

Piotr Stańczyk

ORCID: 0000-0001-5092-9879

University of Gdańsk

Pornland school communications. Images of schools in mainstream porn

The aim of this text is to present the results of a qualitative study of images of schools in mainstream pornography. Therefore, welcome to the schools of *Pornland* (Dines 2011). One of the main features of this imaginary realm is that it explicitly depicts scenes of sexual intercourse or autoerotic activity. This is no different in the schools of *Pornland*. Scenes of sexual intercourse constitute the most important part of the films in quantitative terms. What is overt and explicitly stated, seems – to the person writing these words – less interesting than what these explicative sex scenes are wrapped-in plot-wise. Far more interesting – from the point of view of analysing porn culture and the broader culture – are the plot developments that constitute the prelude to the depicted sexual intercourse. In the case of pornography depicting the school motif, it is in the plot aspect of the films that we are confronted with a reservoir of meanings, values and visual representations that make up the image of the school shared in a dialectical way by the makers, producers, and consumers of pornography. It is the fictional scenes, not the close-up scenes, that contain forms of knowledge about education, didactics, upbringing, social roles or teaching duties, and ultimately knowledge about how the school subsystem functions in the social system, the cultural system, and the linguistic system. There is a presumption here that pornography is a mirror of society (Nijakowski 2007). Although perhaps another optical metaphor may work in these contexts. Tomasz Sikora (2011: 9) writes about pornography in culture as a “blind spot” which, although it remains at the centre of the retina, is devoid of photoreceptors. Pornography seems to be at the centre of culture and at the same time (Dines 2011) remains invisible because marginalised by official culture.

In the case of school and in the case of porn, we are dealing with signifying practices according to cultural studies theory (Barker and Jane 2016: 9). School as

a form of culture and porn as a form of culture include inherent specificity (Barker and Jane 2016: 66–67) and are therefore fundamentally different. Nevertheless, there must be some – as Ludwig Wittgenstein (2009: 36–37) puts it – “family resemblance” in the common part, where pornographic content extends to the school. A school in the pornographic imaginary must resemble a school outside this imaginary. Just as the Hogwarts school also has to show a family resemblance to a school for this language game to exist at all. The language game bears a family resemblance to games much like the society game, which is played out through linguistic moves. The language game at school constitutes a particular variation of the language game and the society game, just like the language game in pornography. The school language game in pornography is just another level of language practice. The educational discourse in pornography depicting the school provides the empirical material for creating this text. And even though Gail Dines (2011: 11) disavows the value of “pseudo plotlines”, it is precisely this part of the material that is crucial, as it is where the references of porn culture to the broader culture are found. In different words, cultural content is processed by porn cultures according to the specificity of the genre to which the work belongs and is thus processed through what is referred to in pornography studies as the “pornographic imagination” (Smith, Liz, Addy 2022: 241). The content in porn cultures does not just appear out of nowhere, and the issue of the “broader culture” (Labinski 2019: 102), derived from social constructivism (Setty 2022: 162), is used to embed porn cultures in a cultural context. The innovation I propose here is to see the relationship between school and porn cultures in terms of a Wittgensteinian’s family resemblance.

School and pornography are cultural forms that the person writing these words looks at from the perspective of pedagogical cultural studies, a multi-strand approach that has its origins in the British school of cultural studies and the American school of critical pedagogy. In view of this, the terms that make up the intellectual repertoire of this variety of social theory will appear in the text without any further explanation. I mean, for example, the theory of the hidden program (Apple 1990; Kwiecieński 2017), the theory of school resistance (Willis 1981; McLaren 2015), voice politics (Szkudlarek 1993), and the role of schools (Althusser 2014; Foucault 1995). This collection of thoughts, concepts, and theories contains visions of a school caught up in material work in favour of the prevailing ideology.

The major axis of dispute in terms of pornography studies

Pornography studies are interdisciplinary (Attwood, Smith 2014: 3) and the main criterion for the definition of their identity is the object of study, pornography. It is therefore difficult to speak of any methodological or theoretical coherence in pornography studies. Among the researchers of pornography are representatives of the humanities, such as literary studies, film studies or art history (e.g. McGlotten

2014; Pietrantonio 2020; Floyd 2023). Legal issues constitute an important topic of *porn studies* (e.g. Johnson 2014; Thorneycroft 2020). However, among the researchers dealing with pornography are primarily representatives of the social sciences: sociology (e.g. Barker 2018; Irvine 2018); psychology (among others Barker 2014; Labinski 2019; Gómez, Pasikowski, Bruno 2022); as well as pedagogy (among others Noble 2014; Albury 2014; Marks 2018; Setty 2022). The field of *porn studies* seems to fully implement Roland Barthes' (1989: 72) radical postulate of interdisciplinarity, according to which a new research object no longer belongs to any one scientific discipline.

Linda Williams (2014) metaphorically describes *porn studies* as a “weedy field”. The term consists of far-reaching interdisciplinarity, but also methodological and – above all – ideological disputes. Currently, pornography studies are in the midst of a rapid process of institutionalisation in the academy, an important symptom of which is the establishment of a journal entitled “Porn Studies” in 2014. The transition from empirical obscene material, its colloquial view, through the development of research methodology, and institutional recognition by pornography researchers is figuratively described as the transition from *plumbing to narrative theory* (Smith, Attwood 2014: 7).

