are lived and negotiated in everyday life in UK universities.

As my thesis centers upon stories from everyday life in UK universities, in this introduction I tell a story of my journey to this PhD project. I explain how and why I chose to undertake this feminist security studies project as an inquiry into staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security in UK universities. I illustrate that my "feminist curiosity" (Enloe, 2004: 4), was sparked through my classes on feminist international politics and security studies, particularly feminist security studies analyses of the everyday and of sexual violence. My curiosity developed out of what I felt to be a disconnect between what I learned of sexual violence and the everyday 'over there' and 'out there' in my studies, and the everyday experiences of staff-student sexual violence that were happening in UK universities. I wondered why, if everyday sexual violence was crucial to understanding the politics of (in)security, everyday relations of staff-student sexual violence in universities were curiously absent from scholarship in security studies.

Why feminist security studies?

I came to feminist security studies and feminist international politics in a moment of (academic) desperation during the second year of my undergraduate degree at Bristol. The truth is, I absolutely hated my international politics modules, which unfortunately for me were compulsory. Even more unfortunately, I wasn't very good at them, and in the second year of my undergraduate degree was on track for another low 2.2 in my 'Contemporary International Politics' module. I hated my classes on international politics because I couldn't make any sense of them. I couldn't wrap my head around international politics being an 'anarchic system', why we read so much about Hobbes and his state of nature, what a 'zero-

sum' game meant, what on earth game theory was, how we might understand states as 'security maximising' (or not), how nuclear deterrence works (or doesn't work), or why having learnt all of this that the rise of international institutions might matter (or not). I'd like to say that I had tried my best to understand this scholarship, but I gave up fairly quickly because to me it was completely bizarre, politics seemed to have become so abstracted from anything I could possibly claim to 'know'.

And so, as my final assessment for Contemporary International Politics (one essay worth 100% of my mark) lingered on the horizon, I found myself in a state of panic; second year counted towards my degree classification, and if I was lucky, I'd probably get a 55. I had, at this point, no idea that feminist international politics or feminist security studies were a 'thing', because it had been absent from any of my course guides, lectures, or seminars.

I did, however, have an interest in feminism more broadly, and my thought process at this moment was that surely in 2016 there must be feminist scholarship about international politics somewhere. And so, I came to feminist security studies and feminist international politics out of a combination of wanting to find something that would help me to attain better grades as well as wanting to develop a burgeoning interest in feminist scholarship more broadly. What is more difficult to explain to you is exactly why I thought that this literature might do things differently. I knew, up until this point, that feminism challenged gendered roles in society, that it took issue with sexism, misogyny, and patriarchy. I understood that feminism paid attention to gendered forms of violence, and specifically ones experienced by women. That it highlighted forms of violence apparent in everyday life, like sexual violence, gendered pay gaps, the 'double' working day, the dominance of men in in political office. Indeed, I was learning that sexism, misogyny and patriarchy were forms of violence in themselves. I understood that feminism wanted to change things, that it was fundamentally emancipatory.

Sure enough, a library search came up with *A Feminist Voyage through International Relations* (Tickner, 2014), *Gender, Violence and Security* (Shepherd, 2008), and *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases* (Enloe, 2000). I was so excited. The tricky thing, though, was that technically we were only supposed to answer essay questions for the module using topics and scholarship that was covered *inside* the course and not from *outside* of the course. Armed with my new books

(I carried them from the library to show what I had found, and explain why I thought it was important), I set off to my tutor's office hours preparing to beg her to allow me to write about feminist international politics. To which, she said yes.

And so, I set about on my own feminist voyage, learning about what feminists had to say about international politics and security studies. I learned about how gender was an important category of analysis, that women's lives were the stuff of international politics and security. That there were 'traditional' approaches to international politics and security studies, and critical approaches to international politics and security studies. I learnt that the traditional approaches (realism, liberalism, strategic studies etc.), were 'mainstream' and were said to dominate the discipline, and that critical theories (feminism, postcolonialism, poststructuralism) were more 'marginalised' (Weber, 1994; Blanchard, 2003; Hansen, 2010; Shepherd, 2016; Sjoberg, 2016). I learnt what it means for a disciplinary field of study to have a centre and a margin. I learned that there weren't always sharp boundaries between these critical approaches; you could be a postcolonial feminist, you could be a poststructural feminist, or you could use both postcolonial and poststructural work to make a feminist argument.

I learnt that feminists in international politics and security studies scholars have 'troubled engagements' with traditional IR scholars (Tickner, 2014). I loved reading about these 'troubled engagements', where "evidence of awkward silences and miscommunications can be found in the oral questions and comments IR-trained feminists frequently encounter when presenting their work to IR audiences" (Tickner, 2014: 73). This was because I was having some troubled engagements with the stuff of IR. Every question I asked, or was asked to answer, was met with an awkward silence because I quite simply did not understand the world of anarchy, war, and nuclear strategy as it had been presented in my classes.

However, in this new (to me) field of study, nuclear weapons and warfare as central to strategic studies and international politics and security studies were no longer sanitized discussions of nuclear deterrence and 'zero-sum' games, but deeply entrenched in gendered, sexualised and domestic discourses. I learned what a discourse was, and I learned that language mattered (Cohn, 1989; Shepherd, 2008, 2016; Stern, 2005, 2016; McLeod, 2015). Better yet, I came to understand that gender, sex, and the domestic come to constitute the

world of international politics and the lives of nuclear strategists, and we could come to understand this through paying attention to the language that they used (Cohn, 1989).

This stood out in stark contrast to the stories I had heard previously that presented both nuclear weapons and nuclear strategists as neutral, objective, and disembodied. States, power, violence and technology thus appeared through a different lens, one that foregrounded the home and the body. I learned that the violence done to bodies in warfare mattered, more than that, that warfare was fundamentally about violence done to bodies (Sylvester, 2012; Wilcox, 2015). I learnt that gender, race, and sexuality mattered in international politics, and then that they were constitutive of international politics and security studies. That "[a] picture of war is a picture of gendered bodies" (Welland, 2019: 130), that "[w]ithout gender, and [..] race and sexuality war loses its bearing(s)" (Masters, 2019: 206). I learnt that women's lives mattered, be that the lives of sex workers servicing soldiers, the wives of male diplomats, women working in factories across the world, though particularly in the Global South (Enloe, 2000a, 2000b, 2004; 2011), or women protesting human rights abuses in detention (Tyler, 2013). I learned that feminists question institutions and political practices – like states, international organisations, militaries, and borders - who claim to provide 'security' to particular populations, and that these institutions in myriad ways are bound up in the production of violence and (in)security (Peterson, 1992; Shepherd, 2008).

I also learned that while women had been excluded from an overwhelmingly androcentric mainstream IR, that we should trouble the presentation of women/men as ontologically fixed categories. That particularly poststructural approaches to feminist security studies and international politics "see "men" and "women" as socially constructed subject statuses" (Sylvester, 1994: 7). And thus, whilst these fields seek to combat (unequal) gendered relations, at times they can reinscribe (violent) binary understandings of gender. Equally, I came to understand that particular branches of feminist theorizing in international politics and security studies (liberal, standpoint in particular) often fall foul of reproducing racialized and colonial logics within international politics and security studies. Where "[l]iberal and standpoint feminism cheerlead from the rear as they seek to liberate ''Third-World'' women

to become more like their ''First-World'' sisters" (Agathangelou and Ling, 2004: 25)[1]. And so, for all its problematics, learning about women's lives led me to learn about how gender and race mattered in international politics, including how and why we should think through how feminist scholarship has reified/universalised/homogenised 'women' and 'women's lives' as if this is a pre-existing ontologically fixed category.

I loved learning about feminist international politics and feminist security studies, and I was very good at it. So much so that, to the shock of my friends and those family members who had previously had to bear (or endure!) my rants about how much I hated international politics modules, I started taking optional modules on the subject, and even applied for (and completed) a master's degree in International Security. I loved it because it made me see international politics in a different way, because I learned about how gender and race were constitutive of our world, because I got to develop my interests in feminism and feminist protest and activism. Because it felt more relevant and accessible than anything I had learned previously.

This is because one of the most important things that this scholarship taught me was that what I had learned up until that point was not an objective representation of what international politics 'is' or what security/insecurity 'is', but that my education in more traditional approaches to international politics and (in)security had curated a particular way of understanding international politics. Or, as many scholars of feminist international politics have noted, what I had learned thus far was a particular narrative/story of international politics that appeared on the surface to be "*the story*" (Starnes, 2017: 2, original emphasis) of international politics.

In other words, the ontological and epistemological grounds on which I had come to (try, and fail) to 'know' international politics were not 'fixed', not the 'right' or 'only' way of international politics and security, but a gendered, masculinised, elitist and colonial story presenting as neutral, objective, and 'scientific'. As Wibben (2011a: 2) notes, "the insistence

---

[1] On the topic of racialized/colonial theorising in security studies see also: Pinar, 2010; Seth, 2011; Barkawi and Laffey, 2006; Mohanty, 2015; Spivak, 2015; Aganthangelou and Ling, 2004; Anievas, Manchanda and Shilliam, 2015; Henderson, 2015; Howell and Richter-Montepetit, 2019, 2020, 2023; Henry, 2018; Massey and Tyerman, 2023.

of a singular narrative is itself a form of violence". It is through this that I learned that stories of (in)security mattered, and that 'security' and the 'international' are political practices, rather than fixed categories, made and unmade through relations and structures of power. In other words, "'security' is not a state of being (something that is), but a process, understood as a logic" (Åhäll, 2019: 151-152). How it is we attempt to understand these practices, helps us understand what kind of security studies scholar we are (or want to be), and what stories of (in)security we choose to hear (or not hear). These are the fundamental ontological and epistemological decisions we make in research (Hansen, 2010; Zalewski, 2010).

This thesis isn't about the politics of university curricula on international politics and security studies. However, I have shared this story about my initial experiences of studying international politics and international security as a way of explaining how I got to the problem(s) this thesis grapples with. This story shows you how and why I wanted to tell a different story about (in)security and international politics. Namely, of staff-student sexual violence in UK HE as a politics of everyday (in)security within our university, and why I wanted to ground this story in feminist security studies and feminist international politics.

Feminist Security Studies, Sexual Violence and the Everyday

I was particularly interested in feminist security studies because of the wealth of literature there was on sexual violence specifically. I have long had an interest in understanding sexual violence, because I have, since my teens, been deeply concerned by issues of sexual violence. Instances of sexual violence and sexual harassment initiated my interest in feminism. Sexual violence seemed so ubiquitous; it was at school, on the way home from school), in the park at the weekend, it was on public transport, it happened on nights out, it happened in people's homes, in their workplaces, it happened at university. The NUS's Hidden Marks (2010: 3) report, based on a survey of women undergraduate students in the UK, found that: "one in seven survey respondents has experienced a serious physical or sexual assault during their time as a student [...] Over two thirds of respondents (68 per cent) have experienced some kind of verbal or non-verbal harassment in and around their institution [...] inclu[ding] groping, flashing and unwanted sexual comments", that "16 per cent have experienced

unwanted kissing, touching or molesting during their time as a student, the majority of which has taken place in public", and "[s]even per cent have been subject to a serious sexual assault, the majority of which occurred in somebody's home".

For sexual violence to be a key topic in feminist security studies was of great interest to me. I learnt so much about sexual violence through reading feminist security studies scholarship. Feminist security studies scholars have gone to great lengths to make the disciplines of international politics and security studies hear stories of sexual violence across different international and institutional contexts. In my classes and during my own time researching and writing university assignments, I read about how nuclear experts employed violent sexualised and gendered languages (Cohn, 1989). How gendered forms of violence, including sexual violence, are constitutive of the production of and (in)securing practices of states (Peterson, 1992). How rape has become understood as a weapon of war (Crawford, 2017), how peacekeepers have engaged in acts of sexual exploitation and abuse (Grady, 2010; Henry, 2013). How the language used to understand and respond to sexual violence in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 works to reproduce violent relations of gender (Shepherd, 2008). How militaries have engaged in acts of sexual violence (Basham, 2016; Bourke, 2007). How governments have facilitated the exploitation of sex workers by the military (Enloe, 2000). How the concept of militarised masculinities can help us understand these practices, as "military cultures are maintained by hyper or hegemonic masculinities that promote military and sexual prowess and the objectification of women" (Henry, 2013: 127). I learned that military masculinities and colonial violence are interlinked (Henry, 2013). And how sexual violence against men has been neglected in the fields of international politics (Zalewski et al, 2018; Drumond, 2019).

Across the stories of sexual violence explored in this scholarship, I heard about institutional abuses of power, patriarchal and colonial relations of power and violence, of those who have experienced abuse being failed by institutions or practices of security that are supposed to offer protection. However, I wondered why it was the case that we always heard stories of sexual violence happening 'over there', in contexts of war, or post-conflict, or post-colonial regions. Or, if not 'over there' it seemed to be 'out there' in dominant sites of inquiry, such as states, militaries, and powerful international actors such as the United Nations (UN).

I therefore wanted to interrogate why there was a continued location of sexual violence 'over' and 'out there', when sexual violence happened 'over here' in UK universities. I heard stories of sexual violence at university outside of class, in corridors before class, in the pub after class, sometimes we even talked about during class, when we were supposed to be discussing sexual violence in another context. And so, I wondered why these stories of sexual violence in the university were never a part of what we studied in feminist security studies classrooms.

 It is here that I particularly became interested in staff-student sexual violence. While there has been significant attention to issues of sexual violence between students[2], staff-student sexual violence is seriously lacking examination. Staff-student sexual violence had, in this context, become one of the most common topics of conversation I began having, as I heard stories from friends, acquaintances and teachers about experiences of staff-student sexual violence. In my fieldwork, my participants relayed to me included stories of offers to co-publish in return for sex, sexual harassment in classrooms and academic conferences, sexual assault on and off university campuses, and an inability to access institutional reporting procedures. Emerging research in the study of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities has found that staff-student sexual violence in UK universities has included: sexualized culture; sexually inappropriate comments or questions; sexual coercion and offers of academic rewards for sex; bullying and controlling behaviours; grooming behaviours; stalking; and sexual assault (Bull and Rye, 2018; NUS and 1752 Group, 2018).

These experiences have profound effects on students in UK universities. Bull and Rye's (2018) research found that student responses often include fear of the perpetrator of abuse, anger towards the university's response in cases where students have reported abuse, alongside "depression, anxiety, suicide attempts or feeling suicidal…[and] post-traumatic stress disorder…panic attacks, self-harm, bulimia, and insomnia" (Bull and Rye, 2018: 5, 17). My participants detailed the profound effects staff-student sexual violence had on them, leaving

---

[2] See, for example: Jones and Sanders, 2022; Sundari and Ruth (eds.), 2018; Henry and Powell (eds.), 2014; Steele et al, 2021; Bovill et al, 2022; Jones, Chappell, and Alldred, 2021; Phipps and Smith, 2012; Phipps and Young, 2015; Phipps, 2017, 2018, 2020; NUS, 2011.

them feeling "broken" (Marta, SUR3) as they negotiated the university as a site of ongoing relations of violence and (in)security.

The absence of these stories from feminist security studies laid the groundwork for this thesis. Building upon the insights I learned through feminist security studies scholarship on sexual violence, I wanted to examine relations of sexual violence 'over here', to ask how our universities are implicated in the production of insecurities related to sexual violence. I wanted to take seriously the relations of sexual violence that are happening within the everyday context in which academic scholarship on sexual violence is produced.

I wanted to ask how these stories illustrated what seemed to be experiences of (in)security that were so crucial to everyday life in the university. These were personal stories of violence that impacted how people negotiated the university, how they came up against institutional forms of power, how they experienced institutional responses that compounded their feelings of (in)security. Indeed, feminist security studies showed me that attending to embodied and affective experiences was important for understanding how (in)security impacts those who experience violence. Why not then, look to how sexual violence in the university affects where people go, where they feel safe or unsafe, how they negotiate campus. How they live (in)security in contexts of sexual violence that make them feel afraid, anxious, panicked, unable to sleep, unable to go to class, dreading going to class, or losing their thread in a conference presentation.

While the everyday of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities was missing from feminist security studies scholarship, at the same time it was feminist security studies scholarship that showed me that the everyday mattered to understanding (in)security and the international. That security "shapes everyday life" (Nyman, 2021: 314), that "the domestic/local/everyday cannot be separated out from the global in our studies of 'international relations'" (Åhäll, 2019: 150). Feminist security studies scholarship on the everyday was of particular interest to me because it felt the most disruptive, because it feels the inverse of understanding (in)security and international politics as 'up-there' in elite spheres of states and anarchy. Instead, the everyday isn't far away (intellectually or materially) but is right here.

Feminist scholars have used the everyday to show that the politics of gender, militarism and (in)security in international politics are in cans of soup (Enloe, 2000a, 2000b), and operating through murals you pass when you walk out of the train station in Manchester (Åhäll, 2019). The everyday shows us how international politics is made through intimate and, often, violent relations, be that at the border, among military personnel, in the lives of sex workers servicing soldiers on military bases, or what happens when international peacekeepers use their relative positions of power for exploitation and sexualized forms of violence. The relationship between the everyday and violence is important in its ability for us to understand both how violence and (in)security and the international are far from exceptional, but instead operate in and through day-to-day relations, however mundane they may appear to be on the surface, like buying soup, holding a child's hand, or going to work. The everyday is how the international politics of security and insecurity become real, or to use Sara Ahmed's words how "theory [came] back to life" (Ahmed, 2017: 10).

I came to see the everyday politics of (in)security and the international while walking around the streets of Bristol, noticing the monuments to military campaigns, the buildings and statues of colonialists and traders of enslaved persons, such as the name of the building I graduated in. It made me think of my mother's own university experience, working in the day and studying at night in the then USSR, where Moscow's underground metro doubled up as a mode of travel and a place of study; or of travelling to the UK in 1991, heavily pregnant with one sister, holding my other sister's hand. An everyday account of life in the Cold War. It was through noting how my everyday surroundings and my family's personal history connected to themes in international politics and security studies that I came to understand "that theorizing is a way of life, a form of life, something we all do, every day, all the time" (Zalewski, 2010: 346).

And indeed, theorizing sexual violence is something being done all the time by feminist security studies scholars in universities within and beyond the UK. The knowledge this field produces on sexual violence and of everyday (in)security is researched and written up into papers and monographs and reports as part of the everyday life of universities. The work feminist security studies scholars produce is developed while chatting to colleagues in university lunch areas, in corridors, in research seminars, at the best coffee spot or place to get a drink near the university, or at conference dinners and drinks receptions, where

researchers from disparate institutions come together throughout the year. It is written up through the mundanity of clacking on the keyboards of frustratingly slow university computers in university offices, behind on a deadline, chugging coffee to stay awake, much like I am right now. Or even at home on laptops perched on kitchen and dining room tables, sometimes due to caring responsibilities, or to overwork. Or between 2020-22 as was necessitated by the 'lockdowns' that happened across the world as a result of the covid-19 pandemic, where working from home was, for many, the only option. And so, while not all feminist security scholarship explores (in)security through the everyday or through the university, the everyday politics of the university is ever-present, whether it is explicitly invoked or not.

It is worth noting here that the everyday life of the university does figure more explicitly in some feminist security scholarship. Be that Zalewski's "diffracted attention" to the university, understood as a "deeply personal and simultaneously politicized space" (2013: 16). Ling's (2014) exploration of the racist, sexist, and colonial logics circulating in the graduate IR seminar. Choi's (2021) story of everyday racism, sexism, and complaint in Western universities. Or Henry's argument that posits "whiteness as central to the operation of women/gender, peace and security in academic settings" (2021: 22). It is not possible to read Starnes's (2017) book, which analysis popular international politics textbooks, without recalling time spend in university classrooms and libraries.

I argue staff-student sexual violence figures as an important part of this everyday terrain of (in)security within our universities, but so far has been absented from feminist security studies. The spaces in which research on sexual violence and (in)security is written on clunky university computers are also spaces in which staff-student sexual violence is enacted, be that in office hour meetings, lunch areas, the pub after research seminars, the conference dinner and drinks, the conference hotel, and the local coffee shop. Just as, then, scholarship on sexual violence and (in)security is written in/through and at times about the everyday life in the university, it is also written in the context of everyday staff-student sexual violence. Therefore, a huge amount of research has been produced on the (gendered and racialised) politics of security and insecurity in attempts to take seriously everyday, embodied, and complex experiences of (in)security. However, little, if any, attention has been paid to the

sexual violence taking place in the very site where these key bodies of knowledge of sexual violence and (in)security are produced.

In my thesis, I argue that the tendency to locate sexual violence 'over there' works to reproduce racialised and colonial logics in security studies. This is because in this logic sexual violence is typically located as the problem of racialized (often black and brown) gendered bodies (usually men) enacted onto also racialized bodies (usually women). To be sure, to renew the focus on UK universities may seem strange given that the discipline remains a deeply Eurocentric field. However, it is my contention that addressing relations of staff-student sexual violence in universities in the UK is a way to contribute to confronting how universities are embedded within gendered, racialised, and colonial practices of violence. In tandem with this, I argue that looking to staff-student sexual violence as a form of everyday (in)security can extend research on the everyday in feminist security studies. Rather than what I consider to be an orientation to the everyday that typically sees this conceptual and methodological framework invoked to understand dominant sites of the international, I take seriously the everyday life of the university as a focal point of inquiry in security studies. This extends our understanding of how the everyday is critical to understanding how relations of security/insecurity are made and unmade. I do this through locating the university as the everyday site in which knowledge of security and insecurity is produced, but situating the university as a site of inquiry into relations of (in)security.

In my inquiry into staff-student sexual violence, I build upon insights in feminist security studies scholarship to demonstrate the politics of everyday (in)security these forms of violence engender in UK universities. I take seriously the profound impacts staff-student sexual violence has on students in UK universities through attending to stories of violence and (in)security from everyday life. I pay particular attention here to how feelings of (in)security circulate through everyday conversations, embodied and affective charges, and everyday attempts to access institutional apparatuses of 'security' constructed by universities in the UK. I show that within this context, UK universities are engaged in a politics of (in)security that (re)produces patterns of violence and marginalization, particularly in relation to gendered and racialised questions of (in)security. I demonstrate that practices of (in)security in UK universities are constantly under negotiation, as students and staff members navigate

a complex web of everyday enactments of (in)security in contexts of staff-student sexual violence. Through my inquiry, I question who and what 'security' is for in the university.

Chapter Outlines

In order to demonstrate the linkages between the university and wider gendered, racialised and colonial practices of violence and (in)security, in **Chapter one**, I argue that greater attention to the university and relations of sexual violence within it can make contributions to security studies scholarship on the gendered, racialised, and colonial contours of the discipline. To demonstrate this, I examine the relationship between the UK university and the wider politics of international security. I argue that universities in the UK are grounded in racialised, colonial and gendered modes of (in)security. I examine the historical interconnections between the university and relations of race, gender, and coloniality, looking to the role of the UK university in the transatlantic slave trade and colonial politics. I demonstrate that everyday life in the university is bound up in this politics, including the development of a complex apparatus of (in)security within UK universities. Putting these insights into conversation with scholarship in security studies, I show that the university and relations of sexual violence within it have not been subject to sustained attention within this field. I show that further examination of the university and relations of staff-student sexual violence within it can make contributions to this scholarship.

Having shown that universities in the UK are embedded within a politics of everyday (in)security and that relations of staff-student sexual violence are critical to this, in **Chapter two** I turn to feminist scholarship on the everyday and sexual violence in security studies. Reviewing this scholarship, I show how feminist insights into the everyday form a theoretical framework for analysis in my thesis. However, I argue that within these bodies of scholarship there is a continued orientation to relations of sexual violence 'over there' in ways that reproduce colonial and racialised logics within the discipline. In conjunction with this, I argue that the everyday is most often invoked as a means to garner deeper understandings of already dominant sites of inquiry in security studies. I argue that turning to relations of sexual violence 'over here' in the UK university contributes to resisting these racialised and colonial practices. As well as extending the conceptual reach of the everyday to examine the everyday

context in which security studies is produced, and the relations of everyday sexual violence therein.

Having established this, in **Chapter three** I show how we can uncover the everyday within the university. In this chapter, I outline my use of Hartman's (1997, 2008, 2021, 2022) 'critical fabulation'. I explain how and why I use this method to fabulate two scenes of staff-student sexual violence in each of my empirical chapters, the Classroom (4), the Conference (5), and the Hearing (6). I argue that critical fabulation enables me to be an everyday theorist that is "committed to telling stories" (Hartman, 2008: 4) about the everyday lives of those who experience staff-student sexual violence. I show how critical fabulation has allows me to do three things. Firstly, to home in on violence as everyday rather than exceptional. Secondly, to respond to and work with silences/absences in stories of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security in UK universities. Thirdly, to "defamiliarize the familiar" (Hartman, 2022: 2) by locating the everyday spaces of the Classroom, the Conference and the Hearing as everyday sites of (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. Following from this, I outline how I gathered the stories of staff-student sexual violence through semi structured interviews and qualitative surveys and reflect on some of the challenges I faced during this process, particularly in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Chapter four is the first empirical chapter of my thesis. In this chapter, I turn to the classroom to begin exploring the politics of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. Classrooms on the politics of (in)security are a familiar site within UK universities, a critical site related to knowledge of (in)security in UK universities. Working to 'defamiliarize' this familiar space, I destabilize the site of the classroom. I situate classrooms as a site through which we can discern the politics of (in)security enacted in UK universities and understand the classroom to extend beyond formal lecture theatres or seminar classrooms. In this vein, I fabulate two scenes of staff-student sexual violence, the scene of the 'EDI Training Workshop' and the 'Office Hour Meeting with the Head of Department'. In the first scene, the EDI training workshop, I examine how staff-student sexual violence constitutes negotiations of (in)security by tracing the politics of frustration and pushback, and scandal and reputation. In the second scene, I examine the notion of open secrets on staff-student sexual violence, arguing that the politics of gender, heteronormativity, and institutional hierarchies of power

underscore how knowledge of staff-student sexual violence circulates in UK universities. These scenes come together to constitute everyday lessons on (in)security in the university that underscore how in the context of staff-student sexual violence, students and staff members learn about (in)security, share knowledge of (in)security, and negotiate an institutional politics of (in)security.

Following on from this, in **Chapter five** I examine a different site of knowledge production and dissemination in security studies, turning to the Conference in the field of international politics and security studies. I argue that staff-student sexual violence is embedded within and contributes to wider relations of gendered, racialised, and colonial practices at conference events in the field of international politics. In order to do so, I curate two scenes of staff-student sexual violence at conference events. The first scene, 'A Conference Presentation on Sexual Violence and Everyday (in)Security', I disentangle the layers of the conference as a site where everyday enactments of violence are present in the context of everyday knowledge production. In the second scene, 'Colonial cocktails at the Hotel Bar', I illustrate how everyday staff-student sexual violence at the hotel bar works to reproduce hierarchies of gender and race, alongside the ways everyday acts of solidarity underscore negotiations of (in)security and gendered forms of institutional labour. Together, these scenes illustrate how the elision of the public/private, formal/informal space of the conference is critical to relations of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security.

Lastly, in **Chapter six**, the final empirical chapter of this thesis, I look to the 'Hearing' of staff-student sexual violence. Here I conceive of the 'hearing' in two ways. Firstly, referring to institutional apparatuses of (in)security via formal complaints processes and their adjudication in UK universities. Secondly, as a reflection on how we hear stories of staff-student sexual violence, and the importance of underscoring their relationship to everyday (in)security. The first scene 'Trying to be Heard by the University: Navigating Institutional Complaints Procedures', examines how institutional apparatuses of 'security' are navigated in everyday life. Building on feminist security scholars who have shown that institutional structures often operate in ways that are "profoundly contradictory" (Peterson, 1992: 32), I argue that institutional apparatuses of security in UK universities work to compound everyday insecurities for students who attempt to be heard by their institutions. The final scene, a

closing scene for this thesis, puts into conversation the story of PhD students and the everyday 'hearing' of staff-student sexual violence and the importance of stories in feminist security studies. I underscore my arguments that turning to staff-student sexual violence 'over here' in the university offers valuable contributions to feminist security studies. I contend that this contributes to our understandings of the everyday and the institutional, the importance of stories of (in)security, and the ways institutions of security work to reproduce insecurity in contexts of sexual violence.

Chapter 1: What is the relationship between the university and (in)security?

Introduction

In this chapter, I argue that universities in the UK are grounded in racialised, colonial and gendered forms of violence (Howell, 2018; Bhambra, Gebrial and Nişancıoğlu, 2018; Gebrial, 2018). As my thesis engages the UK university as a site of everyday (in)security, this chapter demonstrates the longstanding connections between the UK and the politics of gendered, racialised, and colonial practices of (in)security. I show that this politics is manifest in a complex web of everyday practices of (in)security on campus, and intimately connected to relations of sexual violence. I put this analysis into conversation with feminist and postcolonial analyses of the gendered/racialised/colonial contours of security studies. I illustrate that further attention to both the university and sexual violence within the university contributes to understandings of the discipline of security studies and its relationship to gendered/colonial/racialised logics.

To do so, I explore the relationships between universities in the UK and wider histories of transatlantic slavery and colonialism, arguing the university is inextricably bound up in these wider international practices of violence and (in)security. While I examine universities across the UK, I pay additional attention to the Universities of Bristol and Manchester specifically, as these are the universities that I have attended, and without which I would not have been able to conduct this PhD project.

As such, my argument that the UK university is embedded within wider gendered/racialised/colonial forms of violence and (in)security involves an acknowledgement that this PhD project, and my educational journey - like all feminist security studies scholarship in the UK - is embedded within these relations of violence. Having established that UK universities are constituted by/through these relations of (in)security, I look to the ways universities engage in contemporary practices of (in)security on campus. I pay attention to campus policing, surveillance, and 'security services', and policies and procedures for responding to violence and discrimination on campus. I show how (in)security in the UK

university is not simply a question of historical foundations or resonances but is enacted in everyday life on campus.

Turning to the discipline of security studies, I argue that although there is a large body of scholarship on the gendered, colonial, racialised, and Eurocentric contours of this field of study, more can be done to subject the university to sustained analysis within this context. Moving on from this, I argue that as sexual violence is fundamental to racialised and colonial practices of (in)security, the university is embedded within this politics. Overall, I make two arguments in this chapter. Firstly, that the university is embedded within a wider politics of gendered, racialised and colonial relations of (in)security. Secondly, that situating university as a focal point of analysis in the context of sexual violence allows me to engage in a deeper analysis of the relationship between security studies and ongoing relations of everyday sexual violence and (in)security. I close this chapter by unpacking why I have chosen to look to staff-student sexual violence as an understudied and undertheorised everyday form of sexual violence in UK universities.

Understanding Everyday life in UK Universities as Embedded within the Politics of (in)security

As Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nişancıoğlu (2018: 5) note, "in both colony and metropole, universities were founded and financed through the spoils of colonial plunder, enslavement and dispossession". The UK university's role in relation to British colonialism and the transatlantic slave trade are multifaceted. The British university was, in many ways, utilised as a tool through which to expand and cement British colonial control and the construction of a racialised imperial international order. The founding and development of universities in colonised regions, for example, worked to "extend British domination over indigenous lands and peoples, asserting [..] metropolitan 'expertise' in the colonies and fashioning loyal imperial subjects in the classroom" (Pietsch, 2016: 1). Additionally, the British university has been a central actor in the development, proliferation, and dominance of racialised and colonial knowledge production. These forms of knowledge have worked to sustain the racist

violence of these endeavours, as "it was in the university that colonial intellectuals developed theories of racism, popularised discourses that bolstered supported for colonial endeavours, and provided ethical and intellectual grounds for the dispossession, oppression, and domination of colonialised subjects" (Bhambra, Gebrial, and Nişancıoğlu 2018: 5).

While the 'internationalism' of British University is often touted as a result of the increasing marketisation of education in the context of neoliberal reform, the concept of the 'international university' is rooted in colonial logics. International knowledge production and knowledge exchange were both internationalised and institutionalised as structure of imperial relations. The international institutionalisation of colonial and racialised knowledge, alongside the expansion of the British university system in colonised regions, gave rise to a number of international congresses and conferences amongst academics of the British Empire, including the Congress of the Universities of the British Empire and the Allied Colonial Universities Conference (Pietsch, 2011, 2016). Colonial knowledge and the spread of the influence of British academia across colonised regions were a central structure that was utilised throughout the major conflicts of the 20th century, which are intimately connected to imperial expansion and the development of the structure of international politics. Here universities in the UK, settler colonial regions, and the Allied regions, came together to support British war efforts in the first and second World Wars, including the development of weapons, aircraft engineering, map-making, recruitment efforts, and war-time medical science (Pietsch, 2011, 2013; see also Howell, 2018).

As scholars of international politics and international security have unpacked extensively, the racialised violence of colonialism and transatlantic slavery have been central to the constitution of a Western, Eurocentric, liberal world order, as well as to the constitution of the disciplines of international politics and international security (Howell, 2018; Pinar, 2010; Seth, 2011; Barkawi and Laffey, 2006; Mohanty, 2015; Aganthangelou and Ling, 2004; Anievas, Manchanda and Shilliam, 2015; Henderson, 2015; Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2019, 2020, 2023; Gruffyd Jones, 2006). The role of the UK university in the development of racialised hierarchies and the expansion of colonial control are central to the ways the British higher education system is deeply embedded within wider practices of international (in)security. Colonialism and transatlantic slavery were crucial processes through which the

"significance of race and racism as fundamental organising principles of international politics" have been sedimented, producing an "axis of hierarchy and oppression structuring the logic of world politics as we know it" (Anievas, Manchanda and Shilliam, 2015: 2). The development of the UK university as an international mechanism of racialised and colonial power has therefore played a key role in racialised and violent practices of (in)security on a global scale that continue to structure international relations. The development of the UK university, racialised and colonial matters of international (in)security, and the reproduction of racialised hierarchies in international politics, are thus interconnected practices.

From 'Whiteladies Road' to the 'Cottonopolis'

The role of the UK university in the production of racialised modes of (in)security on a global scale continues to structure UK universities today, and these violent histories in many ways have been implicated in the production of this feminist security studies project. My PhD project began its life at the University of Bristol, originally as an undergraduate dissertation project, which later, while I was completing my master's degree (also at Bristol), morphed into my application to continue on as a PhD project at the University of Manchester. While I was writing my PhD research proposal, I lived in a predominantly middle-class area of Bristol called Redland which is close to the University and popular with undergraduate and master's students. The boundaries of this residential area are demarcated by a long, uphill, street called Whiteladies Road, the upper section of which was once named Black Boy Hill. While this is no longer the official name of the top of Whiteladies Road, at the time of my undergraduate degree there remained a pub called the Black Boy Inn, and if you go to Whiteladies Road today, you will find a small bicycle shop called Black Boy Cycles.

Bristol as a city, and as a university, is steeped in racialised violence (Carby, 2019). The Black Lives Matter protests in 2020 in Bristol, where the statue of Edward Colston was thrown into the Bristol harbour, are testament to the ongoing relations of racialised (in)security and resistance to this within Bristol (Siddique and Skopeliti, 2020). Hazel Carby explores intimate histories of imperialism in Bristol, showing how "Bristol [has] been intimately entangled with the colonial word for centuries" (2019: 180), and "was deeply bound to the enslavement and transportation of Africans in the Atlantic trade" (2019: 186). Street names continue to mark

"the site of the homes of men who traded in human flesh" (2019: 181). The University of Bristol is grounded in these histories, as donations from "the Wills family who made their fortune from Tobacco plantations worked by the enslaved, and the Fry family whose wealth came from chocolate" (Carby, 2019: 185), allowed the university to gain its charter (Carby, 2019). The Wills Memorial building remains named after the Wills family, and is where students graduate, pose for pictures with their degree certificates with their friends and family, or sometimes take pictures even before graduation with their fresh-off-the-press undergraduate or master's dissertations. From Whiteladies Road to Black Boy Cycles, to the veneration of Edward Colston, to Wills Memorial Building at the University of Bristol, to the monuments in honour of British military campaigns, everyday life as a student at Bristol is inextricably tied to the contemporary manifestations of the racialised violence of transatlantic slavery and colonialism. This history is present when walking around the city, attending a concert at Colston Hall, sitting exams or graduating in the Wills Memorial building. Everyday life as a staff member or student at the University of Bristol is situated in and inflected by the constitution of the university through racialised violence.

Moving to the University of Manchester, I was met with similar reflections on the interconnection between everyday life in the university and these wider histories of violence and (in)security. I am sitting writing this chapter from the 'Cottonopolis'. The language of the 'cottonopolis' is best understood as part of a colonial lexicon, a play on the metropolis as the centre of the Empire. Cottonopolis rehashes this term to denote Manchester as the centre of cotton production, its role in the industrial revolution, and the vast amount of wealth accumulated through this for the region of Lancashire, and the British Empire as a whole (Grabner, 2018; Sherwood, 2017; Hahn, 2020). The cotton spun by these workers in Manchester was grown by enslaved persons, largely those in the United States, but also by enslaved persons in South America, as well as by workers in India under British colonial rule (Grabner, 2018; Sherwood, 2007). As Grabner puts it, cotton workers in Manchester "were deeply entangled in a system of global production and trade predicated on chattel and wage slavery" (2018: 258).

Manchester's history as a city is associated with its pivotal role in the Industrial Revolution, and particularly its role in the cotton industry. Hahn (2020: 90) describes Manchester as "the

world's first industrial landscape, with its monumental, repetitive brick mills, and its spewing smokestacks". If you leave the Arthur Lewis Building (where the Politics department is located) walk down Oxford Road, past the End Racism Sign at a bus stop by university, and then right onto Cambridge Road, you can see two of these old mills, which have now been converted into luxury flats. They are impressive, imposing red brick structures, and you can stand and imagine (as I have done many times), hundreds if not thousands of workers (mostly very poor women, men, and children) putting in long hours spinning cotton, smoke billowing from each of the enormous chimneys. And so, when you look up at the old mills just a 15-minute walk away from the office in which I am sitting, you are looking at a building that represents much more than the luxury flats it has now been turned into; it is an everyday reminder of the violence of chattel slavery and imperialism through which Manchester as we know it came to be.

The University of Manchester is a part of this broader political landscape, and has recently engaged in research to 'uncover' its relationships to transatlantic slavery. It has produced several online outputs available via the University of Manchester's website as part of an effort "to address the legacy of slavery" (University of Manchester, n.d(a): n.p), including the Race Matters at Manchester Report (University of Manchester, 2020). This research found that wealth amassed through colonialism and slavery was fundamental to the formation of the University of Manchester. For example, the Heywood family were crucial to the development of the University of Manchester. The Heywood family's banking enterprise was "generated from capturing, forcibly transporting, and enslaving thousands of men, women, and children, as well as the trade of enslaved created commodities including cotton and sugar" (Pimblott and Booth, 2021: np). They went on to help fund the Manchester Mechanics' Institute, which later became a part of the University of Manchester (Pimblott and Booth, 2021; University of Manchester, n.d(a)). The Gladstone family, who were fundamental to the development of Owens College (also later a part of the University of Manchester), derived their wealth largely through Sir John Gladstone, and his "multiple ventures associated with slavery including, but not limited to, plantation ownership in the West Indies, the shipments of enslaved produced commodities, and insurance on ships that moved throughout the Atlantic" (Pimblott and Booth, 2021: np). Whitworth Hall, quite easily the grandest building at the University of Manchester, was built on land donated by Murray Gladstone (Pimblott and Booth, 2021). It

is in this building that students from the University of Manchester attend their graduations. As the beginnings of this institution are grounded in the histories of slavery and imperialism, so the end of every student's educational journey within the University of Manchester is celebrated on ground procured through the violence of slavery.

Colonial History in the Present at UK Universities

Bristol and Manchester undoubtedly have particularly strong connections with the history of British colonialism and the transatlantic slave trade, particularly given Bristol's role as a crucial 'port city' and Manchester's role in the development of the industrial revolution. However, the legacy of colonialism and transatlantic slavery is built into the architecture of university campuses across the UK. This is present in the form of iconographical veneration of prominent colonialists, eugenicists, and slave traders who contributed to the founding and/or development of the university campus on which they can be found.

There are numerous examples of this across Universities within the UK, including: the statue of colonialist Cecil Rhodes at Oxford University; the naming of campus buildings at University College London (UCL) after prominent eugenicists Francis Galton and Karl Pearson[3]; the Huxley Building at the aptly named Imperial College London, named after eugenicist Thomas Henry Huxley[4]; and the Gladstone and Leverhulme buildings at the University of Liverpool, named after Sir Henry Gladstone, who profited from the transatlantic slave trade, and the Lever family, who owned plantations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and the Solomon islands[5] (Perraudin, 2017; Oriel College Oxford, 2023; Rhodes Must Fall Oxford, n.d; University College London, 2023a; Imperial College London, 2021; The Leverhulme Trust,

---

[3] As of 2020 UCL has 'denamed' campus buildings and lecture theatres named after Galton and Pearson, following their internal inquiry into the university's relationship to eugenics. 'De-naming' here refers to the practice of removing any campus signs, maps, and signposts on the campus (UCL, 2023).

[4] Imperial College London's (2021) *Community Report from the History Group,* which involved research into Imperial College London's history and its relationship to the British Empire, recommended that the Huxley building be renamed due to his influential role in the development of eugenics. However, the university's management and administration teams decided not to follow this recommendation, and the Mathematics and Computer Science building at Imperial remains named after Huxley (Ball, 2022).

[5] It is worth noting that the Lever family set up the Leverhulme Trust, which was founded by a large donation from Lord Leverhulme on his death in 1925. The trust offers some of the most prestigious and competitive scholarships and grants for academic research in the UK.

2023). Resultantly, the architecture of many UK universities is testament to the ways "the physical environment of the academy is built on white domination" (New Urban Collective, 2015, in Peters, 2018: 264).

While architectural embodiments of racialised and colonial violence are certainly more prominent at the elite Russell Group universities, the Eurocentrism of the curriculum and its role in securing racialised hierarchies of knowledge production extend across UK universities and beyond national borders. Racialised and colonial practices have been fundamental to "the dominance of the Western canon of European thought" (Mirza, 2018: 14-15) globally. Within UK universities, Eurocentric modes of knowledge production and their sedimentation in university curricula are a key mechanism through which "whiteness is persistently reproduced in the university" (Ahmet, 2020: 682). Evidenced by a curriculum dominated by white (often male) European scholars and ontological and epistemological constructions of the West as the central ground on which (legitimate) knowledge of the world is produced. As such, the curriculum at UK universities is (re)productive of racialised and colonial logics in which "Europe, in its colonial incarnation laid sole claim to sole epistemological authority; [as] legitimate knowledge could only occur within its remit" (Gopal, 2021: 880).

Recent protest movements at universities across the UK have simultaneously addressed the curriculum and the physical embodiments of slave traders and colonialists on campus, situating these practices as interconnected structures. The Rhodes Must Fall movement at Oxford University in 2017 was a particularly pivotal moment in the development of the recent wave decolonisation campaigns across the UK (Mirza, 2018; Gebrial, 2018; Peters, 2018; Ahmet, 2020). It brought together the calls to remove the statue of the prominent colonialist Cecil Rhodes with wider calls to address whiteness and eurocentrism within university curriculums, alongside racism on campus and overwhelmingly white staff and student bodies at elite institutions within the UK (Gebrial, 2018; Shilliam, 2015; Mirza, 2018).

This campaign, however, was both local and global, having its roots in the Rhodes Must Fall movement in South Africa in 2015, where the statue of Cecil Rhodes "was symbolic of the imperial logic of white privilege that still dominates the South African higher education system 25 years after the collapse of the reign of terror that was Apartheid" (Mirza, 2018: 16). As this protest movement "spread like a flame to the metropole" (Mirza, 2018: 16-17), calls to

decolonise the curriculum have proliferated across UK universities, including, for example: the University of Manchester, UCL, the University of Bristol, Manchester Metropolitan University, Sheffield Hallam, the University of Glasgow, the University of Stirling, the University of the Arts London, the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), Oxford University, the University of Swansea, and Ulster University[6] (Peters, 2018). The transnational character of these protests speaks to the international interlinkages between colonialism, the university and the mobilisation of resistance to these practices. Moreover, as Mirza (2018) argues, campaigns to decolonise the curriculum are situated within a broader historical landscape of resistance to colonial power, and are thus "rooted in a long history for racial justice that reaches back to the early twentieth century when Black and Asian anti-colonial and liberation scholars in India and Africa began their intellectual struggle for freedom and independence from British imperial rule" (Mirza, 2018: 14-15). Equally, the campaigns are indicative of how relations of (in)security on university campuses are engaged in a politics of contestation.

The UK university's relationship to wider practices of international security is thus interconnected across national and international boundaries, and these relations of (in)security are manifest within everyday life. Be that in the buildings students and staff members work and study in, the tutorials, lectures and seminars where the curriculum is taught and studied, or the development of activist networks. The everyday ways (in)security structures the UK university are testament to the continued impacts of colonial and racialised practices of (in)security, the role of the UK university in perpetuating these practices, and the everyday impacts this has on students and staff members. As one undergraduate student, activist and woman of colour told me in our interview: "it's like why did I even come here you know? [..] I'm never going to be the kind of student that thrives here" (Alicia, INT3). Attending to relations of (in)security and everyday life within UK universities, I argue, opens up space to consider the multiple ways universities in the UK are engaged in the production of a variety of everyday practices of (in)security on campus.

---

[6] This list is not exhaustive, but contains a range of universities (including Russell Group, Oxbridge, and Post-1992) across the UK.

Everyday practices of (in)security on campus

I have described how UK Universities are embedded in racial and colonial logics of insecurity. Now I turn my attention to how universities in the UK are engaged in a variety of practices of (in)security that structure everyday relations on university campuses. University claims to provide 'security' on campus are multifaceted, but typically revolve around preventing, detecting, and responding to violence, crime and/discrimination on campus. Apparatuses of security constructed in this vein include: the development of campus Security Services; policies and procedures regarding to acceptable/unacceptable conduct, including policies regarding violence, harassment and discrimination, and disciplinary procedures; the advent of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion initiatives; and university led campaigns against violence and discrimination on university campuses.

Alongside this, the university is implicated in the enactment of state practices of security, such as immigration and border control, and the PREVENT scheme. Universities participate in these broader state practices as a legal duty that forms an extension of the protection of the nation, and thus are engaged in everyday racialised practices of securing the state. Notably, this relates to questions pertaining to extremism, terrorism, and racialised surveillance particularly of Muslim students, and the presence of the border and border controls at UK universities. The roll out of the UK government's PREVENT strategy, which calls on educators to report any students or staff members who may be 'radicalised' by extremist politics, and thus pose a potential 'danger' or 'threat' to the society (Jenkins, 2014; Mirza, 2018; Saeed, 2018). The PREVENT strategy is situated within a broader set of racialised and Islamophobic state practices of 'security', which have particularly targeted Muslim persons and those racialised as Muslim, acting as a form of "state-sanctioned Islamophobia" (Mirza, 2018: 14). As for the border, the university engages in ongoing surveillance of non-British nationals, and particularly those who are on Tier 4 visas using regular 'census' check-ins and attendance monitoring as practices of (in)security.

In terms of the university developing its own apparatuses of security in the name of securing the campus, university security services offer a fruitful starting point. This is because they operate as a highly visible presence of 'security' on campus and have been developed in ways that work to mimic broader national institutions of security, such as the police. Security

Services "minimise, prevent and detect crime and its effect on campus" (University of Manchester, 2019: np). They have been developed by universities across the UK to secure the university, explicitly invoke the language of security, and are a common presence on university campuses, available "24 hours a day, every day of the year" (University of Leeds, nd: np), patrolling the campus on foot and in security service cars (University of Manchester, 2019; University of Birmingham, 2023; University of Bristol, 2023a; University of Edinburgh, n.d). They often have a "dedicated central control room" (University of Salford, 2023)[7], through which they monitor the campus day and night, including extensive CCTV surveillance. At the University of Leicester (nd: np), for example, security services monitor 900 CCTV cameras across the campus from their control room.

Security services tend to have a specific uniform, and it is not uncommon for university security services to wear uniforms reminiscent of local and national police forces or even certain military contexts. For example, the wearing of padded vests with officer ID numbers, holstered radios, and the use of bodycams[8]. As the University of Swansea security services website explains in regard to their choice of uniforms specifically: "[w]e are a uniformed service. Our uniform acts as a significant, yet cost-effective crime deterrent and also makes us easily identifiable to the community we serve" (University of Swansea, n.d: np). Here then we can quite explicitly see the logic at play in the construction of the uniformed service as a deliberate part of the performance of security, particularly given the similarities between security services uniforms and the uniforms worn by the police.

Beyond day-to-day surveillance, monitoring, and patrol of the university campus, some UK universities develop long term 'security strategies' (See University of Bristol, 2023b; University of Glasgow, 2020). The University of Bristol for example, situates the university's

---

[7] A university Security Services' 'control room' or 'control centre' is common across universities in the UK, for some other examples please see: University of Bristol, 2023a; University of Cambridge, 2023; Nottingham Trent University, n.d; University College London, 2023b; Imperial College London, 2023; Sheffield Hallam University, n/d; University of Nottingham, n.d; University of Aberystwyth, 2022; University of Oxford, nd; University of Stirling, nd; Queen's University Belfast, nd.

