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‘Ideal teachers are those who use themselves as bridges over which they invite their students to cross...’ (Nikos Kazantzakis)

I wish to thank Dr Devika Naidoo for accompanying me on a journey of learning over the last two years. She has been a patient and tireless guide, has opened new vistas and built bridges for her students to cross.
ABSTRACT

The compulsory subject Life Orientation in the school curriculum serves a central role in the socialization of learners into the constitutional imperative of non-discriminatory and democratic values as evidenced by the specific subject aims contained in the CAPS statement. Given the dearth of knowledge in the area of sexuality and the formation of sexual identity through curriculum materials, and framed by the sociological view that sexuality and sexual identity is a social construction, the aim of this study was to investigate the representation/construction of sexualities and sexual identities in a sample of Grade 10 Life Orientation textbooks. The study is informed by critical discourse theory in conjunction with queer theory and examines the vocabulary, grammar and textual structures of language, to expose how representations of sexuality implicitly and explicitly function to a construct and transmit dominant form of sexual identity. A selection of the content of three Life Orientation textbooks was analysed in terms of coverage given to LGBT sexualities and heterosexualities, using a quantitative research approach. The context and quality of those representations was also interrogated using qualitative methods including thematic content analysis and a queer critical discourse analysis to examine the discursive construction of those representations. A standard hegemonic notion of heterosexuality appears to be the all-pervasive and unexamined norm in the Life Orientation textbooks whereas LGBT identities, as revealed by a content and thematic analysis, are virtually invisible. Generally it would appear that Life Orientation textbooks transmit a dominant notion of heterosexuality as the norm, arising out of a common-sense understanding of sexuality which naturalizes a form of heterosexuality that privileges male desire and subordinates women. These underlying ideological meanings are revealed through an examination of the experiential, relational and expressive value of the language such as the lexicalization (connotations and denotations), overlexicalization, classificatory schemes, euphemism and register. Grammatical features for instance active and passive voice, nominalization, modality and the use of logical connectors also serve to bolster a heterosexual sexuality in the Life Orientation textbooks. Frequently, the stated intention of the writers to challenge stereotypes and prejudice would appear to be contradicted or betrayed by the language used and illustrations which further reinforce heterosexuality as a universal norm. Where LGBT identities are mentioned it is usually in the context of human rights, abuse, violation, pathology and emotional disorder.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

With the democratization of South Africa and the implementation of an inclusive constitution which enshrines wide-ranging protections of human rights, the expectation exists that the broader social values, contained in the Bill of Rights, will be reflected in the public school curriculum and all prescribed learning materials. The Constitution safeguards the right of individuals to enjoy equality, regardless of sexual orientation:

The state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth (Bill of Rights, The Constitution of South Africa).

Following shortly on the ratification of the constitution, the South African Schools Act of 1996 undertook to inaugurate a new education system that confronts ‘racism and sexism and all other forms of unfair discrimination and intolerance’ (South African School’s Act, No. 84 of 1996, Preamble). The Department of Basic Education subsequently laid down guidelines for an intervention programme entitled ‘Safe, Caring and Child-Friendly Schools’. This document identifies the establishment of rights-based, inclusive schools as the first of six pillars, asserting that schools ‘will not discriminate against any child or educator based on gender, race, colour, creed, physical/mental ability, economic status, HIV and AIDS status, health status, sexual orientation, nationality or ethnicity, or culture’ (Implementation guidelines: Safe and Caring Child-Friendly Schools in South Africa, 2008, Department of Education and UNICEF South Africa: 7). In addition, the Revised National Curriculum Statement asserts that the national curriculum is intended to guide learners to become responsible, contributing citizens who embrace a broad human rights based culture founded on the national constitution:

The critical and developmental outcomes are a list of outcomes inspired by the Constitution. They describe the kind of citizen it is hoped will emerge from the education and training system and underpin all teaching and learning processes. The critical outcomes... (are intended to produce) responsible, sensitive and productive citizens.

More recently, the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS), declares that the National Curriculum is based on the principle of ‘social transformation; ensuring that the educational imbalances of the past are addressed’. It is evident that the historical imbalances which are mentioned appertain not only to racial inequality but also gender discrimination and prejudice based
on sexual orientation. Furthermore, CAPS states that the National Curriculum aims to promote ‘human rights, inclusivity... and social justice; infusing the principles and practices of social and environmental justice and human rights as defined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa.’ As such, CAPS states that the National Curriculum is ‘sensitive to issues of diversity such as poverty, inequality, race, gender, language, age, disability and other factors’ (Life Orientation CAPS, Grades 10-12: 3). In order to give effect to these precepts CAPS states that teachers must have ‘a sound understanding of how to... plan for diversity’ (Life Orientation CAPS, Grades 10-12: 4).

Of all the subjects offered in the high school curriculum Life Orientation, which is a compulsory subject, is possibly the one with the most significant impact on the construction and transmission of sexual identities since it deals explicitly with themes of sexuality, relationships, human rights, values and beliefs. It is for this reason that the teaching materials used in Life Orientation will be the focus of this study. The Revised National Curriculum Statement for Life Orientation plainly states that teachers are required to promote tolerance of diversity and support the values contained in the National Constitution. For example, within the topic Social Development, Grade 10 learners are required to ‘critically investigate issues of diversity in South Africa...’(The Revised National Curriculum Statement: 9). Among the specific aims for Life Orientation listed in CAPS are the following intended outcomes. To:

(i) Guide and prepare learners to respond appropriately to life’s responsibilities and opportunities;

(ii) Equip learners to interact optimally on a personal, psychological, cognitive, motor, physical, moral, spiritual, cultural and socio-economic level;

(iii) Guide learners to make informed and responsible decisions about their own health and well-being and the health and well-being of others;

(iv) Expose learners to their constitutional rights and responsibilities, to the rights of others and to issues of diversity... (Life Orientation CAPS, Grades 10-12: 7)

Underlying all these broad principles and aims for Life Orientation therefore is the assumption of inclusivity, social justice and equality as enshrined in the equality clause of the Bill of Rights of the National Constitution. One can therefore reasonably expect that the treatment of all topics such as life’s roles and responsibilities, health and well-being, rights and responsibilities and optimal psychological, spiritual and moral functioning will be infused by these constitutional principles and will give recognition to diversity among the learners; based not only on race, culture, gender, ability and creed but also on sexual orientation.
This study aims to explore the construction of sexualities and sexual identities in LO textbook firstly in terms of whether the prescribed textbooks for Life Orientation address the issues of heteronormativity, homophobia and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and sexual identity and promote tolerance of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) identities. Secondly, it will then proceed to explore how sexualities, both heterosexualities and LGBT identities, are discursively constructed in a selection of Grade 10 Life Orientation textbooks.

This research is premised on the principal that the formation and reproduction of heteronormativity is to a large extent a social and epistemic construction, resulting from curriculum practices that transmit a hegemonic notion of heterosexuality as the norm. This arises from common-sense understandings of sexuality which naturalize heterosexuality. Thus pedagogy transmits and perpetuates heterosexuality as standard. On the other hand, a queer approach offers liberation from the clearly bounded notions of sexuality that prescribe compulsory heterosexuality and that, not only exclude LGBT identities but also elide the many varieties of heterosexualities.

It is widely recognised that textbooks play a significant role in the construction and reproduction of cultural meanings and values, serving as a vehicle for the implementation of educational directives and curriculum as well as being the basis of pedagogic practices. Sleeter and Grant point out that ‘the major conveyor of the curriculum is the textbook’ (Sleeter and Grant, 2003: 281) while Issitt argues that the use of textbooks in pedagogic practice is ‘practically ubiquitous’ (Issitt, 2004: 683). According to Issitt, textbooks demarcate and delimit the subject boundaries by representing a ‘discipline’s internal workings and its sense of self-identity as a coherent domain of study’ (Issitt, 2004: 688). In addition, they serve an ideological purpose by the selection of knowledge, transmitting the ‘thinkable’ and excising the ‘unthinkable’ and reproducing the epistemic and ontological beliefs enshrined in curriculum policy:

Where better to build the epistemological foundations of a culture and police the ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ way to find out about the world? Where better to select from and edit history? Where better to develop and protect the silences in our cultural memory and cover our national sins? Where better to construct the enemy or ‘the other’? At the extreme, the textbook is the vehicle for the transmission of authorized dogma. In its role as an essential

---

1 The use of the plural form in ‘heterosexualities’ is intended to challenge simplistic notions of heterosexuality as a singular concept. There are many different heterosexual practices and a variety of ways of identifying as heterosexual which makes the broad term ‘heterosexuality’ a problematic oversimplification that is ideologically suspect.
site of learning, the textbook is a key mechanism for the production and reproduction of ideas (Issitt, 2004: 688).

A further reason for choosing to focus on textbooks is that many teachers are guided in their interpretation of the curriculum and in their pedagogic practice by the prescribed textbooks. The recently released Grade 10 CAPS-aligned texts are structured around the nationally prescribed scheme of work titled ‘Outline of what is to be Taught’ (Life Orientation CAPS, Grades 10-12: 9-20). Many teachers who make use of these textbooks will in all likelihood base their pedagogic practice and activities as well as assignments and assessments on these texts. The textbooks are therefore a central component of the classroom pedagogy. Furthermore, CAPS stresses the centrality of textbooks in learning and teaching. The CAPS Training Manual for Grade 10 states that while previously teachers were ‘expected to develop learning materials, undermining the textbook as the most effective tool to ensure consistency, coverage and better quality’, CAPS seeks to ‘centralise nationally the quality assurance and catalogue development for textbooks and other LTSM.’ In addition CAPS envisages that ‘each learner from Grade 4 to Grade 12 should have a textbook for each subject’ (CAPS training Manual for Grade 10: 2). It is, therefore, evident that textbooks will play an increasingly significant role in the teaching of Life Orientation.

This research, founded on the premise that sexuality is socially constructed and linguistically communicated, will analyse how a selection of textbooks transmits hegemonic versions of sexuality. It will deploy content coverage study, queer theory and critical discourse analysis to uncover how sexuality is discursively constructed in textbooks. Queer theory, which problematises the conception of stable normative sexual identities and challenges essentialist notions of gender, sex and sexuality, advocates that, just like gender, sexuality be treated as an analytic category in the field of curriculum studies. Although there is a growing body of queer theory, it has only rarely been applied in the terrain of curriculum studies. A queer theory approach to curriculum studies seeks to disrupt underlying heteronormativity by stripping away the illusion that the curriculum is neutral and non-sexualised. Queer theorists argue that on the contrary the curriculum is strongly heterosexualized and that the curriculum in a democratic country should promote a culture of human rights and challenge heteronormative thinking – ‘not only to promote social justice, but to broaden possibilities for perceiving, interpreting and representing experience’ (Epstein et al, 2001: 141). It is hoped, therefore, that this research will provoke reflection on the way in which heteronormative values are imparted and perpetuated, particularly through textbooks that are prescribed for FET Life Orientation learners, and fill a gap in terms of the interpretation of Life Orientation instructional materials.
This study also draws on a Foucauldian analysis of discourse and the social construction of sexual identity and applies these to the examination of curriculum documents and teaching materials. In this way not only social fabrications of LGBT identities will be interrogated but the construction of heterosexuality as a category of identity will also be problematised. Critical discourse analysis will also be deployed to explore the context in which these texts are produced and examine how, at a micro-level, the texts construct heterosexuality as the norm. An analytical framework which combines queer theory and critical discourse will be developed. It is therefore hoped that, through the application of queer theory, this study will provide a fresh and challenging re-examination of Life Orientation textbooks.

The primary research question on which this study is focused is:

- How are sexualities and sexual identities discursively constructed in Life Orientation textbooks?

Secondary research questions that arise are:

- What is the extent of coverage given to LGBT and heterosexual identities?
- Do prescribed Life Orientation textbooks address the issues of tolerance towards LGBT identities, in accord with the precepts laid down by the RNCS, CAPS and fundamental constitutional values?
- To what extent is content heterosexualised?
- What assumptions of sexuality underpin the pictures, visual representations and illustrations?
- How do language and visual representations serve to establish a hegemonic (heterosexual) version of sexuality?

Finally, it is necessary to reflect on the broader social conditions that make investigation of heteronormativity and the construction of sexual identities imperative. Given the high degree of discrimination and violence against sexual minorities in this country it is important that these issues are explored. Despite the constitutional protections afforded LGBT people a number of high profile people, including President Jacob Zuma, and King Goodwill Zwelithini have made homophobic comments. Leaders of countries north of our borders have also been vocal in their condemnation.

---

2 ‘Zuma needs a bashing for his gay hate speech’, Cape Argus, September 29, 2006, [http://iol.co.za](http://iol.co.za), accessed 1 March 2011. Then deputy-president, Mr Zuma was reported to have made the following remark at in a Heritage Day speech: “When I was growing up, an unqgingili (a gay) would not have stood in front of me. I would knock him out.”
of sexual minorities and homosexuals and lesbians are routinely arrested, harassed and banished to silence and invisibility. Uganda for example has proposed the death penalty for repeat ‘offenders’ who engage in homosexual acts while in Malawi gay men have been criminalized and persecuted. Currently the Nigerian senate is debating the introduction of a law which will punish homosexuals with a mandatory fourteen-year prison sentence. Against this background a prominent Nigerian Muslim Cleric, Malam Abdulkadir Apaokagi, stated that ‘Homosexuality and lesbianism are just too dirty in the sight of Allah, those who engage in them deserve more than capital punishment. When they are killed, their corpse should also be mistreated.’ Homosexuals are criminalised in 29 African countries.

Locally, lesbians frequently fall victim to corrective rape and other forms of physical and sexual abuse. It therefore goes without saying that this study addresses a burning social issue. The 2011 Human Rights Watch report entitled ‘We will Show You you’re a Woman’ states:

While (there have been)... significant advances, lesbians, gay men, and transgender people in South Africa continue to face hostility and violence. Social attitudes lag: recent social surveys demonstrate the wide gap between the ideals of the constitution and public attitudes towards individuals. Negative public attitudes towards homosexuality go hand in hand with a broader pattern of discrimination, violence, hatred, and extreme prejudice against people known or assumed to be lesbian, gay, and transgender or those who violate gender and sexual norms in appearance or conduct.... And constitutional protections are greatly weakened by the state’s failure to adequately enforce them (HRW, 2011: 1).

Human Rights Watch argues that schools frequently ‘perpetuate and reinforce social prejudices due to poor implementation of policies by school governance bodies as well as by irregular enforcement of non-discrimination policies by teachers, principals and other school authorities’ (HRW, 2011: 60).

To address these problems Human Rights Watch proposes that the Department of Basic Education undertakes the following corrective measures:

- Develop in collaboration with civil society organizations educational material on gender expression and sexual orientation for use in life orientation classes in all schools.

---

3 Speaking of homosexuality King Goodwill Zwelithini stated that “This is something new within the Zulu nation and it needs to be condemned. No matter who you are, if you are doing it, you are rotten.” (The Mercury, 24 January 2012)


Include material on sexual orientation and gender expression and identity in teacher training material.

Ensure that all school counsellors receive training on issues of gender-based violence, including information about sexual orientation and gender expression.

Establish monitoring systems to ensure effective implementation of non-discrimination policies, such as a toll free helpline for reporting verbal, physical, and sexual abuse of learners by teachers and other school authorities (HRW, 2011: 63).

There is therefore an urgent need for research into how heteronormative values and homophobic attitudes are constructed and transmitted and corrective action is required to ensure that educational policies, learning materials and textbooks, across the curriculum, are aligned with constitutional principles, promote inclusivity and challenge entrenched prejudices that are frequently represented as common sense and public knowledge.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The objective of this research is to explore the ways in which sexuality is represented in Life Orientation textbooks and how heteronormative values are transmitted. This study will therefore be informed by social constructivist theories of sexual identity, psychobiosocial notions of identity formation and contemporary queer theory. This literature review will provide a broad outline of the theoretical background with a short exposition of the social constructivist concepts of Michel Foucault (1975&1976) and Judith Butler (1999&2004), Eliason and Worthington et al’s psychobiosocial theory of identity sexuality formation, and contemporary queer curriculum studies. A number of textbook studies have also been included in the literature review in order to observe the methodologies employed in this field of research. In addition, since the premise of this study is that sexual identities are discursively and linguistically constructed, this literature review will briefly examine the role critical discourse analysis can play in investigating how language operates to naturalise heteronormativity and assert hegemonic sexual identities.

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF SEXUALITY

Social constructivism, critical discourse analysis and queer curriculum analytics form the conceptual lens through which Life Orientation textbooks will be examined. Michel Foucault’s theories of how sexuality and sexual identity are discursively constructed will inform the conceptual framework of this study. In addition, this research will be directed by Foucault’s theories related to the disciplinary role of education. In The History of Sexuality: Volume 1 Foucault explores the discursive construction of sexuality in the Western world. He argues that there has been a proliferation of discourses dealing with sexuality since the early nineteenth century. These have taken the form of many discourse modes including medical observations, legal regulations, religious injunctions, sociological and psychological investigations and educational treatises. This ‘discursive explosion’ has formed part of what Foucault calls the ‘general economy of discourses on sex’ (Foucault, 1976: 11). Rather than sexuality being invisible it has been foregrounded in almost every discipline. This outpouring of discourses has been part of a greater effort to regulate the forms and expressions of sexuality and create a ‘regime of power-knowledge-pleasure’ (Foucault, 1976: 11). Foucault argues that it is important to explore who constructs the discourses around sexuality (‘who does the speaking’) and investigate how the knowledge of sexuality is constructed, stored and distributed, to examine the ways in which they are communicated and how they serve to regulate desire, pleasure and the most intimate forms of behaviour (Foucault, 1976: 11).
Another emergence in the nineteenth century was that sexuality became a criterion that was used to classify people (Foucault: 1976). Whereas previously sex was something people did, from the nineteenth century people became identified by their sexual preferences and acts and thus designations such as ‘homosexual’ and ‘heterosexual’ entered the lexicon in order to sustain the regulation of sexuality:

The nineteenth century and our own have been... the age of multiplication: a dispersion of sexualities, a strengthening of their disparate forms, a multiplication of ‘perversions’. Our epoch has initiated sexual heterogeneities (Foucault, 1976:37).

In this process, however, the reproductive heterosexual couple was established as the standard and the measure by which all sexuality was judged. Thus the ‘legitimate couple’ came to serve as the norm (Foucault, 1976:38). By contrast an array of new perversions was also defined, scrutinised, investigated and inscribed in discourse. Homosexuals, lesbians, bisexuals and transgendered people would form part of an entire ‘sub-race’ of humans who were criminalised and pathologised. Foucault states ‘There emerged a world of perversion which partook of that of legal and moral infraction’ (Foucault, 1976:38).

Foucault, however, cautions against a simplistic notion of the exercise of power as a top-down process. He contends that there is no simple binary opposition between authority and the subject(ed), the powerful and weak. Power does not exist in some ‘central point’ as an essential and timeless concentration of authority; it is exercised through a complex matrix of relationships and encompasses multiple competing forces. Power is shifting, contingent on place and time and continuously negotiated. It is ‘the moving substrate of force relations which, by virtue of their inequality, constantly engender states of power, but the latter are always local and unstable’ (Foucault, 1976:93). Hence, there are within power relations plural points of resistance.

Foucault’s work (1976), however, does not merely provide a historical perspective of the process by which embodied sexual identities have been discursively constructed and have evolved in Western societies; it also offers analytical tools to deconstruct heteronormativity. This research, using a Foucauldian analytics, will seek to explore how LGBT and heterosexual identities are constructed, find the slippages, cleavages and points of rupture in heterosexualized Life Orientation textbooks and suggest ways in which the appearance of a seamless heterosexual norm can be countered by showing the shifting and contingent nature of sexual identity as well as the plurality of modes of being. In this manner it will seek to displace the perceived centrality of heterosexuality.
Foucault’s analysis of power and authority will also inform the theoretical framework. In *Discipline and Punish* he argues that disciplinary power is exercised, not by enforcing uniformity, but rather through a process of differentiation and normalization. Instead of forcing human subjects into conforming and merging into a single homogeneous conglomeration, Foucault argues that disciplinary power operates through hierarchical differentiation which simultaneously rewards compliance and penalizes deviance/defiance: ‘It carries its procedures of decomposition to the point of necessary and sufficient single units’ (Foucault, 1975: 170). Thus the mass of humanity is atomized into ‘small, separate cells, organic autonomies, genetic identities and continuities, combinatorial segments’ (Foucault, 1975: 170). In this manner individuals are constructed through discipline to serve both as objects and instruments of the disciplinary process.

Two of the instruments of disciplinary power that Foucault identifies are hierarchical observation, which involves coercion through observation, and the imposition of normalizing judgments (Foucault, 1975: 171). Disciplinary apparatuses create a hierarchy on which ‘good’ and ‘bad’ subjects are ranked according to their relation to one another and according to their ability to conform to a norm. The advent of standardization in teaching led to ‘Normal’ becoming a fundamental principal of coercion against which behaviour was measured and, on the basis of which, transgressions were punished (Foucault, 1975: 184). This was accompanied by the implementation of a whole scale of normality by which one’s membership of a uniform social body was determined and by which individuals were classified and ranked within a social hierarchy. Thus, while the norm seeks to standardize and homogenize behaviour, it is also used to differentiate subjects according to the degree to which they conform to prescribed standards and act in compliance with certain norms.

The work of Judith Butler is also helpful in extending the theoretical framework by offering a more nuanced approach to the discursive construction of gender and providing further insights into the practice of deconstruction. In *Gender Trouble* Butler posits the existence of a hegemonic patriarchal and heterosexual order which circumscribes thought and action: ‘the very thinking of what is possible in gendered life is foreclosed by certain habitual and violent presumptions’ (Butler, 1999: viii). She endeavours to deconstruct dominant discourses, masquerading as ‘truth’, that delegitimate and undermine sexual and gender minorities. This challenge to hegemonic modes of sexual and gendered identity does not, however, come without risk. Under threat of exposure of the
constructed nature of gender and sexuality the dominant discourse will be defended fiercely, Butler writes:

What worried me most were the ways that the panic in the face of such practices rendered them unthinkable. Is the breakdown of gender binaries, for instance, so monstrous, so frightening, that it must be held to be definitionally impossible and heuristically precluded from any effort to think gender? (Butler, 1999: viii)

Butler deploys poststructuralist theory in order to subvert entrenched patriarchal constructs of gender and undermine heterosexism. By investigating the variety of non-normative sexual practices Butler calls into question not only the supposed stability of sexual identities but also the permanence of solid categories of gender. Queer identities not only undermine the idea of distinct and stable categories of sexual identity but also undermine the foundations of gender. Thus Butler interrogates the problem: ‘How do certain sexual practices compel the question: what is a woman, what is a man? If gender is no longer to be understood as consolidated through normative sexuality, then is there a crisis that is specific to queer contexts?’(Butler, 1999: xi)

Gender and sexual identities, Butler argues, are performatively constructed. By this she means that society imposes particular meanings upon one’s performance or observable behaviour which define one’s nature and being. These meanings are external to individuals but are imposed upon them by society. Over time, however, these meanings may be internalised as people begin to live out social expectations:

... what we take to be an ‘internal’ feature of ourselves is one that we anticipate and produce through certain bodily acts, at an extreme, an hallucinatory effect of naturalized gestures (Butler, 1999: 15).