The main theoretical divisions in pornography studies date back to the phenomenon of moral panics surrounding pornography in the late 1970s called *porn wars* or *sex wars* (McNair 2014; Galbraith 2017; Oeming 2018). During that period, strong divisions were established between researchers, who were forced to take an antagonistic or celebratory stance towards the phenomenon of pornography without being able to take a middle ground or move beyond the dividing line (Attwood, Smith 2014: 4). Therefore, there were anti-pornographic or pro-pornographic positions available, as well as either sex-critical or sex-positive positions (Smith, Attwood 2014: 7; Attwood, Maina, Smith 2018: 1; Irvine 2018: 16). While the “anti-” positions are characteristic of feminist understandings of pornography as an epiphenomenon of structural sexism and rape culture (McNair 2014: 161–162), they have – paradoxically – evolved from a conservative Puritan sexual ethic that treats the bodily aspect as something suspicious (Smith, Attwood 2014: 11). “Pro-” positions, on the other hand, are founded on the assumption that human sexuality and the right to express it can have a positive impact on human life, society, and culture (Queen, Comella 2008: 278). Both positions towards pornography are threatened by the *petitio principii* fallacy, but the fallacy of anti-pornography feminism is more interesting.

A good example of a feminist researcher who takes an anti-pornography stance is Gail Dines (Dines, Jensen, Russo 1997; Dines 2011), from whom, incidentally, the title *Pornland* is derived. This researcher is involved in the Stop Porn Culture movement, which immediately reveals her attitude towards the research subject, and at the same time may raise doubts as to her scientific integrity. On the other hand, the great figures of the social sciences are well known, such as Karl Marx,

who engaged in the struggle against capitalism, or Frantz Fanon, who fought against colonialism. At this point the question arises whether the social sciences may not be socially engaged, or at least until the reduction of social conflicts, which is how Paulo Freire questioned the possibility of neutrality (Stańczyk 2012). However, the problem with the feminist anti-pornography position is somewhat different, as this research position precludes more subtle interpretations than simply reducing the explanation of the phenomenon of pornography to rape culture and sexism coupled with late capitalism. A perfect example of the cognitive incapacity of this position is the impossibility of understanding the phenomenon of feminist pornography (Lust 2010; Libermann 2015), in view of which some representatives of *porn studies* propose that the former “criticality” towards pornography should be replaced by a new form of criticality that takes into account a “reparative reading” of pornography (Sedgwick 2003; Paasonen 2014). As Susanna Paasonen (2014: 137) writes, such a reading of pornography leads from a “weaker theory” that remains “partial” and “open to moments of ignorance” and therefore leads to ambiguous conclusions. Hence the justification for choosing research methods from the repertoire of qualitative methods.

Methodology of research concerning schools in *Pornland*

A research project involving images of school in mainstream porn constitutes a comparative, qualitative, inductive, and exploratory project aimed at achieving in-depth insights into the meanings given to education in porn cultures. The body of images-texts included 30 scenes from six films from the North American series *Slutty times in Innocent High School* (IH) as well as 28 intercourse scenes and seven feature scenes from the British series *Young Harlots* (YH). The analysed material included more than 27 hours of recordings. Both series meet the definition of mainstream porn, i.e. they are easily accessible and cheap (Dines 2011: 9–10). Both series are popular on streaming services: the most popular scene in the series (IH) had 3.6 million views at the time of data collection, and the most popular scene in the series (YH) had 200,000. The body of images-texts meets the criteria of a pragmatically conceived theoretical saturation of the sample (Low 2019).

The study was organised around the question of the meanings given to education in pornography. Specific questions included: communicative relationships between educational entities, school architecture, object-symbols surrounding actors, concepts of teaching and learning, school curriculum content, and character identity. This article mainly reports on the communication relationships between the characters involved in the learning process in *Pornland* schools.

The film is composed of image and text and is therefore an example of multi-modal discourse (Kress, Leeuwen 2006), hence the need for hybrid methodological solutions. Solutions developed by grounded theory (GT) were applied to visual data

(Konecki 2008; 2011). Even though the (GT) methodology is inductive in nature, it is permissible to locate the research results in a broader cultural or social context (Konecki 2011: 140), which is crucial for the hypothesis of a family resemblance between the school and the image of a school in pornography.

Solutions specific to critical discourse analysis (CDA) were used to analyse the textual data (Fairclough, Wodak 1997; Wodak, Meyer 2016; Fairclough 2018). However – and this should be emphasised – (CDA) as a methodological solution emerged due to the specificity of the material collected. In other words, among the multitude of varieties of discourse analysis, its critical variety, which focuses on power relations, proved to be the most pertinent, as the school depicted by porn cultures is a school in which the plot is based on power relations. Such an idea is crucial in terms of getting ahead of the possible accusation of a “paranoid reading” (Sedgwick 2003) of both porn and school cultures. In both cases, the application of (CDA) could face the objection of an error of *petitio principii*, in which power relations are at the starting point and at the point of the analyses. My analyses, like many studies using (CDA) (e.g. Cackowska et al. 2012; Popow 2014; Ostrowicka, Stankiewicz 2019; Kopińska 2020; Szkudlarek 2022), however, do not aim to uncover power relations, but to describe their cultural specificity.