[8] Examples of University security services who specifically wear police style uniforms include the University of Bristol, University of Manchester, University of Glasgow, University of Swansea, University of Leeds, and the University of Nottingham.

security strategy in response to a context of "unprecedented challenge and transformation" (2023b, np). (In)security at the university is presented here through familiar registers of exceptional states and the uncertainty of constant evolution. Bristol's security services, then, have constructed the problem of (in)security in the university in a way that is strikingly familiar to the framing of (in)security on a global stage.

In addition to the development of long-term security strategies, the development of a service that works in many ways to mimic national policing, several universities in the UK have gone through the 'Secured Environments' accreditation process, including the University of Leeds, Brunel University of London, Imperial College London, Middlesex University, the University of Bristol and the University of Bath (Secured Environments, 2023a; Imperial College London, 2023a, 2023b). As Imperial College London (2023b: np) state on their website: "we are proud of the fact that we are one of a select group of universities in the UK to be awarded the Secured Environments accreditation [...] the accreditation is recognition of excellence in security and crime prevention". Investing in this security accreditation process is not only evidence of the importance universities in the UK place on the development of security services, but of the interconnections between UK universities and national policing in the UK. Secured Environments was developed through a collaboration between the UK police forces and a private research group: "Secured Environments Accreditation has been developed through the partnership of Police Crime Prevention Initiatives (Police CPI) and Perpetuity Research and Consultancy International (PRCI) a specialist in community safety, crime risk management & security management" (Secured Environments, 2023b: np). UK universities who apply to take part in this scheme are therefore having their security services trained, tested, and if successful, accredited by the Police.

In this way, universities have constructed security services and produced their power to secure the campus via the emulation of familiar enactments of institutionalised security. Practices (surveilling, patrolling), aesthetics (uniforms), the construction of institutional spaces (control rooms), a particular language of (in)security that are traditionally associated with established institutions of security (e.g., the police), and training from Police services combine to produce this department of university staff as bodies of 'security' on campus. Indeed, the language of the 'control room' produces institutional space and institutional

power in a way that is redolent of state, police, and/or military operations. Security as achievable through policing is a familiar logic; to police, to surveil, and to protect are cornerstones of claims to 'secure' across a range of institutions and organisations. In part, this works through the notion that policing/surveilling and related enactments of security such as monitoring and disciplining are necessary to achieve protection from various 'threats' to security. Importantly, as an institutionally constructed department within universities, their power to secure the university campus is therefore bound up in the institutionalisation of everyday security on campus.

Alongside the development of security services, universities across the UK have developed a range of policies regarding the prevention of violence and discrimination, and disciplinary procedures in the event that violence and discrimination occur within the university community. These policies vary across UK universities, but are often centred around issues such as bullying, harassment, and assault, and sexual misconduct (See, for example, University of Newcastle, 2022; University of Cardiff, 2019; and University of Manchester, 2019). Key university workers who support those who experience sexual violence like Erin (INT4) described the process of helping students and staff members through policies and disciplinary procedures as centred upon making sure students and staff 'feel safe' on campus. For example, asking "do you feel like you're safe? And if you don't feel safe" taking steps to ensure feelings of safety are met to the best of the university's ability. At the same time, universities engage in practices of security in the name of protecting students from harm, particularly in attempts to 'secure' students, more specifically women students, from sexual violence. For example, the development of transportation systems for women from Student's Union's after nights out, the distribution of rape alarms at fresher's week events, sexual consent training events, Zero Tolerance policies against sexual violence on campus, and the development of anonymous reporting tools (See Sundari and Ruth, 2018).

However, like all claims to 'secure' a particular state, institution, or population, everyday practices of 'security' on campus are involved in a complex politics of contestation. On the surface the apparatus of security developed by the university are designed to protect students and staff from a variety of everyday forms of (in)security (violence, harassment, discrimination). However, these practices often work in ways that engender (in)security on

campus, reproducing racialised and gendered modes of (in)security. Moreover, these stories paint a complex picture regarding what, and who, the referent object of security within the context of the university.

Both university security services and university reporting mechanisms, particularly in contexts of sexual violence on university campuses have been subject to scrutiny for their role in producing gendered and racialised experiences of (in)security on campus. For Alicia (INT3), the gendered/racialised production of (in)security specifically related to Security Services' policing of the campus, where she felt that "it's so interesting the way institutions always react, it's like 'What are we going to do?' Police, 'What are we going to do?' Police. And the police aren't protecting us". At the University of Manchester, Zac Adan, a Black student at Manchester was racially profiled by Security Services staff while coming back to his halls of residence, accused of not being a university student and "looking like a drug dealer" (Freeman-Powell, 2020: np). At the University of Oxford, Femi Nylander, a Black man and graduate of the University who was visiting a friend still studying at Oxford, was subject to racialised surveillance when a "CCTV image of Femi was circulated to staff and students who were urged to 'maintain vigilance'" (Joseph-Salisbury, 2018: 1). For Joseph-Salisbury, Nylander's experience of racism at the university is product and productive of an "institutionalised web of whiteness" (2018: 3) in UK universities. Adan and Nylander's experiences of policing and surveillance within this 'web of whiteness' are testament to the ways that ongoing practices of (in)security and racialised violence are part of everyday life in the UK university, where going home or visiting a friend is a politics of (in)security for Black men on campus.

Alicia's (INT3) comments that increased policing of the campus is a common university mechanism that doesn't protect students were made in relation to an increased security service and police presence on campus following the racialised assault of a student. Her reflections here underpin familiar arguments that forms of policing reinforce everyday (in)security for racialised students on UK university campuses. It is worth noting in this context of that the development of policing and surveillance tactics more broadly within the UK were born out of the development of the police as a mechanism for colonial control (Danewid, 2019). As such, the logics of policing as 'securing' university campuses are interconnected

with, and developed out of, colonial logics, grounding the reproduction of everyday (in)security on campus within wider histories of gendered/racialised global projects of (in)security.

University policies and procedures for reporting staff-student sexual violence have likewise been subject to criticism for their role in reproducing gendered experiences of (in)security on campus. Alicia (INT3) interlinked her criticism of university reporting mechanisms with modes of policing on campus. She felt that universities responses to staff-student sexual violence operated within a logic that reproduced gendered practices of (in)security and discourses of 'victim-blaming', where reporting to the university "is similar to maybe going to the police, very like unempathetic, telling people it's because they were wearing the wrong clothes or drinking too much or doing this or doing that" (Alicia, INT3). In a familiar narrative, Alicia (INT3) identifies victim blaming as a means of "reinforcing structural inequalities" (Montoya, 2016: 149) in which victims of sexual abuse are located at fault for their experiences.

For Elizabeth (INT2), university policies and procedures for reporting sexual violence worked as a mechanism for silencing students and protecting alleged perpetrators, rather than helping students. She felt they deliberately wanted to "clamp it [complaints of sexual violence] down, shut it up, and refuse to really look at it or hear about it", resultantly working to inhibit students from receiving support and compounding experiences of mental distress. For Elizabeth (INT2), Alicia (INT3) and Rosa (INT5), although complaints procedures are articulated as a mechanism for aiding those who experience sexual violence, they felt that these processes were often used as a way to protect staff members who were accused of abuse. As Alicia remarked (INT3), "I have a friend of a friend who was sexually harassed by a lecturer and the university basically it like didn't do anything about it, and I think the older more established academics who have been at the institution a long time, I think they're very protected".

Equally, while universities have developed policies and procedures for dealing with sexual violence on campus, there is often a lack of sufficient institutional resources and staff members equipped to effectively support students. At one university, funding for staff members and a research project on student experiences of sexual violence on campus was cut from "£750,000 to £70,000" (Alicia, INT3). This left them with one member of staff tasked

supporting the entire university community (staff and students) in the event they experienced sexual violence on campus and wished to be supported through the process of making a complaint. I later interviewed this member of staff, who was working at capacity, initially appointed as the manager of a team of three other people, who told me that "unfortunately because of funding restrictions we've not actually gone ahead and appointed the two senior case workers nor the admin worker who would have been part of that team so at the moment it's just myself" (Erin, INT4).

For Anthony (INT1), a combination of a lack of training combined with competing priorities within the Human Resources (HR) department that was charged with dealing with complaints of staff-student sexual violence worked to produce "institutional failures". Here he cited an "institutional failure to properly train people" and argued that "HR is not the right place for it [the complaints process] to sit, because HR in a way, its employed by the top of the university so has a very strong incentive to do what the top of the university is after which is usually to avoid a scandal at all costs, but of course they also have this other incentive at the top of the university which that students feel like these sorts of concerns are seriously held" (Anthony, INT1). Anthony paints a complex picture here of competing priorities and a lack of investment that negated his university's ability to effectively handle complaints of staff-student sexual violence, even when those engaging in investigations were, he felt, "well-meaning" (Anthony, INT1).

Contestations over the referent object of (in)security paint a complicated picture of how university apparatuses of security are embedded within a politics of (in)security on campus. Simultaneously, the university situates staff, students, and the wider university community as the object of its protection, for which security services and university policies and procedures operate as practices to achieve security for staff, students, and the wider university community. However, the experiences of students and staff members engaging with these apparatuses give rise to competing articulations of what and who 'security' is for. For example, experiences of racialised policing from university security services can be seen as mechanisms for securing 'whiteness' on campus. For many students and staff members, university reporting mechanisms for dealing with staff-student sexual violence were primarily engaged with protecting the university's reputation or shielding the university from 'scandal'

in the news media, which I return to in more depth in Chapter four. Navigating everyday practices of (in)security and multiple and competing referents of security in the context of staff-student sexual violence therefore involves engaging in this politics of (in)security in everyday life on university campuses, and the broader practices of inequality and violence in which it is embedded.

Feminist Security Studies critiques of the (racialised, gendered, colonial) discipline of security studies: tracing the absences of the university and sexual violence

The university, therefore, is involved in multiple practices of (in)security within everyday life. We can discern this through looking to the ways that the university has been constituted through the gendered and racialised violence of colonialism and transatlantic slavery, as well as everyday enactments of (in)security on campus. Feminist and decolonial/postcolonial scholarship in security studies and international politics have extensively engaged with issues of colonialism, Eurocentrism, and racialised knowledge production in the field of security studies. However, despite this engagement with the gendered/racialised/colonial contours of the discipline, the university and sexual violence within it are not often subject to in depth analysis.

As Howell (2018: 126) notes, "IR [is] a discipline born out of colonialism and war". The legacies of colonialism and transatlantic slavery are therefore not only evident in the ways they were fundamental to the founding of our universities, and to ongoing practices of everyday (in)security within them, but to the development of academic practice and academic disciplines. Critical, post-colonial, and feminist scholarship in security studies has paid significant attention to this. They have detailed at length the ways that the discipline of international security is embedded within relations of Eurocentrism, coloniality, and racialised practices of knowledge production. This scholarship in security studies has thus extensively unpacked the ways in which the discipline is grounded in racialised and colonial forms of violence (Howell, 2018; Pinar, 2010; Seth, 2011; Barkawi and Laffey, 2006; Jones, 2006; Mohanty, 2015; Aganthangelou and Ling, 2004; Anievas, Manchanda and Shilliam, 2015; Henderson, 2015; Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2019, 2020, 2023).

These scholars note the ways the development of security studies as a scholarly discipline have been constituted by and through racialised and gendered forms of violence. They argue that this had been fundamental to the production of what knowledge of (in)Security is, where we locate knowledge of (in)security, and who constitutes a 'knower' of security and who does not (Bilgin, 2010; Seth, 2011). Indeed, "[u]nderstanding security as gendered and racialised means understanding gender and race as ways of ordering the world that are imbued with power to create, legitimize, and naturalize knowledge (for example, knowledge about and for people, places, ideas)" (Khalid, 2019: 40), is applied here to the practice of security studies as a discipline of knowledge production.

Security studies, including its more 'critical tenants', such as feminist security studies, has explored the ways the discipline is engaged in the reproduction of ontological, epistemological, and methodological whiteness, maleness, and western centrism (Bhambra, 2017; Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2019, 2020; Massey and Tyerman, 2023; Anievas, Manchanda, and Shilliam, 2015; Henderson, 2015). This includes the marginalisation of scholarly work, lived experience, and the perspectives of/from the Global South (Barkawi and Laffey, 2006; Bilgin, 2010). As well as the Western centrism that pervades much scholarship that does consider the Global South. As Bilgin notes: "While there is a body of work that looks at security in the South/Third/developing world, it offers relatively little insight into non-Western insecurities […] [t]his was because these writings view the developing world as an object of security, not a subject […] what is on offer views insecurity in the non-West from an avowedly Western-centric perspective" (2010: 617). These scholars therefore highlight ethe lack of attention to relations of race/racism and coloniality in the theoretical underpinnings of the discipline. Alongside a lack of attention to the ways particular theories, methods, or epistemological frameworks reinforce practices of gendered, racialised, and colonial disciplinary violence (Aganthangelou and Ling, 2004; Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2019, 2020, 2023; Massey and Tyerman, 2023).

The university does figure into some of the analysis within this body of work, particularly in regard to the reproduction of racialised and colonial knowledge within security studies and international politics. For example, Richter-Montpetit and Howell make insightful critiques into the racism of Foucauldian studies (2019). As well as this, the 'is securitisation theory

racist?' debate that played out in the journal *Security Dialogue* pointed towards the relationship between academics in the UK and Europe and underlying structures of racism both in theory and gendered and racialised practices within universities (Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2020, 2023). Massey and Tyerman (2023: 3) nod to the university in their thoughtful critique of methodological whiteness in critical military studies, and show that their analysis is pertinent for "questions concerning which research subjects and sites we choose to engage with, and in doing so whose voices and perspectives we foreground, what methods we employ, and how we position ourselves as researchers". As I return to in more detail in Chapter two, Henry (2021), Parashar (2019) and Haastrup and Hagen (2020, 2021) all highlight the relationship between whiteness and coloniality within universities in the context of the Women, Peace, and Security agenda (WPS).

Building on this scholarship in my thesis, I argue that more can be done to examine the role of relations of gender, race, and (in)security within the university. This is especially important given the university as the context in which the discipline of international (in)security is (re)produced, in all its racialised and colonial guises. The everyday context of the discipline of security studies and international relations is written as security services patrol the campus, in buildings named after prominent members of the slave trade, and as disciplinary hearings on staff-student sexual violence are ongoing. In this way the university looms as part of the background of discussion in much scholarship on the discipline of international politics and security studies. As it is "vital to examine material hierarchies and disciplinary institutions and how they, in turn, shape the intellectual content of the discipline" (Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2023: 16), bringing the university into focus within this context allows for a deeper confrontation of the relationship between the everyday logics of (in)security in the university and their relationship to the fields of security studies and international politics. Moreover, it allows for an analysis of the considerable impacts of sexual violence and (in)security that are part of the ongoing politics of university campuses in the UK. This is particularly pertinent given that the discipline, I argue, is of the university, and the university, as I have shown, is embedded within the very racialised/colonial/gendered politics this critical scholarship has done so much to unpack.

Where is sexual violence?

Although sexual violence has featured prominently as a field of study particularly within feminist security studies and international politics, the role of sexual violence within the university requires further attention. Sexual violence is a key feature of gendered, racialised and colonial practices that have come to constitute the fields of international politics and security studies. However, there is not sufficient attention to sexual violence in disciplinary scholarship that untangles the colonial, racialised, and gendered contours of international (in)security as a field of knowledge production and the university. As the university is also embedded within these violent practices of (in)security, ongoing issues of sexual violence within the university must be embedded within this politics.

Sexual violence was ubiquitous during the transatlantic slave trade, where white men raped "with impunity" (Carby, 2019: 304) on plantations and on ships of enslaved peoples as they travelled to the Americas and Europe (Carby, 2019; Hartman, 2008; Spillers, 1987). Sexual violence was a central part of racialised logics and practices of domination during this period, where "serial rapes […] offer a graphic account of the pleasures extracted from the destruction and degradation of life" (Hartman, 2008: 6). The role of sexual violence in transatlantic slavery worked to cement the status of the white man as with "absolute power" (Carby, 2019: 282) over the enslaved.

Colonialism is also deeply implicated in relations of sexual violence. In colonial contexts, sexual violence was a prominent way in which relations of gender and race were configured, fundamental in the construction of racialised masculinities and femininities, and the dominance of white/European supremacy, configuring social, political, and legal colonial practices (Maddison, 2013; Coetzee and Du Toit, 2018; Jaleel, 2021; Heath, 2016). Coetzee and Du Toit (2018: 215), for example, looking to South Africa and the context of British Imperial relations, argue that "neither […] colonial and postcolonial contexts can be properly grasped without a clear understanding of its gender/sexual dimension". In South Africa, the gendered and racialised politics of colonial rule figured together as producing the Black man as "bestial and predatory" (Coetzee and Du Toit, 2018: 221) and Black women as "as always already raped and therefore unrapeable both in law and in social understanding" (Coetzee and Du Toit, 2021). For Jaleel, it is not possible to understand rape and sexual violence without

attending to "power and knowledge achieved from racial, imperial, and settler colonial domination" (2021: 3), that we must be mindful that sexual violence central to the production of subjectivity through racialised and colonial modes of violent domination. Remembering also that gender, race, and (in)security are forms of violence that are enacted onto bodies in international politics (Sylvester, 2012), sexual violence is a central practice of (in)security that produces subjects and objects of international (in)security.

The UK university, as a site that is embedded within racialised, gendered, and colonial violence, is bound up within these relations of sexual violence. For example, if we turn back to the everyday ways racialised and colonial violence manifest in everyday life in the university, it is worth pointing out here that the wealth of colonialism and transatlantic slavery that funded university land and university buildings, the dominance of whiteness and eurocentrism in our disciplines and curriculums, and the names of our buildings are inextricably tied to "rape as a way to make slaves, rape as a way to make workers, and rape as a way to grab land" (Jaleel, 2021: 7). Moreover, experiences of sexual violence and responses from institutions such as universities to issues of sexual violence continue to be embedded within gendered and racialised practices (Gore et al, 2022).

As I examine further in Chapter 2, feminist security studies in particular has produced an enormous body of scholarship on sexual violence and international (in)security (see, for example: Zalewski et al, 2018; Zalewski, 2013, 2018, 2022; Dolan, Gray and Stern, 2020; Baaz, Gray and Stern, 2018; Baaz and Stern, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2016; Kirby, 2019; Higate and Henry, 2004; Kirby and Henry, 2012; MacKenzie, 2012; MacKenzie, Gunaydin and Chaudhuri, 2019; Gray and Stern, 2019; Massey, 2021; Shepherd, 2011; Sjoberg, 2016; Crawford, 2017). Much of this feminist scholarship has been concerned with sexual violence in colonial and/or racialised contexts, often looking to post-conflict and post-colonial regions, and/or the relationship between international organisations and sexual violence. Equally, feminist security studies is central to the production of scholarship on the everyday and the everyday as intertwined with relations of violence within and beyond sexual violence specifically (Zalewski, 2013; Innes and Steele, 2019; Nyman, 2021; Enloe, 2000, 2004, 2011). Indeed, as Enloe writes, feminist work in security studies and international politics has shown us that to understand matters of (in)security and violence we need to look to "kitchens,

bedrooms, and secretarial pools […] pubs, brothels, squash courts, and factory lunchrooms – and village wells and refugee camp latrines" (2011: 447).

However, the university's relationship to sexual violence has not thus far been subject to sustained analysis within this field. This also the case in scholarship in security studies that has addressed the university's relationship to broader practices of gendered/racialised/colonial politics. For example, while Howell's (2017: 128) analysis of the US university as its situation within what they term 'war-like' is a welcome argument that allows us to understand how "[t]he academy is not the victim of military breach but has been foundationally produced and formed, in its specificities through warfare", sexual violence only features as a briefly note in the analysis. Similarly, Parashar (2019), Henry (2021) and Haastrup and Hagen (2020, 2021) analyse whiteness, racism, and coloniality in the context of the WPS/GPS agenda and universities in the Global North. However, sexual violence within universities does not figure into their analyses.

Sexual violence within the university, then, is an understudied site through which to examine the interconnections between the everyday and matters of gender, race, and coloniality within the discipline. Looking to the university, I bring together analysis of the racialised, colonial, and Eurocentric violence that is embedded within both university and the discipline of international (in)security, alongside forms of gendered and racialised violence in which sexual violence is central to their constitution and (re)production (Jaleel, 2021; Carby, 2019; Hartman, 1997; Sharpe, 2010). In doing so, I attend particularly to the everyday within the university, a context in which sexual violence, (in)security and the discipline of security studies are all intertwined. It is where feminist security studies scholars work, teach, write insightful papers and books on matters of race, gender, coloniality, sexual violence, the importance of everyday lives and everyday stories of violence as matters of (in)security. The university, then, is the "deeply personal and simultaneously politicised space" (Zalewski, 2013: 16) in which feminist security studies scholars go about their everyday lives in the presence of everyday forms of sexual violence and their gendered racialised and colonial foundations in the university.

As I demonstrate within this thesis, everyday sexual violence within the university allows for a more detailed examination of the implication of the university in the reproduction of

everyday practices of (in)security in the context of sexual violence. As I explore in Chapter 2, the continued orientation to "womenoverthere" (Henry, 2021: 23) raises questions regarding the need to confront ongoing disciplinary relations of coloniality, and the ways that examining staff-student sexual violence in the UK university offers a way to do more to confront the situation of security studies and international politics in relations of violence.

Why staff-student sexual violence in UK Universities?

In order to explore the relationship between everyday sexual violence and the university as present/absent within the field of feminist security studies, I engage with staff-student sexual violence in UK universities specifically. In the wake of the #MeToo movement, the subsequent hashtags such as #TimesUpAcademia generated an international exposition of acts of sexual violence enacted by academic staff members in universities across the world. Rosa (INT5) an activist and academic described the impact of this on her blog, which documented sexual violence perpetrated by staff members in academia, saying she was "absolutely deluged with sexual harassment stories" so much so she "was planning it [the posts] two weeks in advance four posts a day, that's how many were coming in" including a high number of stories of staff-student sexual violence specifically. Stories of staff-student sexual violence often highlight the ways universities responses to sexual violence committed by academic staff members involved any number of the following: a lack of due process, protecting perpetrators of abuse, looking to quash 'scandal', discouraging reporting, threats against those who wished to make a report, and general patterns of institutionalised abuse and/silencing of those who had experienced sexual violence (Dey and Mendes, 2022; Bull and Rye, 2018).

Many of these stories focussed specifically on staff-student sexual violence in universities. Although this is a significant issue impacting students on UK university campuses, staff-student sexual violence in UK universities remains an understudied form of sexual violence (Bull and Rye, 2018). The range of abuse highlighted in my fieldwork included, for example: sexual assault; sexual harassment in the form of sexualised comments, jokes and objectification of particularly women's bodies, both in one-on-one settings (e.g., office hours), and more public settings (e.g., academic conferences or university classrooms); and offers to co-publish in return for sex. In my fieldwork, I found that university responses to staff-student sexual violence were enormously difficult to access. Students relayed experiences of being

silenced by senior members of staff in their department, humiliated by members of staff, including staff members mocking their experiences of sexual violence and attempts to make reports, inaccessible reporting mechanisms, and threatening and ableist behaviour from staff in university hearings on staff-student sexual violence.

Staff-student sexual violence is an ongoing form of violence experienced in everyday life in UK universities that has enormous impacts on the students who experience it, which are often compounded by university responses. Bull and Rye's (2018: 17) study into institutional responses to reports of staff-student sexual violence found their participants experienced inordinately high levels of mental illness, for example "depression, anxiety, suicide attempts or feeling suicidal, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)". In my fieldwork, participants noted students feeling "constant anxiety" (Anthony, INT1), "self-blame and guilt" (Elizabeth, INT2), "feeling humiliated, upset, and blaming [themselves]" (Abigail, SUR2), feeling "unsafe wherever [they] went" (Sam, SUR3), and "unsafe, vilified and traumatised" having "completely destroyed [their] confidence, ability to work, and self-worth" (Marta, SUR3).

In my thesis, I look to staff-student sexual violence as a way to understand the university as engaged in gendered, racialised, and colonial practices of (in)security that are product and productive of everyday relations of sexual violence in UK universities[9]. As I go on to show throughout this thesis, attention to staff-student sexual violence as a politics of everyday (in)security offers significant contributions to understanding the role of everyday violence and the university in the context of broader gendered, racialised, and colonial politics in security studies.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have argued that everyday sexual violence within UK universities is situated within a wider web of racialised, gendered, and colonial violence and (in)security. I have

---

[9] By staff in this thesis, I refer specifically academic staff members in teaching and/or teaching and research and/or research positions at universities in the UK, and students encompassing undergraduate and postgraduate taught, as well as postgraduate research students.

argued that the university has been constituted through relations of racialised, colonial and gendered violence. As well as this, I have explored everyday practices of (in)security on campuses in UK universities and argued they are indicative of the development everyday apparatuses of security on campus, alongside how these practices engender contestations over (in)security, and the gendered/racialised contours of this in relation to race, gender, and sexual violence.

Next, I looked to feminist scholarship in security studies that has extensively unpacked and critiqued whiteness, eurocentrism, maleness and coloniality within security studies. I argued that despite the insightful contributions this scholarship has made, the university is rarely foregrounded in analysis, and that subjecting the university to more sustained analysis can contribute to this field of scholarship. I then argued that sexual violence in the university also requires further attention. I situated the colonial/racialised/gendered practices of sexual violence within the wider terrain of transatlantic slavery and colonialism in order build on my previous arguments that the university is situated within this wider politics of (in)security, and underscore how sexual violence within the university is thus interconnected with this broader politics. I argued that while feminist security studies produces a large amount of highly important scholarship on sexual violence, and the relationship(s) between sexual violence, race, and coloniality, more can be done to examine the role of the university within this context. Lastly, I unpacked why I have chosen to look at staff-student sexual violence as an understudied form of everyday sexual violence within the university.

In the next chapter, I attend in detail to theorisations of the everyday and scholarship on sexual violence in feminist security studies. I do so to both outline the contributions of this scholarship and unpack how they form a theoretical framework of analysis for this thesis, and also examine the politics of the university and relations of sexual violence therein not being foregrounded within this scholarship. I argue that tendencies to locate sexual violence "overthere" (Henry, 2021: 23) reinscribe racialised and colonial logics in security studies. Confronting the everyday university as embedded in relations of sexual violence and (in)security thus contributes to scholarship on the everyday, sexual violence and (in)security, and the importance of attending to and confronting the reproduction of gendered/racialised logics in feminist security studies research.

Chapter 2: The Everyday and Sexual Violence in Feminist Security Studies

Introduction

Following on from Chapter one, where I located everyday relations in the university as embedded within a wider politics of (in)security, I turn first to scholarship on the everyday in feminist security studies. I outline how and why this scholarship forms a theoretical framework for analysing staff-student sexual violence as a form of everyday (in)security in UK universities. Following this, I turn to scholarship on sexual violence in the field of feminist security studies, unpacking the considerable contributions that have been made to the field, particularly in conflict, post-conflict and institutional contexts. I show that this scholarship has foregrounded the ways that sexual violence is a critical site of inquiry for security studies scholars, contributing in particular to knowledge regarding the gendered and racialised politics of (in)security, and in institutional contexts more specifically, the relationship between institutional security providers and their implication in the reproduction of insecurity.

Taking both these sets of scholarship together, I then carve out both my critique and contribution to feminist security studies analysis of the everyday and of sexual violence. I argue that although feminist security studies has made significant interventions in regard to sexual violence particularly, there remains an orientation to sexual violence 'over there' reproducing racialised and colonial hierarchies within the discipline. While the everyday has made enormous contributions to the field of security studies, I argue that in the context of sexual violence the everyday is often used as a conceptual tool in already established and legitimised sites of inquiry in international politics and security studies. More can be done, then, to expand the conceptual and empirical terrain of the everyday. Turning to everyday staff-student sexual violence in the university offers a twofold response to these problematics. Firstly, it allows this thesis to contribute to anti-racist and decolonial feminist scholarship highlighting the importance of uncovering disciplinary relationships to racial and colonial logics. Secondly, it enables me to develop the concept of the everyday by unpacking

the relationship between the everyday university and relations of (in)security via foregrounding experiences of staff-student sexual violence.

The Everyday in Feminist Security Studies

In this first section of this chapter, I overview key contributions of feminist scholarship on the everyday in security studies. I pay attention to the everyday as a conceptual framework shifting the study of security and insecurity from 'elite' spheres of international politics to the everyday lives of those marginalised by mainstream discourses in international politics; the importance of understanding violence as everyday rather than exceptional; and how feminist security studies scholars have understood everyday (in)security as embodied and affective practices. Within each of these sections, I nod to how this scholarship enables me to develop a framework of analysis within the empirical chapters of this thesis.

From 'elite' politics to everyday life

The everyday has been a critical theoretical intervention within feminist security studies. The everyday, for feminist scholars, is a means to examine the ways in which the everyday practices, sites, and lived experiences are central to the way that international (in)security is made and unmade. As such, attending to the everyday involves reconceptualising what has previously been considered unpolitical, private, domestic and therefore outside of the elite spheres of international (in)security, and instead seeing these spheres as central to what (in)security is, how it functions, and whose lives are impacted by relations of (in)security. In this vein, feminist scholars of the everyday have challenged dominant or mainstream approaches within the discipline of security studies that have "analytically and political locates significant practices in elites, aggregated identities, and abstractions [...] detached from the daily concerns of people" (Guillame and Huysmans, 2019: 280-281).

The turn away from these 'elite' spheres and to the everyday has in part been motivated by challenges to the androcentrism of disciplinary foci on "great (state) powers and their regimes, decision- makers, economic zones" (Sylvester, 1996: 267) that have marginalised the lives of women specifically, as they are often excluded from these public/international spheres of politics. As Wibben notes, for example, "women and their experiences are rendered invisible by the traditional focus on the public, on politics understood as

competition for power, and on male experience as representative for human experience. Therefore, asking "Where are the women in IR?" by itself is a powerful challenge to IR—it refuses to ignore this bias, offering a corrective by populating international relations with women." (Wibben, 2004: 105). Women's stories of everyday life have therefore been central to constituting the everyday and (in)security as interlinked practices (Enloe, 2000a, 2000b, 2004, 2011; Wibben, 2004, 2011; Zalewski, 2010; Nyman, 2021). As Enloe writes, "making useful sense – feminist sense – of international politics requires us to follow diverse women to places that are usually dismissed by conventional foreign affairs experts as merely 'private', 'domestic', 'local', or 'trivial'" (2000: 3a). Moreover, feminist scholars of the everyday highlight the ways that the production of these boundaries are intensely political. The idea that that the personal is distinct from the political, and everyday lives are outside of the international are political constructions that do the work of maintaining ontological distinctions between what is public/private, inside/outside of the scope of politics and (in)security (Enloe, 2000a, 2000b).

As such, attention to the everyday is deeply interconnected with feminist security studies' contention that everyday lives, and particularly women's everyday lives, are not 'outside' of the politics of (in)security. Rather the everyday lives of women are central to understanding (in)security. In this regard, feminist scholars have shown how the everyday lives of women illustrate the ways matters of international (in)security are negotiated through everyday practices, routines, ordinary encounters, drawing attention to the "complex experiences and ideas of domestic workers, hotel chambermaids, women's rights activists, women diplomats, women married to diplomats, women who are the mistresses of male elites, women sewing-machine operators, women who have become sex workers, women soldiers, women forced to become refugees, and women working on agribusiness plantations" (Enloe, 2000a: 3).

In looking to these stories of the everyday, feminist scholars have made important connections between the everyday lives of women and key themes within international politics, such as conflict, post-conflict, peacebuilding and peacekeeping, militarism, migration and international political economy. Enloe (2000a) draws attention to the everyday lives of women on military bases, from laundresses to sex workers, illuminate process of militarisation, masculinities/femininities, and the intersections of race, gender, and sex.

Women's everyday experiences of sexual violence in conflict and post-conflict contexts have troubled distinctions between war/peace, challenged temporal frameworks surrounding the 'beginning' and 'end' of conflict, and generated understandings of how conflict related sexual violence can be situated within broader structures patriarchy and colonialism (Sjoberg, 2009, 2016; Shepherd, 2009, 2016; Wibben, 2020). Women's resistance to violence in everyday life has been explored as a means to understand broader relationships between protest, power, embodiment and state violence (Tyler, 2013). Looking to the state in particular, Peterson shows that the states foundation through relations of patriarchy and its implication in ongoing forms of violence within the state that impact women in their everyday lives is one such way we can understand security as "profoundly contradictory" (1992: 32).

While there has been significant attention to women's lives specifically, the everyday is invoked more broadly to examine the ways that gendered, racialised, and colonial (in)securities are products and productive of everyday life. Several scholars, for example, have underscored the relationships between the everyday life, (in)security, and the international political economy, considering the way everyday lives garner insight into structures of racism and colonialism within the international (Agathangelou, 2017; Hudson, 2018; True, 2012). In contexts of peacekeeping, Highgate and Henry, for example, look to everyday experiences of sexual violence and abuses of power by peacekeepers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, finding that "colonial stereotypes of hypersexualized 'African' women and girls appear to shape the identity work of this particular masculinity" (2004: 490) of peacekeepers who engaged in sexual abuse during the mission. Mertens (2023: 529) looks to everyday sexual violence also in the DRC to ask how these forms of everyday violence work "structure colonialism as part of a continuum of violence". The everyday has also been invoked as a means to explore how gender, race, colonialism and state violence with bordering practices, where everyday transnationalism, everyday intimacies, and everyday racialised acts of state violence are unpacked (Innes, 2021; Côté-Boucher, Infantino, Salter, 2014; Axster et al, 2019; Innes and Steele, 2019).

The everyday thus represents an ontological and epistemological shift in security studies. Ontologically, it marks a shift in how the 'international' and (in)security are conceived, challenging previously articulated notions of where and what (in)security is by rendering

everyday practices, routines, encounters, and lived experiences as central to the (re)production of relations of (in)security at the international level. In this sense, the everyday comes to be understood as constitutive of the international, and thus ontological distinctions between the local/global, private/public, personal/political no longer hold. This meaning that far from being distinct spheres, they are interconnected political processes. In addition to this, it changes conceptions of who the actors are in international (in)security, as far from the elite spheres of states, state makers, foreign policy officials, or high-level members of international organisations, ordinary people are constructed as actors of international (in)security in their everyday lives. Epistemologically, it represents a reorientation of how we can know international politics and (in)security, reconceptualising knowledge of international politics and security studies from peoples' everyday lives.

In my thesis, I build on this scholarship in order to understand the university as a site of ongoing relations of (in)security in the context of staff-student sexual violence. Doing so involves foregrounding the everyday experiences of ordinary people as a means to understand how (in)security is enacted, experienced, and negotiated in everyday life in the UK university. I consider the ways staff-student sexual violence engenders relations of (in)security that are discernible through everyday spaces, places, routines, encounters, and practices within the UK university. This involves thinking more deeply about the ways the everyday and the university are embedded within security studies.

The everyday university occupies a complex position in relation to security studies. The scholarship on the everyday I have overviewed here, for example, has its roots in everyday life in universities, and much of it has its roots in everyday life in universities within the UK specifically. The scholarship that has shown us to look away from elite spheres of international politics, to consider the everyday lives of women, to think through the ways that gendered, racialised, and colonial practices are experienced, negotiated, and contested in everyday life, has been produced in the everyday university. Feminist security studies theorising occurs over cups of tea in office kitchens, through presentations at departmental and conference seminars, where conversations and feedback on work in progress are crucial to how feminist theorising of the everyday is made. This involves interrogating these spaces as interconnected with relations of gendered and racialised modes of (in)security in international politics. As

such, my exploration of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence takes us to familiar sites of the university and of knowledge production and dissemination in security studies, such as The Classroom (chapter 4) and The Conference (chapter 5), but rethinks their relationship(s) to everyday (in)securities by focusing on staff-student sexual violence within these spaces.

Understanding Violence as Everyday

An important contribution of the everyday within feminist security studies is the reframing of violence. This is particularly significant as violence, conflict, post-conflict, and militarised contexts of violence have been central to security studies since its inception as a (sub)discipline of international politics. In looking to the everyday, to "those forms of violence that occur as part of the banal experience of everyday life" (Innes and Steele, 2019: 151) are reconstituted as pertinent grounds on which relations of (in)security operate. This challenges 'exceptional' frames of violence in security studies. This meaning that rather than being exceptional sites of politics, violence and (in)security are located in "practices, places, people, or experiences that are common, and therefore seem to be unimportant or indeed non-political" (Nyman, 2021: 316). Rather than seeing these experiences as pre-political or unimportant however, the everyday is resituated at the heart of relations of violence. In this way, everyday relations of violence are seen as important sites of political contestation, for theorising the (re)production of violent structures, and attending to the lives of those most impacted or marginalised by violence and (in)security. Moreover, what has been rendered unimportant is not only political, but has been discursively produced as non-political. Accounting for violence as everyday thus pushes back against ideas that personal, mundane, ordinary, or interpersonal experiences are not matters of (in)security or the international (Innes and Steele, 2019; Cockburn, 2004; Enloe, 2000a; Yadav and Horn, 2021; Wibben, 2011a, 2020; Sjoberg, 2009; Zalewski, 2010, 2013).

An important aspect of this is understanding that forms of violence are not an exceptional but are ongoing and pervasive practices enacted in people's everyday lives, engendering relations of (in)security on a day-to-day basis. This has been a key mechanism for incorporating stories of violence from the everyday lives of those marginalised by more traditional accounts of 'security' and 'insecurity' in the international. In doing so, given that everyday violence has

often been relegated to the 'private' or 'domestic' sphere, and in the process marginalised women's experiences of violence, feminist reconceptualisations of violence and (in)security as everyday make important contributions to challenging divisions between the public/private and the domestic/international (Elias and Rai, 2015; Tickner, 2014; Blanchard, 2010; Wibben, 2011a; Enloe, 2000a, 2011, 2014; Sjoberg, 2009; Shepherd, 2009).

Thinking about violence in this way changes "where we will look, and how we will know violence" in security studies (Zalewski, 2013: 11). In this sense, turning to the everyday is not simply a matter of an additional lens through which to understand violence and (in)security, but changes our understanding of both the concept of (in)security and the concept of violence. This has ramifications for the field more broadly. For example, everyday forms of violence have been crucial for feminist scholars troubling the distinction between war/peace. These scholars argue that far from distinct spheres, the interconnections between violence in warfare and violence in peacetime are part of a 'continuum of violence' that is bound up in gendered/racialised/colonial relations (Sahin, 2020; Freedman, 2011; Cockburn, 2004; Yadav and Horn, 2021; Wibben, 2004, 2020; Boesten, 2017; Blanchard, 2003). For example, Freedman (2011: 170) explores the ways that sexual violence in post conflict DRC is deeply interwoven with the experience of warfare, arguing that "this violence has expanded to become a "normalised part of everyday life". Equally, these scholars have argued that relations gendered and racialised violence in peacetime inform the violence of conflict.

Everyday violence is often explored to garner understandings of how the everyday and the international are linked by structures of gender, race, colonialism. Scholars have also shown that stories of violence from the everyday are not simply related to the international but that the everyday and the international co-constitutive of (in)security (Enloe, 2000a, 2011). In this vein, Cockburn (2004: 43) argues that "gender links violence at different points on a scale reaching from the personal to the international, from the home to the backstreet to the manoeuvres of the tank column and the sortie of the stealth bomber: battering and marital rape, confinement, 'dowry', burnings, honour killings, and genital mutilation in peacetime; military rape, sequestration, prostitutions, and sexualised torture in war". Looking to everyday violence has been a way to deepen analysis of key themes and empirical sites in international politics and security studies. Many scholars look to the ways everyday violence

in conflict and post-conflict, and particularly sexual violence, are embedded within broader structures of patriarchy and gendered inequalities. Including, for example, the production of masculinities/femininities, the concept of militarised masculinities, women's mobilisation movements and resilience (Wibben, 2004, 2020; Higate, and Henry, 2010; Campbell, Demir and O'Rielly, 2019; Cockburn, 2004)

In my thesis, these insights allow me to locate staff-student sexual violence and the relations of (in)security it engenders as ongoing within everyday lives, everyday spaces, and everyday institutional practices within the UK university. In the UK university, staff-student sexual violence was ubiquitous. So much so, that many participants remarked that these forms of sexual abuse and the insecurities they engendered were just "as you'd expect" (Abigail, SUR2), as they structured everyday relations and everyday encounters in the university. Staff-student sexual violence in everyday life in the university is enacted in the form of "sexualised comments; invites back to hotel rooms, hands placed on smalls of backs" (Abigail, SUR2), "'locker room talk' at conference bars (mostly about female colleagues' bodies and behaviour" (Jack, SUR2), sexualised text messaged sent from senior male staff to junior female PhD students, a need to check "whether doors are open, if anyone else is in the room…" (Rosanna, SUR2). These experiences are indicative of the ways that routine encounters like a conversation, a meeting, or a conference is embedded within a wider politics of (in)security that is constitutive of relations of sexual violence in the university.

The routineness of staff-student sexual violence in the university is one such way this form of violence becomes "as you'd expect" (Abigail, SUR2), "so part of the norm as your lived experience as a woman" (Rosanna, SUR2), "so utterly banal and predictable" (Abigail, SUR2). The banality of everyday staff-student sexual violence was counterposed with the exceptional, as it became "both utterly banal and predictable, and shocking" at the same time. The contrast between the everyday and the exceptional offered a point of reflection on the normalisation of staff-student sexual violence, where those who experience it grapple with the feeling it should be exceptional, while at the same time it was so commonplace in everyday life that at times it was "hard to think of specific events" (Abigail, SUR2).

Everyday experiences of staff-student sexual violence offer pertinent ground to consider the ways that everyday violence is central to the (re)production of gendered and racialised

(in)securities in the university. Everyday accounts of staff-student sexual violence underscore their relationship to broader gendered and racialised of (in)security in the university. For Sasha (SUR2), staff-student sexual violence and its normalisation in the scene of the academic conference is representative of "a male dominated culture in which male privilege is not questioned but assumed as normal".

Embodied subjects of (in)security in the everyday

Feminist security studies has long been concerned with questions of embodiment (Sylvester, 2012; Wilcox, 2014). The recent 'affective turn' (Ähäll, 2019: 154) in security studies and international politics together with attention to questions of embodiment, are central to understanding (in)security as embedded within everyday lived experiences (Nyman, 2021: Ähäll, 2019). Attention to the everyday (in)security as embodied and affective offers everyday theorisations of (in)security a theoretical way in to the ordinary and the mundane. Therefore, looking to the lived experience of (in)security as embodied and affective is what allows feminist security studies to locate the politics of (in)security within ordinary practices in everyday life.

Looking to the body has been central to the development of feminist security studies as a discipline. As Vaittinen notes, "in feminist analyses of security, the question of sexed and gendered bodies as well as their differential value has been a central concern" (Vaittinen, 2019: 245). Bodies, then, are "contested and diverse entit[ies] that comes with gender, race, class, generational, cultural and locational markings that affect and are affected by social experiences" (Sylvester, 2012: 5). It is not only the "biopolitical fact of the body" (Sylvester, 2012: 5) that feminists are interested in, however, but how practices of violence and (in)security work to produce embodied subjects. As Wilcox puts it: "violent practices of International Relations produce the bodies that they affect; violence is not merely harmful but is constitutive of the embodied subjects of IR" (2014: 12). Feminists in security studies, therefore, have looked to questions of the body to ask how practices of violence and (in)security work to produce embodied subjects, and particularly have been interested in the ways gendered and racialised subjects are produced through relations of violence and (in)security (Elshtain; 1987; Vaittinen, 2019; Sylvester, 2012; Wilcox, 2014).

Bodies of (in)security, then, are produced discursively through relations of violence. More recently, feminists in security studies have attended to the interconnections between the gendered, racialised production of subjects to questions of heteronormativity (Weber, 2014, 2015; Richter-Montpetit, 2018), and while this remains limited to questions of the disabled body (Howell, 2012; Vaittinen, 2019). Feminist theorising of the body and embodied subjects as central to practices of (in)security and the international have from the outset have worked against the presentation of matters of 'security' and the 'international' as the stuff of 'rational' disembodied (political) actors, but rather questions of embodiment have always been central to the makings of (in)security.

Feminist security studies scholarship argues that attention to the everyday, to the body, and to affect, is a means to explore what "often remain[s] unseen, unnoticed, and unrecognised" (Åhäll and Gregory, 2015: 5). Sylvester (2012), for example, takes her analysis of the importance of lived experience, the body, and affect, as central for understanding the ways "war is experienced through the body" (Sylvester, 2012: 5). Moreover, questions of lived experience and/or embodiment and/or affect have been used more broadly to generate feminist analysis of war, militarism, sovereignty, biopower, migration, state violence, and peacekeeping, international health (in)security (Basham, 2013; Åhäll, 2019; Wilcox, 2014; Innes and Steele, 2019; Higate and Henry, 2010; Vaittiman, 2019).

Questions of affect are intimately linked to questions of embodiment, particularly as a means to understand (in)security and violence through everyday lived experience (Wibben, 2011a; Åhäll, 2019, 2019; Sylvester, 2012; Nyman, 2021). As Nyman (2021: 320) writes, "for theorists of everyday life, the everyday is a perpetual process that is lived through […] Lived experiences are emotional, affective, and embodied". Embodiment and affect thus "interlock and mutually create experiences" of (in)security (Sylvester, 2012: 6). The question for feminist security theorists who are concerned with (in)security and violence as everyday, then, is how matters of (in)security are lived through on a day-to-day basis, how it feels to navigate violence done to the body, how these everyday experiences are central to the production of subjects and objects of violence and (in)security.

The relationship between embodiment and affect as crucial to understanding (in)security and violence through everyday lived experiences offers a unique window into the ways that

violence and (in)security manifest in ordinary and mundane ways "that "often remain unseen, unnoticed, and unrecognised" and emerge when bodies encounter other bodies, spaces, objects and atmospheres" (Nyman, 2021: 320) of (in)security. The embodied and affective are thus what makes (in)security and violence "feel like something" (Stewart, 2007: 2), and are therefore central to how matters of violence and (in)security are navigated by ordinary people in everyday life. Far from the high politics of states and their elites, the lived experience of (in)security can be felt "as an empty pause or a dragging undertow, as a sensibility that snaps into place or a profound orientation" (Stewart, 2007: 2).

It is through bodily and affective experience that (in)security and violence can be made visible within ordinary spaces like the workplace, the local pub, the public bathroom, and in ordinary acts. In other words, it is the embodied and affective that gets us to understand that violence and (in)security is about "cups of tea, about washing clothes, about using the word processor, about driving a car, about collecting water, about joking, about what counts as relevant to international politics and about how we relate to colleagues, students, families, friends, or strangers" (Zalewski, 2010: 346). Importantly, this involves understanding that everyday violence is product and productive of ordinary life. Be that in the everyday life of militarism and warfare as it structures where and how we live, or of the everyday lives of those subject to gendered and patriarchal state violence, or of the violence between intimate partners, family members, and friends.

In my thesis, thinking about (in)security as embodied and affective allows me to trace the ways that lived experience of everyday sexual violence is negotiated in university spaces. In the Conference (chapter 5), for example, I consider the ways that everyday relations of (in)security in contexts of sexual violence impact the negotiation of the hotel bar, considering how, for example, this context tells us about the affective charges of gendered practices in everyday spaces of knowledge production. I also consider the ways that the impacts of everyday staff-sexual violence manifest in affective charges that enable us to discern the ways the conference is imbued within a broader context of gendered, racialised, and colonial violence in the international. Additionally, focusing upon affective and embodied practices allows me to take seriously the ways that everyday staff-student sexual violence have

enormous impacts on those who experience these forms of violence, as well as the ways they are impacted by institutional mechanisms of (in)security.

Sexual Violence

Sexual violence has been a central concern of feminist security theorists in security studies. The centrality of sexual violence within this field of scholarship is intertwined with violence as central to both the disciplines of security studies and the wider feminist movement. As Zalewski notes, "both feminism and international relations are deeply indebted to and attached to violence" (2013: 7). In the feminist movement more broadly, sexual violence has been a central concern of feminist theorists and activists, and is understood as a key mode through which violent relations of gender and patriarchal structures in society are (re)produced (Brownmiller, 1975; Bourke, 2007). In security studies writ large, relations of violence are at the heart of this field of study, tracing back its origins to the study of warfare.

While violence has been central to the study of (in)security and the development of security studies as an academic discipline, it is feminists in security studies who have drawn attention to sexual violence as a form of (in)security in a variety of empirical terrains. Of of this scholarship, I review here what I consider to be the most significant contributions/threads of feminist security studies scholarship on sexual violence, including: sexual violence in conflict; the idea of 'rape as a weapon of war'; and the relationship between sexual violence and institutions of international (in)security.

