Making sex, moving difference

An ethnography of sexuality and diversity in Dutch schools

Krebbekx, W.J.P.

Publication date
2018
Document Version
Other version
License
Other

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Krebbekx, W. J. P. (2018). *Making sex, moving difference: An ethnography of sexuality and diversity in Dutch schools* . [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

Chapter 2

Ethnicizing Sexuality: An analysis of Research Practices in the Netherlands

Abstract

Ethnicity is a frequently used category in research into youth and sexuality in the Netherlands, a country known and admired for its favorable sexual health outcomes. This chapter critically examines the production of knowledge about sexuality and ethnicity in the Netherlands. It traces the concept of ethnicity through four research practices (rationales of taking up ethnicity and compiling research populations; determining ethnicity; statistical calculations; making recommendations). It shows how the notion of ethnicity is flexible, slippery and changeable, yet at the same time becomes solidified and naturalized in relation to sexuality. The paper is based on a literature review of youth and sexuality in the Netherlands.

Introduction

> Samantha is a 17-year-old girl from Antillean origin. She lives in a large suburban area in the south of Amsterdam. [...]. Samantha had her first sexual experience at the age of 14. [...] She knew from the start how to protect herself against pregnancy, as she learned in school. [...]... She was careless with contraception. Somehow, she had the naive idea that it would not come to that. [...] But of course, Samantha was not so lucky all the time. She became pregnant and a year ago she gave birth to her daughter, Destiny. The father was a 25-year old man, Wesley, with whom Samantha had an affair. Samantha and Wesley do not see each other any longer. (Picavet, Berlo, & Tonnon, 2014, 449–450)

The vignette reproduced above is taken from an international handbook of adolescent pregnancy. In the original text, the vignette was introductory, informative, and meant to represent a specific situation. At the same time, the tropes it mobilizes are immediately evident. One of the first things we learn about Samantha in this vignette is her Antillean origin. We also read that, despite sex education in school, Samantha got pregnant during her affair with Wesley. Samantha thus stands in for teenage pregnancy, embodying the figure of the careless teenager and the hypersexual black woman.

Here, we also use the vignette as an introduction. This time, though, not as an illustration of the situation of adolescent pregnancies in the Netherlands. Instead, what it represents is the broader context of research on sex and ethnicity in that country. It points us to three concerns, namely the issue of sexuality in relation to the Dutch nation; the workings of social categories; and the production of knowledge in scientific research practices. It is these concerns, and their interconnectedness, that we engage in this chapter.

The Netherlands, sexuality and nationalism

The Dutch have been internationally applauded for their pragmatic and progressive approach to teenage sexuality (Aggleton, 2001; Senanayake, Nott, & Faulkner, 2001). It has become a common opinion that, for the Dutch, sexuality is accepted as a normal aspect of teenage development: an aspect discussed in schools, families and health care clinics (Schalet, 2011). National policy requires that secondary school pupils learn about contraceptives and condom use, identity formation, social skills and sexual diversity. The 'Dutch approach' (Lewis & Knijn, 2002; Senanayake et al., 2001) has been characterized as pioneering and successful in preventing sexual transmittable diseases (STI's) and teenage pregnancies. As a result, the Netherlands have been praised as having achieved the status of a guiding country for the prevention of teenage pregnancies (Harbers, 2006), and its sex-education became a successful export product (ZonMW, 2012).

In this narrative of the Netherlands as a leading country, sexual progressiveness has increasingly become a defining characteristic of the nation (Mepschen et al., 2010). Simultaneously, religious beliefs, irrationality, and traditions came to be seen as characteristic of ethnic minority groups (Lesko, 2010; Rasmussen, 2012; Scott, 2009; Verkaaik, 2010). Such framings are easily turned into a mechanism that separates the supposedly progressive Dutch from the allegedly conservative other. This boundary making takes place within a contemporary revival of nationalism in the Netherlands that 'defines its key values, such as gender equality, sexual emancipation, and freedom of speech, in opposition to a perception of Islam as essentially unfriendly to women, homosexuals, and heretics' (Verkaaik, 2010, 71; see also Verkaaik & Spronk, 2011).

According to Nagel (2001), sexual ascriptions in their juxtaposition of ethnic, racial or national groups against *others*, have long been 'part of the ideological material out of which racial, ethnic, and national boundaries are constructed' (p.126). In the particular case of the Netherlands, the figure of the white homosexual that is threatened by immigrants, especially by Muslims, has been central in this sexual nationalism (Dudink, 2011). Immigrants and their descendants are then seen as 'forming bastions of

difference, and, in instances, hostility' (Schalet, 2011, p. 200) and get framed as posing a danger to the sexual health of the 'native' Dutch population (Proctor et al., 2011). It legitimizes subjecting ethnic minorities to heightened surveillance and education (Krebbekx, Spronk, & M'charek, 2013; Van den Berg & Duyvendak, 2012). This process sexualizes ethnic boundaries, turning them into ethnosexual boundaries (Nagel, 2002).

