INTRODUCTION

Sexuality education in schools in urban India today is often perceived as ‘promoting promiscuity’, leading to ‘experimentation’ and being ‘detrimental to society’. The State and religious groups believe that sexuality education is against ‘Indian culture and values’. This heady cocktail imagines a ‘depraved’ adolescent – especially adolescent boys – at the centre, one who needs to be taught ‘restraint’, ‘abstinence’ and whose ‘natural tendencies’ are sought to be controlled. Adolescent boys are imagined to possess ‘uncontrollable sexual urges’ while adolescent girls are imagined as victims of these ‘urges’. Various organisations have advocated for comprehensive sexuality education which includes information about the body, sexual and reproductive health and rights and identities. But is that enough? Can there be a way to imagine sexuality education outside the binaries of abstinence/‘Indian values’ and comprehensive sexuality education? Simultaneously, can there be a way to rethink adolescent male sexuality outside the ‘uncontrollable urges’ paradigm? Putting these concerns together, I ask in the dissertation: how can rethinking adolescent masculinities in middle class Mumbai reveal to us the limits of sexuality education as we know it today?

I reflect on the limits of sexuality education by examining State, feminist, Christian and sexological materials on sexuality education in Mumbai; by exploring adolescent male romance and its affective registers; adolescent male sexual knowledge and the regulation of romance in school spaces. These allow me to point to how the State, feminist, Christian and sexological discourses are limited in their approach; how a discussion of negative affect and love are missing in the curriculum; how the official sexuality education curriculum is limited in providing prohibition, secrecy and thrill in sexual learning and how sexuality education might be counter-productive if student romance is regulated in school spaces.

The research is located at the intersection of sexuality studies, education, masculinity studies and cultural studies. With masculinity studies beginning to contribute to our understanding of gender relations (Roy 2013; Srivastava 2015; Chowdhury 2013), I bring the question of masculinity to bear upon that of sexuality education. The dissertation also points out that sexuality education is being gradually de-coupled from schooling. While the dissertation deals centrally with sexuality education, it does not directly address schools. Rather, it locates
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1 The State has always had a conflicted relationship to sexuality education. As I shall discuss in the later sections, sexuality education has been banned in various states in India citing that the curriculum will corrupt youth and is against ‘Indian values’. In the United States, the State has been promoting sexuality education based on abstinence until marriage, as opposed to comprehensive sexuality education. Comprehensive sexuality education includes information on the body, contraception and sexual and reproductive health. It takes into account the sexuality of the adolescent and does not advice them to abstain until marriage.
sexuality education in Mumbai within the complex web of the middle classes, consumerism, postfeminism, romance, adolescent masculinities and cinema.

Central Concerns of the Thesis

In December 2012, shortly after the brutal gang-rape of the young woman in New Delhi, I raised the following questions regarding the link between sexuality education and sexual violence on Kafila2, an online blog: “Why is sexuality education being resisted and banned by the State, school authorities, parents, right wing parties? Why is there a systematic denial of right to knowledge about our own bodies? Why are principals, teachers and parents so afraid of talking about sex, relationships, bodies and pleasure to children and adolescents? Why is there a systematic silencing of information about sex and sexuality when it comes to children and adolescents? How does this silencing contribute to ignorance, sexism, misogyny, gender discrimination and patriarchal attitudes present in school and college spaces? How does this sexism contribute to the formation of rape cultures?” (Chowkhani 2012)

These questions were meant to think about sexuality education outside the framework of reproductive health and to put gender equality and women’s rights at the centre of an agenda for sexuality education. I was also responding here to the current political climate which had banned the Adolescent Education Programme in certain states in India. As my research progressed, I realised that this framing, while useful, was foreclosing for me certain analytical explorations. The engagement with a solely political question was restricted to thinking about the need for sexuality education; the advocacy for ‘comprehensive sexuality education’; uncovering the inadequacy of the State and its lack of political will for sexuality education; and trying to understand the condition of sexuality education in the country. These, while entirely legitimate, seemed to foreclose any analytical explorations outside those engaging the political.

I found Saba Mahmood’s (2005) work on understanding agency outside the secular-liberal frameworks particularly useful to frame an analytical exploration of sexuality education. Mahmood writes that “our analytical explorations should not be reduced to the requirements of political judgement, in part because the labour that belongs to the field of analysis is different from that required by the demands of political action, both in its temporality and its social impact”. Yet, Mahmood also notes that “it is not that these two modalities of

2 Kafila is a blog run by a team of scholars, writers activists and journalists. The effort is to create a space for critical engagement outside mainstream corporate media.
engagement- the political and the analytical- should remain deaf to each other, only that they should not collapse into each other. By allowing theoretical inquiry some immunity from the requirements of strategic political action, we leave open the possibility that the task of thinking may proceed in directions not dictated by the logic and pace of immediate political events” (Mahmood 2005: 196).

I found Mahmood’s arguments compelling because they allowed a space for an analytical exploration, which while engaging with the political, was not dictated by “requirements of strategic political action”. Research on sexuality education has been largely driven by political action. My research has been framed by this modality of engagement which allows me to step back and ask analytical questions about sexuality education’s relationship with adolescent sexuality, masculinity, romance, sexual knowledge, schooling and curricula. It also extends itself beyond to re-imagine sexuality education today.

I explicitly use the terms sexuality education instead of sex education. Nirantar, an organisation based in Delhi, argues that sex education should be called sexuality education since the latter is more holistic. Sexuality, while increasingly hard to define, has been described by the World Health Organisation as a: “central aspect of being human throughout life and encompasses sex, gender identities and roles, sexual orientation, eroticism, pleasure, intimacy and reproduction. Sexuality is experienced and expressed in thoughts, fantasies, desires, beliefs, attitudes, values, behaviours, practices, roles and relationships... Sexuality is influenced by the interaction of biological, psychological, social, economic, political, cultural, ethical, legal, historical and religious and spiritual factors” (Nirantar 2008: 11). While sex education is a legitimate term to use, I use the term sexuality education since it allows me to discuss more than just sex and sexual activity.