Sexual Violence and War

Feminist security studies have extensively examined the role of sexual violence in conflict. Although sexual violence has long been a key part of warfare, until recently it had not received sustained attention in either academic contexts or at the level of international activism and international policy making contexts. More recently, however, owing to both feminist scholarship in international politics and security studies and international activist groups, NGOs and international institutions, attention to sexual violence in conflict has proliferated, and now there is a wealth of feminist security studies and feminist international politics that interrogates sexual violence (see, for example: Zalewski et al, 2018; Zalewski, 2018, 2022; Baaz and Stern, 2009; 2012, 2013, 2014; 2017; 2020; Kirby, 2012; 2018; Meger, 2016a, 2016b;

MacKenzie, 2012; Crawford, 2017). This has particularly been the case in relation to recent conflicts where rates sexual violence has been widely reported as particularly high, for example in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Sierra Leone, and Liberia. Calling attention to sexual violence in warfare has been a key means through which feminist security studies scholars have shown the gendered workings of conflict and warfare, the embodied experiences of war, the production of particular subjects of war, and particularly the production of masculine/feminine subjects, and militarised masculinities (Zalewski et al, 2018; Baaz and Stern, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2014; MacKenzie, 2012; Higate, 2003, 2004).

Feminist security studies analysis of sexual violence in warfare has been intimately connected to highlighting women's experiences of warfare. Situated within broader critiques of androcentrism in the discipline, feminist security studies theorists argue that women's experiences of war/conflict have been largely excluded within the discipline (Elshtain, 1995; Sylvester, 2012; Sjoberg, 2009, Cockburn, 2004; Wibben, 2014). This is despite the fact that "[a]cross the histories of wars, women have been subject to domestic violence, rape, sexual assault, kidnapping, trafficking, forced prostitution, forced marriage, forced impregnation, slavery, and other violence" (Wibben, 2014: 42). Sexual violence is understood as a form of gender-based violence "that is targeted at women or men because of their sex and/or their socially constructed gender roles" (Carpenter, 2006: 83).

Looking to sexual violence in warfare is therefore one crucial way feminists have both engaged with the marginalisation of women's lives in warfare, and shown how war is fundamentally gendered. Asking how sexual violence functions in conflict therefore involves looking to understudied spaces to unearth women's experiences and the gendered relations of violence underpinning them. In this regard, feminist analysis of sexual violence in war/conflict leads analysis to enter spaces of war/conflict that are not typically explored within the literature, for example looking to the home, the family, community relationships, the experiences of sex workers, and the everyday lives of women living in conflict zones. So too, does analysis of sexual violence in war/conflict alter the temporal axis of war as a concept, acknowledging that heightened instances of sexual violence and their effects on

66

women who have experienced sexual violence often go on much longer than the official 'end' of a conflict (Enloe, 2000a; Blanchard, 2003; Sjoberg, 2009; Shepherd, 2009).

The experience of men as victims/survivors of has, in general, received significantly less attention in the field of feminist security studies than the experiences of women as victims/survivors of sexual violence. In part, this is due to the understanding that women make up the majority of the victims of sexual violence in conflict contexts. However, sexual violence against men in conflict contexts has been shown to be a significant issue and is an area of increasing concern (Zalewski et al, 2018; Drumond, 2019; Carpenter, 2006, 2017). Moving away from a singular focus on women and towards deeper analysis of the gendered relations of warfare, has involved a focus on exploring the relationships between sexual violence in conflict and the (re)production of particular constructions of masculinities/femininities in conflict and post-conflict contexts, this including, for example, the concept of militarised masculinities. I pay further attention to the production of masculinities/femininities in contexts of sexual violence in the following sections on 'rape as a weapon of war' and institutions of (in)security, such as the military.

Rape as a weapon of war

The idea of rape as a weapon of war has gained significant traction in recent years. This conceptualisation of rape in warfare "emanat[es] from the literature of civil society groups, NGOs, and IGOs" (Megerb, 2016: 150), and has also been a central feature of feminist analyses of sexual violence in conflict contexts (Meger, 2016b; Baaz and Stern, 2009, 2013, 2017; Kirby, 2018; Crawford, 2013, 2017). Understandings of the use of rape in war has not only been crucial to international and academic attention to the enactment of sexual violence in conflict contexts, but is now widely recognised in international policy (Kirby, 2018; George, Lee-Koo and Shepherd, 2018; Crawford, 2017). Following the Rome Statute, which marked the first-time sexual violence was legislated in international law as a war crime, the use of rape in war has been the subject of notable International Criminal Court (ICC) cases. In these cases, senior officials have been tried in relation to the use of sexual violence as part of their warring campaigns, for example in trials of senior officials from the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda and the DRC (Koomen, 2013; Fitzpatrick, 2016; Crawford, 2017). As Fitzpatrick (2016: 29) writes, "In September 2013 the Secretary-General provided the Security Council with a

list of parties to conflict that were credibly suspected of committing or being responsible for patterns of rape and other forms of sexual violence in situations of armed conflict. This list included the Central African Republic (CAR), Côte d'Ivoire, the DRC, Mali, the Syrian Arab Republic, Afghanistan, Myanmar, Somalia, South Sudan, the Sudan (Darfur) and Yemen". Consequently, "the storyline of Rape as a Weapon of War has become the most prevalent framing for understanding and redressing conflict related sexual violence globally" (Baaz and Stern, 2013: 42).

Analysis of 'Rape as a weapon of war' is connected to broader analyses of the role of sexual violence in warfare in which rape in warfare is grounded in broader questions of gender and patriarchal relations. In this vein, analysis of rape as a weapon of war involves situating wartime rape as connected with broader underlying patriarchal structures of gender, as well as the role of masculinities/femininities as central to the warscape of rape. In this context rape as a "'weapon' is made possible in part because of the unequal gendered relations that reign in society, and through the violent militarisation of masculinities" (Baaz and Stern, 2013: 23). However, despite these connections with broader theoretical and empirical analysis of sexual violence in warfare, rape as a weapon of war is a particular discursive construction of sexual violence in warfare that foregrounds rape specifically (as opposed to broader constructions of sexualised violence), and understands and examines rape as a *systematic* strategy employed by warring parties as part of conflict. As such, rape as a weapon of war understands rape in warfare as "intentional, following a certain rationality, and devised to effect particular outcomes" (Baaz and Stern, 2013: 46).

The purported function(s) of rape vary across conflicts; however, we can delineate several trends in the literature. These include: the rape of women as a means to commit ethno-nationalist forms of 'cleansing'; the rape of women as a means of undermining and/or demonstrating the 'enemy' male soldier as incapable of acting as protectors of women/the nation; the rape of dissenting men and women or those perceived as potentially dissenting, and thus 'traitors' or potential 'traitors'; rape as a means to strategically inflict long lasting forms of harm that will impact communities, health and social services, and familial relations, including the potential ostracization of victims/survivors and any children conceived and born

through rape; the torture and humiliation of men, including male soldiers (Baaz and Stern 2009, 2013, 2020; Kirby, 2018; MacKenzie, 2010; Hansen, 2000).

As is the case across feminist scholarship on sexual violence in conflict, the role of masculinities/femininities have been central to the analysis of rape as a weapon of war. For example, the role of masculinities/femininities is crucial to understanding the gendering of the nation and its relationship to acts of sexual violence in conflict contexts. The idea of women as bearers of the nation, for example, has been considered crucial to their systematic rape as part of campaigns of 'ethnic cleansing' in conflicts in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Furthermore, the targeting of women in this way has also been understood as a means to humiliate male soldiers and civilians of the 'enemy' group. This 'humiliation' of men rests on conceptualisations of feminine/masculine constructions of women/the feminine as in need of protection and men/masculine as protectors. Masculinised constructions of men as strong/protectors/aggressors and the feminine as weak/vulnerable/in need of protection are also explored in relation to men's experiences of rape in conflict (Kirby, 2018; Baaz and Stern, 2009, 2013; Carpenter, 2006, 2016).

'Rape as a weapon of war' has also been subjected to critique as a mode of understanding the role of sexual violence in conflict. In the context of the DRC Baaz and Stern (2013) argue rape as a weapon of war produces contradictory discourses of rape in war as both normal/exceptional. Here rape in warfare is at once part of the common sense understanding of war, and simultaneously exceptional from other forms of violence, situated as a particular form of 'evil' or 'barbaric' behaviour. In the context of the DRC, they argue this works to "recycle and reinforce familiar colonial images and racialized fantasies" (Baaz and Stern, 2009: 537), attached to Black men, Black masculinity and African nation-states. This is undergirded by racialised and colonial notions of civilised/uncivilised warfare in which sexual violence and rape as a weapon of war are an aberration to the 'legitimate'/ 'civilised' forms of conflict.

Meger (2016b) argues that sexual violence in conflict has become fetishized within international security, including within academic scholarship. Also looking to the DRC, she contends that the fetishization of conflict related sexual violence is inextricable from its 'securitisation'. 'Securitisation' works here to construct sexual violence as an existential threat within the elite politics of international security. Meger argues this not only serves to

warrant militarised responses to sexual violence, but fetishizes sexual violence via its removal from its situated context, its objectification in academic scholarship, international policy, and the media, and commodification within the international political economy. In her discourse analysis of wartime rape and sexual violence in Syria, Banwell (2018) builds on the idea of wartime sexual violence and rape as a weapon of war as productive of the fetishization of conflict related sexual violence, arguing that the process of securitisation and fetishization "obscures the root causes of this violence" (20). Critiques of the festishation/securitisation of conflict related sexual violence sit within broader questions regarding whether we should understand sexual violence through lenses of security (Banwell, 2018; Meger, 2016b).

Institutions of (in)Security and Sexual Violence

State institutions of security including the military, and international institutions such as the United Nations have been a focal point in feminist security studies scholarship on sexual violence. This scholarship highlights the ways that institutions of 'security' are predicated on the production of insecurity. Sexual violence figures into this particularly in regard to questions of gendered and racialised insecurities. There are two central strands I am interested in here. The first sits in relation to the enactment of sexual violence by members of institutions that are inflicted on those they are sworn to protect. The second relates to acts of sexual violence between members of international institutions of (in)security.

Militaries are state institutions that operate as an arm of the state's 'monopoly over violence' that have been constructed in the name of protecting the nation from a variety of 'threats' to security. The military has long been explored as a critical site of the enactment of sexual violence in international politics (Enloe, 2000b; Bourke, 2007; Basham, 2018; Kirby, 2015, 2018). The military and its relationship to sexual violence is interwoven with analysis of sexual violence in conflict and the notion of 'rape as a weapon of war', given that conflict related sexual violence occurs in militarised contexts, and is often perpetrated by members of militarised groups. However, analysis of sexual violence and the military also has involved attention to sexualised violence committed by members of the military outside of active conflict contexts.

For example, the frequenting of brothels stationed near military bases, such as in the case of the US army in South Korea (Enloe, 2000a). The relationship between the US military and local

sex workers has also been shown to involve the state/military procurement of sex for soldiers, involving the liaising between state parties to provide these services. In addition to this, militaries globally have been understood as engaged in the sexual abuse of civilians outside of conflict contexts, for example including the sexual harassment, sexual assault, and rape of civilian women. For some scholars, the perpetuation of sexual violence by military personnel outside of conflict is constitutive of the ways that patterns of sexual violence found within war are a product of broader patriarchal structures that are ongoing, and at times exacerbated in the aftermath of conflict (Enloe, 2000a; Shepherd, 2016; Kirby, 2019; Bourke, 2007).

Outside of these relationships to conflict/post-conflict scenarios, however, the perpetuation of sexual violence between members of the military has received significant attention in feminist security studies and critical military studies. Whereas conflict related sexual violence is more often explored in relation to conflicts in the Global South, the US and the UK feature more heavily in analysis of sexual violence within the military. The US military is said to be an "ongoing epidemic" (Katz, 2015: xi), with widespread reports of sexualised violence perpetrated against both men and women in service. Although there is both analysis of men and women as the victims of sexual violence within the military, men are overwhelmingly understood to be the perpetrators. Both men and women have been found to be subject to sexual assault and rape, including individuals being raped by multiple persons at the same time, and it is common to hear of victims/survivors of sexual violence within the military to experience sexual violence on a repeated, regular basis (Mesok, 2018; Basham, 2018; Enloe, 2000b; Bourke, 2007). The military in this regard accounts for an unusually high number of acts of sexual violence committed against individuals perpetrated by a group. In respect to the US military in particular, widespread acts of sexual violence, particularly against women, have been the subject of national international outcry and inquiry, including the Tailhook incident of 1991 (Kinsinsky, 1998; The Invisible War, 2012).

The United Nations, and particularly its peacekeeping and peacebuilding forces, have been subject to scrutiny regarding the prevalence of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) experienced by civilians in regions where these forces have been deployed. As Alexandra (2011: 369) notes, "Since 2001, reports of SEA by peacekeepers have been documented in

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Eritrea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Haiti, Kosovo, East Timor, Mozambique, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Somalia". While peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations are complex, broadly, they have mandates that involve engaging in restoring, maintaining, and keeping peace in post-conflict contexts. Widespread issues of SEA thus highlight how "throughout the history of UN peacekeeping, sexual abuse has been perpetrated by the very people sent to restore or keep the peace" (Freedman, 2018: 963). This includes, for example, insisting civilians engage in sexual acts in return for food rations or other supplies, engagement in local prostitution and sex trafficking, sexual relations with minors (Freedman, 2018; Higate and Henry, 2004, 2010, 2009; Grady, 2010; Alexandra, 2011). This is despite peacekeeping mandates having "merged with the WPS agenda and […] made women's representation and gender mainstreaming in peacekeeping missions a major priority within the UN" (Karim, 2018: 334). The WPS agenda entails a specific focus on sexual violence experienced by women and girls in militarised contexts, and thus the enactment of sexual abuse by peacekeepers stationed in post-conflict regions raises serious concerns regarding the reproduction of these modes of (in)security by these groups.

The concept of militarised masculinities has been crucial contribution feminist security studies scholars have made to analyses of sexual violence within the militarised contexts. The idea of militarised masculinities is applicable to sexual violence perpetrated by militaries and peacekeeping and peacekeeping forces as militarised groups. Militarised masculinities are produced via deliberate training and socialisation processes that work to construct the solider as a masculinised subject that is capable of committing acts of violence on behalf of the state, such as being "able to kill and follow orders that may well contradict ethical norms and behaviours" (Hobbs, 2022: 3; see also Zalewski et al, 2018; Baaz and Stern, 2009, 2013, 2014; Higate, 2003, 2004; Basham, 2016). The production of the militarised-masculine subject is achieved through repeated and systematic enactments of violence as part of the training and socialisation process of soldiers. These violent practices have been explored in regard to the ways in which they denigrate the women/femininity, and privilege particular forms of masculinity (violent/aggressive/strong/heterosexual/white), "reinforc[ing] a masculine entitlement not only over women, but also over other (less privileged men)" (Zalewski et al, 2018: 7; see also Hobbs, 2022; Highgate, 2003, 2004; Higate and Henry, 2017; Baaz and Stern, 2009).

The concept of militarised masculinities situates sexual violence in this context as part of a broader process of (violent) gendering practices within militarised contexts. Scholars have used this concept, for example, to think through the ways experiences of sexual violence committed by male soldiers against women soldiers' functions as a means to reaffirm hierarchies of the masculine and the feminine subject within the military. As well as this, the use of sexual violence as part of hazing rituals is understood through the production of hierarchies of militarised masculinity, as well as a means to beat out the 'feminine' within the new recruit. Furthermore, the disavowal of the sexual in the context of hazing rituals is indicative of the relationship between heteronormativity and militarised masculinity. Therefore, sexual violence is (re)productive of the enforcement of a militarised/masculine soldier-subject, as well as the instability of the militarised/masculine subject as a fixed ontological category (Basham, 2016; Higate, 2012).

Experiences of sexual violence within the military have been understood to cause enormous psychological and physical impacts to victims/survivors. Including the sustaining of physical injuries that require considerable medical attention, and long-term mental-health impacts. For example, Mesok's (2018) analysis of one man's repeated experiences of sexual violence committed by a group of men in his naval unit resulted in severe mental health difficulties, addiction issues, and suicidal thoughts. In addition to this, the response of these international institutions to allegations of sexual violence have often worked in ways that underscore the relationship between the power to secure and the power to make insecure. As a woman service member in the US military stated: "I didn't have anyone to go talk to, because the people that were perpetrating me were the police" (The Invisible War, 2012: 1.15).

Feminist scholarship has therefore made significant contributions to the study of sexual violence and to understanding the everyday as a pertinent site of security studies inquiry. However, in the next section of this chapter, I unpack my critique of scholarship on sexual violence and the everyday. I argue that there is a continued orientation to the study of sexual violence 'over there' in ways that reinscribe racialised and colonial gazes within the discipline, and that the everyday is often truncated as a conceptual framework by its exploration within more traditionally accepted sites of international (in)security.

Sexual Violence 'Over There': Racialised and Colonial Orientations and Disciplinary Boundaries Surrounding the Everyday

In this section I make two interconnecting arguments. Firstly, it is my contention that within feminist security studies, there is a pattern of disciplinary orientation that involves examining sexual violence "over there" (Haastrup and Hagen, 2021: 27; see also Parashar, 2019 and Henry, 2021), predominantly in regions of the Global South. I argue that this disciplinary orientation reproduces racialised and colonial logics within security studies. Secondly, while analysis of sexual violence within and enacted by institutions such as the military in the Global North offer a divergence from this trend, I argue that the focus on traditionally accepted spheres of institutional (in)security reaffirms disciplinary boundaries regarding what sites are legitimate sites of inquiry within security studies. This is amplified by the location of scholarship on the everyday and sexual violence in security studies often fitting into either one (or both) of these strands of scholarship. Taken together, this raises questions for both the reproduction of "racialised hierarchies of knowledge" (Haastrup and Hagen, 2021: 27) within (feminist) security studies, and the conceptual reach of the everyday, as the everyday is often situated either in racialised and colonial contexts 'out there', and/or explored within contexts that are generally understood to be dominant sites of inquiry in security studies.

Recent scholarship regarding the reproduction of whiteness and racialised hierarchies of knowledge within the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda is instructive for considering the ways that universities and feminist scholars in the Global North are implicated in the reproduction of racialised and colonial logics in security studies research. Parashar (2019), Haastrup and Hagen (2021) and Henry (2021) all underscore the university and (feminist) academic knowledge production within the Global North as a central problematic at play within racialised and colonial practices of knowledge construction in the subdiscipline of WPS/GPS. Inspired in part by Enloe's critique of 'womenandgirls', Henry argues that scholarship in GPS/WPS underscores a "problematic" racialised politics in which "womenoverthere – women ethnicised and/or racialised as the archetypal victims of conflict and armed violence" (2021: 23) are continually located as objects of (white) academic knowledge production in universities in the Global North. Parashar (2019) illustrates the ways

that within WPS/GPS, "the Global South must perform the site of innumerable "case studies" where people and societies are framed in a perpetual state of conflict and violence" within this context. For these scholars, these practices are underscored by relations of whiteness and racism in universities in the Global North. Within these universities, they locate an orientation of WPS/GPS to racialised women that occurs alongside the marginalisation of the voices of Black academics and academics of colour. They argue this contributes to "protection/saviour narratives" (Parashar, 2019: 387), and (re)produces a "racialised hierarchy of knowledge production" (Haastrup and Hagen, 2020: 29) within the fields of international politics and security studies.

These insights show that universities and (feminist) scholars in the Global North are engaged within this politics, and that this politics has consequences that relate to epistemic forms of violence and the ontological (re)production of racialised hierarchies within the international. Epistemically, these scholars highlight how racialised people are continually figured as objects of knowledge within white academic contexts in the Global North, and rarely understood as knowers of international (in)security (Parashar, 2019; Haastrup and Hagen, 2020, 2021; Henry, 2021). At the same time, these racialised orientations work to (re)construct the Global South as sites of conflict, (in)security, and violence, whereas the Global North appears is positioned as a space of security, peace, and the absence of violence and (in)security. As such, "global feminist discourse seems to have adopted colonial overtones looking down on the Global South as sites of unmanageable conflicts" (Parashar, 2019: 387), while the Global North presides over and above relations of violence and (in)security. This therefore (re)produces racialised and colonial ontologies of the international that underscore the continued existence of hierarchies between the 'North' and 'South', "[re]enabling a colonial division of the world" (Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2023: 11). This figures into the "imperial construction of a series of dichotomous discourses that pit developed and modern and traditional, global and local, and liberal and illiberal against each other. And "other" is the operative word here: "For liberalism 'Others' are the problem to be solved," (Haastrup and Hagen, 2020: 4-5).

Universities in the Global North, including the UK, are implicated in this politics both in relation to the production of knowledge and how this relates to everyday enactments of

racism on campus. For example, the marginalisation of Black academics and people of colour as knowers is enacted through everyday forms of racism within universities in the Global North, including the UK (Henry, 2021; Haastrup and Hagen, 2020; choi, 2021; Joseph-Salisbury, 2021; Shilliam, 2015). However, these relations of violence are often obscured within the racialised modes of knowledge production that continually orient the study of violence to spaces 'over there'.

Scholarship on sexual violence in security studies, I argue, follows similar logics. Although there has amassed a large body of scholarship on sexual violence in international politics and security studies, there is a heavy focus on sexual violence 'over there' in regions of the Global South. To illustrate, I conducted a review of journal articles in the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* between the years 1999 - 2023. I chose to review articles in the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* as it is "the leading source of cutting-edge research at the intersection of global politics [and] feminist" (IFJP, n.d, n.p) research. I searched for all articles that featured 'sexual violence' in the abstract of the article[10], which yielded 51 results. Of these 51 articles, from reading the abstract, 6 had no discernible empirical focus. Of the remaining 45, 28 articles concerned issues of sexual violence in regions of the Global South. Africa was the most explored region, at 11 articles. The DRC was the most examined African country, the focus of 5 of these 11 articles. Of the remaining 17 articles, 7 articles referred to sexual violence in the Global North. In 5 of these articles, the wider context in which sexual violence was examined was possible to glean from the abstract. In all 5 of these articles the exploration of sexual violence was situated in relation to dominant sites of inquiry in security studies. Including: 2 articles referring to sexual violence in the United States, focusing on 9/11 and sex trafficking; 1 article referring to conflicts in Bosnia, Herzegovina and Kosovo; 1 article examining relations of sexual violence in the British Army; and 1 article examining sexual violence in the context of migrant populations in Australia.

---

[10] I chose to include only articles that included 'sexual violence' in the abstract to ensure the search yielded articles in which sexual violence was the focal point. This was to avoid including a review of articles where sexual violence featured in the text but only as mentioned in a brief note, rather than being than being a central thread of the text.

Attention to sexual violence 'over there' in the Global South and within previously colonialised regions, such as the DRC, figures into the reproduction of colonial and racialised gazes within the discipline of security studies. This works to reproduce particular regions and racialised bodies as problems of sexual violence and (in)security. As Parashar (2019: 382) notes in the context of scholarship on the use of rape as a weapon of war, in which regions from the Global South feature heavily, "[t]he uncritical focus on and framing of wartime rape in locations "out there" (Africa and Asia) contribute to a certain kind of "hypervisibility" of case studies". This 'hypervisibility' speaks to "familiar colonial images and racialized fantasies" that Baaz and Stern (2009: 537) warn of in the context of scholarship on 'rape as a weapon of war' in the DRC. Here we can make linkages between the hyper visibility of particular 'case studies' and the (re)production of notions of racialised hyper-masculinities, particularly in respect to the construction of the hyper-sexualised/hyper-aggressive construction of Black and Brown men in Global South regions. As a result, this scholarship contributes to the location of Black and Brown (often male) bodies as perpetrators of sexual violence, alongside the racialised and colonial iteration of sexual violence within the 'insecure' regions of the Global South. Moreover, the attention to particularly exceptionalised modes of sexual violence in this context, such as rape as a weapon of warfare, contributes to "the construction of the barbaric Other whose being is fundamentally different, at the limit, or beyond comprehension" (Gruffyydd Jones, 2006: 8).

The everyday, the university, and sexual violence

This is embedded within a broader politics within universities that scholars in WPS have highlighted, whereby knowledge produced largely within the Global North and its universities, such as universities in the UK, situate sexual violence and (in)security within racialised contexts in ways that reinscribe hierarchies of knowledge production. The politics of these racialised orientations of sexual violence within the field of security studies are compounded by the widespread presence of sexual violence within universities, such as in the UK. The UK university as a site of ongoing relations of sexual violence however is obscured within a disciplinary context that (re)produces racialised images of sexual violence and (in)security in locations 'over there'. This includes the role of universities in the production of colonial and racialised inequality and stratification in the international, the role of the university in generating racialised and colonial relations of knowledge production, and the continued

(re)production of violence, including sexual violence, within UK universities. These factors come together to produce the logic of 'over here' and 'over there' as categories of security/insecurity in the context of sexual violence. As such, this "tells [a] story of 'who we are' and 'who is not us'" (D'Costa, 2021: 514) that works to support racialised constructions of the international.

However, as I noted earlier, it is not only my contention that sexual violence is oriented 'over there', but that both sexual violence and the everyday are often explored within traditionally accepted sites of international politics. Indeed, there are divergences from the pattern of locating sexual violence 'over there'. A pertinent example of this is the analysis of sexual violence committed by institutions of (in)security, for example, the scholarship overviewed earlier in this chapter regarding sexual violence within the UK and US militaries. This scholarship makes important contributions to examining the role of sexual violence in institutions within the Global North, including how they relate to the production of gendered, racialised, and colonial practices of violence.

However, in these examples, alongside scholarship that locates sexual violence 'over there', sexual violence remains largely explored in the context of established sites of international politics and security studies. This including conflict and post-conflict contexts, the state, the military, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, international institutions such as the United Nations, and so on. Indeed, scholarship relating everyday sexual violence is largely embedded within analysis of everyday experiences of conflict/post-conflict, peacekeeping and peacebuilding contexts, and within the military. True (2012: 6) argues that in this way feminist security studies analyses of gender and violence often works "to perpetuate the invisibility of violence against women in peacetime and within national borders", as well as to make "it difficult to comprehend its systemic causes". As a result, for True, "violence against women becomes […] epiphenomenal, derivative of another, more major social process at work such as war or capitalism" (2012: 6).

In the context of the everyday, we can highlight similar processes. The everyday is often utilised as a theoretical tool to examine the role of everyday lives in similar contexts, be that the role of women's everyday experiences in conflict and post-conflict, the everyday politics of state violence, or the everyday politics of militarism. As a result, this dilutes the conceptual

reach of the everyday and security studies scholarship regarding the relationship(s) between the everyday, sexual violence and (in)security. This is largely because the everyday and sexual violence remain bracketed in and through longstanding disciplinary structures that delineate what sites are legitimate spaces of inquiry in international politics and security studies.

The location of sexual violence 'over there', and the exploration of sexual violence and the everyday in established sites of the 'international' work in tandem to obscure relations of sexual violence in the university as embedded within a politics of (in)security. Both the location of sexual violence 'over there' and the tendency to explore the everyday and sexual violence within more typical sites of inquiry within international politics and security studies serve to obfuscate sexual violence that happens 'over here'. They reaffirm the position of university as an institutional space that is not typically the object of inquiry in security studies or international politics, particularly in relation to sexual violence. At the same time, the university is curiously situated here precisely because of its intimate connection to the discipline of (in)security and the production of knowledge regarding the everyday and sexual violence. While then, the university serves as an everyday context in which racialised and colonial locations of sexual violence 'over there' are reproduced in scholarship, and legitimate sites of security studies and international politics are (re)inscribed, everyday relations of sexual violence and (in)security in the university fall out of view.

Bringing everyday staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security into the foreground, then, makes contributions to resisting racialised and colonial orientations, as well as expanding the reach of the everyday in security studies. Rather than reinscribing the racialised colonial gazes of security studies to locations 'over there' and the epistemic and ontological consequences this reaffirms, looking to staff-student sexual violence 'over *here*' involves spotlighting the role of universities as institutions in the Global North as engaged in ongoing practices of violence and (in)security. This therefore involves a reorientation to the university in the UK as engaged in a politics of violence and (in)security. This is as opposed to the UK university presiding over the production of knowledge over (in)securities and sexual violence that happen outside of the university. As sexual violence is persistently attached problems of sexual violence to the bodies of largely Black and Brown men in Global South regions, looking to staff-student sexual violence in the UK university exhibits a shift that involves interrogating

the enactment of sexual violence in predominantly white spaces in the Global North. While it may appear counter-intuitive to focus on universities in the Global North to combat racialised and colonial practices in security studies, doing so contributes to confronting the ways universities as spaces of Eurocentric fields of knowledge production are embedded within gendered, racialised and colonial practices of violence. This focus therefore contributes to "challenging the foundations of power as they are reflected in universities" (Henry, 2021: 23) in the UK.

The university is already situated in relation to the everyday life of (in)security, as the space everyday feminist security scholars find themselves within. The scholarship on the everyday I have overviewed here has its roots in everyday life in universities, and much of it has its roots in everyday life in universities within the UK specifically. The scholarship that has shown us to look away from elite spheres of international politics, to consider the everyday lives of women, to think through the ways that gendered, racialised, and colonial practices are experienced, negotiated, and contested in everyday life were produced in the everyday university. Feminist security studies theorising happens over cups of tea in office kitchens, conversations at the printers, presentations at departmental workshops and conference seminars, in office hours, PhD supervision meetings, tutorials and lectures.

The university offers important ground to examine the relationships between the everyday, violence, and (in)security alongside the gendered, racialised and colonial politics it engenders precisely because the university is always already embedded within the production of what (in)security means, where it is located, and the consequences of these manoeuvres. Building on the everyday as a framework that opens up conceptual space to consider the ways that daily practices and routines are embedded within wider relations of violence, the everyday life of the university therefore provides a window for more deeply interrogating the relationships between gender, race, colonialism and everyday violence and (in)security in the very spaces in which knowledge of these problematics are produced. In this way, while locations 'over there' have been consistently situated as the "the empirical testing ground" (Parashar, 2019: 837) for predominantly white scholars in Global North universities including in the UK, in my thesis the UK university within it are understood empirical sites in which everyday relations of staff-student sexual violence are examined in the context of this wider

politics of (in)security. As there is "there is nothing natural or inevitable about what international relations scholars choose to study, or about what international relations becomes, or what international politics consists of" (Zalewski, 2013: 9), the choice to orient my focus in this way responds to feminist calls to "think more deeply about how research questions are framed and what constitutes a legitimate area of study." (Parashar, 2019: 384).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have reviewed key aspects of the scholarship in feminist security studies on the everyday. I looked specifically to the way the everyday shifts attention from elite spheres of politics to everyday lives, the conceptualization of violence as every day, and the importance of understanding insecurity as embodied and affective. I then reviewed scholarship on sexual violence in feminist security studies, looking specifically to sexual violence in war, rape as a weapon of war, and international institutions in international politics, such as the military.

Moving on from this, I argued that analysis of sexual violence in feminist security studies maintains an orientation to sexual violence 'over there' that reproduces racialised and colonial logics in security studies. Where sexual violence is not 'over there', including scholarship on the relationship between the everyday and sexual violence, it is typically located within empirical sites that sit largely within pre-established legitimate sites of inquiry in international politics. I argued that paying attention to everyday staff-student sexual violence in this thesis acts in response to these problematics, shifting orientations to sexual violence 'over here' in ways that attempt to resist racialised and colonial logics outlined and expand the conceptual reach of the everyday into a space in which knowledge of sexual violence, the everyday, and (in)security are produced.

The next chapter of this thesis sets out the approach this thesis takes to fabulating the three scenes of staff-student sexual violence that are the empirical chapters of this thesis: the Classroom, the Conference, and the Hearing. I outline how I engage in particular with the work of Saidiya Hartman (1997, 2021, 2022), in order to fabulate scenes of staff-student sexual violence using methods of critical fabulation, and reflect on how this enabled me to

grapple with the methodological challenges I faced gathering stories of everyday staff-student sexual violence within UK universities.

Chapter 3: Methodology: Critical Fabulation and Scenes of Staff-Student Sexual Violence in UK Universities

Introduction

It is now clear that sexual violence and the everyday tend to be located 'over there' and that the everyday has often been examined in relation to more traditionally accepted sites of security studies inquiry. In this chapter, then, I unpack how we can uncover the everyday within the university. In order to do so, I outline how the empirical chapters of this chapter are fabulated as scenes of everyday staff-student sexual violence. I fabulate these scenes by building upon Saidiya Hartman's (1997, 2008, 2021, 2022) "critical fabulation" (Hartman, 2008: 11) as theoretical and methodological practice. Scenes of staff-student sexual violence are an approach that allows me to situate everyday (in)security as a violence that is "a process embedded within the ordinary that unfolds through stories" (Berlant, 2011: 10).

I engage with Saidiya Hartman's work as a way to be an everyday theorist that is "committed to telling stories" (Hartman, 2008: 4) about violence in ways that centre the everyday lives of those who experience it. Hartman's method was designed as a way to "struggle within and against the constraints and silences imposed by the nature of the archive" (Hartman, 2022: 13), to engage with silences and absences, to paint a fuller picture of the lives of those experiencing staff-student sexual violence even when there are pieces missing. This is particularly important given the ways that experiences of violence are often inflected by silences and absences.

In this chapter, I begin by explaining how and why this thesis engages with Saidiya Hartman's method of critical fabulation to fabulate three scenes of staff-student sexual violence that comprise the empirical chapters of this thesis. I explain how scenes and critical fabulation as a method allows me to put being an everyday theorist into practice, and how this helps the thesis attend to the ways (in)security and violence as everyday. I also unpack how critical fabulation enables the thesis to push at the silences and absences this thesis has faced in researching everyday staff-student sexual violence and (in)security in UK universities. Secondly, I explain how each scene of staff-student sexual violence has been constructed

through critical fabulation, and why I chose to curate the scenes of The Classroom, The Conference, and The Hearing. Following on from this, I detail the fieldwork I undertook in order to gather stories of staff-student sexual violence in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, and reflect on challenges I experienced in recruiting participants to this project. I end by reaffirming the importance of believing in stories of sexual violence in everyday life.

Critical Fabulation as Method

Put simply, "fabula concerns the content of the narrative" (Wibben, 2011a: 50). Critical fabulation is a methodological practice in which scholars work with the content of stories of violence in order to excavate the way violence is lived and negotiated in everyday life. In order to do so, this involves thinking carefully about the politics of (re)telling stories of violence in scholarly literature. Hartman's method of critical fabulation offers valuable contributions to feminist methodological approaches to everyday violence and (in)security. Critical fabulation contributes to these approaches via examining how processes of representation are involved in the ways violence is rendered exceptional, and how scholars can work with stories of everyday violence to uncover the everyday experiences, situated contexts, and impacts of those who live it.

Hartman's critical fabulation makes three key methodological contributions to making sense of everyday staff-student sexual violence and (in)security. Firstly, critical fabulation as a method works against exceptionalising violence, instead centring violence through everyday life. Secondly, critical fabulation works to negotiate silences/absences in stories of everyday violence, seeing silence/absence as sites of political contestation that can and should be confronted in the (re)telling of stories and analysis of everyday violence. Lastly, critical fabulation defamiliarizes the familiar by situating violence as everyday rather than exceptional. Here familiar sites that might go unnoticed are reoriented to be at the centre of the politics of violence. Resisting the exceptional, confronting silences/absences, and defamiliarizing the familiar thus work as the critical tenets of fabulation. These tenants make critical fabulation both a methodological and theoretical endeavour. I take these points in

turn here, before illustrating how I use critical fabulation as a method to fabulate three scenes of staff-student sexual violence in the empirical chapters of my thesis.

For Hartman, stories of racialised violence tend to recount the violence of transatlantic slavery through "invocations of the shocking and the terrible" (Hartman, 2022: 2) reproducing racialised violence as exceptional horrors. Working predominantly with archival materials, the reproductions of racialised violence she refers to include familiar scenes of lynchings, torture, and rape. Hartman argues that these representations of violence against Black bodies are produced as a "terrible spectacle" (2022: 1), in which often graphic accounts of extreme brutality "reinforce the spectacular character of black suffering" (2022: 2). The 'spectacular character' of these accounts draws our attention to how representations of violence are intimately linked to their audience, as the exceptional/spectacular work to render those who experience racialised violence as exploited subjects for public view. Therefore, interrogating the reproduction of exceptionalised forms of violence involves asking for what purpose representations are produced, communicated, and consumed by their audiences.

It is in the archives of transatlantic slavery that Hartman turns to consider representations of racialised violence and the lives of those who experienced it. The archives to which Hartman refers are largely made up of slave owner ledgers, medical documentation, ship records, stories from abolitionists, eyewitness reports, scholarly research and data collection, newspaper articles, government reports, plantation documents, and the words of enslaved Black persons found in autobiographical accounts and interviews.

These documents and the narratives they present offer an archival record of the violence of transatlantic slavery, but are inseparable from the relations of violence in which they were produced. The documentation in newspapers, plantation, ship, and medical records represent the lives of the enslaved in order to reduce them to "commodities and corpses" (Hartman, 2008: 2). For instance, 'Venus' in Hartman's (2008) *Venus in Two Acts*, refers to the name given in historical legal records to a girl murdered on a transatlantic slave ship by the ship's captain. Her story is told in the archive only by way of a few words in an aside comment, simply as one of two murdered girls. As Venus becomes subsumed within the "catalogues and statements that licensed her death" (2008: 10), what we know of Venus offers "no picture of her everyday life, no pathway to her thoughts" (2008: 2). Here the relations of violence that

licensed her death are reproduced in the archive. Hartman offers a further illustrative example in the form of interviews with formerly enslaved Black persons for the Works Progress Administration. In these interviews, "hierarchical relations between mostly white interviewers and black interviewees" (2022: 12) and the "imperative to construct a usable and palatable national past" in the "picture of slavery drawn in the testimonies gathered" (2022: 12) as part of this national project within the United States, are indicative of the ways Black experience in these testimonies remained embedded in relations of racialised domination.

Consequently, racialised violence is interwoven throughout the archive, structuring narratives and (re)producing racialised subjects of violence. The exceptional 'spectacles' of violence Hartman highlights are one such way this occurs, but the silences/absences surrounding the everyday lives of those who experienced these forms of violence are also illustrative of the ways the archive is marked by silences and absences. In this way, "the archive is, in this sense, a death sentence, a tomb, a display of the violated body, an inventory of property, a medical treatise on gonorrhoea, a few lines about a whore's life, an asterisk in the grand narrative of history" (Hartman, 2008: 2).

Hartman developed critical fabulation as a method to grapple with both the exceptionalisation of violence and the silences/absences imposed by the archive. This is in the service of working to excavate more deeply the everyday lives of those who experience violence, to "do more than recount the violence", and instead "to tell a story" (Hartman, 2008: 2) about how violence was lived and negotiated in the everyday. She argues that focusing on everyday lives as sites of violence is "critical in illuminating the ongoing and structural dimensions of violence" (Hartman, 2022: xxx). In order to do so, critical fabulation involves working with available representations and sources of violence in literary, archival, scholarship and cultural artifacts but reading them in ways that involve "excavations at the margins", "attend[ing] to cultivated silence, exclusions, and forms of violence and domination that engender official accounts [to] listen for other sounds" (2022: 12-13). Critical fabulation thus builds on feminist methods of deconstruction, "to study what is not contained within the text, what is "written between the lines""(Kronsell, 2006: 115), but is also reconstructive, to

build on the stories of violence we hear, "to imagine what might have happened or might have been said or might have been done" (Hartman, 2008: 11).

In this way, critical fabulation endeavours to generate a counter-narrative of the archive, in the hope of creating a fuller account of the everyday, and the everyday ways violence is enacted, negotiated and contested in everyday life. In Hartman's (2021) *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments* she utilises archival materials to push at the limits of representations of the lives of Black girls, women, and queer radicals in the aftermath of formal slavery in the United States. Taking photographs, newspaper articles and sociological studies from the era, she interrogates the racialised gaze of these materials while asking after that which is not documented in the photos, captions, and newsprint. For example, a still life of a tenement taken from a sociological study is counterposed with an interwoven narrative of a young woman whose life unfolded in the streets. A woman who "escapes notice as she watches them [the sociologists] from the third-floor window of the alley house where she stays, laughing at their stupidity […and] wonders what fascinates them about the clotheslines and outhouses" (2021: 4). Hartman fabulates this narrative to foreground the women behind the scenes of the photograph, even though their lives are erased in the still life of sociological archive material. In Hartman's fabulation, they become the centre-point of this scene, their everyday lives on the tenement as encountered with those who come to photograph them, their voices as commentators, their laughter animating the cold gaze of the photograph. The violence of segregation, enforced poverty, and institutionalised ghettoisation is depicted through the encounter of the sociological artifact, its photographers, the lives of women who inhabited the tenement housing, and Hartman's narration. In this encounter, relations of violence and are imbued with both life and death in an everyday account of the alleyway. In this example, the still life of the photograph and the lives it erases offers an example of why to only read what is present and visible is ostensibly to tell a story largely from the perspectives of the centres of power.

Violence is a familiar scene. Graphic accounts of horrifying violence are prevalent across historical archives, in the news, and in academic scholarship. Hartman's critical fabulation, however, works to "defamiliarize the familiar" (Hartman, 2022: 2), shifting from exceptional and reductive accounts of violence to violence as embedded in everyday practices,

encounters, and conversations. Focusing on a narration of everyday life troubles the familiarity of both the everyday and of violence. While the everyday is where we live our lives, the everyday is not often thought of as the centre-point through which violence unfolds, and as a result everyday violence is often over-looked. And while violence is in some ways a familiar scene, the tendency to situate and represent violence through the exceptional works to obscure the ways that violence structures everyday lives, as well as the everyday lives of people who experience violence on a daily basis. In this way, the ability to 'defamiliarize the familiar' entails explicating the ways that watching from a window, snapping a photograph, and laughing as the gaze of the sociologist descends on a neighbourhood, are just as embedded in the everyday as they are in relations of violence. Furthermore, to understand the everyday as the locus of violence is to confront an uncomfortable but important truth, that violence is not exceptional, out or over there in a way that is separate from our daily lives, but is circulating in and through our everyday relations.

Critical fabulation and Stories of (in)security in everyday life

There are important differences between the context in which Hartman developed her practice of critical fabulation, and both myself as a researcher and my thesis. While Hartman's method of critical fabulation has been developed through her experiences as a Black woman in the United States, and her engagement with stories of the racialised violence of transatlantic slavery, I am a white British woman researching staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. Moreover, Hartman developed and has employed critical fabulation as a methodological approach that works to enable her examination of the nexus of everyday violence and life/death in the context of transatlantic slavery and its past, present, and future. In this project, I am not concerned with the intersections of life/death but of the practices in which staff-student sexual violence in the university engender relations of everyday (in)security that are negotiated in everyday lives on campus.

However, inspired by Hartman's commitment to telling stories from everyday life, refusing the exceptionalisation of violence, and 'defamiliarizing the familiar', I utilise critical fabulation as way to draw attention to the gendered, racialised, and colonial contours of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in UK universities in scenes of staff-student sexual violence. I acknowledge and respond to the ways universities and staff-student sexual

violence are embedded within these relations of violence and (in)security. I do so inspired by Hartman's methodological commitment to the everyday, the everyday lives of those who experience violence, and their relationship to wider structures and practices of violence. By using critical fabulation to tell stories of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in UK universities, I argue, we can 'do more' to contribute to everyday in security studies by asking after the ways everyday lives in academia are embedded within everyday enactments of sexual violence.

Critical fabulation contributes in particular to making sense of the everyday in security studies, and methodological approaches that build analyses of violence and (in)security through telling stories from everyday life. Stories are fundamental to how we "make feminist sense" (Enloe, 2000a: 29) of (in)security (Stern, 2005; Wibben, 2011a; Krystalli, 2019). They are "essential because they are a primary way we make sense of the world around us, produce meanings, articulate intentions, and legitimise actions" (Wibben, 2011a: 2). Stories of everyday sexual violence have been a central methodological device within feminist security studies. They are a pertinent for reorienting analyses of violence and (in)security within the everyday, as opposed to exceptional spheres of 'elite' politics. As such, stories of everyday violence illuminate the ways violence and (in)security is lived and broader structures of patriarchy, racialisation, and colonialism come to bear on everyday relations. Looking to stories of (in)security is to understand that matters of (in)security are produced through discursive practices that are always embedded within the politics of representation and interpretation (Wibben, 2011a; Kronsell, 2006).

Stories of everyday life then, are fundamental to shifting the epistemological ground of how scholars generate knowledge of (in)security, and whose everyday lived experiences of violence come to constitute this knowledge. In foregrounding stories of violence in everyday life, scholars are engaged in a process of changing the story of (in)security. As I unpacked in the preceding chapter, stories from everyday life "reclaim "the importance of everyday life to understanding global processes…presenting alternative voices (and consequently unheard stories) of [ordinary] peoples, places, and events" (Moulin, 2016 in Wibben, 2018: 51), that challenge the conventional story of (in)security in myriad ways. Likewise, centring stories of violence and (in)security as a methodological approach "challenges the rigidities, norms, and

boundaries of disciplines, questioning the very ways in which academics have been trained to think speak and write, and provid[es] alternative forms of engagement where theories are intertwined with stories" (Mehta and Wibben, 2018: 51).

Changing the story of (in)security, however, is both a theoretical framework and a methodological practice. Feminist security studies scholars concerned with stories from everyday life are engaged in processes of collecting, recounting, and analysing stories from the everyday. They (re)tell these stories to inquire into the relationship(s) between the everyday and (in)security. In this process, scholars foreground particular aspects of violence, the lives of particular people and their situated contexts, assess different ramifications of the impacts of (in)security, and as a result different meanings are ascribed to what it means to be in/secure. Maria Stern (2005) for example, foregrounds the lived experiences of Mayan women, negotiating their everyday lives, experiences of violence, and how this relates to their narratives of identity and (in)security in Guatemala. Feminists in feminist security studies have long been involved in the practice of engaging with questions of silence. This has taken on many guises, be that silences around questions of gender and race within the discipline or the silencing of the experiences of (in)security in women's lives. To engage with silences when we encounter them is a crucial part of feminist research methods, enabling feminist researchers to "study what is not there, what is hidden" (Kronsell, 2006: 115), and ask after the political structures that led to this silence/absence.

There is no "singular narrative" (Wibben, 2011a: 2) of violence, and all stories of violence and (in)security (re)produced within security studies are mediated through scholarly curation. Scholars of feminist security who work with stories of violence are thus involved in practices of reconstruction in the retelling of stories for the purposes of analyses. Doing so involves engaging with silences/absences within the field of security studies, the stories that are collected and recounted in security studies analysis, and "acknowledge[ing] in our writing that some stories will *always* be unspoken and unheard" (Mehta and Wibben, 2018: 50). Silence is thus a productive category, a space through which to explore the limits of what we know and what we don't know about questions of (in)security and people's everyday lives within the university, to begin "thinking about how to articulate the pieces, the lost ideas, the broken

thoughts, the puzzles the curiosities, the silences, the not seen/not there" (Zalewski, 2006: 52).

In engaging with critical fabulation, this thesis builds upon and extends feminist methodologies of working with stories and engaging with silences/absences/gaps. As I argued in chapter 2, although feminist security studies scholars have done much to reorient analysis of violence and (in)security, including sexual violence, to the everyday, the continued orientation of stories of sexual violence to racialised and colonial contexts reproduces colonial logics that in tandem reinscribe ontological distinctions between the 'over there' and the 'over here'. As such, while everyday life in the UK university is embedded within relations of sexual violence, it has thus far not been subject to sustained attention as a site of everyday (in)security and sexual violence.

In order to contribute to the stories of (in)security and everyday sexual violence in feminist security studies, I therefore engage with the method of critical fabulation to foreground the ways everyday staff-student sexual violence is experienced in the "mundane and quotidian, rather than exploit the shocking and the terrible" (Hartman, 2022: 2), and "illuminate the practice[s] of everyday life" (Hartman, 2022: 13) that structure (in)security in UK universities. In doing so, I 'defamiliarize the familiar' position of the everyday university as a site in which security studies scholarship is produced, by rendering this space that forms the everyday backdrop of security studies theorising as a locus of everyday practices of staff-student sexual violence and (in)security.

What is a scene of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security?

The empirical chapters of my thesis, The Classroom (chapter 4), The Conference (chapter 5), and The Hearing (chapter 6), each contain two scenes I have fabulated. These scenes involve a narration of stories of staff-student sexual violence that are closely informed by stories I gathered during my fieldwork. These scenes structure these chapters and form the bedrock of my analysis. I have chosen to fabulate the scenes of The Classroom, The Conference, and The Hearing not only because these are pertinent sites of everyday life in UK universities and, as informed by my fieldwork, of incidence of staff-student sexual violence, but because they

are equally pertinent sites for the discipline of security studies. The classroom is a crucial site for the teaching and learning of security studies, where teachers enable students to think critically about questions of power, violence, and (in)security. The Conference is a notable part of the academic calendar, where academic staff, PhD students and ECRs come together to generate and exchange knowledge of (in)security. The Hearing picks up on multiple important aspects of security studies, for example, what it means to 'hear' stories of (in)security in everyday life, and what institutional hearings tell us about the relationships between (in)security and the everyday. Each scene has been written as a story that I have crafted through stitching together data taken from fieldwork. The stitching together of multiple stories is what allows me to push at gaps and silences in the stories of staff-student sexual violence.