Category work: Gender, ethnicity, intersectionality

How to deal with the ways in which sexuality and ethnicity are entangled? The framework of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) provides a rich and powerful way to approach this question. In an intersectional perspective, gender is not treated separately from sexuality, class or race/ethnicity. These markers of difference are seen as working together in the construction of identities. The concept has its origins in black feminist thought, and asked for a reconsideration of the categories woman (assumed to be white) and black (assumed to be men). The black woman, thus, became the quintessential 'intersectional subject' – at the crossroads, simultaneously experiencing oppressions of gender and race. One criticism of the intersectionality framework focuses on the need to understand social divisions at different analytical levels, because their ontological base and their relations to each other differ (Yuval-Davis, 2006). The different categories work according to different logics, and intersectionality is not helpful to understand this process, as it 'lumps' them together, according to some critics (Skeggs, 2008).

Intersectionality assumes categories as given, knowable and stable, which implies they can be analyzed separately. Indeed, this framework claims to *know* which categories matter, and who belongs to them, though the list seems one of endless proliferation and always ends with the notorious 'etc.' (Butler, 1990). It is this assumption of a received knowledge about what categories are and their ease of recognition in empirical realities that we want to challenge.

Instead of an understanding of differences as stable and pre-existing,

that can just be 'encountered', we could also consider social differences as always in the making. Gender, race/ ethnicity, sexuality, disability, and class can work with or against one another, they can interact and interfere with each other, and in this way they can increase or decrease oppression or privilege (Moser, 2006). Differences are the *effect* of interferences in specific practices. Differences do not always materialize in bodies. They are relational, they can be made durable, but can also be forgotten – they can be fragile (M'charek, 2010) or made solid.

Research as practice of knowledge production

If we consider categories as made and not given, as the *effects* of certain practices – then where do they take place? One of the sites where this production becomes particularly evident and effective - because of its authority and legitimacy - is that of research. Science and Technology Studies (STS) consider science as 'a set of practices that are shaped by their historical, organizational and social context' (Law, 2004). Scientific knowledge comes from somewhere: it is produced in a variety of practices, in universities, research institutes, expert centers, and scientific publications. These practices do not take place outside social contexts, but are shaped by them, and also shape them in return. They do not merely describe, but they make things, and in so doing they co-produce reality. Consider for example the ways in which groups of people are clustered in scientific research: these are often reflections of dominant societal norms (Essed & Nimako, 2006; Hacking, 2006; Krieger, 2011; Lupton, 1995). But they also work the other way around: they inform social norms.

Research does not discover a reality that is already 'out there' but instead this reality is produced by research practices 'in here', through collecting, clustering, and extrapolating from data. Again, this should not be taken to say that the realities of these categories come from nowhere; they are 'embedded in social practices, identities, norms, conventions, discourses, instruments and institutions – in short, in all the building blocks that we term *social*' (Jasanoff, 2004, p. 2–3). We aim to find out in what way knowledge

about sexuality and ethnicity is produced, or, in other words, how sexual ascription (Nagel, 2001) takes place in sex research (Spronk, 2014). Following Law (2004), we argue that research methods are not purely technical sets of procedures, but that practices like surveying, naming, dividing or merging groups contribute to the creation of those very groups. This process is what philosopher of science Ian Hacking calls making up people (2006). It is the process that renders vignettes such as the 'Antillean teenage mother Samantha' possible. The process of naturalizing risk groups impedes their critical interrogation as it results in obscuring the stages that are involved in their making. These stages will be examined here. Our objective is not to elucidate undisclosed assumptions about ethnic groups, but to show the methods and the effects of taking on the notion of ethnicity in sexuality research. Based on a detailed analysis of research practices as described in reports and articles, this article traces how ethnicity and sexuality are co-shaped in research into youth and sexuality in the Netherlands.

Methods

For the purpose of this study, publications on youth, sexuality and schooling in the Netherlands that appeared between 2000 and 2011, were reviewed. We searched academic databases (such as Pubmed, PsycINFO and Google Scholar) using the terms youth, adolescents, education, school, schooling, socioeconomic status, parents, peers. Furthermore, the archives of relevant Dutch academic journals were searched, as were the archives of knowledge centers on youth, sexuality and education. Only original empirical studies into youth and young adults were selected. Where periodical studies were involved (like sexual health monitors), only the most recent edition was included. The focus was primarily on studies that studied sexuality in relation to schools or educational level.

The described search and selection methods resulted in 32 publications. As this article focuses on the use of ethnicity, only those publications that mentioned ethnicity (or a related concept such as cultural background or allochthonous/autochthonous) in their introduction, abstract or in the first

two pages were included, resulting in a sample of fourteen studies. Thus, ethnicity was not always taken up by sexuality researchers. However, we are interested in what happens when it is: therefore we analyzed the studies that are delineated in table 1.

