Greetings to all sex and gender members!
This is an exciting time to be a sex and gender scholar, with increasing recognition by the multitudes that our field provides some crucial literacy helping people interpret the world around them. Every day I see some of our members in the newspapers, radio programs or on social media explaining, exhorting, critiquing or otherwise weighing in on what is going on. We are one of the most vital sources of sociology today, public or otherwise.

It has been a busy fall for our section, which remains the largest one at ASA at just under 1200 members. There is a natural ebb and flow to section work and one peak happens in September/October, when all the committees are appointed and the panels organized for the next year’s ASA meeting. In case you were wondering, this section is uniquely well run, benefiting from all the energy of our many members, and all the work people have put in for years to set up good systems. Like many of you, I am a member of multiple sections, and none of the others I’ve been a part of have been this active, this organized, and this engaged. We have scores of volunteers stepping forward, many committees, folks active on social media, help coming in from many corners. It’s inspiring to be a part of this excellence and an honor to do what I can to continue it.

Some of these volunteers are standing by right now to receive your nominations for our section awards. We give four awards every year – to recognize a distinguished book, distinguished article, meritorious graduate student paper, and feminist scholar activist. Please nominate yourself or someone you admire to receive one; we want to hear about (and be able to acknowledge!) all the good work on sex and gender that is out there.

The program committee (Jennifer Reich, Elena Shih, Fareen Parvez, Leslie Salzinger, Freedon Ouer, and myself) hammered out the 2016 panels from the many suggestions we received. Start preparing your submissions now.
for what promises to be an exciting meeting in Seattle, with panels on emerging social movements, embodied labor and intersectional inequalities, feminist and queer methodologies, global masculinities, children and youth, sexual commerce and intimate markets, and an invited panel looking at how sex and gender has shaped other subfields (see the descriptions at the end of the newsletter for more detail).

I’d also like to take a moment to recognize those who came before. Jessica Fields is really a model for how to be a section chair – energetic, careful, fair, and on top of it. When ASA received our annual report this year – penned by Jessica -- the staff there replied with special commendation, calling the report on communications “probably the best I’ve seen from a section. If you don’t mind I’d like to use it as a model for how sections should think about their communications strategies.” Luckily she’s still around as chair of our nominations committee helping to ensure a terrific slate for us to vote for this year. Folks who are stepping down from the council this year – Shari Dworkin, Mignon Moore, and Kristen Schilt – have done some outstanding work for the section for years, serving on awards committees, weighing in on crucial decisions, even spearheading the bowties effort for which ASA 2015 will be fondly remembered. We’re still benefiting from Mignon and Kristen’s involvement on the nominations committee this year as well, but I wanted to make sure to thank all three for their council service.

Finally, thanks to you all for the work you do to keep the section moving, but more important, for what you do to keep sex and gender scholarship and activism the dynamic and powerful force it is today. We all benefit from that, every day.

Warm Regards,

Allison Pugh
Associate Professor of Sociology
University of Virginia
apugh@virginia.edu

---

**Check out our Section’s Website:**

[HTTPS://ASASEXANDGENDER.WORDPRESS.COM/](HTTPS://ASASEXANDGENDER.WORDPRESS.COM/)
CONGRATULATIONS TO THIS YEAR’S AWARD WINNERS!

Sociology of Sex and Gender Sally Hacker Graduate Student Paper Award Winners Annalise Loehr, Lisa Miller, and Long Doan (Indiana University)

*Joy Hightower (University of California-Berkeley) was also acknowledged for her paper, which also received the Sociology of Sex and Gender Sally Hacker Graduate Student Paper Award

Sociology of Sex and Gender Sally Hacker Graduate Student Paper Award Honorable Mention Kate Averett (University of Texas-Austin)

Sociology of Sex and Gender Distinguished Article Award Winner Kimberly Hoang (University of Chicago)

Sociology of Sex and Gender Distinguished Article Award Honorable Mention Carla A. Pfeffer (University of South Carolina)

Sociology of Sex and Gender Distinguished Book Award Winner Sanyu A. Mojola (University of Colorado-Boulder)

Sociology of Sex and Gender Feminist Scholar Activist Award Winner Esther Chow (Professor Emerita at American University)
Introduction to the Newsletter Mini-Symposium
Written by Organizers Catherine Bolzendahl and Melanie M. Hughes

In our quest as sociologists to better understand the organized patterns of gendered relations, we’ve long recognized the importance of politics and power. Yet, sociological research on sex and gender developed during a time when women’s exclusion from formal politics was nearly universal. Many sociologists thus focused on gender and politics outside of governments and elections. Sociologists have ceded much of this ground to political science.