Engaging in critical fabulation to push at gaps, silences, and absences intentionally renders a more complex picture of the politics of (in)security, and was in part inspired by listening for silences inherent in accounts of sexual violence within UK universities. While all modes of storytelling, and all representations of (in)security are necessarily partial, stories of violence are more often inflected through that which we do not know. This is because stories of sexual violence are told within the context of power relations that structure everyday life. To negotiate these power relations, participants had to curtail aspects of their stories. Sometimes they omitted details of particular cases, and sometimes they were unable to tell some stories of sexual violence altogether. When I was conducting the interviews and surveys for my fieldwork, participants often remarked explicitly on the silences and omissions within their stories. Abigail (SUR2) didn't "want to write the specific (or most memorable)" experience of sexual violence she had at a conference because she was "a little concerned the people involved would be able to identify themselves". Anthony (INT1) couldn't "go into details about any specific cases", and Alex (INT6) had signed an NDA that prohibited them from speaking about a specific case of staff-student sexual violence at a UK university, including the universities' response to this case and Alex's role within it.

These examples are indicative of the ways the power relations in which stories are told can work to curtail the stories that can be told, and prompt questions in their wake. In the case of Abigail, for example, while it might appear clear that she was concerned about the

anonymity, it is less clear who 'the people involved' are. They might be, for example, perpetrators of sexual violence, bystanders to incidence(s) of sexual violence, those involved in an institutional complaints process, or a combination of all three. What were or could be the repercussions of the loss of anonymity that she feared? In Anthony's case, what was his motivation for omitting the details? Was it because he needed to protect the anonymity of those students and staff members involved, or perhaps he was mindful of his position of power as a Head of Department presiding over these cases, adjudicating outcomes and disciplinary processes. Although Alex signed an NDA, we don't know the parameters of this agreement, the experience they had of being asked to sign it, and what exactly the motivations were for the university asking Alex to do so.

Critical fabulation is a way to "struggle within and against the constraints and silences" (Hartman, 2022: 13), by asking after silences and constraints in stories of sexual violence and what they can tell us about (in)security in everyday life in UK universities. This also works to situate more clearly how staff-student sexual violence and everyday life are intertwined within in the politics of (in)security. To illustrate, the first scene of chapter 5 centres on the experience of being "approached via text for sex whilst presenting at a conference" (Amari, SUR1) by a senior male academic, a story gathered during my survey data collection on staff-student sexual violence at conferences in the field of international politics. I engage in the practice of critical fabulation to push at the gaps and the silences in the story, weaving a narrative informed and indebted to wider stories from fieldwork on staff-student sexual violence in UK universities to paint a fuller picture of politics of (in)security in which we can situate this experience of everyday violence at the conference. In this scene I fabulate the story of the conference presentation in order in to examine a text message at a conference within a broader context of knowledge production on sexual violence and the everyday in feminist security studies and international politics. In doing so, I locate the experience of sexual harassment via text message during a conference presentation as a critical site through which we can examine the interrelationship between the politics of everyday (in)security and sexual violence within the university and the everyday as a field of knowledge production in feminist security studies. I bring together these interconnected spheres to inquire into the politics of what experiences and knowledge of sexual violence and everyday (in)security figure as the stuff of (legitimate) knowledge at the conference, and what enactments of everyday

(in)security and sexual violence are rendered outside of these formal presentations of knowledge, even as how they circulate as everyday practices at the conference.

I do so to ask how everyday life and staff-student sexual violence work to engender relations of everyday (in)security. Of course, it is impossible to tell a complete story, indeed there are no complete stories, no final account of what violence or (in)security means, in the everyday or any other sphere (Wibben, 2011a; Mehta and Wibben, 2018). In this way, to engage in critical fabulation by curating scenes of staff-student sexual violence offers a way to, in Hartman's words, "do more than recount the violence", and instead "to tell a story" (Hartman, 2008: 2), about how staff-student sexual violence is lived as everyday (in)security. These scenes have been fabulated not as an attempt to tell a complete story, as that remains both an impossibility, and as Wibben (2011a) warns, an act of violence in itself. But to push at the boundaries of what we know of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in the university, ask after the ways everyday lives are impacted, (in)security is negotiated and lived within the university. Critical fabulation as a method allows me then to bring more starkly into contestation the politics of (in)security that staff-student sexual violence engenders.

These scenes of staff-student sexual violence are also designed to offer space to reflect on how security studies as a discipline is situated in relation to these scenes. Indeed, as staff-student sexual violence is happening in universities across the UK, feminist security studies scholars may "bear witness" (Hartman, 2022: 2) to this violence already, may have knowledge of members of academic staff engaging in these acts of violence. They may have, as came up in my fieldwork, an in-depth knowledge of instances of staff-student sexual violence at conference events in international politics. Moreover, the scenes of The Classroom, The Conference, and The Hearing are already embedded within the discipline of security studies. The Classroom, The Conference and The Hearing, then, allow me to "defamiliarize the familiar" (Hartman, 2022: 2). I do this by augmenting our understanding of how (in)security and the everyday relate to these familiar sites of the university and of security studies, drawing attention to the ways they are embedded within the (re)production of sexual violence and everyday (in)security in UK universities. This enables me to destabilise the familiar sites of sexual violence in security studies as shocking enactments of violence that

happens 'over there', and instead the familiar everyday contexts in which feminist security studies is located within the university become the scenes of violence and everyday (in)security.

In this way, the scenes of my thesis take us to spaces that indeed might on the surface seem utterly banal, but understands them as imbued within practices of everyday (in)security that are made through relations of staff-student sexual violence. Be that after work/class drinks, a text message sent during a conference presentation, the young woman poring over university complaints procedures, the glances between PGRs at a conference drinks event, or the eye you keep on those you think might be around someone known to be 'dangerous'. The scene thus enables the thesis to explore what is the expansive reach of everyday life in the university. Universities live beyond institutional walls and are made up of more than offices, lecture theatres and seminar or tutorial classrooms (though these are important too). They leak out into the street, into any number of local establishments and businesses in surrounding areas, they are international, as scholars from across the UK travel to overseas locations, they are online and in person. Conducting fieldwork online, largely from the floor of my bedroom or living room in house-shares in Manchester is just one example of how research in the university spills out, and the boundaries of the university become muddled with other spaces and places in our everyday lives.

To fabulate these scenes, there are important power relations to consider. As Ackerly and True (2008: 705) note: "It is our collective responsibility as ethical researchers to put our commitment to self-reflexivity, our attentiveness to the power of epistemology, of boundaries and relationships into the practice of our research". As I piece together each scene of staff-student sexual violence and analyse the relations of everyday (in)security engendered within stories of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities, I am engaged in a process of (re)telling the story. Although power relations in research cannot be resolved, I have constructed these scenes of staff-student sexual violence with my participant's stories, experiences of staff-student sexual violence, and the impacts it has had on the people who have experienced these forms of violence at the heart of my inquiry.

Lastly, in fabulating each scene, I endeavour to provide an additional layer of anonymity for those who graciously shared their stories with me during my fieldwork. Processes of

augmentation in light of this are common within qualitative research methods and are a particular ethical concern in relation to stories of violence from everyday life. In response to this, it is an ethical practice to give pseudonyms, redact personally identifiable information, and augment some of the details of the story. In my fieldwork, I took great care to redact any information that would render my participants or their institutional affiliations identifiable. For example, I gave pseudonyms to all survey and interview participants, and used terms like 'EDI worker' and 'activist' to encompass a wide range of job titles and forms of student and staff activist groups. It is, however, difficult to provide a detailed account of an everyday life and an everyday experience or experiences of sexual violence while protecting the anonymity of the person who lived it. As each of these stories are interwoven with one another through the method of critical fabulation within in each scene, this enables me to provide a deeper level of anonymity to my participants and allows me to further obscure identifiable details.

Gathering the Stories during COVID-19

To gather stories for my thesis, I wanted to have conversations with staff and students at UK universities about everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence on campus. Through these conversations, I wanted hear stories from students that would enable me to generate a better understanding of how people experienced everyday (in)securities in relation to staff-student sexual violence. I wanted to understand how it impacted their lives, their careers, their interactions with university spaces. I also wanted to understand how students had engaged with their universities in contexts where they had experienced staff-student sexual violence. I wanted to understand how when students experienced everyday (in)securities as a result of staff-student sexual violence, their universities responded, and to what extent this either gave them a greater sense of security, or exacerbated their feelings of (in)security. Lastly, I wanted to speak to those in activist positions and those working in EDI related positions to gain insight into the ways that students have attempted to navigate and/or resist the prevalence of sexual violence on campus (activists). As well as to understand the how staff members who work on issues of EDI had responded to (and if they had responded to) issues of staff-student sexual violence, and what their perspectives were on institutional processes for responding to cases of staff-student sexual violence.

Originally, I had planned to conduct in-person interviews with activists and Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) workers in UK Universities, and to run four sets of focus groups with students at six universities across the UK (24 focus groups in total). The focus groups were designed to reach both undergraduate and postgraduate students across the UK, with separate focus groups for taught students and postgraduate research students. The reason for this not only being that taught and research students have important divergences in their experiences of university and their relationships to academic staff members, but that postgraduate research students are often those who teach taught students – most often undergraduate students.

However, the ethics approval for fieldwork for this project was finalised one week after the first nationwide lockdown announced on 23 March 2020 in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. At that time, the first lockdown was announced as a three-week period. We know now this lockdown went on for much longer. While restrictions were eased for the first time in June of 2020, the UK remained subject to various in-person restrictions, and subsequent nationwide lockdowns were called between November - December 2020, and January – March 2021 (Commons Library Research Briefing, 2021). Manchester remained subject to additional 'local' lockdowns during this period, including, for example, additional restrictions being implemented in the Summer of 2020, and an additional set of restrictions in the Autumn of 2020, prior to the second nation-wide lockdown. This meant that for the majority of the time between May 2020 and March 2021, like the rest of Manchester, I was under strict lockdown rules while conducting research and fieldwork for my thesis. The end of the third lockdown in March 2021 did not mean an immediate 'return to normal', but a gradual reduction in restrictions across the UK; the end of all restrictions was eventually announced for the 19th of July 2021, an event the then Prime Minister Boris Johnson termed 'Freedom Day' (British Medical Journal, 2021).

While during the pandemic many chose to move their fieldwork online, and I was able to do so, it was a personal ethical decision not to shift the focus groups for the project to an online platform. Two of the central issues here concerned potential harm to participants and potential issues over privacy and confidentiality. Firstly, conducting focus groups on an online platform made it significantly more difficult to offer support to participants should they

experience any feelings of distress during the focus group, which given the subject matter of sexual violence was an important concern. While my in-person plan had involved a 'distress protocol' to support anyone who experienced feelings of distress (including a second room specifically in case someone needed well-being support, and a second focus group facilitator to help in cases where anyone became distressed), this wasn't possible to transfer into an online platform. I was worried that if anyone felt overwhelmed or uncomfortable during the focus group they might simply 'exit' the online room, that I'd have no way of supporting or helping them beyond sending an email. In regard to privacy, using online platforms threw up a host of issues around the potential for recording any material shared in the meeting, which needed to be kept strictly confidential. Equally in the context of everyone being locked in their house shares or family homes, it might be impossible for some students to have access to a private space without anyone else being in the room or overhearing their focus group's conversation.

I was also very wary of asking so much of students in UK universities given what they were living through at the time. The Covid-19 pandemic was scary. Everyone was isolated from friends and loved ones, their daily routines changed, their everyday lives curtailed. All the while we all watched as hospitalisation numbers grew, and as more and more people lost their lives. I was acutely aware that any number of students I might conduct focus groups with may not only being dealing with the difficulties of being isolated in lockdown, but that they or their loved ones may be 'clinically vulnerable' or immunocompromised, that they may have had loved ones in hospital with Covid-19, or had sadly lost someone to the illness.

Thinking (or trying to rethink) about how to research everyday life and be an everyday theorist of feminist security studies was challenging in this context because the Covid-19 pandemic seemingly changed so sharply and suddenly what people's everyday lives were. And at the same time, our everyday lives changed because they were embedded within international matters of health (in)security and biopolitical modes of (global and local) governance. Due to the 'threat'[11] of Covid-19, many of us became deeply engaged with thinking through ideas of

---

[11] I use inverted commas here not to deny that Covid-19 was a "'real danger in the world", but that all 'risks' are embedded within a "process of interpretation" (Campbell, 1992: 2).

'risk', 'harm' and 'danger' in our everyday lives, which for many are the interpretive bedrocks of discursive practices of (in)security (Campbell, 1992). We didn't leave the house to go to work, or to go to class, or to meet friends or family. Staying at home, many of us used Zoom and Microsoft Teams for work and socialising, parents navigated childcare and home-schooling responsibilities, and 'lockdown challenges' were all the rage.

Thinking about the multiple entanglements of the everyday, the exceptional, and the state of global (in)security helped me find my way through researching everyday life despite the circumstances. That is to say, no matter how much things seemed to have changed, the everyday wasn't lost or inaccessible, however much the everyday had been reconfigured. This isn't to negate the significant impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, but rather that it gave me space to reflect on and understand better the ways in which (in)security is always lived through the everyday. And so, just as our everyday lives were reconfigured during the Covid-19 pandemic, I had to find a way to reconfigure the methodology of my PhD to navigate this.

Fieldwork: Online Surveys and Interviews

In order to speak to as many people as possible, I utilised online surveys. I designed these around two areas of interest: experiences of staff-student sexual violence at conference events in the field of international politics, and experiences reporting staff-student sexual violence to universities across the UK. I began the release of the surveys with the conference first, and to begin this conducted a pilot survey that was sent to a specific working group within a UK based conference association in the field of international politics, who agreed to share the pilot version of this survey, which included a second section that asked questions that allowed participants to provide feedback on the survey design, e.g. 'If there was one thing you could change about this survey, what would it be?'. The feedback was overwhelmingly positive, and the only change that was instigated based on the pilot involved adding a definition of staff-student sexual violence at the beginning of the survey, and not only including this definition in the participant information sheet. Other than this, no changes were made to questions. As this had been the feedback on the conference survey pilot, before sending the survey on reporting instances of staff-student sexual violence out for the recruitment of participants, I amended this survey to include a definition of staff-student

sexual violence at the beginning of the survey, in line with feedback on the pilot conference survey.

The surveys were designed to elicit stories of people's experiences in regard to staff-student sexual violence through the use of multiple open ended questions[12], for example: 'During your time as a PhD and/or Master's student at a UK university, did you ever experience staff-student sexual violence at a conference event?; 'Have you ever witnessed an instance of staff-student sexual violence at conference events?', 'Have you ever heard stories of staff-student sexual violence at a conference events?'; 'How did your experience of reporting staff-student sexual violence affect your feelings of safety on campus?' In both surveys participants were also asked if they felt that what they experienced/witnessed/heard in relation to staff-student sexual violence was impacted by race, gender, class, heteronormativity, and/or disability. They were invited to give an answer to why (if they did feel these factors were significant) they thought this was the case. They were also asked if staff-student sexual violence had affected their feelings of safety at conference events (SUR1&2) or on their university campus (SUR3).

The conference survey was limited to the field of international politics to make the data collection more feasible for the period of time I had to collect fieldwork, and reflecting the limits of a PhD thesis. While attendees at conference events in the field of international politics will often include many people who are not current or former members of UK university institutions, I controlled for this. The survey information sheet detailed that only current or former students or staff members at UK institutions could answer the survey, that their experiences shared on the survey should relate to experiences they have had, or stories of staff-student sexual violence at conference events they have heard during their time affiliated to a UK university. The first question was also designed to help with this inclusion/exclusion criteria in the research design, asking potential participants if they were a

---

[12] Please see the appendices for full list of questions for each survey. The survey results are not provided in full within the appendices for two reasons. Firstly, as per University of Manchester policy regarding the use of surveys in PhD theses, as these surveys have not been published, it is not necessary to include the survey and responses as part of the thesis. Secondly, I choose not to include the survey responses in full in the appendices in order to maintain the anonymity of my participants, particularly given the sensitive nature of their responses to questions relating to staff-student sexual violence in the university.

current or former staff or student at a UK university, in the event that they ticked 'no', the survey ended, and their response was deleted.

The survey concerning experiences of reporting staff-student sexual violence to universities in the UK was open to any current or former student or staff member at a UK university. This was confirmed on the information sheet and the survey began with a question to ensure that the inclusion/exclusion criteria was followed. Survey participants had one week to complete their survey responses, and respondents were unable to complete the survey more than once. Other than the first question of each survey, which was designed to help ensure the inclusion/exclusion criteria of the research design were met, all questions were optional, allowing participants the ability to complete the survey without being forced to provide stories they felt unable to tell, or did not want to tell. The surveys were designed to maintain anonymity as far as possible, meaning that no details regarding the institutional affiliation and/or names and/or ages and/or gender, and/or race or ethnicity and/or details of disability and/or sexuality of participants were systematically recorded, and no email addresses or contact details were taken.

My main tools of recruitment during the pandemic were email and social media, because the circumstances necessitated the exclusive use of online methods. In terms of social media, I used Twitter because anecdotally I was aware that there is a sufficient amount of engagement from the UK academic community (staff and students) on Twitter. Additionally, this is the only public social media profile I have, meaning I was much more likely to reach a greater number of people, and people outside of my personal network. Anyone could view my recruitment posts, and anyone could 'retweet' the post, meaning they shared it to their network. As such, Twitter is a good tool when trying to reach large groups of people. Outside of Twitter, I emailed university administrators and administrators at conference associations with my call for participants and survey link, and asked for the surveys to be sent to student/staff email lists or conference association members respectively.

I combined the use of surveys with online interviews with activists who were in involved in activism relating to sexual violence at UK Universities, those in EDI roles at universities who had experience in this role relating to issues of staff-student sexual violence, and those in institutional positions that directly relate to supporting students who have experienced

sexual violence at UK universities. The interviews were semi structured and conducted via Zoom and Microsoft Teams. The questions were largely designed as a way to engage in conversations around the participants experiences of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities via their work as activist/EDI/other institutional position in UK universities[13]. I wanted to hear about a number of issues. Including: how they understood the problem of staff-student sexual violence at UK universities; how they had supported students who had experienced this form of violence; how they felt it impacted students (in any number of ways); how their activism responded to/resisted the problem of staff-student sexual violence on campus; and how they would characterise university responses to staff-student sexual violence on campus. Interviews were recorded via an encrypted device and later transcribed. During the transcription process, identifying details were removed from the transcript (e.g., current or former institutional affiliations, names of any persons mentioned during the interview, names of any locations mentioned in the interview). All interview and survey participants were given a pseudonym.

Navigating Recruitment Difficulties

Gathering the stories for this thesis was not easy, and I encountered a number of problems along the way. It is not uncommon in feminist security studies, or indeed in security studies more broadly, for researchers to grapple with problems relating to what is often termed 'access'. Having a problem with access in research essentially means you face barriers in gathering the kind of 'data' or sources you wish to use in your research. This might mean you are unable to reach out to potential research participants, or when you do, you find no one wants to or feels able to talk to you, or that the documents you wish to access are classified in some way, and you do not qualify as a person with the kind of 'clearance' needed to read them. As Belcher and Martin write, "[a]ccess, confidentiality, and classified information can be tremendous challenges for research on security" (2019: 33). This is entirely unsurprising given the kind of sites security studies scholars often want to engage in, be that the politics

---

[13] Please see the appendices to view my semi-structured interview guide. Note, that as these interviews were semi structured, this interview is not an exact account of each interview.

of state elites, or of the military, or of nuclear weapons experts, or highly influential international organisations like the UN, warfare, and so on.

Compared to these more traditionally explored sites of security studies, the UK university doesn't on the surface seem to be the kind of place where access would be a significant issue. There are no state secrets to be found, no international war crimes, no representatives of superpower nations, no groups of military officers, no peacekeepers engaging in human rights abuses. Moreover, while many feminist studies scholars enter their fields of research "as an outsider" (Cohn, 2006: 98), which can impact research in many ways, I am very much on the 'inside'. By that I mean, rather than going out of the university to research any number of empirical and/or institutional contexts, I was already inside the site I wanted to engage in research on. I am, and have been for the last 8 years, a student at UK universities, and during my PhD have also become a staff member in a variety of casualised roles as a teaching assistant, and a research assistant. I have organised with colleagues and friends in a Women's Collective in my department, I have participated in EDI meetings, and I am an active member of my trade union. This is all to say that I am very much a part of everyday life within the university. This, combined with the university on the surface seemingly like a relatively innocuous site in which to gather research (at least in relation to aforementioned more traditional sites of security studies research), might make it seem like gaining 'access' wouldn't be so hard at all.

And yet, in trying to find ways to talk to students and staff members, to hear stories of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security, I encountered significant barriers. Firstly, I could no longer recruit people in ways I had planned due to lockdown restrictions. I couldn't, for example, put up posters around university buildings because I couldn't go to the university buildings, and neither could anyone else. Lockdown had made it harder to reach people, and online methods were my only real option. I had to send a lot of emails. First off, to get my surveys out to staff and students at UK universities and those who were UK based staff or students who attended conference events in the field of international politics, I needed to email people who had access to email lists of staff and students at UK universities and those who were members of conference associations in the field of international politics.

For example, for my (full) survey on staff-student sexual violence at conference events in the field of international politics, I contacted three conference associations in the field of international politics. I chose these conference associations on the basis of being the major conference associations that to my knowledge UK based staff and research students are regularly affiliated with, and regularly attend. I received one reply. For my survey on experiences of reporting staff-student sexual violence to a university institution, I created a document listing all UK Universities in the UK and used a random generator to decide which 20 universities to contact. When a university had been chosen by the generator, I then contacted those in administrative roles (whose emails are publicly accessible via university websites) to ask if they would send my survey to their staff and student lists. Often it was necessary to send multiple emails to each institution, for example, one email to each of the 'School' or 'Faculty' contacts, and at times as there were distinct PGR, PGT and UG contacts, and in this case multiple emails would be sent per school or faculty. Going back to count just how many emails I sent is painful, and the reason for that is because I sent 163 emails in total, and I received one reply.

The silences I experienced during my fieldwork were an invitation for critical interrogation. As is often the starting point of a critical interrogation of anything, the silences I encountered gave rise to a series of questions. Why was it, that those I contacted (be that university staff or the staff of conference associations) did not reply to my emails? Were they concerned about the reputation of the conference association or their university? I was acutely aware of the fact that at the same time I was sending out my survey on reporting instances of staff-student sexual violence to universities in the UK that the Al Jazeera (2021a) podcast 'Degrees of Abuse' had just been released. This podcast detailed the abuse of several members of academic staff at universities in the UK, naming these staff members and their institutional affiliations, as well as details of the universities handling of the cases.

Critical fabulation as a method to bring together the stories of staff-student sexual violence across my interviews and surveys offered a way forward despite the recruitment difficulties I faced and the silences I was met with during data collection. Interweaving and stitching together multiple stories across interviews, surveys. I worked to push at the limits of these questions, to utilise silences and gaps in the data collection process as sites for critical

contestation. In chapter 6, for example, I bring together the two stories I collected as part of my third survey on reporting alongside interviews with student activists and EDI workers to flesh out the ways practices of 'hearing' and not 'hearing' impacts students reporting staff-student sexual violence to their universities.

Importantly, I am also able to do so because despite the recruitment difficulties I encountered, and the constraints imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic, so many staff and students at UK universities generously shared their stories with me. Fourteen participants completed the initial pilot survey on staff-student sexual violence at conference events in international politics, sixty participants told me about their stories in the full roll out of this survey. Two participants answered my survey on reporting staff-student sexual violence to their universities giving detailed accounts of their stories. And six interviewees including students and EDI workers and academics in UK universities spoke at length with me over Zoom and Microsoft Teams during the pandemic. The stories of these eighty-one participants, their experiences of everyday staff-student sexual violence and (in)security drive the scenes of sexual violence within my thesis. Believing deeply in the importance of these stories, and their exposition of everyday relations of sexual violence and (in)security within UK universities, is at the foundation of my project.

Believing in Stories of Sexual Violence

"I do not think you should include such information – hearing stories – is just that, hearsay. I have heard many stories from over the years from people that enjoy gossip. This is not political science." (Remy, SUR2)

One of the most interesting, and unexpected, survey responses I received from a member of academic staff at a UK university during my fieldwork was that my thesis was engaging in gossip. I should not be asking the kind of questions I was asking because the kinds of answers I would get would be gossip. I should not be asking specifically after stories of staff-student sexual violence, and as a result of this, they thought that the work I was doing was not a legitimate research project in the social sciences. This particular response is indicative of the ways stories of sexual violence, and those who tell then, are often subject to particular forms

of delegitimisation and marginalisation. Gossip is notoriously embedded within gendered, heteronormative, racialised, and classed discourses. It is something "women, [queer] men, [and] servants" (Adkins, 2017: 3) do. In terms of its content, gossip is often seen as elaborate and exaggerated stories about things that are trivial, that do not matter, or even complete fabrications. Gossips are often understood as unreliable sources, people who spread 'rumours' about others, constantly whispering behind people's backs (Adkins, 2017). It is no surprise in this gendered terrain that the terms gossiping, and bitching are often used interchangeably. The use of 'gossip' in this context is therefore deeply embedded within a wider political framework in which stories of sexual violence are not believed or taken seriously.

As I have noted, feminists within and beyond security studies highlight the importance of listening to stories of sexual violence and taking them seriously. Much of this relates to the ways that stories of sexual violence are often dismissed, not only in the sense that they are marginalised as 'legitimate' forms of knowledge, but that their experiences of sexual violence are doubted, people are disbelieved, people are told they are lying. The idea that women lie, for example, about sexual violence is a pervasive problem (Srinivasan, 2021).

The differential application of the word gossip tells us a lot about who is afforded the legitimacy of knowing (in)security, and what conversations are understood as the legitimate subject matter of (in)security. Equally, this response is interconnected with the delegitimisation of feminist methodological approaches that centre the role of everyday stories of violence. In this sense, it is reminiscent of disciplinary subjection of feminist scholarship to intense scrutiny, as it so often falls outside of accepted, conventional, and 'legitimate' methodologies in social science research (Zalewski, 2006). And so, when stories of staff-student sexual violence and (in)security are understood as gossip, this tells us how the discipline continues to engage in practices that undermine knowledge of everyday lives, of stories of sexual violence in the everyday. As well as how this compounds longstanding patterns through which gendered, racialised, heteronormative and classed practices impact the status of those who are considered knowers and those who are not.

Feminists in security studies have done so much to show that people's stories of (in)security are valuable and that their everyday lives are important. Secondly, feminist security studies

have shown that when feminist methods are called into question, interrogating this often tells us a great deal about the relationships between what is understood as legitimate/illegitimate research method, what constitutes legitimate/illegitimate knowledge of (in)security in security studies, and how this relationship is often implicated in the (re)production of (in)security (Zalewski, 2006; Tickner, 2006; Ackerly, Stern and True, 2006). In this sense, in taking stories of sexual violence from everyday life seriously, feminist approaches are "deeply and deliberately subversive" (Shepherd, 2016: 263), challenging ideas of what counts as legitimate/illegitimate knowledge, by choosing instead to consider stories from everyday life as sites of knowledge production. Importantly, embedded within this is a commitment to believing in stories of sexual violence. My thesis, then, is predicated on the commitment to taking stories of staff-student sexual violence seriously. Each scene of staff-student sexual violence is carefully pieced together using the stories of those who spoke to me during my fieldwork. Their stories are therefore taken as legitimate sources of knowledge of everyday (in)security and sexual violence in UK universities, that tell us how everyday life, (in)security, and staff-student sexual violence are situated within the university.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have unpacked critical fabulation as a theory and method that has inspired the fabulation of scenes of staff-student sexual violence that make up the empirical chapters of my thesis. I have underscored the ways this enables the thesis to understand, represent, and interpret staff-student sexual violence and (in)security as everyday. I have explained how critical fabulation involves working with methods of deconstruction and reconstruction (Hartman, 2008) to bring together multiple stories of staff-student sexual violence as everyday (insecurity) in UK universities.

I next outlined how I gathered the stories for this thesis using three online surveys and semi-structured interviews with activists, EDI workers, and those in institutional positions in UK universities whose job roles involve working with students who have experienced sexual violence. I explained how I encountered silences, problems with access within the research process, and how I navigated these difficulties in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic. I finally reflected on experiences of feminist research design and stories of sexual violence

being subject to disciplinary processes of delegitimisation and outlined why I believe we should take stories of everyday staff-student sexual violence seriously.

In the next chapter of this thesis, I turn to the first scene of staff-student sexual violence: The Classroom. Here I return to the scene I began with in the introduction of this thesis, turning back to the question of classrooms on (in)security and sexual violence. In this chapter, I explore the ways the classroom is a crucial site for the teaching and learning of (in)security in universities. Understanding the classroom to spill out beyond traditional or 'formal' spaces such as the lecture theatre or the tutorial room, I fabulate two scenes of staff-student sexual violence and the classroom, the EDI training workshop and the office hour meeting with the Head of Department.

Chapter 4: The Classroom

Introduction

In this first empirical chapter, I turn to The Classroom in UK universities to inquire into the relationship(s) between staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security in UK universities. Classrooms on international (in)security are a critical part of everyday life within the discipline of security studies. They are crucial sites where the politics of (in)security is taught and learned within universities in the UK. The classroom has been examined in regard to the teaching of international politics and (in)security, particularly in respect to the gendered, racialized, and Eurocentric curriculum (Ling, 2014; Rowley and Shepherd, 2012; Shiliam, 2015; Bhambra, Gebrial and Nişancıoğlu, 2018). Building on this scholarship, and taking a feminist and decolonial approach, I work to I destabilize where classrooms on (in)security are located in the university. I argue that classrooms of (in)security within the university extend beyond disciplinary borders and traditional classroom formats. This is interconnected with an understanding that everyday relations of (in)security permeate throughout the campus. As a result, the spaces in which we can 'learn about (in)security' are diffused throughout everyday life in the university.

In this chapter, I fabulate two classrooms on (in)security and the university that fall outside of more typical understandings of the classroom, the EDI Training Workshop and the Office Hour Meeting with the Head of Department. These scenes come together to constitute everyday lessons on (in)security in the university that underscore the ways that in the context of staff-student sexual violence, students and staff members learn about (in)security, share knowledge of (in)security, and negotiate an institutional politics of (in)security.

I first examine the parameters of 'the classroom'. I show that while the classroom might seem like a straightforward site of inquiry, the classroom within UK universities is situated within a complex politics within universities. Here the classroom of (in)security figures in the more traditional scope of seminars, lectures, and tutorials on international security studies,

themselves having been shown as implicated in various forms of disciplinary violence. I argue however, that the classroom extends beyond this, both in the form of bleeding out into other less traditionally conceived spaces in the university that serve as critical ground how (in)security is learned. The first scene of this chapter, the EDI Training Workshop unpacks this scene as a lesson on institutional (in)security that illuminates how institutional training sessions constitute lessons on the negotiations over what (in)security is for, and how institutional priorities regarding questions of 'security' and their contestations can be discerned. The final scene of this chapter, the Office Hour with the Head of Department, offers a lesson on open secrets and (in)security in contexts of staff-student sexual violence, where institutional hierarchies manifest in the everyday distribution of knowledge of staff-student sexual violence in universities.

What is a Classroom of (in)security?

On the surface, what we mean by a classroom in a UK university might appear simple. We might more traditionally think of lecture theatres, seminars and tutorials, or PhD supervisions. All of these sites are contexts in which the university as an educational space comes to life. We might think of academic staff members engaged in introducing undergraduate and postgraduate taught students to the fields of knowledge which a particular academic subject discipline, developing their grasps on the academic histories and debates of their chosen subject(s), teaching students to critically think and write, and supporting PhD students as they develop original contributions to knowledge within their subject fields.

The classroom in security studies "can emerge as a potentially crucially significant political site for the definition and constitution of knowledge" (Zalewski, 2013: 15) within the discipline, though it "remains sorely under-theorised, and by […] under-noticed" (Zalewski, 2013: 15). The everyday life of the security studies scholar involves curating classrooms on international (in)security, devising a curriculum which will enable students to understand key theoretical approaches to the study of (in)security, as well as choosing key empirical contexts for examination. Teachers of (in)security devise lesson plans, generate PowerPoint presentations, hold office hours and mark papers assessing students' grasp of the material. These are a part of the "nitty gritty of the everyday" (Zalewski, 2013: 15) within UK

universities; tapping at computer keys responding to student emails, practicing lecture materials in offices, printing off student handouts, answering questions in class on what (in)security means and how it matters. These practices intersect with the everyday life of students on university campuses. Where studying for your degree course involves the everyday practice of attending these lectures, visiting the library, going to an office hour meeting with your lecturer, and poring over reading lists and class assignments.

What is on, or not on, the curriculum is a political decision that is embedded within wider relations of power both within the university and in the context of disciplinary constructions of knowledge. As scholars in security studies have argued, racialised, gendered and colonial modes of disciplinary violence and exclusion bleed into the life of the classroom. They have highlighted this in contexts where the curriculum of (in)security remains bound in predominantly white, androcentric and Eurocentric knowledge (Bhambra, Gebrial and Nişancıoğlu, 2018; Gebrial, 2018; Shilliam, 2015, 2018). As Gruffydd Jones (2006: 5) argues, "the 'self-images' of the discipline, its self-consciousness or self-construction, take shape and are in part reproduced through the imperatives of teaching". The classroom takes hold then as a space in which the contours of international (in)security are made, which can work to reinscribe the violent practices of exclusion within the discipline and within the university.

The field of international security studies and the classroom are thus intertwined as discursive practices in which knowledge is learned and shaped, legitimate/illegitimate modes of inquiry, and what constitutes an empirical site through which we can learn about relations of (in)security (Rowley and Shepherd, 2012; Ling, 2014; Shilliam, 2020; Sen, 2022). As Gabriel (2018: 19) notes, "the university is a site of knowledge production, and, most crucially, consecration; it has the power to decide which histories, knowledges and intellectual contributions are considered valuable and worthy of further critical attention and dissemination". These practices are embedded within practices of exclusion that are intertwined with racialised and colonial practices within the discipline more broadly. The proliferation of student activist campaigns to decolonize the university, such as 'Why is my curriculum so white?', and 'Rhodes Must Fall', speak to the ways in which our university classrooms remain implicated in these forms of violence, and how they continue to enact

forms of violence and marginalisation that impacts students of colour in particular (Bambra, Gabriel and Nisancioglu, 2018; Gabriel, 2018; Shilliam, 2015).

Ling's (2014) *Imagining World Politics: Sihar and Shenya, a Fable for Our Times*, offers a pertinent starting point for unpacking how gendered, racialised and colonial violences are at work in the classroom. The Epilogue/Introduction of this text tells the story of Wanda, an African American woman entering her first 'Theories of International Relations' class as part of her PhD programme in IR at a US university. Through conversations with her Auntie Ann and her previous college education, Wanda brings to the class a vast knowledge of racialised and colonial violence, of how Asian, African and Native American peoples "endure[d] the whip of colonial masters who wanted them for their gold, their bodies, and their souls" (2014: 188). For Wanda, the lives of those who have experienced these forms of violence animated her curiosity in international politics, not in ways that reduce people to their experienced of white supremacist violence, but of focusing on their rich histories of knowledge, culture, and politics, and seeing that these are central to understanding how international politics works.

Entering her classroom however, she is met with a familiar story of international relations theorising, with the "Founding Fathers of IR: Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes" (2014: 190). The class centres on Hobbes' Leviathan. A racialised, colonial, and gendered text, where indigenous people are "savages" and women reduced to "chattel". Wanda offers important critiques of the racism embedded in this text, alongside contributions of indigenous knowledges of dreams "as a source of wisdom", and of the "Choctaw leader Pushmataha, [who] argued against going to war" (2014: 194-195). However, she is shut down, as her Professor "must take back control" (2014: 195), telling her that "this is a class on *International Relations*, not Native American culture" (2014: 194-195, original emphases). Here, the classroom is produced as a white, gendered, colonial space through the dismissal of both Wanda as student and the knowledge(s) she contributes to the class as 'not the stuff of international politics'. Wanda reflects on this as a form of violence, as being "assaulted at every turn […] a kind of violence that professors mistake for 'intellectual rigor'" (1994: 200).

The role of the Professor as an institutionalized figure of university hierarchy is critical to the production of these dynamics within the classroom. Disciplinary hierarchies of knowledge production and dissemination in the classroom are interwoven with the production of

institutionalized hierarchies within the university. Here, "we are inscribed as either student or professor: students take exams, teachers don't; students are graded, teachers' grade. Such inscriptions are key in the production of subjectivity, identity, and knowledge in pedagogical encounters" (Luke and Gore, 1992: 2). Understanding the classroom as central to the production of institutionalized hierarchies and disciplinary knowledge production is critical in moving towards an understanding of the classroom as constituting a deeply political space.

This has been long noted by black feminist scholars, anti-colonial and queer scholars who have situated the classroom as a site in which the politics of power and violence are at play within educational spaces, with attention across these fields of scholarship to racialised, gendered, classed, colonial, and heteronormative practices as constitutive of university classrooms (hooks, 1994; Brim, 2020; Shilliam, 2020). For hooks, her experiences of the university classroom worked to reinforce racialised forms of domination, as "they [the Professors] often used the classroom to enact rituals of control that were about domination and the unjust exercise of power" (1994: 5). Classrooms, therefore, operate within a complex politics within universities. On the one hand, classrooms are critical spaces for the teaching and learning of matters of (in)security, while simultaneously, they are inflected by broader relations of violence both in regard to the disciplinary (re)production of knowledge, and as spaces in which this violence is reproduced.

Ling (2014) brings the politics of sexual violence to bear on this broader gendered, racialised, and colonial context. In this classroom, the story of IR begins through violent sexualised imageries. As "Professor Miller opens the class with an attempt at humor, "that sex and politics have much in common…The answer is, somebody's always on top…The point is, ladies and gentlemen, International Relations is about power. And, like sex, power means A making B do what B would otherwise not do." (2014: 190). Power and sex are constituted through violence, with this statement both reading as a definition of power and of rape. As such, international relations is framed here through the intersection of power and sexual violence.

The Professor's asides generate further exposition of the intersection of power, sexual violence and institutionalised hierarchies in the classroom. Framed through asides that detail the Professors thoughts as he teaches his class. Here one (white) woman student's joke and Wanda's laughter lead their actions to be "dismissed" as they're "*always a little frisky in the*

beginning" (2014: 190, original emphasis). Two male students catch the Professor's eye for their contributions, and he thinks "*it's nice when they're still fresh and impressionable* […] *Saves a lot of time later on*" (2014: 191, original emphasis). In my reading, particular students within this classroom are produced as sexualised subjects in/through the Professor's gaze, the women 'frisky', the men 'fresh and impressionable'. The power relations between the teacher and the students in this classroom are thus constructed through the sexualising gaze of the Professor. In contexts of staff-student sexual violence, the classroom also involves a site in which gendered relations and institutionalized hierarchies come to bear on this everyday part of university life in the UK.

The classroom, however, extends beyond formal spaces of the lecture theatre or the seminar. In my fieldwork I found that the politics of staff-student sexual violence was most discernable outside of 'formal' classroom spaces. It was in the pub after workshops, in office hours, in meetings with heads of departments. As well as while attending EDI training sessions and committee meetings that my participants relayed what they learnt about everyday (in)security within the university and how institutional negotiations over (in)security worked (or didn't work). In pubs after workshops students navigated "fending off" (Anthony, INT1) men in their department, in office hour meetings students who had complained of staff-student sexual violence were labelled "troublemakers" (Elizabeth, INT3), and debated the existence of open secrets in regard to staff-student sexual violence and a lack of institutional action. In EDI meetings when staff-student sexual violence entered the agenda, a complex negotiation of scandal, institutional denial, notions of legitimate modes of 'protection' for staff and students and competing institutional priorities of (in)security.

My intervention into this terrain thus involves extending the site of the classroom of (in)security beyond these 'formal' spaces, and into these everyday sites in which relations of staff-student sexual violence and (in)security are learned, negotiated and contested. This builds on feminist and postcolonial understandings of how everyday life shows us that classrooms, as spaces we learn about the politics of (in)security, are much more expansive than the lecture theatre or the seminar room (Shilliam, 2020). As such, the classroom spills out into everyday life in the university, into corridors, office hours, workshops, and training sessions. In this chapter, then, I conceive of the classroom as less of a fixed institutional space

bounded by traditional notions of what it means to enter a university classroom, instead locating everyday spaces in the university where we can learn about how (in)security functions in everyday life. In this sense it is everyday life within the university, imbued as it is in relations of violence, institutional hierarchies, and staff-student sexual violence that comes to constitute a classroom on everyday sexual violence and (in)security.

Scene 1: The EDI Training Workshop

Michael has organized an EDI training workshop, where he will be offering training on the university's guidelines that discourage staff-student relationships but do not ban them. Alongside this, he's delivering a seminar-style session to the group on power dynamics in the classroom, acceptable and unacceptable behaviour policies, and institutional support for students who've experienced sexual violence. Student and staff representatives from across the Humanities departments as his university are in attendance. Beginning his session on the university's new guidelines on staff-student relationships, several Professors shake their heads. After they've been shuffled into small groups to discuss Michael's first question 'What kind of power relations should we be aware of in the classroom?', a discussion ensues between several students and academic staff members:

Declan, a Professor of Anthropology, asks if the new universities guidelines are dangerously close to legislating love between consenting adults on campus, and if any untoward consequences have really happened as a result of student-staff relationships. Eloise, an undergraduate representative for the department of Sociology rolls her eyes, tired of people questioning whether or not sexual violence really happens or not in these sessions. She comes back to Declan's comments despite his seniority, suggesting that what's at stake isn't love on campus but students' safety. Sensing hostility brewing, Lara, a Senior Lecturer in Politics attempts to shift the conversation along in a more positive note, suggesting that the existence of the new guidelines and the training session will help the university's Silver Athena Swan accreditation application next year. Sarah, a PhD student in Philosophy suggests that the new guidelines have probably been made to help the university improve their reputation and avoid the scandals other universities have seen over the last few years.

Lessons on University Negotiations of (in)Security

In this scene, we can delineate several interwoven processes within the everyday that speak to negotiations over (in)security in the context of the classroom. This scene offers an exhibit of the development of equality, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at universities, where universities in the UK have utilized educational spaces and classroom contexts as a means to generate more inclusive practices on campus and provide new policies and training to mitigate violence and discrimination on campus. At times, these initiatives offer students and staff members to come together to learn, discuss, and enact these initiatives (Ahmed, 2012). In regard to sexual violence more specifically, there exists a plethora of campaigns and initiatives across universities in the UK. These focus on reducing levels of sexual violence on campus, providing support for students who have experienced sexual violence, and the development of improved reporting mechanisms. These include, for example: Zero Tolerance policies against sexual violence, the distribution of rape alarms at fresher's week events, safe taxi schemes, consent training classes that are compulsory for new undergraduate students, and anonymous reporting systems (Donaldson et al, 2018; Phipps and Smith, 2012).

As university efforts to develop more inclusive practices have expanded across universities in the UK, so have institutional markers of 'success' in these endeavors been produced. For Ahmed (2012: 57), diversity work can become "one means for pursuing [a] prior end of excellence; [where] diversity becomes a technology for this pursuit". Underscored here are the relationships between institutional drives to diversify the university, while at the same time pursuing 'excellence' on the national and international stage. Institutional 'excellence' can be understood as bound up in a neoliberal and marketized project that has seen university structures more readily attached to questions of capital (Phipps, 2020; Phipps and Smith, 2012). The pursuit of 'excellence' both locks in and reproduces the hierarchical stratification of universities within the UK, which are classed and racialised.

Athena Swan accreditation processes, for example, originated in STEM subjects as a project centered upon redressing the gender balance within these subjects and increasing the

number of women engaging in science degrees and at more senior levels within the university. Developing on from this project, Athena Swan accreditation has become a process in which universities apply for Gold, Silver, or Bronze awards on the basis of evidencing their 'success' to challenging gender inequality in their university. The awards serve as indicators plastered across university websites, and posted on job advertisements, an indicator of a 'good place to work' or a 'good place to study' because of the university's excellence in gender equality. However, research into universities who have achieved Athena Swan awards has shown there is no concrete evidence these universities have significantly challenged experiences of sexism or gender discrimination within the university. Additionally, the only universities to have achieved 'Gold' awards are all Russell Group institutions, underscoring what is already a hierarchy of universities across the UK. This particularly intersects with different financial capabilities of universities across the UK, given that taking initiatives required for this application process, such as funding training workshops, comes at a cost (Tsouroufli, 2019; Tzanakou and Pearce, 2019).

The development of training workshops and policies and initiatives relating to sexual violence gendered and racialised practices of violence and discrimination are increasingly present in institutional contexts of (in)security more broadly. Militaries, for example, have engaged in processes of developing policies surrounding sexual violence between service members and constructed themselves as (newly) inclusive spaces. The UK military's 'Made in the Royal Navy' campaign (Ministry of Defence, n.d), for example, released three campaign videos, showing the Navy to be a 'way out' for young working-class men and young working-class women of colour. This campaign speaks to an attempt to reconstitute the military not only as a place where these groups are included and represented within the ranks but of the military as space where people can 'make themselves' into the person they want to be, with no limitations to the potential for their success, if they join. International Institutions of security, particularly in the context of the GPS/WPS agenda, have likewise engaged in extensive efforts to develop practices, protocols, and training, for example in the aftermath of SEA in peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations. This includes, for example, the development of new policies surrounding sexual misconduct in peacekeeping operations, and gender mainstreaming training both within this context and as a broader umbrella for efforts to

generate institutional change in the (re)production of gendered insecurities (Simic, 2012; Ndulo, 2009; Henry, 2013; Bleckner, 2013; Karim and Beardsley, 2016).

As I remarked upon in Chapter one, everyday practices of (in)security on campus involve the construction policies, procedures, and campaigns that form part of apparatuses of 'securing the campus', and particularly students from violence and discrimination. The training session on EDI work at universities marks a classroom of (in)security because it exhibits an everyday mediation on how institutional responses to insecurities produced by staff-student sexual violence are negotiated. As this is embedded within the context of EDI at UK universities, this scene is situated within the wider context of university initiatives that aim to provide security from a range of harms relating to violence and discrimination on campus.

The EDI training session then, is a scene that is illustrative of the ways EDI work involves bringing students and staff members across the university to "work on" (Ahmed, 2012: 22, emphasis removed) matters relating to violence and (in)security in everyday life on campus. It offers a window into the ways that students and staff members respond to everyday staff-student sexual violence.

Declan, Eloise, Lara and Sarah's conversation illuminates a series of contestations and negotiations regarding the development of policies and training practices in contexts of staff-student sexual violence. Including debate over whether sexual violence 'really happens', what authority the university has to legislate relationships between members of the university community, and concurrent desires to escape 'scandal' in the news media and achieve Athena Swan accreditation. These competing strands as evidenced in the small group conversation give rise to a series of experiences many of my participants relayed to me. Many of my participants were deeply engaged in EDI work in their universities, but simultaneously encountered a series of pushbacks to their work relating to issues of staff-student sexual violence. Alongside this, they noted an ambivalence towards the priorities of their universities, questioning to what extent work was done in the service of protecting students from harm, and what does done in the service of protecting structures of power within the university. This gave rise to an interplay in particular of scandal, reputation, pushbacks to generating institutional policy, and frustration at the lack of progress. These were critical focal

points of the negotiation on (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in the context of EDI work, as reflected in the above scene.

Pushback and Frustration

Pushback to policies and initiatives surrounding staff-student sexual violence, and subsequent frustration felt by those engaged in EDI related work in this context were a common theme in my fieldwork. In the above scene, Declan's fears of 'legislating love' and questioning whether or not instances of sexual abuse 'really happen' are of everyday modes of pushback to the work done to shift university structures. The idea of 'legislating love', for Anthony (INT1) worked to obfuscate relations of power between staff and students, which he labored in his EDI work to have recognized in university policy. At the same time, Declan's questioning of whether or not staff-student sexual violence 'really happens' or not underscores a politics of credibility that circulates in contexts of sexual violence, whereby experiences of sexual violence is questioned. The frustration Eloise feels is a common experience of those engaged in these negotiations over sexual violence and (in)security on campus. As Ahmed writes, "frustration can be a feminist record" (Ahmed, 2021: 7), where rolling your eyes constitute a "feminist pedagogy". As a feminist record, rolling one's eyes is an indicator of the record of pushback to feminist work to combat the persistence of staff-student sexual violence in university spaces, as a pedagogy it signals the lessons that (feminist) frustration provides in this context. Taken together, resistance and frustration underscore an everyday lessons on how contestations over everyday staff-student sexual violence, where doing this work can feel like a "tug of war" (Alicia, INT3).