In the Dutch case, a particular terminology is used to demarcate ethnic minorities. The most used term and aggregate category for all minorities is 'allochtonen', originally a geological term. The term allochthonous (lit.: not from the soil) is used to indicate those of non-Dutch birth or ancestry, whereas autochthonous (lit. from the soil) is used for those of Netherlands birth and ancestry. The terms became used like this in public policy and national statistics, and have become mainstream in public discourse (Essed & Nimako, 2006; Geschiere, 2009). The term allochthonous 'is not connected to any particular cultural background and hence individualizes, while categorizing at the same time' (Ghorashi, 2014, p. 105). In this sense, this terminology tends to both isolate and group together, in a 'lumpy' way, different groups (Yanow & Van der Haar, 2013, p. 249).

Ethnicity as category in scientific practices

In the reports and articles on sexuality, we identified four research practices: (1) compiling an ethnically diverse sample; (2) determining ethnicity; (3) statistically calculating and comparing; and (4) making recommendations. Although our discussion of these practices might be read as suggesting a chronology, this temporal order is used only to narrate our findings. In the complex practices of science in the making, practices might overlap, be iterative or work simultaneously. Following research practices will reveal a particular co-constitutive relation between sexuality and ethnicity. They show how ethnicity is changeable and, at the same time, when related to sexuality, contributes to the solidification of rigid ideas about sexuality, ethnicity and their relationship.

1: Compiling an ethnically diverse sample

Five times, in the literature we considered, knowledge about ethnicity is deemed necessary to match educational programs to 'allochthonous youth' (table 1). In three studies the reason for taking up ethnicity in the first place remains unexplained, and seems to be one of routine. Twice, striving for a sample representative of the Dutch population, led researchers to include ethnicity as a variable. The qualitative studies we found were exclusively aimed at allochthonous youth twice and at Islamic youth once. Once, the sample also included autochthonous Dutch youth (Cense & Van Dijk, 2010).

Following up on their decision to attend to ethnicity often proved to be difficult for researchers: when the usual methods for recruiting research participants were used, ethnic diversity in the sample frequently turned out to be small (Cense & Van Dijk, 2010; De Graaf et al., 2005; Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003). To make sure the so called hard to reach populations (Hollander & Frouws, 2011; Smerecnik et al., 2010) were part of the sample, alternative recruitment strategies were used. These included, for example, inviting schools with 'more than 60% allochthonous pupils' to take part in a study (De Graaf et al., 2005, p. 4). Another strategy was identifying and inviting youth with a Surinamese, Antillean, Turkish or Moroccan background via the municipal registration of the two Dutch largest cities, Amsterdam and Rotterdam. In one study, area codes of urban areas where 'a lot of allochthons live' were dialed to contact potential study participants (Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000, see also table 1).

The compilation of an ethnically diverse group was considered a challenge that required alternative recruitment strategies, making use of existing infrastructures to document ethnicity (the municipal registration, school percentages of ethnic groups), or journals and websites popular among a specific ethnic group. The effort to establish ethnic diversity shows that researchers take into account criticisms on the earlier 'one-size-fits-all-model' of biomedical knowledge-making (Epstein, 2007, p. 15), in which white males functioned as the 'standard human' (Epstein, 2007, p. 16). Instead, inclusion of diversity (Epstein, 2007) has increasingly become the norm. But, when considering diversity, the focus quickly turns to ethnicity

– what has been called an ethnicity-first approach (Paulle & Kalir, 2013, p. 1357). As a result, the image arises of social groups as differing from each other purely on the basis of ethnicity. This tendency to ascribe causal power to ethnicity or culture has been observed more widely in relation to (sexual) health (Epstein, 2007; Gravlee & Sweet, 2008; Proctor et al., 2011). Such framings decrease attention for similarities between groups and differences within groups, privileging a specific notion of social groups. *In other words, diversity, in this step, becomes synonymous with and is practiced as ethnic diversity.*

2: Determining an individual's ethnicity

Different conceptualizations of ethnicity were used, namely: ethnic background, origin, descent; cultural, traditional or religious background; and migration or immigration history (see table 1). The operationalization of such concepts determines the ethnic label that gets attached to a participant. Ethnicity was often operationalized using the country of birth of the participant and his or her parents. Two large research projects used the definition of the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) to divide 'non-western allochthon', from 'western allochthon' and 'autochthon', and between 'first' and 'second generation' (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2014). As is conventional in the methodology of the CBS, eight other researchers used the country of birth of the participant and his or her parents to determine ethnicity. In two projects, self-identification was used (see table 1).