Yet, change is afoot. Women are increasingly serving in all types of political positions, from local councilor to national legislator to president. And, as the election season here in the U.S. progresses, issues of sex and gender will be at the forefront. Much is happening that should interest sociologists who study sex and gender. Further, we suggest that sociologists have much to offer the study of gender and politics. Sociological perspectives are particularly important because they able to fully draw upon the intersectional, situated nature of gender identities and processes, and bring to bear theoretical tools from the most micro to the most macro of social conditions. Sociological theories of gender provide a compelling lens to see how

Gender as a Macro Analytic Tool for Understanding Political Conflicts
Myra Marx Ferree

Joan Scott’s “gender as useful concept for historical analysis” insisted that it was important to understand more than “what women did in the French Revolution” and look at what gender relations meant for the goals, processes and outcomes of the French Revolution as a whole. This approach to studying political transformations of various sorts has finally begun to be carried out in depth, and the best examples present a much more complex and interesting view of gender at the macro level than any mere counting of representation could. Consider these two recent books.

Jocelyn Viterna’s Women in War, despite the narrow title, is an impressive example both methodologically and theoretically. Viterna doesn’t only examine what women guerillas (and men guerillas, and women and men non-guerrillas) did in the civil war in El Salvador and what the war did to...
them, but also examines how gender relations were integral to the strategic thinking of the revolutionary movement (FMLN) and the relatively favorable negotiated settlement they won. One quick example is the way that the battle for international support required being seen as “the good guys” in the conflict, which meant that the leadership had to ensure that women who were not mothers were recruited to fight and mothers were protected from the violence associated with the government. Women of particular characteristics (young, non-mothers) became 30% of the soldiers, many mothers and children were protected in refugee settlement, and some mothers served as strategic suppliers of essential information and materiel to the rebels. In the rebel camps, women were in fact safe from sexual assault and Vitera looks closely at how this was accomplished; she also points to how sexual assault of men soldiers on both sides were not discussed even though she found direct evidence for these, while claims of government soldiers cutting fetuses out of the their mothers’ bellies were widespread although she could find no direct evidence of these. Which women found military service a route to postwar opportunity, how motherhood could be a negotiated status separate from bearing a child, and what relation ideological commitment had to military service are all questions with superficially surprising answers that Vitera anchors neatly into the overall study of what gender relations were like and shaped what politics could and couldn’t do in transforming El Salvador.

Valerie Sperling’s *Sex, Politics and Putin* also displays a profound understanding of gender as a political foundation of a state undergoing contested transformations. Drawing on masculinity and sexuality studies as well as gender theory about patriarchal power relations, Sperling shows how symbolic and rhetorical claims about the Russian regime link gender and power in highly visible ways. Putin’s use of masculinist display to gender his personal power is a tool used to legitimate the church-state alliance that exercises administrative authority and to build a national patriotic identity that is similarly masculinist. While Putin is so extreme as to seem funny to outsiders, his language and images are not alien to Russian political thought and are echoed in less conspicuous forms in other political systems. Pronatalism, militarism, generational conflict, and homophobia are national issues that have successfully been mobilized through patriarchal ideas and images to buttress authoritarian leadership. Yet these same concerns are also being seized upon as gendered concepts for resistance by Pussy Riot and others. Sperling uses gender analysis not only to illuminate the struggle over actual inequalities by gender in Russia but also to show how democracy and authoritarianism, power and subordination, national identities and exclusion from the “people” are very centrally gendered concepts. Feminism thus becomes a form of critical analysis that has important insights to offer into more that “just” gender equality.

*Myra Marx Ferree is the Alice H Cook Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where she is also a joint governance member of Gender and Women's Studies and member of the executive committee for European Studies. She is especially interested in exploring intersectionality from a macro perspective on stratification processes around status, power and material resources.*

*Interested in submitting an essay or organizing a symposium for the next issue of the newsletter? Send an email to Newsletter Editor Alicia Smith-Tran at acs150@case.edu.*
The Sociological Lens and Women’s Political Representation

Pamela Paxton

The growth in women’s formal political representation around the world is a critically important trend of the past 100 years. In 1907, Finland became the first country to elect a female member of parliament. In 1946, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) became the first country to reach 10% women in its national legislature. Today, 81% of countries have at least 10% women in their national legislatures. And, although women still are substantially underrepresented in politics in most countries of the world, women’s formal representation in politics is increasing quickly. In the 10 years between 2000 and 2010, the average number of women in parliaments nearly doubled, from 11.7% to 19.4%