Students and staff members who attempted to change their universities approach on staff-student sexual violence, or even simply have their university acknowledge this was happening at their university, were met with multiple forms of pushback. Anthony (INT1), for example, struggled in his work with pushback to policies regarding staff-student sexual violence. This pushback, however, was simultaneously coupled with being repeatedly asked to give training sessions on staff-student relationships and gendered politics of institutional power in the student-teacher relationship. In his experience as an academic, activist and EDI worker in the university, the negotiation between pushback and university reputation framed his everyday negotiation with staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security. Experiencing

"resistance" to attempts to ban staff-student relationships was navigated in the context of arguments pertaining to "preventing a lifelong love" between consenting adults on campus (Anthony, INT1).

For Anthony these pushbacks were iterative of a revision of what staff-student sexual relations were entailing on campus. These, in his experience, had ranged from encompassing "casual sexual relationships" between male academic staff and women PhD students, to instances of sexual harassment between male academic staff and women PhD students. These instances of sexual harassment had significant impacts on women within his field, pushing "the woman, the PhD students, out of academia" (Anthony, INT1). This was visible in the marked decline of women students across hierarchies within the field, tantamount to an "awful attrition rate, you know we are at 50% women at undergrad, and it basically drops by about 10% at each career stage after that" (Anthony, INT1). Against this backdrop, it was not only staff-student sexual relationships that were met with pushback, but broader calls to diversify curriculums, and calls to diversify citational practice, particularly in respect to scholars of colour and women in his field of study. These practices are worked as ways to secure gendered and racialised university cultures that privileged white and male scholars in his department and his field. While Anthony's work was explicitly oriented towards protecting students, and explicitly women students, from gendered forms of (in)security and sexual harassment in the department, the pushback worked to reinscribe white/male hierarchies of power within his department.

For Alicia (INT3) and Elizabeth (INT2), pushback in their universities worked specifically around the refusal to acknowledge that everyday staff-student sexual violence was a problem on their university campuses. In EDI meetings, Alicia's (INT3) university refused to engage in conversations around staff-student sexual violence, despite them figuring as "10%" of cases reported to her university's sexual violence liaison team. In meetings where she attempted to suggest that academic staff members attend mandatory classes on consent in the context of unequal power relations, she was met with silence. For Elizabeth, her university's responses to similar attempts to hold staff members accountable for their involvement in sexual violence were met with a university line that "no no no, we never have these issues, that doesn't happen here". For Alicia (INT3), these experiences were like a "tug of war, like

does it exist does it not exist, is this happening, is this not happening". This contributed to questioning the legitimacy and credibility of students' experiences of sexual violence, proving "upsetting and triggering for a lot of people involved in this process, because they do have experience of the issues at hand" (Alicia, INT3). Believing in the experiences of staff-student sexual violence amongst her peers then, produced immense feelings of frustration towards a university that disavowed these students' experiences.

The refusal to engage in conversations on staff-student sexual violence, to believe it is happening, or facilitate policies, initiatives or support in these instances is part of a wider landscape in which issues of staff-student sexual violence receive considerably less attention than issues of sexual violence between students across universities (NUS, 2018; Bull and Rye, 2019). While, as I have remarked, there exists a large proportion of campaigns, policies, and initiatives directed at combating sexual violence on campus, these largely focus on student-student issues of sexual violence on university campuses. As a result, large swathes of universities across the UK have a lack of engagement with issues regarding staff-student sexual violence, contributing to a notable absence of training, campaigns, as well as modes of protection for students in this context.

Overwhelmingly, the impacts of this on those involved in EDI amounted to intense feelings of frustration that the university was unwilling to challenge structures, provide more support for students, or even believe that staff-student sexual violence was happening. The labour involved in this work and the constant push backs from universities had enormous impacts on those involved in EDI work, and their faith in their universities. Alicia (INT3) asked whether she could "even do feminism" within her university anymore, precisely because she was "within an institution that [was] harming their students". At the same time, the "tug of war" that moved back and forward for her was a block that stopped her from having "the real debates [she was] really interested in", about "transformative justice [and] all the things [she'd] learned about in her classes" for her undergraduate degree. For Elizabeth (INT2), the experience was so "distressing", "disgusting" and made her so "angry" that she and another student filed a legal complaint against her institution.

In the context of a surge in EDI commitments, campaigns, and university initiatives to combat sexual violence on campus, and respond to inequalities relating to gender, race, and other

forms of discrimination on campus, these experiences were indicative for these participants of a persistent institutional resistance that contradicted public institutional claims to provide safe, inclusive environments. At once then, university claims to support students and staff members from matters relating to sexual violence occurred alongside universities refusing to "look at it, to hear about it or talk about it" (Elizabeth, INT2). This was illustrative of a discord between public campaigns, initiatives, and accreditations, inside the university the story was at odds with this outward presentation. For many participants, these contradictory practices were indicative of the university's investment in their outward reputation, while inwardly the university often worked to "silence" (Elizabeth, INT3) issues of staff-student sexual violence. Here my participants felt that institutions worked to keep abusers "protected" (Alicia, INT3), as well as university reputations, underscoring a hierarchy of priorities of 'security' in the university. As I examine in the next section, the institutional desire to foster this outward presentation while engaging in silencing tactics on the inside was iterated in particular through a desire to avoid public scandal that would damage the university's reputation as a safe, inclusive, and equal environment.

Scandal and Reputation

Institutions globally have been exposed in numerous 'sex scandals', in which sexual violence within or perpetrated by members of institutions has entered the public eye. This has often resulted in the circulation of information regarding the 'scandal', including the experiences of sexual violence uncovered, reported in the news media as well as increasingly on social media (Gore et al, 2022). Sex scandals across international politics are numerous, including: scandals in the military including the exposure of soldier's engagement with local sex workers, including the solicitation of children; SEA in peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations; sexual violence committed by high ranking members of international political economy institutions, such as Dominique Strauss Khan, then director of the International Monetary Fund, accused of sexually assaulting a hotel worker; and the Harvey Weinstein scandal, which saw a large number of women come forward within the entertainment industry to give their stories of his sexual abuse in the workplace (Gore et al, 2022; Montoya, 2016; Enloe, 2000b).

Within this wider context, universities across the UK, India, South Africa, the United States and Australia have been embroiled in various 'sex scandals' on campus (Tongai, 2013; Dey

and Mendes, 2022; Sundarum and Jackson, 2018; Yang, 2022; Canales, Cassidy and Remeikis, 2023). For Gore et al (2022: 94), the 'scandal' is typically understood as "when moral or legal wrongdoing is exposed and causes outrage". 'Outrage' here is intimately connected to the production of the scandal as an exceptional form of violence, wrongdoing, institutional failure, or all of the above. As the 'scandal' involves the production of violence/institutional failings as exceptional, this framing has a number of consequences for how sexual violence is understood, as well as the responsibility of institutions in which acts of sexual violence are committed. This posits acts of sexual violence as exceptional aberrations, as opposed to 'normal/acceptable' behaviour, and is indicative of perceptions regarding institutional power and responsibility to address and protect members of their institutions from sexual violence. Within this, critical to the construction of the 'sex scandal' in institutional contexts, including the university, is abuse of power (Sundarum and Jackson, 2018; Gore et al, 2022). In contexts of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities, the abuse of power is located both within the asymmetrical power relationship between students and their teachers, but also the institutions complicity in this abuse of power. The institutional abuse of power is often encompassed by a failure to respond to abuse, or being seen to protect perpetrators. This is an abuse of power because the institution has the power to secure and there is an expectation that this power should be wielded to protect those who experience violence.

Sex scandals in universities across the UK and internationally have typically involved cases of staff-student sexual violence, or university failures to adequately respond to instances of staff-student sexual violence or issues of student-student cases of sexual violence. For instance, in UK universities, 'scandals' have erupted over the cases such as those at the University of Sussex. This case involved a student who had been in a relationship with her lecturer, having met him through classes at the university. During this relationship, she experienced severe physical abuse. This case entered the headlines both as a story of inappropriate sexual relationships, abuses of power, as well as an institutional failure to adequately protect the student, and hold the staff member accountable for his actions (Westmarland, 2017; Batty, 2017). The University of Warwick came under scrutiny in the news for their refusal to investigate acts of sexual violence that occurred between members of the university community off the official campus, and the failure to adequately discipline several male undergraduate students for their participation in a 'rape chat' on a Facebook Chat. In

this chat, among other sexualised and misogynistic messages they made jokes about how they were going to "rape [a] whole flat [of women undergraduate students] to teach them a lesson" (Lee and Kennelly, 2019: n.p). The University of Edinburgh hit the headlines as a result of the Instagram account *EdiAnonymous*, which posted testimonies from students who had experienced sexual harassment, rape, and assault both from other students and staff members. Including, for example, one student's experience of being 'stealthed'[14] by an academic member of staff (Butcher, 2020).

In the scene of the EDI training session, the notion of the scandal looms, and is closely intertwined with notions of institutional reputation. The interconnection between scandal and reputation fused due to the 'moral or legal failing' that serves to produce the 'sex scandal' often being dually held by the perpetrator of abuse and by the institution that fostered an environment that enabled that abuse to occur. Here the institution is often seen as failing in its duty to protect students and staff from experiencing violence within the university, and/or failing to respond to the to the instances of sexual violence in a way deemed appropriate. For example, the University of Sussex came under fire not only because the abuse occurred, but for failing to fire the senior lecturer in question, and for allowing him to continue supervising students while the investigation was ongoing (Westmarland, 2017; Batty, 2017). In Westmarland's (2017) review into the case, she found that Human Resources (HR) handled the investigation. In part using previous student evaluations of his teaching, HR deemed him not to be a "risk" to the safety of campus, as he "did not generally assault people at work" (Westmarland, 2017: 3). This was despite being under police investigation for allegations of violently abusing the student he had been in a relationship with, including stamping on her face and pouring salt in her eyes, for which he was later convicted of assault by beating (Westmarland, 2017; Batty, 2017). Students surveyed as part of Westmarland's investigation felt that the university had reinforced institutionalised hierarchies by prioritising the lecturer and the university rather than the victim of abuse in the handling of this case. While in this case the university had attempted to construct a "wall of silence" (Westmarland, 2017: 7) around the case at the time, as the events came out in the press and the independent review

---

[14] 'Stealthing' or 'being stealthed' refers to non-consensual removal of a condom during sex.

was subsequently conducted, staff and students at the university felt this had an immeasurable impact on the universities reputation in the public eye.

In my fieldwork, the avoidance of scandal as a mode of persevering institutional reputation became a key theme in the negotiation of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security in everyday life. Participants felt that the institutional need to avoid a scandal, and the failure to protect students from harm, reflected an institutional priority whereby the reputation of the university became the object of security, rather than those students who had experienced staff-student sexual violence. As institutional reputation and the avoidance of scandal come together, it is clear then that part of the "transgression" (Gore et al, 2022: 94) that produces actions or events as scandalous in the context of the university figures around a failure to provide adequate measures of 'security' for students, instead focusing on the security of the institution.

Securing institutional reputation, for my participants, worked through practices that aimed to keep knowledge of staff-student sexual violence and institutional (in)security from getting 'out there'. This largely involved attempts to keep knowledge and information of staff-student sexual violence and university responses within the university itself, in order to avoid it spilling into the public eye. The protection of university reputation and the fear of a scandal was illustrated by Elizabeth (INT2), where, after a class at her university, several students who had made complaints of sexual violence were told they "should not say anything and just get over it [that they couldn't] say anything to [their] parents or friends back home because then they might tell the neighbours and then they might tell their friends and then word might get out". For Alicia (INT3), her university was particularly "obsessed with this idea of the whistle-blower", leading to their clamping down on online activist pages where students had shared experiences of sexual violence (student-student and staff-student) at her university.

On the one hand, the whistle-blower marks a key figure that threatens an institution's security as they spread information of violence, harm, or illegal activity present within an institution into the public eye. Simultaneously, the whistle-blower is situated as a figure who acts in the interest of those being harmed by the institution. The whistle-blower thus straddles a complex position in regard to the provision of 'security' in the university. On the one hand, they are a threat to the security of the universities reputation, on the other, they might be

figured as acting to provide security to those within the university experiencing violence or harm. There is therefore contestation here that underscores different positions on the referent object of security in this context, with securing the university and securing students being situated in opposition to one another. The universities 'obsession' with this (potential) figure in Alicia's (INT3) case, was pivotal to a push to keep knowledge of relations of violence and (in)security within the university, for fear of it getting 'out there'. Mechanisms for keeping relations of (in)security inside the institution are thus indicative how institutional priorities of (in)security are at times at odds with the protection of students and staff from harm, but figure into maintaining university reputations on the 'outside'. This underscores how relations of (in)security and staff-student sexual violence are embedded in practices of (in)security that (re)produce the boundaries of what is inside/outside of the university.

Attempts by universities to use institutional apparatuses to keep knowledge of everyday staff-student sexual violence and (in)security on the 'inside' contributed to an overarching cynicism about the universities claims to generate safe, diverse and inclusive spaces. For Alicia (INT3), she lamented that her university feared the 'whistle-blower' instead of doing the work to reduce violence on campus and combat gendered and racialised structures within the university. As she put it, "it's like, you wouldn't have a problem with whistleblowing if you actually dealt with the problem that has been occurring here for so many years". For Anthony (INT1), while he thought that conducting training sessions around the university meant that they were 'getting through', it became clear in this process that the university's requests for training were less concerned with greater development of student protections from harm in contexts of staff-student sexual violence, but more with institutional reputation. As he told me: "initially we thought it was great, but it became clear that it was actually something of a tick box exercise for departments who wanted to get Athena Swan accreditation" (Anthony, INT1). For Anthony, then, the reputation of the university figured into the proliferation of EDI training requests on issues of staff-student sexual violence, but where this reputation combined with the promotion of gender equality, it belied a performative practice where the university's reputation was on the line. At the same time as working to bolster the institutional reputation at the university via Athena Swan accreditation, he found in his participation in EDI work that his university was largely working to "avoid a scandal" (Anthony, INT1).

On the one hand, the negotiation of (in)security via a politics of what is inside/outside the institution replicates familiar narratives in institutions of (in)security and that contribute to how violence is kept inside institutions in contexts of (in)security and sexual violence. And, importantly, those looking to speak out are silenced. At the same time, however, we can also reflect here on how the circulation of knowledge of staff-student sexual violence and (in)security within the university also troubles the public/private and inside/outside as clear distinctions. While attempts to circumvent the scandal figure as mechanisms for keeping violence on the inside, knowledge of these instances circulate throughout everyday classrooms and in everyday conversations within the university. Staff-student sexual violence, university failures to protect students, and what university mechanisms of 'security' are for, are not only discussed in EDI training sessions but in conversations that occur throughout universities. These conversations extend between colleagues and friends across institutions and international borders. Rosa (INT5), for instance, in her activism and in her role as an academic gathered stories and helped students and staff who had experienced staff-student sexual violence within various universities across the UK, Canada and the United States.

As conversations proliferate throughout universities and across institutional and international borders, this signals points at which the distinctions between public/private, inside/outside become more porous. Critically, this highlights the circulation of knowledge of staff-student sexual violence within and across university communities, though contexts that form part of everyday life. While a scandal produces sexual violence and institutional failures as exceptional acts of violence and exceptional institutional failures, this illustrates how staff-student sexual violence, institutional failures are routine aspects of daily life. The question at hand, therefore, is not about a neat distinction between public/private, inside/outside, but of in what contexts everyday staff-student sexual violence comes to be understood as public, and in what contexts knowledge of everyday (in)security threatens the reputation on the 'outside'.

As I examine in the next scene of this chapter, the circulation of these stories within and across universities has come to be understood as 'open secrets' surrounding the problem of staff-student sexual violence within universities. The 'open secret' is indicative of the widespread knowledge of these forms of violence. At the same time, however, unpacking the 'open

secret' in contexts of staff-student sexual violence underscores the ways in which the circulation of knowledge across universities is situated within an institutional politics that impacts how knowledge of everyday staff-student sexual violence is shared.

Scene 2: The Office Hour with the Head of Department

Charlotte, Warda, Branwen and Lily, are three master's students who have all organized to meet with Head of the Politics Department, Daniel, to discuss what they think is an open secret in the department. Everyone seems to know that three members of staff have been continually harassing masters and PhD students. One of whom has been continually making inappropriate comments at drinks after research seminars, and the other two have persistently been texting and emailing sexualized messages to students in the department. Several masters and PhD students have become absent from the department as a result. All of the master's and PhD students regularly talk about the actions of these students in social settings outside the department, and everyone seems to know about it. Warda and Branwen spoke to their dissertation supervisors, who suggested they avoid drinks after seminars in future. At the beginning of the meeting, they tell the Head of the Department about the behaviours they have seen, witnessed, and heard about regarding these three members of staff. They are angry and frustrated that everyone in the department seems to know, but nothing is being done about it. They feel that the department is deliberately protecting these staff members by refusing to hold them accountable for their behaviour. Shocked and appalled at the behaviour, Daniel tells the students he had no idea that any of this had been happening, no one had told him anything. The students struggle to believe him, asking if they all knew, how could he possibly not be aware of the actions of staff members in his own department?

Open Secrets in the University

The idea of sexual violence as an 'open secret' within universities builds on the everyday circulation of stories of sexual violence, where circulation of knowledge produces an environment in which 'everybody knows' about the existence of violence within the university. The notion of the open secret is not exclusive to universities, but more generally denotes a state in which knowledge of abuse or violence is widespread within any given context. While the idea that 'everybody knows' is what makes this 'open', the 'secret' generally refers both to this knowledge being kept largely within institutional communities, as well as entailing lack of institutional response to the sexual violence that 'everybody knows about' (Gore et al, 2022).

The above scene details a discussion of the open secret within a Politics department in a UK university. Here four master's students approach their Head of Department about the ongoing behaviour of three members of staff in the department that 'everyone knows about'. This knowledge is situated within a context whereby they feel nothing has been done to hold these men accountable for their behaviours towards PhD and master's students at after workshop drinks events and via text messages. The knowledge of this open secret throughout the department underscores their disbelief that their Head of Department 'couldn't know' this was happening.

In contexts of staff-student sexual violence at universities in the UK, the notion of the 'open secret' has been repeatedly iterated. For Anthony (INT1) #TimesUpAcademia, an offshoot of the #MeToo movement that focused on sexual violence in universities, particularly between staff members or between staff and students, illustrated on a large scale what had been an "open secret" in his field for years. For Elizabeth (INT3), the idea of the open secret was a painful indictment on her universities lack of protection for students. It was also indicative of the ways she felt betrayed by her university, as it worked to protect staff members engaged in sexual violence.

The everyday circulation of stories of staff-student sexual violence across universities in the UK facilitates the development of widespread knowledge of sexual violence, as well as institutional failures, such as the privileging of perpetrators of abuse. However, while the notion of the open secret is common in contexts of widespread sexual abuse, the sharing of knowledge of staff-student sexual violence in universities is mediated by and through gendered and heteronormative institutional hierarchies and structures of seniority/juniority in UK universities. This is not to say that there are not 'open secrets' regarding staff-student sexual violence in universities in the UK, but rather that knowledge and information of sexual violence circulates within the context of gendered, heteronormative and hierarchical structures within UK universities. As such, tracing this politics means tracking how these factors impact the circulation of knowledge across universities, and how this is a politics embedded in gendered and heteronormative practices.

In our interview, Anthony (INT1), wove a complex narrative of the politics that led to his failure to know about widespread issues of staff-student sexual harassment, which came to light while he was acting as the Head of Department. Anthony was engaged in a number of modes of activism and EDI work at his university. He was heavily engaged in EDI initiatives that hoped to produce training and policy surrounding staff-student sexual/romantic relationships. As well as this, he had presided over allegations of staff-student sexual violence within his university. However, at the same time, he was met with incredulity from students who refuted his claims he was not aware of persistent harassment of women PhD students by several male staff members within his department. In meetings with his students about this, he expressed that "some of these women PhD students would talk to [him] about this and [he] would say [he] didn't know they would […] kind of rightly express a lot of skepticism about that sort of say 'There's no way you didn't know, we all know'."

Experiencing these conversations with students, Anthony engaged in a two-part reflection on what he considered where a gendered and heteronormative politics that impacted his knowledge of everyday staff-student sexual violence in his department. Many of these stories had, he later found out, circulated among members of straight male staff in his department. He saw his absence from these conversations amongst straight men in the department as a result of heteronormative practices and sites of straight male bonding he was excluded from

as a queer man. Here he felt the culture amongst staff in the department was one in which "gay men are just not people that straight men" would talk to about the relationships they were having with students, the behaviours of other men towards at drinks events, and "who they're attracted to" amongst women in the PhD student body. Anthony (INT1) offered insight into the way gendered and heteronormative practices of 'male bonding' were central to the circulation of knowledge of staff-student sexual violence in his department, as well as how these facilitated heteronormative structures of inclusion/exclusion. These practices figured into modes of straight, masculine cultures that normalized both acts of sexual harassment towards women PhD students specifically, and their place in securing particular masculinised cultures of gendered violence. Relations of heteronormativity were a key mechanism through which these conversations were structured, impacting who was included or excluded in these practices, and resultantly impacting Anthony's (INT1) knowledge of everyday acts of staff-student sexual violence in his department, despite his level of seniority at the time.

While this works to evidence a particular function of gendered and heteronormative practices in contexts of staff-student sexual violence, gender factored in multiple ways in Anthony's (INT1) story. At the same time as his exclusion from these conversations between straight men in the department, Anthony implicated himself in what he considered to be a gendered pattern of "willful ignorance" (Anthony, INT1). Willful ignorance refers to a pattern of behaviours that involve practices of refusing to 'know'. While this can operate at the individual level, willful ignorance, particularly when widespread across a particular context - for example, an institution - can be understood as a structural force. In the context of race and racism in security studies, for example, building on the work of Mills and Krishna, Howell and Richter-Montpetit consider patterns of willful ignorance and willful amnesia as a "pervasive structural pattern of not knowing" (Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2023: 316, emphasis removed).

Anthony's (INT1) story involved individual acts where, witnessing inappropriate sexual behaviour, and hearing stories of sexual harassment in his department he "downplayed it, or pretended [he] didn't know". As well as this, his willful ignorance came to impact the structure of the department, where pretending he didn't know both served to "avoid doing something

about it". This worked to reinforce the normalization of everyday staff-student sexual violence in the the culture of the department, and also reinscribe a structural lack of institutional intervention. Downplaying it, or pretending he didn't know, were mechanisms that factored into the process where cultures and structures of everyday sexual violence became instituted, forced into "part of the background" (Ahmed, 2012: 21).

Anthony's (INT1) exposition of the gendered structures that underscored his knowledge also related to what he considered to be his relative position of privilege as a man in academia. He felt that being a man in his field had meant that he had been "completely unhindered, without any of these concerns [about sexual violence]", because in his experience women students were largely abused by (straight) male members of staff. Anthony's reflections on his own male privilege as a form of protection against sexual violence in academic contexts offer insight into male/masculine/heteronormative practices as central to the women's experiences staff-student sexual violence specifically. Notwithstanding Anthony's (INT1) reflections on male privilege within academic contexts, it is worth noting that this particular gendered 'script' of sexual violence when applied as a generalization can reinscribe gendered and racialised conceptions of sexual violence (Montoya, 2016). Indeed, recent studies have highlighted the experiences of staff-student sexual violence on male students at UK universities, with queer men reporting higher rates of this form of violence on campus than their straight counterparts[15] (NUS and 1752 Group, 2018).

Crucially, however, for those women PhD students who had come to Anthony to discuss the pervasive issues of staff-student sexual violence, issues of everyday staff student sexual violence where very much in the foreground of their experiences as students in this department. He felt that the open secret of staff-student sexual violence was constantly the topic of conversation amongst these PhD students as they navigated this ongoing problem in the department and had extensive knowledge of "who had done what and who had slept with who". Anthony's (INT1) willful ignorance, as he put it, was in part down to a failure to listen

---

[15] To date, there is no data on the experiences of nonbinary or trans individuals in this context.

to women specifically, that ""if [he'd] spoken more to women about this this wouldn't have been such a revelation".

The idea of both 'speaking to more women' and 'women coming forward' to tell senior institutional figures about problems of staff-student sexual violence is a common theme, here the idea being that if women come forward, something can and will be done to resolve the abuse. As Rosa (INT5) said on the topic of open secrets, "the students assume that everybody knows and they don't know until someone tells them, they don't necessarily see it, and so they'll feel like nobody cares but it's actually that nobody knows, and yes sometimes that's a kind of 'willful ignorance' not wanting to see it but sometimes it's a genuine lack of knowledge and you know?". The process of coming forward is seen as pivotal in breaking the 'open secret' and generating institutional response and change. However, as I will examine further in Chapter six, coming forward to have your story heard is itself implicated in a gendered and ableist politics, with often serious consequences for those who attempt to have their story heard.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I turned to the classroom as a critical site in which knowledge of (in)security is taught and learned within the university. Understanding the 'classroom' to spread beyond traditional or 'formal' understandings of the tutorial room or lecture theatre, I conceived of the classroom as extending beyond this, operating in multifaceted spaces within the university through which lessons on the politics of (in)security and staff-student sexual violence can be discerned. Following on from this, I fabulated two scenes of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. The first, the EDI training session, examined negotiations over (in)security and sexual violence in the context of universities across the UK engaging in various forms of work relating to equality, diversity, and inclusion. Here I looked to the EDI training workshop to examine negotiations over pushback, frustration, scandal, and reputation as key parts of the politics of (in)security and its navigation by those involved in EDI work in the context of staff-student sexual violence. Next, I fabulated the scene of the Office Hour with the Head of Department and explored the role of open secrets of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. I argued that the circulation of the open secret is

embedded within wider gendered and heteronormative practices in UK universities that impact the distribution of knowledge.

In the next chapter, I turn to the Conference in International Politics. Following on from the Classroom, The Conference focuses on a different site of knowledge production in UK universities. In this chapter, I explore the relationship(s) between the conference as an everyday site of knowledge production within the field of international politics and security studies, while also being a site in which everyday forms of staff-student sexual violence are enacted. Alongside this, I extend my analysis of the politics of telling stories of staff-student sexual violence in this chapter. I consider how gendered modes of knowledge sharing can also work as acts of resistance, looking specifically to the conference hotel bar to examine this. In the next chapter, I fabulate two scenes. Firstly, the scene of the 'Conference Presentation on Everyday Violence and (in)Security', and secondly, the scene of 'Colonial Cocktails at the Hotel Bar'.

Chapter 5: The Conference

Introduction

Following on from The Classroom, this chapter engages with the scene of The Conference in the field of international politics and security studies. The conference exhibits what is perhaps most obviously international site of inquiry. Scholars from universities around the world travel to meet up in conference hotels and convention centres, in order to participate in workshops, panel presentations, and roundtable discussions. Conferences in the field of international politics are critical sites for the development and exchange of (international) knowledge in international politics and security studies. This includes knowledge of the everyday and of sexual violence, and the relationship of these fields of study to questions of (in)security in the international. As feminist scholarship has developed within the field of security studies and international politics, more and more space at conferences has focused upon questions of the everyday, violence, and (in)security (Wibben, 2004; Wibben, 2011b). The conference is a critical part of the everyday academic calendar, an often-annual event that for PhD students in particular can act as an important initial foray into their field of study, and their career development.

At the same time, conference events are situated within a wider web of gendered, racialised and colonial forms of disciplinary violence. Scholars have highlighted the dominance of the Global North, Eurocentric modes of knowledge production, and everyday sexism and racism at conference events within this field (Weber, 2015; Wikinson et al, 2016; Shilliam, 2020). Engaging with this broader politics, I argue that everyday staff-student sexual violence is embedded within these wider relations of violence at conference events.

To do so, this chapter curates two scenes of staff-student sexual violence. The first, 'A conference presentation on sexual violence and everyday (in)security', presents a scene in which everyday staff-student sexual violence is enacted during the panel presentation. The scene prompts a disentangling of the layers of the everyday. I do so in the service of exploring how everyday enactments of violence are present in the context of everyday knowledge

production. Here I argue that everyday staff-student sexual violence plays a critical role in disciplinary practices of gendered and racialised modes of violence and structural hierarchies within the fields of international politics and security studies. The second scene: 'Colonial cocktails at the hotel bar', explores the 'hotel bar' and the ways these relations of everyday violence configure in the reproduction of white/male/elite/hierarchical institutional space, as well as how everyday acts of resistance underscore both everyday collective negotiations of (in)security and gendered institutional labour. Taken together, these underscore how the elision of public/private, formal/informal space at the conference is a critical site through which we can discern the politics of everyday staff-student sexual violence at the conference.

What is a conference?

Academic conferences are routine events in the academic calendar, often happening annually. At these conferences, scholars from across the world come together to put on panels and roundtable events, give paper presentations and exchange feedback on work in progress. Bringing together academics and PhD students from different universities and across international borders. Conferences, then, are cross-institutional and transnational spaces of knowledge production and exchange. For PhD students, conferences can seem like a 'rite of passage', and are a valuable opportunity to receive feedback, meet scholars in their field, navigate the post-PhD job market, and gain a deeper understanding of their field of study.

At the same time the conference is a space in which relations of violence are reproduced within the discipline. This has been explored by feminist and de/colonial scholars and activists within international politics and security studies. Although conferences have seen a significant increase in events relating to feminist, post/decolonial knowledge, and expertise on and about the Global South, conference events remain embedded within patterns of gendered and racialised marginalisation (Davenport, 2004; Weber, 2015; Wilkinson et al, 2016; Shilliam, 2020; Särmä, 2016; Zalewski, 2016; Guildford, 2018; Zvobgo, 2023; Valeriano, 2008).

As I remarked upon in Chapter 1, conferences were organised for the specific purpose of shoring up colonial power and influence within universities across the British Empire and settler colonial regions (Pietch, 2011). Contemporarily, these racialised logics persist in the

structure and everyday experience of conference events in international politics. Feminist and post/decolonial scholars in international politics and security scholars have examined the role of the conference in reproducing structures and cultures of sexism, racism, and coloniality within the field. Their analysis involves highlighting both the structural components of the conference, such as where conferences are held, who attends, and what forms of knowledge are prioritised on conference panels, presentations, and roundtables. As well as the ways that sexism and racism permeate throughout the conference as everyday practices and encounters between scholars in the field (Davenport, 2004; Weber, 2015; Wilkinson et al, 2016; Shilliam, 2020; Särmä, 2016; Zalewski, 2016; Guildford, 2018; Zvobgo, 2023; Valeriano, 2018).

While, for instance, the conference is a transnational and multi-institutional event, Conference Associations such as the British International Studies Association, the European International Studies Association, and the International Studies Association and their annual events continue to be configured as the eminent conferences within the field. Their geographical location in the UK, Europe and North America are spatial manifestation of the dominance of these regions within international politics, a history and practice interwoven with the racialised violence of the international system, and the development of the conference as a tool of colonial rule. The conference is a thus site in which gendered and racialised practices within the discipline of international politics are enacted in everyday ways, as exhibited by the routine practice of "[a]ll-male panels, all-white panels, mansplaining, everyday persistent sexism and cissexism" (Zalewski, 2016: 492). This politics is interconnected with the wider history of the conference as a site of knowledge production within a field that is inextricably tied to relations of gendered and racialised violence and the production of a colonial international order.

Scholars from the Global South, for instance, are regularly unable to attend these conferences contributing what overall is the high concentration of white, European, and North American scholars participating in these conference events. Weber (2015) highlighted the pervasive whiteness of the Sapphire Series at the ISA's 2015 convention in New Orleans, where all scholars participating in the series, which included panels on Epistemology in IR and The State of IR theory, were all white scholars from the Global North. As Eken (in Wilkinson et al, 2016:

479) reflects upon in their story of these institutionalised inequalities, conference events require scholars to "incur various expenses to be deemed safe to be unleashed and accepted by international authorities […] Put simply, one must prove oneself a responsible, non-threatening individual". The conference is therefore situated within a wider web of relations of international (in)security that operate within hierarchical logics and world ordering that continue to privilege the White Western scholar. Racialised and colonial practices of world ordering and the continued dominance of White/Western/Male spheres of knowledge within the discipline of international politics come together to constitute the space of the conference as it "continues to cohere through good old inconspicuous absences: over presences of white-western-male, fewer presences of white-western female, and many absences of the rest" (Wilkinson et al, 2016: 479). This is testament to the ways the conference reproduces the "Western university as the privileged site of knowledge production" (Bambra, Gabriel and Nasinglu, 2018: 3), as well as how "Eurocentric histories and geographies shape and inform the field of security studies" (Barkawi and Laffey, 2006: 495).

Gendered encounters are ubiquitous at the conference, manifest in myriad ways. Including all-male panels, the mansplaining refrain of 'it's more of a comment than a question', persistent "manterruption" (Wilkinson et al, 2016: 482), and the continued marginalisation of feminist knowledge at the conference. Saara Särmä, for example, weaves a personal narrative of everyday sexism at the conference in her paper, which begins with an encounter with the all-male panel. The all-male panel, for Särmä is indicative of "the pervasive existence of all-male panels keeps women's expertise invisible and in the margins. It also reproduces white middle-aged (and older) men as the only source of serious expertise in many fields" (Särmä, 2016: 471). All male panels are a particular iteration of gendered practices that reinstate both the IR as a disciplinary field of knowledge production and the conference as a white/male dominated space.

While gendered, racialised, and colonial practices have been subject to attention by these scholars, issues of staff-student sexual violence at conference events are under researched. My fieldwork is the first set of data that focuses on staff-student sexual violence at academic conferences specifically. In this fieldwork, I found that everyday acts of staff-student sexual violence were pervasive throughout conference events in the field of international politics.

My participants' stories brought together the hotel, the hotel bar, the conference dinner, and the panel presentation as ongoing sites of everyday staff-student sexual violence. This including: "men trying to pick up women" (Heather, SUR2), "so many drunk inappropriate conversations, sexual come ons etc. at every conference" (Ola, SUR2), "being approached via text regarding sex while presenting at a conference" (Amari, SUR1), "sexual banter, inappropriate jokes, and a culture that made women feel very uncomfortable and insecure" (Sasha, SUR2), and "offers to co-publish in reward for sex" (Roisin, SUR2). The prevalence of everyday sexual violence at conference events is an important focal point through which to examine the relationship between the conference as a site of knowledge production and as embedded within the (re)production of gendered and racialised contours of the discipline. In the first scene of this chapter, I work to elucidate the politics through which the conference is simultaneously a site where knowledge of everyday sexual violence is produced, and everyday staff-student sexual violence is enacted.

Scene 1: A Conference Presentation on Sexual Violence and Everyday (in)Security

Ayla, a PhD student at a UK University, is attending the conference to give a presentation based on the first chapter of her thesis. Her thesis is about the everyday lives of women in Haiti who have experienced sexual violence and abuse of power from peacekeepers, and have tried to report this to the United Nations. To explore this context, she brings together the work of feminist studies scholars like Cynthia Enloe (2000), Annick Wibben (2011) and Maria Stern (2005), who are interested in women's lives and their stories of (in)security and international politics, and Laura Shepherd who has written extensively about the (re)production of gendered violence and the United Nations, with Rana Jaleel's (2021) The Work of Rape, which thinks through the interrelationships between race/racism, coloniality, international law and law making practices regarding sexual violence.

Ayla didn't sleep all night, her stomach is swirling with nausea, her palms are clammy, and her mouth is perpetually dry. It's her first conference presentation, and there are a lot of people she admires in the room, including someone she hopes will examine her thesis one day (when it's finally finished). Also in the audience is a man from her department, who is a

senior academic. She'd rather he wasn't present, because last night at the conference drinks
he got drunk enough to ask all of the young women around if they'd walk him home (and by
that he meant to his hotel room).

The panel is intimidating, mainly because everyone else seems to be a fully-fledged
security studies scholar already. They've all got PhDs and postdocs or lectureships or
professorships and they are here to share their expertise on everyday life and sexual violence
in a variety of contexts, from the lives of those in immigration detention to feminist activists
in Bosnia. Their papers analyse the interconnections of gender and race, think how women
engage in acts of resistance, and argue we need to do more to think about disability in
contexts of sexual violence and the everyday.

As her presentation begins her heart rate slows and the nerves subside; she's doing well,
she thinks. People are nodding along in the audience, others still look interested, only a few
people are scrolling on their phones. After her presentation, she sits down, ready for the
Questions, hoping no one asks something she does not have an answer to. The chair is about
to take the first question from the audience, when her phone lights up, she has a text from
the senior lecturer from her department, and it's more of a comment than a question: "Great
presentation, my room number is 305. Come up later." Trying to supress her emotions, Ayla
puts her phone down, and takes another question from the audience, who asks her "Why
understand the experiences of women in Haiti through the everyday?".

Everyday (in)security and sexual violence at the conference

Ayla's story depicts a familiar scene in feminist security studies. She's presenting on her first
panel as a PhD student in feminist security studies, and her work considers the everyday,
sexual violence, and post-colonial and peacekeeping contexts. She's nervous and excited; she
wants to do well. She's amongst scholars she admires and she's hoping to get some
interesting questions that will help her with her thesis. So are the other presentations on the
panel familiar to feminist security studies. They are presentations on the everyday in familiar
sites of (in)security: conflict/post-conflict regions and state violence, border practices and the

politics of migration. At the same time, the scene of the conference panel on the everyday in feminist security studies is a space in which sexual violence is enacted in the form of a text message. This is not an isolated presentation of staff-student sexual violence, but an ongoing pattern of behaviour that Ayla knows about because she saw it happening last night at the conference drinks reception.

The above scene of the conference presentation exhibits multiple layers of the everyday, (in)security, and sexual violence at conference events. The conference panel is a site in which feminist security studies scholars share (feminist) knowledge of the everyday, how it relates to questions of sexual violence, and what this means for the study of everyday (in)security. It is here that iterations of sexual violence and (in)security are presented; the politics of women experiencing sexual forms of violence in post-colonial contexts, in conflict and post-conflict contexts, and in relation to the violence of borders (Kirby, 2012; Baaz and Stern, 2009; Hansen, 2000; Tyler, 2013).

This is a scene in which feminist security studies scholars present analyses of gendered, racialised, and otherwise marginalised bodies in order to draw attention to the ways that relations of (in)security are produced through everyday enactments of violence (Innes and Steale, 2019). It is where we attend to women's stories of (in)security (Wibben, 2011; Enloe, 2000a; Stern, 2005). Equally, it is a scene in which feminist security scholars attend to modes of resistance, and remark upon absences within the current scholarly literature, and their consequences for the field. The actors are familiar within these stories of everyday sexual violence and (in)security, both in regard to those who have experienced sexual violence as everyday (in)security and those who are implicated in the perpetration of everyday sexual violence and (in)security. Be that feminist anti-war protestors, women in postcolonial contexts, migrant women, the state, UN peacekeepers, guards at the border.

At the same time, this is a scene in which everyday sexual violence is enacted. This thus constitutes another layer of everyday in this conference presentation. Here Ayla's experience of sexual harassment via a text message from a man who is a senior member of staff in her department, and in the audience happens alongside her presentation on everyday violence and (in)security. This text message impacts Ayla's ability to carry on with her presentation, but she must swallow her feelings of (in)security carry on with the panel, answering questions

on why the everyday matters, albeit in a different context. Her experiences of sexual violence here are "a situation of ongoing violence for women that impacts their everyday experiences" (Innes and Steele, 2019: 156).

The 'elevator incident' at the ISA in San Francisco in 2018 is indicative of this wider situation of 'ongoing' relations of sexual violence at conference events. This incident sparked international discussion and debate on the topic of sexual harassment in the discipline and at conference events specifically. In this incident, Professor Simona Sharoni, having offered to press elevator buttons for those who could not reach, was met with Dr. Richard Lebow calling out 'women's lingerie', followed by laughter from other men in the elevator. This inappropriate sexualised remark casually expressed in an everyday encounter in an elevator, along with the response of other men, denotes "deeper systemic problems and a persistent culture of white and male privilege that still characterises the ISA" (Sharoni, 2018: np). As so his remarks her complaint was "frivolous", that his joke was a "standard gag line" and that she couldn't understand the context having not been 'from' the US or UK (Sharoni, 2018: np).

Sexual harassment is thus embedded within the reproduction of the conference as site of white/male dominance, where broader structures of gendered and racialised practices are manifest in everyday encounters. The construction of complaints of sexual harassment as "frivolous" or "something completely blown out of proportion" (Mischa, SUR2) are an important part of maintaining these structures. All at once, they work to dismiss the problem of everyday sexual violence, marginalised knowledge and lived experience sexual violence, and construct the complainant, and their faulty perception, as the problem at hand (Ahmed, 2021). They are representative of the everyday conversations that frame sexual violence in ways that "contribute to structures that bolster and perpetuate these everyday insidious episodes" (Wilkinson et al, 2016: 482).

Although "some stories were well-publicised and even litigated (e.g., from ISA conferences)" (Jack, SUR2) my research found that there are pervasive issues of staff-student sexual violence at conferences across the field of international politics that require further attention and examination. These experiences circulated in everyday conversations at the conference like a "near constant drip of anecdotes and stories, often shared between groups of women PGRs/ECRs: sexualised comments; invites back to hotel rooms; hands placed on the smalls of

backs – all of the things utterly banal and predictable" (Abigail, SUR2). Staff-student sexual violence, in Abigail's (SUR2) account formed part of the everyday structure of academic conferences in international politics. That staff-student sexual violence at the conference was so normalised as to become "banal and predictable", even "hard to think here of specific things" (Abigail, SUR2) is testament to its insidiousness. Encountering sexual violence at the conference became just "as you'd expect" (Abigail, SUR2) within your everyday working life.

Sharing stories of everyday encounters with sexism, misogyny and racism, are more broadly a common practice amongst feminist security studies scholars. It is a regular occurrence for example, for "female scholars speak of such episodes 'in private' – in conference coffee breaks, lunches with colleagues, seminar wine receptions" (Wilkinson et al, 2016: 482). At the conference, as Särmä put it, "the important discussions happen at the hotel bar" (2016: 472). Having heard so many stories of staff-student sexual violence at conference events through her activism, Rosa (INT5) came to find "it sometimes awkward at conferences you know you're sitting there at the breakfast table, and somebody comes and joins, you're like 'oh yeah I don't wanna make conversation with him!'".

Alongside evidencing widespread problems of staff-student sexual violence as well as the sharing stories of everyday violence at the conference, these reflections highlight how the conference elides private and public space. On the one hand, the conference is a 'professional' space in and simultaneously a curiously personal space. They are, at once, formal, professional sites of knowledge production and knowledge exchange, but they also involve a reconfiguring of academic space, as the university often extends to conference centres, hotels, and hotel bars. These are spaces were colleagues and students share hotels, sleep next door to one another, drink at conference receptions and hotel bars, and when in a foreign city or country to their own go on sight-seeing adventures. The everyday rhythm of the conference revolves around this intersection between the personal and the professional, where "you're away from home, in a hotel with lots of alcohol, it's long days you work really hard all day, and then you go to the bar and the restaurant" (Rosa, INT5) with other students and academics.

 It is not the case that academics and students do not engage in these activities outside of the conference, as I have argued, the university often extends out of formal institutional walls,

143

spilling out into informal/'private' spaces. However, the conference, more than any other site of the university, is where this shift intimate/private/informal is instituted. Conferences are designed and structured around the conference hotel, the hotel bar, the conference dinner and drinks. In this context, the circulation of stories of sexism, racism, and sexual violence elide public/private space to constitute the conference as embedded within relations of gender and race that are constantly navigated by scholars in the field, and particularly those most affected by these hierarchies.

Stories of sexual violence at conference events were situated within broader patterns of gendered and racialised structures within the discipline of international politics. For example, the sexualisation and objectification of women PhD students and ECRs by male academics was a common trend identified by participants, where "all stories were about men trying to pick up women" (Heather, SUR2), "the subject of their jokes were all women" (Heather, SUR2), and "it was older, white, male academic making the comments" (Abigail, SUR2), including "commenting on the appearance" (Heather, SUR2) of women researchers, making jokes or asking invasive questions about women's sex lives, and making sexual propositions to women, as well as men graphically detailing their own sex lives and relationships to their wives to women at the conference, and engaging in "locker room talk" (Jack, SUR2) with one another.

My participants equally highlighted the intersections of gender and race in contexts of sexual violence at the conference, with "often the most shocking anecdotes that come from friends/colleagues who are Black or Brown" (Abigail, SUR2), and the combination of "gender/race/class/professional privilege" (Abigail, SUR2) they considered to be enabling factors in the reproduction of "male dominated environments" (Jack, SUR2) at the conference. As gender and race figured in the (re)production of institutionalised hierarchies in this context, so too did institutional hierarchies relating to levels of seniority within academia. Here the senior status of male academics who perpetrated these forms of sexualised violence and the "precarity of the position" (Jordan, SUR2) of the PhD were noted in particular. However, the institutionalised hierarchies here are complicated by the implication of male PhD students participating in sexualised harassment initiated by more

senior male colleagues. This therefore raising questions regarding the production of particular roles and constructions of institutionalised masculinities across institutionalised hierarchies.

Staff-student sexual violence, and the telling of stories of staff-student sexual violence, permeate throughout everyday life at the conference. They play a critical role in disciplinary practices of gendered and racialised modes of violence and structural hierarchies within the fields of international politics and security studies. Examining everyday relations of staff-student sexual violence at the conference thus opens up space to expand and develop understandings of the conference as situated within a wider politics of race, gender, and coloniality. As feminist and decolonial scholarship has highlighted, confronting the role of the discipline of international politics in the continued reproduction of gendered and racialised logics is pertinent to making visible the role of the discipline in ongoing relations of violence (Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2020, 2023). In tandem, as the conference operates as a cross-institutional and transnational space, staff-student sexual violence offers a window to examine the role of everyday staff-student sexual violence at the conference as a global extension of university space embedded within colonial divisions of knowledge consecration.

Paying attention to stories of staff-student sexual violence at the conference builds on feminist insights into stories from the everyday as critical modes of knowledge production that are often marginalised as forms of legitimate empirical evidence for modes of security studies theorising (Wibben, 2011a; Zalewski, 2006). That all of the participants in my survey who took the time to share their stories and/or experiences of staff-student sexual violence are situated within the discipline of international politics is indicative of both the problem at hand and the considerable experience, impact, and wider knowledge of staff-student sexual violence at academic conferences in international politics and security studies.

The scene of Ayla's conference presentation underscores the pivotal role feminist theorising upon stories from the everyday have made to security studies scholarship. Over recent years, the feminist and decolonial scholarship has proliferated at the conference, with the uptick of working groups and conference association sections on gender, feminist and de/postcolonial theory (Wibben, 2004; Wibben, 2011b). Stories like Ayla's, however, also highlight the ways that more can be done to explore how stories from the everyday lives of scholars and students

in international politics are critical building blocks for understanding everyday relations of violence and (in)security within the field.

As I will go on to demonstrate, there exists widespread knowledge of everyday staff-student sexual violence amongst members of the field. However, this site of everyday knowledge of sexual violence and (in)security has not been configured as a source of academic knowledge in security studies. It has not appeared on conference presentations or in scholarly texts in (in)security. As scholarship on everyday violence and (in)security has shown that those sites that seem to be outside of international politics are "in fact, inextricably tied to international politics and international security" (Innes and Steele, 2019: 151), looking to relations of staff-student sexual violence takes us to a site that is intimately intertwined with the makings of international politics and security studies. Here I situate the conference as a focal point to unpack how negotiations over sexual violence and (in)security are negotiated in everyday life.

Homing in on the elision of professional/personal, public/private space, in the next scene of this chapter I focus on everyday staff-student sexual violence at the hotel bar. I examine the ways that students navigate the conference as a site of relations of everyday staff-student sexual violence, considering the ways it structures the simultaneously private/public, personal/professional, space of the hotel bar. Focussing on the affective charges and embodied politics of this space in contexts of sexual violence, I unpack the ways that staff-student sexual violence is embedded within wider negotiations of gender, race, and coloniality within the discipline of international politics and security studies. I argue that situating everyday staff-student sexual violence as the object of study here opens up space to begin to carve out some of the contributions of centring everyday relations of staff-student sexual violence for the field of feminist security studies. I explore these contributions in relation to two themes of feminist security studies: firstly, I understand staff-student sexual violence as situated within gendered, racialised, and colonial contours of the discipline. Secondly, I explore the contributions that can be made to understanding everyday 'small' acts of resistance to everyday sexual violence and (in)security through practices of 'keeping an eye'.

Scene 2: Staff-student Sexual Violence and Colonial Cocktails at the Hotel Bar

Sam, a junior academic at a UK university, has entered the conference hotel for the conference reception drinks. Sam isn't staying at the conference hotel, because she has friends in the area and their one-year lectureship contract doesn't stretch to conference funding. But she's on the job market again in about two months, so it seems best to turn up. Walking in, she's reminded of just how uncomfortable these situations make them. In their experience, and today is no exception, the hotel bar, and indeed the entire conference hotel, is always pretty imposing. For Sam, it embodies the elitism of the university, and she hates being a part of it. This time, as she walks into the room, she sees the walls are covered in gold and adorned with pictures of white men, who on closer inspection of the plaques below their portraits all in one way of another built their fortunes out of colonial exploits during the British Empire. Almost everyone here for a drink (including Sam) is white, while the make-up of the staff in the room is much more diverse, most likely reflecting the local residents from the city the conference is being held, which is one of the most diverse parts of the UK.