The differences in labeling seem marginal at first sight. When we turn to the Dutch royal family, and take the example of crown princess Amalia, however, the scope of the resulting differences becomes clear. Amalia's mother, queen Máxima, is, in the definition of the CBS, a first generation non-western allochthon (she was born in Argentina). Amalia's father, king Willem-Alexander, is, again following the CBS, a second generation western allochthon (his father was born in Germany). What label will our fictional participant Amalia get in the studies analyzed? In two research projects, she would be labeled as second generation non-western allochthon (De Graaf et

Table 1. Analysis of research into youth and sexuality (terms as used in the original publications)

	Qualitative/ Quantative	Reason to attend to ethnicity	Concepts used	Operationalization of ethnicity	Categories used	Recruitment of participants	Ethnic composition of sample
Cense & Van Dijk, 2010	Ql	Previous research	Cultural and religious background	Country of birth parents	Surinamese/Antillean/African, Turkish/Moroccan/Hindustani, autochthonous, other	1) websites, intermediaries, earlier participants; 2) specific groups on the streets; on the streets; youth event in the district Amsterdam South-East, youth centers Amsterdam	Autochthonous (n=23), Surinamese/Antillean/African (n=22), Turkish/Moroccan/Hindustani (n=17), other (n=6)
De Graaf et al, 2005	Qn	Representativity, ability to compare groups	Non-Dutch origin, allochthonous youth	CBS definition allochthon	Dutch, Western allochthon, Moroccan, Turkish, Surinamese, Antillean, other- non-Western	via schools and municipal administration	78% Dutch; 7% Western allochthon; 16% non-Western allochthon
De Looze, 2010	Qn	None	Ethnic background	CBS definition allochthon	Dutch, Surinamese, antillean/Aruban, Moroccan, Turkish, other Western and other non-Western	Surveys in schools (a select sample)	80% Dutch, 2% Surinamese, 1% Antillean/Aruban, 3% Moroccan, 4% Turkish, 5% other non-western, 5% other western
Hemmes & Ulichki, 2010	Qn and Ql	Previous research tailored interventions	Allochthonous background, traditional background	Unknown	Turkish, Moroccan, and allochthonous youth with a non-Turkish and non-Moroccan background	Choice of school(s) unknown. Respondents via websites popular amon Turkish and Moroccan youth. Interview participants unknown	Survey: 50 allochthonous seconday school pupils; Chat: unkown; Interviews: 3 respondents with a traditional Turkish background
Hollander & Frouws, 2011	Ql	Previous research, tailored interventions	Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese or Antillean background	Self-identification	Mostly used: youth with Surinamese/Antillean or Turkish/Moroccan background	Respondents approached in places such as schools, youth and on the street	Each of the ethnic groups is represented by at least 3 men and 3 woman
Inspectie van het Onderwijs, 2007	Qn	Representativity	Non-Dutch mother	Country of birth participant and his/her mother	Pupils with a mother born in Surinam, Morocco, Turkey or the Netherlands	Case studies on 27 seconday schools and 8 vocational schools	Secondary school: 20% has a non-Dutch mother; vocational school: 28% has a non-Dutch mother

	Qualitative/ Quantative	Reason to attend to ethnicity	Concepts used	Operationaliza-tion of ethnicity	Categories used	Recruitment of participants	Ethnic composition of sample
Kuyper et al., 2009	Qn	Previous research	Cultural and religious background	Country of birth participants and parents	Autochthonous/Western, Turkish/Moroccan, Surinamese/Antillean, other non-western	Via youth media and several schools	Three questionnaires: 1) 82% Dutch, 7% Turkish/Moroccan, 4% Surinamese/Antillean, 6% other non-western l2) resp. 88%, 3%, 3%, 7%; 3) resp. 89%, 2%, 4%, 5%
Kuyper et al., 2011	Qn	Previous research	Ethnicity	Country of birth participants and parents	Western and non-western	Via youth media and several schools	1257 youth, 130 from non-western origin
Sandfort et al., 2010	Qn	None	Ethnic background	Unknown	Dutch and non-Dutch, (subdivided into Surinamese, Moroccan, Turkish and Antillean)	8 secondary schools in Amsterdam	56% Dutch, 24% Surinamese, 19% Moroccan, 15% Turkish, 5% Antillean, 37% non-specified other
Schouten et al., 2007	Qn	Previous research	Ethnic background	Country of birth participant and parents	Dutch, non-western and Turkish/Moroccan	Pupils of four secondary schools in different provinces	Dutch (n=406), non-Western (n=33), Turkish/Moroccan (n=29)
Smerecnik et al., 2010	Ql	Previous research	Muslim or non-Muslim, immigrant or Dutch	Self -identification (Muslim/non-Muslim), Dutch/non-Dutch unknown	Muslim/non-Muslim, Dutch/non-Dutch	Visitors of an internet forum on Islam and sexuality	44 Muslims, 33 non-Muslims
Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003	Qn	Tailored intervention	Origin, background, ethnic communities	Country of birth parents	Islamic, Caribbean, Dutch	Unknown	Both parents born in the Netherlands, 73%; at least one parent born in Morocco/Turkey/other Islamic country, 11% at least one parent from Caribbean/Surinam/ other Latin American country, 7%
Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000	Qn	Tailored intervention	Allochthonous background, allochtonous youth	Country of birth parents	Moroccans, Turks, Surinamese, Antilleans	Recruitment of Dutch respondents unknown. Allochthonous respondents from areas where many allochthons live	38 Moroccans, 15 Antilleans, 100 Surinamese, 47 Turks
Wolfers et al., 2010	Qn	Tailored intervention	Ethnicity, immigrants	CBS definition allochthon	Dutch, Surinamese, Antillean, Turkish, Cape Verdian, Moroccan, other Western and non-Western	First and second year classes of 5 vocational schools near Rotterdam	Dutch (38%), Surinamese (16%), Antillean (12%), Turkish (10%), Capverdian (6%), Moroccan (5%), other western (6%), non-western (8%)