There is also significant variation in women’s political representation across countries. In two countries (Rwanda and Bolivia), women have broken the 50% barrier. But half of all countries have less than 20% women in their national legislatures. And five countries have no women at all. Sociologists have important theoretical and methodological contributions to make in understanding the causes and consequences of women’s representation around the world. But to date we have often ceded the field to political scientists. This is a shame because politics is the arena for societal decision making. Individuals who hold formal and official positions in government allocate scarce resources, e.g., tax revenues, and direct resources to some groups at the expense of others. Decisions by politicians affect people’s individual choices by encouraging some behaviors and outlawing others. Those with formal or informal political power hold power over other social institutions that sociologists study, such as the family or education, and are able to codify particular practices into law. The makeup of individuals in formal positions of power and important positions in civil society highlights who is legitimated to make society-wide decisions in that society. Sociologists have much to contribute to understanding gendered political representation – let us enter the conversation.

Pamela Paxton is Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs and Christine and Stanley E. Adams, Jr. Centennial Professor in the Liberal Arts at the University of Texas at Austin. With Melanie Hughes, she is the co-author of the forthcoming (January 2016) book, Women, Politics, and Power: A Global Perspective.

Masculinities and Politics

James W. Messerschmidt

Rarely are the state and its plurality of agencies seen by political sociologists as a gendered milieu. Feminist research since at least the early 1980s however demonstrates that gender is a major characteristic of the state and a principal domain of its operations. In terms of personnel, style, and function, the state is a masculine-dominated institution and thus embodies gendered power relations (see Raewyn Connell’s book Masculinities). This does not mean that the state is omnipotent; the state is the site for the mobilization of special interests, including feminist interests, yet simultaneously the state is an apparatus with a bias toward protecting the gendered status quo; men do not mobilize as a group in an effort to gain access to the state because such access is institutionalized in the state itself. Beyond this masculine character of the state, there have been interesting and insightful examinations by sociologists on the masculinities of particular politicians. An example that immediately comes to mind is Michael Messner’s (“The Masculinity of the Governor,” Gender & Society, 2007) scrutiny of the changing masculine constructions of Arnold Schwarzenegger and how he deployed the masculine imagery of the “kindergarten commando” to get elected as Governor of California. Messner does not stop there but goes on to demonstrate that during the “real life of governing” Schwarzenegger constructed a “terminator” form of masculinity as a strategy for deploying class, race, and heterosexual forms of
power. Jackson Katz’s book Leading Men (2012) explores historically the way presidential elections are guided by the perceptions of masculinity amongst the various candidates. And some of my most recent work—Hegemonic Masculinities and Camouflaged Politics (2010) and Masculinities in the Making (2015)—investigates historically the orchestration of regional and global hegemonic masculinities through the speeches of George H.W. Bush, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama. My examination of these three presidents make the case for a multiplicity of hegemonic masculinities and outlines how state leaders may appeal to particular hegemonic masculinities in their attempt to “sell” wars and thereby camouflage salient political—and sometimes criminal—practices in the process. Permit me to close

James W. Messerschmidt’s most recent book is Masculinities in the Making, which brings together three seemingly disparate groups—wimps, genderqueers, and U.S. presidents—to examine what insight each has to offer our understanding of masculinities. Currently he is comparing how hegemonic masculinities are embedded in the speeches of Barack Obama, George W. Bush, and Osama bin Laden as well as juxtaposing life-history data on how masculinities are constructed by genderqueers and transmen. Messerschmidt is a Professor of Sociology at the University of Southern Maine.

Feminism and the State

Ann Shola Orloff and Talia Schiff

The implications of feminism’s changing relations to institutions of state power and law in the US have become the focus of what we believe to be a new and evolving debate among analysts of sexuality, political economy and culture. According to these analysts, to whom we refer as the critics of feminism in power, several conditions pose new questions and challenges for feminists: the growing number of women who occupy positions of formal authority and power, the ways in which some foundational feminists’ ideas are installed within core sites of state power and law, and the fact that the successes of socially conservative and neoliberal intellectual and political projects have resulted, in part, from the appropriation and reshaping of ideas originally forwarded by feminists.