Therefore divergent sexualities that challenge the heterosexual norm have the power not only to disrupt heteronormativity but to undercut the very foundations on which gender is constructed. Butler argues that non-normative sexual practice have the power to destabilize gender since ‘normative sexuality fortifies normative gender’ (Butler, 1999: xi).

Butler’s work has had a great impact on queer activism and educational research and theory since it provides a challenge to gender essentialism and denaturalizes heteronormative constructions of sexuality and sexual identities.
PYSCHOBIOSOCIAL THEORY OF HETEROSEXUAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT

However, as the title of this study suggests, the purpose of this investigation is not merely to examine the discursive construction of LGBT identities in the selected textbooks, but also to investigate how heterosexual identities are constructed and transmitted. For this purpose this study will deploy Eliason (1995) and Worthington et al’s (2002) psychobiosocial theory of heterosexual identity formation. This study is predicated upon the constructivist notion that sexual identities, be they lesbian, gay, bisexual or heterosexual, are to a large extent socially constructed, rather than merely being the product of biological determinism or gender essentialism.

Since the majority of people identify as heterosexual, Eliason argues that that there has been little reflection on or examination of how heterosexual identities develop, since heterosexuality has been seen as all-pervasive, normal and natural. Thus heterosexuals are assumed to constitute: ‘a monolithic, stable group with predictable attitudes about nonheterosexuals and a consistent clear sense of their own heterosexual identity’ (Eliason, 1995: 821). While questions are frequently asked about the construction of gay or lesbian identification, with the notion of coming outing being a common theme in literature related to LGBT experience, heterosexuals are rarely required to consider how they ‘became heterosexual’ or reflect on their coming out. As Worthington states:

Most heterosexually identified individuals, because of societal assumptions about normative development, are likely to experience very little conscious thought about their adoption of compulsory heterosexuality (Worthington et al, 2002: 515).

Worthington et al point out that there has also been scant research on how heterosexual identities are constituted, even as extensive work has been done on how gay and lesbian sexual identities develop:

Research that addresses the ways that heterosexual individuals perceive their own sexual identity is all but nonexistent. Indeed, some scholars may question the extent to which anything exists that might remotely resemble something called ‘heterosexual identity development’, a point demonstrated in the reality that virtually all literature regarding sexual orientation is situated in volumes designed to address lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) issues. Alternatively, such a process is likely to be ignored or relegated to unconsciousness in a heterosexist society as a result of ‘normative’ assumptions about heterosexuality (Worthington et al, 2002: 496).
Worthington et al identify a number of biopsychosocial influences that impact on heterosexual identity formation, namely:

- **Biology**: Genetics plays a significant role in determining a person’s sexual orientation but sexual identity and sexual orientation must not be regarded as necessarily synonymous. While sexual orientation refers to sexual attraction or a disposition towards sexual relations which range from exclusive homosexuality to exclusive heterosexuality, sexual identity relates to a person’s acceptance of and identification with their sexual orientation (Worthington et al, 2002: 497). It is possible therefore for individuals to engage in same-sex activity (sexual orientation) and yet identify as exclusively heterosexual (sexual identity).

- **Microsocial factors** relate to the role played by friends, family and close associates in influencing a person’s sexual identity development. Worthington et al argues that sexual attitudes and values are to a large degree learned within the context of close social relations.

- **Gender norms and socialization** are two of the macrosocial factors that impact on sexual identity formation. Worthington et al argue that heterosexual identity development is ‘subordinate and concomitant to the processes involving gender’. Gender functions as an ‘organizer and structurer’ which determines the social and cultural norms and standards and shape the roles that men and women play. Worthington et al argues that these gendered sexual roles are transmitted and perpetuated through discourse: ‘Specific views of men and women are also depicted through language and discourse about gender’ (Worthington et al, 2002: 504). In addition, through social interaction males and females internalize socially constructed gender roles and act in accordance with these internalized modes of behaviour.

- **Culture**: Challenging biological essentialism, Worthington et al argue that sexual identities take shape in a cultural context which attaches particular meanings to sexual acts: Human sexuality is defined and given meaning in the contexts of cultures. Cultures are specific to locations in time and place, making human sexuality as much a social construction as any other aspect of human functioning (Worthington et al, 2002: 506).

- **Religious orientation**: Since most religions to some degree regulate and constrain the sexual behaviour of their adherents, imposing particular mores and values, they play a powerful role in shaping sexual identities.

- **Systematic homonegativity, sexual privilege and prejudice**: Worthington et al argue that to a significant degree heterosexual identity is established in opposition to homosexual and lesbian identities:
Heterosexuality has become defined most critically by what it is not (e.g. lesbian, gay, or bisexual), rather than by what it is, resulting in the relative absence of a true sense of sexual identity for many (if not most) heterosexually identified individuals (Worthington et al, 2002: 509).

Thus heterosexual identity is also shaped to some degree by homonegativity. In fact, according to Worthington et al, an important part of heterosexual self-definition is either an overt or tacit recognition of belonging to a power-holding and privileged group:

... the assumption that heterosexual identity development entails an understanding (implicit or explicit) of one’s membership in an oppressive majority group, with a corresponding set of attitudes beliefs, and values with respect to members of sexual minority groups (Worthington et al, 2002: 510).

LESBIAN, GAY AND QUEER CURRICULUM STUDIES

Both Foucault and Butler have had a significant impact on lesbian and gay studies and queer theory. Lesbian and gay studies which was a forerunner to queer theory emerged from gay rights activism and became applied to educational research from the late 1970s onwards. Lesbian and gay studies has generally sought to address issues of homophobia by exposing social injustices and inequalities that have been attached to divergent sexual orientations. Much of this early writing in the field of education is biographical or autobiographical and tends to focus on the othering of gays and lesbians and their victimization and oppression within learning institutions. LGBT youth are frequently depicted as being ‘at risk’ of not only homophobic violence but also internalized homophobia which may manifest in substance abuse and suicide (Epstein et al, 2001: 141). This approach has, however, been criticized by more recent queer theorists for not only perpetuating ideas of the victimhood and abjection of gay and lesbian people, thus disregarding their personal agency and unique cultural identity and negating the possibility of counter-discourses, but also unwittingly conspiring with heteronormative essentialism by uncritically adopting the sexual categories on which heteronormativity is founded (Mayo, 2007:80). On the other hand, queer theory, which emerged in the 1990s, seeks to confront and deconstruct the discursive composition of sexual identities, not merely by challenging the hegemony of heteronormativity but also by questioning the nomenclature that forms the basis of the inscription of sexual identities. Elisa Abes, elaborating on Fuss’s definition, describes this radical interrogation of identities based on sexual orientation as follows:

Queer theory suspends the classification of ‘lesbian’, ‘gay’, ‘bisexual’, ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’. Rather than grouping these classifications into one category, queer theory recognizes sexual and gender identities as social, multiple and fluid. Principles of queer
theory suspend identity categories based on the supposition that identity is performed and therefore unstable and composed of fluid differences rather than a unified essence. Categories are insufficient because identity is ‘continually assumed and immediately called into question... with multiple and contradictory meanings’... Queer theory also challenges assumptions of ‘normal’ and ‘deviancy’ with regard to sexuality and gender. ‘Proponents of normalcy and deviance have accepted a sexual binary – heterosexual-homosexual – that privileges some and silences others’ (Abes, 2007: 59-60).

Thus queer theory problematises the notion of stable normative sexual identities and ruptures essentialist thinking that gender, sex and sexuality are necessarily related.


The focus of this literature review, however, will be on textbook analysis. A survey of literature in the field of textual analysis of the construction of LGBT identities and the transmission of heteronormativity in instructional materials has turned up a modest body of work. Most studies that have been undertaken have adopted a content analysis approach, quantifying the number of references to LGBT identities as a percentage of total coverage in texts. More nuanced approaches have worked thematically, to uncover the quality of representations. It will be argued, however, that these approaches are hampered by certain limitations; while they can expose the presence of heteronormativity in its many guises they do not reveal how these discourses are constructed. It will be argued that the use of queer critical discourse analysis (CDA) can overcome this deficiency by not only locating the texts in their broader social context of production and interpretation but by offering a set of analytical tools to scrutinise how the discourses are linguistically constructed. It is the contention of this research that since heteronormative ideologies are linguistically composed, it is vital that one is equipped with hermeneutic procedures for revealing how meanings are ordered and transmitted.

One of the most rudimentary approaches to exposing heteronormativity in textbooks is to engage in a basic content audit, in which references to LGBT identities are counted and calculated as a
percentage of the entire content. For example, by examining the number of paragraphs dedicated to lesbian and homosexual identities in psychology textbooks, Matthew Hogben and Caroline Waterman were able to report, in their article entitled *Are All of Your Students Represented in their Textbook?*, that ‘coverage of homosexuality, gay men, lesbians, homophobia, and heterosexism is minimal’ (Hogben and Waterman, 1997: 98). In fact total coverage of gay and lesbian identities in the psychology textbooks that were surveyed amounted to a paltry 0.31%. This underrepresentation of gay and lesbian content in psychology textbooks is confirmed by Jane Simoni in her paper entitled *Confronting Heterosexism in the Teaching of Psychology*. Not only does she report that scant attention is paid to LGBT issues but when they are raised they are usually mentioned in the context of dysfunctionality and sexual disorders (Simoni, 1996: 222).

Other writers have combined basic content analysis with thematic analysis. For example, Ian McGillivray and Todd Jennings, in their article *A content Analysis Exploring Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Topics in Foundations of Education Textbooks*, begin by quantifying the coverage of LGBT issues and then go on to explore the ways in which LGBT identities are dealt with in course readers used in pre-service teacher training. They argue that there is a gap in the field of content analysis of teaching materials since ‘most diversity-related content analyses to date have focused on race and gender bias’ while little work has been done in analysing the transmission of heteronormativity (Macgillivray & Jennings, 2008: 172). They also observe that while a great deal of effort is being made to promote diversity and anti-oppressive education, particularly in terms of race and gender, most of these texts continue to perpetuate negative stereotypes and the marginalization of LGBT people. Through their rigorous content analysis they found that most of the widely prescribed texts paid negligible attention to LGBT issues with less than one percent of coverage in most publications. By counting the number of lines in each text and then counting the lines that dealt with LGBT content, they discovered that the highest estimated percentage of coverage given to LGBT content was 0.70% while the lowest was 0.08% (Macgillivray & Jennings, 2008: 179). They then proceeded to analyse the content of these textbooks, looking at the ways in which they dealt with issues of victimization and discrimination, identity and experience, lesbian and gay family structures, LGBT history and legal and professional obligations of teachers towards the LGBT community. Their research questions which guided their reading were as follows:

a) Which foundations of education textbooks include LGBT topics?

b) What percentage of the text is devoted to LGBT content?

c) What LGBT themes are included?

d) How are LGBT people portrayed?
Where in relation to other topics, are LGBT topics placed within the text?

How do the texts treat discussions of sexual orientation?

How do the texts treat discussions of gender identity?

Which LGBT topics are excluded from the texts? (McGillivray & Jennings, 2008: 176)

In general they established that LGBT people were depicted mainly as victims of social discrimination and harassment. They were frequently mentioned in these texts among ‘other’ groups that are perceived to be ‘at risk’ and are pathologised such as substance abusers, HIV/AIDS sufferers and students at risk of depression and suicide. McGillivray and Jennings also argue that none of the texts attempted to confront essentialist notions of sexuality or heteronormative hegemony but instead treated LGBT issues as part of social diversity:

... treating sexual orientation as a diversity issue only, assumes that heterosexuals are not affected or constrained by their own sexual orientation. Thus issues of social power and hegemony go unquestioned. (McGillivray & Jennings, 2008: 183)

They also point out the virtual exclusion of any mention of the positive and meaningful contributions that LGBT individuals have made historically or socially.

In their investigation of heteronormativity in the McGraw Hill Ryerson Biology 12 textbook, widely prescribed in Ontario schools, Bazzul and Sykes were also struck by a general silence regarding issues of same-sex attraction and divergent sexual identities and practices. They reported on the invisibility of alternative sexualities in the text and accounted for it by referring to the wider body of research:

Britzman (1998) points out that often people are unconsciously resistant to that which they ‘don’t want to know’; and this unconscious ignoring becomes a form of resistance.

Remarking on the silence in relation to these texts is one way to ‘queer’ a text (Snyder and Broadway 2004). When considering textbooks in the human/biological sciences Temple (2005) found that ignoring was the approach taken by these texts towards alternative sexualities, and ignoring sexuality is part of the way heterosexual privilege is maintained (Bazzul & Sykes, 2011: 274-275).

They lamented the fact that despite a heightened sensitivity to oppressive discourses in instructional materials, this text, which was selected on the basis of its wide circulation, transmits binary representations of gender and sexuality and strongly heteronormative constructions of sexuality (Bazzul & Sykes, 2011: 265).

Bazzul and Sykes deployed textual analysis, locating, quoting and enumerating the number of heteronormative references and binary constructions of gender. They observed that the highest
prevalence of heteronormative discourse took place in the chapters related to hormones and the endocrine system, human reproduction, physiology, evolution and steroid use. They suggest that this may be indicative of an underlying problem in the way in which scientific discourses deal with the human condition:

This raises important epistemic questions for science discourse and knowledge. Science educators must ask themselves; is it simply the case that scientific discourses become politicized or socioculturally infused when they deal with human affairs? Or, rather, are the effects of this politicization and sociocultural infusion simply more noticeable when they involve human affairs? (Bazzul & Sykes, 2011: 275)

In her article entitled ‘People who are different from you’: Heterosexism in Quebec high school textbook Julia Temple also engaged in thematic analysis. She surveyed Quebec high school textbooks from a range of five subjects across the secondary school curriculum to analyse representations of sexuality and LGBT identities. A list of thematic concerns common to most of the textbooks under review was drawn up and then she explored how LGBT identities were treated within each theme. Eleven sexuality or relationship themes formed the basis of her content analysis namely:

(a) personal sexuality (e.g. feelings), (b) reproduction, (c) dating/relationships, (d) marriage, (e) sexually transmitted diseases, (f) abuse/assault, (g) prostitution, (h) laws, (i) contraception, (j) families, (k) effects of drugs on sexual behaviour (Temple, 2005: 179).

Where she found content that made reference to these criteria she coded it in the following manner:

(a) Sexuality defined exclusively as heterosexuality, (b) heterosexuality in a positive context, (c) heterosexuality in a negative context, (d) same-sex sexuality in a positive context, (e) same-sex sexuality in a negative context, or (f) sexuality that does not specify either homosexuality or same-sex sexuality (Temple, 2005: 180).

She found that almost no mention of same-sex attraction or sexuality was made while generally sexuality was ‘explicitly defined as heterosexuality’ (Temple, 2005: 280). Lesbian and homosexual practices and identities, when mentioned, were placed in a negative context 80% of the time by being related to sexual abuse, HIV/AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases and prostitution. She concluded that:

The definitions in these texts dichotomize heterosexuality/ homosexuality, setting a stage to see sexuality in terms of opposites of normal and abnormal (Temple, 2005: 281).
Myerson et al. in their article entitled *Who’s Zoomin’ Who? A Feminist, Queer Content Analysis of “Interdisciplinary” Human Sexuality Textbooks* engage in content analysis informed by their queer, feminist theoretical framework. They explore how texts used in the study of human sexuality frequently reinforce binary constructions of gender and sexuality and either overtly or covertly reinforce ‘dominant heteronormative narratives of sexual dimorphism, male hegemony, and heteronormativity’ (Myerson et al., 2007: 92). Through their systematic, analytic, qualitative review of the textbooks they aim to uncover implicit heterosexist narratives (Myerson et al., 2007: 96). They state their objectives as follows:

Our feminist, queer goal is a deconstructionist one that attempts to ‘make subterranean meanings of the academy visible, and expose them as gendered processes of power’ (Morley 1995:173), which includes radical questioning of all categorizing systems (Sedgwick 1990, Seidman 1996), especially categories of sexual orientation and the belief in sexual dimorphism (Myerson et al., 2007: 96).

Their aim is to detect and describe sexual dimorphism, male hegemony, and heteronormativity in the texts —expressed through sexist and heterosexist assumptions (Myerson et al., 2007: 97).

Suarez and Balaji undertook a similar thematic content analysis of sociology textbooks, comparing texts from the 1950s with current publications. They found that ‘lingering heteronormativity, homogenization of homosexuality and problematic representations of non-normative sexuality’ were common across the fourteen texts which they chose to study (Suarez & Balaji, 2007: 239).

Although, by comparing older texts to more recent ones, they observed that greater exposure has been given to homosexuality, coming out, gay rights, heterosexism and homophobia; there is a general lack of coverage regarding how sexual identities intersect with race, gender and class. They also point to an underlying tendency to homogenize gay and lesbian identities through generalizations (Suarez & Balaji, 2007: 246).

Despite the fact that they reveal some useful insights regarding the predominance of heteronormative discourse, content and thematic analyses provide only limited insight into the social conditions of production and interpretation, and do not illuminate how the discourses are constructed. It is for this reason that critical discourse analysis will also be applied.

**CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

Since heteronormativity is universal, permeating all social space, and yet appears largely invisible (Yep, 2003: 18) it is necessary to find ways of exposing it and bringing to light the operation of
heteronormativity. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) offers one way of exploring how heteronormativity is constructed in Life Orientation textbooks. Given that heteronormative ideology is largely implied, Norman Fairclough’s approach to CDA provides a powerful tool for the vital process of uncovering what has been normalised, naturalised and taken for granted:

The distinction between what is explicit and what is implicit in a text is of considerable importance... Analysis of implicit content can provide valuable insights into what is taken as given, as common sense. It also gives a way into ideological analysis of texts, for ideologies are generally implicit assumptions. (Fairclough, 1995: 5-6)

Thus CDA promotes questioning regarding the dichotomy of presence and absence, what is foregrounded in the text and what is backgrounded and provides the researcher with an analytical device for investigating how heteronormativity and heterosexual and LGBT identities are discursively constructed (Fairclough, 1995: 6).

CDA provides the heuristic tools to read texts both on the macro-level of sociocultural practices that inform the production of the text, the meso-level of the discourse practices at which the text is produced and interpreted as well as at the micro-level at which the linguistic features are analyzed (Fairclough, 1995: 98). CDA therefore equips the reader to examine critically the situational, institutional and societal factors that influence the construction of discourse, the processes by which meaning is both encoded and decoded and the way in which language is used to construct meaning. CDA also serves to explore how social power is exercised through discourse. Hegemonic groups cannot rely merely on brute force and the threat of violence to enforce compliance and achieve consent. It is rather through the construction of discourse which conveys ideology, standards and behavioural regulations, that conformity is attained:

Power is predominantly exercised through the generation of consent rather than through coercion, through ideology rather than through physical force, through the inculcation of self-disciplining practices rather than through the breaking of skulls... It is mainly in discourse that consent is achieved, ideologies are transmitted, and practices, meanings, values and identities are taught and learnt (Fairclough, 1995:219).

The manner in which educational texts construct and transmit meanings is of particular interest to Fairclough. He contends that the aim of education is the ‘inculcation of particular cultural meanings and values, social relationships and identities... educational institutions are to a greater or lesser extent involved in educating people about the sociolinguistic order they live in’ (Fairclough,
Education plays an integral role in socialization and enforcing compliance with hegemonic meanings and values:

Educational practices themselves constitute a core domain of linguistic and discursive power and of the engineering of social practices (Fairclough, 1995:220).

Fairclough, however, rejects notions of determinism and instrumentality. He argues instead that while hegemonic discourses seek to impose particular meanings on learners, there is also the space for resistance and counter-discourses:

Struggle and resistance are in any case a constant reflex of domination and manipulation: the will to impose discursive practices or engineer shifts in discursive practices from above is one thing, but in actuality the conditions in which such a will to power must take its chance may include a diversity of practices, a resistance to change, and even contrary wills to transform practices in different directions (Fairclough, 1995:221).

Given the general socio-political transformation that has taken place in South Africa, with the transition to democracy and the inception of an inclusive and human rights based constitution, this research will enquire whether this general discursive shift in society at large is reflected in the discursive construction of heterosexual and LGBT identities in Life Orientation learning materials. Fairclough posits that changes in power relations and the social order will be reflected in the orders of discourse:

Orders of discourse embody ideological assumptions, and these sustain and legitimize existing relations of power. If there is a shift in power relations through social struggle, one can expect transformation of orders of discourse. Conversely, if power relations remain relatively stable, it may give a conservative quality to reproduction (Fairclough, 2001: 33).

A critical discourse analysis approach acknowledges that the construction of curricula and learning materials involves a selection of knowledges, a favouring of certain competences and particular practices of knowledge transmission which are ideologically informed in order to serve a hegemonic group since discourse is intrinsically implicated in the ‘reproduction of… unequal social relations… through naturalizing hierarchy’ (Fairclough, 2001: 34). This is affirmed by Apple who points out that dominant cultural and political groupings ‘control what counts as legitimate knowledge in school for their own interests’ (Apple, 1999: 62). Thus the discourse of the dominant group tends to prevail.
A number of textbook studies, using CDA have been carried out. Yongbin Liu, in *The Construction of Cultural values and Beliefs in Chinese Language textbooks: A critical discourse analysis*, points out that texts in particular are used to enshrine what hegemonic groups hold to be official and authorized knowledge in order to serve their own interests (Liu, 2005: 18). Liu explores the extent to which:

The cultural knowledges, values and beliefs of the dominant groups are selected and legitimated in textbooks, while those of the dominated groups in terms of gender, race, age, and class are excluded or subjected to distortion (Liu, 2005: 18).

