Teacher training for sexuality education and discourses of gender, sexuality and power.

By: Julia Lazar Chaskalson

Student number: 862275

Supervised by: Professor Srila Roy

Word count: 28,374

Research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Arts (MA) Degree in Development Studies.

March 2020

University of the Witwatersrand, School of Social Sciences.

Declaration

I declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts in Development Studies at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree at any other university.

Julia Lazar Chaskalson

24 March 2020.

Abstract

This research report is concerned with how teachers are trained to deliver sexuality education in South African schools. Situated in a rich body of literature which demonstrates the importance of school-based sexuality education to several important sexual health and social outcomes, this research report centres the voices of teachers undergoing in-service training for Life Orientation (LO) and argues that teachers are key to furthering adolescent sexual and reproductive health. It takes a Foucauldian approach to the process of teacher-training. Research was conducted at Rhodes University, where focus groups were conducted with fifteen practising LO teachers enrolled in in-service training. Focus groups illuminated teachers' existing attitudes towards and challenges with sexuality education. I examined the teachers' hegemonic constructions of gender, sexuality and power, which illustrated deep-seated 'cultural' investments to heteropatriarchal power-relations. The research report then turned to state discourses regarding sexuality education, undertaking a textual analysis of the state's newly released Scripted Lesson Plans (SLPs) for sexuality education. I explored the pertinence of the new SLPs for future teacher-training. The SLPs precipitated a widespread moral panic about sexuality education. I examined the widespread social conservativism which caused the backlash to the SLPs, and argue for a conscientization process – centred around teachers – to ensure ownership and understanding of their material. Overall, it is argued that LO teachers – and the process by which they are trained for their role – are neglected, and effort must be made to support LO teachers while challenging hegemonic discourses pertaining to gender, sexuality and power.

Acknowledgements

There are many people without whom this research report would not have been possible. To begin, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Srila Roy, for her guidance throughout this project.

There are too many academics from institutions around the country whom I contacted for advice for me to name, but I am very thankful for their inputs. In particular, I am grateful to stakeholders at Rhodes University for granting me permission to conduct research on campus. To Deon Louw, the teacher-trainer for in-service Life Orientation teacher-training, I am incredibly thankful. Without your enthusiasm and generosity, I could not have undertaken this research.

To Mr "L"'s class of students – it is not every day that a group so readily welcomes a stranger into their midst, and is willing to engage them so honestly and thoughtfully. I am in awe of the work that you do as teachers, and I learnt so much from the short time we spent together. Ndiyabulela kakulu!

Although data from the University of Pretoria did not, in the end, make it into this project for reasons of scope, I am grateful to stakeholders at UP for their willingness to let me observe teacher-training. I am incredibly impressed at the content of your second-year course and the observations I did there widened my understanding of this research area profoundly.

To researchers at the Center for Studies of Aids and Gender at UP: thank you for making time to meet with me and share your work. We need more research units like yours.

To my friends who have backed me and helped me through this project, I am so appreciative of your help. Thank you for buying into the idea, participating in pilot surveys and for being with me through the many ups and downs it took for me to get here. Thank you for being there for me throughout it all.

My family's support and interest throughout this project have made it worth doing. My stepmother and father's discerning edits at the final stage of drafting helped tie this together – I am so appreciative for that. My mother, Karen Lazar, has been a complete rock to me throughout this project and without her careful edits and calm support throughout the process, this could not have been submitted.

This project would not have been possible without the financial help of my scholarship – the Mandela-Rhodes Foundation. I thank MRF for their assistance.

Acronyms

ACDP	African Democratic Christian Party
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ANC	African National Congress
ASRHR	Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights
B.Ed	Bachelor of Education
C2005	Curriculum 2005
CAPS	Curriculum Assessment and Policy Statement
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CSE	Comprehensive Sexuality Education
DBE	Department of Basic Education
DOE	Department of Education
DOH	Department of Health
DSD	Department of Social Development
EDC	Educational Development Centre
EG	Educator Guide
ESA	Eastern and Southern Africa
FET	Further Education and Training
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
INSET	In-Service Educational Training
ITGSE	International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education
LB	Learner Book
LGBTQI+	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Intersex, Plus
LO	Life Orientation
LTSM	Learning and Teaching Support Material
NCS	National Curriculum Statement
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSC	National Senior Certificate
PRESET	Pre-Service Educational Training
RU	Rhodes University
SA	South Africa
SLP	Scripted Lesson Plans

SP	Senior Phase
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights
STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UP	University of Pretoria
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 | Introduction

Background to this research

South Africa has exceptionally high rates of gender-based violence (GBV), sexually transmitted infections (STI) and HIV/AIDS transmission. The violence and inequality that characterise South African society – the burdens of which are still disproportionally borne by women and youth – have their roots in South Africa's complex history of "ideological, normative and structural violence of colonialism and apartheid" (Bhana, Crewe & Aggleton, 2019, p.361). These legacies endure despite the post-1994 governments' commitment to a non-racial and non-sexist constitutional democracy.

The effects of GBV and HIV/AIDS are experienced acutely by youth, and in particular by young women: 1,900 adolescent women contract HIV each week, and young women are more than four times as likely to be infected with HIV as their male counterparts (Department of Basic Education, 2017; South African National AIDS Council, 2017). One in four South African women between the ages of 18 and 49 has experienced intimate partner violence and studies show that approximately a third of adolescent women have reported physical abuse (Government of South Africa, SANAC & Phila, 2018; Karim & Baxter, 2016). South Africa also has high rates of unplanned pregnancies, which have adverse effects on young women's school attendance – only one in three teenage mothers return to finish their schooling after giving birth (DBE et al, 2009; Department of Social Development & National Population Unit, 2014; Grant & Hallman, 2008).

Sexuality education at school is an important element of the state response to these issues. The Department of Basic Education (DBE) has stated that "the impact of HIV [and] STIs ... can be prevented, managed, contained and finally reversed in the Basic Education Sector" through comprehensive sexuality education (2017, p. 5). From grade 4 to grade 12, school-based sexuality education happens in the compulsory Life Orientation (LO) learning area. LO comprises sexuality, religious, civic and physical education, career guidance, life and study skills (DBE, 2011).

This research report focuses on the sexuality education that is delivered to the Further Education and Training (FET) phase in South African schools, which spans grades 10 to 12. The current curriculum for LO is the Curriculum Assessment and Policy Statement (CAPS). CAPS, and the teachers who deliver the curriculum, have been critiqued for being ineffective at combating the sexual coercion, GBV, and HIV infections that characterise much of South African life. Scholarship shows that educators tend to have comprehensive knowledge about HIV/AIDS, but learners experience a large and concerning knowledge gap in this area (Ahmed et al, 2009; UNESCO, 2015). [1] The communication of sexual and reproductive health messaging by sexuality education teachers is thus a key concern. Teacher-training must be a central element of state responses to this problem. UNESCO comments: "By better preparing teachers… the education sector may close the knowledge and skills gap faced by learners" (2015, p.9). Practical limitations, as well as the reported conservatism of teachers often restrict the effectiveness of sexuality education (Francis & dePalma, 2014; Francis & dePalma, 2015).

LO's sex education component according to literature, is narrow in its scope. Its focus on HIV/AIDS and STIs has led authors to describe the sexuality education section of the curriculum as 'instrumentalist', in that it neglects a discussion of the social and political forces at play around the virus and its transmission (Baxen et al., 2011; Macleod, 2009). Research shows that the biological and reproductive elements of sexuality predominate the sex education syllabus in South Africa. with biomedical facts couched in moralistic terms (Bhana, 2016; Francis & DePalma, 2014). This contradicts research which shows that comprehensive sexuality education, which mandates conversations about power, diversity of sexualities and genders, is more effective than abstinence-based approaches in achieving adolescent sexual and reproductive health objectives like delayed sexual debuts, uptake of contraceptive practices and having fewer sexual partners (DBE, 2019; Syzdlowski, 2013; UNESCO, 2009, 2018; UNFPA, 2016). [2]

[1] To clarify terminology, throughout this research report, when I use the term 'learners', I am describing young people who are in school in the basic education system; 'students', 'student teachers' or 'trainee teachers' are utilised to denote people who are enrolled in a tertiary institution to study education and become teachers; 'teachers' are educators already practicing in the basic education system, sometimes called 'in-service teachers'; whereas 'trainers' or 'teacher-trainers' are lecturers or academics in the tertiary education space who instruct trainee teachers at universities.

[2] Scholarship distinguishes between sex education and sexuality education (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2015; UNESCO et al., 2009; UNESCO et al., 2018; United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)., 2015). The literature shows that comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) is "lifelong," and "holistic", with the objective to

Scholars have commented on the lack of progressive messaging about Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex Plus (LGBTQI+) identities and experiences in the South African sex education curriculum. Despite an internationally renowned progressive constitution, South Africa remains a homophobic and heteronormative society as evidenced by high rates of hate crimes against people who are not cisgender or heterosexual (dePalma & Francis, 2014; Muholi, 2011). dePalma and Francis comment that the lack of clarity regarding LGBTQI+ messaging in the curriculum allows for the neglect of such discussions by teachers:

> In terms of legislation and policy discourses, there seems to be a strong disconnect between the progressive legislation detailed above and education policy, from which sexual diversity is strikingly absent… While the South African Constitution and other aspects of the national legal framework are quite clear in their support of LGBT rights, educational policy is sufficiently vague to support potential curricular silences... (2014, p.1690).

Another limitation is that the LO curriculum was not detailed enough for teachers (Kirby, 2011, p.2). In the absence of a 'scripted' curriculum, teachers simply avoided culturally sensitive topics concerning sexuality (Jarvis, 2014).

The current conjuncture which underlies sexuality education in SA

In response to these findings, the DBE embarked on a process to review the sexuality education curriculum through scripted lesson plans (SLPs). The SLPs were piloted in five of the nine provinces over the course of 2018 and 2019, but became the target of vitriolic public outcry over the second half of 2019. Although sexuality education is not new to South African schools, and has notionally been delivered in classrooms since 2000, the conjuncture (Hall, 2000) of this historical moment when the SLPs were released highlights a pervasive sexual and moral conservatism. At this conjuncture, sexuality education has become a subject for aggressive debates on social media, radio stations and in the news, assuming the role of barometer for a number of

equip learners with needed knowledge, attitudes and skills to understand their own sexual development, as well as improving health sexual and reproductive health and relationships generally (UNFPA, 2015, p. 11). Sex education, on the other hand, is restricted to the reproductive aspects or physical dimensions of sexuality. The usages of the terms 'sex education' or 'sexuality education' in this research report are thus intentional.

broader social anxieties. This research report follows these debates and aims to link teacher-training concerns to contemporaneous debates around sexuality education. In the section that follows, I outline a brief timeline of public outcry around the new SLPs between 2019 and early 2020 (to which I return in the conclusion).

Myths (and mania) surrounding the SLPs

Over the course of 2019 and early 2020, various groups – including a teacher union, various parent groups, religious groups and political parties – have canvassed against the introduction of SLPs into schools. The SLPs have become a source of mass hysteria over social media and traditional media platforms. In May 2019, for example, leaked excerpts from SLPs showed that grade 4s would learn about masturbation, consent, gender non-conformity and sexual pleasure (Govender, 2019; Selisho, 2019). For this, the DBE received much public ire. The DBE denied these claims, but published a statement confirming its plans to reform the sexuality education curriculum to be in line with international best-practice guides (Government of South Africa, 2019). Despite the DBE's statement, "Curriculum 2020," as it has come to be known, has been plagued by myths and protests since that time. In the conclusion of this research report, I offer a timeline of the anti-CSE lobby's activities during 2019 and speak to what these widespread protests mean for teacher-training in sexuality education.

One moment, however, bears particular attention from the onset. In August 2019 – the same month when protests were staged rejecting CSE by the African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP) and a parents' lobby called #NotWithOurChildren – the brutal rape and murder of Uyinene Mrwetyana sparked protests across the country. The #AmINext movement, which was forged in the weeks after Mrwetyana's murder, drew attention to the pervasiveness of high rates of sexual violence and the state's inability to address and reduce GBV (Eyoh, 2019; Thamm, 2019; Thom, 2019). South Africa has the highest rape rates in the world – 138 per 100,000 women – and femicide has increased 11% over the past two years (Makou, 2017; StatsSA, 2018; SA Police Services, 2018).

What these statistics show is that Mrwetyana's death was not an isolated incident, but central to the workings of a society where sexual violence is normative. Sexual socialisation and education

are key to addressing this scourge – and yet parallel to the #AmINext protests, a movement apparently equal in fury began amassing support to abolish CSE. The anti-CSE lobby does not recognize how age-appropriate CSE can combat GBV, rape and prejudicial attitudes. Conversely, it appears that the #AmINext movement did not adequately engage the conservative majority of the country to change attitudes and behaviours which lead to such violence. These two groups of hashtag protestors – the #AmINext group on one side, and the anti-CSE lobby called #LeaveOurKidsAlone on the other – seem to be talking past each other at while sharing a particular contingent historical moment.

In a context where many important stakeholders – like parents, teachers, political figures and religious leaders – so zealously oppose the delivery of compulsory CSE, this research report contributes to a body of literature which reiterates the pressing need for sexuality education in schools.[3] Francis & Msibi (2010) and Jarvis (2014) show how teachers may neglect CSE if it contradicts their religious or cultural beliefs. How teachers are trained for LO – and whether this training reproduces or challenges hegemonic discourses pertaining to sexuality, gender and power – has not been examined in much detail by scholars. This is explored further in the rationale for this research below.

Rationale for Research

What originally drew me to this research was an interest in young women's sexual education. I left school with many questions about my body, my rights and my sexuality. My curiosity in researching sexuality education began with a desire to equip young women with knowledge, rights and access to sexual and reproductive health rights services. But as time passed, and as the #AmINext protests spread across the country – with many men denying, at best, their involvement in GBV, and at worst, its existence at all – what became clearer to me is that sexuality education

[3] Indeed, the DBE's own position on sexuality education seems unclear. A Ministerial Task Team recommended that LO be phased out in the FET band over the next 7 years and replaced with History (Ndlovu et al, 2018). There appeared to be no public protest about 'scrapping' LO, and the DBE has never publicly refuted such claims. Data from my research shows, in Chapter 4, that this announcement had tangible effects on the teaching and learning of LO. LO for the FET band is at risk of being abolished, despite the fact that this age group is highly sexually active (DePalma & Francis, 2014; Jewkes et al, 2009). That there was no public outcry about the scrapping of LO, and now that there is such uproar about CSE means that many stakeholders are against the new plan and puts the DBE in a complex position.

needs to pay particular attention to the attitudes and behaviours of boys. Although not the explicit focus of this piece, it is my view that sexuality education has to go beyond discourses of morality and female victimhood, and challenge hegemonic masculinity in South Africa.