While these critics of feminism in power differ in the types of arguments that they level, they all contend that the alliances formed between some feminists and neoliberal and conservative elites -- coupled with the installation of feminist ideas in law and state institutions--problematize the once commonly held assumption, shared by most second-wave feminists, that all women, regardless of differences in social location, faced certain kinds of exclusions. With women entering positions of formal authority in states, global governance institutions, NGOs and corporations, this assumption cannot stand. And it is precisely this growing awareness to feminism’s and feminists’ changed relations with institutions of state power and law that has become the focus of these new critiques. These critical analysts insist that we consider the implications of advancing a feminist politics not from the margins of society but from within the precincts of power. Building on work on inequalities and hierarchies among women, these critics take up specifically political questions concerning the kind of feminist politics to be promoted in today’s changed gendered landscape. Perhaps most notably, they make explicit a concern shared by radical political movements more generally: what does it mean when the ideas of those who were once political outsiders become institutionalized within core sites of state power and law? We think these questions must be investigated,
pushing beyond often broad-brush narratives concerning the cooptation of feminism by neoliberalism, with historical and empirical research on specific instances of feminism’s reciprocal, though still unequal, relationship with political and social power in all its guises.

Ann Shola Orloff is Professor of Sociology and Political Science and Board of Lady Managers of the Columbian Exposition Chair at Northwestern University.

Intersectionality Is a Challenge to Electoral Politics as Usual
Joshua Kjerulf Dubrow

Intersectionality is a revolution waiting to happen. The fact that people are composed of multiple identities and demographics rooted in social structure challenges every concept, theory and method used by social scientists and law and policy researchers. The foundations of democracy and electoral political equality – who can participate, whose voice is heard, who in the political process benefits and how, who has freedom of choice – relies on the actions of intersectional groups who simultaneously operate within and struggle against a reluctantly changing social structure. In Silicon Valley parlance, intersectionality is a disruptive technology that could wreak creative destruction to this core of political research. Our concepts and theories of the “who” of electoral politics -- the actors who shape, and are shaped by, political institutions -- are historically based on the either-or model: either gender or class, either race or religion. The classic theoretical literature on electoral politics is compatible with an intersectional approach, but it is not explicitly stated. The contemporary empirical literature could deal with the complexity that intersectionality demands, but it overwhelmingly favors models in which demographics are added, one at a time. As popular as it is, and as contested as it is, intersectionality has only scratched the surface of its potential.

Methodology is the key to unlocking its revolutionary potential. We need much more research on how to match the various conceptions of intersectionality with the various methodological techniques popular with social scientists. This is the type of project that can only advance by small increments and painstaking work. There will not be...
some magical theoretical treatise that illuminates everything and changes what we know. The revolution comes through accumulated practicalities and knowledge based on careful testing.

The challenge is to empirically demonstrate that the intersectionality framework reveals new insights and patterns of political attitudes and behaviors. To meet the challenge, we need to re-think how we are using existing data, and how we can design data collection to account for varieties of intersectionality. We need an interdisciplinary perspective on our methods to discover how best to analyze the complexity of intersections, and ideal ways to present this research. Intersectionality is a challenge to electoral politics as usual. We need to develop a research strategy that balances our desire for parsimonious explanations with the complex messiness of political reality.

Joshua Kjerulf Dubrow is an Associate Professor at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, and executive board member of the Committee on Political Sociology (ISA and IPSA). His edited book, Political Inequality in an Age of Democracy: Cross-national Perspectives is published by Routledge (2015).


Congratulations!

Rachael J. Russell successfully defended her dissertation, "Constructing Global Womanhood: Women’s International Non-Governmental Organizations, Women’s Ministries, and Women’s Empowerment," in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Irvine. It takes a world society/neo-institutional approach to study the global construction of women, women’s ministry establishment in governments, and women’s empowerment cross-nationally.

Corey Wrenn was awarded with a grant from The Pollination Project to expand the Vegan Feminist Network, which she founded. Wrenn was also named the 2016 Exemplary Diversity Scholar by the University of Michigan’s National Center for Institutional Diversity. She is a graduate student at Colorado State University and a full-time lecturer at Monmouth University.

Want to share your accomplishments with the section? Send an email to Newsletter Editor Alicia Smith-Tran at acs150@case.edu.