Furthermore, he argues that the hegemonic group legitimates its version of reality by depicting it as natural or as ‘fact’ or ‘common knowledge’ in order to eschew the subjective, arbitrary and constructed nature of the authorized version of reality. On the other hand critical curriculum studies, which undertake discourse analysis, can reveal ‘the constructedness, interest-serving, and oppressive realities of dominant values and practices, students and teachers can be empowered to challenge the dominance and make changes’ (Liu, 2005: 18). Liu for example found that contemporary Chinese school textbooks and readers have appropriated traditional cultural values, namely concentration and diligence, respect for authority, modesty and tolerance, collective spirit and honesty, and positioned these in discursive constructions that revere a new political, economic and cultural elite. Thus school textbooks serve the interests a new hegemonic order that has emerged in China in recent times (Liu, 2005: 18).

In *Critical Discourse Analysis in Education: A Review of the Literature* Rogers et al argue that CDA equips the educational researcher to expose the differential positioning of subject identities. They argue that ‘language is central in the formation of subjectivities and subjugation’ (Rogers et al., 2005: 368). The most invidious form of oppression they argue is ‘internalized hegemony’ in which the subjects accept their subjection as natural and inevitable and internalize the discourses that subordinate them. They argue that language is not impartial or value free. While it may reflect reality it also constructs reality:

Discourse moves back and forth between reflecting and constructing the social world. Seen in this way, language cannot be considered neutral, because it is caught up in political, social, racial, economic, religious, and cultural formations (Rogers et al., 2005: 368).

Therefore, in order to observe how language functions to construct and transmit heterosexual and LGBT identities and heteronormative meanings, a queer critical discourse analysis approach will be deployed. This will be based on Fairclough’s model of discourse as text, interaction and context
(Fairclough, 2001: 21) and his ten question method will be applied in a close critical analysis of extracts from the selected textbooks (Fairclough, 2001: 92-93). This investigation will be informed by queer theory which provides an organizing framework for the analysis.

Since critical discourse analysis has its own technical lexicon it is necessary to briefly elaborate on each of the ten questions which Fairclough raises when interrogating a text. Firstly, Fairclough explains the distinction he makes between experiential, expressive and relational value. The experiential value of a textual feature such as vocabulary or grammar, relates to the knowledge and beliefs communicated through the text (the contents); the relational value of a textual feature refers to the social relations implied between the addresser and the recipient; and the expressive value alludes to the social identities constructed and communicated through the text (Fairclough, 2001: 93-94).

The first four questions deal with vocabulary. In Question One Fairclough is concerned with how ideological content is coded through the diction or choice of vocabulary. Particular lexical choices may indicate an underlying classification scheme which Fairclough defines as ‘a way of dividing up some aspect of reality which is built upon a particular ideological representation of that reality’ (Fairclough, 2001: 94). In short, therefore, the writer’s or speaker’s word choice reflects a construction of reality which may be ideologically motivated and the addressee must be sensitive to the deeper semantic meanings (not merely the denotation, but also the connotations and broader cultural and linguistic attachments to words). When exploring the experiential values of vocabulary the reader should pay particular attention to instances of overlexicalization (over-wording) and relexicalization (rewording). Over-wording takes place when the writer or speaker uses a number of words that are synonyms or near synonyms to describe a concept or phenomenon. Fairclough maintains that over-wording can be suggestive of an underlying ideological contest as it may suggest a ‘preoccupation with some aspect of reality – which may indicate that it is a focus of ideological struggle’ (Fairclough, 2001: 96). Relexicalization, or rewording, on the other hand may point to a deliberate attempt to contest existing or hegemonic meanings by substituting a dominant mode of expression with a different or alternative form of expression. Fairclough explains overwording as follows: ‘An existing, dominant, and naturalized wording is systematically replaced by another one in conscious opposition to it’ (Fairclough, 2001: 94). In addition, authors may use other lexical devices in order to construct and transmit ideological meanings such as synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy and collocation. While both synonymy and antonymy create the impression of cohesion,
may also be used to stress or reinforce a particular proposition as opposed to antonymy which relies on ‘meaning incompatibility’ to juxtapose or contrast meanings (Fairclough, 2001: 97). Hyponymy serves as a form of linguistic classification which does not merely reflect an objective universe, but also may be indicative of the author’s construction of the world, pointing to his or her subjective classification scheme. Finally collocation, which links a particular idea over a number of sentences or even successive paragraphs through the use of pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, synonyms, ellipsis or repetition, can serve both to strengthen coherence but also to bolster the author’s construction of reality.

Fairclough’s second question deals with the relational value of words. Here he is concerned with how lexical choices reflect and help to structure social relationships between participants (Fairclough, 2001: 97). Of particular interest to Fairclough is the register or level of formality of the language and the use of devices such as euphemism. Register, which is reflected in the diction or choice of words as well as phrasing, may be a sign of a differential in terms of status, position and social power between the author and the addressee. One linguistic device that can be used to modulate register is euphemism which may be used to mitigate harsher meanings by avoidance of words that may appear insensitive or negative.

Questions 3 and 4 respectively deal with the expressive value of words and the use of metaphor. The expressive value of words refers to the means by which an author’s evaluation of or attitude towards reality is expressed through words. Expressive value is closely linked with the author’s classification scheme as well as the discourse type through which the author’s meaning is transmitted:

A speaker expresses evaluations through drawing on classification schemes which are in part systems of evaluation, and there are ideologically contrastive schemes embodying different values in different discourse types (Fairclough, 2001: 98).

Metaphor is a device whereby the writer, according to Fairclough, can generate new conceptions of reality by linking existing, sometimes variant, ideas and meanings. Fairclough’s interest lies in the choice of metaphor used by the writer – out of the vast number of possible metaphors. Herein, according to Fairclough, lies the ideological attachment.

Fairclough is not merely interested in the lexical features of texts and how they convey ideological meanings; he is also concerned with how grammatical structures influence meaning. Question 5 deals particularly with the experiential values of grammar, with how ‘grammatical forms of language
code happenings and relationships in the world’, describing spatial and temporal relations as well as the manner in which they occur (Fairclough, 2001: 100). Fairclough encourages the researcher to question ‘What type of process and participant predominate?’ since the author, when seeking to represent an action, condition or relationship in writing, has a choice between different grammatical process and participant types. Fairclough argues that the selection of process and participant type can be ideologically motivated (Fairclough, 2001: 100). Fairclough identifies three main types of processes, namely actions, events and attributions:

- An action involves two participants – an agent and a patient. The agent acts upon the patient. Thus an action contains a subject, verb and object.
- An event involves one participant and an occurrence, that is, a subject and a verb.
- An attribution has a participant (subject) to which some attribute is attached, either as an adjective or as a noun.

The choice of process type may also be ideologically motivated.

Choices that either foreground or conceal agency may be deliberate or unconscious. Whatever the case, they serve an ideological function:

‘Such choices to highlight or background agency may be consistent, automatic and commonsensical, and therefore ideological; or they may be conscious hedging and deception.’ (Fairclough, 2001: 102)

Fairclough identifies a number of means by which the grammatical constructions can be used to obfuscate agency. While simple sentences in the declarative mode are written in the active voice with the subject at the beginning of the sentence, passive voice can be used to screen agency, either by reversing the subject-object positions, or by deleting the agent phrase at the beginning of the sentence which creates: ‘agentless passives... (that) leave causality and agency unclear’ (Fairclough, 2001: 104). Another means of concealing agency is to ascribe responsibility to inanimate objects or abstract nouns in sentences such as ‘Lorries shed stones’ or ‘Xenophobia kills’. A further means for manipulating meaning is nominalization, which is the device by which an event, action or process is represented as noun and therefore as a ‘thing’, similar to reification. According to Fairclough this strips the sentence of much of meaning, since elements of agent, patient and timing are evaded, ‘leaving attributions of causality and responsibility unclear’ (Fairclough, 2001: 103).

Finally in exploring the experiential values of grammar, Fairclough questions whether the sentence is written in the negative or positive form. When written in the negative form this may presuppose meanings that exist outside the text. The writer may in this instance appear to be challenging or
contesting the corresponding positive assertion which might be more broadly held. This therefore may suggest that the text is located in a broader intertextual setting.

The relational value of grammatical features is also of interest in CDA (Question 6). Here the focus is upon how grammatical constructions simultaneously reflect and construct differential relations of power and status. The researcher is required to examine the mode of the text as well as how the use of pronouns and articles modify and influence meanings. Sentences may be phrased in the declarative, grammatical question or imperative mode. The three modes position the addressee differently and may be indicative of asymmetrical relations of power:

- In the declarative mode the subject is followed by a verb. ‘The subject position of the speaker/writer is that of a giver (of information), and the addressee’s position is that of a receiver’ (Fairclough, 2001: 104-105).
- In the interrogative mode the author is asking for information, while the addressee is positioned as the provider of information.
- The imperative mode does not have a subject. The imperative mode is a command; the speaker is in ‘the position of asking something of the addressee (action on the latter’s part), while the addressee is (ideally!) a compliant actor’ (Fairclough, 2001: 105).

In addition, Fairclough identifies relational and expressive modality as two further features of discourse which serve as markers of ideological construction. Relational modality is an indication of author’s social authority or as Fairclough puts it ‘the authority of one participant in relation to another’ (Fairclough, 2001: 105). This is expressed through modal auxiliary words like ‘may’, ‘might’, ‘should’ and ‘ought’ which indicate the degree of power that the author exercises over the addressee. Expressive modality, on the other hand, refers to the author’s standing in respect to ‘the truth or probability of a representation of reality’ (Fairclough, 2001: 105).

Pronouns and articles also influence the relational value of the text. Pronouns, for example, will indicate in/out relations through the use of words such as us/we/you/them. The pronoun ‘we’ can be used, for example, to create the impression of a shared and common view that all ‘right thinking people’ would hold whereas as ‘they’ can be used to exclude some group that is perceived to be ‘other’ than the ideological norm (Fairclough, 2001: 106). Gendered and sexist assumptions are also frequently conveyed through the pronouns that are used (for example ‘he’ used as a universal pronoun regardless of gender) while power, status and social distance between author and addressee are influenced by the considered use of either the first, second and third person pronoun.
Question 7 which Fairclough proposes in his outline of CDA is ‘What expressive values do grammatical features have?’ The ideological interests that the text serves are influenced by the author’s claims to incontestable knowledge and authenticity which are evidenced by the use of modality forms (Fairclough, 2001: 107). In answering Question 7, therefore, Fairclough argues that the reader must examine the expressive modality by looking at:

- Modal auxiliaries such as ‘may’ which indicate not only with permission (relational value) but also possibility, ‘must’ which is associated both with certainty as well as obligation and ‘can’t’ which may signify impossibility or denial.
- Modal verbs which are verbs the author uses in relation to truth. The choice of verb may indicate the author’s level of certainty and commitment to the truth imparted. For example the writer can choose between the emphatic ‘is’ and ‘are’ or the more tentative forms of the verb such as ‘may’ and ‘maybe’.
- Modal adverbs such as ‘certainly’, ‘possibly’ and ‘probably’ also influence the expressive value of the text.

The linking of simple sentences, Question 8, is also an important aspect to be examined. Connectors make spatial, temporal and logical connections between sentences. Fairclough points out that logical connectors can indicate underlying ideological assumptions (Fairclough, 2001: 109). Conjunctions, which function as connecting words, may modify meaning, depending on the context. Authors can deploy any of the following conjunctions, depending on context and the meaning they wish to convey:

- Coordinating conjunctions join two independent clauses
- Subordinating conjunctions link a dependent clause to the main clause. In the instance of subordinating clauses, the main clause is usually ‘informationally prominent’ while the subordinate clause is backgrounded (Fairclough, 2001: 109). The subordinate clause usually contains content which is presupposed to be known or a given, and therefore goes unquestioned (Fairclough, 2001: 110).
- Additive conjunctions indicate addition (for example ‘and’).
- Causal conjunctions reflect cause and effect (for example ‘so’, ‘therefore’, ‘because’).
- Adversative conjunctions indicate opposition of meanings (for example ‘yet’, ‘although’).
- Temporal conjunctions indicate time and sequence (for example ‘while’, ‘before’ or ‘after’). Furthermore, conjunctions can be used to set up chains of cause and effect. The author’s choice of conjunction can therefore significantly modify meaning, while other connectors can refer to features outside of the text, alluding to the situational context or intertextual relations.
The last of the broad areas of investigation that Fairclough recommends is an examination of textual features. Here the focus is on interactional conventions, which Fairclough defines as the ‘higher-level organizational features which have relational value’, in particular ‘naturalized conventions and their implicit links to power relations’ (Fairclough, 2001: 110-111). In conversational analysis Fairclough examines turn-taking and the negotiation process whereby participants engage in conversation, particularly where one participant, through social power, is able to control the contributions of others. In the context of textbook study, this research will focus on who speaks, whose voice is heard, who is quoted in direct speech, who is quoted in indirect speech and who is silenced.

Lastly, in Question 10, Fairclough directs the researcher to ask ‘What large-scale structures does a text have?’ According to Fairclough a reader can broadly anticipate the type of content that a text will contain, depending on the type of text. The genre and context provide the addressee with certain intimations as to the kind of the conceptual content that can be anticipated. According to Fairclough, this may serve an ideological purpose since the author is constrained by the conventional structures and expectations and the reader is primed and predisposed to be receptive to the ideological content:

Participants’ expectations about the structure of the social interactions they take part in or the texts they read are an important factor in interpretation – and particular elements can be interpreted in accordance with what is expected at the point where they occur, rather than in terms of what they are. But the significance of global structuring is also longer term: such structures can impose higher levels of routine on social practice in a way which ideologically sets and closes agendas (Fairclough, 2001: 115-116).

Fairclough warns, however, against a simple mechanistic application of CDA. The researcher needs to be sensitive to the contextual and intertextual conditions in which the text has been composed, and recognize that authors presuppose that addressees have certain understandings and social and intellectual resources that help them to decode texts (termed members’ resources):

‘The producer can be simultaneously doing a number of things, and so a single element can have multiple speech values. Speech act values cannot be assigned simply on the basis of formal features of an utterance; in assigning values, interpreters also take account of the textual context of an utterance (what precedes and follows it in the text), the situational and intertextual context and elements of member’s resources’ (Fairclough, 2001: 130).
Critical discourse analysis therefore equips the researcher with the tools to investigate how language functions to linguistically construct, transmit and reproduce sexual identities. In combination with constructivist theories regarding the production and regulation of sexual identities, particularly the work of Foucault and Butler, contemporary queer theory and the psychobiosocial theories of sexual identity formation of Eliason and Worthington et al, critical discourse analysis can be deployed to reveal the fabricated and arbitrary nature of socially-constructed sexual identity categories. This research therefore draws on a number of different and yet overlapping ideas to establish a theoretical framework.
CHAPTER 3
OPERATIONALISATION OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The approaches to the analysis of heteronormativity and the construction of sexual identities in textbooks, examined in the literature review, have severe limitations in terms of their ability to meaningfully convey how sexual identities and heteronormativity are linguistically constructed and transmitted. The content analysis approaches used by Hogben and Waterman and Simoni can at best reveal exclusionary practices and omissions. They do not, however, reveal the quality of the representations of LGBT experiences and identity. The thematic approaches adopted by McGillivray and Jennings, Bassul and Sykes, Suarez and Balaji, Temple and Myerson et al provide a qualitative perspective by describing the nature of depictions and constructions of sexuality. They, however, also are limited in that they do not provide any insight into how these identities are constructed. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) provides a powerful heuristic tool to not only describe the construction of LGBT and homosexual identities and hegemonic heteronormative discourses but to interrogate how they are constructed and what interests they serve. This research therefore commences with a content analysis in order to establish the proportional coverage given to LGBT and heterosexual identities in Life Orientation textbooks. It then proceeds to a thematic analysis, informed by a queer and psychobiosocial identity formation conceptual framework, in order to describe the nature and quality of depictions of LGBT and heterosexual identities. Finally, a queer critical discourse analysis (CDA) is engaged to explore how hegemonic sexualities are constructed and transmitted in Life Orientation textbooks.

CONTENT COVERAGE ANALYSIS

A simple quantitative procedure has been carried out to establish the amount of coverage given to LGBT and heterosexual identities in Grade 10 Life Orientation textbooks, particularly in the three learning topics, namely:

- Development of the self in society
- Social and environmental responsibility
- Democracy and human rights

This has involved the counting of every sentence in the text, dealing with these topics, to establish an overall total. Thereafter every sentence that makes reference to LGBT and heterosexual experience or identity was counted. By lesbian and gay experience is meant any reference to same-sex attraction or sexual activity. In addition, every instance of implicit and explicit heterosexual
identification or practice was counted. By implicit is meant any reference which presupposes that certain social practices or institutions are exclusively heterosexual in nature, for example depictions of marriage as a union between a man and woman or families headed by a mother and father. On the other hand, any mention of opposite-sex attraction or sexual practices involving a man and woman were counted as explicit references to heterosexuality. These totals were then worked to percentages of the total content in order to allow for comparisons to be made between the coverage of categories of identity and between texts. This has provided an arithmetic total which shows up the presence/absence of LGBT identities in texts, as opposed to the predominance of heterosexual identities, and the extent to which sexual minorities are given a voice or conversely silenced. In addition this has enabled the researcher to quantify the degree of prevalence of heteronormativity. In the context of this study heteronormativity will be defined as any utterance or statement which either overtly or by implication asserts heterosexuality as the norm. Since heteronormativity can be either explicit or implicit, it will be necessary to differentiate between these two modes. Explicit statements directly assert heteronormative messages while implicit statements reflect an underlying assumption or presumption of heterosexuality as the norm. In addition, many of the heteronormative messages are conveyed not through the text but in the illustrations that accompany the text. These illustrations frame and modify the meaning of the text so it is also important to quantify the number of images that transmit heteronormative meanings. It also is important to examine the interaction between text and visuals: while the authors may attempt to avoid explicit heterosexual assumptions or constructions of heterosexuality or LGBT identities, the illustrators may have interpreted the text in terms of a particular heterosexual norm. It is therefore necessary to examine how text and pictorial representations work together to convey meaning. The result of this calculation has been presented in tabulated form, using the following template:
Table 1
THEMATIC ANALYSIS

While content analysis provides useful insights into the extent of coverage of LGBT and heterosexual identities it provides little understanding of where they are located in the text and the context of the coverage. A thematic analysis, however, enables the researcher to observe the nature of the coverage of LGBT and heterosexual identities. Various common issues dealt with in Life Orientation texts and inscribed in the subject topics provide the basic criteria for thematic analysis. These analytic categories have been arrived at by reviewing the various topics contained in the CAPS documents and noting the section and unit divisions in the prescribed Life Orientation textbooks. In addition, some of these criteria have been derived from Worthington et al’s theory of psychobiosocial sexual identity formation or have been used in previous studies that have explored LGBT identities in textbooks. A system of coding has been used and the findings have been tabulated. What follows is a list of thematic issues which were examined.

- **Sexual practices and safe sex:** Frequently safe sex instruction functions on the assumption that all learners are heterosexual and descriptions of sexual acts and safe sex practices are predicated on this supposition. This study will therefore examine whether penetrative heterosexual sex is established as the norm when dealing with issues of sexuality and safe sex.

- **Dating and relationships:** According to Temple, frequently the assumption is made that adolescence is a period when people begin to be attracted to the opposite sex. Same-sex attraction is mostly ignored when topics of dating and relationships are raised (Temple, 2005: 280). Case studies, pictures and role play activities will be examined to observe whether recognition is given to lesbian or homosexual experiences of dating and relationships.

- **Marriage:** Discourses around marriage will be analysed to determine whether marriage is constructed as the preserve of heterosexual couples.

- **Family:** The nuclear family, headed by a mother and father, is frequently assumed to be the norm. Textbooks will be analysed to determine whether there is a diversity of depictions of family structure. For example: father/father, mother/mother, single parent and child-headed households and polygamous family structures. Family is also identified by Worthington et al as one of the most significant microsocial factors that influence sexual identity development. Worthington et al argues that sexual attitudes and values are largely learnt within the context of close social relations associated with family (Worthington et al, 2002: 504).
- **Disease and pathology:** Frequently homosexuality, lesbianism, bisexuality and transgendered identities are specifically associated with illness and are medicalised. Attention will be focused on whether same-sex attraction is inscribed in terms of diseases such as HIV/AIDS.

- **Emotional and psychological disorder:** Since gay and lesbian teenagers are frequently categorised as 'at risk youth' it will be important to observe whether LGBT identities are associated with psychic disturbance, suicide and substance abuse.

- **Abuse and victimization:** It will also be explored whether homosexuality is associated with violence, violation and assault in textbooks. In addition, LGBT learners are frequently depicted as victims of bullying and verbal and physical abuse. It is therefore important to determine whether LGBT learners are only described in terms of victimhood or whether they are also viewed as agents in their own right.

- **Citizenship and rights:** Sections of the texts which deal with citizenship and human rights will be examined to determine whether assumptions are made that contributing citizens conform to a heteronormative paradigm and whether the citizenship and rights of LGBT people are recognized.

- **Culture and religion:** Cultural stereotypes abound in general social discourses such as the notion, popularised by Winnie Madikizela-Mandela, that 'homosexuality is unAfrican'. It will therefore be necessary to observe whether heterosexual identities are represented as the norm in particular cultures and lesbian and gay identities are disavowed. This criterion is also significant within Worthington et al’s psychobiosocial theory of sexual identity formation, which posits that cultures attach particular meanings and values to sexual acts and relationships, while religions frequently seek to regulate and place certain restraints on sexuality (Worthington, 2002: 506).

- **Gender roles:** Since Butler observes that stereotypical depictions of gender roles are deployed to shore up heteronormativity (Butler, 1999: viii), it will also be important to observe whether texts communicate gender normativity and privilege heterosexual masculinity. Furthermore, Worthington et al stress that gender functions to organize and structure the socio-cultural norms which in turn are internalized by men and women (Worthington et al, 2002: 504).

- **Life roles and responsibilities:** most Life Orientation textbooks stress the topic of changing life roles and responsibilities. Since this topic addresses psychosocial development and the

---

evolving social roles of individuals that accompany physical maturation, there are frequent references to sex and gendered roles that attach to being boyfriends/girlfriends, husbands/wives and fathers/ mothers.

- **Role models**: Role models are frequently used in Life Orientation textbooks to model particular values or characteristics. The question therefore arises whether heterosexuals as well as LGBT learners can 'see themselves' reflected in the texts and whether a diversity of role models is provided for learners, including visible and recognisable LGBT people.