Schools of *Pornland*: initial findings

Selecting the body of images-texts is deliberate, as the two schools are, in concept, diametrically opposed to each other. IH is a product of the American and YH of the British porn industry. IH represents a co-educational public school and YH an elite boarding school for girls. This difference, which is crucial from a pedagogical point of view, allows us to risk a certain thought experiment of treating the empirical material as it is treated by comparative pedagogy, which deals with differences in the functioning of education systems in different countries. This will, of course, be a virtual variation of comparative pedagogy. Let's take a closer look at both institutions.

Determining the level of schooling the IH poses a bit of a problem. On the one hand, there are threads that would suggest that it is a college, i.e. an institution of higher learning (dean, campus, tuition fees). On the other hand, the IH series features educators, the principal, there is talk of teenagers, and they stay in detention after hours. In addition, the setting suggests a secondary school with distinctive décor, equipment, teaching aids, or social action posters. However, the scenes (3/29) are decisive, as they feature the motif of verifying the age of a schoolgirl, as in scene [IH8S3].

The schoolgirl sits in the library in front of a computer screen and shows off to a webcam. She makes pink bubble-gum bubbles. She touches herself sensually to finally remove her bra. Without removing her blouse. She slowly unbuttons her

uniform blouse with the IH logo and exposes her breasts. Suddenly a librarian teacher approaches her and takes her to the back room, stepping definitely into the teaching role.

Sit down, sit down here, missy! – the librarian commands in a raised voice, maintaining the archaic form of politeness. *OK. What's your name?* – he asks at the beginning of this interrogation. *Jade* – the student replies. *And your surname?* – the teacher asks. *Nile* – she replies. *And your tutor is?* – the librarian persists. *I have done nothing wrong* – she explains. *Of course you were doing something wrong!* *Who is your tutor?* – the teacher accuses and shouts trying to force a confession from the student. *Who!* – the teacher shouts out the question. *Professor McLean* – the student replies quietly. *McLean?* – repeats the teacher. *Yes, but still, I did nothing wrong* – the student explains. *What were you doing at the computer?* – the librarian seeks to force a confession from the student. *I was just talking to my friends* – the girl insincerely explains, resisting admitting a real or imagined offence. *You were talking to your friends!?* *Let's see what you were actually doing. I've been watching you* – the librarian doesn't relent, and she smiles. In a moment the tables will turn. Meanwhile, he accuses in a raised voice – *Oh, it looks like you've been showing off to online viewers on quite obvious sites. And this is blatantly against our policy. You will be expelled. Now tell me Missy, what grade are you in?* The librarian accuses, alludes to shared values and some assumed moral consensus, explains, and finally threatens, but inadvertently asks the question of age. *I'm in senior grade and I'm eighteen* – she replies, and he repeats under his breath, as if he needs time to process this information. And then she takes the initiative by accusing half-jokingly, half-seriously: *I saw you looking at me.* – *Nooo, no, no, no, not at all, no...* *I, I, I...* – mumbles the librarian clearly experiencing an internal conflict. Meanwhile, she stands up, goes around the desk and undoes the buttons of her uniform blouse again, and he can do nothing more except make a series of mumbled sounds that are a substitute for explanation and disagreement with this accusation – *What, what are you doing?.... I don't, no, no...* The student does not relent – *I know you want to see more. Is that why you called me here?* – she asks, but actually accuses. *We have, we have a strict policy here* – the librarian explains after regaining his elemental balance. *Oh, Mr. Deep* – she states. And he, looking at the student's bare breasts, says to himself: *Nice, beautiful.* He adds after a while in a full voice: *No, no, no, no, no, no!* *You see, we have a policy here. I have to suspend you. Oh god, oh, oh. I see you are trying to get me suspended, fired* – the teacher loses and regains his temper. She, undressing, states: *I know you like it.* The teacher mumbles on: *Yes, oh.... I know what you're trying to do,* but she's the one with the initiative, asking and accusing: *Is that why you made me come to your class?* He, out of helplessness, can only appeal to extraterrestrial entities: *You know... oh god,* and at that moment she shoots at him using her underwear like a slingshot. *Oh god, you know...* the teacher mumbles helplessly. *It's OK, relax now, no one will know,* – the student commands, referring to the value of keeping a secret. *Okay, okay, let's do it quick* – the teacher gives up, giving his explicit consent to the intercourse.

The scene is quite typical of a school from the American *Pornland*, that is, a school that has been touched by the idea of a new education, of the Dewey variety, with the idea of the school as a mirror of social life, and therefore a school that prepares young people for democracy (Dewey 1930). At the same time, the democratic nature of the American school is called into question (Bowles, Gintis 1976), as if democratic relations in education had to be dosed with small doses in order not to harm the pupils in their adaptation to a late capitalist world characterised by a permanent democratic deficit (Bowles, Gintis 1987), in the face of which, however, it is the teacher (superior) who has the discursive advantage over the pupil (or student, i.e. subordinate). It is the teacher who is more likely to ask questions, interpellate, accuse, explain, threaten, praise, shame, or invoke shared values. The students rather respond, nod, and explain. To emphasise this strongly: the key difference in what both sides of the educational relationship in American *Pornland* can and cannot do is summed up in the difference that teachers rather explain and students rather excuse. A reverse situation happens rarely. Whereas, an opposite situation does not happen in British *Pornland*, nor does what can be observed in the scene quoted above, i.e. educational resistance in the form of lying, negotiation and agreement between the parties to the sexual intercourse, as well as the weaker party taking the initiative in the pedagogical relationship.