Sexuality education in schools in India is heterogenous and has different histories in different regions. But we know very little about the way it pans out on the ground in most schools. The State has been conflicted in its approach to sexuality education. The Adolescent Education Programme (AEP), prepared in collaboration with National AIDS Control Organisation (NACO) and UNICEF, was launched in schools in 2006. The primary aim was to address the spread of HIV/AIDS. This programme was met with great resistance from different local governments and in 2007 a petition was filed in the Rajya Sabha to put the programme on hold since it went against ‘Indian values’. In 2009, the AEP was banned in various states including Maharashtra. Public schools in Mumbai are not allowed to teach sexuality education, but conduct programmes on gender and health. Private schools sometimes include modules on sex education, but none of this is formally institutionalised.
In June 2014, after the Hindu Nationalist BJP Government came to power, Harsh Vardhan, a Right wing politician who was then the Union Health Minister, commented that the “so-called "sex education" should be banned". He later clarified that this statement of banning was in regard to the AEP. This was met with ridicule and discussion on social media. Some media reports also described how sex education in India was being outsourced to individual teachers rather than being taught in schools. Various comedy groups in India responded to this comment on banning sex education by uploading ludicrous videos imagining what a State curriculum might look like. East India Comedy’s video (2014), which explicitly responded to the Minister’s comments, critiqued the State’s decision to not use the word sex in the curriculum and to talk about ‘Indian values’, ‘yoga’ and ‘meditation’ instead. Other comedians also enacted the role of teachers, taking a dig at the State’s insistence on ‘Indian culture and values’.

Keeping sexuality education as the central focus, my dissertation engages with different interlinked concerns. These do not always directly engage with sexuality education, rather they re-orient themselves towards it by contributing to debates within the scholarship on sexuality education. The chapters roughly follow these areas of concern and I lay them out once again at the end of the introduction. All the areas explore the limits of sexuality education.

The first concern is to engage with the discourse of desire, arguing that there is a ‘missing discourse of love and romance’ within the curriculum on sexuality education. I examine the sexuality education curricula materials available in Mumbai and Delhi, arguing that these occupy largely four discourses: the feminist, Christian, State and sexological discourse. The
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feminist discourse brings to the fore the social and political context of sexuality education, stressing on a Rights-based discourse; the Christian organisation brings in an extensive discussion of romance and love; the State discourse brings in the scientific and the moral discourse and the sexological discourse, while located within the scientific, crucially brings in a discussion of sexual pleasure. I examine each of these discourses in detail suggesting that individually each represents only a partial approach to sexuality education.

The second concern is to extend the discussion of desire and romance by rethinking male desire and the affective registers of romance as experienced by adolescent boys. This includes understanding how intimacies are shaped by consumerism, indeterminacy and failure; the relationship between romance and sex and experiences of dating and romantic relationships. This allows me to re-conceptualise adolescent male desire, centring experiences of failure and ‘negative’ affects to a project of sexuality education.

The third concern is to rethink what constitutes sexual knowledge. This includes examining the different networks, peer groups and sources of information on sexuality that adolescent boys have access to. This allows me to rethink the knowledge gap between the official and unofficial discourses around sexuality education and seeks to decentre the official discourse of sexual knowledge as most legitimate.

The fourth concern is around the relationship between adults and adolescents. This is explored through teacher-adolescent relationships in school and their understandings of student romance in schools spaces. It seeks to understand adult perceptions and desires to regulate and control adolescent sexuality. Through the narratives I seek to theorise how regulation around sexuality in school spaces are states of exception.

**Research on Sexuality and Rationale for Researching Adolescent Sexuality**

Research on sexuality in India is a fairly recent development. The 1990s saw a great deal of discussion on sexuality. There were discussions on the role the state plays in regulating and reforming sexuality (Uberoi 1996), scholarship on the sexual economies of modern India (John 1998), on the relation between sexuality and censorship and the feminist response to it (Ghosh 1999), on the female body and desire (Thapan 1997, Puri 1999) and so on. The landmark text on sexuality, during that decade, was the book *A Question of Silence? The Sexual Economies of Modern India* (1998) which was concerned “with the materiality of the sites where discussions of ‘sex’ are laid out and contested...” (John and Nair 1998: 7). It brought together for the first time a plurality of sites of sexuality which included the more
well ploughed areas of law, state, nation, citizenship and also constructions of sexuality through the experience of puberty (Kalpana Ram 1998), birth control (Anandhi S. 1998), sexual violence and love (Prem Choudhary 1998, V.Geetha, 1998), marriage, religion, caste, debates around the beauty business, music and female bodies and the representation of sexuality in media and literature. The 1990s also saw feminist scholars engaging with questions of representation of sexuality and censorship in colonial India.

The next decade is characterized by a shift in the discussion of sexuality. Sexuality studies in the first decade of the 21st century in India are challenging heteronormativity and specifically addressing the question of homosexuality and identity politics of gay and lesbian communities. But the scholarship on sexuality has not ceased to discuss questions of sexual violence and prostitution (Kotiswaran 2011) and the relation of sexuality to the state and law. Current scholarship specifically looks at the question of sexuality by examining urban middle class women’s sexuality (Phadke 2005, 2010), lower middle-class youth romance and sexuality (Lukose 2010), and the connections between ‘footpath pornography’, the industry of sex clinics and masculinity (Srivastava 2006) and sexuality studies (Srivastava 2013a, Menon 2007a, Thapan 1997, Uberoi 1996, Bose and Bhattacharya 2007, Bose 2002).

All these debates on sexuality have examined normative sites where the discussion of ‘sex’ is laid out and contested. But what are the un-examined sites where sexuality is produced, regulated and controlled? Is it sufficient to look at only the well-ploughed areas of law, state, nation, citizenship, puberty, birth control, sexual violence and love, marriage, religion and caste, to talk about sexuality? What new connections can we make to complicate and examine the question of sexuality in India today? How might we think about sexuality and schooling, sexuality and adolescence? My research on sexuality education aims to address some of these gaps within the scholarship on sexuality in India.

Sexuality education allows an entry point in thinking about adolescent sexuality. While feminist scholarship in India has theorised adult lives and conflicts, children’s and adolescent’s lives have often taken a back seat. These have been relegated to either disciplines like education, psychology or social work. I do not contest the disciplinary interest in adolescents by education or psychology, but point out that feminist theory and feminist politics in India has not paid attention to adolescent lives in detail, especially those outside conflict zones, or those who are not in danger. Schalet (2009) raises this question in the Western context, stating that adolescent sexuality was the ‘unexplored room’ of the feminist debates on sexuality before the 1990s. She notes that post the 1990s “a group of feminist scholars had begun shining a light on that forgotten room of adolescent sexuality. Rooted in
studies and activism of the previous decades, they drew attention to the unique dilemmas that teenage girls faced in negotiating their sexuality in the post-sexual revolution era. Since the mid-1990s, feminist scholarship on adolescent sexuality, which has focused largely on girls and their heterosexual desires, activities, and relationships, has culminated in several books” (Schalet 2009: 134).