These criteria have also been enumerated, according to the number sentences which feature them, and presented in a tabulated form, using the following template:

**Table 2: Template for Thematic Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Analysis</th>
<th>Heterosexual references</th>
<th>% Heterosexual references</th>
<th>Homosexual references</th>
<th>% Homosexual references</th>
<th>Lesbian references</th>
<th>% Lesbian references</th>
<th>Bisexual References</th>
<th>% Bisexual references</th>
<th>Transgender references</th>
<th>% Transgender references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual practices and safe-sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease and pathology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional disorder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship &amp; human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles/norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing life roles &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUEER CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

Thematic analysis also sheds light on how LGBT and heterosexual identities are constructed in Life Orientation textbooks. In conjunction with thematic analysis a poststructuralist queer theory approach combined with critical discourse analysis has been adopted to interrogate the treatment of topics within the thematic categories in order to expose the fault lines and rupture simplistic binary
constructions and monolithic depictions of sexuality and gender and explore how meanings are linguistically constructed. A goal of this research is to expose weaknesses within hegemonic heteronormative constructions of sexuality, by revealing the fluid and contingent nature of sexual identities, and at the same time demonstrate how language serves as the vehicle for the transmission of these meanings. Through the literature review a number of queer analytical criteria have been identified that have been engaged in the textual analysis in order to deconstruct hegemonic discourses of sexuality. These aspects of analysis form the subheadings that have been used to structure the critical discourse analysis. They include:

- **Differentiation of sexuality and binary constructions of sexuality:** Foucault argues that control is established, not through homogenization or enforcing uniformity, but rather through classification, naming and differentiation (Foucault, 1976:42-43). This research seeks to observe the extent to which sexualities are categorised and expose the fragile and contingent nature of these constructions. The texts have therefore been interrogated to observe whether sexuality is constructed in a binary manner with heterosexuality, for example, being defined by contrast with homosexuality. Exploration of binaries may help to reveal the constructed nature of the sexual discourses. Essentialist definitions and narratives of sexuality which ignore the fluidity of sexual identity and sexual categorisation have therefore been examined.

- **Extent of self-disclosure that is encouraged in activities:** Foucault argues that the panoptic observation of sexuality is promoted through the incitement of people to discursively construct themselves through self-disclosure and confession (Foucault, 1975: 173). Texts have been examined to determine whether learners are encouraged to talk about their sexuality and the underlying intentions behind invitations to self-disclosure have been questioned.

- **Normalizing judgments and regimes of truth:** This research queries whether Life Orientation textbooks engage in the normalization of heterosexuality through normalizing narratives and assumptions. The extent to which the texts lay down certain moral and behavioural prescriptions and invoke the notions of 'naturalness' or 'normality' (and by extension exclude certain forms of sexuality) has been assessed. Dominant discourses, as Butler argues, frequently present themselves as the only 'truth' (Butler, 1999: viii). In so doing certain identities and ways of being are privileged while others are marginalised. The truth claims made in Life Orientation textbooks are therefore questioned.
• **Performative construction of sexuality:** Butler points out that meanings and identities are imposed upon sexual practices and she therefore posits that sexual identities are performatively constructed (Butler, 1999: 15). Texts have been examined to determine the extent to which representations of sexuality in textbooks confer rigid and naturalised identities based on sexual performance.

• **Heterocentric depictions of relationships and identities:** Learning materials have been closely read to detect whether heterosexuality is constructed as the assumed norm in these texts, privileging heterosexuality and silencing and invisibilising LGBT identities.

• **Personal agency:** Texts have been scrutinised to determine whether LGBT people are represented as actors in their own right or whether they are merely acted upon by society and hegemonic authority.

• **'Reading against the grain':** Attention has been given to examine whether learners are encouraged to question the constructed nature of identity or are expected to adhere to predetermined constructions of reality. It is necessary to examine whether authoritative discourses are disrupted through activities that promote dialogical learning, during which learners are allowed to confront 'unpopular things' that may challenge normative constructions of reality (Britzman D, 1991: 61). For example, Sumara and Davis argue that pedagogy should initiate heterotopic events which bring disparate issues, incongruencies and supposed binaries into a dialogue, allowing for new and creative readings and constructions:

  ... a heterotopia is an event structure in which things not usually associated with one another are juxtaposed, allowing language to become more elastic, more able to collect new interpretations and announce new possibilities (Sumara & Davis, 1999: 205).

• **The contingent and historically constructed nature of sexual identities:** Learning materials have been examined to determine whether sexual identities are depicted in rigid, essentialist terms or whether they give recognition to the multiple forms of heterosexuality as well as the fluidity and contingent nature of sexual identities.

• **Privacy to silence and foreclose discussion:** It has been observed by Meiners & Quinn that discretion and notions of privacy are used to silence discussion of sexuality (Meiners & Quinn, 2010: 147). It has therefore been investigated whether texts encourage and create the space for LGBT learners to discuss their sexuality or whether they are silenced by a 'Don't ask, don't tell' policy. Thus it is necessary to observe whether texts feature public/private binary constructions.
- **Homonormativity through assimilation**: Meiners and Quinn observe that attempts are sometimes made to assimilate LGBT people into dominant heterosexual modes and norms (Meiners & Quinn 2010: 152). In an effort to achieve inclusivity textbook writers may attempt to minimise differences between LGBT people and heterosexuals. It has therefore been necessary to question whether textbooks deliberately disregard differences and seek to construct LGBT identities as 'just like us', based on the assumption that LGBT people seek assimilation into traditional heterosexual institutions.

Finally, since sexuality is linguistically constructed, the researcher has been guided by a CDA approach in the textual reading. This has involved, firstly, an examination of the social conditions of production and interpretation that impact on the creation and reading of the texts. The National Curriculum Statement, CAPS and other policy documents have been examined to establish the broader social context (macro-level analysis). The study also touches on the meso-level of interaction through an examination of the interpretation of the curriculum that takes place during the production of teaching materials and the implications of this for pedagogic practice. The primary focus of this study, however, is on the micro-level of discourse construction, looking at how language encodes meaning and exploring the experiential, relational and expressive value of words and grammar. The following diagram, adapted from Fairclough’s illustration of text, interaction and context (Fairclough, 2001: 21) depicts the three interdependent levels of analysis which have been undertaken:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macro-level analysis (Context)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural practices and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constitution and government policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Curriculum policy and directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broader social and cultural values and beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meso-Level (Interaction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production and interpretation of the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of curriculum policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of curriculum materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Textbook authorship and publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of learning materials in pedagogic practice by teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-Level (Text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How the language used in textbooks constructs and transmits meaning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experiential value of words and grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relational value of words and grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expressive value of words and grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Textual structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the micro level analysis of the operation of language in the linguistic construction of discourse, this study has engaged Fairclough’s procedure for critical discourse analysis which aims to provide insight through: ‘description of the text, interpretation of the relationship between text and interaction, and explanation of the relationship between interaction and social context’ (Fairclough, 2001: 91). The CDA has been directed by what Fairclough terms ‘the ten main questions (and some sub-questions) that can be asked of a text’ (Fairclough, 2001: 92). Fairclough summarises the ten questions as follows:

A. Vocabulary

1. What experiential values do words have?
   What classification schemes are drawn upon?
   Are there words which are ideologically contested?
   Is there rewording or overwording?
   What ideologically significant meanings relations (synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy) are there between words?

2. What relational values do words have?
   Are there euphemistic expressions?
   Are there markedly formal or informal words?

3. What expressive values do words have?

4. What metaphors are used?

B. Grammar

5. What experiential values do grammatical features have?
   What types of process and participant predominate?
   Is agency unclear?
   Are processes what they seem?
   Are nominalizations used?
   Are sentences active or passive?
   Are sentences positive or negative?

6. What relational values do grammatical features have?
   What modes (declarative, grammatical question, imperative) are used?
   Are there important features of relational modality?
   Are pronouns we and you used, and if so, how?

7. What expressive values do grammatical features have?
Are there important features of expressive modality?

8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?
   What logical connectors are used?
   Are complex sentences characterised by coordination or subordination?
   What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

C. Textual Structures

9. What interactional conventions are used?
   Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?

10. What larger-scale structures does the text have?

(The following rubric has been used to guide the critical discourse analysis of extracts from the Grade 10 Life Orientation textbooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What experiential values do words have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How ideological meanings are coded through vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Classification Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lexicalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (denotation and connotation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Over-wording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Overlexicalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rewording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (Relexicalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Synonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Antonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hyponymy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Question 2** |
| What relational values do words have? |
| Social relations of meaning. |
| - Euphemism |
| - Register (level of formality) |

| **Question 3** |
| What expressive values do words have? |
| Writer’s evaluation and attitude expressed through vocabulary. |
### Question 4
What metaphors are used?
Transfer of word or expression from one domain to another.

### B. Grammar

### Question 5
What experiential values do grammatical features have?
What type of process and participant predominate?
Spatial, temporal and manner of occurrence.

- **Process type**
  - Action
  - Event or
  - Attribution

- **Participant type**

- **Agency**

- **Active voice**

- **Passive voice**

- **Nominalization**

- **Positive sentences**

- **Negative sentences**

### Question 6
What relational values do grammatical features have?

- **Modes**
  - Declarative
  - Grammatical question
  - Imperative
  - Relational modality
  - Expressive modality

- **Pronouns**

- **Articles**

### Question 7
What expressive values do grammatical features have?

- **Modal auxiliaries**

- **Modal verbs**

- **Modal adverbs**

### Question 8
How are simple sentences linked together?

- **Logical connectors**
  - Coordinating conjunctions
  - Subordinating conjunctions
  - Correlative conjunctions
  - Additive conjunctions
  - Causal conjunctions
  - Adversative conjunctions
  - Temporal conjunctions
C. Textual Features

**Question 9**
What interactional conventions are used?
- Controls of turns
- Direct Speech
- Indirect speech

**Question 10**
What large-scale structures does a text have?
- Aspects of genre
- Contextual concerns
- Members’ resources
- Presuppositions

This multiple approach is intended to overcome the limitations of earlier textbook studies that have tended to focus merely on content and thematic coverage. While these approaches are helpful in attesting to the (in)visibility of LGBT identities in texts and the incidence of heteronormativity, they provide little insight into how sexualities are linguistically constructed and transmitted. It is hoped that critical discourse analysis, framed by queer theory, can help to illuminate how sexualities are discursively produced and communicated.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

This research has deployed a multiple-method approach, combining quantitative analysis of content coverage and thematic content with a qualitative document analysis informed by queer theory and based on Norman Fairclough's model of critical discourse analysis.

Since the CAPS curriculum at the FET level is being phased in from Grade 10, this study will focus particularly on the Grade 10 Life Orientation Curriculum. CAPS is presented as a refinement of the National Curriculum Statement to ‘streamline and clarify policies... (provide) definitive support for all teachers and help address the complexities and confusion created by curriculum and assessment policy vagueness and lack of specification, document proliferation and misinterpretation’ (CAPS training Manual for Grade 10: 1). With the phasing out of learning outcomes and assessment standards the four basic learning outcomes, namely: ‘Personal Well-Being’, ‘Citizenship Education’, ‘Recreation and Physical Well-Being’ and ‘Career and Career Choice’ have been replaced by six broad topics:

- Development of the self in society
- Social and environmental responsibility
- Democracy and human rights
- Careers and career choices
- Study skills
- Physical Education

This research will centre on three of the six topics covered in Life Orientation, namely:

- Development of the self in society
- Social and environmental responsibility
- Democracy and human rights

The reason for choosing these three topics is that while normative sexuality and sexual orientation is frequently implicitly assumed, it is in the treatment of these topics that textbook authors and educators explicitly address issues of sexuality. It is also necessary to narrow the focus in order to permit for effective critical discourse analysis which requires an intense scrutiny of the functioning and effect of language. In addition, because of the restricted scope of his research project, the researcher has limited the study to three topics in the Grade 10 Life Orientation curriculum.
TEXTBOOK SELECTION

The focus will be on three of the recently released CAPS-approved Grade 10 textbooks. As the new CAPS compliant textbooks have only become available for distribution in the last two months (since November 2011) sales figures could not be used as a criterion in textbook selection. Furthermore, it would appear that publishers are generally reluctant to release their sales figures publically (Macgillivray & Jennings, 2008: 176). A number of surveys, however, have been undertaken to establish the general market share of the major educational publishers in South Africa. The SA Publishing website, has established that ‘95% of the market spend each year is shared between just 10 publishers’ (http://sapublishing.cet.uct.ac.za, accessed 10/12/2011). Among the top publishers are Maskew Miller Longman, publishers of Focus Life Orientation, who according to a 2007 report commissioned by the Department of Arts and Culture, entitled Factors influencing the cost of books in South Africa, hold a market share of between 34% and 50% in the educational sector (South Africa Book Development Council, 2007: 17). Oxford University Press, publishers of Successful Life Orientation, is listed among the top five educational publishers with an annual turnover of R 28 million in 2006 (South Africa Book Development Council, 2007: 17). Finally, Shuter & Shooters, publishers of Shuters Top Class Life Orientation, has approximately 8% of the market share (South Africa Book Development Council, 2007: 17). It is therefore evident that these publishers produce some of the most widely prescribed Life Orientation texts. Furthermore, informal discussions with Life Orientation teachers reveal that these texts are very popular. It is for this reason that these books will be studied. For ethical reason, these texts will not be referred to by title, author or publisher in the analysis which follows, but will rather be referenced as Textbooks A, B and C (in no particular order).

PROCESS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Each of the methods used in this research can be viewed as steps in a wider process of investigation. At the outset content and thematic analysis reveals the presence/absence and visibility/invisibility of sexual identities and sheds light on the contexts in which these sexualities are mentioned. For definitional clarity, the following meanings have been employed for the categories of sexual identity8. By lesbian and gay experience and identities the researcher means any references which are made to same-sex attraction and sexual behaviour or people who identify as being gay or lesbian.

---

8 This categorization is used for the purposes of simplification and is not intended to imply that sexual identities are rigid and clear-cut. As early as 1948 Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin, for example proposed that sexuality and sexual identities exist on a continuum from exclusively same-sex attraction to exclusively opposite-sex attraction (Worthington et al, 2002:498).
on the basis of their sexual orientation. Bisexual references would refer to any acknowledgement that humans can be attracted to members both of the same sex as well as the opposite sex, to people who engage in sex with members of the same sex as well as members of the opposite sex or who base their sexual identity upon a bisexual orientation. Although transgender identities are not specifically related to sexuality, denoting a disparity between biological sex and conventional gender identity, transgender identities do confront traditional sexual binary constructions and are viewed by activist such as Butler as important in challenging and subverting traditional patriarchal authority (Butler, 1999: xi). No references were found in any of the texts to polysexuality or pansexuality (sexual attraction regardless of gender, which may include attraction to people who identify as transsexual or intersexual) and for this reason these categories of sexual attraction have not been included in the study.

During first stage of this study every sentences that makes reference to heterosexual practices or identities was highlighted using an orange marker and sentences making references to LGBT identities were highlighted in blue as can be observed in the following extract A below (Textbook A: 105):
The number of sentences in each category were then counted and worked to a percentage of the total text to provide a broad audit of the incidence of heterosexual and LGBT identities. Heterosexual references were subsequently classified into explicit and implicit references. In the above extract, for example, ‘brainstorm ideas about things that you think … attract the opposite sex to you’ would be categorised as a sentence which makes an explicit heterosexual reference since it plainly suggest opposite-sex attraction or sexual activity between members of the opposite sex. By implicit heterosexual references is meant any references that that assume an identity or lifestyle that is predicated upon a heterosexual orientation, for example, according to a case study in Textbook A one figure, used as an exemplar of traditional patriarchal masculinity, states ‘The Bible says that man is the head of the home’ (Textbook A: 12). While the textbook contests the masculinist assumptions in this assertion, it does not question the supposition that a family is
comprised of a mother and father. Thus the notion of the family as a heterosexual institution goes unchallenged.

Thereafter, a thematic analysis, guided by previous gay and lesbian and queer textbook studies as well as psychobiosocial theory was undertaken, in which each reference was categorised under broad thematic headings.

Pictures and illustrations also communicate meaning regarding sexuality and were examined in the investigation of content coverage and thematic analysis. Of particular interest is the interaction between text and visual. For example while the authors use apparently impartial language such as the gender neutral pronoun ‘someone’ in ‘relationship with someone’ (extract B below) and the non-gender specific term ‘partner’ (extract C below) and marriage and parenthood can be viewed as institutional practices in which LGBT people can also participate, the adjacent pictures clearly transmit heteronormative versions of marriage and parenthood which reinforce the normative values implicit in the phrase ‘husband or wife’ used in extract B. Thus the illustrations do not merely reinforce the authors’ meaning but may also modify it. For this reason it is important to examine the interaction between visuals and the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract B</th>
<th>Extract C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="textbook_a_95.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="textbook_a_95.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extract B (Textbook A: 95)</td>
<td>Extract C (Textbook A: 95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, using the critical discourse analysis guided by queer theory, the texts were analysed to explore how sexualities are linguistically constructed. The rubric that appears in chapter three was used as template, and every textual reference was analysed using Fairclough’s ten question approach. The following extract from extract B serves as an example of the approach used.

During this stage you are likely to have a permanent relationship with someone, be married and a parent.... You have many roles at this stage – husband or wife, provider and also son or daughter to your parents and a role at work (Textbook A: 95).

A. Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What experiential values do words have?</td>
<td>How ideological meanings are coded through vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Classification Schemes**
  - Classification schemes reflect the ideological representation of reality – appears to suggest that there is a natural progression towards ‘permanent relationship(s)’ (construed as marriage) – with a binary opposition between male and female, suggesting that each sex pursues a unique developmental path.

- **Lexicalisation**
  - (denotation and connotation)
  - The word ‘stage’ has connotations of a ‘natural’ and inevitable developmental process. ‘Likely’ conveys a normative assumption – that most people will follow this progression. ‘Someone’ is gender neutral and therefore inclusive but this is undermined by subsequent gender-specific terms ‘husband or wife’ which curtails the inclusivity.

- **Over-wording**
  - (Overlexicalization)
  - ‘Permanent relationship’ → ‘be married’ → ‘husband or wife’

- **Rewording**
  - (Relexicalization)
  - ‘Permanent relationship’ serves as evidence of deliberate attempt by authors to be inclusive – rather than using the heteronormative ‘married’.

- **Collocation**
  - Coherence established by repeated use of the pronoun ‘you’ and noun ‘stage’ which indicates continuity of agent and subject.

- **Synonymy**
  - Repetition: ‘stage’ and ‘role’.

- **Antonymy**
  - Husband/wife and son/daughter – establish binary constructions/dichotomies which suggest that men
and women follow inherently/’naturally’ different developmental paths based on sex.

- **Hyponymy**
  The authors appear to use the term ‘permanent relationship’ as an organizing concept with ‘be married’ and ‘husband or wife’ as elaborations – therefore it appears that the apparently neutral ‘permanent relationship’ is in fact construed as a male-female marriage arrangement. Also ‘roles’ serves an organizing concept superordinate/hypernym with husband/wife and son/daughter as subordinate concepts or hyponyms.

**Question 2**
What relational values do words have?
Social relations of meaning.

- **Euphemism**
  ‘Permanent relationship’ may serve as a form of inclusive political correctness – discretion by writer.

- **Register (level of formality)**
  Colloquial style created by use of pronoun ‘you’ and simple diction – establish rapport with reader.

**Question 3**
What expressive values do words have?
Writer’s evaluation and attitude expressed through vocabulary.

Diction conveys a sense of normative judgment – the subject (‘you’) has obligations to family – to be a satisfactory ‘provider’, a dutiful son/daughter, husband/wife and employer – fulfilling a socially prescribed role.

**Question 4**
What metaphors are used?
Transfer of word or expression from one domain to another.

**B. Grammar**

**Question 5**
What experiential values do grammatical features have?
What type of process and participant predominate?
Spatial, temporal and manner of occurrence.

- **Process type**
  - Action
  - Event or
  - Attribution
  Primarily possessive attribution – Subject+verb+Complement
  You+have+permanent relationship
  Person is ‘likely’ to embody the attributes of: being married, a parent and an employee – perceived to be natural, inevitable and normative.

- **Participant type**
  The participant ‘you’ is an agent rather than a patient.
  In broader context the reader is passive recipient/participant.

- **Agency**
  Although ‘you’ occupies subject position, it appears
that the agent is not invested with qualities of self-determinacy: since process is primarily of attribution – no indication of action undertaken by the agent – reinforces the perception of this state as being ‘natural’, ‘normal’, ‘inherent’ and ‘inevitable’.

- **Active voice**
  
  Active voice places the subject ‘you’ in role of active agent – however, as above, process of attribution seems to deny active role by the agent.

- **Passive voice**
  

- **Nominalization**

- **Positive sentences**
  
  Sentence is stated in the positive – suggests strong affirmation of ideological content of sentence – author addresses topic with authority and does not question the broader normative assumptions, permit discursive challenge or show ideological content that would invite divergence of thought.

- **Negative sentences**

**Question 6**

What relational values do grammatical features have?

- **Modes**
  
  - **Declarative**
    
    Sentences are in the declarative mode which transmits a sense of authority – the author invested with transcendent knowledge/insight.
  
  - **Grammatical question**
  
  - **Imperative**
  
  - **Relational modality**
    
    Authors’ authority established through assertions e.g. ‘you have’ = blunt assertion, partially mitigated by ‘likely’ – which may be a form of hedging.
  
  - **Expressive modality**
    
    The authors’ authority in relation to the truth: authors’ representation asserted as singular truth – does not permit for variation, indicated by modal verbs ‘have’.

- **Pronouns**
  
  Repeated reference to ‘you’ – direct address to the reader – reductionist – author makes assumptions about the readership (you = a generic pronoun that reduces a diversity of readers to a singular concept) – also betrays the authors’ ideological perspective.

- **Articles**
  
  Repeated use of the indefinite article ‘a’ e.g. ‘a permanent relationship’, ‘a parent’ and ‘a role’: author appears to allow for diversity of different forms of relationships, parenting and roles – but
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>What expressive values do grammatical features have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Modal auxiliaries</td>
<td>Modal auxiliaries ‘be’ implies attribution – these are intrinsic, inherent characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modal verbs</td>
<td>‘Have’ shows categorical assertion regarding authors’ perception of ‘normal’ life experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modal adverbs</td>
<td>‘Likely’ used as a form of mitigation or hedging – but has limited impact given the broader assumptions made in the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>How are simple sentences linked together?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Logical connectors</td>
<td>'During’ – temporal conjunction – used to reinforce the implicit notion that there is a ‘natural’ progressive development towards opposite-sex attraction and heterosexual union with the attendant familial and working responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sequencing of information</td>
<td>Sense of sequential development: (permanent relationship) married → provider → family responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Textual Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9</th>
<th>What interactional conventions are used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Controls of turns</td>
<td>Text does not invite interaction or discussion – essentially a monologue with the author established as the more knowledgeable authority and reader as recipient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct Speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indirect speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10</th>
<th>What large-scale structures does a text have?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Aspects of genre</td>
<td>Textbook – perceived to be authoritative – a vehicle for the transmission of generally accepted knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contextual concerns</td>
<td>Learners/readers are positioned as recipients of discourse – passive participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Finally, to conclude this chapter on methodology some discussion of validity is required. Although a document study, engaging in thematic and critical discourse analysis is not an exact science; measures have been taken to avoid subjectivity.

