**Introduction**

*Erin Pritchard (Liverpool Hope University)*

*Delyth Edwards (University of Leeds)*

Whilst men of privilege can regularly openly talk about omitting acts of sexual assault, victims of sexual assault are often forced to remain silent. The #MeToo movement has helped to give victims of sexual assault a voice and highlighted the commonality of sexual assault. However, whilst victims, who are mostly women, have been given more of a platform to speak out, the structures in place to convict sex offenders still remain problematic. Therefore, when victims are encouraged to speak out and even offered support, without appropriate structures and a change in attitudes, they are almost being set up to fail.

The founder of the #MeToo movement, Tahana Burke, wants to focus on the systems in place which have allowed sexual misconduct to exist and be kept hidden (Schwartz, 2019). #MeToo encouraged women who were brave enough and not impacted by a digital divide to share their experiences of sexual assault. #MeToo has put the focus back on the victims (Schwartz, 2019), but instead of blaming them it is empowering them to speak out. The movement has raised awareness in regards to the magnitude of the problem of sexual assault in a variety of professions, but like any movement, it can easily fade away. It can also act as a mask that suggests that sexual assault is being taken seriously, when in fact the problematic structures still remain. While a few high profile celebrities have been named and shamed, nothing much has changed. Even the publicly shamed and criminally convicted celebrities such as Harvey Weinstein have been defended on social media by men Laura Bates (2020) refers to as ‘incels’ (involuntary celibates). These individuals, the products of a toxic masculinity, drive the narrative that women are out to get men through vicious lies, including false rape claims (Banet-Weiser 2021, Ging 2017). Victims of sexual assault are still blamed and the same old laws and procedures apply. According to Sanyal (2019), the problem is that historical beliefs have shaped laws around sexual assault and have also allowed myths to remain. According to Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994, p. 134) myths concerning sexual assault are “attitudes and beliefs that are generally false but are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women”.

Hashtag activism has become popular as a way for social movements to mobilise wider support, grow networks and create awareness of important issues online and to call for redress (Jackson et al 2020).But it also allows for counter hashtags, with counter narratives to be created and shared widely, as a way to mock, delegitimize, silence and offend social movements and the communities who they stand for and the individuals who stand with them. For example, in response to #MeToo, Trump’s supreme court nominee, Bret Kavanagh (who was accused of rape), used the hashtag #HeToo to support the notion of false rape claims. However, according to Boyle and Rathnayake (2019) the hashtag, which gained popularity amongst conservatives, was quickly met with backlash, including from men, and challenged with the hashtag #IBelieveSurvivours[[1]](#footnote-0). Yet, despite the support shown to the #MeToo movement and to survivors online, rape myths are still held as prominant beliefs amongst many communities in both on and offline settings, including amongst students (O’Connor et al., 2018). This suggests the need to shift a focus from online debates and discussions and to pay attention to what people are saying and doing about sexual misconduct in their everyday lives. The aim of this book is to keep this important conversation going, with a focus on academia.

**#MeToo in academia**

Over the past few years we have seen #MeToo expose the experiences of sexual misconduct in several industries; Hollywood has already been mentioned, but we have seen sport, politics, art, music as other industries where sexual misconduct has been exposed. But the ‘industry’ we are focusing on here is academia, which too has been outed as a space that enables sexual misconduct to exist and where perpetrators go unpunished. According to Tutchell and Edmonds (2020), sexual abuse is a serious problem in academia and Bondestam and Lundqvist (2020) suggest that sexual misconduct in HE is a *global* ‘epidemic’. In fact, sexual assault reports at UK universities have more than doubled in four years, with over 3,500 incidents reported since 2015 (Woolcock, 2021). How these are currently handled by the institutions is worrying. In the UK, the Al Jazeera investigation *Degrees of Abuse* (Howlett and Davies 2021), revealed not only the worrying scale of sexual misconduct experienced at University campuses, but also the low rate of investigations into complaints. This means that ‘about 87 percent of complaints of sexual misconduct did not result in disciplinary action of any kind for the subject of the complaint’ (Al Jazeera Investigative Unit and Howlett 2021, n.p). One of the victims told Al Jazeera that coming forward and the subsequent investigation conducted by her University had been so distressing that she would never do it again (Al Jazeera Investigative Unit and Howlett 2021). This suggests that there is something terribly wrong with complaints procedures and how victims are supported, which has been known for a long time *(*Bull and Rye 2018 and please see the ongoing research from the 1752 Group: *Examining institutional responses to sexual misconduct: Higher education after #MeToo*[[2]](#footnote-1)*).*