After an hour or so she finds themselves in a group of senior academics, all white, all men sipping mint julips at the bar. They're going on about something to do with Foucauldian 'grids of intelligibility' and the racialised distribution of life and death. One of the more senior members of the group jokes that feminists never get Foucault right, no matter how hard they try. As he discusses his next book on biopolitics and the border, Sam sees a group of women PhD students and ECRs she knows walk into the bar. Sam knows this group of women always attend and leave conferences in a group because of the behaviour of a couple of professors a few years back, though Sam doesn't know the full story of what happened. One of the men remarks that his friend texted one of these women earlier in the day, but she never replied. As Sam exits the group, tired of another conversation about biopolitics with old white guys, and concerned about what the content of this text message may have been, she notices that as the women disperse, they seem to be watching each other, keeping an eye on how the other is doing.

'Colonial Cocktails at the Hotel Bar': everyday staff-student sexual violence and the gendered, racialised, and colonial contours of the conference

Stories of sexual violence and its navigation by students and ECR researchers gathered during my fieldwork featured the hotel bar more heavily than any other space at the conference. The hotel bar is a focal point of many conferences, and often at larger scale conferences such as the ISA there is a specific conference hotel chosen by the conference association. Bringing together public/private space, the hotel bar is a place academics and students regularly meet throughout the conference. This may be informally or as part of conference organised events, for example a conference dinner and drinks reception.

The socio-spatial make-up of the conference bar involved for many of my participants a constant navigation with relations of sexual violence and harassment. Here the negotiation of the hotel bar worked through affective registers and embodied practices that underscored the gendered and racialised politics staff-student sexual violence engendered and the wider disciplinary violences in which it was embedded. At the same time, the hotel bar operated as an informal space of feminist activism more broadly, and resistance in contexts of staff-student sexual violence specifically. Unpacking this involves considering both the efforts students and staff members go to in order to combat relations of violence at the conference, but also raises questions regarding how everyday negotiations of sexual violence often involve gendered forms of work that are ongoing at the conference.

In Sam's scene, there are multiple ways in which this scene layers the embodiment of these relations of violence and (in)security within the physical/spatial make-up of the room. On the one hand, we have the iconographical celebration of colonial wealth via portraiture hanging from the walls. There plaques that inform us that the room in which academic staff members, PhD students and hotel workers stand, sit, drink and work is a product of the spoils of the British Empire. Indeed, the there is more than just a deep irony to the white men's scholarly discussion of Foucault and the racialised distribution of life and death. If Foucauldian security studies is implicated in the continued disciplinary enactment of "Foucault's whitewashing of

the raciality and coloniality of modern power and violence" (Howell and Richter-Montpetit, 2019: 2), then this scene embodies this politics of (in)security at the scene of the conference. Unacknowledged in their academic discussion is the way they are presently implicated in the production of racialised, classed, and gendered distributions of knowledge, power, and labour. An all-white male group, they muse on the theoretical implications of race/racism in international politics while sipping drinks in a building built on the spoils of the British Empire.

Guildford's (2018) experiences of racism as a Black academic woman attending the ISA Conference in San Francisco in 2018 are illustrative of everyday enactments of racist violence at conference events. Three times at this conference, she was mistaken for hotel staff, being asked questions such as "When are you going to bring out more appetizers?" (Guildford, 2018: n.p). Her repeated experiences of this speak to the intersections of gender, race, and labour at conference events, and within the context of the hotel specifically.

In addition to individual stories such as Guildford's, the hotel and the hotel bar as embedded with this politics has been drawn attention to in relation to particularly 'controversially' located conference locations in recent years. The 2010 International Studies Association in New Orleans (LA), five years after the devastating impacts of Hurricane Katrina, is one example of the location of conference hotels and hotel bars in the context of geopolitical events with particularly racialised and classed contours. The ISA conference was, in part, held in New Orleans in an effort to contribute to the recovering economy of the city in the aftermath of the hurricane. However, the situation of a largely white body of academic scholars in the context of an unfolding disaster affecting predominantly Black and poor populations of the city raised questions regarding the implication of the discipline in unequal relations of race. Indeed, ISA's chosen conference hotel chain, Hilton Hotel, is situated in the more affluent French Quarter of New Orleans, had a huge refurbishment budget utilised to re-build the hotel in the wake of the disaster, while many of the poorest in the city, including a large Black population, continued to experience extreme poverty and deprivation (Bozzo, 2007; Bergin, 2008; Graham, 2008).

 In this context, scholars such as Western (2010) - while in attendance at the conference - participated in Katrina 'bus tours', in what he termed an uncomfortable experience of "disaster tourism" (Western, 2010: np). This bus tours bring together the white, western gaze

on the scene of racialised poverty and disaster, alongside the socioeconomic priorities that enabled the conference and chosen hotel to be hosted within the city against this backdrop. This speaks to the relationship between conference location and its global significance to ongoing relations of race and class. While events such as the 2010 ISA conference in New Orleans have drawn significant critical attention, they are not an outlier in this regard. The British International Studies Association's conference in 2018, for example, also stands to exemplify the socio-spatial politics of the conference as embedded within racialised and classed relations of power. This conference event was hosted at the Royal Society in London, which following the murder of George Floyd in 2020 has recently made further efforts to acknowledge its relationship to the British Empire, including its previous investment in colonial expeditions, and the role of its fellows in the proliferation of racialised knowledges (The Royal Society, 2023).

Staff-student sexual violence is situated within the with gendered, racialised and colonial guises of the hotel bar. Working to (re)produce gendered and racialised distributions of space that offer insight into the embodied relations of the politics of everyday (in)security at the conference. As questions of space are central understanding (in)security as negotiated in everyday life, the scene of the hotel bar underscores the ways staff-student sexual violence, and gendered and racialised practices, are everyday scenes of knowledge production in international politics and security studies. While everyday spaces are often drawn attention to because they have been constructed as those "spaces outside of formal politics" (Nyman, 2021: 317), the conference hotel bar marks an interesting intervention because it is a space of formal knowledge production in international politics and security studies. Everyday relations of sexual violence and the site of formal knowledge production are thus intimately intertwined here. The scene of the hotel bar therefore exhibits a space in which research on Foucauldian analyses and everyday staff-student sexual violence can be enacted in the same breath.

The connection between critical scholarship and critical scholars in the discipline and their implication in relations of staff-student sexual violence was highlighted by my participants. For Rosanna (SUR2), it was "pretty awful to know that in my field, he is one of the critical scholars (at least on paper)". The relationship between criticality on 'paper' as opposed to his

behaviour in 'practice' shows that the elision of everyday sexual violence and scholarly criticality can feel like a contradiction. Whereby those engaged in dismantling relations of violence in their scholarship are simultaneously implicated in the reproduction of everyday relations of violence. Drawing attention to this then involves examining further the discipline of international politics as a white and masculinised space and of white/senior/male actors predominantly from Global North institutions as perpetrators of sexual violence. This thus underscores a disconnect between the theory of security and its enactment at the conference.

Participants detailed multiple experiences in which staff-student sexual violence was enacted in the hotel bar in ways that reinforced institutionalised hierarchies. Often involving often white, senior men utilising the hotel bar as an opportunity to engage in sexualised harassment directed specifically at more junior women colleagues, and particularly PhD students. Take Roisin (SUR2) who detailed how at the hotel bar "a male professor approached [her] table (a table of female PhDs and early career researchers), told us that he had an open relationship with his wife and then spent the next hour making inappropriate comments about the way we looked, our relationships/partners and other people who had attended the conference" (Roisin, SUR2). Or Elise's (SUR2) story of "multiple older (male) academics making inappropriate comments to younger female (often PhD) colleagues – inviting them back to their hotel room to discuss something". In both instances institutionalised hierarchies of gender and seniority/juniority were manifest in the experience of everyday staff-student sexual violence at the conference, undergirding the structure of these interactions.

It is in this space that relations of gender/race are negotiated in the navigation of the political structures of the room and their relationship to wider histories of violence. In this context, the politics of everyday violence circulates like "like a thickness in the air" (Ahmed, 2004: 10). Manifest in mundane ways such as who you stand with and talk to, who is drinking and musing on the politics of knowledge production at the border, who is serving the drinks, what the décor is, and how everyday sexual violence is enacted, by whom, and who experiences these forms of violence.

In particular, the negotiation of this site was mediated through affective experiences of (in)security in the room, as "bodies are continuously busy judging their environments and

responding to the atmospheres in which they find themselves" (Berlant, 2011: 15). Rosanna (SUR2) described this as being constantly "very alert (and I cannot begin to describe how tiring this is)" having "periods of time where it has affected [her] more (and [she's] been afraid to go home when it gets dark, [she] used to time going home so [she] can make it before it is dark". The exhaustion of constantly being afraid of what might happen, of whether it's safe to enter or to leave the hotel bar, of always "checking [...] if there's another person in the room" (Rosanna, SUR2) when walking around the hotel are indicative of the ways the everyday acts like entering a bar, walking home at night, and whether or not someone is in the room with you, or who is in the room, are everyday manifestations of the politics of (in)security that sexual violence engenders. For Rosanna conference events had become profoundly difficult to navigate, while simultaneously necessary to in order advance the beginning stages of her career. Many participants remarked upon their feelings of discomfort and unease in these spaces, and the overwhelming sense of exhaustion that constantly negotiating gendered and racialised spaces in academia. Alongside this, participants noted that their experiences of sexual harassment and objectification at the conference - including jokes about women's bodies and sex lives - gave rise to feelings of public humiliation, whereby PhD students experiencing this felt "I remember feeling humiliated, upset, and blaming [themselves]" (Abigail, SUR2) for what had happened. In all, this made Abigail (SUR2) feel that conferences weren't spaces for her as a woman ECR, leaving her feeling like a "silly little girl" in a masculine environment that demeaned and belittled her. Such experiences are therefore (re)productive of gendered hierarchies within academia and particularly the pressure of precarity on PhD students and early career researchers, themselves bound up in broader sexist and racist practices within universities.

Equally, the ability of perpetrators of sexual violence to walk through the conference freely, and to regularly receive no, or limited, consequence for their behaviours, despite knowledge of their implication in sexual violence being known to researchers across the discipline, underscores the power relations in (white) "male dominated" environments Jack (SUR2) spoke of. As Santana (SUR1) put it, "if he were not senior, white, male etc. he wouldn't have been invited [to present], rather than inviting him and telling PhD students to be responsible for his poor behaviour". The notion that PhD students are responsible for this staff members behaviour, that they were "told, in advance [of the conference] at a meeting, not to sleep

with him as he was known to be predatory with PhD students" (Santana, SUR1), raises institutional questions regarding the division of responsibilities surrounding sexual violence and (in)security.

Here rather than perpetrators of sexual violence being held to account, particularly in the context of his behaviour being well known throughout at least one university, junior members of the university are both forewarned and expected to protect themselves accordingly. Race and seniority thus merge together as mechanisms through which a white masculinity is privileged as part of the socio-spatial hierarchy of the hotel bar. The idea that PhD students must do the work of negotiating those well-known to engage in predatory behaviour shows work that goes on behind the scenes, at the margins of the conference and the hotel bar, often by PhD students and ECRs, to navigate relations of ongoing relations of everyday (in)securities and sexual violence. This highlights both feminist forms of resistance and activism at the conference as well as work that goes on at the hotel bar that is inflected by institutionalised hierarchies and gendered relations.

'Keeping an Eye'

'Keeping an eye' and 'sticking together' offer fruitful examples of the ways that the affective/embodied manifestations of practices of (in)security and everyday violence at the hotel bar not only work in ways that (re)produce histories of gendered and racialised violence but are also mechanisms through which "amazing spaces of care and friendship – both formal and informal" (Abigail, SUR2) are at work. Many of my participants reflected on the work they did to extend practices of resistance and care in the context of ongoing relations of sexual violence in the hotel bar. This including: "only attend[ing] conferences where I know and trust someone else who is going (normally another female). I then tend to stick to this person for most of the conference – I make sure they are okay and they tend to do the same for me (Roisin, SUR2); "agree[ing] with other female researchers to go to events together and leave together. I tend to keep an eye on female friends to make sure they get home safe, offer to walk or travel together, and my friends to do the same (Heather, SUR2); "I keep an eye on my female friend and women I meet, especially at drinks events" (Ola, SUR2); "making sure no one is left in a situation they are uncomfortable in" (Ola, SUR2); and "when attending a

conference another female scholar warned [her] about being careful about a male Prof who in her words had been sexually abusing/harassing female scholars (esp PhD and early careers) (Rosanna, SUR2).

Sticking together, keeping an eye, and warning other women specifically were iterated repeatedly as part of their routine at the conference. These acts of resistance had a specific gendered orientation, focusing on protecting other women from male academic staff members at the conference, and particularly at the hotel bar or other drinks events. Looking to these as acts of resistance involves interrogating the way a particular gendered relations work in and against this everyday terrain of (in)security. Here everyday acts of who you walk in with, who you leave with, who sticks together and why, and who you keep a watchful eye on at the conference are indicative of mechanisms whereby women at the conference attempt to keep other women safe from everyday sexual violence.

Attention to resistance and solidarity in contexts of violence and (in)security, particularly amongst groups of women and against forms violence relating to gender/race are a significant part of feminist security studies literature. Understanding acts of resistance to violence and (in)security as everyday has been a critical development in feminist security studies scholarship, and critical approaches to the study of security more broadly (Shepherd, 2009; Wibben, 2011b; Sjoberg, 2009). Feminist resistance and women's organising at conferences has also been a specific mode of inquiry within feminist security studies and international politics (Wibben, 2011b). This scholarship has produced valuable insights into the mechanisms through which people engage in contestations over resistance in their daily lives, as well as the role of the conference as a mechanism for those engaged in feminist activism, and women's organising, including on the issue of sexual violence.

On the one hand, this contributes to understanding the ways in which relations of (in)security as violence are felt through the everyday, and product and productive of relations of power therein. It also enables feminist security studies research to understand the ways the everyday is a critical site through which we can explore how people resist and challenge practices of violence and (in)security in ways that push back at violence and their groundings in broader structures of violence and unequal relations of power. A significant aspect of feminist scholarship on everyday resistance as explored the ways that everyday resistance to

154

gendered violence, including sexual violence, operates through seemingly 'small' or mundane acts (Shepherd, 2009; Enloe, 2011; Parpart and Parashar, 2019). Here, then, in looking to violence of the everyday we must attend to those acts that might go unnoticed, or not be made visible as practices of resistance, but nonetheless play a fundamental part in the ways those experiencing everyday sexual violence work against the violence of (in)security.

The hotel bar is a space that brings these insights to bear on the everyday practices of PhD students and academic staff in contexts of everyday violence at the conference. To hark back to Särmä's comment that "the importance discussions happen at the hotel bar", this comment was part of a broader story of everyday feminist activism in international politics. In her story, the hotel bar was a place for feminist organising, where "sitting with Annick Wibben […] [they] brainstormed intervention strategies for the following year's conference, such as leaving posters on the doors or on the tables of all-male panels, calling them out for excluding women speakers (Särmä, 2016: 472). Conversations at the hotel bar are therefore modes of feminist organising, activism, and resistance to persistent cultures of gendered inequality at the conference.

Keeping an eye and sticking together bring to the analysis of the scene the ways in which negotiations over (in)security was both produced through relations of violence and enactments of care amongst women scholars. Here, keeping an eye and sticking together were often articulated as ways to enact modes of care over other women at the conference. They were thus were a way of checking in, keeping tabs on who seemed comfortable or uncomfortable, when and how to step in or get someone out of a 'dangerous' situation. Women who were further ahead in their careers used their greater knowledge of histories of everyday staff-student sexual violence as a means to care for more junior members of staff. This was often explicitly expressed as a way to protect women PhD students and ECRs who experienced overlapping forms of marginalisation and violence in their everyday lives, with more senior (though still early career) women at the conference taking particular effort to

look out for women or colour. As Abigail (SUR2) put it, she was particularly mindful of "the shit young WOC[16] face at conferences".

While these stories are indicative of modes of resistance and care in the context of staff-student sexual violence the hotel bar, they are also indicative of gendered forms of labour in contexts of sexualised violence and institutional contexts. Grey and Kelly (2020; see also Grey, 2018) put forward the concept of 'safety work' to describe routine practices through which women attempt to mitigate the possibility of experiencing sexual harassment, "from changing routes home to choosing seats on public transport, physically reducing themselves in public, to using headphones and sunglasses as a way of feeling invisible" (Grey and Kelly, 2020: 266). 'Safety work' here is typically understood as a pre-emptive strategy and a form of invisible labour, and thus builds on expositions of women's invisible work, for example in the home.

'Safety work' is useful for examining how pre-emptive and individual strategies are employed in contexts of everyday sexual violence. However, the notion of 'invisibility' warrants troubling here, particularly in the context of collective acts of resistance at the conference and of institutional knowledge of everyday staff-student sexual violence at conference events. As 'keeping an eye', 'sticking together' and 'warning one another' worked generally as mechanisms of resistance between women PhD students and academic staff members, this highlights the visibility of the issue of everyday staff-student sexual violence at the conference between members of the academic community. Moreover, 'warning others' worked not only as an act between women PhD students and academic staff members but at the university meeting prior to conference attendance. This betrays not only the very institutional visibility of everyday staff-sexual violence at the conference but also offers a counter example of how 'warning others' can be used to institute expectations of responsibility onto PhD students rather than addressing the behaviours of perpetrators of violence.

Indeed, the relationship between university policy regarding sexual violence and the conference as a transnational space that brings together multiple institutions raised questions

---

[16] WOC stands for women of colour.

regarding the lapse in university policy governing these spaces. As Rosa's (INT5) highlights, this can enable abuse, as one professor "only got drunk and groped random women when he was giving a paper in another department, or he was at a conference, because as I'm sure you're aware of those are massive grey areas in terms of policy, and that made it clear that he knew what he was doing." The international waters of the conference highlight how the absence of university policy can result in conferences being seen as spaces in which sexual abuse can be enacted with impunity.

However, a lack of university policy can also be understood as constituting a university approach to staff-student sexual violence at conference. The warning given to PhD students at the university prior to attending a conference signals how this approach can work to position PhD students, and informal modes of protection, as responsible for navigating (in)security and sexual violence at the conference. This warning illustrates how everyday staff-student sexual violence is visible to universities, while simultaneously universities refuse to take institutional responsibility for the issue. This reinforces the politics between the formal/informal, professional/personal, public/private space at the conference. University resolve to keep the provision of 'security' in the realm of the personal/informal works to keep relations of staff-student sexual violence, and the experiences of those who encounter these forms of violence, at the margins.

The question then, is not whether everyday staff-student sexual violence is invisible but the gendered politics through which it is made visible/invisible, to whom, and in what contexts. The visibility of everyday staff-student sexual violence at the hotel bar, then, is therefore mediated in and through gendered and institutional practices of (in)security. In this context, the informal acts of resistance in this personal/professional space underscored the gendered modes of activism and labour at the conference. These forms of resistance, however, are interconnected with institutional practices which attempt keep the issue of staff-student sexual violence in the realm of the personal/informal. The relationship between the personal/professional, the informal/formal and the public/private is therefore crucial to the politics of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence at the conference. It is critical to understanding the how everyday staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security is negotiated in affective and embodied practices at the hotel bar, how this

interconnects with broader practices of gender, race, and colonialism, and the politics in which it is resisted in everyday ways. These insights speak to the importance of rendering relations of everyday staff-student sexual violence at the conference visible as a site of scholarly inquiry in the field of security studies.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I curated two scenes of staff-student sexual violence at the conference, the 'Conference presentation on everyday sexual violence and (in)security' and 'Staff-student sexual violence and colonial cocktails the hotel bar'. In the analysis of Ayla's story in the first scene, I examined the multiple layers of the everyday at play in the scene of the conference presentation, paying attention to the ways the conference is a site of knowledge production on the everyday but also a site of gendered and racialised violence. I argued that sexual violence is situated within this wider terrain, and further examination can make contributions to understanding how the discipline is embedded within the reproduction of gendered/racialised/colonial violences in the international.

In the second scene of staff-student sexual violence, I argued that everyday staff-student sexual violence at the conference is embedded within wider practices of gendered, racialised and colonial violence at the conference and in the field of security studies. I looked to the ways that we can trace this through considering embodied and affective configurations of space in the hotel bar in the context of staff-student sexual violence. In the second part of this section, I looked to acts of everyday resistance in this context, 'sticking together' and 'keeping an eye', to think through the ways scholars in security studies engage in practices of resistance to everyday staff-student sexual violence.

In the next chapter, I turn to the final scenes of staff-student sexual violence I fabulate in this thesis. This chapter, 'The Hearing', I fabulate two scenes. Firstly the scene of 'trying to be heard by the University: navigating institutional complaints procedures' and secondly, 'a conversation between PhD students in feminist security studies'. In the first scene, I think through the ways everyday attempts to access institutional apparatuses of 'security' compound experiences of insecurity for those who have experienced sexual violence. In the

second, I end this thesis by underscoring the importance of hearing stories of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in UK universities.

Chapter 6: The Hearing

Introduction

Having explored The Classroom and The Conference, this chapter now turns to the 'hearing' of staff-student sexual violence in UK HEIs. A 'hearing', in this chapter, is conceptualized in two ways. Firstly, a hearing can be understood as meaning a formalized process through which a claim of sexual violence is adjudicated upon by senior members of a particular institution. Secondly, 'hearing', might be understood in a more colloquial way, as simply the act of hearing and listening to stories of staff-student sexual violence. Working to delineate practices of 'hearing', this chapter fabulates two scenes of staff-student sexual violence. The first, is a scene in which grapples with the university as an institutional site of (in)security, looking to the ways students engage with, or attempt to engage with, formal complaints procedures in contexts of staff-student sexual violence. The second scene, a conversation between PhD students in feminist security studies, reflects on importance hearing of everyday stories of staff-student sexual violence, and what they tell us about the politics of everyday (in)security in the university.

To do so, the first scene puts feminist security studies scholarship on institutional (in)securities and sexual violence into conversation with stories of students attempting access institutional apparatuses of (in)security in the university. I argue that there are considerable connections that can be made between the university and other institutions of international security in contexts relating to sexual violence. This first scene builds on feminist security studies scholarship that has drawn out how institutional structures of security work to reproduce everyday violence and (in)security in ways that are "profoundly contradictory" (Peterson, 1992: 32) for the students who attempt to access them. As these structures paradoxically works to generate everyday insecurities for those students who attempt to be formally heard by their institutions. The final scene, a closing scene for this thesis, puts into conversation the story of PhD students and the everyday 'hearing' of staff-student sexual violence and the importance of stories in feminist security studies.

Within this chapter, hearing is explored as a practice that is embedded within the politics of (in)security and works across the everyday and the institutional in the context of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security in UK universities. In this chapter I therefore ask how 'hearings' of (in)security are fundamental to understanding sexual violence and the everyday. What they tell us about the 'profoundly contradictory' nature of institutions of security. And how and why stories of everyday hearings matter for understanding everyday sexual violence and (in)security. I argue that that examining the relationships between 'hearings' of staff-student sexual violence in everyday and institutional contexts in UK universities makes contributions to feminist security studies theorising of institutional providers of (in)security, and the relationship between the everyday, the institutional, and practices of (in)security in contexts of sexual violence. I argue that incorporating sexual violence that happens 'here' in the university within the everyday deepens our understandings of the everyday/the institutional in contexts of sexual violence and puts under the spotlight UK universities as spaces in which everyday sexual violence is a matter of institutionalized (in)security. In doing so, I contribute to feminist security studies analyses of the everyday/institutional in contexts of sexual violence by expanding the reach of the institutional and the everyday to the university and situating the 'hearing' as a practice embedded within relations of (in)security in institutional contexts of sexual violence.

What is a hearing?

The 'hearing' is an everyday practice and an institutional practice enacted at local, national, and international levels. A 'hearing' is a term that takes on multiple meanings in the context of sexual violence and (in)security. A 'hearing' can operate in the form of a conversation, one person telling a story of violence to another. To hear a story of sexual violence is to be on the receiving end of that conversation, to listen to another person. Rosa (INT5), an academic and activist who ran an anonymous blog detailing stories of sexual violence in UK universities, said that a lot of the ways she worked to support people was to hear their stories, she would "write back to somebody and say, hey this sounds really bad do you want to talk?". Hearings are a deeply political practice. Whether a person is heard (or not heard) and how they are heard (or not heard) is inextricably tied to relations of power. As is whether their story is listened

to, believed, or some form of action taken as a result of what has been heard. Experiences of being heard have enormous impacts on people who experience sexual violence. Impacting their mental health, impacting their ability to go about their daily lives, but also critically impacting the salience of institutions of security as providers of security.

Questions of 'hearing', and of 'hearing' stories of sexual violence, are crucial to feminist approaches to (in)security. This is both in the sense of hearing stories of sexual violence being crucial to feminist theorising in security studies, but also to reimagining the discipline of security studies as a field that feminist intervention has shown has lacked attention to matters of sexual violence. As I examined in Chapter 2, stories of sexual violence have been crucial for feminists examine the ways (in)security works to engender relations of gender, race, masculinities/femininities, colonial relations, and so on. Importantly, part of this process is thinking about what stories of violence come to be understood as embedded within the politics of (in)security specifically, and why it matters that sexual violence is understood as a question of (in)security.

Participants relayed everyday conversations about staff-student sexual violence throughout and beyond institutional walls. They spoke of stories being shared after classes on campus, chats between women PhD students and ECRs at academic conferences, institutional meetings with PhD students where they were warned of a visiting professor's reputation of sexual violence in the local pub after research seminars, conversations between EDI workers in an office while designing training materials for staff members in their departments, and chats via online mediums with experiences of staff-student sexual violence failures posted anonymously on social media accounts. Everyday conversations and the stories that are told through these them proliferate throughout our universities. As students and staff members throughout our universities share stories of staff-student sexual violence they themselves have experienced, or witnessed, or have heard from others. These are ordinary stories of violence that form part of everyday life in our universities, as people share stories over a cup of coffee, after class, via text message, though DMs[17] on social media accounts, or over a

---

[17] DMs refer to direct messages on social media accounts.

cigarette outside the library. To put it quite simply, stories of sexual violence and everyday (in)security are happening all the time, anywhere and everywhere throughout the university.

At the same time, a 'hearing' perhaps more obviously refers to a formal legal or institutional process, in which 'hearing' becomes tied to an institutional process of adjudication, embedded within an institutional apparatus of disciplinary process. Institutional hearings of (in)security in the context of the university, on the surface, might seem the most obvious institutional site to turn to in a study of staff-student sexual violence and (in)security. The formal hearing is the more obvious site of institutional power, institutional structure, and institutional (in)security. It is where we ordinarily might go first when thinking about staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. Hearings like this occur across institutions of security. At the state level legal proceedings on allegations of sexual violence are adjudicated upon in courts of law. Within the international, the ICC might be considered a context for a 'hearing' as a mode of international reckoning and international disciplinary process in the context of war crimes including sexual violence and rape used as a 'weapon of warfare'. Within feminist security studies, there is a focus on institutions of security and stories of sexual violence, and particularly the ways institutions of security work to reproduce relations of (in)Security in contexts of sexual violence (Peterson, 1992; Basham, 2016; Higate and Henry, 2012; Shepherd, 2008).

Institutional hearings of staff-student sexual violence are part of institutional apparatuses of security through which students who have experienced sexual violence attempt to navigate. In a sense then, you are *supposed* to go to the institution, because it is the institution that has the power to do something about staff-student sexual violence, and has the responsibility to protect those who have experienced acts of violence. As Alicia (INT2) told me, their university had been "sending out some really weird comms, like, you must 'report [sexual violence] to the university', and 'not speak on social media'". Alicia (INT2) felt that her university in this way was "kind of obsessed with reporting". For Elizabeth (INT3), university structures were a way that students "were told they'd be safe and supported and cared about". In this way, the institution is positioned as a provider of security for its students, with the formal complaints procedure being the institutional process whereby students through which security can be achieved.

The everyday and the institutional, however, are interconnected practices, as everyday conversations, practices, and encounters are interwoven with the 'institutional'. Institutional hearings of staff-student sexual violence are part of everyday life in UK universities, as Sara Ahmed expresses in regard to her experience being involved in hearing on a formal complaint at her university: "I would keep entering that room, the same room in which we had that meeting. It was my department's meeting room, a much-used room. We would have other meetings in that room, academic meetings, papers shuffling" (Ahmed, 2021: 7). Accessing formal hearing process often begin as an everyday conversation, like Marta (SUR3), who approached both her supervisor and her Head of Studies to help her navigate the complaints process. It is also bound up in everyday practices, reading through university complaints procedures that seem just "flooded with process" (Anthony, INT1), or sitting at computer as you "click your way through" (Erin, INT4) the online university systems for wellbeing and sexual violence support. The impacts of the formal hearing permeate throughout everyday life, rendering students feeling "unsafe wherever [they] went" (Sam, SUR3), "scared I would bump into him all the time" (Marta, SUR3).

One of the reasons the everyday serves as such a pertinent starting point to access the machinations of institutional power are because formal proceedings are incredibly difficult to reach. The formal institutional hearing has been extremely hard to access during my research. It was difficult to find people who would or could talk about it. Institutional staff members seemed reluctant to engage with my survey on reporting staff-student sexual violence. Interviewees who had been part of formal hearing processes appeared to sidestep questions: they would say they didn't want to, or couldn't go into details, or relayed university policy back to me, word for word. One interviewee, Sarah (INT6) had signed an NDA, meaning that most of the questions I had planned to ask were suddenly off limits, as Sarah would be breaking her agreement by answering almost any of the questions I had planned. The interview itself, while informing my understanding of the formal hearing process, couldn't be quoted at any length due to concerns regarding her precarious status and legal complications that could possibly arise for her. I found this period of fieldwork intensely frustrating; it is hard to hear about the formal complaints process if very few people will talk to you about it.

At the same time, the ubiquity of everyday conversations about staff-student sexual violence were overwhelming because of their ubiquity, as Jacobson writes, "what makes everyday life so difficult to capture is that it is or seems to be *everywhere*" (2009: 15, original emphasis). We might say that the fieldwork for this thesis consisted of gathering stories of everyday staff-student sexual violence. Myself and my research participants shared stories over Zoom, as we sat chatting in our respective private residences, sometime across borders and time zones. I heard stories of staff-student sexual violence across the UK every time I read the responses to each of the surveys designed for this PhD: whether that was as I sat at my desk on the 4th floor of the Arthur Lewis Building at the University of Manchester, on the bus back to Levenshulme catching up on some work on the way home, or standing staring at my phone in my Mum's kitchen back home after Christmas. I hear stories of staff-student sexual violence almost everywhere I go: in the women's toilets (at university, at the pub, in nightclubs), at university libraries, at house parties, in corridors on university campuses, in public parks, at my favourite bakery, in the street, text messages coming through from WhatsApp to my phone, in every city I've been to throughout my PhD.

The everyday, then, is crucial for accessing the politics of institutional practices of (in)security and their negotiation in contexts of staff-student sexual violence. In this chapter, the everyday thus offers a window into the institutional. It is in the everyday that we can locate attempts to access institutional 'formal' hearings, discern the effects of these processes, and locate the politics of how everyday hearings of staff-student sexual violence circulate throughout the university.

Scene 1: Trying to be heard by the University: navigating institutional complaints procedures

Liera, a PhD student, is sitting at her computer in her department's office pouring over her university's complaints procedures to see if there's anything else she can do to try and get the university to help her. A Professor in her department assaulted her last summer at a workshop organised by her supervisor. Last time she looked at the university complaints procedure it said she was outside the window for reporting the assault, but she's hoping if she keeps looking, she'll find some other route, some loophole or something.

Liera already tried going to her supervisor, but she laughed it off, told her she was overreacting, that it was just another one of her anxiety episodes and she wasn't thinking clearly. When she went to the head of department, he told her it wasn't worth ruining her career over a little incident at a workshop.

She already feels like her career is over. She hasn't slept in weeks, can't eat much, doesn't feel like herself anymore. She has a panel review in two months that will determine her PhD progression, but she's too sick to work on her thesis chapter. It doesn't help that Liera has to see the Professor who assaulted her all the time; his office is right next to her desk, and sometimes he even smiles and winks at her when he walks past her desk.

Getting up, done for the day, Liera walks to the bathroom on her way out. While she's in the cubicle, her supervisor and another lecturer in their research group walk in. Not noticing anyone else is in the bathroom, her supervisor begins telling her colleague that she has a nightmare PhD student, who's so insecure she's lost grip on reality. Liera holds herself together until they leave, and when they finally do, she's so overwhelmed, she vomits.

Contradictory provisions of (in)security and the university

In the above scene, Liera, having experienced an assault from her professor, is experiencing institutional barriers that are working to compound her experience of sexual violence and (in)security within her university. She cannot get through to the university via policy, she has been ridiculed by her supervisor, chastised by her head of department, and is being openly mocked within her workspace. Moreover, she has been betrayed by people she trusted, expected to help her, hoped would hold the perpetrator of violence to account. She's sick, unable to sleep, eat, or work, considering leaving her PhD programme altogether. She has no one left to turn to for help. This scene lays bare the impacts of everyday sexual violence and the everyday insecurities it engenders within the university, where Liera quite literally feels the effects of insecurity in her ability to go to work, eat a meal, sleep through the night, be believed by the people around her, finish her PhD or have the career she would like. It is also a story of the ways institutional recourses to security are deeply implicated in the production of (in)security. At every turn she takes to seek help from the institution, be that the formal complaints process, her head of department, or her supervisor, the institution and those with

institutional power to help her have not simply turned away from her but worked in ways that have exacerbated the violence she has experienced.

Being unable to access formal institutional processes and experiencing profoundly negative impacts on students' everyday lives are a common theme in contexts of staff-student sexual violence in the university. Marta (SUR3) conveyed how her experience being unable to access formal complaints procedures left her feeling "unsafe, vilified and traumatized […]", she told me it had "completely destroyed" her "confidence, ability to work, and self-worth". Bull and Rye's (2018: 15) study on institutional responses to staff-student sexual violence found that all their interviewees were "blocked or dissuaded from reporting in some way". The ramifications of these experiences can be long term for those who try to report staff-student sexual violence through formal complaints procedures, where "a lot of people then develop these issues where they're constantly thinking back on their past, and thinking about things they missed, or things they should have done or should have said […] then that just piles on this self-blame and guilt" (Elizabeth, INT3). The history of these institutional practices circulates within the everyday in ways that discourage students and staff recommending attempting the institutional process, as Rosa (INT5) put it, "I mean it's hard, from the perspective of the profession you want the complaints to be filed so that we can do something and get people out, but from the perspective of the victim, it may make more sense for them to just find someplace else they can go and start over you know?" (Rosa, INT5).

Feminist security studies scholarship in these contexts is deeply engaged with thinking about the ways institutions of security prove "profoundly contradictory" in the ways they are complicit in and work to engender sexualized violence and its gendered and racialized logics. The role of everyday experiences sexual violence and institutional recourses to security are crucial here to countering the construction of analytical distinctions between the personal/political, everyday/institutional, everyday/international (Enloe, 2000, 2011; Jacobsen, 2009; Tickner, 2014; Ackerly, Stern and True, 2006; Zalewski, 2006; Innes and Steele, 2019). The ways that institutions of 'security' are implicated the production of (in)security, particularly in contexts of sexual violence, have been extensively examined in relation to key institutional 'security providers' such as the state, the military, and international organizations such as the United Nations (Peterson, 1992; Grady, 2010; Basham, 2016; Mesok, 2018; Shepherd, 2008). Across these institutional sites, feminists have

unpacked different layers of institutional practices of (in)security to engender broader critiques of institutional security providers. This is an enormous set of scholarship that ranges from policy documents at the United Nations that "reproduce gendered violence" (Shepherd, 2008), to the implication of the state and state making practices in the reproduction of gendered violence and its domestic and sexual iterations (Peterson, 1992), to experiences of sexual violence between members of the US military (Mesok, 2018; Basham, 2016), to sexual abuse committed by UN peacekeepers while stationed in post-conflict regions.

Bringing this analysis to the university, I argue the ways the institutional power to secure is bound up in contradictory logics that are familiar paradoxes of (in)security within feminist security studies. Showing the university to be both a provider of 'security' to its students and staff, and implicated in paradoxical practices of 'security' that exacerbate feelings of (in)security that are engender broader gendered, and as I will show, ableist politics within the university. Extending analysis of the institutional, the everyday, sexual violence and (in)security involves making connections and contributions between existent feminist security studies literature and the university in the context of the 'hearing'. I therefore expand both the notion of the institutional security provider and the everyday in the analysis of these contributions and connections. The 'hearing' within the university offers a new terrain in this regard as an institutional site of everyday (in)security that has been thus far understudied as a security provider or site of everyday relations of (in)security. Equally, as an institutional space that is predominantly white and, as I argued in Chapter 1, steeped in racialised and colonial histories, this analysis involves spotlighting the ways institutions outside of the conventional empirical sites of security studies analysis, and white colonial institutions are embedded within the (re)production of everyday relations of (in)security.

The institutional power to 'secure': formal hearings, sexual violence, and gendered/racialized constitution of institutions of 'security'

In Chapter one, I argued that the university has been constituted by/through gendered, racialized, and colonial practices of violence and (in)security. Universities are institutions that have been born through these modes of violence. These practices are fundamental to the buildings we sit in, our classrooms, our conferences, they are reproduced in our disciplinary construction of 'knowledge', our curriculums, who feels safe and unsafe in university spaces.

I argued that these relations of violence and their operation within the university are continually reproduced through relations of everyday staff-student sexual violence, and staff-student sexual violence is thus a form of everyday (in)security through which the gendered, racialized, and colonial constitution of the university is continually reproduced through the everyday.

These practices of violence and (in)security are equally fundamental to the production of the university as an institution of (in)security. Indeed, from the state to the military to the United Nations, the institutional power to 'secure', is grounded in and through racialized, colonial, and gendered modes of violence. At the same time, sexual violence is bound up within both institutions of (in)security, and their relationships to wider histories and contemporary enactments of racialized/gendered/colonial violence. As Jaleel argues, sexual violence cannot be understood without attending to "a bloodied, tumultuous and cumulative backdrop of colonial and imperial warfare" (Jaleel, 2021: 3).

Institutions of (in)security are situated within the literature as engaged in practices of sexual violence, be that through state sanctioned gendered and racialized violence, the use of sexual violence within the military either as a way to produce militarized/masculine/hetero subjects and/or as a 'weapon of war', or the engagement of international organisations and their personnel in acts of sexual violence (Crawford, 2017; Baaz and Stern, 2013, Mesok, 2018, Basham 2016). They are also, increasingly, engaged in claims to secure (particularly women) against experiences of sexual violence as a form of violence and (in)security. And so, while institutions are engaged in acts of sexual violence, and born out of broader histories of gendered/racialized violence in which sexual violence is a fundamental part, simultaneously we have the proliferation of policies, campaigns, disciplinary, legal, and criminal procedures within institutions of (in)security that aim to 'secure' against sexual violence (Jaleel, 2021; Shepherd, 2008, 2020). We can locate here the proliferation of United Nations resolutions on sexual violence against women and girls, the use of gender mainstreaming training in militarized contexts, and investigations into the use of sexual violence in the military by the military.

Indeed, sexual violence has become a crucial part of the international, and international law-making practices, whereby "rape and other forms of sexualized violence were for the first

time emphatically configured as enumerated violations of international, rather than national, law" (Jaleel, 2021: 2). At the same time, institutions of (in)security are implicated in acts of sexual violence and their situation in broader patterns of gendered and racialized violence, and positioned these as providers of 'security' in these contexts. This speaks to what feminist security studies scholars have long noted as paradoxes of (in)security, where security is always grounded in relations of violence, and particularly gendered and imperial practices of violence. The institutional power to 'secure' in contexts of sexual violence is thus situated within this paradox of violence and (in)security.

The university, as a space constituted by global relations of gendered and colonial violence, is also situated as a provider of 'security' to students having experienced staff-student sexual violence in their everyday lives on campus. It is the university students are supposed to turn to in order to receive support, and indeed universities have engaged in the construction of apparatuses of security in the construction of institutional policies, procedures and (potential) disciplinary actions decided upon through formal complaints processes and formal hearings on staff-student sexual violence that determine the validity of the offence, the scope of disciplinary action (if any). To return to the above scene, it is the formal complaints process that Liera is struggling to access, but desperately trying to in the hope that she will have her complaint heard by the institution, who she sees as in a position to redress her experience of everyday (in)security.

The formal complaints process that Liera is trying to access to have her story of staff-student sexual violence heard functions as part of a wider apparatus of security enacted through the development of policies, procedures and investigative processes that form complaint and reporting processes available to students and staff in UK Universities who have experienced violence within the institution. These complaints procedures are often situated in relation to multiple and overlapping university policies, such as policies concerning acceptable behaviour for staff and/or students, dignity at work and study policies, and harassment, bullying and discrimination policies.

UK universities paint a picture of institutional security that has those who experience, or are at risk, forms of violence at its heart. Take, for example, the University of Bristol's Acceptable Behaviour at Work Policy, where they claim to be "committed to building an inclusive

environment where opportunities are open to all, diversity is valued, and where everybody can reach their full potential without fear of harassment, prejudice or discrimination" (University of Bristol: 1). They state that they "strive for an environment within the University in which discrimination, harassment, bullying and victimisation are simply not tolerated" and that "[s]uch unacceptable behaviour must be identified early and managed effectively", that they will "support any member of staff or student who is subjected to such behaviour and encourage them to report this as early as possible" (2019: 3). Or the University of Glasgow, who in a recent press release that "[they] take all allegations of sexual harassment seriously, they said if complaints are upheld, they take disciplinary action where appropriate and steps to ensure safety and well-being of staff and students" (Al Jazeera, 2022b: 17.07).

Students and staff are to be 'encouraged' to report, the university is 'committed' to their 'safety and well-being'. Here university apparatuses of security are configured as welcoming, as a safe place to go. Not only that, university complaints and reporting processes are where things will get done. Complaints will be 'managed effectively', and 'disciplinary action' will be taken. The construction of UK Universities as providers of institutional security in the event of violence is fundamental to the construction of formal complaints procedures as where we would ordinarily expect students to turn to in the event of staff-student sexual violence. It is here that students can go to be heard by their institution, to be protected, where they will find help and disciplinary powers will be used against those who have perpetrated abuse. It is here that students are supposed to be able to have "faith in the process" (Bull and Rye, 2018: 5). The explicit invocation of the languages of diversity and inclusion mean that these apparatuses of security are articulated as being particularly oriented in response to histories of racialized, gendered, ableist and heteronormative violence within and beyond the institution.

The idea of 'faith in the process' is in embedded within the conviction that these apparatuses can be improved in a way that provides security in contexts of staff-student sexual violence, as Elizabeth put it (INT3): "if you saw that a school owned up to something happening, faced it, investigated it, handed out discipline and had this openness and realism, people would feel a lot safer" (Elizabeth, INT3). Indeed, Anthony (INT1), Erin (INT4), Rosa (INT5), and Sarah (INT6) all spoke of their involvement in formal complaints processes in ways that underscored an ambivalence towards formal complaints procedures. All these participants in various ways

had both been involved in complaints procedures and in working specifically to improve formal complaints procedures in contexts of staff-student sexual violence.

Anthony (INT1) for instance, felt HR staff presiding over complaints of staff-student sexual violence were managing competing aspects of security and negatively impacted what he termed the 'incentives' of the investigation. As he stated, HR "has a very strong incentive to do what the top of the university is kind of after which is usually avoid a scandal at all costs […] but of course they have this other incentive at the top of the university which is that students feel like these concerns are seriously held, student voice is so crucial to universities now, so the incentives are definitely complicated" (Anthony, INT1). For Rosa (INT5), the complaints process was difficult to navigate as a Head of Department even when they had what she considered to be the best of intentions, as her encounters with institutional mechanisms belied a complex web of challenges. As she put it, "it's really really hard, the disciplinary procedures are slow, and they're hard to institute and this is a problem right […] I'm not saying it's okay, but it's not necessarily the individual Head of Department not caring, but that the institutional procedures may be shitty right, and also sometimes it's not that they're shitty, so due process can be an excuse for not taking things seriously but due process is also an important protection" (Rosa, INT5). Anthony's reflections on 'incentives' here are redolent of the dynamics of scandal versus reputation I discussed in Chapter four, where avoiding a scandal and taking student complaints seriously come up against one another as competing avenues of institutional security. They underscore a contestation over what it is that institutional complaints process is meant to secure, putting student support at odds with institutional reputation. Rosa's reflections of the difficulties of enacting institutional process as a Head of Department underscore an ambivalence surrounding institutional complaints processes.

The formal hearing of (in)security is situated within a complex web of practices and actors within universities. It is in their everyday encounters, like speaking to HR, or trying to institute a slow process, that institutional (in)security as contested and under negotiation is discernable. Turning to the experiences of those students who have tried to access these institutional complaints procedures, revealed that these practices often worked to reproduce forms of everyday insecurity that have a deeply negative affect on their everyday lives. In this way, formal complaints procedures figure into paradoxes familiar within the (feminist) study

of institutions that claim to act as providers of security, which "proves profoundly contradictory" (Peterson, 1992: 32) in the way that it is "implicated in the reproduction of hierarchies and structural violence against which [it] claim[s] to offer protection" (Peterson, 1992: 51).

The impacts of this on students are manifold, causing serious ruptures in the ability to put trust in universities as institutional bodies that will support and protect students experiencing violence on campus. As Elizabeth (INT3) put it, students "feel like they've bought into lies, that they're told what they'll be safe and supported and cared about, and they think well would my life have turned out differently if I'd gone somewhere else, if I didn't believe those lies, if they hadn't advertised themselves so falsely […] I think betrayal is a really good word". To draw out the ways universities are implicated in the reproduction of everyday (in)security within this context, I put Liera's story into conversation with the experiences of those in other institutions of (in)security in feminist security studies, examining the ways that institutional policy, and institutional figures of power and (in)security in contexts often work in ways that reproduce logics of (in)security.

To be heard/not heard as everyday institutional violence and (in)security

Across institutions of international security, people appealing to institutional recourses of security are met with numerous barriers that work to compound their feelings of (in)security. This takes many guises, from the refusal of institutional figures of power to hear stories of sexual violence, to refusal to believe stories of sexual violence, to inadequate constructions of institutional policy and procedures. In many ways, what these dynamics do work to engender and cement everyday violence as a fundamental part of institutional (in)security. Anthony (INT1) acknowledged that there was an "institutional failure to properly train people" conducting investigations on the nuances of sexual violence and harassment. Marta (SUR3) found her Head of Studies was "incredibly unsupportive", felt "silenced" by her supervisor when she approached her for help, and was unable to access the institutional complaints procedure because "the official system told [her] she had waited too long". Sam (SUR2) was "threatened […] without real basis [they] told anyone about the process". Elizabeth (INT2), felt like her university just wanted to "clamp it [reports of staff-student sexual violence] down and shut it up".

173

Within institutions of international security, these types of experiences have a long history. Victoria Basham (2016) has remarked on "the ways that military authorities tolerated and indeed encourage certain types of misbehavior by service men…[suggesting] 'boys will be boys' when dozens of women aviators were sexual harassed and assaulted by servicemen during the 1991 Tailhook incident" (2016: 38-39). Indeed, "the Pentagon report…[into the Tailhook] incident told of senior Navy officials who deliberately undermined their own investigation to avoid negative publicity (Kasinsky, 1998: 90). Researching the experiences of men who have experienced acts of sexual violence from fellow (male) soldiers, where sexualized violence often occurs in groups and is framed as 'hazing' for new recruits in particular (Basham, 2016; Mesok, 2018), servicemen have faced significant acts of violence when reporting instances of abuse. As Mesok (2018) notes, in one such story of abuse, a US serviceman who had been assaulted by fellow soldiers, "they were just initiating him, that this was something all new guys have to deal with, and that they would kill him if he told anyone what happened" (Mesok, 2018: 57). When he appealed to his superior officers for help, "each time he was met with responses such as, 'this didn't happen', 'you're a liar', and 'where's your proof'" (Mesok, 2018: 61).

As I examined in Chapter two, international peacekeeping operations have likewise come under harsh criticism under the exposure of allegations of sexual violence perpetrated by peacekeeping personnel against those civilians they are tasked with protecting in their promotion of both peace and human rights. For example, peacekeeping personnel have been accused of multiple instances of sexual abuse, including: "sex with minors (under 18), employment for sex, sex with prostitutes, sexual assault, rape and other incidents that include sex in exchange for food or assistance in kind" (Grady, 2010: 219). Al Jazeera's documentary Haiti by Force (2017) showed the UN's failure to enable victims of abuse to seek redress, as one interviewee put it in response to the UN's failure to respond to requests to cooperate with maternity claims: "they never respond to us, they never said nothing. The problem is [..] we never have any mechanism to do nothing" (06:48).