In the Indian context too, there is a rise in activist and scholarly work on adolescent sexuality, but largely restricted to girls. Vacha, a women’s group based in Mumbai, has extensively worked and published on adolescent girls in slums in Mumbai (Shukla and Hora 2010; Namjoshi 2010; Uma 2012, Vacha 2002). Kabita Chakraborty (2016) has examined young Muslim girls’ negotiations with risk, sexuality, digital cultures, romance and media in urban slums in Kolkata. But these studies specifically focus on adolescent girls living in slums or from the lower classes. These studies do not focus on middle class urban girls, nor do they focus on adolescent boys, especially those from the urban middle classes. Urban middle class subjects are most commonly discussed in shrill media reports which narrate stories of depravities. In this dissertation I aim to fill the gap in how we might think about middle class adolescent sexuality, especially adolescent sexual knowledge and adolescent romance. I also think about student and teacher relationships outside the crisis laden understandings of harassment, murder and rape in schools.

I am also specifically examining heterosexuality. As Beasley (2009) notes, heterosexuality should not “remain the unmarked and un-remarked category. It seems to me that it is important to make heterosexuality visible, just as we might aim to render masculinity and whiteness visible” (Beasley 2009: 29). Beasley goes on to argue that “heterosexuality is largely taken to be of little critical interest, as simply to be equated with heteronormativity…” While some of the young men I have interviewed identified as homosexual, I am interested in unpacking heterosexual male desire. I elaborate on the rationale for studying men, masculinities and the middle classes in a later section.

**Scholarship on Sexuality Education**

Academic scholarship on sexuality education is minimal in India. But there is a vast literature on sexuality education in the United States, New Zealand, UK and other countries. Michelle Fine (1988), in her path breaking work on sexuality education in the United States, conducts an extensive ethnographic research to ascertain that there is a missing discourse of desire within sexuality education curricula. She argues that the onus to remain ‘safe’ is often on
girls, youth of colour, disabled and LGBT youth. She examines the different discourses around sexuality in the classroom and in the school. One of the dominant discourses of sexuality is that of sexuality as violence. This discourse is conservative and maintains that a lack of conversation about sexuality will make sexual activity disappear. This is contrary to empirical research which demonstrates how not talking about sexuality actually discourages use of contraceptives.

The second discourse is that of sexuality as victimization where the women are constantly portrayed as victims and men as predators. In this discourse, sexuality education is premised around saying no to sexual intercourse, practicing abstinence and knowing all the ‘dangers’ associated with sexual activity. This discourse denies agency to adolescent girls as well as leaves the structures in which violence occurs, untouched. The third discourse of individual morality stresses on self-control and abstinence till marriage and connects the depravity of premarital sex with larger problems of the community and presents it as a ‘tax burden’. Fine finds that the discourse of desire is missing.

Fine notes a discord between the complex ways in which feminists have thought about the dichotomy of violence/victimhood and pleasure/choice and the simplistic ways in which it is presented in class: girls as victims of predatory men and consent as located only within the marriage. Fine argues that silencing the discourse of desire constantly constructs the woman as victim and object rather than subject and agent and hinders the development of sexual subjectivity. In a later essay (2006) Fine proposes a combination of teaching about pleasure and risk, since teaching either one of them would be either naïve or perverse. The discourse of desire is central to most scholarship on sexuality education. I engage with this scholarship in chapter three and four, where I elaborate on how romance can be discussed within the curriculum.

In the New Zealand context, Louisa Allen has examined sexuality education and its various concerns in great detail. I will draw on her exhaustive work through the dissertation. Mary Lou Rasmussen (2012), located in Australia, contributes extensively to the debate on sexuality education in the context of the United States, especially to the debate between abstinence only sexuality education and comprehensive sexuality education. In the UK some of the scholarship has examined the politics and practice of sex education (Alldred and David 2007), sexuality education and masculinity (Haste 2013).

In the Indian context Leena Abraham (2004) looks at the gender differences in the cultural construction of youth sexuality in India, focussing on lower class youth in Mumbai and examining the gender differences between the experiences of sexuality, the differences in the
sources of knowledge on sexuality and the centrality of marriage and family for girls. Raveendran and Chunawala (2015) examine NCERT’s class XII textbooks on reproductive health to uncover “a patriarchal, reductionist science designed to interfere with the menstrual cycle and technologies that pose risks to the woman’s body”. They further note that the teachers who teach these also reflect the same understandings of reproductive health. Arpita Das (2014) discusses the “Adolescent Education Programme’s teacher curriculum revised in 2009-2010 by the National Council of Educational Research and Training”. She notes how the language is vague and confusing and excludes “people who do not conform to societal stereotypes of sex, gender, and ability.” She recommends that any comprehensive sexuality education programme “must be inclusive, cater to diverse needs and present content in a rights-based language without adding to the socio-cultural context of mystery and shame attached to sexuality” (Das 2014: 210). The dissertation aims at engaging with this literature by thinking about how sexuality education in India adds to this body of knowledge as well as complicates it.

**Masculinities and Sexuality Education**

Scholarship in the field of sexuality education is also beginning to understand the ‘problem of boys’ within the classroom. Haste (2013) notes that “within sex education research, the marked shift in emphasis away from the needs of girls, to the question of how to tackle the ‘problem’ of boys, can be seen as part of a wider trend in gender and education research described by Weaver-Hightower (2003, 2010) as ‘the boy turn’” (Haste 2013: 516).

Louisa Allen (2005) notes that “an increasingly common phenomenon in research labelled feminist is a shift away from an exclusive focus on women and women’s issues to the incorporation of male participants and theories of masculinities (Francis and Skelton, 2001; Kelly, Burton, and Regan, 1994). The inclusion of males in feminist research has invited parallels in discussion to the move in universities from Women’s Studies to Gender Studies” (Allen 2005: 19). Beasley (2013) also argues that feminist, sexuality and masculinity studies cannot be de-linked. He suggests that a “persuasive case exists for considering the association of Feminist, Sexuality and Masculinity Studies as forming a recognisable overarching field and that it is now difficult (if not well-nigh impossible) to disaggregate the subfields” (Beasley 2013: 111).