This exposure of the extent of abuse and failings of universities to support students and staff who report sexual misconduct is a positive step because now more people are acknowledging it (Germain, 2016; Hansen and Richards, 2019; O’Connor et al., 2018; Oliver, 2016; Towl and Walker, 2019; Tutchell and Edmonds, 2020). But we cannot pretend that it is a recent phenomena, when it has been happening for many years but has been made (purposely) unknown (Tutchell and Edmonds (2020). One of the reasons for this silence is because numerous universities try to cover up what happens at their institutions as they have a reputation to maintain (Oliver, 2016). This procedure of denial and cover up stems from the marketization of higher education, in that Universities have to be viewed as desirable places to study , especially when they are reliant on student numbers for financial purposes (Towl and Walker, 2019). However, research has shown that there is a recent increase in the interest in the seriousness of incidents of sexual misconduct and well-being (Oman and Bull 2022, Page et al 2019), from within the HE institutions themselves and from different political or organisational levels. For example, as a response to the growing concern to sexual assault on American campuses, in 2014, President Obama formed the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (O’Connor et al., 2018). Similarly in the UK, in 2015 the Universities UK Taskforce was established with the aim of tackling violence against women (Towl and Walker, 2019) and there have also been research and campaigns to make in the UK the National Union for Students (NUS and the 1752 Group) and the University and College Union (UCU).

However, given that many victims who experience sexual assault do not report being assaulted due to the fear of not being believed, we have to question how accurate the reported incident figures are and whether we can really know how widespread the problem is. According to Rape Crisis England and Wales (2021) 85,000 women and 12,000 men (aged 16 - 59) experience rape, attempted rape or sexual assault every year. However, only 15% of those who are sexually assaulted report it to the police (Rape Crisis England and Wales, 2021). As Brownmiller (1975) argued, rape is part of partriachal structures within society and this impacts how we view and treat victims and perpetrators. Rape myths and the expectation of having to relay the whole experience in a court room full of strangers, only to be disbelieved, is enough to put even the strongest person off from reporting the incident. In *Why Women are Blamed for Everything,* Taylor (2020) explores how ‘victim blaming of women is prevalent and normalised in society’ because of misogyny and patriarchy existing in and structuring all facets of society. Academia is not exempt from these patriarchal structures, for example, Oliver (2016) explores how male students are held in such high regard, especially those who excel at sports, that in numerous cases they often get away with sexually assaulting female students. It seems as if a sports scholarship is also a free pass to be sexualaly violent . This is mostly associated with US academic institutions whereby sports play a highly important role (Crosthwaite, 2017). Furthermore, Wade (2017: n.d.) states that ‘On average, athletes are more likely than other students on campus to identify with hypermasculinity and to accept "rape myths” to justify sexual assaults.’ .

Whilst this research is needed and is important, there remains other experiences of sexual misconduct in academia that are still underreported, researched or even acknowledged. Jones et al (2019) notes that research and education in this area has tended to focus on the experiences of students rather than staff. But as this book will show, sexual misconduct is much more widespread, takes place beyond the campus and can happen to anyone. Through the use of different voices, this book explores the ethics of care that exists or rather *should* exist in HE to support universities and staff and students with lived experience. Drawing on theory around ethics of care (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004) and pedagogical practice (Burke et al 2017) this book offers the different ways we can address, research and write about sexual misconduct. This includes empirical research on and autoethnographic considerations of the diverse ways sexual misconduct has been experienced and disclosed by staff and students on and off campus and addressed by the institutions in which they take place. But before we continue, it is important to clarify terminology.

**Terminology**

Sexual misconduct can be defined as an umbrella term that includes, sexual harassment and sexual assault. Sexual harassment is a broad term, including many types of unwelcome verbal and physical sexual attention (Rainn, 2021), such as being sent sexually explicit images or being leered at. Kloß’s (2017) defines sexual harassment as ‘as coercive behaviour, which may include gestures, actions, and other modes of verbal or nonverbal communication, with sexual connotations, which intimidate, humiliate, and exercise power over another person’. Sexual assault refers to sexual contact or behaviour, often physical, that occurs without the consent of the victim (Rainn, 2021). Rape is an example of sexual assault. Therefore, sexual misconduct is used here to include a broad range of behaviours (Page et al 2019), from harassing statements to criminal sexual assault. It includes all behaviours that constitute misconduct including: sexual harassment (Kloß 2017), assault (Pritchard 2019) and gender-based violence (Anitha and Lewis 2018). Please note that although we define what we mean by these terms in this introduction, each author will draw on their own references for defining key terminology in their chapters.