In our context, where intergenerational discussions about sexuality between caregivers and children are frequently restricted by religious or cultural taboos, teachers are important transmitters of sexual and reproductive health messaging to young people (Helleve et al, 2009; Wood, 2009).[4] As such, this research report places teachers and teacher-training at the centre of broader discussions about adolescent sexual and reproductive health. It links sexuality education in the basic education sector, to the role of tertiary institutions in constructing knowledge and practice through teacher-training. My data reveals teachers' attitudes towards gender, sexuality and power; and reveals the shortfalls and tensions evident in teacher-training. I aim to explore ways in which training can be designed to address teachers' existing attitudes and needs.

Research Questions

This study is concerned with how teacher-training – with Rhodes University in the Eastern Cape constituting my case study – constructs discourses of sexuality, gender and power. Teachers are trained to deliver a politically constructed national curriculum; the newly piloted SLPs represent a novel moment in discourse transmission from the state. Teacher-training thus reflects, among other things, the priorities of the state and offers insights into young people's sexual socialisation. While the main source of my empirical data originates at RU, this research report draws on various contemporaneous sources and employs a multimethodological approach. The objective of this research report is to interrogate the ways in which the discourses of teachers participating in tertiary in-service training shapes and reproduces certain gender discourses.

[4] While there are some important NGO sexuality education interventions (Adams et al., 2017; Dickinson, 2014; Perlman et al., 2013; Warwick & Aggleton, 2004), it is ultimately schoolteachers who are responsible for delivering sexuality education to learners. This research report acknowledges that school is never the only source of information for adolescent sexuality education, and that religious and cultural institutions, peer-led education, and social media are all significant factors in adolescent sexual socialization and remain important areas for future research. It would, however, not be possible to discuss all of these influences here. And because school-based sexuality education through LO is state-mandated and the materials for it are state-produced, it offers unique insights into state discourses.

This research report thus aims to answer the following questions:

- ➢ What are the attitudes of practising teachers in the Rhodes University in-service teacher-training programme towards sexuality education?
- ➢ How can training processes be developed to equip teachers better to teach the complexities of sexuality education?
- ➢ In what ways do state discourses in the new scripted lesson plans for sexuality education reproduce or challenge hegemonic constructions of sexuality, gender and power?

Research Report Outline

The body of literature in which this report is situated pertains to how sexuality education is central to the uptake of safe sexual and reproductive health messaging for young people. Chapter 2's literature review will examine the history of sexual socialisation in South Africa, and the use of sexuality education by the state as a form of control. It then looks at the contemporary context of sexuality education in the country, along with the challenges experienced by LO teachers. The literature will be situated within the broader theoretical framework of this piece – critical discourse analysis (CDA).

Chapter 3 discusses the multi-methodological design – consisting of a qualitative case-study of teacher-training for sexuality education through focus groups, and a discourse analysis of texts – at stake in this research. My site selection is detailed, as well as how data was collected and analysed according to the methods of CDA. I also discuss the ethical considerations of the study.

The report turns to discussion of the data from my research site – Rhodes University – in Chapters 4 and 5. Rhodes University offers a part-time B.Ed qualification for in-service teachers practising in the basic education system who are looking to improve their qualifications. In Chapter 4, data collection from my observations and focus groups with participants of the in-service B.Ed LO teacher-training at Rhodes is described. Chapter 5 examines the attitudes of teachers, focusing on discourses of gender, sexuality and power, as well as the roles of – and interrelationships between – tertiary institutions, teacher trainers and trainee teachers in the construction of these discourses. This chapter offers original socio-linguistic insights to the teaching of sexuality education.

In Chapter 6, I undertake a textual analysis of the new SLPs for sexuality education for Grade 10. Here, the new SLPs are compared to previously reported issues with the sexuality education curriculum and addressed in relation to the conversations I had with teachers in the chapter prior.

Finally, the report concludes with a chapter situating my research in the broader context of protest regarding sexuality education and sexual socialisation. It consolidates the central argument of this report, namely that teachers and teacher-training are crucial to the uptake of progressive adolescent sexual and reproductive health rights messaging. The chapter also evaluates the limitations of this research report and indicates possibilities for future research.

Chapter 2 | Literature Review

This literature review commences by outlining histories of sexual socialisation in South Africa, before proceeding to explore some of the main criticisms that have been reported about the curriculum for LO. I situate this analysis in terms of the global contexts for sexuality education. The chapter then illustrates the particular teaching challenges faced by LO educators, and examines critiques of the dominant pedagogical style employed by them.

Sexual socialisation in South Africa: a brief historical overview

Foucault argues, in *History of Sexuality*, that "[t]he sex of children and adolescents has become… an important area of contention around which innumerable institutional devices and discursive strategies have been deployed" (1978, p. 30). Interventions to address the perceived 'problem' of adolescent sexuality have been made throughout South Africa's history. Indeed, as analysis in Chapter 5 shows, "sexuality education in South Africa provides a powerful lens for understanding the effects of colonial and apartheid creations of race, class and oppressed groups" (Bhana et al, 2019, p.363).

South Africa has a rich historical canon on sexuality. Two central threads are informative for this literature review. The threads pertain first to the significance of adolescent sexual experimentation and pleasure in precolonial sexualities, and then, to the (violent) control of sexuality by the state to attain specific political and economic ends. These threads, while related, will be explored independently next.

The concept of pleasure in pre-colonial sexual discourse

To account for how sexuality was constructed before colonial contact, historians have explored a variety of archival and oral sources. While still administered through patriarchal and heteronormative regulations, pre-colonial sexual socialisation, such sources show, permitted certain forms of premarital sexual expression and experimentation. Southern African traditional communities, researchers have commented, permitted certain forms of pleasure and desire as long as they did not result in pre-marital pregnancy (Delius & Glaser, 2002; Erlank, 2004). Young

adults in some communities were permitted to have 'sweethearts' and engage in types of regulated sexual experiences which did not risk premarital pregnancy, such as intracrural sex (Burns, 1996). Deviation from these regulated forms of sexuality was a punishable offence, and so peer-group education and monitoring systems developed to instruct younger adolescents about what was and was not culturally permissible in terms of sexuality (Burns, 1996). Delius and Glaser (2002) juxtapose this robust system of peer-education from the pre-colonial past to a society where taboos, silences and misinformation among youths have exacerbated the effects of HIV/AIDS and unplanned pregnancies of the post-apartheid present.

In South Africa, the articulation of settler colonisation, Christianity and the emerging form of white nationalism shifted prevailing sexual norms and consolidated a form of dominant sexuality which prioritized heterosexual, procreative, monogamous marriages (Bhana et al, 2019; Duff, 2015a & b, 2017; Epprecht, 2008; Gaitskell, 1982). The harsh criminal sentences imposed for sodomy as early as the 18th century in the Cape and the later 'sexual offences' Acts passed by the Apartheid government in the 20th century show a long historical trajectory of state control over sexuality. Same-sex sexual experiences and identities were increasingly criminalized, violently dealt with and framed as deviant (Sanders, 2009). Discourses of pleasure or desire, which authors have shown were perceived as acceptable and natural in the precolonial period, were then positioned as sinful and dirty (Duff, 2015a & b, 2017).

Authors in South Africa, but also across the African continent, have documented the existence of and sometimes even societal tolerance towards same-sex relationships in pre-colonial and colonial eras (Gevisser & Cameron, 1994; Nyanzi, 2013; Oyewumi, 2002; Van Zyl, 2011). It is critical to question and deconstruct what 'tradition' or 'culture' are where there is a tendency – as there is in South African sexuality education today – to paint concepts of sexual and gender diversity as 'foreign' contaminants to an otherwise stable and pure set of previous norms. Literature on post-apartheid sexuality education in schools – and my own analysis discussed later – shows that many teachers reiterate the idea that homosexuality is 'foreign' to African cultures, in turn leading to the neglect of LGBTQI+ rights by LO teachers (Francis & Msibi, 2010). I will return to questions regarding the contradictory conservatism and cultural nostalgia that predominate public discourse on homosexuality in South Africa later. This report takes the view, then, that 'culture' is never

static or uniform, and is constantly contested and mediated through different discourses and power relations. These themes connect to the historical role of the state in regulating and disciplining 'appropriate' forms of sexuality through sex education.

Sex education and state control of sexuality

The control of sexuality, historians have shown, became central to the colonial and apartheid states' political, economic, social and ideological goals. Racist anxieties that 'miscegenation' would 'degrade' the white race underpinned various segregationist policies aimed at sexual and social regulation, including the Immorality Act of 1927 and the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act in 1950 (Delius & Glaser, 2002; Duff, 2015; Jochelson, 2001; Gibson, 2019). The racial ideology and pseudo-science that drove much of the Union and apartheid governments' policies took a eugenicist approach, with Duff arguing that "sex education spoke to eugenicist interest in improving the national stock. If taught to youth at school, sex education could become an important tool in improving the physical and moral health of the nation" (2015, p.201). The control of sexuality to achieve state goals is not unique to South Africa's history alone. Foucault's (1979) work on the centrality to Western state formation of disciplining sexuality, and Ann Stoler's *Race and the Education of Desire* (1995) which addressed the intersections of race, sexuality and state control to colonial experiences in former French and Dutch colonies in the then East-Indies are two of many scholarly pieces which demonstrate the diverse forms and functions that state control of sexuality assumed.

Throughout the 20th century, there was no school-based sexuality education for South African learners.[5] In the absence of a curriculum for sex education, historians have however examined legislation, health pamphlets and propaganda as evidence for limited sex messaging (Duff, 2015; Jochelson, 2001). Sex education, through these sources, formed an important part of the white state's Christian nationalist moral project for social control (Dovey & Mason, 1984; Jochelson, 2001). Macleod shows that the 'Guidance' subject, which was introduced into 'white' schools in 1967 and 'black' schools in 1981, contained "informal, tacit messages concerning appropriate

[5] Indeed, as mentioned earlier, 'sexuality education' is a 21st-century term. Throughout the twentieth century in South Africa, 'sexual hygiene' or 'moral education' were terms used more broadly to describe instruction regarding sexual health (Burns, 1996)

sexuality and gendered conduct in relationships" (2009, p.4). This subject, the predecessor to LO, sought "to 'guide' students into their roles as future citizens, roles that were clearly racialised" (2009, p. 9). Although it was not delivered through a school subject, the use of sex education messaging reproduced gendered, sexual and racial differences that were central to the white state's economic and ideological goals.

The effects of sex education messaging of South Africa's past – which prioritized discourses that reified Christian monogamous heterosexual marriage – are long-lasting. I argue that after the first democratic elections in 1994, when LO was established as a mandatory subject, the new curriculum was not politically neutral. Despite being more egalitarian, and focusing on democracy constitutionalism and gender equality, it retained discursive continuities from the past. The new curriculum in 1994, did not constitute an end to state control of sexuality; rather it represented a shift in interests and the nature of control and discourses, as I show next.

Contemporary sexuality education in South Africa

The introduction of Life Orientation and school-based sexuality education

LO's immediate function as a new subject in the curriculum of the democratic dispensation was to communicate the new country's democratic and constitutional principles. [6] Gender and sexuality issues were secondary to the first curriculum, known as Curriculum 2005, while the political master-narrative of nation-building and reconciliation was pursued (as I explored in a previous study; see Chaskalson, 2018). When C2005 was revised in 2003 to become the National Curriculum Statement (NCS), a greater emphasis was placed on HIV/AIDS education through LO (DoE, 2003). Without comprehensive free antiretroviral therapy (ART) available until 2005, high HIV transmission rates, and civil society mobilisation regarding access to treatment, characterized the early 2000s. The spread and effects of the virus were worsened by widespread stigma towards

[6] The introduction of Life Orientation as a compulsory subject in 2000 tied into global educational trends In 1994, the World Health Organisation (WHO) published a report entitled "Life skills education for children and adolescents in schools" in which the idea of teaching life skills at school - as opposed to parents or community leaders taking on the role - was globally mainstreamed. The WHO advocated for the development of school curricula which included "core skills" like "interpersonal relationship skills," "self-awareness", and "coping with emotions" for children and adolescents (1994, p.1).

HIV positive people as well as AIDS denialism (A. Butler, 2005; Heywood, 2009). Youth were targeted in national HIV policies, and a (patchy) inter-sectoral response was developed to respond to the urgent need for HIV prevention education (Simelela & Venter, 2014).

Due to "ongoing implementation challenges," the NCS was revised to make way for the current curriculum, CAPS, which was adopted in 2011 (DBE, 2011). Although the names of topics were adapted in CAPS, analysis showed that subject material for LO remained largely unchanged despite the curriculum revision, and some revisions were even regressive. Issues of gender and sexuality were limited in their scope in the CAPS curriculum, with Francis and dePalma arguing that HIV prevention and sexuality education were "synonymous" (2014, p. 83). Stressing the biomedical aspects of HIV - couched in scientific jargon - limited the extent to which social and political forces at play around the virus and its transmission were discussed (Baxen et al., 2011; Francis & DePalma, 2014). Sex education focusses solely on "disease, danger and damage" (Glover & Macleod, 2016, p.1). While it is incredibly important to address the enduring realities of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, the high prevalence of unplanned pregnancies and GBV in South Africa indicates that educational interventions have been ineffectual (Bhana, 2016; Macleod, 2016).

CAPS was the first national educational policy which advocated for abstinence. In a curriculum point otherwise identical to NCS, abstinence was inserted into CAPS for grade 10. International research – and multilateral agreements to which South Africa is a signatory – at the time of CAPS' release asserted the marked failures of teaching 'abstinence-only' sex education (UNFPA, 2011, UNESCO, 2009; Szydlowski, 2013). It was therefore contradictory and concerning that abstinence was given national political clout through this insertion into CAPS. Furthermore, CAPS did not cover methods of contraception, refusal skills, risks of concurrent sexual partners or STI testing and reproductive health services (Kirby, 2011; UNFPA, 2015).

Where the NCS had contained a glossary of terms with a progressive definition of gender (see DBE, 2003, p.68), CAPS did not include any definitions of or delineate the differences – and relationships – between gender, sex and sexual orientation. Some local literature exposes the often-moralistic forms of teaching about sex because of its causative relation to HIV/AIDS, STIs and

unplanned pregnancies (Ahmed et al., 2009; Bhana & Pattman, 2009; Baxen et al., 2011; Shefer et al., 2013). Concepts like sexual diversity, gender, pleasure, consent and patriarchy were neglected (Glover & Macleod, 2016; MacEntee, 2016; Young et al., 2016). While discussions about discrimination, stereotypes and power were mandated within the LO curriculum, the interconnections between these ideas and sexual and reproductive health were not delineated.