al., 2005; De Looze, 2010). In the project of Vanwesenbeeck and colleagues (2003) she would be part of the Caribbean group: youth who have at least one parent that is originating from the Caribbean, Surinam or a different Latin-American country. Furthermore, Amalia would be labeled: allochthon (De Graaf et al., 2005), high-risk immigrant (Wolfers, Kok, Mackenbach, & de Zwart, 2010), non-western (Kuyper, De Wit, Adam, Woertman, & Van Berlo, 2009, 2011), allochthon youngster with a non-Turkish and non-Moroccan background (Hemmes & Ulichki, 2010), and non-Dutch (Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000). Speculating that Amalia would self-identify as Dutch (her being the royal princess of the Netherlands, 'Princess of Orange'), she would be Dutch in the study of Hollander and Frouws (2011). In the studies considered, Amalia could thus be ascribed any ethnicity ranging from Dutch to non-Dutch.

The majority of studies established 'national origin' by asking participants to fill out their own and their parents' country of birth. In drawing on existing conventions, researchers obscure how these categorizations became conventional and how they result in an ethnic reflex (Ham & Meer, 2012): leading to a conflation of origin with ethnic group, and to a problematization of groups (for example youth with an Antillean background) instead of phenomena (for example condom-use). The often-used term allochthone is increasingly becoming controversial, due to its negative connotations and generalizing effects. This has not gone unnoticed in sexuality research. Vanwesenbeeck et al. (2003) for example use the term, but note that there are vast differences between allochthones and that the group must be differentiated to be meaningful. A footnote stating 'respect […for…] all differences between individuals and subgroups' (Cense & Van Dijk, 2010, p. 102) suggests that making these classifications can be a complex exercise, leading to inclusion of an Iranian respondent in the research category 'Turkish and Moroccan youth' and a Ghanaian and Nigerian respondent in the Surinamese and Antillean category.[26] Despite the explanation about the

---

26   The group of Surinamese and Antillean youth includes a Ghanaian and Nigerian respondent, because 'their cultural script is on the same wavelength' (Cense & Van Dijk, 2010, p.102). A Hindustani and an Iranian respondent belong to the category 'Turkish and Moroccan youth', because 'their cultural baggage also includes honor-sensitivity' (idem). How the label 'Hindustani' was established is unclear, the methods section states that categories were based on country of

constructed character and inaccuracy of categories, these same categories are used when conclusions are drawn or recommendations are made: earlier nuances tend to disappear. These groups are often ones that already have a marginalized position in Dutch society, and, as Proctor, Krumeich and Meershoek (2011) suggest, function as 'the other'. *Ethnicity figures here as a sociodemographic characteristic that is used to make groups, and is rooted in place of birth. Not just any group: groups that were already made important and meaningful in national discourses are now related to sexuality.*

3: Statistical calculations: comparing groups and predicting behavior

Much quantitative research starts from an analysis of differences between groups –for example to find out differences between men and women in terms of ability to talk about condom use (Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000). A precondition for the statistical validity of difference tests is that the size of the groups needs to be sufficient. It is not always possible to make differences within ethnic categories visible, as groups will become too small for statistical tests (De Graaf et al., 2005; Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003; Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000). When this is not the case, subgroups are often combined in the analysis. Groups that are often merged are youth with a Turkish and with a Moroccan background.

This happens for example in the report of Kuyper and colleagues (2009), where the sample size did not allow for splitting up in 'subgroups', for example between Moroccan and Turkish youth or between Christian and Jewish youth. Turkish and Moroccan youth in this way are depicted as subgroups of a larger group, the allochthons, which is not an unusual practice in the studies reviewed (Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003; Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000). Another effect of this statistical requirement is that the findings cannot be specified in terms of educational level, age, or religion, even though this might be necessary to understand the findings. Social class and educational level, for example, often get a meager treatment, despite evidence suggesting these variables might be more relevant than ethnicity

---

birth of participant and parents.