Firstly, despite the limited scope of this research project, every effort has been made to select a representative sample of Grade 10 Life Orientation textbooks.

The first part of this study is quantitative in nature, with a simple enumeration of sentences relating to sexuality and heteronormativity. Meticulous attention has been given to accurate counting with sentences totals having been recorded for every page.

In order to minimise subjectivity in the critical discourse analysis of texts, attention has been paid to specific language features and their functions. As far as possible extracts that are analysed have been reproduced in their entirety and the researcher has sought to provide contextual information in order to convey a sense of where these extracts are located in the text. This linguistic approach is based on conventional and widely accepted practices of language study. A structured rubric for the critical discourse analysis has also been drawn up to ensure rigorous application of generally recognised CDA methods.

In conclusion, it is intended that, by means of a multiple method approach of content, thematic and critical discourse analysis, the findings of this research will be both rigorous and accurate.
The aim of the content analysis of the three selected Life Orientation textbooks is to establish the frequency of references to LGBT experiences and identities in relation to the references to heterosexual experiences and identities. From this comparison one can begin to establish the level of visibility given to LGBT people in the texts as opposed to that accorded heterosexuals and move towards establishing the degree of heteronormativity within the text.

**TEXTBOOK A**

A broad content analysis of Textbook A reveals a high prevalence of heterosexual references and a virtual silence on issues related to LGBT identity and experience as can be observed in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of sentences</th>
<th>Total number of sentences with LGBTQ content</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to LGBTQ content</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to lesbian experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to lesbian experience</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to gay experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to gay experience</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to bisexual experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to bisexual experience</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to transgender experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to transgender experience</th>
<th>Total number of explicit heterosexual references</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook heterosexual references</th>
<th>Total number of illustrations related to heterosexual content</th>
<th>% of illustrations related to heterosexual content</th>
<th>Total number of illustrations</th>
<th>% of illustrations related to illustrations</th>
<th>Total number of illustrations</th>
<th>% of illustrations related to illustrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook A</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of self in society</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>10.46%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental responsibility</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy and human rights</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13.04%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall references made to LGBT identities in Textbook A amount to 1.03% of the units dealing with the topics ‘Development of self in society’, ‘Social and environmental responsibility’ and ‘Democracy and human rights’. This is in distinct contrast to the representations of heterosexual experience which amount to 21.11% of the text, with 14.7% being explicit mentions and 6.41% of the references being implicit. Most content related to heterosexuality occurs in the treatment of the topic ‘Development of self in society’, with passing mentions being made to heterosexual identity and experience in the other two themes. Illustrations that accompany the text deal more extensively with sexual identity or experience. 35% of all illustrations suggest heterosexual themes while 2.41% deal with gay experience. These figures clearly illustrate the preponderance of discussions related to heterosexual identities and experience over those related to LGBT references. In order, however, to establish the thematic context it is necessary to explore the context in which these references are located. The following table indicates the number of sentences related to heterosexual and LGBT identity in various common Life Orientation topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook A</th>
<th>Thematic Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heterosexual references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual practices and safe-Sex</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease and pathology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional disorder</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship &amp; human rights</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles/norms</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing life roles &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Textbook A sexuality and sexual identity are dealt with largely in terms of family, gender roles, gender stereotyping and gender inequality, sexual abuse, life roles and responsibilities, social
changes that accompany adolescence and early adulthood, coping with change, and responsible decisions about sexuality. Almost every topic in Textbook A appears to be imbued with a presumption of the normality of heterosexuality.

Numerous implicit references to heterosexuality occur in representations of the family where, despite the attempts to broaden the definition of the family, visual representations and the text continue to perpetuate a normative heterosexual version in which a mother and father play a role. Thus despite the authors’ encouragement to learners to reflect on how ‘traditional gender power roles are still perpetuated’ in many families (Textbook A: 13), most portrayals of family depict nuclear heterosexual relationships. There are no examples of same-sex couples/parents or any other structures which deviate from the nuclear family model such as child-headed households or polygamous family structures.

Dating is also depicted as a heterosexual social practice with the textbook making explicit references to opposite sex attraction (such as the assertion that ‘You may start to break away from (mixed gender) groups and begin going out in couples’, Textbook A: 102), whereas same-sex attraction is never mentioned.

Explicit heterosexuality is most common in the treatment of sexual practices and safe sex. While it is obvious that the issues of pregnancy and contraception will deal primarily with heterosexual experience it also dominates the section on responsible decision-making regarding sexuality. The highest number of references to heterosexuality is made in the context of safe sex while no mention is made of LGBT sexual practices. This serves to create the impression that sex between members of the opposite sex is the only natural or normal mode of sexual expression. It also leaves LGBT people at risk, since they are excluded from instruction on safe-sex practices.

In addition, discussions of life roles and responsibilities and gender norms are dominated by normative heterosexual messages. The learners are, for example, told that in the 19-25 years period of their lives they can anticipate the ‘big responsibility of marriage and parenthood.’ The text is accompanied by a picture which evidently expresses the idea that marriage and parenthood are experiences shared by a heterosexual married couple (Textbook A: 95).

References to heterosexuality and heterosexual identity appear to permeate most themes in Textbook A, with exception of Democracy and Human Rights. Presumably the reason for the lack of
reference to homosexuality under the rubric human rights is that its status and claim to equal value and social recognition is not in dispute or in any way challenged or questioned. Since, to all intents and purposes, heterosexuality is the hegemonic mode of sexuality and identification it is not necessary to have to defend its right to exist. The coverage of heterosexuality could generally be described as affirmative and encouraging. The only context in which heterosexual desire is perceived as potentially detrimental is in the treatment of sexual coercion and rape which covers approximately 3.85% of the textbook.

On the other hand, Text A makes no reference to bisexual or transgender experience or identities. Of the 19 sentences which relate to lesbian and gay experience in this text all but one of the sentences place same-sex activity in an unfavourable context. The only neutral reference to same-sex attraction is made in the context of sexuality. Under the heading ‘what is sexuality?’ the authors include among six bulleted points the following mention:

Whether we are attracted to people of the opposite or the same sex (Textbook A: 105).

The authors, however, having established that same-sex attraction is a possibility, proceed to instruct the learners, working in groups, to discuss the following questions related to opposite-sex attraction, under the heading ‘Discuss your ideas about sexuality’:

1  ... brainstorm ideas about the things that you think:
   a)  attract the opposite sex to you
   b)  the opposite sex does not like about your gender
   c)  the opposite sex finds attractive in you.
2  Brainstorm ideas about things that your group:
   a)  finds most attractive in the opposite sex
   b)  dislikes about the opposite sex... (Textbook A: 105)

There is no elaboration on the possibility that people can be attracted to the same sex and other elements of contextual framing of this statement further minimize the significance of this assertion.

The text is accompanied by two illustrations that appear to depict sexuality and dating as exclusively heterosexual activities. Adjoining the heading ‘What is sexuality?’ is a picture of a teenage boy and girl walking hand-in-hand. On the adjacent page is a series of illustrations on the theme of dating which depict it entirely in terms of heterosexual experience with speech bubbles that read:

- (Young man replacing telephone receiver): ‘I can’t believe she said “Yes”! She even said she had hoped I would phone her.’
- (Two teenage boys speaking,) ‘Gloria’s fine. She certainly looks good. But I’m waiting for something better to come my way!’
• (Two young women in discussion.) ‘I know you think he’s great but you’ll just have to wait and see if he phones you’ (Textbook A: 104).

Thus the possibility of same-sex attraction, while it is affirmed in the definition of sexuality, appears at best to be evaded and at worst entirely negated by the related illustrations and group activities.

The other references to same-sex attraction are located in contexts associated with violence, sexual assault and abuse. Lesbianism is mentioned only in the context of gender-based violence where it is offered as one reason for sexual abuse inflicted on women by men:

So-called ‘corrective rape’ where lesbians are raped in the mistaken belief that it will change their sexual orientation (Textbook A: 18).

The references to homosexuality are also located largely in the context of abuse and violation, but in these instances it would appear that it is men, who experience same-sex attraction, that are the offenders. Under the heading ‘sexual abuse’ in the first unit of the text the authors give two examples of boys who have been sexually assaulted by older males (Textbook A: 17). Later in the text, under the heading ‘sexual abuse and rape’ the authors provide a case study of Pete who was molested by a male teacher. In this instance there is an explicit description of a homosexual act (Textbook A: 112). Five pages later, under the heading ‘Too frightened to talk’ there is a further illustration of four figures, two of whom would appear to be boys, relating their experiences of abuse and intimidation by older men (Textbook A: 117). Therefore, virtually all references to homosexual acts in this text are placed in harmful contexts of sexual violation, intimidation and abuse.

Although 2% of illustrations are linked with same-sex activity, these illustrations also locate homosexual acts in the context of abuse. In two of the three illustrations the teenage boys depicted are relating their experience of sexual abuse by older men while the third illustration, a depiction of camping scene with a group of boys sitting around a fire and an older man standing in the background, is linked to the case study regarding a male teacher’s molestation of boys.

A distinct omission in Text A is any reference to LGBT identities within the treatment of the topic of human rights. While the textbook frequently calls for tolerance of diversity, sexual orientation is repeatedly excluded from the definition or ambit of diversity. For example, in the introductory paragraph to Unit 5, headed ‘Democracy and Human Rights’, the authors invoke a very limited conception of diversity:
South Africa is a diverse country, with people from many different cultures. Each culture has traditions handed down from one generation to the next (Textbook A: 38). When they address discrimination the writers also exclude prejudice based on sexual orientation from the definition, despite providing a relatively broad and multi-dimensional definition:

Discrimination is treating groups of people as if they have less worth or dignity than others because of their race, religion, gender, age, health or economic status (Textbook A: 41).

This omission is also evident in Unit 1, ‘Development of Self in Society’, when the authors address this issue of acknowledging and respecting ‘the uniqueness of self and others and respect for difference’. The authors, in affirming the value of pluralism, provide an example of a group of learners working together and discovering the benefits of being members of a diverse group:

They realised that it was good to have a group where there was a mixture of gender, race, religion and ability, because they could all benefit from different ideas and they could help each other (Textbook A: 11).

The authors therefore create a vision of social inclusion and harmony which embraces a diversity of different people with the exception of LGNT people. Nowhere in the text is sexual orientation mentioned as an example of diversity.

In a follow up activity learners are asked to identify abuses of human rights as well as respect for human rights from a list of examples of either harmful or constructive behaviours. Despite a catalogue of 10 different kinds of affirmative or discriminatory actions, no single example deals either with tolerance of or discrimination based on sexual orientation. Five pages later the learners are required to carry out a similar activity, with the instruction to ‘spot gaps in human rights culture’ (Textbook A: 43). Yet again, out of the variety of different forms of discrimination, no mention is made of homophobia or prejudice towards LGBT people. The only mention of sexual orientation in the entire chapter is a direct quote from the Bill of Rights, where it is listed among the various grounds on which discrimination is not permissible.

**TEXTBOOK B**

By contrast, in Textbook B the only references made to lesbian and gay identity are in the context of human rights and democracy, as can be observed in the following table:
|                            | Total number of sentences | Total number of sentences dedicated to LGBT content | Estimated % of textbook dedicated to LGBT content | Total number of sentences dedicated to Lesbian experience | Estimated % of textbook dedicated to Lesbian experience | Total number of sentences dedicated to Gay experience | Estimated % of textbook dedicated to Gay experience | Total number of sentences dedicated to Bisexual experience | Estimated % of textbook dedicated to Bisexual experience | Total number of sentences dedicated to Transgender experience | Estimated % of textbook dedicated to Transgender experience | Total number of explicit heterosexual references | Estimated % of implicit heterosexual references | Total number of illustrations related to heterosexual content | Percentage of illustrations related to heterosexual content | Total number of illustrations related to LGBT-related content | Percentage of illustrations related to LGBT-related content |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Textbook B                | 2559                      | 3                                             | 0.12%                                         | 2                                                | 0.08%                                           | 0                                                | 0.12%                                           | 0                                                | 0.12%                                           | 0                                                | 0.12%                                           | 168                                              | 6.55%                                           | 50                                              | 2%                                              | 103                                              | 7.7%                                           | 0                                               | 0%                                              |
| Development of self in    | 1161                      | 0                                             | 0%                                            | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 166                                              | 14.3%                                           | 39                                              | 3.6%                                           | 39                                              | 15.4%                                           | 0                                               | 0%                                              |
| Social and environmental  | 531                       | 0                                             | 0%                                            | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 4                                                | 0.75%                                           | 27                                              | 0%                                              | 27                                              | 0%                                              | 0                                               | 0%                                              |
| Democracy and human       | 867                       | 3                                             | 0.23%                                         | 3                                                | 0.35%                                           | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 0                                                | 0%                                              | 2                                                | 0.23%                                           | 7                                                | 0.8%                                           | 37                                              | 5.4%                                           | 0                                               | 0%                                              |
| rights                    |                           |                                               |                                               |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |                                                  |
Text B is considerably longer than Text A but includes even fewer references to LGBT identity or experience. Of the three sentences, representing 0.12% of the content dealing with the themes that have been selected, mention is only made of same-sex attraction in the context of human rights. The text, however, makes fewer heteronormative assumptions and although heterosexual presuppositions pervade the treatment of most themes the writers have sought to mitigate these by using gender neutral language. Despite this apparent discretion on the part of the authors, 8.55% of the sections of the text that have been studied feature references to heterosexuality across a variety of topics. This comprises 6% explicit references and 2.55% implicit references. The following table provides a more detailed summary of the distribution of LGBT and heterosexual references:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook B</th>
<th>Thematic Analysis</th>
<th>Heterosexual references</th>
<th>% Heterosexual references</th>
<th>Homosexual references</th>
<th>% Homosexual references</th>
<th>Lesbian references</th>
<th>% Lesbian references</th>
<th>Bisexual references</th>
<th>% Bisexual references</th>
<th>Transgender references</th>
<th>% Transgender references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual practices and safe-sex 158</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating 81</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage 39</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family 44</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease and pathology 12</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional disorder 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse 40</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship &amp; human rights 7</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture 19</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles/norms 43</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing life roles &amp; responsibilities 12</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like Text A, this text also excludes references to LGBT identities in the discussion of diversity. It also fails to include sexual orientation in the discussion of the equality clause contained in the Bill of Rights although it does note, in an explanation of freedom of religion, belief and opinion that ‘same-sex couples are allowed to marry’. This is an atypical context in which to mention same-sex marriage. The final ratification of the Constitution in 1996 pre-dates the passing of the Civil Union Act, which gave legal recognition to same-sex unions, by a whole decade. Nowhere in the
constitution is same-sex marriage mentioned. Furthermore, the legal recognition of same-sex marriages was not based on the principle of freedom of belief and opinion, but on the basis of the equality clause which asserts that one cannot discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation (not mentioned in this textbook). By locating same-sex marriage in the context of ‘belief and opinion’ the text would seem to suggest that it is a matter of personal conviction and attitude rather than a matter of fundamental equality.

Sexual orientation is also referred to in the context of discrimination based on sexual orientation; a definition of homophobia is provided and the criminalization of homosexuals in Malawi and Uganda is cited as an example:

Gay men are jailed just because they are gay, for example in Malawi and Uganda
(Textbook B: 74).

While it is a significant that the authors mention homophobia this example might create two misconceptions: firstly that homophobia is a form of institutional legal discrimination, rather than a general social phenomenon and secondly that homophobia is something that happens elsewhere, in other countries and not in our society. The learners are not encouraged to reflect on their own behaviour in terms of discrimination against LGBT people and serious social issues that exist in South Africa such as the corrective rape of lesbians go unmentioned. Learner activities in this unit have no bearing on homophobia. Learners are required to apply the Bill of Rights to a number of case studies and discuss discrimination in a variety of situations, none of which include any reference to same-sex relationships. Therefore, the three sentences that touch on LGBT experience are merely passing mentions.

Issues of family, gender power relations, sexuality, life roles and responsibilities, changes from adolescence to adulthood and lifestyle choices are all treated as heterosexual concerns. Statements such as the following imply that families are essentially heterosexual institutions that comprise a man and woman:

Just because it is the woman who gives birth does not mean that the man has no parental duties. It is best to use common sense and to discuss and agree together about the duties for women and men (Textbook B: 19).

And

Women have to do more housework than men (Textbook B: 20).
In terms of sexuality, Textbook B clearly depicts sex as a heterosexual phenomenon with assertions such as:

As you grow towards adulthood, you also start to think and feel differently. Adolescents become very interested in the opposite sex (Textbook B: 171).

And

Abstinence means choosing not to have sexual intercourse. It means not doing anything that allows the male’s sperm in or near the opening of the female’s vagina or anus (Textbook B: 190).

Descriptions of changing life roles and responsibilities include stereotypical heterosexual assumptions depicting opposite-sex attraction and dating as the ‘natural’ progression that teenagers follow:

Older adolescents make friends with the opposite sex, start having romantic relationships and start dating (Textbook B: 172).

Normative heterosexual assumptions are also made in dealing with the issues such as problem solving, critical thinking and goal-setting. In each of these instances, the authors use scenarios which deal with adolescents having to make sexual choices, such as Lisa who has to decide whether she will have sex with Zola:

I am so worried... Zola says he will dump me if I don’t have sex with him this weekend... (Textbook B: 184).

Thus a heterosexual premise appears to underlie many of the issues raised under the rubric of self-development, even those which are not intrinsically sexual in nature.

TEXTBOOK C

By contrast, Textbook C has the highest representation of gay identities and experience and also appears to be the least heteronormative in that it has the lowest frequency of explicitly and implicitly heterosexualizing references, as can be observed in the following table:
Table 7: Content Coverage Analysis Table (Textbook C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text C</th>
<th>Total number of sentences</th>
<th>Total number of sentences with LGBT content</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to LGBT content</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to lesbian experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to lesbian experience</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to gay experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to gay experience</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to bisexual experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to bisexual experience</th>
<th>Total number of sentences dedicated to transgender experience</th>
<th>Estimated % of textbook dedicated to transgender experience</th>
<th>Total number of explicit heterosexual references</th>
<th>Total number of implicit heterosexual references</th>
<th>Total number of illustrations related to heterosexual content</th>
<th>% of illustrations related to heterosexual content</th>
<th>Total number of illustrations related to LGBT-related content</th>
<th>% of illustrations related to LGBT-related content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text C</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of self in society</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and environmental responsibility</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy and human rights</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This textbook makes no reference to lesbian or bisexual identities but 3.57% of the text relates to homosexuality. The references to homosexuality appear largely in the section related to the topic democracy and human rights while mention is also made in ‘Development of self in society’. 10.44% of the text refers to heterosexual experience and identity, with 3.91% of the references being explicit and 6.5% being implicit. Again the greatest number of allusions to normative heterosexuality is made in the section dealing with ‘Development of self in society’. The following table provides a more detailed examination of the distribution of LGBT and heterosexual references:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook C Thematic Analysis</th>
<th>Heterosexual references</th>
<th>Homosexual references</th>
<th>Lesbian references</th>
<th>Bisexual references</th>
<th>Transgender references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual practices and safe-sex</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease and pathology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship &amp; human rights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender roles/norms</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing life roles &amp;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total number of references to LGBT identity in Textbook C, homosexuality is treated primarily as a matter of tolerance and a civil liberties issue. Learners are required to discuss the discriminatory statement ‘Gay teachers are a threat to our children’ and explore the fears which might underpin such a viewpoint. Accompanying this activity is a picture of protestors opposing the passing of the Civil Union Act. The text on the posters reads: ‘Homosexual marriage is an act of terrorism’ and ‘Protect traditional marriage’. Below this picture is a detailed account of a gay teenager’s experience of homophobia. The narrative, written from a mother’s point of view, describes her son’s awareness of his homosexuality, the emotional anguish which he suffered, his first suicide attempt, his
mother’s initial anger and denial, his social ostracisation and subsequent bullying and homophobic assault and finally his death by suicide. The questions that accompany this text require the learners to reflect on their own attitudes towards homosexuals, general social stereotypes regarding homosexuals, how gay people are treated at their schools and in their communities and whether gay people should be entitled to marry and have children. Additional information, contained in a textbox entitled ‘Note Pad’ provides a short psychosocial developmental view of homosexuality. Finally, this activity concludes with a discussion of AIDS and the stigmatisation that HIV positive people experience. Thus there is an intersection of a number of critical criteria in this activity, with homosexuality being linked not only to human rights concerns but also abuse, emotional disorder and pathology. While the authors have sought to be inclusive in their approach to homosexuality, it is dealt with primarily as a human rights issue – rather than a subject in personal development or sexuality. Thus homosexuals are not viewed as subjects in their own rights but rather as people in need of tolerance and understanding. In the narrative, homosexuality is directly related to abuse, victimization and gay abjection since Daniel, the protagonist, is tormented by his peers and physically assaulted by older boys. Furthermore, the issue of gay identity is directly linked to issues of emotional and psychological distress since the protagonist of the story attempts suicide, even before he has come out to his mother or begun to experience social discrimination. In addition, by linking the activities on which this narrative is based with the stigmatisation that HIV positive people experience the authors might inadvertently be perpetuating the stereotypical notion of HIV/AIDS as a gay disease. Thus gay identity is implicitly linked with disease and pathology.

An obvious omission in the unit dealing with democracy and human rights is the failure to mention sexual orientation as a feature of diversity. The authors define diversity as ‘people who are different and varied from each other in terms of race, language, culture, religion and beliefs’ (Textbook C: 23). Furthermore, Textbook C states, ‘Our country aims to celebrate diverse cultures, races and religions and prevent discrimination and violation of human rights’ (Textbook C: 23). Discrimination is defined only in terms of race, gender, age and ethnicity. Thus, the appeal which the textbook makes for tolerance in this unit is not founded on a sound constitutional basis. Tolerance of LGBT people appears to be a matter of personal conduct and choice, rather than a fundamental constitutional principle. This is evidenced by the questions ‘Should gay people have the same rights as heterosexual people?’ and ‘Should gay people be allowed to marry and have children?’ (Textbook C: 28) These questions are technically redundant since gay people in South Africa have these rights. This activity in combination with the omission of a comprehensive explanation of the equality clause in the Bill of
Rights and the exclusion of sexual orientation from the definition of diversity, however, creates the impression that these rights are moot and contestable.