So, what are the characteristics of a school in British *Pornland*? Enough said that the setting is a palace, and the scenery consists of its interiors with rooms such as bookcases, studies, playrooms, boudoirs, or rooms arranged as dormitories. In the scenes that serve as interludes to the scenes of sexual intercourse, schoolgirls dressed in school attire are constantly going somewhere, strolling through the garden adjacent to the school building, or standing in the windows. SfYH interiors do not contain the usual public school items: blackboard, teaching aids, charts, globes, etc. The essence of a school is conveyed through uniforms, pedagogical relationships, and pervasive discipline. Here is a scene that depicts the founding moment of SfYH [YHFS0].

Two middle-aged men are talking while standing in the entrance of a historic palace. They are laughing. *This place is great!* – enthuses the first. *Wonderful, isn't it? Especially looking at the price I paid* – the investor and future headmaster of the school is pleased. *What will you do with it? Will you turn it into a hotel or resort or something?* – the former asks. *Fuck no! This definitely requires too much work* – the future headmaster replies. *Wait! I know! Maybe a brothel? This way we make money and get pussy* – speculates the former. *Yes, but that's illegal* – replies the future headmaster. *Only technically...* – the former doesn't give up. The future headmaster puffs on a cigar and says – *I've come up with something better. Friend!* – Placing a hand on his shoulder, he points to the front door – *Welcome to the school for young ladies.* At such a statement the former explodes with enthusiasm – *Fuck yes! Excellent! We'll get those rich bitches whose rich daddies send them here for extra lessons.* With an appreciation of his own genius, the future headmaster nods

– *Yhm*. Meanwhile, quite new possibilities open up in the former's mind – *And we can give fake diplomas with fake degrees*. – *Degrees of suffering* – interjects the future director. – *And we'll finally get Cousin Harold a job. You know how he likes to keep things clean* – concludes the former. An image of cousin Harold sweeping the floor appears on the screen, turns suddenly to the camera and stares at it with madness in his eyes.

Another important scene [YHCE00] that betrays the mercurial nature of SfYH depicts the school headmaster hiring a new teacher. From this scene, it appears that a novice English teacher named Mr. D hands over £4,000 cash bribe for being employed by SfYH. The characters of cousin Harold and Mr. D fit into the hierarchical ladder of relationships recognised by participants in pedagogical relationships in SfYH. There are no exceptions to the hierarchy. The headmaster is at the top of the social ladder. One level below is an experienced teacher. Two ranks below a novice teacher like Mr. D. Three ranks lower the caretaker, the cousin in question – Harold. At the bottom of this social ladder are the schoolgirls and a student who appears in just one scene. Slightly higher up is a student on-duty who tells on her fellow students to the teachers. This strict hierarchy is reflected in the modes of communication that occur between unequal actors. Irrespective of what objective social position one has, what matters in a given communication situation in SfYH is the relativity of these social potentials. To illustrate this phenomenon, let us use the scene [YHFS1] with a schoolgirl, janitor, and teacher.

The janitor, cousin Harold, sniffs a pair of panties found somewhere and starts masturbating. A schoolgirl in uniform comes down the stairs to the dungeon and calls out again and again – *Hello! Hello! Hello!* Cousin Harold grabs the schoolgirl from around the corner and starts groping her. *Shhhhhh!* – he commands the girl to be silent. Suddenly a teacher appears in the dungeon and shouts in a commanding tone – *Harold! You know I've ordered that you can't do this without me!* The teacher joins the intercourse by issuing a command to the girl – *Suck it!*

One can also use the scene [YHYO4] or any other scene, especially one with more than three characters, to consider the hierarchy as an explanation of the statements and actions following each other in SfYH.

Scene [YHYO4] takes place in the dormitory, where one of the female students is undressing for her evening rest. Suddenly, a second student appears and begins to embrace and hug the first one. Just as they are about to have intercourse, two teachers, who a moment ago were still patrolling the corridors, wielding rods in their hands, burst into the dormitory. The more experienced teacher tries to discipline the students by shouting – *Girls!* The younger says only – *Oh dear!* The older one embarrasses the girls with a question – *What are you thinking?* The schoolgirls respond politely together – *Sorry, sir.* The more experienced teacher addresses his younger colleague in a mentor-like tone – *Do you see, Mr. Tailor? This is the kind of behaviour I warned you about. These girls need severe punishment.* The younger asks like a diligent student – *With the rod?* The older one does not step out of his

role as a mentor – *Not with a rod, but with a dick. I think you know what to do.* The schoolgirls tacitly agree to have a group intercourse, and if they even silently do not agree to it, it doesn't matter in a British *Pornland* school.