Researching masculinities does not necessarily mean a study of men or male bodies. Scholars like Halberstam (1998) within queer theory have undone the direct relationship between
masculinity and men and have gone on to examine female masculinities. In the dissertation I specifically examine the experiences of those who were born and continue to identify as men. Some of the reasons for examining masculinity and men alongside sexuality education are, one: sexuality education curriculum focuses on girls (and sometimes boys too), and restructures our understanding of female desire leaving dominant ideas of male desire and sexuality unchallenged. As Chris Beasley (2013) notes: “it is almost impossible to find any account of heterosexual men’s pleasure in Masculinity Studies that does not presume desire = damage” (Beasley 2009: 33). The other reason for studying masculinity along sexuality education is that within the scholarship on adolescent sexuality in India, there seems to be greater anxiety over adolescent males’ sexuality, sexual violence and its ‘depravities’ which needs to be unpacked.

Adolescent masculinity has been largely under-studied outside the medico-legal framework. Radhika Chopra (2004a) defines adolescent masculinity as being incomplete. Scholarship on masculinities and schooling in the Western context has examined boys and schooling, the hierarchies of masculinities and schooling and hegemonic masculinities (Pascoe 2007; Renold 2005; Kehily 2002; Haywood and Mac an Ghaill 2013). A large part of the scholarship on boys and education in the Western context is also centred on boys’ underachievement and performance in schools (Epstein et al 1998). Krishna Kumar’s (1986) essay on growing up as a boy in a small town in Madhya Pradesh discusses, albeit in a limited manner, how boys perceive girls in school and how their desire for women develop as they grow up. He suggests that the school can be a space which “can act as a counter-socializer in sex-role learning”.

One of the key conceptual tools used in masculinities studies is hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity has been theorised by RW Connell, Tim Carrigan and John Lee as “a particular variety of masculinity to which others - among them young and effeminate as well as homosexual men - are subordinated” (Connell et al 1985: 587). Hegemonic masculinity “is centrally connected with the institutionalization of men's dominance over women. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that hegemonic masculinity is hegemonic so far as it embodies a successful strategy in relation to women… The most important feature of this masculinity, alongside its connection with dominance, is that it is heterosexual” (Connell 1985: 592- 593). At the same time, “the hegemonic model so to speak, may only correspond to the actual characters of a small number of men... there is a distance, and a tension, between collective ideal and actual lives… Yet very large numbers of men are complicit in sustaining the hegemonic model” (Connell 1985: 592).
Connell’s hierarchies of hegemonic, subordinate and complicit masculinities have been critiqued as adult, fixed and which don’t allow boys to ‘occupy multiple and contradictory masculinities’ (Renold 2005: 66). Chopra, Osella and Osella (2004a) have also noted how the concept of hegemonic masculinity is problematic. In 2005, Connell and Messerschmidt reviewed the term to state that “hegemonic masculinity need not be the commonest pattern in the everyday lives of boys and men. Rather, hegemony works in part through the production of exemplars of masculinity, symbols that have authority despite the fact that most men and boys do not fully live up to them” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005: 846).

What I find useful in this revision by Connell is the impossibility for most men and boys to attain hegemonic masculinity. Similarly, in the Indian context, I find Sanjay Srivastava, Rahul Roy and PK Vijayan’s conceptualisations of masculinity and hegemonic masculinity useful to think through the ‘cool dude’ in school. Srivastava maintains that masculinity is a fragile identity which is easily offended. Srivastava deploys the term ‘fragile’ to point to the instability of masculinity- in representation and as a social fact. Rahul Roy, like Connell, posits hegemonic masculinity as an aspirational model- something to be attained. PK Vijayan unpacks hegemonic masculinity using the concept masculine hegemony to argue that there is no single hegemonic masculinity, but a plurality of hegemonic masculinities, which are all part of a larger hegemony that is necessarily masculine. He argues that within a hierarchical social structure, different masculinities can be hegemonic for different social groups. All these point to the fact that masculinity and especially hegemonic masculinity is unstable, fragile, plural, in constant anxiety and an impossible category to embody.

Many studies on boys and schooling (Renold 2005; Kehily 2002) point out that hegemonic masculinity in most schools is centred on performances of heterosexuality. J Pascoe discusses the ways in which the boys’ “talk about heterosexuality reveals less about sexual orientation and desire than it does about the centrality of the ability to exercise mastery and dominance literally or figuratively over girls’ bodies” (Pascoe 86). Pascoe coins a term ‘compulsive heterosexuality’ to describe the “constellation of sexualized practices, discourses, and interactions” (86) that boys engage in to perform their masculinity.

I have examined adolescent masculinities in chapter four and chapter five. I do not extensively make use of the concept of hegemonic masculinity. Rather, I conceptualise masculinity at the intersection of adolescence, sexuality, romance, the middle classes and the city of Mumbai. I examine how masculinities restructure our understanding of sexual
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8 I draw these from the lectures and discussions at the International Conference on Interrogating Masculinities at St Stephens College, Delhi University, 6-8 March 2015.
knowledge and adolescent male desire. I examine how middle class masculinities in Mumbai are structured. In the following paragraphs I establish the connections between masculinities and romance and masculinities and cinema.

While scholarship on adolescent boys’ romance is practically non-existent, academic deliberations on adult young men’s experiences of romance are also few. Osella and Osella (2006) have examined young men’s romantic experiences in Kerala. In their account, young men’s ways of acquiring a romantic partner are harassment, double entendre, flirting, ‘tuning’, ‘giving line’ and teasing. The authors also explore the impossibility for these romances to translate into marriage.

In another paper, Osella and Osella (1998), discuss the ambiguities and ambivalences of flirting in detail. They maintain that harassment of women by young men is “only half the story: idealized romance is equally important. Aspirations towards heroism and romance are commonly played out among young men…” (192). Consequently they note that “a young man can be both a sensitive creature and an aggressive lout. He is equally capable of artistic endeavour and physical assault.” They discuss how harassment cannot be reduced to “simplistic ideas about gender identities, gender hierarchies and their fixedness.” Rather, they explore “the links between harassment and flirting, aggression and love, and the difficulties in identifying the differences” (Osella and Osella 1998: 193). Osella and Osella discuss the role of ambiguity, play and ambivalence in flirting and romance between young men and women in Kerala. They read the thin lines between flirting and harassment as a strategy for the young man to save himself in the face of rejection. They interpret what might be read as harassment as a play of ‘dominance and submission’ (Osella and Osella 1998: 194).