The only other references to homosexuality in the Textbook C are made in the context of culture and religion. The textbook states that in a multicultural and multi-faith society topics like homosexuality are matters of controversy. The learners are later instructed to research religions and, among other doctrinal aspects, examine their teachings regarding homosexuality. Thus, while the authors make no cultural or religious judgments regarding homosexuality, they do point out that it is a matter of cultural and religious contention.

Although most of the explicit references to heterosexuality in Textbook C are made in the sections dealing with sexuality and safe sex, the authors have minimised the heterosexual assumptions by referring to sexual acts rather than sexual identities. There are also a number of explicit heterosexual references in the sections dealing with life roles and responsibilities, where gender-stereotypical notions of boyfriends and girlfriends, and husbands and wives are raised and challenged. The authors counter and disrupt stereotypical notions of gender and patriarchal constructions of marriage on a number of occasions, for example:

> Old ideas of masculinity and femininity are now outdated and power should be equally shared between people, regardless of their sex or gender (Textbook C: 11).

A significant challenge in terms of the transmission of LGBT identities in the three Life Orientation textbooks that have been studied is the absence of role models. Since heterosexuality is generally perceived as the norm most figures that appear as role models in the texts are assumed to be heterosexual, unless they are specifically identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered. All three texts feature contemporary and historical figures who have contributed to establishing democracy and a human rights culture in South Africa. The focus is, however, primarily on people who have participated in the anti-apartheid movement and liberation struggle or who are associated with HIV/AIDS activism. There is, however, no mention of activists who have fought for the recognition of same-sex relationships. Even where an openly gay person is mentioned in two of the textbooks, the authors appear to evade this aspect of his identity: Zackie Achmat, who is a vocal advocate for gay and lesbian equality and is openly gay, is identified in Textbook C as a ‘gender activist’ (Textbook C: 32) while in Textbook A his photograph appears above the caption: ‘Zackie Achmat of the Treatment Action Campaign (TAC) and the Coalition to End Discrimination’ (Textbook A: 49). The authors of both texts would appear to have missed an opportunity to present a powerful
and constructive role model of a successful, respected and proud gay person to learners. In addition, other gay activists such Constitutional Court judge Edward Cameron, Linda Ngcobo or Simon Nkoli could also have been mentioned alongside other figures who have contributed to the struggle for human rights in South Africa. This would have had the effect of demonstrating that LGBT people are not only identified as subordinated and marginalised.

It is evident, from the content and thematic analysis that heterosexuality appears to infuse almost every aspect of Life Orientation in the three topics under investigation. Its presence is so pervasive and naturalised that its ideological power to construct a hegemonic heteronormative worldview goes virtually unnoticed. The three textbooks generally exclude any reference to LGBT identities in units dealing with the topics of development of self in society and social and environmental responsibility. By mentioning LGBT identities primarily in the context of human rights, the authors fail to recognize the personal and psychological needs of LGBT learners, or acknowledge or validate their identities in terms of emotional and social development. Their sexuality and sexual health, relationships, family associations, social roles and responsibilities are ignored. The learners are informed that gay and lesbian people exist and have a right to be treated as equal citizens and thereafter their identities are virtually negated. The depiction of heterosexuals is equally problematic as the texts appear to be premised on the assumption that heterosexuality is a singular and uniform phenomenon. The nature of the linguistic construction of sexual identity is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6
DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF SEXUALITIES: A QUEER CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Having established through content and thematic analysis that heterosexual constructions of sexuality predominate and that where gay and lesbian identities are mentioned they are usually placed in the context of victimization, emotional disorder and pathology or represented as a human rights issue; this research will proceed to examine how these discourses, concerning sexuality and sexual identity, are linguistically constructed. The focus will be on the operation of language and how it constructs and transmits ideologically-motivated fabrications of identity. This investigation will deploy Norman Fairclough’s model of critical discourse analysis as a tool for interrogating the functioning of language and will be framed by queer theory. The various analytical dimensions, suggested by queer theory, will be used as subheadings to lend structure to the linguistic analysis.

NORMALIZING JUDGMENTS AND REGIMES OF TRUTH REGARDING THE CONSTRUCTION AND TRANSMISSION OF SEXUAL IDENTITIES

Life Orientation as a subject is clearly intended to socialize learners into a set of normative societal values. This is made explicit in the specific subject aims stated in the CAPS document which, among other objectives, declares that the subject aims to:

(i) Guide and prepare learners to respond appropriately to life’s responsibilities and opportunities;
(ii) Equip learners to interact optimally on a personal, psychological, cognitive, motor, physical, moral, spiritual, cultural and socio-economic level;
(iii) Guide learners to make informed and responsible decisions about their own health and well-being and the health and well-being of others;
(iv) Expose learners to their constitutional rights and responsibilities, to the rights of others and issues of diversity;
(v) Equip learners with knowledge, skills and values... (Life Orientation Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement, 2011: 7)

Embedded in all of these aims is a set of normative values and standards. The infinitive verbs ‘to guide and prepare’ suggest that the subject is pastoral in nature while the infinitive ‘to equip’ clearly states that the subject is aligned with what is perceived to be greater social, cultural and economic
imperatives. The subject also invokes a set of normative values which are implied by the modal adverbs ‘appropriately’ and ‘optimally’, which suggest that performance can be measured against a standard, normative scale with ‘appropriate’ and ‘optimal’ being the highest degree of achievement. Furthermore, the statement of aims invokes the discourse of civic responsibility in a democratic multicultural society. It is therefore, not surprising that the Grade 10 Life Orientation textbooks that have been studied feature frequent normalizing judgments, particularly with regard to the discussion of sexuality and sexual identity.

Construction of Heterosexuality

Textbooks A, B and C, to varying degrees, communicate normalising discourses regarding heterosexual identity. Whereas there are numerous heterosexualities (multiple ways of being heterosexual, many forms of identity that heterosexuals embrace and numerous acts of heterosexual practice) the three Life Orientation texts appear to convey a particular ‘type’ of heterosexuality as the norm. This can be summarised as essentially a monogamous sexual relationship between a man and a woman which takes place ideally within the sanctioned space of marriage. Typical of this depiction of heterosexuality is the following excerpt from Textbook A:

By now you should know that the best method of contraception is to say ‘no’ and to abstain from sex until you are ready for the responsibilities of parenthood (Textbook A: 109).

This extract clearly transmits a normalizing judgment that depicts sex as a fundamentally heterosexual act, with the primary purpose of reproduction, and promotes restraint and abstinence among young adults until they are ready for commitment to a long-term responsible relationship, (which in assumed in all text to take the form of marriage). The adjectival clause ‘by now you should know’ implies that the balance of the sentence which follows conveys information which is common knowledge and requires no further investigation or examination since its import is perceived to be ‘natural’ and self-evident. The use of the pronoun ‘you’ communicates that the authors make certain assumptions about the outlook and nature of the reader, namely that ‘you’ are a heterosexually orientated teenager. It also appears to convey the impression that the meaning contained in the sentence is a shared view that all ‘right-thinking’ people would hold. The modal verb ‘should’ as well as the modifier ‘best’ clearly indicate that a value statement is being made: the modal verb ‘should’ denotes moral obligation or duty whereas the superlative ‘best’ suggests that behaviour is measured on a moral scale with ‘best’ being the highest standard of conduct.

Textbook B also conveys the notion of adolescent sexuality as being an abstinent form of heterosexuality. For example the authors assert:
To make the most of your life, delay sexual intercourse. If you wait before you are sexually active, you will prevent problems such as unwanted teenage pregnancy... (Textbook B: 176)

The imperative mode of the first sentence is heightened by the use of the bold font. The blatant normative judgments in terms of sexual practice are further reinforced by content such as the following table (Textbook B: 183):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good choice, good effects</th>
<th>Bad choice, bad effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay sexual intercourse</td>
<td>Have sexual intercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became a parent when mature enough for</td>
<td>Become a parent while at school and too young for the responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writers set up a clear opposition between ‘good’ and ‘bad’, conveying a dichotomous view of morality through binary moral oppositions. Thus normalising judgments are emphatically expressed.

Part of the heterosexual paradigm constructed in Textbook C is based on a normative view of gender. The authors ask learners to, for example consider the question:

What qualities and deeds deserve respect

(i) in a woman?

(ii) in a man? (Textbook C: 5)

This appears to create an essentialist idea of gender and what constitutes a man and a woman. Men and women are established in binary opposition to one another and it would appear that the authors envisage that certain attributes are of typical men, whereas others would be typical of women. The premise of the question and its phrasing by the use of the interrogative ‘what’ tacitly indicates that there are qualities deserving of respect that are uniquely male or female. Thus learners are not encouraged to question the underlying premise on which this statement is based. In the follow-up activity they are required to interview adults regarding this particular question. Thus an intergenerational transfer of opinions regarding the admirable qualities of a men and women is meant to take place, socializing the learners into a broader gendered value system.

While the authors acknowledge that gender is largely a social construct which is learned rather than biologically determined, the writers offer a very simplistic view of gender:

We either learn to behave as a girl and later as woman; or as a boy and later as a man.

(Textbook C: 9)
This would suggest that there is something quintessentially ‘woman’ or quintessentially ‘man’ and that one identifies with either role. In addition, the authors offer a deterministic point of view which posits that a girl inevitably identifies with the role of a woman, while a boy will inevitably identify with the behaviour and functions of a man. This binary polarity is reinforced by the adjacent textbox which defines gender simplistically: ‘You are either of the masculine or feminine gender’ (Textbook C: 9). This normalising judgment with its distinct categorical classification does not allow for any ambiguity or ambivalence in gender identity.

The normative heterosexual relationships that are depicted in these texts are usually characterised by fairly formulaic gender roles. Despite frequent attempts by the authors to challenge stereotypical gender roles in relationships most of the text and visual illustrations dealing with heterosexual relations appear to transmit the notion of female passivity and male assertion. For example the following dialogue from Textbook A accompanies the text headed ‘Idea for self-development: Communicate’:

   Girl 1: I’m like a scared little mouse. Jake doesn’t even know I exist.
   Girl 2: If you write one of your stunning poems and send it to him, he’ll notice you for sure.

(Textbook A: 8)

Whilst the submission of female desire to male attention is evident, the degree of female subordination can be illustrated by a closer textual analysis. Firstly the metaphorical language used by Girl 1, who likens herself to a mouse, clearly suggests timidity. This is intensified by the synonymy between ‘scared’ and ‘little mouse’ (with its connotations of apprehension and timorousness). Although the sentence is in the declarative mode, the subject of the sentence is not attached to an action through a verb but is rather followed by a complement, in this instance an adjectival phrase, in what Fairclough would describe as a process of attribution. This further reinforces, therefore, the sense of the passivity of the speaker. The second sentence places Jake, the male figure, in the subject position as an active agent, whereas Girl 1 is the object of the sentence. This implies that Girl 1 requires validation from Jake who holds the power to recognize or disregard her existence. The negative construction of the sentence, communicated through the negating ‘doesn’t’, stresses Girl 1’s dependence on the male figure for affirmation. This is also highlighted by the hyperbolic phrase, ‘doesn’t even know I exist’. Girl 2’s advice, rather than challenging the assumption that Girl 1 requires male validation, offers her a possible means to achieve the sought after validation. Her advice commences with the subordinating conjunction ‘if’ which suggests that should she carry out a particular action she will attain the desired recognition. Jake’s attention is therefore conditional on compliance to certain acts of propitiation. The main clause ‘he’ll notice you for sure’ yet again places
the male in the subject position as the actor while the girl is the object of the sentence. The emphatic tag, ‘for sure’, at the end of the sentence contradicts the more tentative subordinating conjunction ‘if’ which implies an underlying uncertainty – that Girl 1 is at the mercy of the fickle desire and attentions of the male. The illustrations further reinforce the message, depicting Girl 1 in a state of emotional distress, her head inclined and eyes downcast. Given the context of this dialogue, it would appear that sending a poem to Jake would constitute a form of ‘self-development’ for Girl 1. The authors may have intended to convey the concept that girls should be more self-assertive and take the initiative in communication but this message appears to be negated by the perception that is transmitted, namely that Girl 1’s self-worth is based on gaining Jake’s recognition.

The above is not a single isolated example. The notion of female passivity and subordination to male desire is reiterated several times in Textbook A. For example, on the adjacent page the authors provide the fictional diary entry of a teenager named Thobeka which the learners are required to discuss in terms of self-esteem and self-confidence:

All the other girls in my class are so pretty and the guys like them. I hate myself... Chris said, ‘Well done and welcome.’ He’s in the choir and he’s quite a cool guy. Of course I acted like a dork and just giggled (Textbook A: 9).

While the authors seek to draw attention to Thokeba’s challenges in terms of self-esteem, they yet again take for granted the importance of male recognition which goes unquestioned both in the fictional diary entry as well as the instructions that follow. ‘All the other girls’, in the subject position of the first sentence, have no real agency since the verb which follows is not one of ‘doing’ but one of ‘being’. Yet again, therefore, females are described in a process of attribution rather than action. Although the two clauses are joined by a co-ordinating conjunction, ‘and’, implying equal standing, the juxtaposition of the two clauses makes it evident that reason for the ‘guys’ liking the ‘girls’ is that they are ‘so pretty’. Therefore the impression is conveyed that girls merely have to be ‘pretty’ in order to achieve male approval. The syntactical apposition of the second sentence with the first makes it evident that Thobeka expresses self-loathing because she believes she is not pretty and, since she is not pretty, the boys do not like her. The female submission is contrasted with the confidence and self-assertion of the male figure, Chris. He is the subject of the third sentence, is the active agent and is quoted in direct speech. The relational value of the author’s lexical choices are also noteworthy: the text is written in an informal register with words such as ‘dork’ and ‘cool’ that are lexically derived from the teenage conversation. The author’s intention would appear to be to communicate in a manner which directly appeals to teenagers and to give a feeling of authenticity to the diary entry. The intended result is that teenagers can identify with Thobeka and relate to her
experience as their own. Finally, according to the instructions that follow the text, the learners are required to suggest ways in which Thobeka can build her confidence. They are, therefore, not encouraged to question the underlying assumptions – that in heterosexual relationships females require the validation of males in order to have self-esteem.

The theme of male assertion and female passivity in heterosexual relationships is also often raised in discussions of sexuality and transgressive sexual behaviour. Textbook A frequently creates the impression of a rampant male sexuality which preys on females. The following extract comes from an illustration which is headed ‘Behaviour that can lead to intercourse’ and is accompanied by an activity in which learners must discuss the consequences of unplanned sex:

Girl 1: I got involved in heavy kissing and petting with my boyfriend. I didn’t want to go further than that. But he thought it meant I wanted to have sex with him.

Girl 2: I thought being alone on a date, just the two of us, was romantic. I didn’t know the guy was going to make moves on me to have sex. I’ll stick to a crowd next time (Textbook A: 107).

The speakers are female and there is no evidence of a male voice in any of the examples presented in this activity. In each instance the males are described as the initiators whose ‘behaviour… can lead to intercourse’. The text is written using the first person pronoun ‘I’, employing a confessional style and accompanied by pictures of girls with anguished expressions. The impression of female subordination to male desire is reinforced by the phrasing of the sentences. In the first sentence, for example, the auxiliary ‘got’, in ‘got involved in heavy kissing and petting’, is used in the sense of becoming. Thus although the speaker occupies the subject position, the sentence appears to mitigate the subject’s responsibility by a subtle evasion which diminishes the subject’s role, since the phrase ‘got involved’ fails to reveal an initiator or agent. The notion of female subjection to male desire is repeated over the following pages with assertions such as:

A male teen may think he has to ‘score’ as much as possible with girls so that he can be popular with his peers. A female teen may feel that she has to go along with whatever a guy wants so that he will remain interested in her (Textbook A: 113).

The antithetical structure of the adjacent sentences clearly asserts a dichotomy between supposed male sexual assertiveness and female submission. This dichotomy is further reinforced by the antithetical verbs: males are associated with intellect (‘think’), females with emotion (‘feeling’), and males associated with action (‘score’) as opposed to female who are associated with submission (‘go along’). Their motives are also contrasted, while males seek social popularity and recognition, girls are said to merely seek male interest and approval (‘so that he will remain interested in her’).
Textbook B also provides several case studies that contain examples of sexual coercion of females by males. For example, in one activity a girl called Lisa, who is illustrated as being in great emotional distress, describes her boyfriend’s insistent demands for sex:

I am so worried... Zola says he will dump me if I don’t have sex with him this weekend... I don’t know what to do... sob... I love him so much... but I don’t want to have sex yet... I am only 16 years old... he says this my last chance... (Textbook B: 184)

Here again a stereotypical construction of female indecision, emotionality and vulnerability is communicated, in opposition to male assertiveness. The authors therefore, while addressing an important issue of sexual exploitation unwittingly appear to reinforce the very gender stereotypes and values on which this exploitation is predicated.

Opposite sex attraction is assumed as normative in all three Life Orientation texts. This is evident in the informational content, questions and activities. For example, in Textbook A learners are required to engage in the following group discussion:

1 ... brainstorm ideas about the things that you think:
   a) attract the opposite sex to you
   b) the opposite sex does not like about your gender
   c) the opposite sex finds attractive in you (Textbook A: 105).

The author adopts a heterosexual essentialist position by establishing a binary polarity between the sexes and assuming that attraction necessarily exists between members of the opposite sex. This is communicated not merely through the content of the sentence but also in the language: the instructions to the task are phrased in the imperative mode. This establishes the author as the authority and the assumptions contained in the sentence as the hegemonic truth.

Courtship and dating are also depicted as exclusively heterosexual practices. This is most pronounced in the sections of the texts related social changes arising during adolescence and early adulthood. The authors of Textbook A state in the section on late adolescence:

At this stage groups tend to be loosely mixed gender groups rather than the same sex groups of early adolescence. You may begin to break away from groups and begin going out as couples (Textbook A: 102).

On the following page the authors assert in a similar vein:

Same-sex friends are a great source of comfort and security. But one of the most important social changes to happen in adolescence is dating (Textbook A: 104).
It is evident that authors view this as a developmental progression from same-sex friendship to heterosexual pairing off. The noun ‘stage’ in the first sentence suggests a progressive development while the verb ‘tend’ implies a natural disposition or inclination towards opposite-sex relations. The writers appear to be suggesting that people go through a natural progression towards heterosexual relations. (The writers also use the words gender and sex interchangeably, indicating a conflation of the two concepts. This would appear to suggest that despite their earlier treatment of the topics sex and gender, they inherently adhere to a form of biological determinism in which gender identity is perceived of as a function of biological sex.) Again the use of the pronoun ‘you’ not only addresses the reader directly but also implies that the authors make assumptions about their readership, presuming them to be heterosexual in orientation. While the first extract appears to be tentative, using gender-neutral language and the modal verb ‘may’ which allows for exceptions; the following paragraph makes the heterosexual orientation more explicit and uses the more categorical ‘is’. The authors assert the value of same-sex friendship and then introduce the next sentence with the logical connector ‘but’, a subordinating conjunction which clearly indicates a contrast with the preceding sentence. Thus heterosexual dating is seen as superseding same-sex friendships. A further inference that can be drawn is that opposite-sex attraction represents a sign of maturity while same-sex affinity is associated with immaturity and impaired development.

It is also evident from the context in Textbook A that dating is viewed as a form of social interaction that takes place exclusively between members of the opposite sex. This meaning is further reinforced by the text and visuals that follow. The writers state, under the sub-heading ‘negative reactions’ that:

Dating can reinforce gender stereotypes. It is still unusual for an adolescent girl to ask a boy out on a date (Textbook A: 104).

Therefore, while the authors challenge stereotypical gender relations they fail to confront heteronormative stereotypes regarding dating. Girl-boy dating is assumed to be the only form of dating. Moreover, this heterosexual paradigm is further underpinned by a subsequent statement:

Having a steady boyfriend or girlfriend is often regarded as having high status within the wider group (Textbook A: 104).

The illustrations also serve to bolster this reading. A three part-visual shows a teenage boy expressing his excitement at having successfully asked a girl out on a date. In the second frame two males appear to be in conversation, with the one telling the other:

Gloria’s fine. She certainly looks good. But I’m waiting for something better to come my way! (Textbook A: 104)
In this monologue the boy asserts that Gloria is acceptable (‘fine’). He qualifies his assessment in the adjacent sentence by asserting that she is physically attractive. The third sentence, commencing with the adversative conjunction ‘but’, however, places the male figure yet again in the position of power. He can choose to accept and validate her or reject her. The use of the pronoun ‘something’ further heightens the sense of female objectification since it is usually used to denote an object or ‘thing’. The third frame reinforces the impression of female subordination, depicting a couple of girls in discussion over the possibility that a boy will invite one of them on a date:

I know you think he’s great but you’ll just have to wait and see if he phones you (Textbook A: 104).

In this additional example of a heteronormative dating situation, the authors again construct female passivity (‘you’ll just have to wait and see’) in contrast to male assertion (‘he phones’). Finally, the adjacent page features a teenage boy and girl walking hand-in-hand. Thus the location of the text, in relation to the visuals leaves the reader in no doubt that dating refers exclusively to heterosexual couples. This section then concludes with the previously cited activity in which learners are required to discuss what attracts them to the opposite sex, and what makes them attractive to the opposite sex.

The normalizing discourses related to heterosexuality presuppose that heterosexual relations culminate in marriage and parenthood. While the authors contest traditional patriarchal family structures in which men are designated as breadwinners while women are the homemakers, they do not challenge the heteronormative family paradigm. In most illustrations and discussions of family life depictions are of conventional nuclear families, which is at odds with the social realities of the broader societal context. For example, the authors assert:

No one should judge a woman who chooses to stay at home, or a woman who wants to pursue a career. An interesting change in traditional roles is that there are now men who stay at home to take care of the children and household, while the women work and earn money (Textbook A: 14).