The hierarchical nature of the relationship finds expression in the fact that from a higher position something is explained to someone, from a lower position someone excuses himself/herself to someone. From a higher position one accuses and from a lower position one apologises. From the higher one asks, interpellates, threatens, and from the lower one nods, answers, and agrees in an explicit, though mostly silent, manner. One can be an experienced teacher but step aside before the headmaster. One can even be a headmaster, but ultimately step aside before a visiting supervisor as in scene [YHIJ5].

Concluding the introductory characterisation of SfYH, it is important to emphasise that, although the idea of this school initially boiled down to making quick money and gaining other benefits, by the second film of the series the school begins to improve its level. In the third film there is a clear theme of hard work and a culture of perfectionism. Finally, SfYH becomes an elite school – at least in the perception of one of the candidates from scene [YHIJ2] – *Yes, I really want to be admitted to your school because it is the school that is the hardest to get into. And they will do absolutely anything to get here. I want to get in so badly that I am completely open to you.*

Communication in the schools of *Pornland*: empirical flesh

All forces in *Pornland* push the participants towards intercourse. This is no different in the schools of *Pornland*. The language game that plays out between the characters ultimately leads to a sex scene. IH is a co-educational school, so there is a rapprochement between male and female students (6/29), because she feels attracted to him, she jokes with him, whoever likes each other likes each other, she needs help on a test and he fantasises about her or she about him. In SfYH, even though it is a single-sex school, a student appears in one scene. He won't say anything. Silently follows the teacher's instructions. They will be testing what she already knows.

IH teachers are constantly asking for something (22/23). They ask *what is written on the blackboard and what was the topic of the lesson?* because she talks to him in an incorrect way. They ask, *have you handed out leaflets*, because that's the task she was given. They ask *aren't you late*, because she probably is. They ask, *what are you willing to do to raise your grade?* They ask how she is feeling, expecting her to say she feels good when he spansks her. They are already asking candidates for IH. They ask for her name and the name of her tutor because she was just doing something inappropriate. They ask, *what the fuck is this, what the fuck?, what were you doing? what are you doing? what are you doing here? and what do you hope to*

achieve, young miss? because they have been caught selling their own underwear to kids, burglary, organising a party, providing sex work, trying to seduce a teacher or other school offense. *You don't want to go to the principal, do you?* – they ask, and *doesn't she want to become a porn star?* because she wrote that in an essay. They ask and negotiate (8/23) if she *will do anything* for the chips and *what can she give?* or *how will we handle it?* And they agree for the intercourse, to keep quiet, to turn a blind eye to rules and regulations, higher grades or passing a subject.

They keep explaining (17/23) because they were selling underwear for tuition fees, because they didn't have that experience, because they didn't have time to produce their school ID, because they thought the hall was empty, and in general they were just a little late and that they were studying, and it's still early. They explain that they have to pass volunteering and that they can't repeat a grade or they have to win the election for prom queen. They explain that they don't understand anything and don't drink alcohol or smoke pot at all. They make excuses for truancy, burglary, and for the fact that the credit work has stains and scribbles. *She has done nothing wrong. She will take his penis into her mouth.*

And they keep explaining (19/23) their role, school traditions, what tasks need to be done and what affects the final grade. They explain the principles of test writing and testing. They explain the rules of the school, that the *bell is about to ring* and that *she has to behave like a student and not like a slut*, that she should not sit on the teacher's lap and should avoid conflicts of interest. That's just the way they explain it, because in the end he'll show her anyway that *Valentine's Day with a man is different to Valentine's Day with a teenager* or that *you have to practice to achieve professionalism*, and we know what that means at a Pornland School.

IH teachers give commands, orders, and prohibit (17/23): *you can't sell your panties and bras to kids; don't do that; show your ID; come closer; turn around; sit on the lap; don't think too much; smile; let him; sit here; be hones; come to the centre; to the blackboard; come in; go out; you can't be here; get dressed; you have to stay in class; show it; no cheating; no looking; don't cheat; on your knees; come here slut; you have to practice; move away; learn page 69 by heart; no running in the hallway; pull your skirt down; don't be late; calm down and spread your legs.*

And they sometimes initially disagree (5/23) with the consequences, with oral sex with a substitute teacher, with blackmail, with a behavioural assessment, with intercourse, because *you can't do that, you're a teacher!* They resist (8/23). She lies that she was praying, when really she was kneeling for a completely different reason; that she handed out leaflets, when she didn't; that she lost something under her desk, while she made a break into the test question room. They pretend activity. They offend – *Don't be a dick* – one demands. *Suit yourself, dickhead* – says another. From behind the frame, it's easier to shout to the teacher – *Fuck you fucking asshole!* or *The coach is a homo!* You can say to the teacher's face – *I don't give a shit.* Add to that – *You're in charge of shit.* And even though IH is a different school than SfYH, even there a female student will be forced into a intercourse as penalty (1/23).