And despite claiming to further the ideals of the South African Constitution, the curriculum remains heteronormative and cisnormative (dePalma & Francis, 2014). LGBTQI+ content is neglected by many teachers, marginalizing the needs of LGBTQI+ learners, and falling short of the goals of inclusivity and non-discrimination which LO was meant to champion (Bhana, 2016; dePalma & Francis, 2014a & b; Francis, 2012; Wilmot, 2013). Furthermore, in CAPS, sexual diversity is not represented in the curriculum outside of notions of molestation or violence (Wilmot, 2013; Francis, 2015; DePalma & Francis, 2014).

Even when the curriculum is not silent on issues of sexual diversity, CAPS outlines some ambiguous discourses about sexuality. For instance, in grade 10, learners are required to learn "Values and strategies to make responsible decisions regarding sexuality and lifestyle choices," as well as "where to find help regarding sexuality and lifestyle choices" (DBE, 2011, p.15). The ambiguity here arises from the understanding of "sexuality", a term which is not defined by the curriculum. If one takes sexuality to mean sexual orientation – which proved to be the common understanding in my focus groups (explored in Chapter 5) – the discourses from these phrases suggest that sexuality is a "choice" or "decision" that can be responsible or irresponsible. This affirms the hegemonic idea that heterosexuality (which is never construed as a choice) is the only tolerable form of sexuality and deviations constitute 'irresponsible choices'.

Another "curricular silence" (dePalma & Francis, 2014, p.1690) is that the term 'consent' is not used once in the curriculum. In a context where sexual coercion, GBV and rape are so pervasive, CAPS does not mention consent, still less clarify the legal framework for consent in South Africa.

The curriculum, furthermore, is ambiguous on the question of gender roles. While simultaneously claiming to combat gender inequality and "stereotypical views of gender roles" (DBE, 2013, p.20),

the curriculum mandates discussions regarding "life roles" (2013, p.15) which appear to follow a static and heteronormative nuclear family script. Scholars (Ngabaza & Shefer, 2019; Hodes & Gittings, 2019) have commented on the fact that the curriculum's centring of the nuclear patrifocal family does not mirror many learners' or teachers' experiences in reality – South African family life remains highly disrupted due to the violent legacies of apartheid and colonialism. Many South African children are raised in female-headed households (Hodes & Gittings, 2019; Ngabaza & Shefer, 2019). In spite of this, other sources of sexuality education – in particular the important rite of passage of circumcision schools for young men, practiced by many South African cultural-linguistic groups – tend to propagate images of male-headed families as well as male sexual dominance and entitlement in contrast to female subservience and victimhood (Bhana & Pattman, 2009; Hodes & Gittings, 2019; Macleod, 2016).

Authors show that cultural, religious and societal stigmas surrounding topics of sexuality and gender limit the scope of LO discussions, and these stigmas are often most acutely felt by young female learners. Female learners reportedly "cannot find their sexual voice(s) within the lessons" (Brown, 2013, p.77; Young et al., 2019). Indeed, researchers illustrate that the curriculum reinforces gender stereotypes of toxic masculinity and female passivity and victimisation (Bhana, 2016; dePalma & Francis, 2014; Saville Young, Moodley & Macleod, 2018, Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015). This potentially allows for the continuation of harmful stereotypes regarding gender roles and agency.

Pedagogically and institutionally, LO has limitations. LO is a compulsory subject for all South African learners, and requires a pass mark of over 70% to get into university. However, it does not offer university entrance points (Matshoba, Rooth, & Umalusi, 2014, p. 40). The learning area receives only two hours of class time per week – one hour of which is always dedicated to physical education. Despite being promoted by curriculum-developers as an important pedagogical and political tool, LO is widely perceived as a "second class subject" (Francis & dePalma, 2015; Matshoba et al., 2014, p. 3; Ndlovu et al., 2018).

Despite LO's importance to state plans for eradicating HIV, it has not been backed with sufficient political will (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Green, 2018). The state's discourse in CAPS continues

to reflect a pervasive conservatism, which is shared by many teachers to whom I spoke (see Chapters 4 and 5). Notwithstanding these limitations, the state has attempted to enact international best-practice for sexuality education, as I show now.

South Africa in relation to the global context of sexuality education

A number of local policies espouse CSE given its proven successes elsewhere in the world.[7] South Africa adheres to numerous multilateral benchmarks by having a compulsory standalone subject which includes sexuality education (UNESCO, 2009; UNESCO, 2015; UNESCO et al., 2018). In 2013, furthermore, South Africa convened a Ministerial conference, Ministers of Education and Health from 21 countries in Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) committed to "ensure quality comprehensive sexuality education and youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health services in the ESA region" and "invest in teachers who are well trained, resourced and supported to deliver [CSE] programmes" (UNESCO, 2013, p. 5). Given that ESA was the only region where HIV infections in adolescents increased between 2001 and 2013, and that AIDS was the leading cause of death for 10-19-year olds in the region in 2016, this policy was seen as a critical measure to combat new infections (UNFPA, 2016).

There is a vast body of literature about sexuality education elsewhere in the world: Globally, only 34% of youth worldwide demonstrate comprehensive understanding about HIV prevention strategies and the transmission of the virus (UNESCO, 2015). In India, misinformation linking the spread of HIV/AIDS and other STIs to extra-marital or pre-marital sexual relations has been uncovered in popular school textbooks for grade 10 learners (Smrithi, 2019). The rollout of CSE into schools in Latin America has been haphazard, and consequently 70% of young people in the region do not receive accurate and vital sexual and reproductive health messaging (Regional Platform Latin America and Caribbean, 2017; Fajardo-Heyward, 2016).[8]

[7] See for example, Department of Education, 2003; Department of Basic Education, 2017; Department of Health & Department of Basic Education, 2012; Department of Social Development, 2015.

[8] Nor are obstacles to sexuality education solely a problem of the developing world; indeed, in countries of the Global North, sexuality education has its challenges (Chege, 2006; Ketting & Ivanova, 2018). Recently in the United Kingdom, parents protested against lessons about LGBTQI+ rights, which were perceived by parents as promoting gay or transgender lifestyles (Parveen, 2019). Since 1995, $1.5 billion have been channelled by religious lobby groups into abstinence-only sexuality education programmes in the United States (Sydlowzdki et al, 2009).

While sexuality education remains so contested globally, it is commendable that South Africa has a stand-alone mandatory subject in which sexuality education is taught, despite widespread local conservatism. Nonetheless, implementation of CSE in South Africa has been slow and patchy (Francis, 2012; Van Deventer, 2009). The specific challenges of teaching sexuality in South African schools are explored below.

Teachers' difficulties with sexuality education in South Africa

In literature about sexuality education in South Africa, teachers for LO are described as "confidantes", "counsellors" and "change agents" (Francis & DePalma, 2015, pp.35-36); "keystones" or "role models" (Pillay, 2012, pp.167-168); "gatekeepers of knowledge" (UNESCO, 2015, p.25) and "ambassadors of change" (Wood, 2009, p.85). This shows that LO teachers are expected to play many roles simultaneously.

LO does not receive resources on par with other subjects (Ahmed et al., 2009; Matshoba et al., 2014; Prinsloo, 2007; van Deventer, 2009). Many LO teachers are not trained specifically for the subject, but take it on for a higher teaching load and salary (Francis & dePalma, 2015; Matshoba et al., 2014; Pillay, 2012; Shah, 2012). For this reason, researchers argue that regular in-service training and professionalization of non-specialist teachers, as well as continuous refresher-courses for trained LO teachers are vital to ensure the uptake of sexual and reproductive health messaging in learners (Francis, 2012; Green, 2018; UNESCO, 2015). But UNESCO's (2015) study of teacher-training for CSE in South Africa shows that most in-service training is extracurricular and non-mandatory.

Even when educators have been trained LO, there are challenges. According to research, LO frequently is at odds with many teachers' personal religious or cultural beliefs (dePalma & Francis, 2014a; Francis & Msibi, 2011; Jarvis, 2014; Ngabaza, Shefer, & Macleod, 2016; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015). Some teachers contribute to the perpetuating of compulsory heteronormativity, gender stereotyping and trans-erasion in classrooms (dePalma & Francis, 2014; Saville Young et al., 2018). Many reportedly use discourses of 'tradition' or religion to neglect or limit discussions

in ways that contradict the rich historical canon written about sexual socialisation (Francis, 2012; Francis & Msibi, 2011).

Some teachers, furthermore, are allegedly anxious that educating learners about safe-sex practices, let alone about pleasure or sexual diversity, might embolden sexual activity – as such, the curriculum and the teachers employed to deliver it tend to transmit highly prudent messages which centre "a 'responsible sexuality' framework" aimed at individual management of sexuality (Macleod, Moodley & Saville Young, 2015; Saville Young et al., 2018). Some teachers employ moralistic injunctions and 'scare tactics' to discourage learners from sexual activity, or the perceived "moral decline" that resulted in the HIV/AIDS pandemic (Francis, 2010; Helleve et al., 2009; Prinsloo, 2007, p. 155).

This is often, according to the literature, couched in discourses of 'protecting' learners who are presumed to be 'innocent', or too young to learn about so-called 'adult' issues pertaining to sexuality (Bhana, 2016; Bhana & Pattman, 2009; Francis, 2010). This does acknowledge that sexuality is part of childhood, adolescence and youth, and does not enable learners to engage critically with their own dispositions. This has effects on sexual health. There is thus a need to recognize the agency of young people by reconceptualizing learners as "knowers" as opposed to being sexually ignorant (Bhana & Pattman, Francis, 2010, p.315; Ngabaza & Shefer, 2019). Sexuality education in South Africa, therefore, far from being comprehensive, has continued to form part of a "regulatory imperative to control and discipline young people's sexualities and desires" (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 64). This stands in continuity with South Africa's history of using sex education as a form of state control.

Literature on school-based sexuality education has focused mainly on the basic education sector, without looking at the ways in which tertiary institutions participate in adolescent sexual and reproductive health through pedagogy, knowledge production and construction of discourses in teacher training-programmes. Teacher-training is understudied (UNESCO, 2015), with Gibson asserting that: "Teacher training is an important but often overlooked component of bridging the gap between sexuality education and positive sexual health outcomes for youth" (2019, p.1). While teacher-training needs to impart skills and knowledge, to be sure, acknowledging and containing

the personal position and affective, social and cultural investments made by teachers is also needed from the teacher-training process (Saville Young et al., 2018). The links between tertiary and basic education sectors through the instruction of teachers and discourse transmission is thus a fruitful area for inquiry.

Framing sexuality education through discourse analysis

This research report takes as its point of departure that neither sexuality nor gender are static; both are socially constructed and performed (J. Butler, 1988; Vance, 1992). And because hegemonic forms of sexuality and gender are constituted, not natural, they "can be constituted differently" through teacher-training (J. Butler, 1988, p. 901). This is one of the central themes guiding this research – how are sexuality, gender and power constructed through discourses in the LO curriculum and training process for LO teachers, and how can these be constituted differently?

I adopt a Foucauldian approach to school-based sexuality education and teacher-training by examining the production and use of discourses. Foucault (1978) contends that power and knowledge are constructed in and through discourse. Discourse is the highly varied forms of expression through which different institutions, disciplines and bodies encode power relations. Discourses and the links between knowledge and power, according to Foucault, shape society and the construction of sexuality. As Crowly and Himmelweit assert, "Sexuality and identity can only be understood, then, in terms of the complicated and often paradoxical ways in which pleasures, knowledges and power are produced and disciplined in language and institutionalized across multiple social fields" (1992, p.278).

Applying a Foucauldian lens to teacher-training allows me to look at the process of training, training texts, and state documents like curricula and policies. The convergence and contradictions of different discourses within these are discerned.

To analyse the spaces and texts associated with teacher-training, critical discourse analysis is a useful framework. Fairclough argues that "education, along with all other social institutions, has as its 'hidden agenda' the reproduction of … high level social structures, in addition to its overt educational agenda" (1989, p. 40). Fairclough, an important scholar in the study of discourse,

language and power, stresses "the significance of language in the production, maintenance and change of social relations of power" (1989, p. 15). This is true of curriculum documents, textbooks and school policies, which, Giroux contends, are "implicated in producing relations of … domination, and oppression" (1997, p. 243). In Chapters 5 and 6, I examine – through the framework of discourse analysis – teacher-respondents' own language and discourses, as well as discourses from state curricula.

Conclusions

This literature review has attempted to synthesize a number of key threads in the literature pertaining to the history of sexual socialisation in South Africa, the regulation of sexuality by the state, the introduction of LO and its problems within national and global contexts. Central to the discussion has been the role of teachers in discourse transmission. I argue that LO, through its curriculum, as well as the training and practice of teachers who deliver it, perpetuate a heteronormative and cisgendered hegemony, where sexual and gender diversity is perceived to be deviant from the 'natural' norm. LO's narrow focus on HIV/AIDS in a biomedical sense avoids discussion of the gendered power dynamics which shape the pandemic. Furthermore, limited conversations about power, desire, consent and LGBTQI+ issues in the curriculum and teachers' pedagogy impede the effectiveness of sexual and reproductive health interventions in schools.

While there is a rich body of research on the limitations in LO's curriculum, and challenges with learning and teaching sexuality education in the South African context, there has been less scholarly interest in the process of teacher-training and its impact on teacher attitudes and classroom practice. The role of tertiary institutions in the production of gender discourses through its training of teachers is understudied. Critical discourse analysis is the theoretical framework used to explore these areas. I turn to this more comprehensively in the next chapter.

Chapter 3 | Methodology

This chapter will outline the research design for this project, using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as the methodological backdrop. It will detail the process of data collection, the selection of texts, and the ethical considerations for the research report. It concludes with some reflections on the fieldwork and data collection process, examining the bias and limitations of the research.

I will employ CDA to examine dominant discourses of teacher-training for sexuality education. Meyer (2001) argues that CDA is not "a single method but rather … an approach" (p.14). Many early theorists who developed CDA were linguists. They focused on the micro-linguistic components and functions of texts. However, many authors have used CDA at broader levels to analyse the relationship between language and power, or

> analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse). (Wodak, 2001, p.2)

CDA thus concerns itself with how expressions of power and ideology inform and maintain unequal social relations. It analyses the language and discourses of those who are in power and maintain the status quo through the production of discourses. Ideology sustains these discourses and with them, particular relations of power and domination (Foucault, 1978; Fairclough, 2001). The basis of CDA's critique must thus be imaginative, radical and transformational – the theory has "emancipatory objectives" (Fairclough, 2001, p.126).