These stories offer insight into the ways that sexual violence is enacted within these institutions, but also of the ways in which institutional recourses to security in contexts of sexual violence across these sites work to compound experiences of (in)security for those who have experienced sexual violence. Here, a question that is familiar to feminists in and beyond

security studies arises, namely: what do you do when institutions that are supposed to protect you, commit acts of violence against you when you ask for that protection? As Elizabeth (INT3) expressed, "it's terrifying for people to see how often these things go wrong, and that's terrifying in itself but also to see you don't have anywhere to go […] you don't have a place to make sure your voice is heard".

To go back to Liera, she has turned to everyone, but no one will listen to her, help her, take her story of sexual violence seriously, or provide her with any institutional help despite of the existence of policies, procedures, and institutional figures of power within the institution who are supposed to help her. Liera's story helps us unpack the barriers and acts of violence that those who experience staff-student sexual violence at their universities are often faced with. The lack of, or barriers within, institutional process and the ongoing affects this has on feelings of (in)security in everyday life are key features of institutional (in)security within the university and echo many of the patterns of violence, abuse, and (in)security that are enacted in other institutions of (in)security.

There are important differences between these institutional contexts and the experiences of those within them who have experienced forms of sexual violence. However, the point I wish to make here is that across these institutional contexts, the institutions that are supposed to provide 'security' for both their institutional communities, and/or the people they 'serve' in the name of security, in fact worked to compound experiences of insecurity, perpetuating pervasive issues of sexual violence within the institution. And so, in we can trace connections between the stories of the institutional (re)production of (in)security in these more traditional sites of security and the university. in particular the (re)production of (in)security in the context of sexualised forms of violence in these institutions raises important questions about who 'security' is really for, and how this politics plays out within the university, as everyday encounters with the institution underscore a gendered, and as I will show, ableist politics of insecurity on campus.

The university and the reproduction of institutional (in)security
A lack of access to, or barriers constructed within/by, institutional policies in contexts of sexual violence and (in)security, are common modes through which institutions reproduce (in)security through a lack of recourse to institutional process. Within the university, this

functions in multiple ways, but ultimately render access to institutional apparatuses of 'security' impossible for many students. University policies and procedures differ across the UK, and indeed, many universities still do not have specific sets of complaints procedures and/or policies relating to staff-student sexual violence specifically (Bull and Rye, 2018). This meaning that students are often left trawling through multiple different complaints procedures and policy documents that relate to any number of the following: inclusion and diversity, acceptable/unacceptable behaviour within the institution, dignity at work, or conflict of interest policies. Here institutional policy regarding staff-student sexual violence becomes "flooded with process" (Anthony, INT1), in a way that Anthony identifies as a cross-institutional problem in contexts of security, suspecting "this is often what's done in other bits of security and nuclear stuff, it looks like there [is] lots of process put in place, the document's quite long and there are lots of people who can be involved in any of these investigations [...] but [the university doesn't] actually make any of that process particularly sensitive to the situation". When and if students access a route through these materials, the policies themselves can make reporting impossible, exemplified in Liera's experience of being outside of a time limit written into the policy, which is common within universities (Bull and Rye, 2018; NUS, 2018).

For Ahmed, these issues mean that access to institutional policies in contexts of staff-student sexual violence is like dealing with a "mythical golden egg" (2021: 31), as students painstakingly comb through document after document, hoping to find an institutional 'way in'. The myth of the golden egg, however, is produced both by the universities claims to provide security to their students and the construction of institutional avenues of institutional security that are almost impenetrably difficult to follow. The 'almost' does a lot of work here; it is the promise of the possibility of security, and the idea that the institution can provide security, while it always seems just out of reach. It is in this way Ahmed's 'mythical golden egg' is helpful for understanding the contradictory practices of (in)security within the construction of and access to institutional procedure, where (in)security is written into institutional design.

This is why we find Liera in this scene searching again, hoping she's missed something, hoping she'll find another way through. Her affective hold to the promise of security (her hope) is indicative of both the attachments we have ideas of institutional security, and the capacity

for institutions to secure us, while at the same time, "the management and achievement of security is necessarily illusory" (Shepherd, 2020: 330). This reveals the ways institutional (in)security, or the illusion of institutional security, is visible through everyday acts of logging into your computer, looking up university policy, reading documents over and over, moving between having and losing hope.

The institutional reproduction of (in)security is not only enacted through institutional policy the construction of various layers of inaccessibility within these policies (or lack of policies), but institutional figures of power are often directly implicated in the compounding or exacerbation of everyday (in)security in contexts of sexual violence. In Liera's case, this involves gendered and ableist enactments of institutional power from her supervisor and head of department, which are central to the manifestation of violence and (in)security that is producing debilitating effects on her ability to live her everyday life.

Indeed, Liera's experiences here draw attention to the ways that histories of institutional violence draw together and are reenacted in everyday contexts of staff-student sexual violence in UK Universities. Liera is subjected to forms of disbelief and/or minimizing tactics from those in positions of power that are commonly experienced when acts of sexual violence are reported to those within institutional positions of power. She isn't thinking straight, is getting wound up over something small, the repercussions (her career) wouldn't be worth it. Liera's experience is reminiscent of forms of "testimonial injustice" (Manne, 2018: 18). For Manne (2018) this involves practices through which women in particular are "regarded as less credible when they make claims about certain matters, or against certain people, hence being denied the epistemic status of knowers, in a way that is explained by their subordinate group membership" (Manne, 2018: 18). She argues that the construction of women as liars in contexts of sexual violence speaks to a particular lack of credibility where women are positioned as the problem themselves, "subject to suspicion, blame, [and] resentment" (Manne, 2018: 218), perhaps accused of lying with malicious intent. As one student noted in an interview given to a group of researchers: "it was around three hours, the questioning. Incredible cross-examination. Like, really antagonistic, really accusing me of lying over and over and over again, just focusing on the tiniest things [...] then time ran out" (Bull and Rye, 2018: 20).

These forms of 'epistemic injustice' function in and through gendered guises that work to produce and maintain particular (violent) understandings of gender and gendered subjects within the university. Marta (SUR3), for example, was told, "you are our top scholarship PhD student do you really want to ruin your PhD and future over a little complaint" (Marta, SUR3). Marta's experiences of sexual assault were belittled by her Head of Studies in ways that elided both her precarious status and a PhD student and a gendered reductivism that constructed her attempt to access institutional mechanisms as an overreaction. In an everyday exchange reminiscent of Abigail's (SUR2) "feeling like a silly little girl". Producing the gendered subject of the woman as exaggerating, unable to configure a proportional response, as responsible for the (potential) curtailing of her own career. As Sara Ahmed notes: "[c]omplaint seems to catch how those who challenge power become sites of negation: to complain is to become a container of negative affect, a leaky container, speaking out as spilling over" (Ahmed, 2021: 17). The notion of the complainer as 'leaking' as she's 'spilling over' onto institutional space marks an encounter between the everyday, the concept of the feminized body as "areas of chaos" (Hobbs, 2020: 49) and a consequent need to discipline the women/complainer as a defective/irrational gendered subject that destabilizes the security of the institution.

I would like to pay more attention to the interconnections between gender and ableism in Liera's story. In Liera's story, gender and ableism elide in her experience of being both not believed and humiliated by her supervisor. Both her gender and history of mental illness come together as a means by which she is not only not believed but her grip on reality is called into question: she is just having another one of her anxiety episodes. Her mental illness is used by her supervisor to both discredit her account of sexual violence and render the senior male academic as more credible. Gendered disavowals of the feminine body as irrational/defective come together here with broader ableist notions of mental illness, belying the figure of the 'crazy' or 'hysterical' woman who does not know what has happened to her, cannot accurately account for the realities of everyday violence and institutional process, and cannot be trusted as a result.

Ableist experiences as part of the institutional hearing are not uncommon. Sam (SUR3) felt that their "severe mental illness" was "weaponized against" them, making those who handled their complaint "take [their] testimony less seriously". Marta (SUR3) thought she was just being "overly anxious" about the way her department was treating her after she tried to make

a complaint, until she found out her "supervisor documented this, amongst other personal matters [...] on a locked and inappropriate twitter account for kudos and likes". In an interview with researchers investigating the role of silencing in contexts of staff-student sexual violence, one student was told directly by institutional figures involved in her hearing that: "we're going to question your mental health now, your sense of reality. We are going to question the fact that he says that these things didn't happen" (Bull and Rye, 2018: 21). The politics of disability thus appears through the negation of disabled body (or mind) as a credible source, as well as an institutional tactic wielded in the context of the hearing.

Having focused on formal hearings as institutional apparatuses of (in)security that are negotiated in everyday life, in the next section of this chapter I reorient my focus to everyday 'hearings' of staff-student sexual violence. I do so to underscore the importance of everyday conversations on sexual violence and (in)security as they circulate throughout universities across the UK, to examine how everyday hearings entail a negotiation of relations of (in)security in the university, and to highlight why hearing everyday stories of staff-student sexual violence as engendering a politics of (in)security is important in the field of security studies.

A closing scene: A conversation between PhD students in feminist security studies

Samira, Tom, Ellie, and Mischa are sitting in their favourite pub near their department. It's Friday post-work drinks, and they managed to secure the best table. They're all in the same research group 'violence and international politics' at their university, and they all work in the field of feminist security studies specifically. Samira and Mischa are both writing theses about sexual violence in the military; Samira is interested in the experiences of women in the US military specifically, whereas Mischa wants to pay attention to men's experiences of sexual violence in the UK military. Tom works on gendered violence in peacekeeping contexts, and Ellie's thesis is about activist-migrant organizing in the Mediterranean.

The mood this week is subdued because one of their friends, Sarah, quit her PhD this week after months of sexual harassment by her PhD supervisor. They all heard the stories of her supervisions with him, where he'd often comment on what she wore, make jokes about how he'd leave his wife for her, ask her if she had a boyfriend yet or what her 'type' was.

Once, at the same pub they're sat in now, he got really drunk and asked her if he could go home with her. Everyone in the department heard about it, but only the PhD students checked in on her afterwards. None of the staff members in their research group offered Sarah any support, even when Tom appealed to some of them in confidence after the pub incident.

As the conversation turns to Sarah, they all think about whether they could have done more to support her. Tom hits out at their research group for doing nothing, and Samira calls out the institution for making it hard for women to report instances of sexual harassment. After some time, they move on from the discussion, and talk about their upcoming panel on sexual violence and feminist activism at an upcoming workshop they've organized at the university.

Hearing stories of staff-student sexual violence in the everyday

Stories of everyday staff-student sexual violence circulate throughout our institutions, as shown in the above scene of four PhD students in feminist security studies who reflecting on the experience of their friend, the institutional failure to support her, and the failure of members of their research group to hear her even when the violence she experienced was made visible to them. Indeed, sharing stories of staff-student sexual violence is an everyday act in UK universities, which not only speaks both to the ways that stories of sexual violence are everyday but so too are stories of (in)security. They happen in ordinary spaces, in and around the university, be that in watching a protest go by a classroom window, a PhD student telling a colleague to avoid a man at the conference hotel bar, the story of a text message that gets shared among friends after a panel event, a conversation in the pub, or a conversation overheard in the toilets in the department. The #MeToo movement and its offshoot #TimesUpAcademia are public record of these everyday experiences in UK universities.

The proliferation of everyday hearings of staff-student sexual violence meant that in the course of her activism, Rosa (INT5) often found that when she organized meetings regarding staff-student sexual violence as part of her evidence gathering process, when she wanted to find out "if there was a pattern of abuse", that often she would "get on Skype and they [the

academic or student she had contacted to talk to] would say: 'I know what you want to talk to me about, you want to talk to me about Bob', and I was actually contacting them about Chris" (Rosa, INT5). Everyday experiences of staff-student sexual violence for Rosa were as ubiquitous as the stories she heard in her everyday life and in her role as an activist within her university.

Everyday stories work as mechanisms for sharing stories of staff-student sexual violence, as well as the sharing of institutional knowledge of reporting mechanisms. As I explored in Chapter 5, sharing stories can work as mechanisms for developing support networks as students and staff members navigate ways of hearing stories of violence in ways that directly counter the everyday insecurities generated in contexts of staff-student sexual violence. Everyday hearings of staff-student sexual violence often function in ways that work to counter the institution. As Rosa (INT5) worked behind the scenes to help many people who had experienced sexual violence at universities in and beyond the UK said she felt like an "an accidental expert and a secret consultant".

Indeed, while this chapter has focused on stories of institutional (in)security in contexts of reporting (or attempting to report) stories of staff-student sexual violence to universities, these stories are part of everyday life of (in)security within the university. Institutional (in)security is thus not divorced from everyday life but is produced through everyday life, as students negotiate the institution and its barriers through reading policy, talking to friends, talking to their supervisors, head of departments, and so on, sharing their stories of staff-student sexual violence in these divergent but interconnected everyday contexts. It is through these process that power and (in)security are produced through the institution, and so too are particular subjects of institutional power/(in)security. Everyday acts of consulting university policy situate the institutional documentation as a particular way to achieve/not achieve institutional (in)security. The power of heads of departments and supervisors to enact institutional (in)security is made legible through the ways they hear and respond to staff-student sexual violence, or how they share these stories afterwards, perhaps especially in ways that denigrate those who have asked for their help. Stories of staff-student sexual violence in universities bring together the everyday and the institutional, as co-constitutive practices.

In feminist security studies, the stories we tell about matters of (in)security are of fundamental importance to the way we produce knowledge of security and whose experiences of security we look to in order to do so. Stories of (in)security are thus "essential because they are a primary way by which we make sense of the world around us, produce meanings articulate intentions, and legitimize actions" they "are sites of the exercise of power; through narratives, we not only investigate but also invent an order for the world" (Wibben, 2011a: 2). For feminists, stories of everyday violence and (in)security have been fundamental to challenging the stories of (in)security and the international that for so long have worked to obscure everyday life, the lives of women, and the gendered, racialized, and colonial logics that undergird the production of international security as (academic) discipline and practice. It is stories from the everyday that show us how "power [is] deeply at work where it [is] least apparent" (Enloe, 2011: 447), and so we look to the ways that militarism, borders, states, and international organisations are product and productive of everyday lives, and everyday acts of violence. In this way, attending to stories from the everyday is one of the most valuable contributions feminist security studies has countered stories of (in)security that silence the gendered, racialized, and colonial (re)production of (in)security that happens in ordinary ways and is enacted onto the bodies of marginalized groups in their everyday lives (Enloe, 2000a).

As I have argued, the everyday stories of staff-student sexual violence that circulate throughout universities in the UK form part of the everyday life of feminist security studies. This closing scene is one of the everyday lives of early career scholars in feminist international politics which is embedded within the politics of (in)security that staff-student sexual violence produces within the university. Everyday feminist security studies and international politics are intertwined with relations of everyday sexual violence here, as these PhD students reflect on the implication of their department in the fallout of their friend's experience. In this sense, everyday sexual violence is both present/absent within feminist security studies, circulating behind the scenes in a disciplinary context in which stories of sexual violence from the everyday have been so crucial to its contributions to security studies as a discipline. As I argued in Chapter, 2, sustained attention to the university as a site of everyday (in)security contributes to feminist resistance to disciplinary logics surrounding the everyday and sexual violence.

Looking to the university, and staff-student sexual violence within it, expanding the conceptual reach of the everyday. Consequently, involving a deeper interrogation of the university's relationship to the production of (in)security. Doing so makes important contributions to how we can understand the ways everyday insecurities are produced within, and circulate throughout, the university as a focal point for security studies but a site that has not received detailed attention, particularly in contexts of sexual violence. This involves an orientation to violence 'over here' that does more to confront the role of the Western university in the international politics of (in)security. In looking 'over here' with this sustained engagement, the role of the university in the gendered, colonial, racialized and ableist politics of (in)security can be more clearly discerned.

Conclusion

This chapter has fabulated two scenes of staff-student sexual violence in relation to the hearing. The first looked to Liera's experiences attempting to navigate institutional recourses to security having been assaulted by a Professor in her department. I thought through the ways that institutional recourses to security are often profoundly implicated in the (re)production of insecurity, and put Liera's experiences of institutional (in)security into conversation with feminist security studies scholarship on institutions of (in)security and sexual violence. I argued that although feminist security studies has not positioned the university as an institution of (in)security, there are considerable connections that can be made between the reproduction of (in)security in contexts of staff-student sexual violence in the university, and common themes explored in other institutional sites of (in)security. The themes I examined here related to the difficulties in accessing institutional structures: those who attempt to have their stories heard are often disbelieved and/or subjected to gendered and ableist discrimination and violence when attempting to be heard. I also argued that the universities position as a 'security provider' is grounded in interconnected processes of gendered, racialised and colonial histories of violence that are central to the production of institutions of security and their inherent relationship to questions and practices of violence and (in)security.

In the second scene of this chapter, I fabulated a conversation between PhD students in feminist security studies as a base point to reflect on the importance of hearing everyday stories of staff-student sexual violence within the university and feminist security studies. I argued that this allows security studies to consider more deeply the ways that the "mundane matters" (Enloe, 2011: 447), in international politics, that "the sites where we [..] have to dig [are] kitchens, bedrooms, and secretarial pools; [..] pubs, brothels, squash courts, and factory lunch rooms" (Enloe, 2011: 447), by paying detailed attention to the ways the everyday life of the university is embedded within a wider politics of institutional (in)security. Given the connections that can be drawn between matters of international (in)security, everyday violence, and the university, and particularly its constitution through global relations of violence, hearing stories of violence deepens analysis of the university's implication in politics of (in)security, and of the practice of 'hearing' as a locus of feminist security studies theorising. The hearing speaks to complex contestations over security and insecurity within our universities and within feminist security studies. Who, how, and where someone is heard is fundamental to how this impacts their experiences of insecurity within UK universities. Whether you are heard by a friend, a colleague, a supervisor, an institutional panel, if you are heard as credible (or not). In this way, the hearing raises important questions about where we hear (in)security, whose stories we listen to, where these stories are located, and how they figure into how we understand sexual violence and (in)security.

In the conclusion of this thesis I draw together the arguments made throughout this PhD. I reflect upon the overall significance of the arguments I have made in relation to the Classroom, the Conference, and the Hearing. I also take time to reflect on broader contributions this thesis makes through understanding the university and staff-student sexual violence as sites of everyday (in)security, and point to broader significance this has for understanding violence, the everyday, and (in)security through the university.

Conclusion

In my thesis, I have worked to recalibrate the everyday, inquiring into the politics of staff-student sexual violence 'over here' in the UK university. I have demonstrated that staff-student sexual violence is embedded within a wider politics of everyday (in)security on campus, that is interconnected to wider gendered and racialised histories of international (in)security. Fabulating the scenes of the Classroom (4), the Conference (5), and the Hearing (6), I have shown that by looking to stories of everyday staff-student sexual violence we can examine the ways (in)security is experienced and negotiated in everyday life in UK universities.

Looking 'over here' to the UK university has constituted a recalibration of analysis of everyday sexual violence in security studies in a number of ways. I have intervened into theoretical discussions regarding the relationships between the discipline of security studies and the (re)production of racialised and colonial practices of knowledge production. In Chapter two, I argued that the everyday (in and beyond contexts of sexual violence) tends to be located 'out there' in racialised and colonial contexts, or 'over there' whereby analysis of the everyday is typically utilised as a means to understand pre-accepted, and often dominant, sites of international politics. In addition to this, looking to scholarship on sexual violence in feminist security studies, I argued that there is a tendency to locate issues of sexual violence 'over there' in ways that reproduce racialised and colonial logics in the discipline. This works to reinscribe notions that violence and (in)security are outside of the West and the subsequent location of (in)security as a problem of the Global South. Moreover, this involves the continued location of Black and Brown bodies (often men), as the perpetrators of acts of sexual violence.

I have turned to staff-student sexual violence 'over here' in the university in order to take seriously the importance of not reproducing these racialised and colonial enactments within the discipline of security studies. Looking 'over here', then, contributes to scholarship that has sought to both address and resist the reproduction of racism and colonialism within security studies. In addition to this, I argue that looking 'over here' to relations of (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in the university contributes to confronting the gendered and racialised foundations on which the university and security studies are grounded.

As I outlined in my introduction, the disconnect between the university as a space in which I learned so much about everyday (in)security and sexual violence, and the absence of attention to relations of sexual violence and (in)security within the university is what sparked my feminist curiosity in this project. While the everyday and sexual violence in feminist security studies particularly was a critical part of my education at universities in the UK, the everyday enactments of staff-student sexual violence and (in)security in the university were absented from these discussions. While the everyday and sexual violence seemed to be everywhere, I wondered why we did not inquire into these questions of (in)security 'over here' in the UK university.

As I have noted, the university is curiously located in security studies. The everyday life of the university is the everyday context in which large swathes of security studies scholarship is produced. The discipline of security studies, and scholarship on the everyday and sexual violence therein, is produced through everyday practices, encounters, and routines that are part of how everyday life in the university unfolds. Security studies scholarship is produced through the mundane and the banal. It is made and unmade, for example, in university classrooms, as teachers in security studies and their students discuss the merits of feminist standpoint theory or the everyday practices of sexual violence in peacekeeping missions.

I have unpacked the everyday site of the university in relation to staff-student sexual violence in a new light within this thesis. Reorienting attention to the university as a site of ongoing relations of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security. I have therefore reworked the concept of the everyday in relation to the university by situating the university as a focal point for inquiry in this feminist security studies project. Throughout my thesis, I have demonstrated that staff-student sexual violence offers contributions to our understandings of how everyday (in)security and sexual violence related to wider practices of violence and marginalization.

I have demonstrated this in all three of my empirical chapters, situating the scenes of the Classroom, the Conference and the Hearing as embedded within gendered and racialised politics of (in)security in the university. This analysis was framed by my discussion in Chapter one of the university as deeply intertwined in the production of racialised and colonial histories, as my intervention into the theoretical terrain of the everyday and sexual violence

in Chapter two. In Chapter four, I worked to illustrate that the classroom is a political space that is interwoven with gendered, racialised, and heteronormative relations of (in)security in the university. In Chapter five, I situated conference events in international politics within wider gendered and racialised practices of knowledge production in security studies, connecting this politics to the everyday enactment of gendered and racialised relations of (in)security and staff-student sexual violence within this context. In Chapter six, I showed that the power to render secure or insecure is interconnected the production of institutional (in)security which we can situate within a broader racialised and gendered terrain. I further showed that the ways that institutional (in)security works to compound insecurities is embedded within gendered and also ableist enactments of violence.

Critical Fabulation

The methodology of critical fabulation has been crucial to contributing to the deepening of the everyday in contexts of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security in the university. As I examined in Chapter three, stories from everyday life are embedded within relations of power in ways that work to obscure the information from the everyday that we can gleam, particularly in contexts of violence. As such, the everyday, while it is imbued with relations of power, violence, and (in)security in our universities can be difficult to access. In regard to staff-student sexual violence, there were so many points that these relations of power worked to curtail aspects of the stories my participants could relay to me. They had concerns about going into specific details, about their stories and themselves being identified, and about identifying others in their stories. One of my participants had signed an NDA, which became somewhat of an elephant in the room of our interview. We could not discuss large parts of her experiences and knowledge surrounding staff-student sexual violence, nor the details of the NDA she had signed, as the legal constraints of this agreement meant she could not give voice to large parts of her experience. These examples speak to the silences/absences that are interwoven through accounts of staff-student sexual violence and (in)security in the everyday life of universities in the UK.

Critical fabulation as a method allowed me in this thesis to push at these silences/absences, to "excavate the margins" (Hartman, 2008: 2), in order to work with the silences/absences that resonate through stories of staff-student sexual violence precisely because of their

situation in the relations of power that give rise to these forms of violence and the (in)securities they engender. In order to do so, I worked with critical fabulation in my empirical chapters, The Classroom (4), The Conference (5) and The Hearing (6), in ways that allowed me to extend understandings of everyday staff-student sexual violence and (in)security by working with the constraints inflected on the stories of staff-student sexual violence my participants told me. Doing so in order to work to paint a fuller picture of the everyday in contexts of (in)security in UK universities. Building on the stories of staff-student sexual violence I gathered during my fieldwork, I have worked to examine aspects of the everyday we do not always get to see, while my mode of fabulation has remained grounded in the lived experiences of those I spoke to. I have done so in order to enliven the everyday, to enflesh it, to embed it within the broader politics of practices and encounters at universities. I have shown in this vein, that attending an EDI training workshop (Chapter four), receiving a text message at a conference (Chapter five), and trying to access institutional procedures of (in)security (Chapter six) are all everyday sites in which (in)security as lived and negotiated in UK universities can be made visible.

In doing so, I have contributed to scholarship that resists the exceptionalisation of violence and (in)security by showing that staff-student sexual violence and the (in)securities it (re)produces are grounded in everyday practices, encounters, and negotiations in the UK university. Critical fabulation has enabled me to extend our understanding of how the everyday is embedded within relations of violence and (in)security. In place of (in)security and violence being exceptionalised states, I have illustrated how sexual violence and (in)security can be discerned through attention to the everyday practices of grouping up with people you feel safe with when attending a conference, going to an office hour meeting, having a conversation at the conference hotel bar, and pouring over complaints procedures. I have rendered the everyday practices of power and (in)security in contexts of staff-student sexual violence visible through these everyday aspects of life in UK universities.

In this way and linking back to my arguments regarding the tendencies in security studies to locate sexual violence and (in)security 'over there' and 'out there', critical fabulation has enabled me to recalibrate the everyday 'over here' in the UK university. In orienting the study of everyday (in)security and sexual violence 'over here' via the method of critical fabulation,

I have worked to defamiliarize the familiar in the context of security studies and the university. While the university is pivotal to the everyday life of research and teaching in security studies, and is in many ways then a familiar scene, I have defamiliarized the familiar by situating the university and staff-student sexual violence therein as a way to examine the relationship(s) between the everyday, sexual violence and (in)security. To do so, I have taken three sites: the classroom, the conference, and the institutional hearing. These sites are familiar in research and teaching in universities in security studies, however I have worked to render them unfamiliar by situating them as focal points through which to understand how everyday sexual violence and (in)security are enacted, and their impacts felt in the lives of those who experience these forms of violence in their daily lives in universities in the UK.

Critical fabulation as a method for research into everyday sexual violence and (in)security is all the more significant given ongoing and, arguably, increasing uses of institutional modes of silencing in contexts of staff-student sexual violence. As I have noted, the use of NDAs in contexts of staff-student sexual violence is one such method in which people are rendered unable to speak to their everyday experiences of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. In addition to this, universities and publishers have recently engaged in further acts of institutional silencing in regard to staff-student sexual violence on campus. In September 2023, an edited volume entitled Sexual Misconduct in Academia: Informing an Ethics of Care in the University, that had been published by Routledge (Taylor and Francis) in March 2023, was pulled following a cease-and-desist letter issued to Routledge by an academic claiming to be the subject of three (anonymised) stories of sexual violence from three women. Two of these women were PhD students, and one was a postdoc at the time of their experiences of sexual violence enacted by a member of academic staff at a university in Portugal (Morgan, 2023).

In the face of these practices, critical fabulation offers us a way in. It provides a method of inquiry that enables continued excavation of the experiences of sexual violence and (in)security in the university despite ongoing practices of institutionalised silencing. These two examples are indicative of the ways in which sexual violence and (in)security continue to result in experiences of silence and silencing that both compound everyday insecurities and limit the ability of those who have experienced sexual violence to share their stories. As a

result of these practices of institutional silencing, these people can't tell us exactly what happened to them, or what their university did in response to their experiences of staff-student sexual violence, or how it made them feel, or how it impacted their everyday life. They cannot do so precisely because if they share their stories, they will be subject to further forms of violence and (in)security. Critical fabulation allows us to "work with and against the constraints imposed" (Hartman, 2022: 12) by these institutional practices of (in)security. As such, it allows us to continue to examine the role of the everyday and to amplify the importance of everyday stories of violence. It allows us to continue to make ground on understandings of how power, violence, and the university are embedded within a politics of (in)security, even when these relations of power attempt to obscure these stories from everyday life, and the lives of those who experience staff-student sexual violence. Critical fabulation thus matters so significantly because it allows us to always bring the everyday, everyday lives, and stories of violence that have subject to marginalisation back into view.

Future Research Agendas: where do we go from here?

I have demonstrated throughout this thesis that looking 'over here' to relations of everyday (in)security and staff-student sexual violence in the university offers important contributions to feminist security studies. Doing so allows us to unpack in more depth how everyday life in UK universities is engaged in a politics of (in)security that is embedded in gendered, racialised, and ableist modes of violence. Looking to the UK university in this way contributes to resisting racialised and colonial logics that posit the West and Western University as outside of the scope of inquiry as sites of violence and (in)security, particularly in contexts of sexual violence. Recalibrating the everyday to examining relations of (in)security 'over here' therefore opens us space for a future research agenda on the everyday politics of (in)security and UK universities. In particular, this research agenda can contribute to developing the relationship between the university as a site in which staff-student sexual violence is embedded within gendered, racialised, heteronormative, and ableist practices of (in)security. Furthermore, as I argued in chapter one, the university is engaged in a complex set of relations of violence and (in)security, and therefore looking 'over here' in this thesis provides critical ground to expand our understandings of the relationship between (in)security and violence and the UK university beyond sexual violence exclusively.

As I remarked upon in Chapter one, there is a lack of research on staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. My thesis has provided an important new set of empirical data on this issue in the form of gathering stories of staff-student sexual violence through interviews and surveys. For example, my thesis is the first piece of academic scholarship that has situated academic conference events as a focal point for generating data on staff-student sexual violence within UK universities. Moreover, at the time of writing, this is the first piece of scholarship that has gathered empirical data on staff-student sexual violence and relations of (in)security within the university specifically. Given that currently staff-student sexual violence and (in)security is hugely understudied, there are many contributions that future research could make. Doing so would in particular speak to key concerns within feminist scholarship on (in)security and violence, and furthering illustration of the gendered, racialised, heteronormative and ableist politics of sexual violence and (in)security on university campuses.

My empirical findings have demonstrated that staff-student sexual violence is deeply intertwined with gendered and racialised modes of (in)security. In Chapter five, in the scene of 'colonial cocktails at the hotel bar', I illustrated the ways that gendered and racialised practices come to bear on relations of staff-student sexual violence at the conference, producing affective and embodied experiences of (in)security. As the first systematic mode of data collection on conference events and staff-student sexual violence, my research here highlights the importance of continuing to examine the intersection of gendered and racialised hierarchies in international politics and security studies by looking to conference events. In particular by understanding these as spaces of knowledge production and simultaneously a space of ongoing enactments of sexualised violence, where, as I argued, the elision of the public/private is crucial to this politics. In Chapter six, I examined how institutional recourses of 'security' are implicated in familiar and seemingly contradictory practices in which they work to reproduce relations of gendered insecurities they ostensibly offer protection from. Here I have highlighted the ways in which researching institutional apparatuses of 'security' in the university in contexts of staff-student sexual violence can be utilised as a means to examine the reproduction of gendered and ableist practices. I argued that this offers fruitful grounds in particular for achieving greater understandings of the connections and discontinuities between institutions of (in)security in contexts of everyday

sexual violence, and thus from further research on the university we can demonstrate in more detail the relationship between the everyday and institutional providers of (in)security more broadly.

I have made contributions to research on the intersection of heteronormativity and ableism in contexts of staff-student sexual violence and everyday (in)security. In Chapter four, I reflected on Anthony's (INT1) story in this context, demonstrating that looking to the politics of everyday conversations in UK universities can offer important insights into the interconnections between heteronormativity and the circulation of knowledge of staff-student sexual violence and relations of (in)security amongst members of staff in UK universities. As I also noted in Chapter four, I have found that there currently exists no data on the experiences of transgender, gender queer, and nonbinary individuals in the context of staff-student sexual violence in UK universities. Attending to the experiences of these groups is all the more pertinent given the current political landscape across UK universities, in which the transgender community has in particular been subject to increasing forms of violence and marginalisation. The absence of data surrounding the experiences of trans, and gender queer individuals highlights an intersection between their marginalisation in UK universities in the current political climate and within research on sexual violence in UK universities, despite what we know of the higher rates of violence these groups often experience.

In Chapter six, in my discussion of students' experiences of institutional recourses of 'security' and the everyday (in)securities they engender, I argued that gendered and ableist practices, particularly in respect to mental illness, are critical to the reproduction of insecurity in contexts of staff-student sexual violence. This makes contributions to our understandings of ableism, gender, and institutional (in)security. Marta's story highlights the significance of examining the relationship between institutional responses to sexual violence and the utilisation intersection of gendered and ableist modes in which these insecurities are compounded when those who've experienced sexual violence approach institutional recourses of 'security'. The significance of Marta's (SUR3) story of gendered and ableist institutional violence is all the more important given what is overall an under-theorisation of the role of ableism in security studies, in and beyond contexts of sexual violence. Thus, my thesis has signaled important avenues through which we can understand gender and ableism

as interconnected modes of violence and (in)security that are enacted by institutional providers of (in)security.

The significance of looking 'over here' to the UK university to inquire into relations of everyday (in)security has implications for research in security studies that extend beyond staff-student sexual violence specifically. As I detailed in Chapter one, UK universities are engaged in a variety of everyday practices of (in)security on campus that are interwoven with the universities broader situation within relations of international (in)security. This is especially given the UK universities relationship to broader histories of gendered and racialised violence in the international arena. This includes, for example: the development of Security Services, and their role in patrolling, policing, and suveilling of university campuses; the monitoring of students on Tier 4 visas and the enactment of everyday border controls on campus; and the PREVENT agenda and the targeting of Muslim students and those racialised as Muslim (Mirza, 2018).

My analysis of the enactment of a securitised force on campus via Security Services raises pertinent questions surrounding the use of carceral practices and extensive surveillance monitoring across UK universities. As I detailed, security services have been engaged in racialised practices of violence against Black students in particular. This is indicative of security services as an institutional structure of (in)security on campus that is intertwined with the (re)production of racism on campus. In order to understand these practices in more depth, it is necessary to situate the development of security services in the context of the institutionalisation of (in)security at UK universities and their connections to police and militarised forces more broadly.

Border controls on campus and the PREVENT agenda are staunch examples of the universities role in racialised practices of state violence. Everyday practices such as census check-ins, attendance monitoring, and liaison with the Home Office work to produce everyday border practices in the university. Here the everyday acts of checking which students are in class, and which are not, or walking to an administrative office on campus come to constitute everyday practices of securing the state, and by extension, the university. It is not only here that the power of border becomes visible through these everyday acts, but that university staff are (re)configured as those who must work to guard the borders of the state. The PREVENT

agenda, also a state mandated exercise which has resulted in the targeting of Muslim students and those racialised as Muslim works similarly as an extension of state violence and control on university campuses (Mirza, 2018). Where everyday encounters, conversations, and participation in educational environments such as classrooms become subject to monitoring and suspicion, particularly for racialised students. As everyday practices in the university are engaged in the detection and prevention of potential violence, the everyday becomes even further bound up in a reproduction of racialised modes of security that warrant further examination.

What's more, recently, evidence has come to light that shows the surveillance and monitoring tactics of university security services have operated in conjunction with oil and gas conglomerates and private investigators, targeting student activists on campus. At the University of Warwick, it has been uncovered that the security services team worked with intelligence and security staff at BP to surveil a student who was attempting to access the BP archives - which are housed on Warwick's campus – for research to help him write his application for a master's programme. In emails sent back and forth between BP and Warwick's security staff, this student was located as a potential 'threat' to BP due to his involvement in anti-fossil fuel campaigns on campus, and subsequently Warwick and BP entered into a joint surveillance project. The student was placed under multiple forms of surveillance, which Warwick and BP attempted to keep "discreet", "low key, no high viz" (OpenDemocracy, 2021: 26) in order to avoid their project being detected. In 2022, the University of Sheffield hired private investigator firm Intersol Global to investigate two student activists the university alleged to have taken part in protests against Sheffield's links to the arms trade. These students received threatening letters from Intersol Global, including threats regarding the potential receipt of fines, suspension or even expulsion if they were found to have broken any university rules of conduct. They were required to submit bank statements and witness statements proving they were not in Sheffield at the time (Hall, 2023).

What these examples demonstrate is that UK universities are engaged in a politics through which we can investigate multiple threads of (in)security including but extending beyond issues of staff-student sexual violence. Through these practices we can work to uncover the interconnections between securing the university, the (re)production of carceral politics and

everyday practices of racism, state violence, and the development of modes of surveillance and monitoring of student activists. As well as this, we can ask after the relationships between everyday practices of (in)security and the universities connections to private security firms, international oil and gas companies, the arms trade. These practices interlock with questions I have asked throughout this thesis, and most explicitly in Chapter six, namely being that we can and should question the politics of who and what 'security' is for in the university.

It is through the everyday that we can discern the politics of these practices, and their impacts on those who experience everyday practices of (in)security as ongoing forms of violence and marginalisation in UK universities. (in)Security and violence are manifest in everyday conversations, everyday stories of violence, and everyday encounters with apparatuses of institutional (in)security in the university. As I have shown, this politics of (in)security has profound impacts on the lives of those who experience staff-student sexual violence violence in the university.

And so, looking 'over here' to the university matters for understanding how the everyday is central to understanding the politics of (in)security. As I have demonstrated in my inquiry into staff-student sexual violence in the UK university, these practices of (in)security are fundamental to understanding how the everyday is implicated in the (re)production of gendered, racialised, heteronormative and ableist practices. Looking to everyday practices of (in)security in the university matters for resisting racialised and colonial logics in security studies. It matters for confronting the relations of violence and (in)security in the university, particularly as they relate to ongoing forms of violence and marginalisation in the everyday contexts in which security studies scholarship is produced. Lastly, attending to relations of (in)security and violence 'over here' in the university matters for demonstrating the importance of the everyday, and stories of violence from the everyday in security studies.

Bibliography

Ackerly, A., Stern, M., and True, J. (2006) 'Feminist Methodologies for International Relations', in Acklerly, A., Stern, M., and True, T (eds.) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ackerly, B and True, J. (2008) 'Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations', *International Studies Review*, Vol.10 (4): 693-707.

Adkins, K. (2017) *Gossip, Epistemology and Power: Knowledge Underground*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Agathangelou, A and Ling, L.H.M. (2004) 'The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the Poesies of Worldism', *International Studies Review*, Vol.6 (4): 21-50.

Agathangelou, A. (2017) 'From the Colonial to Feminist IR: Feminist IR Studies, the Wider FSS/GPE Research Agenda and the Questions of Value, Valuation, Security and Violence', *Special Issue on Gender Political Economy and Gender Security Studies, Gender and Politics,* Vol.13 (4): 739-746.

Åhäll, L and Gregory, T. (2015) 'Introduction: Mapping Emotions, Politics, and War', in Åhäll, L and Gregory, T. (eds.) *Emotions, Politics, and War,* Abington: Routledge.

Åhäll, L. (2019) 'Feeling Everyday IR: Embodied, Affective, Militarising Movement as Choreography of War', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 54 (2): 149-166.

Ahmed, S (2012) *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2004) *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2012) *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2017) *Living a Feminist Life*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2021) *Complaint!*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Ahmet, A. (2020) 'Who is Worthy of a Place on These Walls? Postgraduate Students, UK Universities, and Institutional Racism', *Area*, Vol. 52 (4): 678-686.

Al Jazeera Investigates (2021a) *Degrees of Abuse Part 1: '[He] Puts the Perv in Supervisor* [Podcast], Available at: https://open.spotify.com/episode/1AeMPzSfZvmFqz99ltCcPu accessed: 01/11/21.

Al Jazeera Investigates (2021b) *Degrees of Abuse Part 2: 'He Still Crossed All of Those Boundaries'* [Podcast], available at: https://open.spotify.com/episode/3GbDhNjqLD3YCQbflqZq1w accessed: 01/11/21.

Alexandra, K. (2011) 'Peacekeepers' Privilege and Sexual Abuse in Post-Conflict Populations', *Peace Review: a Journal of Social Science,* Vol. 23 (3): 369-376.

Ali, S. (2022) 'Managing Racism? Race Equality and Decolonial Futures', *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 73 (5): 923-941.

Anievas, A., Manchanda, N., Shilliam, R. (2015)' Confronting the Global Colour line: An Introduction', in Anievas, A., Manchanda, N., Shilliam R (eds.) *Race and Racism in International Relations: Confronting the Global Colour Line*, London and New York: Routledge.

Axter, S., et al. (2021) 'Colonial Lives of the Carceral Archipelago: Rethinking the Neoliberal Security State', *International Political Sociology*, Vol.15 (3): 415-439.

Baaz, E and Stern, M. (2013) *Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War?: Perceptions, Prescriptions, Problems in the Congo and Beyond*, London: Zed Books.

Baaz, M and Stern, M. (2009) 'Why do Soldiers Rape? Masculinity, Violence, and Sexuality in the Armed Forces in the Congo (DRC)', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.53 (2): 495-518.

Baaz, M and Stern, M. (2012) 'Beyond Militarised Masculinity: The Case of the DRC', in Baaz, M and Utas, M. (eds.) Beyond "Gender and Stir": Reflections on Gender and SSR in the Aftermath of African Conflicts, The Nordic Africa Institute

Baaz, M and Stern, M. (2014) 'Understanding Sexual Violence in Conflict and Post-Conflict Settings, in Evans, M et al (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Feminist Theory*, London and New York: Routledge.

Baaz, M and Stern, M. (2016) Researching Wartime Rape in the Democratic Republic of Congo: A Methodology of Unease' in Wibben, A (ed.) *Researching War: Feminist Methods, Ethics and Politics*, London and New York: Routledge.

Ball, P. (2022) 'Imperialism's Long Shadow: the UK Universities Grappling with a Colonial Past, *Nature*, available at: https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-03253-y accessed: 05/12/22.

Banwell, S. (2018) 'Security, Peace and Development: Unpacking Discursive Constructions of Wartime Rape and Sexual Violence in Syria', *International Journal of Peace and Development Studies*, Vol. 9 (2): 15-30.

Barkawi, T and Laffey, M. (2006) 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies', *Review of International Studies*, Vol.36 (2): 329-352.

Basham, V. (2013) *War, Identity, and the Liberal State: Everyday Experiences of the Geopolitical in the Armed Forces*, London and New York: Routledge.

Basham, V. (2016) 'Gender and Militaries: the Importance of Military Masculinities for the Conduct of State Sanctioned Violence', in Sharoni, S. et al. (eds). *Handbook on Gender and War*, International Handbooks on Gender: Edward Elgar.

Batty, D. (2017) 'Sussex University Failed Duty of Care to Assault Victim, Inquiry Finds', *The Guardian*, available at: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/jan/17/sussex-university-failed-duty-of-care-assault-victim-inquiry accessed: 10/10/2018.

Belcher, O and Martin, L. (2019) 'The Problem of Access: Site Visits, Selective Disclosure, and Freedom of Information in Qualitative Security Research' in De Goede, M., Bosma, E., Pallister-Wilkins, P. (eds.) *Secrecy and Methods in Security Research: A Guide to Qualitative Fieldwork*, London Routledge.

Bergin, K. (2008) 'Witness: The Racialised Gender Implications of Katrina', in Marable, M and Clarke, K. (eds.) *Seeking Higher Ground: The Hurricane Katrina Crisis, Race, and Public Policy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berlant, L. (2011) *Cruel Optimism*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bhambra, G. (2014) 'Introduction: Knowledge Production in Global Context: Power and Coloniality', *Current Sociology*, Vol. 62 (4): 451-456.

Bhambra, G. (2014) 'Postcolonial and Decolonial Dialogues', *Postcolonial Studies*, Vol. 17 (2): 115-121.

Bhambra, G. (2016) 'Postcolonial Reflections on Sociology', DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038516647683.

Bhambra, G., Gebrial, D., Nişancıoğlu, K. (2018) *Decolonising the University*, London: Pluto Press.

Blanchard, E. (2003) 'Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory', *Signs: Journal of Women and Culture in Society*, Vol. 28 (4): 1289-1312.

Bleckner, J. (2013) 'From Rhetoric to Reality: a Pragmatic Analysis of the Integration of Women into UN Peacekeeping Operations', *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 17 (3-4): 337-360.

Boesten, J. (2014) *Sexual Violence During War and Peace: Gender, Power, and Post-Conflict Justice in Peru*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boesten, J. (2017) 'Of Exceptions and Continuities: Theory and Methodology in Research on Conflict-Related Sexual Violence', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 19 (4): 506-519.

Bouattia, M. (2015) 'Beyond the Gap: Dismantling Institutional Racism, Decolonising Education' in Alexander, C and Arday, J (eds.) *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality, and Diversity in the Academy*, Runnymede Perspectives, available at: https://assets.website-files.com/61488f992b58e687f1108c7c/617bcf1cd124685da56a014c_Aiming%20Higher.pdf accessed 01/08/23.

Bourke, J. (2007) *Rape: a History From 1860 to the Present*, London: Virago.

Bovill et al. (2022) 'Female Undergraduates Playing it 'Safe' to Stay 'Safe': Further Understanding Sexual Violence against Women', *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol. 23 (1): 1-16.

Bozzo, A. (2007) 'A Tale of Two Cities: New Orleans After Katrina', *CNBC*, available at: https://www.cnbc.com/2007/08/27/a-tale-of-two-cities-new-orleans-after-katrina.html accessed 01/09/23.

Brim, M. (2020) *Poor queer Studies: Confronting Elitism in the University*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

British Medical Journal. (2021) 'Covid-19: Experts Condemn UK "Freedom Day" as Dangerous and Unethical, available at: https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n1829, accessed: 06/04/23.

Brownmiller, S. (1975) *Against Our Will: Women, Men, and Rape*, London: Secker and Warburg.

Bull, A and Rye, R. (2018) *Silencing Students*: *Institutional Responses to Staff-Sexual Misconduct in UK Higher Education*, the 1752 Group: University of Portsmouth, UK.

Butcher, S. (2020) 'Edinburgh Student Allegedly Stealthed by Uni Staff Member', *The Tab*, available at: https://thetab.com/uk/edinburgh/2020/07/20/anonymous-submission-alleges-edinburgh-student-stealthed-by-staff-member-66393 accessed: 11/10/21.

Campbell, D. (1992) *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Campbell, K., Demir, E and O'Reilly, M. (2019) 'Understanding Conflict-Related Sexual Violence and the 'Everyday' Experience of Conflict through Witness Testimonies', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 54 (2): 254-277.

Canales, S., Cassidy, C and Remeikis, A. (2023) 'Universities Criticised for Failed Response After Report Details Extent of Sexual Violence on Campuses', *The Guardian*, available at: https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/sep/14/universities-criticised-for-failed-response-after-report-details-extent-of-sexual-violence-on-campuses accessed: 20/09/23.

Carby, H. (2019) *Imperial Intimacies: A Tale of Two Islands*, London: Verso Books.

Carpenter, C. (2006) 'Recognizing Gender-Based Violence Against Civilian Men and Boys in Conflict Situations', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 37 (1): 83-103.

Carpenter, C. (2014) 'Recognising Gender-Based Violence Against Civilian Men and Boys in Conflict Situations', in Jamieson, R (ed.) *The Criminology of War*, London: Routledge.

choi, s (2021) 'Everyday Peace in Critical Feminist Theory', in Väyrynen, T., et al (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Peace Research*, London: Routledge.

choi, s. (2021) 'Telling our Racism and Sexism Stories Safely is a Global Security Problem: a Conversation Between Complainers', *Critical Studies on Security*, Vol.9 (1): 7-11.

Cockburn, C. (2004) 'The Continuum of Violence', in Giles, W and Hyndman, J (eds.) *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*, Berkely: University of California Press.

Coetzee, A and Du Toit, L. (2018) 'Facing the Sexual Demon of Colonial Power: Decolonising Sexual Violence in South Africa, *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 25 (2): 214-227.

Coetzee, A and du Toit, L. (2018) 'Facing the Sexual Demon of Colonial Power: Decolonising Sexual Violence in South Africa', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, Vol. 25 (2): 214-227.

Cohn, C. (1989) 'Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol.12 (4): 687-718.

Cohn, C. (2006) 'Motives and Methods: using Multi-Sited Ethnography to Study US National Security Discourses', in Ackerly, B., Stern, M., True, J. (eds.) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Côté-Boucher, K., Infantino, F and Salter, B (2014) 'Border Security as Practice: An Agenda for Research', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 45 (3): 195-208.

Crawford, K. (2013) 'From Spoils to Weapons: Framing Wartime Sexual Violence', *Gender and Development*, Vol. 21 (3): 505-517.

Crawford, K. (2017) *Wartime Sexual Violence: from Silence to Condemnation as a Weapon of War*, Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.

D'Costa, B. (2021) 'Learning/unlearning in International Relations through the Politics of Margins and Silence', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 75 (6): 591-603.

Danewid, I. (2019) 'The Fire this Time: Grenfell, Racial Capitalism and the Urbanisation of Empire', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 26 (1): 289-313.

Davenport, C. (2008) 'The Dark Side of International Studies: Race, Racism, and Research in International Studies', *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 9 (4): 445–49.