The authors make a normalizing judgment which establishes the reasonableness and tenability of women choosing either to pursue a career or remain at home. This judgement is established by asserting that ‘No one should judge’: a statement in the negative form which reinforces the sense that the authors are challenging an established ideological construct that exists beyond the text – namely that married women should not work. The authors, contrary to the old orthodoxy, place working women and women who stay at home on the same level of significance or social importance by using the coordinating conjunction ‘or’. Thus the two antithetical positions are accorded equal
value. Furthermore the pronoun ‘one’ implies that this is a universal rule that applies to the population at large. While the second sentence elaborates upon the new orthodoxy, that women have the right to choose a career over domesticity, it becomes plain that the writers view marriage and family as a heterosexual institution, comprised of a man and a woman.

This is not an isolated example. There are several case studies that appear in the textbooks which establish the family as a nuclear heterosexual unit. When the learners, for example, are instructed to investigate power relations in the ‘De Bruyn family’ (Textbook A: 12), the underlying assumption is that a family comprises a father, mother and offspring. Although the learners are encouraged to question Mr De Bruyn’s dictum, ‘The Bible... says that a man is the head of the home’, they are not required to consider whether there are alternatives to this conventional family unit. In dealing with changing life roles and responsibilities, the authors also write that during the ages of 26-40:

> You are likely to have a permanent relationship with someone, be married and a parent. You have big financial responsibilities setting up a home and maintaining a lifestyle. You have many roles at this stage – husband or wife, parent, provider and also a son or daughter...

(Textbook A: 95)

This text is framed by three illustrations: a young male-female couple holding a baby with a house in the background, a middle-aged male-female couple who are intended to illustrate the 41-65 years stage and an elderly male-female couple who illustrate the ‘over 65 years’ period. Thus, while it may be argued that gay and lesbian people can be married to same-sex partners and have children, the pictures specifically direct the reader to interpret the text as referring to heterosexual couples. The apparently neutral pronoun contained in the phrase ‘relationship with someone’ is undercut by the juxtaposition of text to visuals. The pronoun ‘you’ creates the sense that this is a generalizable principle – that as a rule people in a permanent relationship will be married and will have children. The modal adverb ‘likely’ appears to suggest that there is the possibility of an alternative – but any discussion of that alternative is curtailed by the next sentence which, through the use of the modal verb ‘have’, casts aside any hedging or ambivalence that might have been suggested by the former sentence and makes a bold assertion, stating the presupposition as an accomplished fact. The concepts ‘home’ and ‘lifestyle’ are also treated as if the readers and authors share a commonsense and unproblematic understanding of what these entail. There appears to be a singular and monolithic notion of what a ‘home’ is – that it comprises a husband and wife and their children – and the ‘lifestyle’ is one that is based on the conception of the heterosexual couple as standard. Similarly, in the discussion of changing roles and responsibilities the author describe early adulthood in the following terms:
At this stage in your life you may find a partner and marry. This involves forming relationships with many other people as well. You have to form relationships with parents-in-law and your sisters/brothers-in-law and other relatives. (Textbook A: 103)

While the noun ‘partner’ is gender neutral and the sentence may be interpreted as non-specific in terms of the sexual orientation of the parties, the text is juxtaposed to a conventional wedding photograph with a picture of male-female couple locked in an embrace and the woman in a bridal gown.

In all three texts there is no mention made of alternative family structures, other than single-parent families as a result of divorce or the death of a parent. There is no reference made to alternative family structures – for example male-male or female-female headed households, child-headed households or polygamous family arrangements – all of which are social realities in South Africa. The normative perception of marriage as a heterosexual institution is bolstered by numerous implicit and explicit assertions which are made without invitation to the learners to questions the ideological construct.

Thus the three texts generally convey normalising judgments which entrench a particular conception of heterosexual identity

Construction of LGBT identities

Implicit and explicit normalising judgments are made regarding LGBT identities which are constructed as ‘other’ in the three Life Orientation texts that have been studied. Depictions of gay identities are, in the main, dualistic with gay people generally falling into two broad categories: gay people as victims and gay people as abusers. There are recurring references in Textbook A to same-sex abuse and violation perpetrated by older men. In Textbook C, by contrast, the predominant depiction of gay people is as objects of discrimination and sufferers of emotional and social adjustment disorders.

In Textbook C gay sexual identities are treated primarily as a human rights issue. In the first activity which directly addresses the issue of homosexuality learners are required to discuss a number of discriminatory statements one of which is ‘Gay teachers are a threat to our children’ (Textbook C: 26). While the authors do not appear to endorse this statement, it transmits a negative perception which might be considered as correct by many learners and even teachers. The statement clearly mimics an oppositional rhetoric which sets gay teachers in opposition to ‘us’ – implied by the
possessive pronoun ‘our’ – presumably the heterosexual majority. This creates the impression that ‘children’ belong collectively to the broader heterosexually-oriented community and that homosexual teachers are anathema to this order. Gay teachers are otherised and through the modal verb ‘are’ it is established as an incontestable fact that gay teachers represent a social danger. The word ‘threat’ has connotations of endangerment and menace and coupled with the indefinite article ‘a’, which is non-specific, the reader is left to project his or her own concept of what that ‘threat’ might constitute. This allows for any number of different forms of heterosexual anxiety to be expressed.

The Teachers’ Guide for Textbook C provides little direction as to how this statement should be treated:

You should hold a class discussion of the way fear can lead to prejudices. You can ask learners to suggest other forms of discrimination which may occur in their daily lives (Textbook C Teachers’ Guide: 8).

This means that where teachers or learners hold strongly homophobic views, they may not only go unchallenged but in fact be reinforced by this activity. Since the authors have failed to include sexual orientation as an example of diversity or provide a full explanation of the equality clause in the Bill of Rights, it may appear that tolerance towards LGBT people is a matter of choice rather than a constitutional imperative.

The negative message contained in this activity could be reinforced by the picture on the adjacent page. A group of protestors opposing the passing of the Civil Union Act, which gave legal recognition to same-sex unions, hold posters with the slogans reading ‘Homosexual marriage is an act of terrorism’ and ‘Protect traditional marriage’. No context is provided for this photograph except for an accompanying caption: ‘These people are protesting gay marriages’ (Textbook C: 27). The first poster is in the declarative mode, with a subject followed by a complement which equates gay marriage to terrorism. The word terrorism denotes an organised act of intimidation directed at achieving political ends. It is an emotionally-loaded word which historically has been used in a South African context by a hegemonic group to demonise any resistance to the status quo. Thus the statement clearly establishes heterosexuality as the hegemonic form of sexuality which is under threat. The phrase ‘act of terrorism’ is also a nominalization of the verb terrorise. This device reduces the meaning since it removes tense, thus precluding any indication of timing, process and agent/patient relationship. ‘What is the nature of this purported terrorism? Who is carrying it out? Who is the victim? When did it happen?’ All these questions go unanswered because of the use of
nominalization. The second poster, ‘Protect traditional marriage’, is equally problematic (Textbook C: 27). The sentence is written in the imperative mode and is a command to the elliptically constructed subject. The word protect, with its denotation of ‘shielding from danger’, like the previous poster implies a threat to a prevailing notion of marriage. The sense of a hegemonic institution of marriage is reinforced by the modifier ‘traditional’, a customary practice handed down from one generation to the next. However, in a society with such cultural diversity the word traditional is also problematic. Whose tradition? Until recently it was only Judeo-Christian and civil marriages that were legally recognized. Traditional and customary African, Hindu and Muslim marriages were not protected by law. It was only with the passage of the Recognition of Customary Marriages Act in 1998 that these marriages, which were termed ‘traditional’, gained legal recognition (Government Gazette, 2 December 1998, http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=70656, accessed 14/12/2011). It would, however, appear that by the use of the word ‘traditional’ the protestors are referring exclusively to a Western Christian concept of marriage. The text of the poster would therefore appear to be motivated by a disingenuous attempt by the protestors to minimize differences between heterosexual people, by deliberately concealing the Christian agenda, in order to mobilize the broader heterosexual population in opposition to the Civil Union Act.

The textbook, however, does not address any concerns raised by these pictures except for a question on the following page: ‘Should gay people be allowed to marry and have children? Explain your opinion’ (Textbook C: 28). The modal auxiliary ‘should’ has both a relational and an expressive modality. It implies either ‘allowing for the possibility’ or having the authority to decide on behalf. This is reinforced by the verb ‘be allowed’ which implies that permission must be sought. Essentially, however, this question is ahistorical since same-sex couples may legally marry and may legally adopt children. The text, however, does not provide learners with the historical context in order to discuss these issues from a position of informed judgment. No mention is made of the Civil Union Act of 2006 (Government Gazette, November 2006, http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=67843, accessed 14/12/2011) or the Children’s Act of 2005 (Government Gazette, June 2005, http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=67892, accessed 14/12/2011) which gave legal sanction for people in life-partnerships to adopt. This may leave learners with the impression that same-sex marriage and adoption are still legally contested issues. The sentence also sets ‘gay people’ apart as a distinct and separate group from the dominant heterosexual group. While this question may at first appear neutral, reversing the underlying assumption draws attention to its loadedness: ‘should heterosexual people be allowed to marry and have children?’
The image of homosexuality as morally and socially transgressive is, however, far more pronounced in Textbook A in which the only mention of homosexuality is in the context of molestation and abuse. While this analysis wishes in no way to minimise the enormity of rape and sexual abuse it is abundantly obvious that the only mention of same-sex activity in Textbook A is located in context of rape and violation and this is not ameliorated by any examples of people who are engaged in consenting and mutually-rewarding same-sex relationships. In the section dealing with sexual abuse two figures, who appear to be young males, describe their sexual assault by older males:

Boy 1: My uncle told me this monster with a knife would cut my head off if I told anyone. I was only five years old, so I believed him.

Boy 2: I wanted to tell my gran but I couldn’t find the right words. I was sure he would say it better than I could and so they’d believe him and not me. (Textbook A: 17).

Later in the text, there is a very similar illustration, in which two boys describe their experiences of sexual assault by males:

Boy 1: I was raped by my mother’s boyfriend. He said he would set his dogs on me if I told anyone (Textbook A: 117).

A further instance of sexual violation of a same-sex nature is included in a case study in Textbook A which relates the experiences of a thirteen year-old boy who was molested by a male teacher while on a hiking outing (Textbook A: 112). In addition, the textbook also addresses the issue of male rape in an exercise which deals with misconceptions. Among a list of false statements is the assertion that ‘Boys cannot be raped’ (Textbook A: 113). The learners are required to discuss each false statement in turn and unless the teacher possesses good skills of facilitation and holds unprejudiced views, it is possible that the classroom discourse could lead to homophobic stereotypes being reinforced.

Alternatively, Textbooks A and C construct homosexuals as victims of abuse and discrimination. Textbook A alludes to homophobia in a single sentence in the context of a discussion on gender-based violence:

- so-called ‘corrective’ rape where lesbians are raped in the mistaken belief that it will make them change their sexual orientation. (Textbook A: 18)

Through the use of the compound adjectival modifier ‘so-called’ which collocates with the phrase ‘mistaken belief’ and the use of quotation marks the writers challenge the notion that rape will change a lesbian’s sexual orientation. The pronouns ‘them’ and ‘their’, however, have the effect of distancing the reader from lesbians, setting them apart as a group. Furthermore, the sentence conceals agency, leaving the reader with an incomplete understanding of who is responsible for the
rape of lesbians. The faceless anonymity accorded to the rapists may create the impression of remoteness, allowing readers to distanitate themselves from this issue by seeing it as removed from their experience and their communities.

Textbook C engages more extensively with the issue of the victimization of gay people in a detailed case study accompanied by a comprehensive written activity. The case study is based on a passage ostensibly written by the mother of a gay teenage boy (Daniel) and recounts the events leading up to his suicide. Initially, before Daniel came out, he appeared to a ‘normal’, ‘well-adjusted’ child: ‘he always joined in when his two older brothers used to play soccer in the street. He was always considerate and kind, and made sure he helped me with my chores in the home’ (Textbook C: 27). Therefore, the inference can be drawn that prior to his self-identification as gay he was a healthy, robust and socially well adjusted boy. However, in the second paragraph Daniel undergoes a change in temperament following a breakup with his girlfriend and text continues: ‘After that Daniel seemed to change. He became quiet and moody, and spent a lot of time alone in his room’ (Textbook C: 27). The prepositional phrase ‘after that’ is not merely a temporal conjunction but also implies causality, suggesting that Daniel’s moodiness and isolation was brought on by his realization of his homosexual orientation. The writers make use of hyponymy with ‘change’ as the overarching concept and ‘quite’, ‘moody’ and ‘spent time alone’ as the characteristics that expand upon this concept. Overlexicalization and synonymy are also deployed, with ‘quite’, ‘moody’ and ‘spent time alone’ as closely related concepts that reinforce each other. The impression that the authors create, therefore, is that emotional disturbance and social detachment are associated with adolescent homosexuality.

After a failed suicide attempt Daniel goes for counselling. The narrative continues:

After three sessions with the counsellor, Daniel asked me to go with him. During the fourth session, Daniel admitted to me that he was gay. He confessed that he was in love with one of the Grade 12 boys in his school. I was so angry and upset. I shouted at him and told him that what he was saying was shameful (Textbook C: 27).

Again the writers make use of overlexicalization with the words ‘admitted’ and ‘confessed’ being near synonyms. While both words denote acknowledgement, ‘confess’ also has connotations of sinfulness. This sense of transgression and sinfulness is reinforced by the complement ‘shameful’. Thus the writer invokes the discourse of religious and social judgment. The counselling situation can be likened, in Foucauldian terms, to religious confession with the incitement for people to enter into discourse about their sexual feelings with the counsellor and the mother making normalizing
judgments and occupying positions of power in the hierarchical observation of the boy. Furthermore, the description of the counselling situation would appear to reinforce the notion that gay identification is associated with emotional disorder and pathology.

It is evident that the authors, however, seek to minimize the ‘difference’ implicit in being homosexual by promoting a homonormative view. This is suggested by the following extract:

He (the counsellor) told me that Daniel was an ordinary, healthy boy in need of love and support. Although I found it difficult, I tried my best to accept the way things were (Textbook C: 27).

This is also implied by the nominalization ‘way things were’ which, through the use of periphrasis, evades mentioning Daniel’s homosexuality. Again the overlexicalization functions ideologically to reinforce what may be a contested construction of reality with words ‘ordinary’ and ‘healthy, and ‘love’ and ‘support’ having similar connotations. The underlying ideological meaning that the text appears to be transmitting would seem to be the notion of Daniel’s ‘normality’ (implied by the word ‘ordinary’) and more broadly the ‘normality’ of homosexuals. This could be read as a negation or minimalisation of the uniqueness of gay identity, which seeks to gloss over differences and create the appearance of consensus and uniformity. This sentence also suggests the possible tension between the notions of affirmation and tolerance. While the counsellor seeks to affirm Daniel’s identity, the mother recalls her effort to tolerate his identity in the phrase ‘Although I found it difficult’. This is the theme of the sentence (which occupies the topic part of the sentence), while ‘I tried my best to accept the way things were’ is the rheme (the elaboration on the topic). According to Fairclough, the information contained in the theme is foregrounded as the most significant. In this instance, therefore, the mother’s personal struggle appears to be of greater importance than the son’s sexual orientation. This may have the effect of causing the reader to identify with the mother’s battle to accept her son’s orientation, an identification based on a shared sense of their common heterosexuality, rather than establishing empathy for the boy’s difficult process of establishing a functioning gay identity.

The narrative proceeds to describe the victimization that Daniel experiences:

People treated him cruelly. Some of his friends teased him and called him names, but a group of older learners started beating him up during break... Some of the older boys from school attacked him and beat him up so badly that he couldn’t walk (Textbook C: 27).

In this extract Daniel is depicted as being downtrodden and abused. This is linguistically reinforced by placing him in the object position. In addition the writers use overlexicalization with the links being

Four days after a severe assault Daniel commits suicide. The mother concludes:

  I am so angry with the people who were so cruel to Daniel. Why couldn’t they just leave him alone if they didn’t like what he was? Why did they have to torment him so much?

(Textbook C: 27)

The noun phrase ‘what he was’ can be interpreted both as an acknowledgement that homosexuality is more than a sexual act but also an identity – but it can also be seen as a form of periphrasis – avoiding the using the term ‘homosexual’. The effect of this circumlocutory device may be to create the impression that homosexuality is unspeakable and can only be verbalized with discretion and in euphemistic terms. The final two sentences are in the grammatical question mode but are rhetorical in nature. The writer uses the pronoun ‘they’ to refer to Daniel’s tormentors which positions the reader in opposition to them – representing a renunciation of the actions and attitudes of the people who victimized Daniel. At the same time, however, Daniel remains in the object position of the sentences, suggesting that he has been acted upon by external forces and lacked personal agency.

Though the authors of the text are evidently sensitive to the social pressures that gay teenagers experience and seek, through this narrative, to heighten the reader’s awareness, the narrative fails to acknowledge the agency of homosexual people. The questions that accompany this text also appear to objectify gay people by making them the object of discussion and debate:

1. How do you feel about homosexual or gay people?
2. What stereotypical things have you heard about gay people?
4. Do you think gay learners should be allowed to bring a same-sex partner to a school function such as the grade 12 dance? (Textbook C: 28)

Each of these questions appears to indicate an underlying presupposition of gay otherness (as opposed to the heterosexual norm) on the part of the authors. The first question seems to be predicated upon the unspoken assumption that the readers of the text are heterosexual. It also appears to assert the notion that homosexuals are ‘different’ in that they are identified as a separate group, apart from the learners. The diction is also puzzling because it seems to use the words homosexual and gay synonymously, (while the term ‘homosexual’ is defined, the word ‘gay’ is not explained.) The learners are also required to discuss stereotypical social meanings attached to gay
people. This activity will only be of value if the teacher who facilitates this activity encourages the learners to think critically about these depictions. Question 4 also creates the impression of gay subordination to a hegemonic heterosexual authority. The verb ‘be allowed’ implies that gay people require the consent or licence of heterosexual people in order to enjoy what would appear to be basic social intercourse. At best this question could direct learners to consider adopting a more tolerant approach to gay people, but it does not go so far as to confer equal social standing on gay people.

While the authors appear to have sought to advocate gay equality, it seems that they may have inadvertently intensified the differentiation. The textbook is equally, if not more adamant about issues of racial equality, but it would be unthinkable for the authors to pose a question such as ‘How do you feel about Black people?’ (with the presumption that the readers are white) or ‘What stereotypical things have you heard about whites?’ (with the presumption that the readers are black).

In an accompanying textbox the authors include the following discussion of homosexuality:

Homosexual feelings are not uncommon amongst teenagers. They usually last only a short time, and are a normal part of growing up. Most people who have homosexual feelings while they are teenagers go on to relationships with the opposite sex. However, some people have to relate sexually to members of their own sex. No one knows why people are homosexual. No one chooses to be homosexual, and people who are homosexual can’t change the way they are (Textbook C: 28).

While the writers accurately relate the sexual ambivalence that many teenagers experience, which Freudian psychoanalysts describe as polymorphous perversity, they appear to suggest that the natural progression is from homosexual feeling to relationships with members of the opposite sex. In the sentence ‘They usually last only a short time, and are a normal part of growing up’ the writers make a normalizing judgment which appears to suggest that it is typical for teenagers to outgrow same-sex attraction. The word ‘normal’ may be interpreted in two senses: firstly the innocuous sense of ordinarily or as a general rule, or in the more problematic sense of well-adjusted and functioning according to accepted social standards of behaviour. The discussion of homosexuality also sets up a distinct dichotomy between ‘most people’ who appear to ‘outgrow’ same-sex attraction and ‘some people’ who continue to be sexually attracted to members of their own sex, and, by inference, are stuck at a certain psychosexual developmental point.
The phrasing of this discussion may also, intentionally or inadvertently, reinforce stereotypes. The authors had the option to write either, ‘No one chooses to be homosexual’ or phrase the sentence ‘being homosexual is not a choice’. They chose the former phrasing, ‘no one chooses to be homosexual’, which might seem to imply that being homosexual is not a condition that anyone would choose – that it is of such an untenable and disagreeable nature that no right-thinking person would choose to be homosexual. It would seem to imply that, had it been possible, homosexuals would seek to change the way they are. This reading of the sentence is very likely, since it follows shortly after the narrative of Daniel’s torment and social persecution. If, on the other hand, the authors had phrased the sentence ‘being homosexual is not a choice’ the implication would be that it is an inherent orientation and not a matter of personal volition or will.

In all the discussions and activities related to gay identity and experience there is no evidence of a gay voice. Gay people are spoken about and discussed or people, such as Daniel’s mother, speak on their behalf. Thus gay people lack a real visibility or voice in the texts. This may further advance the notion of gay victimization and passivity since gay people are not seen to be actors in their own right. The lack of a gay voice in any of these texts suggests that there is an ideological power dynamic operating ‘in terms of the more powerful participant putting constraints on the contributions of less powerful participants’; in this instance the authors who constrain the gay voice and assert a hegemonic heterosexual perspective (Fairclough, 2002: 113).

The Life Orientation texts therefore implicitly transmit normalizing judgments which assert a monogamous heterosexuality as the standard with the men and women enacting conventional gender roles. While it is commendable that the authors of Textbook C have addressed the issue of homophobia directly it is possible that the depiction of gay people in this text may unwittingly perpetuate stereotypes about gay people as threatening to the values and morality of the youth, corrupting the institution of marriage, emotionally imbalanced, given to suicidal tendencies and victims of homophobic violence and social stigmatisation.

**BINARY OPPOSITIONS**

According to Foucault disciplinary power is exercised, not by imposing uniformity, but instead through a process of differentiation (Foucault, 1975: 170). Rather than forcing human subjects into obedience and conformity to a homogeneous norm, Foucault argues that disciplinary power functions through atomising and differentiating. This is particularly evident in the binary constructions that the authors of the Life Orientation textbooks transmit. Gender and sexual
identities are depicted as polar opposites: male/female, masculine/feminine and heterosexual/homosexual. Thus the prevalent construction is essentially categorical in its differentiation and grouping of people. For example in Textbook C learners are required to carry out the following activity (Textbook C: 105)

Describe a man and a woman’s life roles and responsibilities as she/he changes from when she/he is a:

| daughter | son |
| sister | bother |
| girlfriend | boyfriend |
| fiancée | fiancé |
| wife | husband |
| mother | father |
| grandmother | grandfather |

This activity would appear to be based on a fundamental premise that biological sex shapes and determines gender roles, identity and experience. The socially-constructed nature of these gendered roles is not examined. Instead learners are encouraged merely to repeat conventional wisdom about gendered identity. Consequently the activity serves to sustain the traditional polarization of the sexes which conflates biological sex with gender.