To do this, CDA centres the "perspective of those who suffer the most" (Van Dijk, 1986, p.4). Consequently, CDA explores not only what is explicitly said, but also what is silenced or implied in texts. Silence has particular relevance for our context given the taboos that shroud conversations about sexuality in schools. Fairclough argues that when one can map what is taken for granted – or silenced – in a text, "[p]ractices which appear to be universal and commonsensical can often be shown to originate in the ... the dominant bloc, and to have become *naturalized*" (Fairclough, 1989, p.33 – emphasis in the original). In our context, where hetero- and cis-normative forms of expressing sexuality and gender identities have become reified as natural and hegemonic (dePalma

& Francis, 2014), this methodological framework allows us to examine what the process of naturalization renders invisible or silent.

Research Design

My original plan for this research report was to conduct discourse analysis of teacher-training for sexuality education by observing teacher-training lectures and textually analysing teacher guides and course materials. However, this proved complicated for logistical reasons that I describe below.

Moreover, I undertook this research in a time of transition; new materials introduced during the course of my research changed the landscape of sexuality education in the country and generated an entirely novel (and heated) public debate. What this meant was that my area of interest was not as fixed as I thought it was when I started this project; instead, it became important to follow developments as they unfolded and to chart a number of different, and often conflicting, trajectories regarding sexuality education in the country.

Consequently, my methodology was forced to evolve due to both practical limitations and the introduction of new documents which broadened the possibilities for inquiry. This research report, then, incorporates a number of sources and methods, some of which I had to struggle to obtain, and others which – serendipitously – found me.

The challenges of site selection

I originally attempted to approach the Department of Basic Education to observe its in-service teacher-training workshops for LO educators. Due to institutional gate-keeping and hostility to outside researchers, I realized that it would not be feasible for me to conduct such observations within the time frame of a one year Masters. Some findings regarding in-service workshops for LO educators are, however, discussed in Chapter 4.

I learnt that although teacher-training for CSE is offered at some universities in South Africa, many do not deliver it comprehensively. I contacted eight universities as potential sites for teacher-

training observation; but due to institutional gate-keeping and widespread disinterest in Life Orientation, I was turned away from most. I could only confirm that the University of Pretoria (UP) and Rhodes University offered teacher-training for sexuality education. UP offers a semester-long course on sexuality education for pre-service undergraduate teacher-training, but it is not compulsory for all LO students. I conducted observations of this training and spoke to staff members involved with the course, but due to time constraints, I could not collect as much data as I would have liked and therefore did not include this data in this research report.

The process of securing research sites turned out to be an interesting finding in and of itself: at various universities, it became clear through correspondence and telephonic communication that significant institutional players in education departments were not clear whose responsibility sexuality education training was, and some were entirely uninterested.[9] My struggle to access the process of teacher-training for sexuality education seemed to demonstrate a gap between the tertiary and basic education sectors with respect to sexuality education.

Data collection at Rhodes University

Rhodes University (RU) offers teacher-training for sexuality education through in-service and pre-service programmes. At RU, various stakeholders were supportive of this project – permission was granted from the Dean of Education, and two teacher trainers agreed to participate. By the time I was ready to undertake fieldwork, the pre-service students had already completed the sexuality education component of their course. I conducted a semi-structured interview with the teacher trainer for pre-service training, Peter Dixon (name changed), regarding the process and challenges of training teachers for sexuality education. I could access the in-service programme and speak to both the students of in-service training and their teacher trainer, Deon Louw (name changed). I

[9] Most universities that I contacted did not have a specific or compulsory course or module on sexuality education, but included it secondarily in LO teacher-training regarding constitutional rights and diversity. Some education faculties do not have LO departments. This raised questions in my mind about the role of the tertiary sector in sexuality education research and interventions, particularly if resources and staff are not made available for this purpose. Tertiary institutions remain an important player in my mind, but given the varied and patchy commitment of different universities to teacher-training for sexuality education, the need for alternative spaces – like peer-education initiatives, NGOs, the state and digital media – to contribute to sexuality education is still pressing.

interviewed Louw for two hours regarding his experiences of the training process, challenges of students, institutional concerns and potential insights for future training. I then ran four two-hour focus group sessions with Louw's 15 in-service students.

RU only has the capacity to train one small cohort of in-service teachers at a time. The current cohort was in their second year. Louw has run this B.Ed for six years. In the past, he explained to me that he waited for students' third year before exploring sexuality education to ensure "they're happy and comfortable with each other" due to their "personal discomfort with the topic". As such, these students had not yet undergone formal training for sexuality education, and due to time constraints, I could not observe the training as it will only occur in late 2020. Instead, Louw offered me some time during the contact session to explore the students' current attitudes and challenges of school-based sexuality education and what they need from future training.

As a methodology, focus groups allow for deep qualitative data to emerge as participants interact with each other and the researcher (Kitzinger, 1999; Morgan, 1997). My four focus group sessions allowed for a diverse sample of participants to engage with each other about sexuality education. Effort was made to ensure that the focus group sessions were interactive and aimed at generating critical engagement and participation. As such, informal activities were used as ice-breakers and focus building exercises; an interactive spectrum activity was designed to ascertain teachers' views on certain statements in relation to one another. For this, I read a statement to the teachers and asked them to position themselves in the space along a spectrum of possible responses, ranging from "I agree fully" to "I partially agree" and "I disagree fully". Teachers were invited to position themselves independently anywhere along the spectrum, and in relation to each other. We brainstormed ideas for support structures for LO teachers and sexuality education – this was designed to stimulate problem-solving and imagine interventions and policies aimed at changing the status quo. We engaged in short role-plays to stimulate critical thought. Some elements of the day were purely oral conversations held in a round and designed to see group members' interactions with each other, and finally anonymous written submissions were taken from teachers regarding questions they have about sexuality education and common questions that they receive from learners regarding sexuality (Appendix II). The entirety of the focus group was audio recorded using my cell phone. Transcripts and written submissions from the participants were then

analysed through the lens of critical discourse analysis to illuminate discourses pertaining to gender, sexuality and power.

Textual Analysis

As mentioned earlier, the state released new scripted lesson plans for LO during the course of my research. These SLPs triggered intense public debate which was reflected in news sources and social media. Chapter 6 employs critical discourse analysis to the grade 10 scripted lesson plans. For reasons of scope, other grades could not be analysed here. Two texts were analysed – the learner book, and the accompanying educator guide. I analyse the SLPs in relation to their particular historical moment, and the tensions and contradictions within the texts are interrogated. In my concluding chapter, excerpts from news articles, social media posts and media statements about the current furore around sexuality education are examined textually.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical clearance (Protocol number DVS20190101) was granted by the School of Social Sciences for this research. Ethical permission was also granted from the RU registrar to conduct research on university campuses. Informed written consent was obtained from all interviewees and participants from the focus groups. As interviewees/participants of observations were not vulnerable, this research fell into a low-risk category.

Chapter 4 | Rhodes University in Makhanda: Context & methodology

Rhodes University (RU) is situated in Makhanda – the town formerly known as Grahamstown – in the Eastern Cape. This chapter explores interactions with teacher trainers at RU, before exploring the attitudes towards sexuality education of 15 teachers undertaking an in-service B.Ed degree for LO. Discourses from the group of teachers illuminate the demanding and complicated job of teacher-training.

The teacher training process

In both pre-service and in-service teacher-training for LO at RU, some instruction on sexuality education is a compulsory element of the curriculum. Louw said that staff were given relative freedom from the university to develop their curriculum and materials in line with the school LO curriculum and topical events.

Louw is a white male who had had a religious Christian upbringing. Although Louw has since disavowed religion, he reflected that this upbringing allowed him to "challenge the students quite a lot" by "sharing [his] own upbringing" and criticisms of organized religion. Some of the students I spoke to for this research were motivated to teach out of a sense of religious duty. The advantages and tensions of having religiously motivated teachers – and teacher-trainers who share that approach – is perhaps an area for further research.

RU has a three year part-time in-service B.Ed for teachers who are already practicing teachers in the basic education system. This assists teachers with professional development and accessing full-salary posts. Louw commented, however, that the priorities of the university seemed to lie in research and not in in-service training:

> We talk about the 'cutting edge people' – those who are doing the research, there's money in research… if you're at the bottom, doing in-service training you're not really in the league… with many of the staff meetings we jokingly have to mention in-service training to bring them back to the agenda, not to forget in-service is there (Louw, 2019).

Focus Group – the teachers

The bulk of my fieldwork occurred with Louw's teachers. The current cohort was in their second year of the training process. I joined the B.Ed cohort for part of their third contact session of the year in the last week of September 2019. 15 teachers were enrolled in the part time B.Ed for LO at RU. I was introduced to the teachers on 23 September 2019, and explained my interest in LO, sexuality education and the process of teacher-training. Consent forms and information sheets were handed out that day, and teachers were told that I would be joining them the next day to discuss the teaching of sexuality education, their attitudes towards it and how the future training process could be shaped to assist them with their challenges. One teacher mentioned verbally that in their church, sex was not spoken about. They were, however, still willing to participate. This formed useful context for me as one of my first interactions. Written consent was obtained from all participants. Teachers' names were changed in this research report.

The teachers

Four of the teachers identified as male, and 11 identified as female. The ages of the teachers ranged between 26 and 64 years old, with the majority of teachers being over the age of forty-five. All of the educators were practicing teachers for the senior phase (SP) to the Further Education and Training (FET) phase. A survey of their schools showed a range of school quintiles and locations, spanning private schools, township schools, and rural schools.[10] This data is represented in the table attached in Appendix I.

Within this small sample group, there is thus a lot of diversity with respect to the types of schools at which the participants taught. All of the teachers except for one taught other subjects in addition to LO. The teachers came from around the Eastern Cape, and all identified as Xhosa – this was expressed linguistically, but also in terms of a shared cultural identification. This report therefore illustrates a highly regionally specific context for sexuality education, in which cultural or ethnic

[10] South African schools, according to the South African Schools Act (Government of South Africa, 1996; DBE, 2006) are ranked into one of five quintiles according to socio-economic and geographic position. Average income, unemployment rate and literacy rate of surrounding community are indicators used to determine quintile score. Quintile ranking determines how much financial support the school receives from the provincial and national structures of the DBE. Schools in quintiles 1-3 are classified as 'no-fee' schools and cannot charge school-fees. In my sample, educators taught at schools across the quintile range.

identity – stemming from the ideological and discursive legacies of apartheid – proved significant. The insights drawn from this group cannot therefore be generalized, but nonetheless offer unique and sometimes contradictory discourses pertaining to sexuality, gender and power. My positionality – as a younger, white woman - was relevant to some of the conversations that I had with teachers. Further insights into the complexities of race, gender and sexuality are discussed further in Chapter 5.

Views on teaching Life Orientation

Teachers were invited to respond to the statement "I enjoy being an LO teacher". All fifteen teachers firmly agreed with the statement contradicting a trend within the literature which portrays LO teachers as disinterested and demotivated (Ahmed et al, 2009; Francis, 2012; Van Deventer, 2009). According to teachers, many learners saw the LO teacher as a trusted figure to approach with complicated problems. Participants acknowledged that they play many roles as an LO teacher:

> Anele: We are teachers, we are social workers, we are counsellors, we are everything, we are even parents to them. Because most of them are without parents… We are multitasking in Life Orientation.
>
> Lindelwa: You listen to their problems and you are able to solve them, and if you cannot, you know where to refer them.
>
> Ntyatyambo: It's as if you are a counsellor.

These excerpts confirm research that LO teachers have multiple concurrent roles to manage. Delivering the curriculum is only a fraction of the role that LO teachers assume.

Nomalanga explained that "LO matters as a subject". Simnikiwe confirmed this, claiming LO helped her "be a better teacher" through helping herself reflect. Six other participants corroborated this. In a struggling education system where educators are extremely burdened by stress, bureaucracy and broader socio–economic problems reflected in schools, LO offered educators a space to reflect on and develop strategies of self-help and mental-health.

Support for LO

Although all of the teachers "enjoyed being an LO teacher", only two teachers – Lwazi and Anele – felt supported in that role. Anele was a school principal, and Lwazi was a teacher whose school was participating in the DBE's pilot programme for Comprehensive Sexuality Education, which at the time of research, was not known about publicly (I will return to the DBE's new approach to CSE later). These two participants thus had unique access to decision-making processes for LO and had the support of school and governmental staff. The rest of the sample had no such access and felt under-supported. This feeling was reflected at various levels – within the school, within the broader community and within the department.

Three of the teachers partially agreed with the statement "I feel supported as an LO teacher" and the majority of the sample – 10 out of 15 – disagreed entirely. I observed that the teachers sounded dejected. Seven teachers claimed that LO is "taken lightly" and "not taken seriously" by important stakeholders at the school level, and that this has implications for teaching and learning. Teachers claimed that LO is not afforded similar budgets to other subjects, and repeatedly teachers mentioned that their lessons were seen as dispensable in that LO periods are used by other teachers for events. Because LO does not offer university entrance points, schools are not rewarded for excelling at the subject and the subject is seen as a "waste of time", according to Nomalanga.

The participants felt the lack of institutional prioritization from the university itself – Louw and his students informed me that where other in-service B.Ed specialisations (like Maths or Physics) offered students funding from the university for accommodation and transport to Makhanda for the contact session, LO students had to fund themselves.

At school level, Smangaliso claimed that "because it comes from the top, because it's a policy" that LO only has two periods per week, it is difficult "to fight for LO" and garner support from important stakeholders. Many of the teachers did not have subject advisors for LO at their local district DBE offices; this meant that these teachers did not receive assistance in terms of setting and moderating exams, compiling student portfolios, developing lesson plans and teaching materials. They also had no person within the DBE to turn to for mentoring or counselling. Four of the teachers in my sample group claimed they took on subject advisor responsibilities for the

district without receiving recognition or compensation. Of the teachers who did have local subject advisors for LO, some complained that their subject advisors were not specialised for the subject. So, without being particularly interested or knowledgeable in LO material, subject advisors were, as Zintle put it, "deployed" to LO posts to "go and babysit" for LO.

Where for other school subjects, teachers attend quarterly in-service training workshops and refresher courses from the DBE, most of the teachers in my sample had never attended a workshop for LO. Multiple participants commented on the attractiveness of RU's in-service training programme because of the lack of alternatives from the DBE.

The neglect of LO was compounded by the DBE's 2018 announcement that it was considering scrapping LO at the FET phase to make way for History as a compulsory subject. Teachers brought this up before I asked them about it and were concerned that their roles would be made redundant if LO was phased out. The announcement also limited opportunities for promotion according to Zukiswa. The DBE maintains that LO will not be scrapped (DBE, 2018), but teachers from my sample were not reassured, and felt that the ambiguity was indicative of departmental indifference towards the subject:

> Smangaliso: this is in low tones, unlike when [the DBE] said it was going to be scrapped, it was shouted high to say it was going. Now it's not going anymore…?
>
> Nomalanga: They said this other thing so loud. Now keeping LO is so hush-hush.