Davis, A. (2019) *Women, Race, and Class*, London: Penguin Books.

Denov, M. (2006) 'Wartime Sexual Violence: Assessing Human Security Response to War-Affected Girls in Sierra Leone', *Security Dialogue*, Vol.37 (3): 319-342.

Dey, A and Mendes, K. (2022) 'It Started with this One Post': #MeToo, India and Higher Education', *Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol. 31 (2): 204-215.

Dimier, V. (2006) 'Three Universities and the British Elite: A Science of Colonial Administration in the UK', *Public Administration*, Vol. 84 (2): 337-366.

Dolan, C., Baaz, M., Stern, M. (2020) 'What is Sexual about Conflict-Related Sexual Violence? Stories from Men and Women Survivors', *International Affairs*, Vol.96 (5): 1151-1168.

Dolan, C., Stern, M, Gray, H. (2020) 'Torture and Sexual Violence in War and Conflict: The Unmaking and Remaking of Subjects of Violence', *Review of International Studies*, Vol.46 (2): 197-216.

Donaldson et al. (2018) 'Preventing Gender Based Violence in UK Universities', in Sundari, A and Lewis, R (eds.) *Gender-Based violence in University Communities: Policy, Prevention and Educational Intervention*, Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Drumond, P. (2019) 'What About Men? Towards a Critical Interrogation of Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics', *International Affairs*, Vol. 95 (6): 1271-1287.

Elias, J and Rai, S. (2015) 'The Everyday Gendered Political Economy of Violence', *Politics and Gender*, Vol. 11 (2): 424-429.

Elias, J and Rai, S. (2019) 'Feminist Everyday Political Economy: Space, Time, and Violence', *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 45 (2): 201-220.

Elshtain, J. (1987) *Women and War*, Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press.

Enloe, C. (2000a) *Bananas, Beaches, Bases*, Berkely: University of California Press.

Enloe, C. (2000b) *Maneuvers: the International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Enloe, C. (2004) *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Enloe, C. (2011) 'The Mundane Matters', *International Political Sociology*, Vol.5 (4): 447-450.

Fitzpatrick, B. (2016) *Tactical Rape in War and Conflict: International Recognition and Response*, Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Freedman, J. (2011) 'Explaining Sexual Violence and Gender Inequalities in the DRC', *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10402659.2011.571601.

Freedman, R. (2018) 'Unaccountable: A New Approach to Peacekeepers and Sexual Abuse', *European Journal of International Law*, Vol. 29 (3): 961-985.

Freeman-Powell, S. (2020) 'Manchester University Student 'Traumatised' by 'Racial Profiling' Incident', *BBC News*, available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-54954602, accessed: 09/04/23.

Gebrial, D. (2018) 'Rhodes Must Fall: Oxford and Movements for Change' in Bhambra, G., Gebrial, D and Nişancıoğlu, K (eds.) *Decolonising the University*, London: Pluto Press.

George, N., Lee-Koo, Katrina, and Shepherd, L. (2018) 'Gender and the UN's Women, Peace and Security Agenda', in Gentry, C., Shepherd, L and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London: Routledge.

Gopal, P. (2021) 'On Decolonisation and the University', *Textual Practice*, Vol. 35 (6): 873-899.

Gore et al. (2022) The Political Economy of the Weinstein Scandal', *Global Society*, Vol. 37 (1): 93-113.

Grabner, C. (2018) 'Defiant Wordlings from Manchester, England: Expulsed Global Solidarities and the International Homeland of Dignity', *Journal of Urban Cultural Studies*, Vol.5 (2): 255-62.

Grady, K. (2010) 'Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by UN Peacekeepers: A Threat to Impartiality, *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 17 (2): 215-228.

Graham, D. (2008) 'The New Orleans that Race Built: Racism, Disaster, and Urban Spatial Relationships', n Marable, M and Clarke, K. (eds.) *Seeking Higher Ground: The Hurricane Katrina Crisis, Race, and Public Policy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gray, H and Stern, M. (2019) 'Risky Dis/Entanglements: Torture and Sexual Violence in Conflict', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 25 (4): 1035-1058.

Grey, V and Kelley, L. (2020) 'Contested Gendered Space: Public Sexual Harassment and Women's Safety Work', *International journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, Vol.44 (4): 265-275.

Grey, V. (2018) *The Right Amount of Panic: How Women Trade Freedom for Safety*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Gruffydd Jones, B. (2006) *Decolonising International Relations*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Guildford, M. (2018) 'Even Progressive Academics can be Racist. I've Experienced it Firsthand', *The Washington Post*, available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2018/09/11/even-progressive-academics-can-be-racist-ive-experienced-it-firsthand/ accessed: 20/05/21.

Guillame, X and Huysmans, J. (2019) 'The Concept of 'the Everyday': Ephemeral Politics and the Abundance of Life'*, Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol.54 (2): 278-296.

Haastrup, T and Hagen, J.J. (2020). 'Global Racial Hierarchies and the Limits of Localization via National Action Plans', in Basu, S., Shepherd, L., and Kirby, P (eds.) *New Directions for Women, Peace and Security*, Bristol: Bristol University Press.

Haastrup, T and Hagen, J.J. (2021) 'Racial hierarchies of knowledge production in the Women, Peace and Security Agenda.' *Critical Studies on Security*, Vol. 9 (1): 27–30.

Hahn, B. (2020) *Technology in the Industrial Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haiti By Force (2017) *Al Jazeera English: Fault Lines* [Youtube] available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ml0I4LolBjI accessed: 09/06/22.

Hall, R. (2023) 'Sheffield University Criticised for Hiring Private Investigator after Protest', *The Guardian*, available at: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2023/mar/13/sheffield-university-criticised-over-handling-of-protest-investigation, accessed: 20/09/23.

Hansen, L. (2000) 'Gender, Nation, Rape: Bosnia and the Construction of Security', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 3 (1): 55-75.

Hansen, L. (2010) *'Ontologies, Epistemologies, Methodologies'*, in Shepherd, L. (ed.) Gender Matters in Global Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations, New York and London: Routledge.

Hartman, S. (1997) *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hartman, S. (2008) 'Venus in Two Acts', *Small Axe: a Journal of Criticism*, Vol.12 (2): 1-14.

Hartman, S. (2021) *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate Histories of Riotous Black Girls, Troublesome Women and Queer Radicals*, New York: Norton.

Hartman, S. (2022*) Scenes of Subjection*, (revised ed.), New York: Norton.

Heath, D. (2016) 'Torture, the State, and Sexual Violence against Men in Colonial India', *Radical History Review*, doi 10.1215/01636545-3594469.

Heath, D. (2016) 'Torture, the State, and Sexual Violence against Men in Colonial India', *Radical History Review*, doi 10.1215/01636545-3594469.

Hemmings, C. (2011) *Why Stories Matter: The Political Grammar of Feminist Theory*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Henderson, E. (2015) 'Hidden in Plain Sight: Racism in International Relations Theory', in Anievas, A., Manchanda, N., Shilliam R (eds.) *Race and Racism in International Relations: Confronting the Global Colour Line*, London and New York: Routledge.

Henry, M and Powell, A. (2014) *Preventing Sexual Violence: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Overcoming a Rape Culture*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Henry, M. (2013) 'Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in UN Peacekeeping Missions: Problematising Current Responses', in Madhok, S., Phillips, A and Wilson, K. (eds.) *Gender, Agency, and Coercion*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Henry, M. (2017) 'Problematizing Military Masculinity, Intersectionality and Male Vulnerability in Feminist Critical Military Studies', *Critical Military Studies*, Vol.3 (2): 182-199.

Henry, M. (2021) 'On the Necessity of Critical Race Feminism for Women, Peace and Security', *Critical Studies on Security*, Vol. 9 (1): 22-26.

Higate, P and Henry, M. (2004) 'Engendering (in)security in Peace Support Operations', *Security Dialogue*, Vol.35 (4): 481-498.

Higate, P and Henry, M. (2009) *Insecure Spaces: Peacekeeping, Power and Performance in Haiti, Kosovo and Liberia*, London: Zed Books.

Higate, P and Henry, M. (2010) 'Space, Performance, and Everyday Security in the Peacekeeping Context', *International Peacekeeping*, Vol.17 (1): 32-48.

Higate, P. (2003) *Militarised Masculinities: Identity and the State*, London: Praeger.

Higate, P. (2004) *Gender and Peacekeeping, Case Studies: the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sierra Leone*, Pretoria (SA): Institute for Security Studies.

Higate, P. (2012) 'Drinking Vodka from the 'Butt-Crack': Men, Masculinities, and Fratriarchy in the Private Militarised Security Company', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 14 (4): 450-469.

Hobbs, J. (2021) 'Plasma Donation at the Border: Feminist Technoscience, Bodies and Race', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 52 (1): 45-61.

Hobbs, J. (2022) 'Capacitating Militarised Masculinity: Genitourinary Injuries, Sex/Sexuality, and US Military Medicine', *Review of International Studies*, doi:10.1017/S0260210522000560.

hooks, b (1994) *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*, London and New York: Routledge.

Horn, D and Yadav, P. (2021) 'Continuums of Violence', in Väyrynen, T., et al (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Peace Research*, London: Routledge.

House of Commons Library. (2021) 'Coronavirus: A History of 'Lockdown Laws' in England', accessible at: https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-9068/CBP-9068.pdf accessed: 06/04/23.

Howell, A and Richter-Montpetit, M. (2019) 'Racism in Foucauldian Security Studies: Biopolitics, Liberal War, and the Whitewashing of Colonial and Racial Violence', *International Political Sociology*, Vol.13 (1): 2-19.

Howell, A and Richter-Montpetit, M. (2020) 'Is Securitisation Theory Racist? Civilizationism, Methodological Whiteness, and Anti-Black Thought in the Copenhagen School, *Security Dialogue*, Vol.20 (51): 3-22.

Howell, A and Richter-Montpetit, M. (2023) 'Upholding Disciplinary Whiteness: The #SdScandal, Gender and International Relations' Critical Turn', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 54 (4): 313-336.

Howell, A. (2012) 'Toward an International Political Sociology of Health and Medicine: Introduction', *International Political Sociology*, Vol.6 (3): 15-16.

Howell, A. (2018) 'Forget Militarization: Race, Disability, and the Martial Politics pf the Police and of the University', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol.2 (2): 117-136.

Hudson, H. (2016) 'Decolonizing the mainstreaming of gender in peacebuilding: toward an agenda for Africa', *New York: Social Science Research Council*, Available at: https://s3.amazonaws.com/ssrc-cdn1/crmuploads/new_publication_3/%7B2DC474C6-B02A-E711-80C4-005056AB0BD9%7D.pdf, accessed: 25/08/23.

Hudson, H. (2018) 'Decolonising Gender and Peacebuilding: Feminist Frontiers and Border Thinking in Africa', in Shepherd, L (ed.) *Building Peace: Feminist Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Imperial College London. (2021) Community Report from the History Group, available at: https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/administration-and-support-services/equality/public/history-group/History-Group-Report-2021---Version-2.pdf accessed: 15/04/23.

Imperial College London. (2023a) *Security*, available at: https://www.imperial.ac.uk/estates-facilities/security/ accessed: 10/06/23.

Imperial College London. (2023b) *Secured Environments*, available at: https://www.imperial.ac.uk/estates-facilities/security/secured-environments/ accessed: 10/06/23.

Innes, A and Steele, B. (2019) 'Gender and Everyday Violence', in Gentry, C, Shepherd, L and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London and New York: Routledge.

Innes, A.J. (2021) 'Banal Bordering: Everyday Encounters Between Migrants and Security Officers', *Migration Studies,* Vol. 9 (3): 968–988.

International Feminist Journal of Politics, n.d. 'About the Journal' available at: https://www.ifjpglobal.org, accessed: 24/09/23.

Jacobsen, M. (2009) *Encountering the Everyday: An Introduction to Sociologies of the Unnoticed*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jaleel, R. (2021) *The Work of Rape*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Jenkins, M. (2014) 'On the effects and implications of UK Border Agency involvement in higher education', *Geographical Journal*, Vol. 180(3): 265-270.

Jones, C., Chappell, A., Alldred, P. (2021) 'Feminist Education for University Staff Responding to Disclosures of Sexual Violence: a Critique of the Dominant Model of Staff Development', *Gender and Education*, 2021, Vol.33 (2): 121-137.

Jones, D and Saunders, T. (2022) *Students, Sex Work and Sexual Violence: An Exploration and Guide for UK Universities*, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Joseph-Salisbury, R. (2019) 'Institutionalised Whiteness, Racial Microaggressions and Black Bodies Out of Place in Higher Education', *Whiteness and Education*, Vol.4 (1): 1-17.

Karim, S and Beardsley, K. (2016) 'Explaining Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Peacekeeping Missions: the Role of Female Peacekeepers and Gender Equality in Contributing Countries', *Journal of Peace Research,* Vol. 53 (1): 100-115.

Karim, S. (2019) 'Gender and Peacekeeping', Gentry, C., Shepherd, L., and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London and New York: Routledge.

Kasinsky, R. (1998) 'Tailhook and the Construction of Sexual Harassment in the Media', *Violence Against Women*, Vol.4 (1): 81-99.

Katz, L. (2016) *Treating Military Sexual Trauma*, New York (NY): Springer Publishing.

Khalid, M. (2019) 'Gender, Race, and The Insecurity of Security, in Gentry, C., Shepherd, L., and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London and New York: Routledge.

Kirby, P and Henry, M. (2012) 'Re-thinking Masculinity and Practices of Violence in Conflict Settings', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol.14 (4): 445-449.

Kirby, P. (2012) 'How is Rape a Weapon of War? Feminist International Relations, Modes of Critical Explanation and the Study of Wartime Sexual Violence'*, European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.19 (4) 797-821.

Kirby, P. (2019) 'Wartime Sexual Violence', in Gentry, C, Shepherd, L and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London and New York: Routledge.

Kooman, J. (2013) '"Without These Women, the Tribunal Cannot Do Anything": The Politics of Witness Testimony on Sexual Violence at the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 38 (2): 254-277.

Kronsell, A. (2006) 'Methods for Studying Silences: Gender Analysis in Institutions of Hegemonic Masculinity, in Ackerly, B., Stern, M., True, J. (eds.) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kystalli, R. (2019) 'Narrating Violence: Feminist Dilemmas and Approaches', in Shepherd, L. (ed.) *Handbook on Gender and Violence*, London and New York: Routledge.

Lee, D and Kennelly, L. (2019) 'Inside the Warwick University Rape Chat Scandal', *BBC News*, available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-48366835 accessed: 06/09/2019.

Ling, L. (2014) *Imagining World Politics: Sihar and Shenya, a Fable for Our Times*, London: Routledge.

Luke, C and Gore, J. (1992) 'Introduction', in Luke, C., Gore, J (eds.) *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*, New York and London: Routledge.

Mackenzie, M. (2012) *Female Soldiers in Sierra Leone: Sex, Security, and Post-Conflict Development*, New York: New York University Press.

MacKenzie, M., Gunaydin E., Chaudhuri, U. (2020) 'Illicit Military Behaviour as Exceptional and Endemic: Media Coverage of Military Sexual Violence and the 'Bad Apples' Paradox', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.64 (1): 45-56.

Maddison, S. (2013) 'Indigenous identity, 'Authenticity' and the Structural Violence of Settler Colonialism', *Global Studies in Culture and Power*, Vol. 20 (3): 288-303.

Manchester Metropolitan University. (2023) *Personal Safety: Helping you to Enjoy Student Life Safely*, available at: accessed: 10/06/23.

Manne, K. (2018) *Down Girl: The Logic of Misogyny*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Massey, R and Tyerman, T. (2023) 'Remaining 'in-between' the divides? Conceptual, Methodological and Ethical Political Dilemmas of Engaged Research in Military Studies', *Critical Studies on Security*, DOI: 10.1080/21624887.2023.2194503.

Massey, R. (2019) 'Reforming Masculinity: the Politics of Gender, Race, Militarism, and Security Sector Reform in the Democratic Republic of Congo', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2021.1937267.

Masters, C. (2019) 'Gender, Violence, and Technology', in Gentry, C., Shepherd, L., and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London and New York: Routledge.

Matera, M. (2010) 'Colonial Subjects: Black Intellectuals and the Development of Colonial Studies in Britain', *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 49 (2): 388-418.

McLeod, L. (2015) *Gender politics and Security Discourse Personal-Political Imaginations and Feminism in "Post-Conflict" Serbia*, London: Routledge.

Medien, K. (2021) 'Israeli Settler Colonialism, "Humanitarian Warfare," and Sexual Violence in Palestine', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 23 (5): 698-719.

Meger, S. (2016) *Rape, Loot, Pillage: The Political Economy of Sexual Violence in Armed Conflict*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meger, S. (2016b) 'The Fetishization of Sexual Violence in International Security', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 60 (1): 149-159.

Mehta, A and Wibben, A. (2018) Feminist Narrative Approaches to Security, in Gentry, C., Shepherd, L and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London: Routledge.

Mertens, C. (2023) 'In the Ruins of Empire: Historicizing Sexual Violence in the Congo', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 25 (3): 529-550.

Mesok, E. (2018) 'Masculinity, Men, and Sexual Violence in the US Military', in Zalewski et al (eds.) *Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics*, London: Routledge.

Mesok, E. (2018) 'Masculinity, Men, and Sexual Violence in the US Military', in Zalewski et al (eds.) *Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics*, London: Routledge.

Ministry of Defence. (nd.) Made in the Royal Navy, available at: https://www.royalnavy.mod.uk/madeintheroyalnavy-22 accessed: 07/08/2023.

Mirza, H. (2018) 'Racism in Higher Education: 'What Then, Can Be Done'', in Arday, J and Mirza, H (eds.) *Dismantling Race in Higher Education*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mohanty, C. (2015) 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', in Williamson, P and Chrisman, L. (eds.) *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory*, London: Routledge.

Montoya, C. (2016) 'Exploits and Exploitations: A Micro and Macro Analysis of the "DSK Affair"', in Hozic, A and True, J (eds.) *Scandalous Economics: Gender and the Politics of the Financial Crisis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ndulo, M. (2009) 'The United Nations Responses to the Sexual Abuse and Exploitation of Women and Girls by Peacekeepers during Peacekeeping Missions', *Journal of International Law*, Vol. 27 (1): 127-161.

Nottingham Trent University. (n.d) *Security at NTU*, available at: https://www.ntu.ac.uk/about-us/campuses/security-at-ntu accessed: 10/06/23.

NUS and 1752 Group. (2018) *Power in the Academy: Staff Sexual Misconduct in Higher Education*, available at: https://1752group.files.wordpress.com/2021/09/4f9f6-nus_staff-student_misconduct_report.pdf accessed: 10/09/19.

NUS. (2010) Hidden Marks, available at: https://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/hidden-marks-2011, accessed 13/04/23.

Nyman, J. (2021) 'The Everyday Life of Security: Capturing Space, Practice, and Affect, *International Political Sociology*, Vol.15 (3): 313-337.

OpenDemocracy. (2021) 'Access Denied: the UK Government Attack on Freedom of Information', *OpenDemocracy*, available at: https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/21091086-opendemocracy_acessdenied_report2021, accessed: 20/09/23.

Oriel College Oxford. (2023) The Rhodes Legacy, available at: https://www.oriel.ox.ac.uk/about/the-rhodes-legacy/ accessed 12/02/23.

Parashar, S. (2019) "The WPS Agenda: A Postcolonial Critique." in Davies, S.E and True, J (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook on Women, Peace and Security*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parpart, J and Parashar, S. (2019) 'Introduction: Rethinking the Power of Silence in Insecure and Gendered Sites', in Parpart, J and Parashar, S (eds.) *Rethinking Silence, Voice, and Agency in Contested Gendered Terrains*, London: Routledge.

Perraudin, F. (2017) 'Liverpool Student Fights to Remove Gladstone's Name from Building', *The Guardian*, available at: https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/nov/16/liverpool-university-student-william-gladstone-halls-of-residence accessed: 12/02/23.

Peters, M. (2018) 'Why is My Curriculum So White? A Brief Genealogy of Resistance', in Arday, J and Mirza, H (eds.) *Dismantling Race in Higher Education*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Peterson, V. (1992) 'Security and Sovereign States: What is at Stake in Taking Feminism Seriously', in Peterson, V. (ed.) *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*, Boulder: Lynne Reiner.

Phipps A and Smith G. (2012) 'Violence Against Women Students in the UK: Time to Take Action', *Gender and Education*, Vol. 24 (4): 357-373.

Phipps A and Young I. (2015) 'Neoliberalisation and 'Lad Cultures' in Higher Education', *Sociology*, Vol. 49 (2): 305-322.

Phipps A. (2017) '(Re)theorising Laddish Masculinities in Higher Education', *Gender and Education*, Vol. 29 (7): 815-830.

Phipps A. (2018) ''Lad culture' and Sexual Violence Against Students', in Lombard, N (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and Violence*, London: Taylor and Francis.

Phipps A. (2020) 'Reckoning up: Sexual Harassment and Violence in the Neoliberal University', *Gender and Education*, Vol. 32 (2): 227-243.

Pietsch, T. (2011) 'Mending a broken World': the Universities and the Nation, 1918–36', in Beers, L and Thomas, G (eds.) *Brave New World: Imperial and Democratic Nation-building in Britain between the Wars*, London: Institute of Historical Research.

Pietsch, T. (2016) *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850-1939*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Pimblott, K and Booth, M. (2021) 'Exploring the Legacies of Slavery and Colonialism at The University of Manchester' available at: https://sites.manchester.ac.uk/salc-making-a-difference/2021/08/18/exploring-the-legacies-of-slavery-and-colonialism-at-the-university-of-manchester/ accessed: 10/04/23.

Pinar, B. (2010) The 'Western-Centrism' of Security Studies: 'Blind Spot' or Constitutive Practice?', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 41 (6): 615-622.

Puwar, N. (2004) *Space Invaders*, London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Queen's University Belfast. (n.d) *Security*, available at: https://www.qub.ac.uk/directorates/EstatesDirectorate/Services/Security/ accessed: 10/06/23.

Rhodes Must Fall Oxford. (N.D) Our Aim, available at: https://rmfoxford.wordpress.com/about/ accessed: 19/10/21.

Richter-Montpetit, M. (2018) 'Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Sex (in IR) but Were Afraid to Ask: The 'Queer Turn' in International Relations', *Millennium*, Vol.46 (2): 220-240.

Rowley, C and Shepherd, L. (2012) 'Contemporary Politics: Using the 'F' Word and Teaching Gender in International Relations', in Gormley-Heenan, C and Lightfoot, S (eds.) *Teaching Politics and International Relations*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sabaratnam, M. (2020) 'Is IR Theory White? Racialised Subject-Positioning in Three Canonical Texts', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 49 (1): 3-31.

Saeed, T. (2018) 'Islamophobia in Higher Education: Muslim Students and the "Duty of Care"' in Arday, J and Mirza, H (eds.) *Dismantling Race in Higher Education*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sahin, B. (2020) *Sexual Violence Crimes and Gendered Power Relations: Bringing Justice to Women in the Democratic Republic of the Congo*, London: Routledge.

Särmä, S. (2016) '"Congrats! You Have an All-Male Panel', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 18 (3): 470-476.

Secured Environments. (2023a) *Previous Accreditations*, available at: https://www.securedenvironments.com/testimonials/previous-accreditations accessed: 10/06/23.

Secured Environments. (2023b) *About*, available at: https://www.securedenvironments.com/about accessed: 10/06/23.

Sen, S (2022) 'Race, Racism, and the Teaching of International Relations', *Oxford Encyclopaedia of International Relations*, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.666.

Seth, S. (2011) Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations, *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol.40 (1): 167-183.

Sharpe, C. (2010) *Monstrous Intimacies: Making Post-Slavery Subjects*, Durham (US) and London (UK): Duke University Press.

Sheffield Hallam University. (N.D) 'How Do I Contact Security?' available at: https://students.shu.ac.uk/shuspacecontent/security/contact-security accessed: 12/03/21.

Shepherd, L. (2008) *Gender, Violence and Security: Discourse as Practice*, London and New York: Zed Books.

Shepherd, L. (2009) 'Gender, Violence, and Global Politics: Contemporary Debates in Feminist Security Studies', *Political Studies Review*, Vol.7 (2): 208-219.

Shepherd, L. (2011) 'Sex, Security, and Superhero(in)es: From 1325 to 1820 and Beyond', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol.13 (4): 504-521.

Shepherd, L. (2016) 'Feminist Security Studies', in Steans, J and Tepe, D. (eds.) *Handbook on Gender in World Politics*, Northampton (MA): Edward Elgar Publishing.

Shepherd, L. (2020) 'The Paradox of Prevention in the Women, Peace and Security Agenda', *European Journal of International Security*, Vol.5 (3): 315-331.

Sherwood, M. (2007) *After Abolition: Britain and the Slave Trade Since 1807*, London: I.B Tauris.

Shilliam, R. (2015) 'Black Academia: The Doors Have Been Opened but the Architecture Remains the Same', in Alexander, C and Arday, J (eds.) *Aiming Higher: Race, Inequality, and Diversity in the Academy*, Runnymede Perspectives, available at: https://assets.website-files.com/61488f992b58e687f1108c7c/617bcf1cd124685da56a014c_Aiming%20Higher.pdf accessed 01/08/23.

Shilliam, R. (2020) 'Race and Racism in International Relations: Retrieving a Scholarly Inheritance', *International Politics Reviews*, Vol. 8 (1): 152-195.

Siddique, H and Skopeliti, C. (2020) 'BLM protesters topple statue of Bristol slave trader Edward Colston', *The Guardian*, available at: https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2020/jun/07/blm-protesters-topple-statue-of-bristol-slave-trader-edward-colston accessed 01/09/23.

Simic, O. (2012) *Regulation of Sexual Conduct in UN Peacekeeping Operations*, Berlin: Springer.

Sjoberg, L. (2016) 'What, and Where, is Feminist Security Studies?', *Journal of Regional Security*, Vol.11 (2): 143-161.

Sjoberg, Laura (2009) 'Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions', *Security Studies*, Vol. 18 (2): 183–213.

Smith et al. (2021) 'Living, Breathing Settler-Colonialism: The Reification of Settler Norms in a Common University Space', *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 40 (1): 132-145.

Spillers, H. (1987) 'Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book', *Diacritics*, Vol. 17 (2): 64-81.

Spivak, G. (2015) 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' in Williamson, P and Chrisman, L. (eds.) *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory*, London: Routledge.

Srinivasan, A. (2019) *The Right to Sex*, London: Bloomsbury.

Starnes, K. (2017) *Fairy Tales and International Relations: A Folklorist Reading of IR Textbooks*, London and New York: Routledge.

Steele et al. (2021) Sexual Violence Among Students Attending a Higher Education Institution in the UK (OUR SPACE): a Cross-Sectional Survey, *The Lancet*, Vol.398, p.S83-S83.

Steinmetz, G. (2013) 'A Child of the Empire: British Sociology and Colonialism, 1940s-1960s', *Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences*, Vol. 49 (4): 353-378.

Stern, M. (2005) *Naming Security – Constructing Identity: 'Mayan-Women' in Guatemala on the Eve of 'Peace'*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Stern, M. (2016) Poststructuralist Feminism in World Politics, in in Steans, J and Tepe, D. (eds.) *Handbook on Gender in World Politics*, Northampton (MA): Edward Elgar Publishing.

Stewart, K. (2007) *Ordinary Affects*, Durham (NC): Duke University Press.

Stoffel, A and Birkvad, I. (2023) 'Abstractions in International Relations: on the Mystification of Trans, Queer, and Subaltern Life in Critical Knowledge Production', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 0(0). https://doi-org.manchester.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/13540661231176907.

Sundaram, V and Jackson, C. (2018) 'Monstrous Men' and 'Sex Scandals': the Myth of Exceptional Deviance in Sexual Harassment and Violence in Education', *Palgrave Communications*, Vol. 147 (4): https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0202-9.

Sundari, A and Ruth, L. (eds.) (2018) *Gender Based Violence in University Communities: Policy, Prevention and Educational Initiatives*, Bristol (UK) and Chicago (IL): Policy Press.

Sylvester, C. (1994) *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sylvester, C. (1996) 'The Contributions of Feminist Theory to International Relations, in Smith, S., Booth, K., Zalewski, M. (eds.) *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sylvester, C. (2012) *War as Experience: Contributions from International Relations and Feminist Analysis,* Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.

The Invisible War. (2012) [DVD] Kirby Dick, United Stated: Cinedigm Corp.

The Leverhulme Trust. (2023) History of the Trust, available at: https://www.leverhulme.ac.uk/history-trust accessed: 12/02/23.

The Royal Society. (2023) The Poison of Empire [Blog], *The Royal Society*, available at: https://royalsociety.org/blog/2020/12/the-poison-of-empire/ accessed 01/09/23.

Tickner, J. (2014) *A Feminist Voyage through International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tickner, J.A. (2006) 'Feminism meets International Relations: Some Methodological Issues', in Ackerly, B., Stern, M., True, J. (eds.) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Todd, Z. (2016) 'An Indigenous Feminist's Take on the Ontological Turn: 'Ontology' is Just Another Word for Colonialism', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, Vol. 29 (1): 4-22.

Tongai, I. (2013) 'Scandal Highlights Sexual Abuse at Universities', *University World News*, available at: https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20130412133156499 accessed: 20/09/23.

True, J. (2012) *The Political Economy of Violence Against Women*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tsouroufli, M. (2019) 'An Examination of the Athena SWAN Initiatives in the UK: Critical Reflections', in Crimmins, G (ed.) *Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tyler, I. (2013) 'Naked Protest: The Maternal Politics of Citizenship and Revolt', *Citizenship Studies*, Vol.17 (2).

Tzanakou, C and Peace, R. (2019) 'Moderate Feminism Within or Against the Neoliberal University? The Example of Athena SWAN', *Gender, Work and Organisation*, Vol.26 (8): 1191-1211.

University College London. (2023a) 'UCL Denames Buildings Named After Eugenicists available at: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2020/jun/ucl-denames-buildings-named-after-eugenicists#:~:text=In%20the%20meantime%2C%20the%20names,(formerly%20the%20Pearson%20Building) accessed: 11/04/23.

University of Aberystwyth. (2022) *Security*, available at: https://www.aber.ac.uk/en/efr/campus-security/#cctv accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Birmingham. (2023) *Security*, available at: https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/campus-services/safety-security/security/index.aspx accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Bristol. (2019) *Acceptable Behaviour at Work*, available at: https://www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/equality/documents/Acceptable-Behaviour-Policy.pdf accessed: 30/08/22.

University of Bristol. (2023a) *Security Services: What We Do*, available at: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/securityservices/whatwedo/ accessed: 16/07/19.

University of Bristol. (2023b) *Security Services*, available at: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/securityservices/ accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Cambridge. (2023) *Security*, available at: https://www.em.admin.cam.ac.uk/operating-estate/security accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Cardiff. (2019) *Dignity at Work and Study Policy*, available at: https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/966669/Dignity-at-Work-and-Study-Policy-2019.pdf accessed: 2/09/22.

University of Edinburgh. (2023) *About the Security Section*, available at: https://www.ed.ac.uk/estates/what-we-do/security/about accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Glasgow. (2020) *Estates and Commercial Services: Security Strategy*, available at: https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/Media_730024_smxx.pdf accessed 10/06/23.

University of Glasgow. (n.d) *Campus Security Team*, available at: https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/securityandoperationalsupport/ accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Leeds. (n.d) *Security Services*, available at: https://estates.leeds.ac.uk/our-services/security-services/#toggle-id-1 accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Leicester. (n.d) *Security: About Us*, available at: https://le.ac.uk/about/who-we-are/professional-services/estates/security/about accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Manchester. (2019) *Dignity at Work and Study Policy*, available at: https://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=22734 accessed: 01/09/22.

University of Manchester. (2019*) Security Services*, available at: https://www.estates.manchester.ac.uk/services/security/ accessed: 10/07/19.

University of Manchester. (2020) Race Matters at Manchester: Supporting the Representation and Inclusion of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Staff and Students, available at: https://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=51691 accessed: 10/04/23.

University of Manchester(a). (N.D) 'Addressing our Historic Links to Slavery', available at: https://www.manchester.ac.uk/discover/history-heritage/historic-links-to-slavery/addressing-our-historic-links/, accessed: 25/01/23.

University of Newcastle. (2022) *Student Complaints and Resolution Policy*, available at: https://www.ncl.ac.uk/media/wwwnclacuk/studentprogress/files/Student%20Complaints%20and%20Resolution%20Policy%202223.pdf, accessed: 10/08/22.

University of Nottingham. (n.d) *Security*, available at: https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/estates/security/home.aspx accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Oxford. (n.d) *Security Services*, available at: https://estates.admin.ox.ac.uk/security-services accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Salford. (2023) *Security*, available at: https://www.salford.ac.uk/estates/security accessed 10/06/23.

University of Stirling. (n.d) *University Security Team*, available at: https://www.stir.ac.uk/about/professional-services/estates-and-campus-services/safety-environment-security-and-continuity/university-security-team/#:~:text=Call%20us&text=Emergency%20number%20from%20a%20mobile,at%20the%20Queens%20Court%20entrance accessed: 10/06/23.

University of Swansea. (n.d*) Security and Safezone*, available at: https://www.swansea.ac.uk/life-on-campus/security-and-safezone/, accessed: 10/06/23.

Vaittinen, T. (2019) 'Embodied (in)Security as Care Needs', in Gentry, C, Shepherd, L and Sjoberg, L (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Gender and Security*, London and New York: Routledge.

Valeriano, B. (2008) 'The Lack of Diverse Perspectives in the International Relations Field: The Politics of Being Alone'*, International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 9 (4): 450–54.

Weber, C. (1994) 'Good Girls, Bad Girls, Little Girls: Male Paranoia in Robert Keohane's Critique of Feminist International Relations', *Millennium*, Vol. 23 (2): 337-349.

Weber, C. (2014) 'From Queer to Queer IR', *International Studies Review*, Vol. 16 (4): 596-601.

Weber, C. (2015) 'ISA'S SAPPHIRE SERIES – IS BLUE THE NEW WHITE?', *Duck of Minerva* [blog], available at: http://www.duckofminerva.com/2015/02/isas-sapphire-series-is-blue-the-new-white.html, accessed: 25/08/23.

Weber, C. (2015) Why is there no Queer International Theory?', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 21 (1): 27-51.

Welland, J. (2019) 'Gender and War' in Gentry, C., Shepherd, L., and Sjoberg, L (eds.) Routledge *Handbook of Gender and Security*, London and New York: Routledge.

Western, J. (2010) 'ISA — KATRINA'S LEGACY', *Duck of Minerva* [blog], available at: https://www.duckofminerva.com/2010/02/isa-katrinas-legacy.html, accessed: 25/08/23.

Westmarland, N. (2017) 'Independent Review into The University of Sussex's Response to Domestic Violence', available at: https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=westmarland-review.pdf&site=303 accessed: 10/10/2018.

Wibben, A. (2004) Feminist International Relations: Old Debates and New Directions', *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 10 (2): 97-114.

Wibben, A. (2011a) *Feminist Security Studies: A Narrative Approach*, London and New York: Routledge.

Wibben, A. (2011b) 'Feminist Politics in Feminist Security Studies', *Politics & Gender*, Vol. 7 (4): 590-595

Wibben, A. (2014) 'Researching Feminist Security Studies', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 49 (4): 743-755.

Wibben, A. (2020) 'Everyday Security, Feminism, and the Continuum of Violence', *Journal of Global Security Studies*, Vol. 5 (1): 115–121.

Wilcox, L. (2015) *Bodies of Violence: Theorizing Embodied Subjects in International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson et al. (2016) 'Responding to #AllMalePanels: A Collage', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 18 (3): 477-491.

Yang, M. (2022) 'Harvard Students Sue, Claiming School Ignored Professor's Sexual Harassment', *The Guardian*, available at: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2022/feb/09/harvard-students-file-lawsuit-claiming-school-ignored-professor-sexual-harassment-for-years accessed 07/01/23.

Zalewski, M. (2006) 'Distracted Reflections on the Production, Narration, and Refusal of Feminist Knowledge in International Relations', in Ackerly, B., Stern, M., True, J. (eds.) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zalewski, M. (2010) 'All these Theories Yet the Bodies Keep Piling Up': Theory, Theorists, Theorising', in Smith, S., Booth, K., Zalewski, M. (eds.) *Theorising in International theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: https://www-cambridge-org.manchester.idm.oclc.org/core/books/international-theory/AD92478337BF7B25736E5F7021BEBB24.

Zalewski, M. (2013) *Feminist International Relations: Exquisite Corpse*, London and New York: Routledge.

Zalewski, M. (2015) 'Stories of Pain and Longing: Reflecting on Emotion, Boundaries, and Feminism through Carrie Mathison and Carrie White', in Åhäll, L and Gregory, T (eds.) *Emotions, Politics and War*, London and New York: Routledge.

Zalewski, M. (2016) '#AllMalePanels…but…but…but…', *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 18 (3): 492-495.

Zalewski, M. (2022) 'Theorizing Sexual Violence in Global Politics: Improvising with Feminist Theory' *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 48 (1): 129-148.

Zalewski, M. et al. (2018) *Sexual Violence Against Men in Global Politics*, London and New York: Routledge.

Zvobgo et al. (2023) 'Race and Racial Exclusion in Security Studies: A Survey of Scholars', *Security Studies,* DOI: 10.1080/09636412.2023.2230880.

Appendix 1: Survey Questionnaires

Survey 1

Q1. Please tick the box that best describes you:

1) I am a PhD student at a UK university.
2) I am a Master's student at a UK university.
3) I am employed in an academic role at a UK university, and completed my PhD at a UK university.

4) I am employed in an academic role at a UK university, and completed my PhD at a university outside of the UK.
5) I completed my Master's and/or PhD at a UK University, and no longer study or work at a UK university.

Q2. During your time as a PhD and/or Master's student at a UK university, did you ever experience staff-student sexual violence at a conference event?

Answer options: Yes/No

Q3. If you feel able, please use this text box to tell your story of the staff-student sexual violence you experienced at conference events:

[open text box]

Q4. Do you feel any of the following played a role in your experience of staff-student sexual violence? Tick as many that apply.

Race

Gender

Sexuality

Immigration status

Class

Disability

None of the above

Q5. If you feel able, please use the text box to detail how these factors played a role in your experience of staff-student sexual violence.

If you would prefer not to do so, or you clicked 'none of the above', please move onto the next question.

[open text box]

Q6. Have you ever witnessed an instance of staff-student sexual violence at a conference event?

Answer options: Yes/No

Q7. If yes and you feel able, please use this text box to tell your story of the staff-student sexual violence you have witnessed at conference events. If no, move onto the next question.

[open text box]

Q8. Have you ever heard stories of staff-student sexual violence at conference events? *You may have heard these stories during your time as a student, after graduating, and/or during your time as a member of academic staff at a UK university.*

Answer options: Yes/No

Q9. If yes and you feel able, please use this text box to detail the stories of staff-student sexual violence at conference events you have heard about. *If you answered no to witnessing and/or hearing of stories of sexual violence at conference events, please move on to question 12.*

[open text box]

Q10. Do you feel any of the following played a role in the staff-student sexual violence you witnessed at conference events and/or have heard stories of occurring at conference events? Tick as many that apply.

Race

Gender

Sexuality

Immigration status

Class

Disability

None of the above

Q11. If you feel able, please use the text box to detail how these factors played a role. *If you do not feel able, or you ticked none of the above, please move on to the next question.*

[open text box]

Q12. How has staff-student sexual violence affected your feelings of safety at academic conference events?

[open text box]

Q13. How has staff-student sexual violence affected your feelings of other people's safety at conference events? *For example, your peers, your colleagues, or your students.*

[open text box]

Survey Feedback Question Section of Pilot:

Q14: How far do you agree with the following statement:

This survey was easy to follow and understand.

Answer options:

    Strongly agree

    Agree

    Neither agree or disagree

    Disagree

    Strongly disagree

Q15. If there was one thing you could change about this survey, what would it be?

[open text box]

Q16. How long did it take you to complete this survey?

Answer options:

1) 0-5 minutes
2) 5-10 minutes
3) 10-15 minutes
4) 15 minutes +

End of Survey

End of Survey message to Participants:

Thank you for completing this survey. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact sofia.doyle@manchester.ac.uk

If any of the questions in this survey have made you feel uncomfortable or distressed, these links and helplines may provide you with some helpful support:

Rape Crisis England and Wales: https://rapecrisis.org.uk

Rape Crisis Scotland: https://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk

Rape Crisis Northern Ireland: https://rapecrisisni.org.uk

NHS Direct (24hrs) Helpline number: 0845 46 47

Samaritans (24hrs) Helpline number: 116 123

Survey 2

Q1. Please tick the box that best describes you:

1) I am a PhD student at a UK university.
2) I am a Master's student at a UK university.
3) I am employed in an academic role at a UK university, and completed my PhD at a UK university.

4) I am employed in an academic role at a UK university, and completed my PhD at a university outside of the UK.
5) I completed my Master's and/or PhD at a UK University, and no longer study or work at a UK university.

Q2. During your time as a PhD and/or Master's student at a UK university, did you ever experience staff-student sexual violence at a conference event?

Staff to student sexual violence in UK HE includes a range of behaviours, such as: sexualised cultures (for example, if/when any of the following appears commonplace: sexual jokes or 'banter', discussions pertaining to a peoples' sex lives, the asking of questions regarding a persons sex life, the display of sexual imagery, and/or sexualised discussions of a person or persons' body - also often referred to as sexual objectification), sexually inappropriate comments or questions, racialised sexual comments, sexual harassment, sexual coercion and offers of rewards for sex, grooming, stalking, sexual assault, and rape.

Answer options: Yes/No

Q3. If you feel able, please use this text box to tell your story of the staff-student sexual violence you experienced at conference events:

[open text box]

Q4. Do you feel any of the following played a role in your experience of staff-student sexual violence? Tick as many that apply.

Race
Gender
Sexuality
Immigration status
Class
Disability
None of the above

Q5. If you feel able, please use the text box to detail how these factors played a role in your experience of staff-student sexual violence. If you would prefer not to do so, or you clicked 'none of the above', please move onto the next question.

[open text box]

Q6. Have you ever witnessed an instance of staff-student sexual violence at a conference event?

Staff to student sexual violence in UK HE includes a range of behaviours, such as: sexualised cultures (for example, if/when any of the following appears commonplace: sexual jokes or 'banter', discussions pertaining to a peoples' sex lives, the asking of questions regarding a persons sex life, the display of sexual imagery, and/or sexualised discussions of a person or persons' body - also often referred to as sexual objectification), sexually inappropriate comments or questions, racialised sexual comments, sexual harassment, sexual coercion and offers of rewards for sex, grooming, stalking, sexual assault, and rape.

Answer options: Yes/No

Q7. If yes and you feel able, please use this text box to tell your story of the staff-student sexual violence you have witnessed at conference events. If no, move onto the next question.

[open text box]

Q8. Have you ever heard stories of staff-student sexual violence at conference events?
You may have heard these stories during your time as a student, after graduating, and/or during your time as a member of academic staff at a UK university.

Answer options: Yes/No

Q9. If yes and you feel able, please use this text box to detail the stories of staff-student sexual violence at conference events you have heard about.
If you answered no to witnessing and/or hearing of stories of sexual violence at conference events, please move on to question 12.

[open text box]

Q10. Do you feel any of the following played a role in the staff-student sexual violence you witnessed at conference events and/or have heard stories of occurring at conference events? Tick as many that apply.

Race
Gender
Sexuality
Immigration status
Class
Disability
None of the above

Q11. If you feel able, please use the text box to detail how these factors played a role.
If you do not feel able, or you ticked none of the above, please move on to the next question.

[open text box]

Q12. How has staff-student sexual violence affected your feelings of safety at academic conference events?

[open text box]

Q13. How has staff-student sexual violence affected your feelings of other people's safety at conference events?
For example, your peers, your colleagues, or your students.

[open text box]

End of Survey

End of Survey message to Participants:

Thank you for completing this survey. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact sofia.doyle@manchester.ac.uk

If any of the questions in this survey have made you feel uncomfortable or distressed, these links and helplines may provide you with some helpful support:

Rape Crisis England and Wales: https://rapecrisis.org.uk
Rape Crisis Scotland: https://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk
Rape Crisis Northern Ireland: https://rapecrisisni.org.uk
NHS Direct (24hrs) Helpline number: 0845 46 47
Samaritans (24hrs) Helpline number: 116 123

Survey 3

Q1. Please tick the box that best describes you:

1) I am a student at a UK university.
2) I am employed in an academic role at a UK university.
3) I am employed in a non-academic role at a UK university.
4) I have previously been a student at a UK university.
5) I have previously worked at a UK university in an academic or non-academic role.

Q2. Have you ever reported an instance or instances of staff-student sexual violence to your current or former university?

Staff to student sexual violence in UK HE includes a range of behaviours, such as: sexualised cultures (for example, if/when any of the following appears commonplace: sexual jokes or 'banter', discussions pertaining to a peoples' sex lives, the asking of questions regarding a persons sex life, the display of sexual imagery, and/or sexualised discussions of a person or persons' body - also often referred to as sexual objectification), sexually inappropriate comments or questions, racialised sexual comments, sexual harassment, sexual coercion and offers of rewards for sex, grooming, stalking, sexual assault, and rape.

Answer options: Yes/No

Q3. If you feel able to, please use the text box to detail the instances of staff-student sexual violence you reported. *If you do not feel able, please move on to the next question.*

[open text box]

Q4. Did the reporting process involve a formal meeting?

At different universities a formal meeting about a complaint of staff-student sexual violence may have different names, for example a 'hearing', a 'panel', or a 'committee'. These meetings are often with particular senior members of staff, for example, a Head of Department. Any type of formal meeting is applicable to this question.

Answer options: Yes/No

Q5. If yes and you feel able, please use the text box to detail your story of the meeting you experienced as part of the reporting process.
If 'no' or you do not feel able, please move onto the next question.

[open text box]

Q6. How did your experience of reporting staff-student sexual violence affect your feelings of safety on campus?

[open text box]

Q7. Are there any other ways your experience of reporting staff-student sexual violence has affected your time at university?

[open text box]

Q8. Do you feel any of the following played a role in your experience of reporting staff-student sexual violence to your university? Tick as many that apply.

Race
Gender
Sexuality
Immigration status
Class
Disability
None of the above

Q9. If yes, and you feel able to, please use the text box to detail how these factors impacted your experience of reporting staff-student sexual violence to your university.

If you do not feel able, or you ticked none of the above, please click on the next page arrow in the bottom right hand corner of the screen to finish the survey.

[open text box]

End of survey questions

End of Survey message to Participants:

Thank you for completing this survey. If you would be interested in participating in a follow up interview about your experience of reporting staff-student sexual violence to your current or former institution, please contact sofia.doyle@manchester.ac.uk with 'Follow up Interview' in the 'RE' line.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact sofia.doyle@manchester.ac.uk.

If any of the questions in this survey have made you feel uncomfortable or distressed, these links and helplines may provide you with some helpful support:

Rape Crisis England and Wales: https://rapecrisis.org.uk
Rape Crisis Scotland: https://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk

Rape Crisis Northern Ireland: https://rapecrisisni.org.uk
NHS Direct (24hrs) Helpline number: 0845 46 47
Samaritans (24hrs) Helpline number: 116 123

Appendix 2: Semi Structured Interview Guide

Welcome

- Interviewees will be welcomed to the interview.
- They will be provided with a paper copy of the participant information sheet and the consent form (they will have already received electronic copies via email prior to the interview).
- They will be given time to read over these documents before signing. Unless the interview is via skype, in which case they will be asked to sign and return the forms prior to the interview. They will be reminded that they can withdraw from the research at any time. Similarly, they will be reminded they can stop the recording and I will delete any audio already recorded at any time.
- I will remind them that if they should become distressed by the material covered within this interviewee they can stop the interview at any point. I will support them in any way I can (i.e., helping them to contact a friend or family member to meet them if they request this support, and signpost them to any services that may be of help, for example if applicable and the interviewee works within a UK Higher Education institution, to the counselling services).
- I will take any questions.

Question Guide (As the interviews will be semi structured and tailored to the interviewee actual questions asked will vary, however this list is indicative of the questions I will ask):

1) Could you tell me about your role within [HE institution or activist organisation] and/or your recent research?
2) From your work [and/or] activism What do you know about staff-to-student sexual violence in UK Higher Education?
3) Would you be able to briefly talk me through your institutions' procedures for dealing with staff-to-student sexual violence?
4) How would you characterise your institutions response to issues of staff-to-student sexual violence ? [or] Thinking about your research, how would you characterise the response of UK HE institutions to staff-to-student sexual violence? [or] What are the key aspects of your activist organisation/campaign in respect to institutional responses to staff-to-student sexual violence?
5) What do you feel the impact of institutional responses to staff-to-student sexual violence is on student well-being, particularly those who have made complaints?
6) What do you think the relationship is between university policy and university practice?

Wrapping up

At the end of the interview, I will thank the interviewee for their time. I will remind them of my contact details on their participant information sheet.