---

**New Articles by Section Members**


---

**#MasculinitySoFragile**

**An Essay by Anthony J. Williams**

When I first started the hashtag #MasculinitySoFragile on Twitter in September, I was not thinking about public sociology. After reading a post from the Twitter user FeministaJones about the violence men inflict on women when their egos are bruised, the tweets flew. Tweeting was not a strategic decision, but merely the quickest way to discuss how toxic masculinities correlate directly to the harassment, abuse, and murder of women. In thinking about these atrocities, I recognized my own complicity as a man and took to a public forum, Twitter, to process through this my silence on the danger of toxic masculinities. But after people contributed their own experiences and my hashtag went viral, an enormous number of people—of all genders—saw the hashtag as “man-bashing.” These claims taught me about the importance of Twitter as public sociology to combine academic and colloquial discourse on social media.

Sociologists have an opportunity to wield Twitter as a public sociology methodology; #MasculinitySoFragile and #ASA15 are case studies of the potential. For example, I attended the ASA conference and tweeted with the hashtag #ASA15, gaining 413 new followers and 1.02 million
tweet impressions that month. I started #MasculinitySoFragile the next month, and I gained 799 new followers and 1.52 million tweet impressions. For context, a tweet makes an “impression” any time a user sees it, regardless of if they engage. Each impression is an opportunity to engage a user in “doing” sociology outside of academia.

I joined Twitter in 2009 and I gain followers daily as I tweet about #BlackLivesMatter as well as the targeted murders of brown, trans, indigenous, queer, and differently abled folks. By centering marginalized folks in my consciousness raising, I write for my audience. With #MasculinitySoFragile, I write for an audience who also seeks to dismantle oppressive systems like patriarchy. Unfortunately, my hashtag also attracted “internet trolls” who threatened my life, thereby embodying what I critiqued: the violent reaction when anyone challenges hegemonic masculinity, even—or especially—on Twitter.

Twitter is often written off by scholars, but we must stop underestimating the value of engaging in and observing real-time conversations from anywhere in the world. When we live-tweet a conference session we are inviting anyone with access to the internet into an archive of knowledge. Whether that knowledge is banal or profound, the Library of Congress is archiving tweets from 2006-2010 with plans to archive from 2010 on as well. I see Twitter as another avenue of sharing our scholarship and holding ourselves publically accountable for our role. Like Audre Lorde, I believe that the personal is political and that we can use Twitter to connect to those we study but rarely reach with our research. With #MasculinitySoFragile, anyone could and still can add their voice. But finally, #MasculinitySoFragile is public sociology that transcends lectures or books to expose the brutal violence that often targets women when they say something as simple as “no” to a man socialized into toxic masculinities.

Anthony J. Williams is Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellow in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. He is working on a senior honors thesis examining the relationship between self-care, sexuality, and leadership in the #BlackLivesMatter Movement. He can be reached at Williams.AnthonyJ@gmail.com. Follow him on Twitter at @anthoknees.

DON’T FORGET TO FOLLOW US ON FACEBOOK!
https://www.facebook.com/ASASexandGenderSection

Call for Research Participants

Personal Narratives of Gender and Disability: Blind and Visually Impaired Men’s Accounts of Embodied Selfhood, qualitatively investigates the relationship between gender, disability and visuality, specifically how visual and textual representations of masculinities and disability shape and are shaped by blind and visually impaired men’s sensory accounts of body and self. In other words, the researchers are interested in learning what masculinity and disability means to my participants in their everyday lives and, beyond this, what it's like having a visual disability in a time when visual information, image and aesthetic are considered important in our society.
The researchers are recruiting males between the ages of 18-75 who are fluent English speakers, permanent residents of the United States currently living in the United States and who identify as visually impaired or blind (from birth or acquired).

Participation in this research will entail one in-depth interview lasting up to an hour and possibly one shorter follow-up interview. Interviews can be conducted face-to-face with participants who live in the NYC area or over the phone if preferred. Interviews with participants who live outside the NYC area will take place only over phone because travel to locations outside NYC is not possible at this time.

Face-to-face interview locations will be agreed upon by the participant and researcher and will take place in public spaces provided they are accessible, suitably quiet to ensure a good recording, and private enough to ensure participant comfort.

This research is anonymous and confidential. Please feel free to distribute this call among colleagues and peers.

If you're interested in participating or would like to know more please contact Tara Fannon, Visiting Scholar at the Center for the Study of Men and Masculinities at SUNY-Stony Brook and PhD Candidate at NUI-Galway: T.FANNON3@nuigalway.ie.