Unlike other scholarship on romance which either talks of agency, pleasure, danger, harassment and coercion, Osella and Osella underscore how “romance is characterized throughout by values of indeterminacy: hesitancy, ambiguity and ambivalence. Dominance, control and relative status remain fluid, as power continually oscillates, and neither roles nor hierarchy can be fixed or maintained…What young people's friendship and romance do, it seems to us, is to point the way towards other possibilities which are also strong but still seriously under-theorized within Indian society: ambiguity as a value and, related to this, flexibility or indeterminacy as a value” (Osella and Osella 1998: 201, 203). Indeterminacy, flexibility, ambiguity, ambivalence and hesitancy, the Osellas maintain, “are more generally widespread and may be crucial to the maintenance of long-term social relations” (Osella and Osella 1998: 204).
I find the Osellas’ theorisation of the “aesthetic of romance, and its reluctance to move towards closure,” very useful since this aesthetic directly speaks to the experiences of middle class young men in Mumbai. The Osellas also risk moving out of the harassment-gender hierarchy-stalking paradigm and think about the ‘play’ and indeterminacy of power within gender relations. They maintain that “the distinction…between coercive harassment and consensual play may be more problematic for outsiders than for players themselves” (Osella and Osella 1998: 203). While I might not have come across similarly openly aggressive masculinities in my research, I further the Osellas’ argument of ‘romance as characterized by values of indeterminacy’ in the fourth chapter.

There are other studies of romance and male desire in Delhi and Kerala too. Shalini Grover (2011), in her ethnography of romance among the urban poor in Delhi, discusses how boys pursue girls relentlessly. This romantic pursuit by young men in Delhi, Grover notes, often results in male aggression, which “in certain instances can take extreme forms, such as stalking, emotional blackmail, consuming poison to ‘win’ a girl’s heart, and coercing a girl into marriage” (83). Ritty Lukose’s (2010) study on college students in Kerala examines the harassment that women face in public spaces, concepts of chastity and honour that are inscribed on women’s bodies, especially upper caste women’s bodies, and the ways in which the college tries to control women’s sexuality. Lukose also examines how young women negotiate questions of choice, romance, marriage and caste with their families. She frames romance within the reform period in Kerala, exemplified by the novel Indulekha. Scholarship on romance and masculinities is varied. The dominant framework of male romance is centred on male aggression, as seen in Grover and Lukose’s work. I argue that this forms only a part of the understanding of male desire. I take recourse in Osella and Osella’s nuanced discussion on romance to rethink the links between masculinities, romance and adolescence.

**Cinema and Romance**

While the cosmopolitan nature of Mumbai resists any understanding of regional masculinity as in the case of West Bengal (Sinha 1997) or Kerala (Osella 2006), it is nonetheless possible to understand middle class adolescent masculinities, sexuality, romance and desire in Mumbai as shaped by post-globalisation and popular cinema. In the context of Mumbai, I turn to looking at popular cinema as a context. As Rachel Dwyer (2007) puts it: “cinematic idioms of love are key to analysing the wider sphere of the language of love in India…Hindi cinema manifests what could be called postmodern love, where consumerism and love are inextricably bound” (Dwyer 2007: 289-290).
In post-globalisation Mumbai, consumerism and love among the middle-classes are closely connected. Steve Derne (2000) in his ethnography of men’s filmgoing in India discusses how popular cinema plays an important role in helping men to understand individualism and romantic love. Ritty Lukose (2009) also marks the shift from nineteenth-century discourse in romantic love today, when “films importantly mediate everyday understandings of romance and love— one that explicitly links romance to consumption and mass mediation. While romance is understood as a privatised emotion, it is a very public form of consumer behaviour” (105). Similarly, Rachel Spronk (2002) discusses how Hollywood cinema provides an alternative frame of reference of love, sexual relating and relationships for middle class professionals in Nairobi, Kenya. This forms a middle class discourse of romantic love which is seen as ‘progressive’ “in contrast to conventional relationships based on ‘convenience’” (Spronk 2002: 230). On a more theoretical level, Laurent Berlant (2012) ties love and romance to fantasy, stating categorically that “whether viewed psychoanalytically, institutionally, or ideologically… love is deemed always an outcome of fantasy. Without fantasy, there would be no love. There would be no way to move through the uneven field of our ambivalent attachments to our sustaining objects, which possess us and thereby dispossess us of our capacity to idealize ourselves or them as consistent and benign simplicities” (Berlant 2012: 69). This last, points to the links between love, desire, fantasy and cinema. As noted by various scholars, cinematic understandings of love and romance often provide fantasies for playing out romance in ‘real’ life.

Francesca Orsini (2007) defines the history of love in South Asia as resting on “an understanding of love as culturally and historically determined, and on the assumption that the repertoire of images, practices and stories about love is varied but limited at any given time, and that some cultural symbols will be more readily available than others” (1). She goes on to trace the history of love in South Asia from the “sophisticated discourses of love in a courtly setting, or the context of a clan-based society which celebrates love as heroic transgression, to the modern period, when new impulses towards individuation and the creation of the modern couple have not displaced but modified the older system of relationships, and values. Romantic ‘love’ has not replaced the older discourses of shringara, ishq and muhabbat but, as well as revitalising the older term prem, has offered an additional style of love” (39). The modern discourse of love is characterised by cinema and explored in essays by Rachel Dwyer and Perveez Mody. Orsini argues that the “spaces for love in Indian society still lie mostly in the literary or filmic imagination, in the interstices of ordinary life, when no one else is looking, or in the interval between the dreams and expectations about the future spouse and the epiphany of reality at the wedding” (Orsini 2007: 37).
Shobha Ghosh (2009) maintains that Bombay cinema refuses “easy assimilation into either high or low, elite or mass. An inveterately hybrid form, it draws with impunity from classical traditions as well as from more popular ones. It is consumed not only by the masses, but also the classes... It is regressive and hegemonic in many of its features, but alongside engages in an ongoing debate about the nature of personal, community and national identity” (Ghosh 2009: 59). Ghosh argues that Bombay cinema and romantic imaginations intertwine, but are also enmeshed within “the needs of global capitalism”. This means that while it presents to us an imagination of “of autonomous romantic love”, it does not necessarily offer freedom and autonomy to women. It “finally return[s] the woman to a reconstituted private sphere as the male lays claim to the public” (Ghosh 2009: 59, 63). In my dissertation I constantly turn to Bombay cinema and to some popular contemporary Marathi films to contextualise ideas of adolescent masculinity, romance, sexual knowledge and schooling. In the methodology I explore further how cinema is used in the dissertation.