The lack of institutional support from 'the top' was reflected at the community level. In contexts were schools are community centres and closely knit with surrounding societies, teachers repeatedly conveyed that they were cautious about upsetting learners' parents. All teachers in my sample agreed that sexuality education should be taught at school, in part because many children do not have present parents and, as Ike explicated, many parents are "uncomfortable to start the conversation". However, teachers did convey that it was difficult to deliver sexuality education without the support of parents. The impact of well-meaning teachers is thus limited if they are not backed by communities. The following excerpt – with which the group concurred – suggested that parents could be critical if their children came home and spoke about sexuality education:

> Smangaliso: the society will be frowning at you, 'you're teaching our kids about sex, hey.' And then you are tiptoeing around the kids around what to say and what not to say… We are caught up in the middle. We are trying to talk to the child, but the child is taught not to talk about this at home. We are stepping in between [the child and the parents] – they say we're pushing the child in the wrong place.

These expressions illustrate that LO teachers are in a delicate position – they are mandated to teach sexuality education from 'above' on the one hand, but the communities surrounding schools can be critical of this process. South Africa's impressive commitments to CSE on paper are therefore not mirrored on the ground, where the lack of intergenerational communication regarding sexuality, and discourses of silence and shame, predominate. Through their position as employees of the DBE on the one hand and community members on the other, these teachers embody the gap between the ideals of the curriculum on one side and people's lived experiences, values and attitudes on the other. Some of the teachers found ways to bridge these gaps and mitigate the challenges of that position, as I show below.

The complexity of teachers' position, Ike said, was exacerbated by teachers being "blamed for everything" like teenage pregnancy and unemployment. Throughout our time together, I got the impression that the teachers appreciated being listened to; at the end of the focus group, Ntyatyambo admitted that the teachers "didn't expect to get such respect from [me]". The complexity of the situation of teachers is also informed by cultural and linguistic considerations, which are explored in the next chapter.

Chapter 5 | Discourse analysis from RU: Teachers' discourses & prospects for future teacher-training

This chapter links discourses emanating from each of the various elements of the focus group – the spectrum exercise, verbal discussions, written exercises and question activity – to explore the teachers' talk on the construction of gender, sexuality and power. In keeping with critical discourse analysis, attention was paid not only to the formal responses to predetermined questions that I asked the group, but also to the discursive interjections, tensions, tone and silences of the sample. I tried not to intervene in group discussions too much, and let the group's interests and energy guide me in terms of what questions I asked and what exercises I employed. The findings from this research are therefore not generalizable, but they do offer productive insights for further research into the process of teacher-training and discourse transmission.

Anxieties surrounding youth sexuality

Teachers demonstrated a high level of concern for learners and their social contexts. Teachers observed that many learners do not have parents and are sometimes raised by adolescent family members. Unplanned pregnancy was mentioned repeatedly as a recurring issue at schools. Teachers were sensitive to the fact that learners have multiple sources of information regarding sexuality, including their peers, the internet and family life. Smangaliso remarked that "if [you] live in a one-room home, then the child knows what happens at night":

> The child is not sure what it [sex] is, but they know that it needs a man and a woman. That goes back to the family situation… they know that the man is on top, the woman is at the bottom. And something is happening.

This excerpt, spoken early on in the spectrum exercise, illustrates several interesting discursive properties. Family life is framed within heteronormative patriarchal norms, where it is assumed that all families have a male and female figure, and where the male is more dominant. Furthermore, vagueness or silences in this quote – units like "*it*" and "*something* is happening" (my emphasis) – illustrate a discomfort with talking explicitly about sex, even within the realm of the family. It is simultaneously a universally known and acknowledged (f)act – the proximity of family members within one room causes this – but is also shrouded in murky suggestiveness.

The sexuality of learners was framed discursively in two interlinking ways – either as what I will describe as the 'uncontrollable sexuality' of learners; or alternatively, in terms of 'youthfulness' or 'immaturity'. Teachers commented on sexual activity on school premises:

> Zintle: they don't know when to do it [sex], or where. They just do it each and every time and any time.
>
> Mandla: According to them, it must be done! No matter how, no matter when.
>
> Smangaliso: The deed will be done.

Again, sexual activity is not named explicitly in any of these statements. These statements were said with animated tones of criticality and concern; the implication was that (despite sex being unnamed) learners are somehow *more* sexual than previous generations, and that learners do not have control over their sexual urges. A silent subtext that I can draw from this concern is that 'uncontrolled' youth sexuality leads to social and moral decay. Indeed, this context had important ramifications for the teaching and learning of sexuality education. Mandla wryly remarked: "They've got three kids and you still think you can teach them sex education? You cannot teach a grade 8 sex education because she or he knows better than you do."

Contrary to Bhana's research which shows that reluctance to teach sexuality education is based on preserving the so-called 'innocence' of young learners, these teachers did not draw on discourses of innocence. Multiple teachers did express concerns about learners not knowing 'the right time' to engage in sexual activity. During the focus group, I asked teachers to write down (anonymously) what questions learners most frequently ask them with respect to sexuality education. Of 33 questions that teachers recalled learners asking them, 8 questions (24%) pertained to the "right time" to be "ready" to have sexual intercourse. Zintle said in passing that she does not teach about "sexual intercourse... just about precautions and consequences." This links to a local study which showed that "young women's sexuality, [is] often framed within 'danger' and 'damage' discourses that foreground the denial of … sexual desire and practices within a framework of protection, regulation and discipline in order to avoid promised punishments of being sexually active" (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 63).

The fixation on 'the right time' could imply, as Zintle suggests, that there is a 'wrong time' for sexual activity and that is associated with reprisal, shame and punishment. Discourses from the group indicated that the consequences for sexual activity had individual effects but broader developmental ones too, engaging sexually at 'the wrong time' may lead to ill-health and poverty (Koffman & Gill, 2013 & 2014). There seemed to be a contradictory discursive thread here – teachers did not name youth sexuality, while recognizing that learners do engage in sexual activity (often uncontrollably), but expected learners to know when the 'right time' to engage in 'it' was.

Although all the teachers agreed that sexuality education should be compulsory at school, they expressed reservation about delivering it themselves. Teachers reiterated findings from research which show concerns that CSE would encourage further sexual activity. Nomzamo and Ntyatyambo said that LO was dismissed as "a sex subject" that encouraged learners to engage in sexual activity. Smangaliso summed up this anxiety: "talking about sex means that you are giving the child the direction to sex, straight away – so rather keep it a secret." The weight of secrets and silences in the context of isiXhosa language and 'culture' is explored respectively in the following sections.

A conversation complicated by language

All of the participants spoke isiXhosa as their first language. I noted that, in spite of my best efforts to include everybody, two male participants – Mandla and Smangaliso – dominated the conversation, thereby reproducing a form of isiXhosa masculinity.

For the teachers in my sample group, language of learning proved to be a barrier to meaningful sexuality education.[11] Mandla reflected on the disparity between the use of English as a medium of instruction for academic purposes, and the use of isiXhosa in learners' everyday lives:

> the problem is, when you teach your kids, you must teach them in English… this language thing, it's the reason why learners they take LO as a school thing. It is

[11] Although South African school policy purports to promote multilingualism, common practice shows that learners can be taught in any of the national languages until grade 3; from grade 4 to 12, learners are taught in either English or Afrikaans because matric exams are written in one of those two languages (Spaull, 2013; Veriava et al, 2017). My sample of teachers taught in English.

> away from the real life. Then outside of the school, they forget about the LO that they do in school… there's no connection between the LO that is academic and the practical LO away from the school… I always say that if you cannot say it in your own language, you cannot say it in English.

Establishing this "connection" proved to be a point of contention for the teachers because of cultural-linguistic norms and taboos in isiXhosa. Linking to earlier discussions pertaining to silence and stigma, teachers explained that in isiXhosa, direct translations of words pertaining to sexuality are, according to Nomzamo, considered "vulgar" or "rude". Tying to notions of respect, privacy and taboo, Nandipha indicated that "euphemisms" were more socially tolerable than using direct language:

> Nomalanga: In our culture, it's hard to use for those sexual organs by their names. Those are names, when you call them, you call them privately.
>
> Mandla: In our culture, we respect. We have that reserved, first name that we don't use – it's a rare name, and then we have a second name. If you call a penis, you can say *'ibhuti'* which is the brother. Or the gun of the man… Even when the learners are reporting each other – maybe one learner sees two learners having sex in the toilet. When he or she comes to you, she has this problem of putting it – they don't know how to put it.
>
> Nomzamo: They'll say, 'they're doing *amanyala'* (obscenities, pornography)
>
> Zintle: Or *'Le nto endaka'* (the thing that is dirty)
>
> Babalwa: We are used to hiding the terms according to our culture.

These quotations reiterate the predominance of silences, suggestions and taboo in discussing sexuality within a predominantly isiXhosa school setting. Where respect, privacy and appropriateness are culturally mandated and linked to generational authority and social mores, school-based conversations regarding sexuality are complicated. These mores are instilled from a young age, as school learners know it would be inappropriate to use direct terms to their elders. The literature has not fully theorized or examined the ways in which the medium of instruction impacts the uptake of sexual and reproductive health messaging and behaviours. Could these conversations be more meaningful in learners' home languages? Or would they be hindered by cultural, linguistic and social norms which dictate silences, euphemisms and intergenerational communicative distance? How does socio-cultural and linguistic socialisation play a role in

teaching and learning of sexuality education? Who defines what culture is, and what role does it have on the uptake of sexual and reproductive health messaging?

The use of isiXhosa words illuminated a number of competing insights. I speak basic conversational isiXhosa, but many of the words used in the focus group were too complex for me to understand, and the teachers offered translations. Although in Nguni languages like isiXhosa, pronouns are not directly gendered – there are no specific pronouns for 'he' or 'she', but rather a gender-neutral 'they' (*'yena'*) – isiXhosa still takes on gendered dimensions. Mandla's use of phallocentric terminology associated with violence to denote male sexual organs – "the gun of the man" – reveals the centrality of aggression and virility to male Xhosa identity. Some of the gendered terms used to describe women had misogynistic undertones – at one point, Smangaliso mentioned the word "*idikazi*" which other members of the group seemed scandalized by. Nomalanga translated the term to mean a "side-chick" but Nomzamo claimed it meant "concubine". The tone of the group's translation showed condemnation for extra-marital sexual relations, focusing the blame (and shame) directly on the female participant. In general, the linguistic expressions of gendered double-standards, misogyny and patriarchy were attributed by the group to 'cultural norms' and histories.

The impact of culture on teaching, learning and discourse transmission

As opposed to religion – often cited as an obstacle to CSE – the group seemed more interested in the explanatory power of 'culture'. Some teachers mentioned that they attend church and believe in God, but in our discussion, sexual norms were not framed discursively with respect to Christian morality; instead, 'culture' was often cited as the justification for certain values.

Deon, the teacher trainer, asked the group if the silences within isiXhosa language regarding the names of sexual organs came from colonisation. Mandla responded, with unanimously support from the group, that these silences and stigmas were "originally African" and that the current generation of parents were too "loose" or open with their children. Group members continued:

> Anele: It's unlike our times where our parents would not, would never, start a topic about sex.

> Lwazi: if you analyse our own upbringing – the way we were shaped by our parents and you look to the way we are shaping our kids… they were strict and they guided us to adulthood and they shaped us well… but when you compare with our own kids, in terms of that discipline, we are loose.
>
> Mandla: at the time that we were respecting sex, the teenage pregnancy was not so bad. [agreement]. If you go back in history, what was done perfectly by those people is what we are missing now. The more we shift to this academic thing, the more things go wrong... things are changing every day. Now you get sex like it's buying sweets. But we say we are learning... the more you get fancy with these words, ne, the more people are getting pregnant.

These points illustrate a historical nostalgia – painting an image of a utopian, and essentialised African pre-colonial past – in relation to a morally corrupt present where sexuality education is the perceived cause of teenage-pregnancy and poor sexual discipline. Intergenerational differences in upbringing, socialisation and social influences, according to these participants, are stark. These exchanges contradict historical evidence that pre-colonial African cultures adopted a more tolerant and open position towards sexuality which changed with the onset of colonialism (Burns, 1996; Delius & Glaser, 2002; Duff, 2015); and that sexuality education decreases unplanned pregnancy rates and STI incidence (UNESCO, 2008; UNESCO 2016). Some of the investment of the participants' in these beliefs stems from racial and 'cultural' difference and the perceived imposition of foreign norms:

> Smangaliso: this is being forced on us only – because these Van der Merwes [implying white/Afrikaans people, pointing at me and Deon] they still keep their thing and don't have a problem.
>
> Lwazi: in terms of their values, yes, they keep them.
>
> Mandla: if you're standing on the Western side you will say it's unfair. But if you're looking at it standing on my side you will see the benefits.

The tone of the group implied 'Western' values from the constitution and CSE were forced onto them, and that isiXhosa 'culture', as Mandla put it, was "better left [alone]". I want to be sensitive to such anxiety, but also do not argue for a culturally-relativist stance on sexuality education. As discussed later in this chapter, some participants seemed to believe that sexual diversity and patriarchy, for example, were alien to Xhosa culture. Mandla even claimed "there is no word for hypocrisy" in isiXhosa when one of his female colleagues pointed out his hypocritical treatment of women. While the expression of patriarchy – an unnamed concept in the group – is situational and not universal, the suggestion by participants that power relations within Xhosa 'culture' are

not gendered is fallacious. Like Ahmed, I want to argue for the development of "a complicated and contingent model" for theorizing sexuality and gender, which rejects both uncritical relativist or universalist assumptions (2000, p.97). In other words, CSE cannot be imposed in a one-size-fits-all paradigm; nonetheless, the context of cultural relativism – where human rights or gender or sexual rights are considered incongruous with local 'values' – must also be challenged.

The basic education sector is vital to creating grassroots buy into rights-based and progressive attitudes towards sexuality and gender. As such, effort must be made within the basic education sector to reconcile so-called 'foreign' imposition of values regarding sexuality and gender with local 'cultural norms'. The 'cultural' anxieties of my participants must be taken seriously because culture – as this analysis shows – is deeply embedded in the unresolved politics of race, gender, sexuality and location of post-apartheid South Africa. The complex challenge for advocates of sexuality education, then, is to challenge culturally-relativist positions while being sensitive to local histories which illustrate the fraught intersections between race, gender and culture. In this context, it is significant that understandings of what is 'cultural' were not uniform within my sample group. Some participants challenged the idea that the values of CSE are foreign, and confronted the dominant expression of 'culture' within the group: Zukiswa and Nomalanga, for example, seemed tolerant of same-sex desire and suggested that homosexuality could be reconciled with Xhosa 'culture.' Other teachers like Anele and Siminikiwe did not condone homosexuality but implied that they would not judge homosexual learners. By destabilising hegemonic constructions of 'culture', perhaps we may start to challenge culturally-relativist arguments which reject CSE.