(see for example Matser et al., 2013). They seem not to have the same recognizability and capability to group people. *In this practice, the limitations of the statistical options result in a foregrounding of ethnicity, the merging of ethnic groups based on assumed similarities in relation to 'culture', and a homogenizing of ethnic groups, obscuring other possible markers of difference due to the statistical need for large, comparable groups.*

There is no unified way to deal with analyses of subgroups. For example, Vanwesenbeeck and colleagues (2003) found that the prevalence of pregnancies was higher among girls in the category Dutch – where it was expected that this would be higher for those classified as Caribbean. As the result was counter-expected, additional analyses were carried out (specifying the results according to age). This resulted in the inability to draw conclusions between Dutchness and teenage pregnancy, because of the small size of the samples. Yet, additional analyses (like age-based subsamples) were not carried out when the expectations of researchers are met in the first place, for example when it was found that Islamic girls 'on all fronts are least sexually experienced' (Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003, p. 33). This exemplifies the way in which researchers' assumptions can influence the production of data on sex.

Besides determining differences between groups, many researchers want to develop a predictive model of sexual behavior by finding out risk and protective factors. Ethnicity is situated in these models among other 'socio-demographic' factors such as sex/gender, educational level and (sometimes) religion. In regression analyses, these independent variables are related to a dependent variable (for example condom use). The advantage of this method is that it creates the possibility to calculate the statistic effects of several independent variables simultaneously. In the research of Kuyper and colleagues (2009) regression analyses showed, for example, that out of ten analyses, only once was ethnicity significant. At the same time, however, this method asks for binary variables, resulting in binary pairs such as man/woman, high educated/low educated, western/non-western (De Looze, 2010; Kuyper et al., 2009, 2011; Sandfort, Bos, Collier, & Metselaar, 2010; Wolfers et al., 2010).

This also happens when researchers use other techniques. Binary pairs that are created are allochthon/autochthon (Cense & Van Dijk, 2010; De Looze, 2010; Hemmes & Ulichki, 2010; Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003) Dutch/non-Dutch (Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000; Wolfers et al., 2010), Turkish/Moroccan and Dutch/Western (Schouten, van den Putte, Pasmans, & Meeuwesen, 2007) or western/non-western (De Looze, 2010). The consequence of this method is that one of the groups becomes the reference group, the norm. With one exception (De Graaf et al., 2005) youth with a Dutch background are considered the norm against which the others are projected. *Thus, we see that a statistical technique asks ethnicity to appear as a binary variable, and that assumptions about ethnic groups' sexuality determine the statistical calculations that are carried out and published. One half of this asymmetric binary pair becomes universal - the other particular.*

It is also important here to note findings that are *not* reported in the text. If we look at the figures published by Von Bergh and Sandfort (2000) we see, following a lot of information about determinants of behavior, that, when it concerns actual behavior (condom use at last sexual contact, in this case), the only significant difference that was found was that youth with a Surinamese or Antillean background used a condom more often than youth with a Dutch background. Despite this finding indicating that the group with a Dutch background is more 'at risk', the risk-label does not stick to the group as it does in case of 'non-Dutch' groups. This shows that 'the Dutch' are not seen as one group as easily. We also see that some categories, like youth from China and youth from Russia are not analyzed and are not included in comparisons (Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003). *Thus, groups that are more present in societal debates, gain more visibility in research reports on sex - sex research solidifies the status of these groups as 'in need of extra attention'*

In statistical practices it becomes evident that autochthones are seen as the reference group, as they get the neutral '0' –value. It is also apparent in phrases like 'the Caribbean group is not inferior to the Dutch', or, 'regarding knowledge, Islamic girls lag behind' (Vanwesenbeeck et al., 2003, p. 32). Such comparisons are invalid because a group based on origin is compared to a group based on religion. Also, they make clear that Caribbean youth or Islamic

girls are excluded from Dutchness, and support the image of the Dutch as progressive, and others as traditional and behind. This practice suggests that epidemiological research does not neutrally report on reality, but instead is influenced by the social context of its undertaking (Brubaker, 2002). This influence is clear when an 'Islamic doctrine', 'a subpopulation among the group of Muslims with extreme views' (Smerecnik et al., 2010, p. 539), or 'a fairly progressive group of allochthons' (Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000, p. 10) are mentioned. The judgmental formulation on allochthones in general and, increasingly, on Muslims, makes understanding research results difficult: it leads to the imprecise use of terms like ethnicity, culture and religion. It makes them appear as solid and unified; while in practice they are not so monolithic. *In effect, in this step, one half of the binary pair, the autochthones, become the unmarked norm against which 'others' are measured.*

4: Making recommendations

Many reports and articles end with making recommendations for future research, policy or practice, like promotional campaigns or school programs. Sometimes, researchers leave the job of formulating recommendations to stakeholders in the field of youth and sexuality (Meijer, Graaf, Vanwesenbeeck, Poelman, & De Graaf, 2005), to experts in the field of sexual health or to youths themselves (Kuyper et al., 2009). Often, recommendations are (at least partly) formulated in terms of ethnicity. Hollander and Frouws (2011, p. 55) state that it is important to educate girls with an Antillean or Surinamese background about the 'not sheer positive sides of becoming a young mother'. For other researchers ethnicity proves to be important in their recommendations as well. According to Vanwesenbeeck and colleagues (2003, p. 38), in the future 'more attention should be given to the sex specificity and cultural specificity of sex education'. Recommendations are not only formulated for youth but for their parents too: 'it is important to start targeting specific communication interventions at migrant families, which aim to increase the openness in communication about sexuality between parents and their children' (Schouten et al., 2007, p. 81).