Context of Mumbai

My focus is specifically urban because I base my study in private schools in Mumbai. Some schools are also State aided, but none of them are Municipal schools. Though I cannot claim to generalise by specifically studying Mumbai, the complex meanings that emerge from the study can say something about similar cities and schools in India. Mumbai has a population of around 16.5 million people which includes the larger metropolitan area\(^9\). Among these, 50% of people live in slums and occupy 8% of the land. Much has been written about Mumbai as a space with obvious class disparities and I do not want to engage with that in the present study. Mumbai at the same time has seen various anxieties revolving around sexuality: the ban and subsequent re-instatement of the bar dancers\(^10\), the ban on mannequins displaying lingerie, the moral policing of couples in public spaces and so on. Mumbai is also a space where women are supposed to be most safe but recent empirical and theoretical work points that access to public spaces by women is complicated by various factors, like the presence or absence of
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\(^10\) Though the Supreme Court has revoked the ban on bar dancers, it has been unconstitutionally challenged by the Maharashtra State Govt. This keeps the debate on sexuality and bar dancing alive in the public sphere.
street lights, street vendors, and by caste, class and religious locations of the women themselves\(^{11}\).

Mumbai has a long history of engagement with sexuality education. Srivastava (2006) notes the importance of Maharashtra in the narrative on sexual reform in India. “It was Maharashtra, with its well established history of social reform movements (Gore 1989; Wagle 1999), which was at the forefront of the body-politics reform movement that, in turn was also connected with issue of population control and ‘sex hygiene’. So, in 1921 RD Karve (1882-1953), opened Bombay’s first birth control clinic, and his works on the topic- in Marathi- were popular in many parts of the state” (44-45). I note in the third chapter how Mumbai has been a centre for sexologists and the FPAI to engage with sexuality education. Mumbai also has a strong women’s movement which has engaged with sexuality education and adolescent girls. Mumbai thus becomes an important city to understand sexuality education. In third chapter I discuss sexuality education in Mumbai and how sexologists, psychologists, NGOs, sex educators and schools deal with it. The engagement with romance is also located within the city and as I note, adolescent intimacies are often public.

Shilpa Phadke (2011) elaborates on the challenges that Mumbai as a city presents to the researcher: “Mumbai as a city in some ways defies understanding given its multiple heterogeneities and complex spaces…. Some scholars of globalisation and cities suggest that the middle-classes in Mumbai have become in many ways representative of the ideal typical example of the rise of new middle-classes in liberalizing India (Fernandes 2000b)” (Phadke 2011: 8). In the following section I examine why it is important to examine the middle classes and middle class subjects when discussing sexuality education.

**Middle Classes, Neoliberalism and Postfeminism**

Who is the subject of sexuality education? Discussions around sexual violence have cast the lower class/lower caste and religious ‘Other’ as the perpetrator of ‘sexual crimes’ whose sexualised body needs to be controlled (Tharu and Niranjana 1996; Phadke 2013). But the subject of sexuality education is not this sexualised ‘Other’. I argue that it is rather the middle class body which is the subject of sexuality education while the lower class/caste body is the subject of population and birth control.

Sexual reform as advocated by the sexologists was also meant for the middle-class family: “the idea of the middle-class family as the site of modernist sexual reform that was variously articulated during pre-Independence gathered further momentum in the post-Independence period.” (Srivastava 2006: 50). Srivastava also notes that sexual reform “became conjoined to the politics of upper-caste nationalism” (Srivastava 2006: 45). At the same time the sexological discourse and sexual reform were, according to Srivastava, embedded “within the context of an internal-external modernity” (61). He goes on to note how “in its attempts to delineate Indian sexual modernity, sexological literature and activism both moved between and established through discourse, the registers of class, gender, the perceived rural-urban divide, familial individualism, national and international identity, pleasure, difference and the truth of biology, the ‘primitive’ as a resource for the modern, and the local as the basis of joining an international modernity” (62).

Sanjam Ahluwalia and Anandhi S. historically trace the ways in which birth control was used to exercise control over the population of the lower classes. Anandhi (1998) discusses how during the birth control debates in colonial Tamil Nadu, the All India Women’s Conference (AIWC), the nationalists as well as the neo-Malthusians shared similar ground in their understanding of the upper caste, Hindu, middle class woman as embodying respectable sexuality, womanhood and motherhood, while ‘other’ women, such as prostitutes, devadasis and poor women needed birth control. Anandhi notes that “the defenders of birth-control within the AIWC linked the maternal health of poor women to the need for birth-control” (151). Similarly, Sanjam Ahluwalia (2008) argues that in colonial India, birth control emerged as a need to control the population of the lower classes and castes and had its roots in eugenics and neo-Malthusianism. Ahluwalia reads the history of birth control as a “part of an elitist agenda that actually restrained women from exercising control over their own reproductive capacities” (1). Ahluwalia maintained that “various intellectual and political currents of Malthusiasm, eugenics, demography, Western biomedical discourse, sexology, and mainstream nationalism, as well as middle-class feminism, framed the reproductive script in colonial India” (Ahluwalia 2008: 3).

As demonstrated above, birth control and population control have been historically deployed for the ‘lower classes’ and sexuality education has been for the middle classes. Since the subject of sexuality education is the middle class adolescent it becomes important to engage with middle class subjects. From the historical literature, it is also clear that the subject of sexuality education is also upper caste. I therefore concentrate on middle class and upper caste subjects within my dissertation.
Research on middle classes in India has highlighted the cultural politics of middle classes and how consumerism, globalisation and leisure are central to the formation of a middle class identity (Baviskar and Ray 2011, Brosius 2010). Fernandes (2006) notes how the “rise of the new Indian middle class represents the political construction of a social group that operates as a proponent of economic liberalization… At a structural level, this group largely encompasses English-speaking urban white-collar segments of the middle class who are benefiting from new employment opportunities (particularly in private-sector employment) (xviii).” The middle classes are often seen as the beneficiaries and proponents of neo-liberalism, which is loosely defined as the rise of market capitalism and consumer citizenship which only benefits the privileged.