It became clear to me that although the springboard for this gathering was CSE in schools, the conversation expressed anxiety about sexual norms in society more broadly. I examine how sexuality education in schools links to (and sometimes destabilises) culturally hegemonic constructions of national, gendered and sexual identity.

Unprompted by me, questions of nationhood, race and ethnicity – and their relationships to sexuality – were top of mind to the group. Given the violent history of state constructions of ethnic difference in South Africa, the pre-eminence of Xhosa identity in our discussions was no accident.

Lwazi initiated a conversation about foreign African men, and the conversation quite quickly descended into xenophobia and Afrophobia. Male participants like Smangaliso were concerned about "how many of ours, how many South African women have boyfriends from outside" situating appropriate sexuality within the tightly bound and disciplined realm of nationhood and culture. Participants seemed to imply that the control of Xhosa female sexuality was central to the group's survival: "this is one of the problems that I always emphasise to my learners," Sive explained, "I have a fear that by 2030, our generation is fading slowly but surely. By 2030 maybe we will say we do not have Xhosas anymore."

While it was men who initiated the link between sexuality, race and nationhood, Nomzamo and Zintle also contributed to this conversation by scapegoating South Asians (Indian and Pakistani people) for domestic joblessness, and describing foreign Africans as "makwerekwere", a slur translated as 'aliens'. Sexuality then, served as a gateway to discuss broader societal anxieties. How sexuality can be controlled, and by whom, served as a touchstone for deciding who is an insider or outsider, and the construction of hegemonic national, raced and gendered identity.

Gendered disparities within Xhosa 'culture'

The day on which these focus groups occurred was Heritage Day – a coincidence which ended up having an implicit bearing on our conversations. Six of the female teachers wore traditional isiXhosa clothing, including headwraps, skirts, beaded jewellery and belts. The rest of the teachers all wore non-traditional clothing. The public expression of isiXhosa identity through dress encouraged me to think about the bearing of tradition, ritual and culture and what South Africa's heritage towards sexuality and gender might be. Our discussions illustrated that the meanings and embodiments of these concepts – tradition, culture and heritage – are not uncontested.

Interestingly, those most dogmatic and assertive in their tone and demeanour about Xhosa 'culture' were men; these men were dressed casually but proposed a view of Xhosa identity which was rigid, 'traditional' and heteronormative. Many of the women, on the other hand, who wore traditional isiXhosa dress, seemed more amenable to tolerance towards same-sex desire and gender equality. The investments and embodiments of particular actors towards culture were thus exposed

and contested. Indeed, many of the women – and especially older women – questioned gendered double standards within Xhosa culture and language:

> Simnikiwe: if you are teaching the difference between male and female reproductive organs the male learners, when you talk about the private parts of the female they laugh and find it funny. I hate that… it's the way society is. For a female is to be a laughing stock… I know it goes back from where they grow up at home.
>
> Nandipha: With physical abuse towards females, boys learn it from the elders that a woman is supposed to be treated like this. That is why they laugh at girls. Ladies are not respected. It's only the male people or the boys who are respected.

Ignoring, for the moment, how these statements do in their own way reinforce gender difference and erase intersexuality and gender non-conformity, they illustrate the ways in which 'culture' and traditional socialisation practices can be criticized in the classroom space. Nomalanga built on this to expose how male and female youth sexuality are policed differently:

> Parents will not allow children to be associated with a certain girl because they've seen that girl as 'loose'… other people will not recommend that girl as a future daughter-in-law … If you get pregnant out of wedlock, the person who gets frowned upon is the girl and not the boy. And when the family of that boy talks about this, it's something that's celebrated.

Here, appropriate female sexuality is circumscribed within the limits of marriage and what makes a 'good' daughter-in-law. These passages show that male sexuality is less constrained than that of young Xhosa women; while still heteronormative, young men are celebrated for virility while young women are shamed and blamed for sexual activity. Nomalanga was critical of what is understood as 'culture' – or rather, the roles afforded to different genders under hegemonic cultural dimensions. In this patrilineal and heteronormative context, "The lineage of the family," explained Mandla, "depends on the boy," or patrilineal and heteronormative discourses which are discussed next.

Teachers' stabilisation of heteronormativity

> Mandla: if your son is nineteen years old and you've never suspected anything, you start getting worried…
>
> Julia: worried about what?
>
> Nomzamo: If he is normal, does he have any problems?

Zintle: Like is he a gay or what?

According to the group, Xhosa manhood was shaped within heteronormative confines. [12] This extract exposes the high level of surveillance of youth sexuality, predominated by heteronormative control and concern, with specific implications on the ability to recognise non-normative sexualities.

Teachers expressed concerns about the impact of same-sex desire on children, and what happens if, as Smangaliso put it, "after having [a] child, you decide" to "become" gay. Smangaliso, Mandla, Anele and other teachers in my sample group were anxious that the disruption of the hegemonic heteropatriarchal family structure would disturb a child's development. I opened up the group that my mother is bisexual, and is now living with a woman. Although the group was astonished at first, very quickly it was swept aside because I am white. A similar situation, the group implied, could not be tolerated in a black community. This demonstrated the ways in which race, gender and sexuality co-constitute each other.

After dismissing my experience of a non-heterosexual family, Mandla and Nandipha struggled to determine a "neutral term" to describe homosexual people. Linking to earlier conversations about language, the words used in isiXhosa to describe homosexuality are directly derogatory:

Nandipha: In Xhosa, we call them '*stabane'*.

Julia: *'Stabane'* is quite a rude word, isn't it?

Mandla: All those words that we use are rude. Which one is not rude?

Smangaliso: But they are correct.

This interchange indicates that my sample group's use of Xhosa is heteronormative and othering towards same-sex desire. Prior to this, I knew that '*stabane'* was used as a slur by many. Tucker

[12] Although not mentioned by the group, the significance of traditional circumcision for young Xhosa men as a rite of passage, and its messaging pertaining to sexuality and family life could form an unspoken context to this conversation. Researchers (Hodes & Gittings, 2019; Mhlalo 2009; Vincent, 2008) have shown that the messaging transmitted to young initiates centres ideas of being a male breadwinner and male sexual dominance over women, despite the reality that many young Xhosa men grow up in homes headed by women.

(2010), Ndzwayiba and Steyn (2019) confirm that the term is derogatory, although local queer communities have reappropriated it and many South African gay people identify as '*stabane*.' The origin of the word, according to research, stems from the isiZulu term for 'hermaphrodite' or intersex person (Swarr, 2012). Swarr notes that the acknowledgement of hermaphrodism "both reinforce[s] gender binaries while undermining them by allowing for the conceptual and physical possibility of intersexuality" (2012, p.184). In other words, although '*stabane'* is used to reinforce heterosexist binaries of gender and sex, its linguistic and conceptual roots in intersexuality troubles the biological basis for gender binaries. In this case, however, it opened a broader conversation about the interconnections of sexuality, gender and biology.

Teachers seemed highly concerned about the connection between sexuality and gender presentation. Repeatedly, teachers seemed to confuse or conflate same-sex desire with gender performance and biology:

> Zintle: we have girls who want to wear the boys' uniform.
>
> Nomzamo: In my school, we have two girls who are boys.
>
> Simnikiwe: I knew a learner as a girl and now she's changing…. so much that now she is having girlfriends and she's beginning to be a boy – behaving like a boy, the facial expression, the way she walks. And then she's having different girlfriends.
>
> Zukiswa: [Lesbians] try to be the man with girls.
>
> Zintle: [A gay learner] doesn't want to be a son, he wants to be a daughter – a girl.

These quotations show that same-sex desire, then, is conflated with performing the 'wrong' gender. Nandipha called gay learners *"inkwembazane"* – a portmanteau for the Xhosa words for boy ('inkwenkwe') and girl ('intombazane'). Only one teacher, Nomalanga, explained that gender and sexual orientation are "two separate things". She was clearly a respected member of the group as a veteran teacher, and her voice carried clout; but Nomalanga also conflated gender with sex in the same explanation: "gender is the way you were born, the physical structure, and not your sexual orientation". In a context where essentialist heteronormative and patriarchal norms are hegemonic – and transgressions of these norms are surveyed and punished – training for sexuality education teachers must be cognisant of the challenges of delineating and explaining the relationships between biological sex, sexual orientation and gender.

Although seeming to collapse gender identity and sexual orientation discursively through discussions of gender performance, dress and behaviour, trans identities were a discursive silence of the focus group. I was asked to explain the LGBTQI+ acronym, which implies that some of the group were ignorant to the breadth of sexual and gender diversity. It appeared that participants held stereotypes about homosexual people which framed homosexuality as not only different or other, but also as fixed identities: male homosexuality was framed by Mandla, Nandipha and Smangaliso as being effeminate, while lesbianism – discussed below – was equated with unhealthy (or ostensibly masculine) lifestyles like smoking and drinking by Sive, Simnikiwe and Mandla. Participants seemed to believe that one could be either heterosexual or homosexual but not something in-between; in so doing, participants continually reinforced culturally appropriate gender roles and the gender binary (Francis, 2017; Khuzwayo & Morison, 2017; Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2017). This conversation demonstrated the interconnectedness of biology, gender performance and sexuality to the group's discourse.

Homosexuality as a choice and the 'threat' of female homosexuality

Sive, Mandla and Zinhle asked me if homosexuality was "a choice". Sive implied that in most, it was a "phase" or "stage" which should pass. Conversely, Anele and Ntyatyambo asked me if homosexuality is "hereditary". I told them that there is mounting evidence that there is a genetic component to sexual desire (Academy of Science of South Africa, 2015; Parker, 2014; Phelps & Wedow, 2019). While framing homosexuality as genetic might be a helpful tool to show that homosexuality is not a choice, but is something natural, it might – as Swarr (2012) suggests – represent homosexuality as a genetic pathology that could either be cured or inherited, like some kind of biological deformity. Seeing homosexuality as "hereditary", then, does not necessarily 'naturalize' same-sex desire; instead, it may "pathologize (and create) difference" (Swarr, 2012, p.201).

Indeed, some of the discourses in the group – particularly ones pertaining to homosexual female sexuality – invoked connotations of contagion:

> Mandla: the problem is that if you are a lesbian, you cannot do your lesbianism without involving someone else… now you must involve someone else's child?

> Ntyatyambo: as a society, it's a shame. it's not normal… We would accept gay or lesbians if this person could do it alone and don't influence others… we don't want those people; we're trying to eliminate them.
>
> Simnikiwe: I knew [a learner] as a girl and now she's changing… so much that now she is having girlfriends and she's beginning to be a boy and she's having different girlfriends… is she not influencing the others now?

I detect two main discourses here: that homosexuality is predatory, and that it is contagious. Terms like "involving," and "influencing" connote that the teachers perceive lesbianism as a dangerous pressure on individuals as opposed to a valid identity. This represents widespread stereotypes that there is something predatory about homosexuality. Mandla was concerned that by assisting the child of a gay parent was addressing "only the symptom, not the sickness". This connotes that same-sex desire is akin to an infectious disease. This depiction seemed to be confined solely to lesbianism, which, as noted above, the group associated with degenerate lifestyles.

The group's discourse also suggested that lesbianism was considered a 'recent' development in their culture, and that it threatened culturally appropriate forms of female sexuality linked to the institution of heteropatriarchal marriage. In general, the control of female youth sexuality was a recurring theme in the focus group. The xenophobic allegations that foreign men are claiming "our" women indicate the primacy of the control of female sexuality once again. Regarding lesbianism, it is possible that female homosexuality was seen as threatening by the group precisely because it represents a realm of female sexuality outside the control of men: in many South African contexts, "sexual behaviour is usually focused on the pleasure men derive from it; when this heterosexist focus dominates, pleasurable sexual encounters that do not involve a penis are difficult to imagine" (Swarr 2012, p.193).

In general, discourses pertaining to sexual activity were framed within their central relationship to child-bearing and marriage. These expressions, the social meanings associated with them and the institutions they support can thus be seen as upholding "the structural relationships of dominance, discrimination and control as manifested in language" (Wodak & Meyer, 2001, p.2). Although the image of a heterosexual nuclear family was recurring in our conversations, teachers admitted the contradiction that many South African families are "broken", "child-headed" or dispersed through

patterns of migration. Participants seemed deeply invested in the imagined nuclear family; even as evidence suggests it is not the dominant family form in SA.

What this analysis shows is that sexuality is the tip of the iceberg, underscored by a number of knotty anxieties and tensions. Anxieties about youth sexuality and CSE go to the heart of dominant ideas about 'culture', nationhood, race and gender. And while teachers acknowledge the need for (some) sexuality education in schools, the state seems to have imposed CSE on teachers without embarking on a comprehensive training and conscientizing process to counter harmful stereotypes, misconceptions and attitudes which still predominate in many teachers' discourses. Until this point, I have focused on the discourses and attitudes that were expressed openly by participants; In the section that follows, I turn to unspoken or silenced discourses.

Silences

Sexual activity for pleasure, recreation or transactional purposes was not mentioned at all – this discursively reiterated the importance of sexual intercourse's reproductive function, negating the pleasurable aspects of it. During the anonymous question exercise, one question that a learner asked a teacher read "Do females have wet dreams?" which was the first expression of (female) sexual arousal. On the whole, sexual desire was only mentioned in discourses representing 'uncontrollability' or 'perversity', or in relation to the disciplining thereof by teachers, correlating to Fine's theory about the "absence of a discourse of desire" in sexuality education (1988, p.49).

Multiple questions from learners (attached in Appendix II) were concerned with accessing contraception and other sexual and reproductive health services like the morning after pill, rape support and abortions. Generally, learners' questions also focused on how to protect themselves during sex. These questions indicate that learners do not know where or how to access sexual and reproductive health services, or have adequate knowledge about their rights in that regard. One finding from this research, then, is that the Departments of Basic Education and Health should develop clearer channels of communication to convey adolescent sexual and reproductive health messaging.

What these silences show is that the teacher-training process must address spoken and unspoken discourses. Teacher-training for sexuality education must be expanded to address the complexities of gender, sexuality and power – and how they interlock and interact.