---

Looking Forward: ASA 2016 Meeting in Seattle

In addition to our roundtables, the section will also be organizing the paper sessions listed below:

Global Masculinities: Domination and Dispossession (open session)
Session Organizer: Leslie Salzinger (University of California, Berkeley)
Male power continues to prevail in the upper echelons of economy and polity around the globe. However, at the same time, we see increasing anxiety around the (purported) fate of less privileged men, seen as falling behind their sisters and treated as waste by capital, both domestically and transnationally. This panel welcomes papers that describe and analyze any element of this contradictory set of processes.

Embodied Labor and Intersectional Inequalities (Co-sponsored with the Section on Organizations, Occupations and Work) (open session)
Session Organizer: Eileen Otis (University of Oregon)
The proposed panel will examine the impact of embodied labor on intersectional inequalities. The use of the body to generate symbols, feelings and relationships as part of paid employment, is of growing interest to both scholars of intersectionality and of organizations, occupations and work. A growing number of occupations adopt explicit rules, as well as implicit norms, for how to present the body as part of work activity, as workers are used as symbolic vehicles to represent firms and consolidate relationships with consumers. These "body rules" are often presented as neutral but in fact convey messages about race, class and gender while also reproducing inequalities. Papers should examine some dimension of aesthetic or embodied work.

Feminist and Queer Methods (open session)
Session Organizers: Michela Musto (USC) and Jessica Fields (SFSU) Feminist and queer theorists have developed significant critiques of the objects and practices of sociological inquiry, suggesting alternative epistemological and methodological approaches to studying social life, structures, meanings, inequalities, and opportunities. This session will highlight these shifting practices and sociologists’ responses—satisfying and unsatisfying—to these changes. We welcome papers that examine a range of methods and methodological concerns, including conventionally qualitative and quantitative designs; queer and feminist understandings of the ethical implications of sociological research; studies foregrounding the intersections of race, gender, class, and sexuality; and empirical applications of feminist, queer, and queer of color critiques and theories. Papers may offer reflective examples of feminist and queer methods or may be sustained discussions of methods and methodologies.
Feminist Conversations and Sociological Paradigms: Have Sociological Subfields Changed? (invited session)
*Session Organizer: Orit Avishai (Fordham)*
Has the prominence of the Sex and Gender Section and related gender scholars' networks increased the visibility of our research and/or translated into a mainstreaming of gender scholarship in sociology? Do gender scholars face obstacles publishing their work and finding mainstream audiences? Do they adapt their research and writing strategies depending on venue and audience? How has gender and feminist scholarship affected sociological subfields? Panelists representing a diverse range of subdisciplines were asked to reflect on the status of gender and feminist scholarship in their respective areas of expertise. The goal is to both compare across subdisciplines and to collectively discuss the state of gender scholarship in the larger discipline.

Children and Youth Troubling Sex and Gender (open session)
*Session Organizer: Amy Best (George Mason)*
Children and youth are some of the central actors in contemporary collisions of gender and sexual regimes, as parents, institutions, and the children and youth themselves navigate the meanings and practices of young people's gender and sexuality. In recent years, scholars have documented a number of transformations occurring in terms of gender and sexual identity for children and youth. While some of these shifts are tied to an increasingly fragmented gender and sexual system, they are also bundled up with broader transformations in identity processes in late modernity and our changing relationships to public and private institutions. This paper session will examine the new terrain of sex and gender for children and youth, shedding light on the social processes that both open and foreclose gender and sexual possibilities with attention to institutional settings, peer groups, family and parenting, participation in increasingly diverse cultures of children and youth, and other factors.

Gender, Sexualities and Emerging Social Movements (co-sponsored with the LGBTQ caucus) (open session)
*Session Organizer: Nancy Naples (University of Connecticut)*
Emerging progressive social movements such as BlackLivesMatter, SayHerName, Shout Your Abortion, the DREAMers, and transgender movements are shaped by gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity and class in ways that reflect the complexity of contemporary intersectional politics. These dynamics are manifest through social movement strategies and political claims as well as in the relationships between social movement participants and identity constructions among other facets of social movement politics. This panel welcomes papers that examine continuities, divergences, and contradictions in constructions of gender and sexuality in emerging social movements.

Sexual Commerce and Intimate Markets (co-sponsored with Sexualities) (open session)
*Session Organizer: Elena Shih (Brown) and Holly Wood (Harvard)*
This panel is interested in the neoliberalization of sexuality across a continuum of intimate and commercial sexual arrangements. We are interested both in research that examines new or previously understudied formulations of sex work and in research that looks at the effects of global markets on sexual policy, the state, and sexual labor relations. The panel intends to unite scholars who highlight the effects of market governance and its entrepreneurial imperative on sexuality and work.
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