Neo-liberalisation is also marked by postfeminism. “Postfeminism is a term used to herald a time when equality is supposedly reached and when feminism is no longer required. Postfeminism can be thought of as an epistemic break from the second wave, but most importantly it is played out in the context of media culture and is often bemoaned as lacking a political agenda. Postfeminism is contextually located in a neoliberal and globalised first world space where there is a constant emphasis on choice and empowerment through a language of the media and globalisation (Gill 2007a). Rosalind Gill and Angela McRobbie warn us against taking this ‘choice’ discourse at face value and try to critically think about the problems and implications of the constant occupations with the self and the body. This move from sexual object to sexual subject is not totally unproblematic (Gill 2007a). Rosalind Gill (2007b) argues that one needs to look at the way power works in these contexts. One needs to be wary of being celebratory of this media discourse of ‘choice’ and unpack the ways in which it interpellates women into normalised roles…Gill observes a returning to the traditional pleasures of femininity: the heterosexual family, giving up work, taking the husband’s name among a few other things. Gill sees this as telling us two things: one, the ‘return of the repressed’ and second, as prefeminist ideas being repackaged as postfeminism. These do not challenge normative heterosexual femininity. The danger that Gill reads into it is that all of this is packaged in the language of neoliberal individualism” (Chowkhani 2013).

Since I examine the middle classes, the sexuality education materials explored in chapter three are not only addressed to the middle classes, but also located within the neo-liberal and postfeminist moment. In describing adolescent male romance and sexual knowledge too, I note how intimacies – mediated, and public- and sexual knowledge are tied to consumerism and transnational flows.
Adolescence, Childhood and Sexuality

While examining adolescent sexuality education, it is important to look at debates on child sexuality. I will broadly touch upon some of the key debates in the area of child sexuality.

Childhood sexuality and history of childhood sexuality differs with time and place. Different cultures and historical periods have different notions about childhood sexuality and its relations to marriage and reproduction. Mary Kehily and Heather Montgomery (2009) discuss the contentious issue of: are children naturally sexual or asexual (Kehily and Montgomery 2009: 70). They examine the way children’s sexuality is socially and culturally constructed. Historically sexuality was closely tied with ideas of marriage and reproduction. Children’s sexuality was alright as long as it was within the marriage. Historically children’s sexuality was also closely connected to legal aspects of age of marriage. But “contemporary writing indicates that children are sexually aware and that adults ignore it” (Kehily and Montgomery 2009: 83). Kehily and Montgomery argue that often there is nothing innately sexual or innocent about children, it is often the adult gaze, male or otherwise which bestows upon the child the lack or excess of sexuality.

Discussion on child sexuality also includes a conversation around child sexual abuse. Examining a contemporary debate in Australia, one notices how very often the boundaries of child sexual abuse and child sexual agency get blurred. Abigail Bray (2009) in “Governing the Gaze” and in the context of the Child Sexual Abuse (CSA) moral panic around the nude photograph of a young girl in Australia argues that the so called progressive position which defends the artist actually mutes a feminist voice which calls it an instance of child sexual abuse. She complicates the debate on how sexual agency of the child can be a dangerous argument. She argues that it might not be productive to consider that any narrative which presents a sexualised child is either solely agential or solely representative of abuse. In the polarisation of what is sexualised and not, it is important to look at the issue at hand. As in the case of the photograph, Bray argued that it represents the paedophilic gaze.

In the Indian context, the discussion of child sexuality is generally in terms of child sexual abuse and in the context of the age of consent. The language is always protectionist and there are no complex ways of talking about children/adolescents and sexuality. The debate on child sexuality can be traced through the age of consent debate and legislations such as Protection of Children against Sexual Offences (POCSO) 2012. This generated a debate on who is the
child and who is a minor. In legal terms, an adolescent younger than eighteen years of age is still a child, but for my purposes here I use the term adolescent instead of children. It seems clear that the debate on adolescents and sexuality is complicated by concerns of abuse, of legislation, of sexual agency. Thinking about it historically points to us how these concerns are often constructed from an adult point of view.

Only a handful of scholars like Patricia Uberoi, Meenakshi Thapan, Krishna Kumar, TS Saraswathi and Shalini Advani have discussed childhood, adolescence and sexuality in the Indian context. Patricia Uberoi (2006) writes how the figure of the child is not a “‘natural’ developmental stage in the human life-course, but as a problematic conceptual category, which is historically produced and must be contextually located” (85). Suman Verma and TS Saraswathi (2002) extensively map out the different studies on adolescence in India in the last three decades of the 20th century, with a focus on the 1990s. The annotated bibliography covers a number of themes: adolescent demographic profile, physical and mental well-being, socialization, education and schooling, work and employment, political and civic participation, delinquency and crime, personality and adjustment, morality, disabilities, social deprivation and institutionalisation and lastly policy and programs.

Meenakshi Thapan (2009) notes that “adolescence in India is a contested category as there is no fixed age span when young women may experience adolescence; it remains a more ambiguous and fluid category than it is perceived in the west” (Thapan 2009: 26). Thapan goes on to explore how cultures of adolescence, especially of adolescent girls in the Indian context are complex since they are “not only shaped by class, gender and educational status but are also mediated by the peer group, marriage and childbearing. There is clearly no well-defined age-period within which adolescence is experienced as a marked transition period between childhood and adulthood by young women in Indian urban and rural society.” Thapan discusses how adolescence is a matter of cultural construction and the cultures of adolescence among women from educationally advantaged and disadvantaged sections (Thapan 2009: 27). She concludes that “adolescence, as a marked, well-defined stage, may appear to be missing but the critical presence of the peer group in the school and in the community, in very different ways for the two sets of young women, ensures the experience of adolescence, as a lived reality and not a mere construct, in the lives of young women” (Thapan 2009: 63). The other set of literature on adolescent sexuality is located within population and health studies (Jejeebhoy et al 2005; Jejeebhoy and Sebastian 2003; Santhya
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12 This is a very contemporary debate, especially after the December 2012 rape case and in the case of the juvenile rapists. The debate also revolved around age of consent. For more on age of consent and sexuality education, see [http://ultraviolet.in/2013/04/02/adolescents-and-the-production-of-consent/](http://ultraviolet.in/2013/04/02/adolescents-and-the-production-of-consent/)
and Jejeebhoy 2007). These understand adolescence within the developmental framework, as a strict age category.