IH is fundamentally different from SfYH. In IH, we often deal with an explicit and informed consent for intercourse between characters. With one exception mentioned above. IH students also initiate a intercourse. Out of pity (2/23), because he doesn't have a valentine or no one came to celebrate his birthday. Out of lust and decided to seduce him (2/23). However, more often they initiate intercourse in order to gain benefits: fries, passing an item, avoiding consequences, *having their backs*, becoming captain of the cheerleaders (5/23). This may not be a pupil-initiated intercourse, but with her explicit consent, although also under pressure of circumstances or as a result of negotiations (10/23). Even if the consent is lined with mockery – *Fine, dickhead!* It can eventually be a silent agreement (3/23) because they have had an affair before or the intercourse takes place because of manipulation. Meanwhile, in SfYH, the intercourse is initiated by the student in only one case (1/25), when she is trying to get into this elite institution. Once a student of it, silent agreement prevails (17/25). Explicit consent means, in SfYH, agreement to do additional practical exercises or homework together, and we already know (7/25) what this means in UK *Pornland*.

The SfYH area is an area of culture of silence (Stańczyk 2011). They silently agree or explicitly agree. They nod (9/25) and apologise (3/25). They do not resist, although there is one exception, as she says *no*. She denies that she wanted to escape from the boarding school. The teacher's authority makes her confess to everything in the next sentence. Values and teacher authority are mutually reinforcing, because the hierarchy, the rules and the punishment for not following them, because the uniform is supposed to be regular, we are perfectionists, he will help her with that. He will educate her, it will be hard work, but *practice makes perfect*. He will explain everything to her, how to dress and that she needs to be taught a lesson. He will explain why it is important to establish a student's level of prerequisite knowledge and that it is better to learn by doing and that she needs practical demonstration. No theory, just practice. He will tell her – *So you see Roxy, a cock is made for more than just pussy. It is also made for the anus, and that it is time for a practical demonstration*. She agrees, because if schoolgirls are naughty, they will be punished. Besides, it's about feeling the words, not seeing them. He will recite *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and then place her hand on his genitalia.

Suck it! – he will give the command. *Come in!* – he shouts. *Come to me! You have to know the rules*. She needs it. Let her just relax. He will ask her, let her continue. He can do it, let her be natural. The drill continues – *Silence! Get up! Bras off! Panties off! Take it off! Suck it! Don't interrupt me! Take off those bloody things! Away!* He will give her the opportunity – *You can start by taking off your jacket*. He encourages – *Get to work! Don't be shy*. Why are they still ashamed after receiving such an education?

He will do a lot for her wellbeing (YHYO5). He will go to distant London and say – *Miss Lee! I had to come all the way to London this evening to have discussion with you. About your behavior, yes? I mean, do you have something to say?* She will

only reply – *I'm sorry*. He will explain to her, embarrass her – *I'm sure you are sorry but there is no excuse for your behavior in school*. She admits – *I know that I've been bad and I know that you came all the way to London to talk to me but... and I know I've been expelled but I really will do anything to stay*. Then he tells her that – *It's like, if you don't change for the better, it's over. It's like this, you see. If you don't change to the better, that's it. You are finished. Finito. There is no future for you anymore. So let me give some advice to you... Let me finish! Don't butt in... There is a couple of pointers for you. One! The uniform*. And she will ask in a weepy tone – *What's wrong with my uniform?* He will point to the fishnets and ask – *Is this a part of school uniform? And what with the tie and with that knot in the shirt here*. He will grab her around the waist and shout – *In fact, I think that the uniform should come off right now! This very instant. Take this bloody thing off! Now! Don't let me repeat myself*. And she is already laughing gleefully, as if she sensed that instead of expulsion from school there would be the usual punishment in the form of intercourse with the teacher.

The extraordinary school of *Pornland*. Ending

Part of that Power, not understood,
Which always wills the Bad, and always works the Good.
(Goethe 2005).

The school, on the other hand, is part of one that, while eternally desiring good, is constantly doing evil. The perspective of long term (Braudel 1958) in education goes back to the dawn of scientific pedagogy, namely Johann Friedrich Herbart (1806), who wanted to “merely” convert Kantian thought into a working pedagogical system, which, after a series of more or less intentional misrepresentations, led to the existence of the Prussian school system (Szkudlarek 2017). Teachers learned to teach from their teachers. Forms of thinking and knowledge concerning schooling are remarkably durable even if the school system is to be set up in opposition to Herbartian thought, as John Dewey (1930) and his disciples aimed to do. This always resulted in a fetishistic attachment to discipline (Bowles, Gintis 1976). Technologies are changing, but these are still ideas straight out of *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault 1995).

Sexual violence in the schools of *Pornland* is hardly concealed, but this feature is not necessarily related to the peculiarity of *Pornland*, but is due to the peculiarity of the school. While it is possible to imagine pornography without violence – for example feminist porn – in line with the idea of “good porn” (Lust 2010), a school fitted into the pornographic imaginary is a place that clearly cannot be thought of and played out without violence. Without the thought of punishment, no hierarchical structure, no imposed rules, no teacher authoritarianism, no socialisation into the role of the obedient student. All this makes the abuse of power seem as

a natural feature of a school language game in *Pornland*. The origins of this image lie in the school experiences of the creators of pornography and the anticipation of these experiences in its consumers.