**On editing this book**

Both editors are victims of sexual assault and harassment, which occurred when we were conducting fieldwork at different UK based academic institutions. How we came together was through sheer coincidence, whilst working at the same institution several years after our experiences. Edwards was working on an article draft about her experience of sexual harassment during ethonographic research and saw on Pritchard’s email signature that she had published an article about her sexual assault during her doctoral research. We arranged to meet and after sharing our experiences over coffee, it led us to believe that incidents of sexual misconduct in academia were more prevalent than we both first thought, happened at different stages of an academic career and occurred in spaces on and *off* campus. There was something about sharing our experiences, acknowledging them that made us want to develop this book. As already noted, much of the existing research has focused on staff-student professional misconduct on campus and prevalence, with some work, particularly in the field of anthropology, on sexual misconduct experienced in the field. As a project, this proposed book aims to build on this important work to consider wider experiences of sexual misconduct in the academy and what we can learn from them to inform a HE wide ethics of care (Gilligan 1982). We want to make that first important step in exposing the problem of sexual misconduct in academia with the hope that there will be less secrecy around the subject and will chip away at problematic myths.

The call for contributions was shared widely amongst numerous academic groups in order to gather varied accounts from academics with various identities and from a variety of academic fields and disciplines. Whilst the call for contributions was not restricted to only women, all responses came from women. This is not surprising since most victims of sexual assault or harassment tend to be women. For example, the 2017 Crime survey for England and Wales found that 20% of women and 4% of men have experienced some type of sexual assault since the age of 16, equivalent to 3.4 million female and 631,000 male victims (Rape Crisis England and Wales, 2021). However, we recognise that men can be allies and in some places are becoming more involved in activism to fight against violence towards women (Westmarland et al., 2021). Of course not all men are perpetrators and would of course condone any form of sexual misconduct. However, sexual misconduct seems to be a product of sexism.

As the proposals came in, we soon came to realise the sheer diversity in perspectives and viewpoints, some proposals were based on first-hand experiences whereas others were based on previous research into this topic, some were from the perspective of students, others from staff and on and off campus. The contributors provide an international perspective on sexual misconduct within academia. From the UK to the Marshall Islands, experiences of sexual misconduct are shared in order to explore the various structures which enable sexual misconduct in academia. We felt that it was an absolute privilege that people were wanting to share their writing with us, but also that we had a very sensitive subject that needed care and consideration. The day-to-day editing of this book, from the call for contributions to providing feedback, made both editors question our own actions and responses. Whilst we were excited to receive abstract proposals, we also recognised that this was only possible if someone else had experienced sexual misconduct. Whilst editors can expect potential contributors to drop out for a myriad of reasons, we had a couple of contributors dropping out as they found their experiences difficult to write about. We struggled with how best to support authors who were writing about their own experiences and to ensure that we, ourselves were also OK during this process of re-telling. We did not want to push authors to share anything that may have upset them or that could have ethical implications for them, as we all know too well the problem of victim blaming when it comes to sexual misconduct. We made authors aware that we were always there to support them, advise them and we understood that deciding not to continue with the chapter was OK. But our overall aim for this book is to create a continued network or space for authors to share their experiences and for readers to acknowledge them.

Another area to consider during the process of editing this book was the ethics of writing about experiences of sexual misconduct. Just like with any empirical research, anonymity is provided throughout by attaching pseudonyms to people and not naming academic institutions. We felt that it was more important to provide anonymity for this topic, due to the fact that in cases of sexual misconduct people who speak up are often disbelieved. In the case of one of the editor’s own experiences, she was threatened with legal action for speaking up about her experience of being sexually assaulted when recruiting participants at an event held by a UK based organisation for people with dwarfism (see Pritchard, 2019). In no part did she blame the organisation, but that did not stop them spending more time and effort trying to discredit what had happened to her as opposed to supporting her and reflecting on what they could do to make their organisation safer for their members. It does not seem uncommon that organisations are more concerned about their reputation than supporting victims of sexual assault. Pritchard’s experience meant that she was able to advise the author’s on the importance of anonymity in order to minimise any backlash from organisations or individuals discussed in their chapter.