Conclusions: Challenging hegemonic discourses pertaining to gender, sexuality and power and the implications for teacher-training

The discourses analysed here are indicative of a unique conjuncture in time and space, and are embedded in the complexities of isiXhosa 'cultural' identity, language and location. This case study is highly localised, and the expression of hegemonic isiXhosa 'cultural' identities tie to the colonial and apartheid legacies of ethnic difference and racial discrimination. While the findings cannot be broadly generalizable, they offer insights into the deep-seated investments of a group of experienced teachers in normative heterosexist and patriarchal notions. Sexuality education, it can be said, sits at the convergence of a number of significant social anxieties that express themselves in the school environment but translate to concerns about morality, sexuality, identity, nationhood and ethnicity more broadly. My focus group here seemed to illustrate that the sexuality of youth acts as a touchstone for issues pertaining to nationhood, cultural identity – at the local level – gender roles and sexual behaviour that are complexly intertwined and discursively co-constituted.

Central to this discussion were linguistic and cultural tensions. Linguistically, the group indicated that isiXhosa lends itself to certain discursive and attitudinal silences. The social norms accompanying language and operating alongside its own silences, in some instances, fostered conditions of taboo and stigma. There did not seem to be, as Mandla explicated, "neutral terms" to describe sexual organs, sexual activity, gender dynamics and sexual orientation. Critical discourse analysis allowed us to question the limitations of existing vocabulary, explore the ways in which language is used as an instrument of maintaining power, and imagine ways in which the connotations of discourses could be altered or reimagined (Fairclough, 1989; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). There is a need, as we can see from this discussion, to develop or shift vernacular lexicons towards being less moralistic and judgmental with respect to sexuality. The impact of learning and teaching sexuality education in a second language – and the effect of this on the uptake of positive and progressive sexual and reproductive health messaging – is an area for future research. What does seem clear is that for as long as these conversations happen primarily in English, the

perception that some participants held that the values of CSE are foreign, white or Western may endure; furthermore, the impact of the messaging on learners' lives may be circumscribed.

Despite there being hegemonic constructions of sexuality and gender based on heteronormative and patriarchal norms in my sample group, tensions did emerge which underscored the instability of these hegemonic discourses in circulation. Although all of the sample group identified 'culturally' as Xhosa, participants' perceptions as to what 'culture' means in terms of attitudes, values and behaviours regarding sexuality and gender were not uniform. The contradictions and diversity within the group illuminated the ways in which culture is often imagined homogenously but challenged in interesting ways. Several teachers explained that through the training, they had become less judgmental and more reflective. Within our session, Zukiswa called out Deon during a role-play, where Deon was pretending to break the news to his hypothetical son that he would be dating men in future:

> Deon: Okay, my 'son'... I've decided that I really like men. I always felt like that, I never wanted to embarrass you or anybody else… I am not going to abandon you.
>
> Zukiswa: if you say you do not want to embarrass him, you make him sound like it's not right. You make him feel like this is wrong, and embarrassing. Make it normal. He must just know it is just one of those things – just like straight people.

The ability of a student to confront tacit heteronormativity from the trainer was impressive and indicated to me that attitudes can shift. And although most teachers retained their cultural investments in certain versions of sexual morality, several teachers said they "would not judge" learners who were homosexual. Although the hegemonic form of Xhosa culture at stake was heteronormative, teachers expressed tolerance based on discourses of common humanity, constitutionalism and human rights. In fact, some of the participants who expressed homophobic rhetoric seemed to soften in their attitudes. Mandla conceded: "if [homosexuality is] a choice, it's a very hard choice. Like if I've got to now be a woman, how hard it will be for me. These people they just do it naturally." Not only does this quote express sympathy towards homosexual people, and assert that sexual diversity is "natural", but Mandla also seemed to acknowledge male privilege and gender inequality at the same time. He went on to say that CAPS should have a section pertaining to the sexual health and safety of homosexual learners. This – at its basic level of discourse – acknowledged the right of homosexuals to exist publicly and to seek public health and

education resources. In the current curriculum, there is no mention made of LGBTQI+ friendly sexual and reproductive health services, and indeed, the only mentions of LGBTQI+ issues come up in relation to violence and discrimination (Wilmot, 2013). Having a section designed to ameliorate the health vulnerabilities of LGBTQI+ learners would position learners as equals worthy of care; not solely – as it is currently – as perpetrators and victims of violence.

Despite alleged cultural injunctions against sexuality education and the linguistic tensions of delivering it, all of the participants acknowledged that sexuality education must be taught at schools. Building confidence of teachers is thus key. I reiterate that the role of training, in this context, is vital. This research shows that there are obstacles to this though – teacher-training for sexuality education must, within restrictive time constraints, counter conservative hegemonic attitudes without comprehensive institutional backing and support from either Rhodes University or the DBE (as evidenced in the previous chapter). Teachers' attitudes can be seen as a source of discourse transmission to the eventual sexuality education that learners receive in the classroom. The importance of studying the ways in which the attitudes of teachers, teacher trainers and tertiary institutions diverge and overlap thus has direct implications for adolescent sexual and reproductive health.

This case study demonstrates, therefore, that the teacher-training process does offer promising outcomes, even over the course of one day. The teachers in my sample critically engaged with each other and exhibited self-reflexivity. Training must generate ownership of the values and attitudes espoused in CSE to counter the idea that discussing sexual diversity, gender equality or other feminist concerns is 'foreign'. The state's new scripted lesson plans offer some potential for these outcomes, and are examined next.

Chapter 6 | The State's New Scripted Lesson Plans

Sexuality education within CAPS, is, as I have shown, limited. One of the main issues with the sexuality education component of the curriculum text is that it focuses predominantly on the transmission of HIV and STIs, as opposed to broader elements of human sexuality. In 2011, when CAPS was released, an American researcher called Douglas Kirby reviewed the sexuality education curriculum in line with the International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education (UNESCO, 2009).[13] Armed with the findings of Kirby's 2011 report and funding from U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the DBE embarked on the process of developing SLPs for sexuality education.

The DBE outsourced to an international NGO called the Education Development Centre (EDC) to develop scripted lesson plans, train teachers and to monitor the piloting of the new SLPs in schools (EDC, 2016, 2019). The pilot process began in 2015, with various rounds of consultation on the drafts of the SLPs before they reached classrooms (DBE, 2019; Kubheka, 2019). SLPs were piloted in schools at five of the nine provinces, and teachers at selected schools were trained at externally facilitated workshops – Lwazi's school participated in the pilot study but he did not attend training.

The SLPs were released to the public in late 2019 and offer a novel source of discourse transmission from the state with respect to sexuality, gender and power. I have been trying to access the pilot SLPs since early 2018, but until this juncture, the DBE was unwilling to share them. Only in November 2019, when public protests opposing CSE were accruing widespread national attention did the DBE eventually capitulate to public demands and released the SLPs, to attempt to dispel the myths in circulation (DBE, 2019b).

[13] UNESCO's International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education (ITGSE), originally published in 2009 and later revised in 2018, details, age-group by age-group, what CSE should cover and how to develop curricula, learning materials and teacher support infrastructure at each level. The content for each age-group is backed up by evidence-based, scientific and psychological research to ensure that information it provides is "in line with [learner's] cognitive abilities" (UNESCO, 2009; UNESCO, 2018, p.34). The ITGSE draws on curriculum reviews from 12 countries and
various human-rights treaties (Ibid). Topics are laid out in a coherent cumulative manner, and the ITGSE aims to achieve knowledge creation, attitudinal shifts and skills-building (Ibid, p.35). I undertook my Honours research on the ITGSE and how the South African curriculum aligns to it in 2018 (Chaskalson, 2018).

Although the SLPs are not teacher-training documents, it would be remiss to neglect a discussion of their content and what it means for the state of sexuality education in 2020. This chapter examines discourses from the grade 10 Educator Guide and Learner Book for the new SLPs for sexuality education.[14] These documents illustrate large discursive shifts from the state, which I detail in the sections that follow. The texts' bibliographic resources demonstrate that the lesson plans were compiled with international benchmarks, scholarly research and best practice in mind (DBE, 2019a & b).[15]

Textual analysis of the SLPs: promising improvements on CAPS?

There is, to date, no scholarly research on the content of the new SLPs for sexuality education in South Africa. I see this as a unique opportunity, therefore, to identify the changing discourses of the state with respect to gender, sexuality and power. The DBE maintains – possibly to placate the public outcry regarding the new SLPs – that "there is no new CSE content that has been added to the curriculum" (DBE, 2019, p.15). I find this somewhat misleading. My own analysis of the SLPs for grade 10 shows that there are some encouraging additions to CAPS.

Building on Kirby (2011) and Umalusi's (2014) respective criticisms, this text details the roles and responsibilities of the sexuality education teacher; stipulates teaching methodologies, activities and assessment requirements for each lesson; offers a directory of SRHR services and contacts whom teachers and learners can approach for assistance; mandates that diversity within the

[14] Grade 10 has 9 lesson plans. The topics/titles of the lesson plans are:

Lesson 10.1 : Developing my self-confidence
Lesson 10.2 : Understanding power. Getting to share it.
Lesson 10.3 : Gender, equality and healthier relationships
Lesson 10.4 : Social and environmental justice: we can make a difference
Lesson 10.5 : My changing life roles and life goals
Lesson 10.6 : Understanding sexual interest
Lesson 10.7 : Our choices, our decisions
Lesson 10.8 : I know what I want
Lesson 10.9 : Consent, rape and taking action
(DBE 2019d, p.3)

[15] The bibliography for the educator guide contains 30 references, of which only 12 are locally produced. The rest were published across the Global North. It is beyond the scope of this paper to examine this further, but it is worth noting the centrality of academic spheres in the global north to the CSE messaging that is delivered in the Global South here.

classroom be respected and suggests strategies to foster critical thinking in learners (DBE, 2019).[16] Although this is not a teacher-training text per se, it offers insights into state discourses pertaining to the role of teachers in transmitting discourses relating to gender, sexuality and power. It attempts to challenge some of the hegemonic attitudes towards gender, sexuality and power that were exhibited by my sample group of teachers. I examine discourses pertaining to sexual and gender diversity, the language of diversity and inclusion, contraceptives and abstinence, sexual desire and pleasure as well as consent.

No longer a "curricular silence": the representation of LGBTQI+ identities in the SLPs

Unlike CAPS' depictions of non-normative sexual and gender identities in relation to violence and perversion (Francis, 2014; Wilmot, 2013), the SLPs contain some positive messaging regarding LGBTQI+ identities. The texts lay out the differences between gender, sex and sexual orientation in non-judgmental language, as evoked in the Educator Guide's "reading and discussion exercise 10.2.3: what is the difference between sex and gender?" (DBE, 2019d, p.89-90):

> Sex (the noun): Being born with male or female sexual reproductive organs. In the case of being intersex, a person is born with both male and female sexual reproductive organs.
>
> Gender: After birth, our gender is determined by how families and society teach us to behave based on whether we are born male or female. Gender socialisation deals with expectations and roles and responsibilities we are taught. Boys and girls are usually socialised differently, which leads to expectations and pressures placed on them about their masculinity or femininity.
>
> Sexual orientation: Who we are attracted to romantically and sexually. For example, if you are attracted to the opposite sex only, you are heterosexual. If you are only attracted to people of the same sex as you, then your sexual orientation is gay (men) and lesbian (women). Bisexual is when you are attracted to both sexes.

This excerpt is written in simple, factual language. These concepts, furthermore, are contextualized in a broader conversation about gendered power dynamics and patriarchy, a concept which the text explicitly names. Earlier revisions of the curriculum seemed to imply that there was nothing

[16] Multiple passages in the Educator Guide are addressed directly to the teacher tasked with delivering CSE. As the name suggests, the SLPs read like a script – the SLPs are highly detailed and contain written instructions for the educator to relay verbally to their learners. One of my early impressions about the text is that it is aimed at an inexperienced or untrained teacher, which, given literature proving that many LO educators are unqualified for the role, might well be the case.

structural about gender inequality or sexual violence by discursively omitting the concept of patriarchy. It is an important step forward that patriarchy is named. The glossary in both texts states that patriarchy is:

> a system that goes back to ancient times in most societies. It is a set of taught and learnt values in which it is accepted that boys and men can and should hold more power and control than girls and women. Power is held in different ways, including through status, ownership, financial means, traditional rights and responsibilities, decision-making and emotional control of others (DBE, 2019d, p.27)

This is certainly a valuable starting point. It shows that patriarchy as a system is transhistorical and transcultural but it might also foster the idea that patriarchy is preordained, natural or justifiable. Teachers from my sample (and public outcry about sexuality education, explored in the conclusion) were concerned that "new developments" regarding sexuality, as Smangaliso put it, were eroding their 'culture'. This definition might implicitly support the idea that gender equality, tolerance and CSE are analogous with so-called 'ancient' systems. Furthermore, claiming that patriarchy is 'ancient' removes its relevance from the present, where patriarchal power relations are still pervasive.

Nonetheless, instead of merely explicating female victimhood and male superiority as CAPS was reported to have done (Bhana, 2016), the SLPs sensitively show how gender socialisation is learnt and in turn creates hegemonic gender stereotypes and roles. Importantly, the text encourages learners to identify ways in which these understandings of gender have consequences for sexual risk and sexual and reproductive health (see Lessons 10.2, 10.3 and 10.5 for more on this). Gender and power are not mere abstractions, but are linked to sexual rights and health:

> Unless we are able to challenge stereotypes about masculinity and femininity and assert our freedom and uniqueness, they may put a lot of unfair and unrealistic pressure on our … relationships. In turn, this affects our sexual and reproductive well-being" (DBE, 2019d, p.25).

In glossaries in both texts (DBE, 2019c, p.92-93 & 2019d, p30-31), the LGBTQI+ acronym in its entirety is explicated – this might have been a useful resource for the teachers I spoke to, who did not know the full acronym. Outside of the glossaries, both texts specifically note the existence of various forms of same-sex desire and bisexuality (see, for instance, page 28 in the Learner Book),

transgender identities (pages 15, 20 and 77 in the Learner Book) and for intersex bodies, the text explicates: "People who are intersex are born with both male and female sexual organs. It is for them to be free to decide their own unique identity" (DBE, 2019c, p.31). Several icons – like the figure on page 90 of the Educator Guide – depict same-sex relationships, visually normalizing same-sex desire (DBE, 2019c).

Contradicting hegemonic ideas from my sample group that same-sex desire is a decision or developmental phase, excerpts from both the new texts emphasize that sexuality is not a choice:

> It is critical that you [the educator] make it clear throughout the class discussions that everyone has the right to their own sexual orientation. Sexual orientation is not a decision or choice that one makes. One makes choices and decisions about sex. (DBE, 2019c, p.42)

The texts acknowledge that these ideas may conflict with learners' and teachers' personal beliefs, but emphasizes that "We can maintain our cultural, faith and other identities and still promote equality through our words, actions, behaviour and attitudes in everyday life" (DBE, 2019d, p.19). Stereotypical gender roles and the construct of a nuclear patrifocal family are also challenged during the activity on gender socialisation: "Gender roles are changing … Are men the only providers and protectors of families? What non-traditional roles are women playing? … For example, there are many different family structures in our country" (DBE, 2019d, p.21). These questions are in tension with the dominant idea of an imagined male-headed family in my focus groups. They encourage learners and teachers alike to interrogate their perceptions about the status quo.