In the recommendations section, again, we see that many researchers do not repeat earlier nuances about the constructed nature of ethnic groups and instead talk about Dutch and non-Dutch people, about allochthons versus autochthons. The differences are presented as large enough to justify distinct research projects; it is suggested that larger groups of allochthonous youth should be studied for differences to appear more clearly (Schouten et al., 2007; Von Bergh & Sandfort, 2000). This recommendation did not fall on deaf ears: next to a large research project into the general sexual health of youth a separate project into the sexual health of allochthonous youth has been undertaken (RutgersWPF, 2011). *Making recommendations for further research, policy and practice in terms of ethnicity or ethnic groups adds to an understanding of the sexuality of 'ethnic others' as problematic. These recommendations often ask for 'action points', in which earlier nuances about the constructed nature and the messiness of the ethnic groupings are brushed aside: it confirms what was already known, namely that some ethnic groups require special attention.*

Impact and spread of research: on ethnic common sense-making

The authority that is ascribed to knowledge institutes, academic journals and universities, means that recommendations for future research and preventive practices often have far reaching consequences. Research results on youth and sex are a popular topic among national newspapers. Referring to the results of a large research project, the Dutch newspaper *De Volkskrant* headlined: Talking about sex still a taboo among allochthones (Budde, 2008). The use of the word 'still' implies that allochthones lag behind the Dutch ideal of 'evidence-based pragmatism with respect to young people's sexuality' (Pillai & Toure, 2010, p. 23) – allochthones thus embody difference and backwardness. Moreover, it implies that the autochthone group is unproblematic. But we have seen that, for example in the case of teenage pregnancies, this does not hold. An example regarding condom use illustrates the tendency to accentuate ethnic differences. The National Public Health Compass, according to its website, offers independent and scientifically

based knowledge on public health (Nationaal Kompas Volksgezondheid, 2014). On its website, a figure on youth and sexuality is presented (Bakker, 2010), see table 2.

Origin	Has sex with others apart from steady sex partner		Has had 4 or more sex partners	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Antillean	21	10	51	34
Surinamese	16	20	63	35
Moroccan	30	5	72	17
Dutch or other western	7	6	34	28

Table 2. Percentage of pupils (12-15 years) that has had multiple sex partners (simultaneously).
Translated from National Compass of Public Health (Bakker, 2010)

The website, however, does not provide information on the number of respondents these figures are based on, its categorizations or generalizability; those subtleties mentioned in the research design disappear. The figure indicates that boys with a Moroccan background have sex with people next to a steady partner and that relatively few girls with a Moroccan background have had four or more sex partners. These numbers are published under the heading 'health determinants' – although the way they correlate with health remains unclear. Interpretation is left to the reader. A more obvious health-outcome is condom use. Condom use is elaborately studied in *Sex under 25*, for example 'condom use while having sex with last partner' – see table 3.

Origin	N	Boys				Girls			
		Always	Some-times	Start affair only	Never	Always	Some-times	Start affair only	Never
Dutch/Western	2164	31 ▼	18	28 ▲	22	20	17 ▼	36 ▲	26
Moroccan	58	53 ▲	18	5 ▼	23	38	25	13	25
Turkish	77	60 ▲	15	8 ▼	17	29	33	13 ▼	25
Surinamese	125	50 ▲	15	8 ▼	27	24	28 ▲	25	24
Antillean	110	31	25	8 ▼	36 ▲	16	28 ▲	32	23

▼ ▲ = respectively high or low given the total percentage

Table 3. Condom use at intercourse with last partner (%)
Translated from 'Seks onder je 25e' (De Graaf et al., 2005, chapter 4).