Elsewhere, Kristeva develops an altogether different understanding of adolescence, removed from any developmental understanding of it. She notes how adolescence is an ‘open psychic structure’ and not a developmental category. This means that adolescence is not an age category but a space which can be occupied by anybody at any point of time. I find this helpful to think about adolescence theoretically. While my study concentrates on late adolescence- between roughly the ages of fourteen to nineteen- this is not strictly defined because a developmental category is difficult to work with. I am more interested in undoing the limits and boundaries of adolescence. Because of the ethical concerns of interviewing adolescents – I elaborate on this in the next chapter – I have interviewed adults who reflect on their adolescence. The study concentrates on adult memories of late adolescence which I discuss at length in the following chapter. The fourth chapter undoes normative notions of puppy love, the methodology discusses how adolescence and adulthood are not separate and the sixth chapter tries to think through the relationship between adulthood and adolescence and attempts to blur their boundaries.

**Theoretical Approaches**

I use an eclectic mix of theoretical approaches to examine adolescent sexuality and sexuality education. I draw from feminist and queer scholarship on affect theory to think about the place of affect, emotions and negative feelings within experiences of adolescent sexuality and sexuality education. Pedwell and Whitehead (2012) discuss how a number of feminist and queer theorists have drawn from a diverse range of theoretical traditions to think about affect (116). They note that “the affective turn has represented a shift away from “text and discourse as key theoretical touchstones’ and a vital re-centring of the body” Citing from Deleuze and Guattari they write that ‘affect thus cannot be reduced to either ‘discourse’ or ‘emotion’, but rather exceeds these categories; it is a material intensity that emerges via the ‘in-between’ spaces of embodied encounters, circulating power not primarily as a mode of discursive regulation but rather as the potential to ‘become otherwise’” (Pedwell and Whitehead 2012: 116). They discuss how the affective turn among feminists has not only been employed to bring back the ontological, but to also forge links between affect, power, oppression and embodiment (Pedwell and Whitehead 2012: 120). Pedwell and Whitehead also maintain how scholars of affect like Sara Ahmed have sought to understand how the personal/emotional is intertwined with the structural. I draw extensively on the diverse work on affect/emotions and
feelings by scholars like Judith Halbertam, Eve Sedgewick, Jen Gilbert, Eva Ellouz and bell hooks to make arguments about love, romance and risk. More specifically, I make use of the concept of negative affects, drawing from Halberstam’s work on failure. I understand affect and negative affect as “constitutive of subjectivity” (Stephens 2015). Thus I have employed affect theory to think about negative affects and feelings as well as to think about adolescent subjectivity.

To think about power and regulation of adolescent sexuality, I find the work of Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, Sandra Bartky and Giorgio Agamben useful. Foucault, Butler and Bartky examine how the subject is created through regulation and how bodies are made ‘docile’ through control. Butler and Bartky build on Foucault’s work. Butler notes how regulation normalises and makes regular and Bartky discusses practices of self-regulation which are not institutionally bound. I also examine how Foucault discusses the making of ‘docile bodies’. I use Agamben’s concept of states of exception to theorise regulation of romance and sexuality in schools. The ‘state of exception’ is a ‘permanent state of emergency’ in response to any conflict. I discuss these in detail in chapter six. In my study power and affect are constitutive of subjectivity. I use feminist media studies scholar Rosalind Gill’s work on intimacies and postfeminism to understand certain texts on sexuality. These are also discussed in detail in the chapters.

**Limitations of the Thesis**

The focus of the dissertation was on a specific group - middle class, upper caste, urban, English educated, school-based. This has left out a large number of subjects, and further research would be required to understand adolescent sexuality in non-urban spaces or among Dalit subjects. In my analysis of sexuality education materials, I have examined Christian materials, but have not found any material specifically prepared by any Hindu group, or other religious groups. It would be interesting to explore how different religions conceptualise sexuality education and adolescence. As discussed before, the dissertation also doesn’t provide an extensive review of sexuality education as it pans out in India. The data that I analyse is from a particular time period, the 1990s and first decade of 2000. My respondents were in school during these decades. Data collected from young people who were in school after 2010 are likely to point to different directions. With the advent of newer mobile and digital cultures, the concerns will change. My study is limited in that it does not deal with how the digital is transforming and inflecting sexualities.
Chapter Plan

The introductory chapter has discussed the central concerns of the thesis, the rationale for studying sexuality education, masculinities, and adolescent sexuality and for examining it in the context of the middle classes in Mumbai. It also discussed the importance of examining cinema, romance and the theoretical approaches used in the dissertation.

The next chapter examines some methodological concerns in writing the dissertation. This includes tracing the modes of analysis, access to the field, field relations, interviews, questions of memory and ethical issues.

The third chapter examines the sexuality education curricula materials available in Mumbai and Delhi, arguing that these occupy largely four discourses: the feminist, Christian, State and sexological discourse. The feminist discourse brings to the fore the social and political context of sexuality education, stressing on a Rights-based discourse; the Christian organisation brings in an extensive discussion of romance and love; the State discourse brings in the scientific and the moral discourse and the sexological discourse, while located within the scientific, crucially brings in a discussion of sexual pleasure.

The fourth chapter examines adolescent boys’ experiences of romance and relationships. I rethink male desire and the affective registers of romance as experienced by adolescent boys. This includes understanding how intimacies are shaped by consumerism, indeterminacy and failure; the relationship between romance and sex and experiences of dating and romantic relationships. This allows me to re-conceptualise adolescent male desire, centring experiences of failure and ‘negative’ affects to a project of sexuality education.

The fifth chapter rethinks what constitutes sexual knowledge. It examines the different networks, peer groups and sources of information on sex and sexuality that adolescent boys have access to. This allows me to rethink the knowledge gap between the official and unofficial discourses around sexuality education and decentres the official discourse of sexual knowledge as most legitimate.

The sixth chapter examines the relationship between adults and adolescents. This is explored through teacher/adult-adolescent relationships in school and their understandings of student romance in schools spaces. It seeks to understand adult perceptions and desires to regulate and control adolescent sexuality. Through the narratives I seek to theorise how regulations around sexuality in school spaces are states of exception.
All chapters explore in different ways the limits of sexuality education: the limits of the different discourses, the limits of formal sexuality education, the missing discussion of negative affect and love in the curriculum and the regulation of student romance in school spaces. The concluding chapter reflects on all these tying up the arguments made in the individual chapters. It also discusses further research in the field and points to the directions in which scholarship on sexuality can advance.