**Method/ologies of researching and writing sexual misconduct**

Sexual misconduct can be both a subject of research, but also a personal experience. When telling people about this book, a common initial reaction was to ask whether it was essentially a book on victimhood. To us, this implies a space where people who have been subjected to sexual misconduct have a space to share their stories and where others can learn about their experiences. In some ways this is a key part of this book, but it is not what this book is about. As we, the editors, have carved out spaces to explore ourselves and our experiences, we wanted to provide a space for people to write about their experiences. Of course, we understand that not everyone is ready or wants to share their story, but we wanted to provide a platform for those who wanted to and a form of support for those who do not. But the victim, although integral, isn't the focus of this book. Instead the systems and practices that allow sexual misconduct to continue in HE is what needs the greatest attention and is where drastic change is required. This is why, as you read through this book, you will see the diversity in approaches to researching and writing about sexual misconduct in HE. All of these chapters aim to discuss, but also educate readers on the problem of sexual misconduct in academia.

In their systematic review of the literature, Bondestam and Lundqvist (2020, p. 410) conclude that ‘[g]enerally, quantitative cross-sectional studies on prevalence dominate the international research field’. This book moves away from presenting work on this subject using that model. Some of the chapters are written from a place of lived experience, through autoethnographical reflections and considerations. Some authors have used poetry as a way to share their story and others have engaged in a duoethnography, a conversation between the two chapter authors . Other chapters are written by those who work in positions of support within and outside of the university, or who have researched the subject. This book presents to the reader the different ways that sexual misconduct in academia can be researched and written about that offers pedagogical potential for learning and how to start thinking about helping others to write about this subject in an ethical way.

**Structure of the book**

There are two key themes explored in the book: *ethics of care and pedagogical practice.* Ethics of care is grounded in the importance of voice and relationships. That is; in this theory and approach to ethical practice it is considered important for everyone to have a voice and to be listened to. Additionally, the responses people receive when voicing concerns is just as important to pay attention to. HE institutions have reached an ‘ethically important moment’ (Guillemin & Gillam 2004) with regards to how they listen to and respond to instances of sexual misconduct, not just in terms of research, but also on campus. Additionally, the responses people receive when voicing concerns is just as important to pay attention to. As we see it, HE institutions have reached an ‘ethically important moment’ (Guillemin & Gillam 2004) with regards to how they listen to and respond to instances of sexual misconduct. It is at this moment where the book's second theme, pedagogical practice is relevant. ‘Pedagogies’ emphasises the contextual nature of teaching and learning practices and the ways that these contexts might be tied in with historical inequalities and exclusions’ (Burke and Crozier 2013, p. 7). If an institutional wide ethics of care regarding sexual misconduct is to be achieved, learning, reflection and reflexivity needs to take place at all working levels within a university, from policy and administration to counselling, teaching and supervision. This theme is offered as a way to think about the university as a place of reflexive learning and a site for self-improvement. These themes are explored through four pedagogical objectives on which the book is structured and areas which could inform an ethics of care:

*Part one: The Intersectionality of Identities and Recognition*

The chapters in this opening section look at academia through the lens of intersectionality to explore how sexual misconduct is experienced by different groups or communities. Whilst there has been some growing attention towards student to student cases of sexual assault, other forms of sexual misconduct, including towards academic staff, remains limited. The chapters in this section will educate readers on the wider experiences of identity and inequality. These chapters raise questions around who is heard and who isn’t. In **chapter one** Keri Cheechoo navigates her own lived experiences of sexual misconduct during a significant celebratory milestone. Cheechoo does this through truth-telling poetics. In *Respectability Politics*, Cheechoo shows the journey of an Indigenous woman and scholar navigating the uncaring landscapes of scholarly spaces, where epistemological violence exists and ethical relationality is absent.  **In chapter two,** focusing on staff-to-staff and at times student-to-staff sexual misconduct,, Lena Wånggren, examines how structural inequalities in university spaces increases the risks of harm and abuse for those in working in precarious positions. Wånggren argues that precarity is intersectional and maps onto gendered and racialized structures of inequality. Wånggrenconclused that a step in addressing and challenging exploitative structures and conditions is through industrial and collective action. **In chapter three** Latika Raisinghani and Poonam Bhagchandani engage in a duoethnography, they have a dialogue about their own experiences and that of others of gender disparity and sexual misconduct in academic environments across different countries. The authors conclude by sharing a (trans-multi)culturally responsive education framework that may help us in creating inclusive, socially just, responsive education spaces by initiating complicated conversations to interrogate the inequities inherent in gender(ed) identities and social roles that often “normalise” sexual misconduct in many socio-cultural contexts. In **chapter four**, Poppy Gerrard Abbott departs from traditional approaches to understanding Gender Based Violence (GBV) to consider the messiness of power and marginalisation. Drawing on experiences of ‘non-paradigmatic events’ and ‘non-paradigm’ forms of violence during research, Gerrard Abbott questions feminist epistemology and methodology, calling for a postmodern approach to feminist research design.In fieldwork, multi-directional allegations of violence were significantly more common than the clear-cut perpetrator/victim dynamics that policy design allowed for. Gendered labour replicating feminised care work is deeply-embedded in fieldwork, revealing symbolic and micro forms of violence through the reinforcement of stereotypic gendered roles. These chapters recognise that the different extent to which an individual’s struggle is recognised by others is informed by their identity and status.

*Part two: Fieldwork Identities and Pedagogy*

Moving on from considering how intersectionality could offer a useful analytical perspective, in part two, the chapters in this section turn to consider *research* identities and the relationships involved in research. It is known that ‘[p]rogrammes for sexual violence prevention have focussed historically on university, school or college students rather than staff working at these institutions’ (Jones et al 2021 p. 121). Additionally, little attention is paid to ensuring the same ethics of care for research staff. Research practices are ever evolving, but the ethics and pedagogies related to them have barely changed. The emergence of research ethics remains mostly focused on the safety of the participants and with good reason. However, given the nature of research and movements such as #Metoo it is becoming increasingly important to include the safety of the researcher. The development of research ethics seems to have failed to take into account experiences of female researchers, especially in research that requires a close rapport with participants.

In **chapter five**, Laura Thurmann focuses on trust-based sexual violence in her autoethnographic reflection of an ethnography and argues that sexual misconduct is a methodological issue. Thurmann explores how emotions and power relations within the anthropological ethnographic field are shaped by academic pressure, vulnerability and trust. Thurmann wants readers to reflect on the positionalities, methods and dynamics of power that enable violence and ask *how* such violence is possible rather than *why*. In **chapter six,** also based on encounters within the ethnographic fieldwork conducted as a PhD student with older Italians living in the UK, Simona Pallendino looks at the ‘unspoken experiences of ethnography’. Pallendino proposes to foreground the role of the researcher when experiencing sexual harassment when interacting with participants and discusses the ‘space of care’ that was created through a workshop aimed at supporting Postgraduate Researcher’s to discuss their field experiences and emotions. Apen Ruiz et al focuses on the problem of sexual harassment in the subject of Archaeology in **chapter seven.** Drawing on survey data the authors analyse the scale of sexual misconduct in Archaeology and point to several particularities in this field. The authors conclude with several recommendations for the field and other fieldwork spaces shaped more widely by identity hierarchies. As well as considering the role and identity of the researcher *and* the researched, the chapters in this section touch upon the practices involved in liminal spaces in fieldwork (use of the body), the relationships involved in conducting fieldwork gatekeeping, power and trust, team work, with the aim to offer the best in ‘applied’ ethical solutions to the myriad of challenges facing contemporary research