Both analysed schools are different, different from a real school or a school from other cultural texts, but they all remain schools. There is a family resemblance between all the schools of the world and the real ones and those from the different universes of our cultural imagination. The school both here and there, yesterday and today, as well as perhaps tomorrow, remains an oppressive institution, and this sociological fact fertilises our imagination. It is impossible to think of a school in any other way, as even an unusual school will be structurally similar to an ordinary one.

Many years ago, Tomasz Szkudlarek (1992) published a text that does not allow me to pass quietly over the phenomenon of the normalisation of school oppression. A picture of a school that is only superficially unusual emerges from an assigned school essay on the topic of an *Amazing School*. This school remains a school with its rationality, norms, authority, hierarchy, and organisational culture. It is no different with a school transformed by a pornographic imaginary. It's still a school, but with a surplus of meaning appropriate to the genre. But what direction does the analysis of communication in *Pornland* schools take our thinking about schools?

Pornography is “a bit subversive, a bit hegemonic” (Paasonen 2014: 137) – so what does the eroticisation of school violence mean? Of course, the material analysed here constitutes a product of hegemony, that is, material resulting from the wielding of cultural resources, but it can also be seen as a form of resistance. The shameless addition of sex scenes to the image of a school makes the hidden violence of the school against the student obscene. Quite simply, it becomes naked. Moreover, the pornographic representations of a school mean that it is on the school that the odium produced by the official culture falls, because, after all, the porn culture is all the same. The cultural conservatism that relegates porn culture to the margins exposes itself to criticism when marginalised culture represents one of the favourite institutions of an enlightened society. The image of a school in mainstream porn is that of an obscenely critical school, though probably unintentionally so.

Literature

- Albury K., 2014, *Porn and sex education, porn as sex education*, “Porn Studies”, vol. 1 (1–2).
- Althusser L., 2014, *On the Reproduction of Capitalism. Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, London – New York: Verso.
- Apple M.W., 1990, *Ideology and Curriculum*, New York: Routledge.
- Attwood F., Smith C., 2014, *Porn Studies: an introduction*, “Porn Studies”, vol. 1 (1–2).
- Attwood F., Maina G., Smith C., 2018, *Conceptualizing, researching and writing about pornography*, “Porn Studies”, vol. 5 (1).
- Barker C., Jane E.A., 2016, *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London–Thousand Oaks–New Delhi–Singapore: SAGE.

- Barker M., 2014, *Psychology and pornography: some reflections*, "Porn Studies", Vol. 1(1–2).
- Barker M., 2018, *The problems speaking about porn*, "Porn Studies", vol. 5 (1).
- Barthes R., 1989, *The rustle of language*, Berkeley–Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Bowles S., Gintis H., 1976, *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*, New York: Basic Books.
- Bowles S., Gintis H., 1987, *Democracy and capitalism: Property, community, and the contradictions of modern social thought*, New York: Basic Books.
- Braudel F., 1958, *Histoire et sciences sociales: La longue durée*, "Annales" 13–4, pp. 725–753.
- Cackowska M., Kopciewicz L., Patalon M., Stańczyk P., Starego K., Szkudlarek T., 2012, *Dyskursywna konstrukcja podmiotu. Przyczynek do rekonstrukcji pedagogiki kultury*, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo UG.
- Dewey, J., 1930, *Democracy and Education. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Dines G., 2011, *Pornland. How porn has hijacked our sexuality*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dines G., Jensen R., Russo A., 1997, *Pornography: The production and consumption of inequality*, New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough N., Wodak R., 1997, *Critical discourse analysis* [in:] *Discourse as social interaction*, ed. T.A. van Dijk, vol. 1, London: SAGE.
- Fairclough N., 2018, *Critical discourse analysis: The critical studies of language*, New York: Routledge.
- Floyd J., 2023, "The words which sailor John put to them when unrestrained were the veriest filth": *Situating chanteys in the field of porn studies*, "Porn Studies", vol. 10 (1).
- Foucault M., 1995, *Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Galbraith P.W., 2017, *Rape Lay and the return of the sex wars in Japan*, "Porn Studies", vol. 5 (1).
- Goethe J.W., 2005, *Faust*, trans. B. Taylor, [<https://gutenberg.org/cache/epub/14591/pg14591-images.html>]
- Gómez S.A., Pasikowski S., Bruno L., 2022, *Adolescents' cyberdating relationships and the socialisation background: Links with sexism in Spanish society and pornography consumption*, "Educational Studies Review", vol. 40.
- Herbart J.F., 1806, *Allgemeine Pädagogik aus dem Zweck der Erziehung abgeleitet*, Göttingen: Röwer.
- Irvine J.M., 2018, *Dirty words, shameful knowledge, and sex research*, "Porn Studies", vol. 5 (1).
- Johnson P., 2014, *Pornography and the European convention on human rights*, "Porn Studies", vol. 1 (3).
- Konecki K., 2008, *Wizualna Teoria Ugruntowana. Rodziny kodowania wykorzystane w analizie wizualnej*, "Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej", vol. 4 (3).
- Konecki K., 2011, *Visual Grounded Theory: A methodological outline and examples from empirical work*, "Revija Za Sociologiju", vol. 41 (2).
- Kopińska V., 2020, *The concept of citizenship in the Polish school education. Political change and the change of core curricula. Discourse analysis*, "Educational Studies Review", vol. 30.
- Kress G., Leeuwen T., 2006, *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*, London–New York: Routledge.
- Kwieciński Z., 2017, *The sociopathology of education*, Wrocław: DSW.
- Labinski M.A., 2019, *The social/political potential of illusions: enthusiasm and feminist porn*, "Porn Studies", vol. 6 (1).