In this figure we see that a relatively small percentage of Dutch/Western boys used a condom during sex with the last partner. Furthermore, the percentage of girls that never uses a condom does not significantly differ when looking at what is defined as origin. This shows that based on the same research

project, different conclusions about the relationship between ethnicity and sexual health can be drawn. The choice of which figure to publish online is a choice to emphasize differences or similarities. It determines the representation of sexuality and ethnicity and influences the sexualized meanings that get attached to ethnic groups.[27]

Research results are not only important inside universities and knowledge centers, but find their way to media and public websites. A call for culturally sensitive interventions is becoming louder (Westmaas et al., 2012), leading to more research into ethnicity being conducted: a self-validating tendency is noticeable here (see also Proctor et al., 2011). The sexual connotations of diversity contribute to the importance that ethnicity assumes in sexuality research, in other words, to the ethnic common sense (Brubaker, 2002) of categorizing along the lines of ethnicity when doing sexuality research. Political actors take the recommendations that researchers formulate seriously. They steer future research plans and government investments (Essed & Nimako, 2006; see also Meijer et al., 2005). The ethnic common sense in research thus becomes an ethnic common ground in the field of sexuality in general. The practices that led to this common sense are not confined to Dutch borders: due to the position of the Netherlands in international sex research and policy, 'Dutch lessons in love' are finding their way to such diverse countries as Bangladesh, Vietnam, Uganda and Brazil (Rutgers, 2015).

Sexualization of ethnicity and ethnicization of sexuality

Through four research steps, we traced the making and uses of ethnic categories and the kind of ethnic data on sexuality they produce. Ethnicity appears as a slippery concept: its definition is unclear, contested and subsequently operationalized in many, often non-coherent ways. Despite its apparent slipperiness, the notion of ethnicity is constantly used and its

---

27   It is important to not only consider percentages but absolute numbers as well. The category youth of 'Moroccan origin', for example, is based on a sample of 58 participants. Statements on 'Moroccan boys' thus are formed on the basis of a sample of 29 (assuming the boy-girl ratio is equal).

importance is not to be underestimated: it has become a self-evident social category in public discourse and in research. In other words, it is both a product of society and it intervenes to produce meanings in society – such as the figure of the Antillean teenage mother Samantha. Through different calculative and comparative practices, ethnicized sexualities solidify. This process has real consequences: through the intricate relationship between research, policy and sex education, ideas of ethnic minorities as forming separate groups that are sexually distinct become embedded in common sense knowledge.

As many have pointed out, categories have a performative effect: they confirm, guide and change human interventions. The four steps discerned here, together result in the materialization of a sexual other that is either sexually excessive and promiscuous, or sexually repressed and not able to communicate about sex. Compiling an ethnically diverse sample, determining ethnicity, statistical calculations and comparisons, and making recommendations all contribute to filling in the categories of ethnicity and of sexuality, the sexual connotations of ethnicity and the ethnic connotations of sexuality. In the analysis of Dutch research into youth and sexuality, we have seen that, in a way, sexuality itself becomes ethnicized. Ethnicity becomes partly defined in terms of sexuality – and this makes it impossible to take ethnicity and sexuality apart. The political work of this ethnicizing of sexuality goes well beyond the walls of research centers. It is part and parcel of the contemporary political moment in the Netherlands, contributing to self and other.

Postscript to chapter 2

Several developments have influenced Dutch discourses on ethnic minorities in general, and in sexuality research in particular since the analysis that resulted in chapter two was conducted in 2011.

In December 2011, two artists that were protesting against the racist caricature of Zwarte Piet, servant to Saint Nicholas, were arrested. The violent arrests would mark the start of a renewed wave of anti-racist protests, centring around the figure of Zwarte Piet. These anti-racist interventions, that had in the past often been marginalized, now gained support from several politicians and commentators. On the other hand though, reactions from those in support of Zwarte Piet have been fierce and widespread, with the prime minister stating that 'those who do not support Zwarte Piet should leave the country'.

Intensifying the ongoing debate on 'Dutch identity', the statement that race does not matter in the Netherlands (Hondius, 2014; Wekker, 2016) has become an increasingly difficult position to defend. This has also affected the use of ethnic categories in research. The use of the terms allochthone and autochthone have been problematized in this debate on Dutch identity as well. The Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy announced its discontinuation of its use of the terms in late 2016, stating that they do not fit 'current day issues surrounding migration' – they are said to be 'out of time' (Bovens, Bokhorst, Jennissen, & Engbersen, 2016, p. 7). An alternative has not been introduced by these institutes, which signals a wish to end the separation between Dutch people with and without a migration background. These are not just symbolic actions, but, as chapter two showed, these effect scientific reports and are taken up in media and politics.

The analysis presented in chapter two was published in a theme issue of the Dutch journal for sociology in 2013. As such, the analysis itself became part of the process of science in the making. It directed attention to the question of ethnic classification in the field of sexual health studies, and led to an expert meeting on diversity in this field of studies. This does not mean, however, that a classification based on origin disappears overnight. The third edition of the largest study into youth and sexuality, *youth under*

the age of 25 was repeated for the third time in 2017. In the survey, one of the first questions asked about the country of birth of the participant as well as the parents' of the participant. The researchers disagreed with the Scientific Council and thought it important to register 'origin' in this way, in order to study differences across groups. While the study has not been published yet, it looks like the terminology will change from 'allochthones' to 'people with a migration background', but that the practices of division and comparison and risk determination will remain in place.