*PART 3 Disclosure, Complaint and Recognition*

The chapters in this section consider the processes of disclosure and complaint. The chapters explore how sexual misconduct ‘is composed of power relations in which multiple axes of differentiation are in play’ (Goldschmidt-GjerlØw and Trysnes 2020 p. 32). For example, how definitions and understandings determine whether instances are disclosed by students or where students know where to go to seek support) and if the response from the institution is adequate. Centering experience as a form of knowledge creation, in **chapter eight**, Alexandria Petit-Thorne asks important questions around liability and the role and responsibility of the institution when sexual misconduct takes place in the spaces that make up the political and social world of the academy. In these ‘liminal’ spaces, instances of sexual misconduct are more likely to slip through the cracks of a formal complaint procedure because institutions refuse to claim authority over these spaces. The author reflects on what trauma-informed responses to academic sexual misconduct might involve. Kimberley Hill and Melanie Crofts in **chapter nine** argue that whilst having a duty of care for students, a gap often exists between legal requirements, experiences and university responses. Drawing on previous mixed methods research on tackling sexual violence in UK Universities, the authors consider the prevalence of sexual violence in UK HE and consider the perceptions of students, staff and university managers. They argue for increased awareness through campus-wide campaigns but acknowledge that real change is not possible when Universities remain to have inadequate policies tackling sexual misconduct and fail to support those who come forward with inadequate disclosure and complaint procedures.

*PART 4 First Responders and Institutional Support*

The chapters in this section shift to focus the gaze on the HE institution and how they respond to disclosure. The chapters in this section identify where institutional and cultural change is needed, by questioning whether the expertise of other agencies could be pedagogically useful in helping HE staff to learn and exploring how the development of ‘responsive education spaces’ could look like and achieve. In **chapter ten** Suzanne Egan and Natasha Mikitas draw on a sexual harassment and sexual abuse prevention program targeting early career PhD supervisors. The programme was developed by Full Stop Australia, one of Australia's leading feminist violence prevention and counselling organisations. The authors provide an overview and analysis of the programme and suggest that the doctoral supervision space be seen and treated as a space of ethical pedagogical practice. Drawing on autoethnographic reflections collaboratively, in **chapter eleven** Viaene et al analyse their individual and collective experiences of sexual misconduct and gatekeeping and their research centre’s violation of professional ethics and care towards early career researchers. They describe the network of characters who enable this violation and the ‘whisper network’ that tries to expose the misconduct.

**What we want this book to do**

As previously stated, research and education on the subject of sexual misconduct has tended to focus on students rather than staff (Jones et al 2019). By bringing together in one book, the experiences of students, staff and/or researchers, we can gather a broader understanding of sexual misconduct in the academy for both students and staff and how to develop ethical pedagogical practices, if an ethics of care is to be truly implemented or transformed. As you read the book, you will become aware of how some of the themes present in one chapter are common across other chapters; such as how the marketization of higher education has allowed sexual misconduct to flourish; how power is embodied and exists intellectually; how everybody knows about misconduct but does nothing about it. Most of all, the key message is that researching, writing about and tackling sexual misconduct is a collaborative effort.

We want readers to see the problem of sexual misconduct as a HE problem rather than a School or departmental one. Only then, can we start to think about embedding an equal ethics of care institutionally. As you read the chapters in this book we want you to think about the following:

1. *Is sexual misconduct openly discussed at your institution or place of work? Could sexual misconduct affect you or those you work with or support in your role? If so, are you able to discuss this with the person?*
2. *Are there spaces or relationships that are more at risk of or more vulnerable to sexual misconduct where you work?*
3. *What policy or guidance is at your institution or place of work?*
	1. *Is it appropriate?*
	2. *Do people know about it?*
	3. *Do you know how to respond to and support someone who discloses their experience to you?*
4. *What is the procedure and policy around disclosure and complaints in your place of work?*
5. *Are you doing enough? What could you do differently in your role?*
6. *Is your place of work doing enough? What could your institution be doing?*

To conclude, this edited book brings together numerous voices within academia and the various relations that can involve sexual misconduct, such as staff to student, staff to staff, student to staff, student to student and participant to researcher. It provides an international perspective by drawing on experiences from academics within North America, UK, India, Australia and several European countries. This broad perspective opens up a pedagogical opportunity (Lundy and Sainz 2018), where ‘negative experiences of ‘lived injustices’’ can be a key resource for reflection and learning in wider HE pedagogy (Goldschmidt-GjerlØw and Trysnes 2020 and Jones et al 2019). However, the central focus of this book is not on victimhood. Instead, the chapters presented in this book traverse a wide range of lived experiences, perspectives and narratives that have largely been unacknowledged by fellow scholars, institutions and the general public. By presenting collective accounts of experiencing, witnessing, researching and writing about sexual misconduct in academic spaces, we can expand knowledge and bring such experiences out of their current marginalised positions within academic discussions. Each of the chapters offer not only opportunities for conversation and reflection, but address and suggest what responses to academic sexual misconduct could and should involve.
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