- Libermann R., 2015, "It's a really great tool": feminist pornography and the promotion of sexual subjectivity, "Porn Studies", vol. 2 (2-3).
- Low J., 2019, *A pragmatic definition of the concept of theoretical saturation*, "Sociological Focus", vol. 52 (2).
- Lust E., 2010, *Good porn: A women's guide*, London: Hachette.
- Marks L.H., 2018, "That wasn't meant to be funny": mirth and the porn scholar, "Porn Studies", vol. 5 (1).
- McGlotten S., 2014, *Zombie porn: necropolitics, sex, and queer socialities*, "Porn Studies", vol. 1 (4).
- McLaren, Peter. 2015. *Life in Schools An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. London–New York: Routledge.
- McNair B., 2014, *Rethinking the effects paradigm in porn studies*, "Porn Studies", vol. 1 (1-2).
- Noble B., 2014, *Porn's pedagogies: teaching porn studies in the academic – corporate complex*, "Porn Studies", vol. 1 (1-2).
- Nijkowski L.M., 2007, *Pornografia internetowa jako zwierciadło społeczeństwa*, "Studia Socjologiczne", No. 3 (186).
- Oeming M., 2018, *A new diagnosis for old fears? Pathologizing porn in contemporary US discourse*, "Porn Studies", vol. 5 (2).
- Ostrowicka H., Stankiewicz Ł., 2019, *The truths of business and the lies of academia: the order of discourse on higher education in Poland*, "Higher Education Research & Development", vol. 38 (3.).
- Paasonen S., 2014, *Between meaning and mattering: on affect and porn studies*, "Porn Studies", vol. 1 (1-2).
- Pietrantonio N., 2020, *Pornography and Indian miniature painting: the case of Avadh, India*, "Porn Studies", vol. 7 (1).
- Popow M., 2014, *The analysis of discursive constructions of national identity in Polish literature textbooks*, "IARTEM e-Journal", vol. 6 (2).
- Queen C., Comella L., 2008, *The necessary revolution: Sex-positive feminism in the post-Barnard era*, "The Communication Review", vol. 11 (3).
- Sedgwick Kosofsky E., 2003, *Touching feeling: Affect, pedagogy, performativity*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Setty E., 2022, *Pornography as a cultural resource for constructing and expressing gendered sexual subjectivities among students in a co-educational boarding school*, "Porn Studies", vol. 9 (2).
- Sikora T., 2011, *Władza, opór, pornografia*, "uniGENDER", No. 6-7.
- Smith C., Attwood F., 2014, *Anti/pro/critical porn studies*, "Porn Studies", vol. 1 (1-2).
- Smith J. G., Liz E., Addy P., 2022, *F*ck the police: resistance, agency, and power in Black male racial-sexual pleasure*, "Porn Studies", vol. 9 (2)
- Stańczyk P., 2011, *Tacit agreement, the culture of silence and the politics of voice*, "Contemporary Learning Society", 61-73.
- Stańczyk P., 2012, *Critical pedagogy and engaged research: Ideology, interests and naivety*, "Ars Educandi", vol. 9.
- Szkudlarek T., 1992, *McLaren i Agata. O pewnej możliwości interpretacji rytualnego oporu przeciw szkole [in:] Nieobecne dyskursy*, ed. Z. Kwiecinski, part 2, Toruń: UMK.
- Szkudlarek T., 1993, *The Problem of Freedom in Postmodern Education*, Westport–London: Bergin & Garvey.

- Szkudlarek T., 2017, *On the politics of educational theory: Rhetoric, theoretical ambiguity, and the construction of society*, New York: Routledge.
- Szkudlarek T., 2022, *Discourse: education, theory of politics, and politics of theory*, "Educational Studies Review", No. 40.
- Thorneycroft R., 2020, *If not a fist, then what about a stump? Ableism and heteronormativity within Australia's porn regulations*, "Porn Studies", vol. 7 (1).
- Williams L., 2014, *Pornography, porno, porn: Thoughts on a weedy field*, "Porn Studies", vol. 1 (1–2).
- Willis P., 1981, *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*, New York: CUP.
- Wittgenstein L., 2009, *Philosophical Investigations*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wodak R., Meyer M., 2016, *Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology* [in:] *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, eds. R. Wodak, M. Meyer, London: SAGE.

Summary

Pornland school communications. Images of schools in mainstream porn

The article is a research report on images of schools in mainstream pornography. Due to the multimodal nature of the empirical material, hybrid methodological approaches based on Grounded Theory (GT) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) were used. The main topic of the presented text is the communication relations between the parties to the educational processes presented in pornographic materials. The article presents the hypothesis of a family resemblance between the real school and the school in the pornographic imaginary. The conclusion boils down to recognizing in pornographic representations of school and education a non-intentional form of resistance against official culture in general and school in particular.

Keywords

school, pornography, porn studies, communication relations, educational cultural studies