Similarly, in Textbook A, the authors state:

Sexuality is about the way we see ourselves as males and females... whether we are attracted to people of the opposite or the same sex (Textbook A: 105)

In this extract the authors establish two fundamental binaries: male/female and opposite-sex attraction/same-sex attraction. This dichotomous depiction of human sexuality does not permit for any variation. A person is either one thing or another. Thus distinct lines of differentiation are transmitted. This would appear to affirm Butler’s proposition that the ‘habitual and violent presumptions’ on which patriarchal thinking is based, condition one’s thought to foreclose and curtail any divergence in thought or weakening of solid intellectual boundaries (Butler, 1999: viii). In this regard it is also noteworthy that none of the textbooks deal with bisexuality, intersexuality or transsexuality which may subvert or challenge and understanding sexuality based on simplistic binary terms with heterosexuality as the norm and homosexuality as a form of deviance. There is thus no effort to problematise sexuality by showing its complex and variable nature.
The textbooks under examination generally tend to also construct a Manichean view of ethics with a moral dualism that differentiates between ‘good’ and ‘bad’. For example, learners are required to distinguish between good and bad choices in Textbook B. Among the list of bad choices are: ‘(having) sexual intercourse’ and ‘(becoming) a parent while at school’ (Textbook B: 183). Thus Textbook B delineates distinct moral boundaries founded on a binary construction of morality.

**BIOLOGICAL ESSENTIALISM**

Queer theory holds that heteronormative assumptions are frequently founded on biological essentialism; the notion that people, as a result of their physiological make up and sex, possess certain intrinsic characteristics which play a significant role in determining their personal and social attributes and identities. This type of deterministic thinking is evident both in the treatment of gender and sexuality (Abes, 2007: 59-60). The authors of Textbook A, for example state that: ‘Another reason that has given men power is the fact that men are usually physically stronger than women... Men and women have different biological roles, which has further led to men having more power’ (Textbook A: 13).

Thus the authors suggest that on the basis of physical attributes, namely physical strength and their ‘biological role’, men have more social power. The phrasing of this sentence asserts the authors’ view as the incontestable truth: it is taken as ‘fact’ that men are stronger than women and that consequently men will possess greater social power. Thus gender inequality is presented as natural and inevitable.

The three textbooks also base their depiction of sexuality on a biologically essentialist notion of development. The description of adolescence in these texts is preceded by an account of the process of physical maturation in which the sexual development culminates in producing a reproductive young adult. Textbook B clearly links sexual maturity with the possibility of heterosexual reproduction:

> Girls ovulate, produce eggs within the body, which can be fertilised by sperm and grow into a baby... Boys produce sperm, which are the seeds that can fertilise a woman’s egg which then grows into a baby (Textbook B: 171).

Implicit in this description is a biological determinism that girls and boys will fulfil their reproductive destiny by having babies. Through collocation of ‘eggs’, ‘which’ and the elliptical ‘and can’ as well as ‘sperm’, ‘which’ and ‘which’ the perception is created that development advances along a coherent and logical natural progression towards heterosexual maturation. Besides disregarding the fact that homosexual men and lesbian women may not engage in heterosexual acts that are suggested here,
sex within heterosexual relationships does not only serve a reproductive function and there are many heterosexual couples who are either unable to or who choose not to have children. This sense of biological predestination continues in the next paragraph headed emotional changes which states:

As you grow towards adulthood, you also start to think and feel differently. Adolescents...become very interested in the opposite sex (Textbook B: 171).

Thus the impression is created by the subordinate clause ‘As you grow toward adulthood’, with the pronoun ‘you’ presupposing a general normative sexuality, that there is a single growth path which all adolescents follow. The climax of this physical process of maturation would appear to be adulthood, since the preposition ‘toward’ implies that adulthood is the goal. Incidentally, the word ‘towards’ also has connotations of ‘favourable and well-disposed’. This reinforces the implication that the authors hold a normative view of progression to heterosexual reproductive adulthood which is perceived as an inevitable outcome since no modal verbs (such as ‘may’ or ‘can’) have been used to mitigate the deterministic portrayal of heterosexual maturation. The authors assume that opposite sex attraction therefore is one of the necessary conditions that adolescents experience in the process of growing towards adulthood. This is not, however, an isolated instance in Textbook B. On the next page, under the heading 'Social Changes: Relationships with others' the authors assert:

Older adolescents make friends with the opposite sex, start having romantic relationships and start dating (Textbook B: 172).

This sentence is written in the declarative mode which appears to assert the content as a universal truth. The declarative mode, as Fairclough points out, can be an indicator of asymmetrical relations of power; in this instance the authors are placed in the position of being the possessors and providers of knowledge while the readers are receivers. The modal verbs ‘make’, ‘start having’ and ‘start dating’ add to the emphatic tone. Again an affinity for the opposite sex is therefore asserted as the natural outcome of biological development and maturation. This has the effect of reinforcing the previous instances in the text where personal and physical growth is portrayed as a natural progression towards heterosexual identity. This would appear to confirm Fairclough contention that the hegemonic group legitimates its version of reality by portraying it as natural ‘fact’ or ‘common sense’ so as to conceal the subjective, arbitrary and constructed nature of this ‘authorized’ account of reality.

In the discussion of reproduction in Textbook C, the heterosexual sex is also established as the norm. The authors urge the learners to develop a sound understanding of the male and female reproductive systems because ‘In this way, we can take responsibility for our behaviour and show
understanding towards the opposite sex’ (Textbook C: 9). The use of the phrase ‘opposite sex’ implies that the sexual intimacy is heterosexual and the personal pronouns ‘we’ or ‘our’ create a sense of inclusivity, suggesting that the dominant or in-group is heterosexual. The Teacher’s Guide makes this even more explicit by directing teachers to:

Begin the lesson by telling the learners that it is important to think about the implications of sexual relationships before becoming too involved with a member of the opposite sex (Textbook C Teacher Guide: 34).

Thus teachers, in their preparations for this lesson, are predisposed to view sexual relationships only in terms of opposite-sex attraction.

SELF-DISCLOSURE AND HIERARCHICAL OBSERVATION

According to Foucault, self-disclosure is an important part of social regulation (Foucault, 1975). From the confessional to the psychiatrist’s couch, from the courtroom bench to the learner’s desk, society creates multiple spaces for entering into discourse. The invitation to confession, however, serves a regulatory function according to Foucault, allowing for hierarchical observation to take place and normative judgments to be made (Foucault, 1975: 173). Probably nowhere in the school curriculum is this kind of confessional discourse more encouraged than in the Life Orientation classroom. Learners are urged to ‘brainstorm ideas’ with their peers about what they find attractive in the opposite sex (Textbook A: 105), describe changes in their bodies brought on by adolescence (Textbook A:100), discuss the responsibilities that they face during adolescence (Textbook A: 96), explore relationships between husbands and wives (Textbook B: 18) and discuss the benefits of being male or female (Textbook B: 21). Thus all three texts tend to encourage learners to engage in self-examination and to either publically or privately reveal their thoughts and feelings about particular topics as part of a process of hierarchical observation.

Textbook C, however, appears to be the most insistent in urging learners to engage in self-disclosure. They are instructed to keep a journal and periodically, throughout the text, they are directed to write reflections on particular topics and record their answers to specific questions that require introspection and self-examination.

In the preface, entitled ‘How to Use this book’, the authors urge the learners to create a safe and tolerant environment in which people will feel free to disclose their thoughts and emotions:

Respect other people’s rights to feel differently about issues... do not laugh at other people, or judge them because of what they are saying or have experienced... Do not talk about
what people say. If someone entrusts you with important information, keep it safe... If you need the answer to a question which you cannot ask in front of your classmates, leave a note on your teacher’s desk (Textbook C: X).

Thus the Life Orientation classroom could be seen as part of the monitoring or surveillance of learners, one dimension of what Foucault terms the ‘panopticon’ (Foucault, 1975: 195). The lesson becomes a public confessional in which learners openly disclose their feelings and experiences. In this way they subject themselves to the surveillance of their teachers and peers who may affirm or correct their perceptions.

‘CONFRONTING UNPOPULAR THINGS’: THINKING AGAINST THE GRAIN

By encouraging learners to question conventional wisdom and expose the underlying social construction of phenomena that are presented as ‘natural’ and ‘normal’ queer theorist argue that educators can disrupt hegemonic concepts of sexuality and gender. For this reason Britzman argues that learners should be provided with opportunities to confront ‘unpopular things’ which invite a re-examination of received ideas and inculcated values (Britzman D, 1991: 61). Although the general aim of the textbook authors would appear to be to socialize learners into a responsible, ‘normal’ role in society, which in general appears to be consistent with the specific subject aims contained in the CAPS document, Textbook C does introduce a number of topics for discussion that may interrupt solid, fortified normative thinking and prejudices and may be considered ‘unpopular’ by teachers who wish to merely reproduce conventional wisdom. The authors of Textbook C invite learners to question a number of heteronormative assumptions. They are confronted with issues that might be considered controversial such as an activity in which they have to discuss the statement ‘Gay teachers are a threat to our children’ (Textbook C: 26). In this activity stereotypes regarding homosexuals can be raised and the learners are urged to consider their own prejudices as well as those of their peer group and community. Similarly learners are challenged to re-examine traditional notions of marriage and family by investigating the topics of gay marriage and gay parenting (Textbook C: 28). Despite a number of difficulties that have been noted with regard to these activities, they may potentially allow learners to consider that there are alternatives to the traditional heterosexual nuclear family.

Textbook C also challenges simplistic notions of sexuality and gender by touching on the subject of transgendered identities. The authors declare:

Sex and gender can be complicated and confusing. There are people who are born one sex and take on the opposite gender. Some people are born as one sex and dress as a member
of the opposite sex. This is called cross-dressing. Others are unhappy with the sex they are born with and have operations to change their sex (Textbook C: 11).

What sets textbook C apart from texts A and B is that the authors clearly distinguish between sex and gender, whereas as texts A and B, while defining sex as biological and gender as a social construct, tend to conflate the two concepts when dealing with issues of gender, sexuality and sexual practices. By introducing the topic of transsexual and transgender identities the authors challenge simplistic biological determinism and demonstrate that sexuality and gender are identity issues rather than mere expressions of biology and physiologically. They also deconstruct the foundations on which binary oppositions of male/female, masculine/feminine, and heterosexual/homosexual are based. Thus learners may be encouraged to examine the constructed nature of gender and sexual identities. In so doing, the authors promote ‘thinking against the grain’, confronting learners with issues which may challenge their assumptions and norms. This has the potential to create a heterotopic learning experience in which disparate issues that might challenge learners’ preconceptions are brought together (Sumara & Davis, 1999: 205).

Sadly, however, the language may unintentionally express subtle normalizing judgments. The writers assert that ‘sex and gender are complicated and confusing’. The complement ‘confusing’ suggests a disturbance of order and a challenge to the norm. Thus transgendered and transsexual people may be seen as disruptive and even subversive. Rather than referring specifically to the terms ‘transsexual’ or ‘transgender’ the authors write: ‘There are people….Some people…. Others’ (Textbook C: 11). These designations all have the effect of distancing transsexuals and transgendered people, creating the impression that they are set apart and do not belong to the in-group which is presumably perceived to be ‘normal’ in terms of gender and sexual identity. The word ‘unhappy’ to express the intense psychological conflict that a transsexual person may experience is an understatement and may also seem to trivialise an intense emotional experience.

However, by inviting an investigation of what may be considered to be non-normative gender/sexual identities, creating a heterotopic learning experience, the authors of Textbook C may prompt learners into questioning the supposed stability of sexual identities.

CONTINGENT AND HISTORICAL NATURE OF SEXUAL IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION

While all three texts encourage discussion of the historical and contingent nature of gender identities and gender roles, none of them deals explicitly with the social factors that impact on the sexual identities. Heterosexual sex is depicted as a social and biological norm and there is no
discussion of how shifting cultural values and religious doctrines contribute to its hegemony. Thus heterosexuality is perceived of as universal, ahistorical and changeless. Text C, however, does invite learners to investigate and discuss how religious teachings and cultural values impact on homosexual identity and experience:

Many religious and cultural groups have strong beliefs on the subject of sexuality. Within religious and cultural groups, beliefs change over time. In our diverse society this results in heated discussion over topics like homosexuality, sex before marriage, adultery, polygamy and rape (Textbook C: 112).

Here the authors acknowledge that beliefs and values related to sexuality are not timeless but are subjected to alteration over time. They also show how normative values are not incontestable truths but are frequently the source of disagreement and debate. The learners are also instructed to research a religion of their choice and find out, among other things:

What does the religion teaches about:
- Other faiths
- Men and women
- Homosexuality? (Textbook C: 161)

The verb ‘teach’ is significant in that it shows doctrinal practices as part of a process of socialization and may suggest that these are constructed values that are imparted to others.

By contrast, Textbook A, while touching on how religious doctrines influence normative gender roles, does not draw attention to the contingent nature of these discursive constructions. For example, the father in the ‘De Bruyn family’ case study utters the following words:

‘The Bible also says that the man is the head of the home’ (Textbook A: 12).

None of the questions that accompany the text invite discussion of the historically constructed nature of this Biblical tenet, either with regard to the normative gender content or the perception that is conveyed that marriage is essentially a monogamous heterosexual institution. Thus the authority of the Bible is invoked to assert a hegemonic notion of masculinity and heterosexuality.

***

A closer textual analysis of the three books therefore reveals that the language used functions to construct and transmit a heteronormative ideology which mostly renders LGBT identities invisible. Where LGBT identities are depicted they are most often mentioned in terms of emotional disorder or in relation to illness and are constructed as either victims or abusers. The language functions to assert the otherness of LGBT identities by generally objectifying them and establishing a binary order
in which heterosexuality features as the norm. Nowhere in any of these texts is a gay, lesbian, transgender or bisexual voice heard. By contrast, heterosexual identity is virtually all-pervasive. The language generally constructs a version of heterosexuality that is conventional, founded on biological determinism and a binary construction of male/female roles and identities. The textbooks frequently invite learners to reflect both publically and privately on their experiences and ideas, allowing for hierarchical observation in which teachers and peers can exert a socialising influence and express normalizing judgments. Divergent thinking about sexuality and gender is generally not encouraged and the language constructs authoritative discourses, with the authors making a selection of the versions of reality that are transmitted to learners. Life Orientation textbooks therefore play a central role in entrenching the ‘thinkable’ in terms of sexuality and gender and marginalizing and eliding the ‘unthinkable’.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This research report has sought to investigate the extent to which sexualities and sexual identities are discursively constructed in Life Orientation textbooks and uncover the ways in which language and visual representations function to transmit hegemonic normative values regarding sexuality. In order to expose the operation of heteronormativity, this study has explored the extent of coverage given to LGBT identities as opposed to heterosexual identities and interrogated the extent to which textbooks have given effect to the explicit precepts of the RNCS and CAPS which are predicated upon constitutional principles. Secondary research questions have focused on the extent to which content, dealing with a variety of different dimensions of the Life Orientation curriculum such as citizenship and development of the self in society, are heterosexualised through reliance upon tacit heterosexual assumptions. Content coverage examination and thematic analysis has been used to show up the relative presence or absence of LGBT identities as opposed to heterosexual identities and explore the contexts in which references to sexuality and sexual identities arise. Critical discourse analysis has also been deployed in order to expose the subtle ways in which heteronormativity is discursively constructed and transmitted.

It is evident that Life Orientation plays a very powerful regulatory role in terms of constructing and transmitting normative values. The textbooks that have been studied are redolent with normalizing judgments concerning behaviour that is deemed either acceptable or unsatisfactory. In particular the textbooks provide, either implicitly or explicitly, particular versions of sexuality that are deemed prevalent and conventional, and sexualities that are seen as abnormal and disruptive. The textbook therefore conveys certain rigid and stable versions of sexuality.

While LGBT identities are almost entirely absent from these texts and heterosexuality is clearly established as the norm, there are also distinct constructions of male and female sexuality. Men and adolescent boys are most frequently depicted as sexually commanding, while women and adolescent girls are often depicted as submissive and forced to acquiesce to male desire. While the male is an active agent, shown to be the initiator of sex, girls are frequently denied personal agency and are merely the objects of male desire. Thus curriculum materials used in Life Orientation appear to transmit a hegemonic notion of heterosexuality as the norm, arising out of a common-sense understanding of sexuality which naturalizes a form of heterosexuality that privileges male desire and subordinates women.
The authors are clearly aware of social and constitutional imperatives that impact on their writing and appear to promote issues of tolerance. Therefore, although LGBT identities are virtually invisible, when they are mentioned they most frequently raised in the context of human rights. LGBT identities are, with few exceptions, excluded from discussions in the topic of ‘Development of Self’ which deals with the psychosocial and physical development of teenagers. Therefore no mention is made of LGBT in the context of roles and responsibilities, family, sexuality, safe sex and sexual health, dating and marriage. Where lesbian and gay identities are mentioned it is usually in the context of abuse and violation – either as the victims of homophobic violence or as the perpetrators of sexual violation. They are also mentioned in one text in terms of emotional disorder and located adjacent to a discussion of HIV/AIDS, thus subtly yoking homosexuality with pathology.

Heterosexuality is, however, all-encompassing in the texts. Almost every theme in the ‘Development of Self’ is either explicitly or implicitly linked with heterosexuality, from the more obvious areas such as reproduction and safe sex to rather arbitrary and tenuous connections made to heterosexuality in subjects such as problem solving, critical thinking, goal-setting and communication. The version of heterosexuality that is communicated is generally one which firstly prescribes abstinence in adolescence and responsible decision-making with regard to sex and envisions the monogamous, reproductive married couple as the adult norm. This idealized version of faithful and generative heterosexual practice is contrasted with cautionary accounts of heterosexuality which construct men as sexually aggressive and coercive and women as passive, emotionally conflicted and vulnerable.

These constructions are linguistically generated and transmitted and an examination of the mechanics of the language helps to expose how these discourses function to construct sexual identities. Writers frequently engage in binary constructions which not only identify LGBT identities in opposition to heterosexual identities but also establish distinct dichotomies between men and women, who are respectively inscribed as either masculine or feminine, active or passive, dominant or submissive and thinking or feeling to mention but a few of the constructions. This is linguistically communicated by frequent references to males as the active subjects of sentences, asserting their will over the female. Generally, despite the authors’ ostensible efforts to counter gender stereotypes, normative gender identities are constructed on the basis of biological determinism. Discussions of gender roles and social functioning are, in all three texts, preceded by detailed discussions of male and female anatomy and physiological functioning.
Underlying ideological meanings are revealed through an examination of the experiential, relational and expressive value of the language such as lexicalization (connotations and denotations), overlexicalization, hyponymical classificatory schemes, euphemism and register. Grammatical features for instance active and passive voice, nominalization, modality and the use of logical connectors also serve to influence the construction of meaning and communicate ideological messages. Frequently, the stated intention of the writers to challenge stereotype and prejudice would appear to be contradicted or betrayed by the language used which may convey unintended meanings.

It is, however, not only the language but the illustrations that construct and convey ideological meanings. Whereas some authors are careful to avoid gendered language and normative assumptions, the illustrations which are intended to frame and elaborate on the text frequently convey different meanings. In some instances the pictures have the effect of entirely modifying the meaning of the text through their visible placement and conflicting messages.

The texts that communicate fewer heteronormative assumptions are characterised by the consistent use of gender neutral language, less conventional depictions of life role and responsibilities, marriage and family and consistently spurn gender normative presuppositions, recognizing ambivalence in gender identity and sexuality. They also feature illustrations that support the text, rather than contradict the authors’ meaning. A queer approach to the writing of Life Orientation teaching materials, however, may lead to greater inclusivity not merely in terms of sexuality but also gender. Queer thinking has the potential to deconstruct the categorisation of ‘gay’ and ‘straight’, and ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’, on which heteronormativity is founded and acknowledge sexual and gender identities as social, multiple, unstable and fluid. Queer theory calls into question the concept of stable normative sexual identities and ruptures essentialist notions that gender, sex and sexuality are inevitably interrelated.

A limitation of this research is that it does not explore the application of textbook materials in pedagogic practice. Although there is evidence in the texts that the authors have sought, with varying degrees of success, to avoid transmitting blatant heteronormativity, this discretion may not necessarily be evident in teachers’ classroom practice. Though constitutional values are entrenched in government and education policy, the Human Rights Watch report attests to the fact that there is a lag in general societal uptake of these values in broader social relations and within education.
Therefore, even with the best intentions of the authors, there is no assurance that the classroom dialogue and the teachers’ pedagogy will reflect the desired values of equality and tolerance/affirmation.

In the final analysis, while heterosexuality is the all-pervasive and unexamined norm in the Life Orientation textbooks that have been studied, LGBT identities are virtually invisible. Where they are mentioned it is not in the context of affirmation and recognition but at most as a plea for tolerance. Whereas the textbook authors deal extensively with diversity, their focus tends to be on race, culture and gender, with little or no mention made of sexual orientation. The virtual invisibility of gay and lesbian people serves to bolster the impression of heterosexual hegemony. The fact that gay and lesbian identities are almost only ever mentioned in the context of human rights may create the impression that their identities are allowed to exist only by the grace and sanction of the hegemonic heterosexual establishment. Ignoring of LGBT identities or subordinating them to a hegemonic norm can be seen as the means by which heterosexuality defends its privileged status. If the South African education system is to function congruently with the constitution it is vital that learning materials and textbooks, across the curriculum, are free of explicit and implicit heteronormative messages, promote tolerance and encourage learners to interrogate essentialising narratives, question ‘common sense’ knowledge and stop ‘learning to thinking straight’. It is hoped that this research report may draw attention to the failure of publishers to give full effect to the principles of the national constitution and the inclusive values that are inscribed in the RNCS and CAPS documents; that publishers, educational authorities and teachers may be encouraged to reexamine assumed norms and become aware of how language functions to construct and perpetuate heterosexist hegemony. By uncovering the subtle and at times invidious ways in which textbooks function to propagate exclusionary and heteronormative discourses it is hoped that curriculum authorities, the authors of educational materials as well as teachers will be encouraged to reflect more critically on the texts which are used in classrooms. The desired eventual outcome is that Life Orientation textbooks become truly inclusive, depicting a variety of different sexualities in ways which are affirmative and nonjudgmental, celebrating a diversity of sexual identities and ways of being, acknowledging the constructed nature and fluidity of sexual identities and freeing the representations of social practices such as roles and responsibilities, dating, marriage and parenthood from the strictures of heteronormativity.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Department of Basic Education (2011), Life Orientation Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement, Grades 10-12.


& J. Blommaert (Eds.), Handbook of pragmatics (pp. 204–210). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Benjamins.


Selected Textbooks


Internet sources