Countering the language of othering: an interesting effort, but room for improvement

Countering Mandla's earlier assumption that "all the words [to describe LGBTQI+ people] that we use are rude", the SLPs develop inclusive language. The text actively attempts to address stigma aimed at LGBTQI+ identities and people living with HIV. While teachers in my focus group othered gay and HIV positive learners through the use of pronouns like "they" or "them" (see earlier, Chapter 5, p.50), and entirely invisibilised transgender learners, the excerpts from the Educator Guide (DBE, 2019c) demonstrate more inclusive language:

> Transgender: Those of *us* whose gender identity does not match the biological sex *we* were born with. Transgender people may have hormonal or surgical interventions to change their bodies to gender identity with which they identify. (p.30 – my emphasis)
>
> *We're* born either male or female or intersex (born with both male and female sex organs). Some of *us* are born male and identify as girls, and vice versa, which would make *us* transgender. Gender is taught and learnt behaviour, usually based on our biology (whether we have male or female sexual organs). Sexual orientation is who we are emotionally, romantically and sexually attracted to. (p.31 – my emphasis)
>
> Those of *us* living with HIV can have a long and healthy life as long as we stick to the medical treatment to reduce our HIV viral load. (p.41 – my emphasis)
>
> *We can unite* to make sure there is social and environmental justice for those of *us* living with HIV and AIDS, and for those who are affected by stigma for any other reason. (p.48 – my emphasis)

The use of the first-person plural pronouns "we" and "us" illustrates the texts' commitments to inclusive discourses. This counters hegemonic exclusionary language, at times demonstrated by teachers in my sample group, which others homosexual people and people living with HIV.

However, gender-neutral pronouns are not used (instead, the texts use "he" and "she" pronouns), and some activities (see Lesson 10.3, for example) call for the teacher to split the class into boys and girls, which only reiterates the gender binary and might alienate trans learners. the section on contraceptives and condom-use (explored more in the section that follows) is also gendered: condoms are described as "male" or "female" (DBE, 2019c, p.122) instead of what is considered more neutral terminology like "external condoms" or "internal condoms". Furthermore, the portion of Lesson 10.5 that pertains to contraceptive options for women uses the pronouns "she" and "her" which may be alienating for trans or non-binary learners who wish to access contraception. Using gender-neutral terminology would help learners (and teachers) who identify as transgender access condoms and contraceptives which suit them.

Information on sexual and reproductive health services and contraceptives – building on CAPS' oversights

The new lesson plans discuss contraception. This is a huge improvement over CAPs where no mention was made of types of contraception. In lesson 10.5, there are five pages dedicated to types

of contraceptives. This links the basic education sector to services provided by the Department of Health. The text also stresses that "dual protection (protection from pregnancy as well as STIs)" (DBE, 2019c, p.60) is necessary, and instructs learners how to use different types of condoms and where they can be accessed. Furthermore, the text stipulates that contraception and condom-use should be the shared responsibility of both partners, not just that of the female.

The EG maintains that "The SAFEST choice is NOT to have sex: abstinence is the only 100% effective method for preventing pregnancy" (DBE, 2019c, p.138) but contextualizes this not solely as a moral injunction, but rather in a broader conversation about sexual risk. "The most important consideration," the foreword to the EG states, "must be how important it is for your learners to know and understand the content, and how they are likely to be more disadvantaged from not being exposed to the specific content" (ibid, p.3). So, discourses of abstinence are balanced in the text with non-judgmental discourses which stress the need for accurate knowledge, and learners' own experience. What we can see here is a stark discursive shift on the part of the state, largely, in my mind, due to the state's commitment to international best-practice guidelines and research which I examined earlier.

While the texts reiterate that "sexual feelings" are "normal and natural to experience" (DBE, 2019c, p.72), the SLPs do not explain that sex is pleasurable or fun. Grade 10 lesson plans explain the process of human reproduction and contain images of the male and female reproductive systems. The menstrual cycle is outlined in detail. The clitoris is named on only one of the three of the diagrams that pertain to the female reproductive system (DBE, 2019d, p.78-79). No mention is made of female sexual pleasure. The corresponding male diagram explains that sexual excitement leads to an erection. One true or false activity contains the statements "Most girls and women do not really want sex" and "If a boy gets an erection, it means he wants to have sex. If a girl's vagina lubricates, it means she wants to have sex" which, in the Educator Guide, are both shown to be false. These statements allude to female sexual pleasure but do not elaborate on it. The discourses in this text, then, pertain mostly to reproduction as opposed to sexual activities that centre pleasure, desire and experimentation. The importance of lubrication – particularly for penetrative forms of intercourse – to sexual pleasure is neglected by the text. This might stem from the same (inaccurate) concern held by many of my participants that teaching learners about

pleasurable elements of sexuality would encourage sexual activity. While the SLPs mirror CAPS' neglect of sexual pleasure, the final SLP pertains to consent and rape, an issue not mentioned at all by CAPS.

No longer neglecting consent

Where the term 'consent' is not mentioned once in CAPS, the new material contains an entire SLP based on covering the importance of consent to healthy and safe sexual relationships. South African law pertaining to consent and rape is explained in simple, firm language. This text also examines the factors which influence one's ability to consent, such as alcohol and drug abuse and gendered power dynamics. This text also addresses victim-blaming. The excerpt below illustrates some of the key points which the activity aims to convey:

> 1. Rape is an act of power. It is violent. It is wrong.
>
> 2. Rape is against the law. A perpetrator (rapist) should be charged as a criminal.
>
> 3. Consent is always required by both partners during any sexual activity.
>
> 4. Always respect when someone says "no" whether they say it verbally or in any other way, including using body language.
>
> 5. Understand that a person has the right to change their mind and to refuse sex, even if they consented before.
>
> 6. If you bully a person into having sex, it is rape.
>
> 7. No one EVER deserves to be raped, or 'asks for it'. Nothing they do can be said to be the reason for rape.
>
> 8. Victim blaming is harmful; we all need to play a role in stopping it, so that more people who are raped will seek the help they need. (DBE, 2019c, p.104)

In an earlier DBE booklet published to address sexual abuse within schools, female learners were told to "always walk with friends" and "behave appropriately to teachers" (DBE et al, 2010, p.22). Discourses such as this place the impetus of changing behaviour on the female learner, as opposed to the perpetrators of abuse, thus reproducing tropes which blame the victim. In comparison to this type of discourse, this text is a marked improvement. It is categorical about sexual coercion and preventing victim-blaming. The lesson continues to discuss bodily integrity and agency, and links the issue of consent to topical issues like rape and femicide. The lesson also includes information

about what to do if someone is raped, linking the curriculum to services offered by the Departments of Justice and Health.

While these are encouraging moves, my one concern regarding the section on consent is that of sequencing: consent should not be an afterthought to a CSE curriculum, but rather consent should form the basis from which all sexual interactions – and discussions about sexual interactions – commence. In this sense, I think it is important that questions of consent be prioritized earlier in the curriculum, so as to better inform all discussions pertaining to sexual activity.

This links to another of my concerns – that of timing. The SLPs insist that "No additional time for teaching is expected when using the SLPs" (DBE, 2019c, p.11). I fear this is unreasonable and might hinder the effectiveness of the messaging of the curriculum. Changes in attitudes, values and behaviour take time, and having solely one hour a week to cover this material on top of the other LO topics – as the current curriculum mandates – might be challenging.

Reflections on the SLPs

Despite these reservations, I think the SLPs are an impressive step in the right direction to operationalizing CSE in South Africa. The discourses contained in the texts – while not uniform or entirely unambiguous – are far more positive and sensitive than the discourses that constitute CAPS. Indeed, the "Core Messages" of the SLPs for this age group do more than simply invoking abstinence and other moralistic scare-tactics that have been reported in the literature to predominate sexuality education (Francis, 2012; Glover & Macleod, 2016). Instead, they aim to address unintended pregnancy, HIV and STI infection rates, GBV and foster self-confidence and gender equality:

> I have the right to say "no" and the responsibility to respect "no" to sexual attention and sex at any time and in any situation.
>
> If my partner and I choose to have sex, my partner and I will use a condom correctly every time.
>
> To protect myself and others, I need to be honest and communicate well in sexual relationships.
>
> …

> I know my HIV and STI and general sexual and reproductive health status.
>
> My partner and I are equally responsible for preventing pregnancy, HIV and other STIs.
>
> I want to be part of a community that stops gender harm and violence and creates safety and peace in its place. (DBE, 2019c, p.16).

I think these guiding principles acknowledge the gravity of HIV and GBV without buying into pathologization and fear. What this chapter shows is that the state has undertaken a valiant attempt at making the South African sexuality education curriculum comprehensive. The material of the new SLPs is more inclusive, less moralistic and judgmental, and covers important concepts like patriarchy, consent and contraceptives; furthermore, the texts offer useful pedagogical resources and plans for teachers who are uncomfortable teaching such material.

Frighteningly, however, a large proportion of the country is outraged about the delivery of this new CSE material. The state has thus not been able to generate sufficient participation in or ownership of the process of developing the SLPs. I explore this in the concluding chapter that follows.

Chapter 7 | Current insights & conclusions

To recall, this research report has examined discourses from practising teachers, teacher trainers and school curriculum documents to explore what the current conjuncture means for sexuality education in South Africa. Here, I position these discursive threads in the most recent uproar about sexuality education, to synthesize what this study means for teacher-training and sexuality education. This conclusion briefly outlines the state of the largest anti-sexuality education lobby and positions this report within that moment. I then make suggestions for teacher-training and future research.

Outrage and hysteria: Responses to the Scripted Lesson Plans

The new SLPs have become the source of moral panic (Cohen, 1972).[17] I tried to keep up to date with the uproar by following it in the mainstream media, social media and radio. I think that the widespread public outcry about the SLPs reiterates my finding from Chapter 5, that sexuality education sits at the centre of a number of knotty concerns pertaining to national, racial, gendered, sexualised and moral identities. It also illustrates a pervasive moral conservativism – held across racial and religious lines – when it comes to issues of sexuality. As mentioned in my introduction, several different groups have protested against the planned roll-out of SLPs, the largest (and most vocal) of which is called the #LeaveOurKidsAlone group. Broadly, the anti-CSE lobby comprises parents, teachers' unions, religious freedom groups (Freedom of Religion South Africa, 2019), anti-abortion organisations (Family Watch International, 2019), and churches, among other constituencies. A group of parents calling itself the "March For Your Child – Not With Our Children" collective emerged in May 2019, whose demonstration was followed by a statement from the South African Teachers' Union (SAOU, 2019) rejecting CSE. The African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP) has also agitated against the roll-out of SLPs, embarking on various marches, pickets and social media campaigns over the second half of 2019.

[17] In *Folk Devils and Moral Panics,* Cohen (1972) asserts that a moral panic arises when a particular episode is considered threatening to societal interests and values; this is then represented in a simplistic and stereotypical fashion by mass media; then various powerful groups lobby against the perceived threat.

To placate these groups and dispel the many myths about the CSE curriculum, the DBE released the new lesson plans to the public in November 2019. The #LeaveOurKidsAlone lobby is a Facebook group of "parents, teachers, principals and schools who oppose the current and planned sexuality education in the LO curriculum for grades 4 to 12" (#LeaveOurKidsAlone Group, 2019; Mamacos, 2019). It was established in response to the SLPs' release in November 2019, and its membership quickly mushroomed, gaining over 90,000 members within two weeks. At February 12th 2020, the group had over 137,000 members.[18] Data published by an organiser on the group on the 4th of February 2020 indicated that the group has members in close to 100 different towns and cities around the country though there is no way of verifying this information.

What follows is an anecdotal analysis of the discursive positions within the anti-CSE lobby, drawing largely on news articles about demonstrations, and posts from the #LeaveOurKidsAlone Facebook group, (based on my own limited engagement with group activity).[19] For the sake of anonymity, individual Facebook members' names have been anonymized; only if the statement was released publicly have I kept personal details in place.

The lobby is currently pressuring government through submissions (private Facebook post, Phaladi, 2019), petitions (Bernardo, 2019; Mercury, 2019; Umphakathi Okhathazekile, 2019) and protests to remove comprehensive sexuality education from the curriculum. The group is right-wing and conservative in its rhetoric regarding gender equality, sexual diversity and access to sexual and reproductive health rights and services, as evidenced by inaccurate and homophobic statements like "Comprehensive Sexuality Education… encourages children to engage in oral, anal, homo and heterosexual practices, among other horrific sexual teachings" (ACDP, 2019,

[18] Group membership is necessarily only limited to those with internet access and a Facebook account. South Africa has 16.2 million active Facebook users, which comes to close to 30% of the total population of the country (Napoleon, 2020). So although this lobby does not constitute an objective majority of the country, its voice has dominated the conversation about sexuality education over mainstream media and social networks.

[19] After co-authoring a pro-CSE article in late 2019, I was blocked from the group, limiting my access to data for analysis. This indicates intolerance of dissent within the group. This is further reiterated by the description to the group, which reads: "The group is not a space for debate, rather for all those who want sex-ed removed from the curriculum" (Leave our Kids Alone Facebook group, 2019, https://www.facebook.com/groups/leaveourkidsalone2020/)

Facebook post). Within this lobby, several different – but interrelated – discursive groupings can be discerned.

Economic concerns

A small cohort of anti-CSE discourse is premised on the idea of state priorities. This group argues that in a time of joblessness and corruption, state resources could be better deployed to creating jobs, improving skills and numeracy instead of CSE (Mbiza, 2019; Kobe & Mamacos, 2019; Hlengani, 2019). One member from #LeaveOurKidsAlone posted: "teach the children to be entrepreneurs, to make money in an economy that does not promise them a job. Teach them skills, not sex." Another member shared a news article about school shortages in the country, stating: "no schools but yet enough money for the CSE roll-out. Priorities?"

This fails to examine the impact of sexual and reproductive health on the workforce, or the costs of an overburdened health sector to the broader economy. Most of the discourses from the lobby, however, are far more dogmatic and ideological.

Religious discourses

A large portion of the anti-CSE lobby is based on discursive foundations of religious morality. While the majority of these discourses stem from a Christian fundamentalist approach, they are not exclusively Christian. On the #LeaveOurKidsAlone group, different religious groupings seemed to have unified over concepts like "protect[ing] the innocence of children" (Matshili, 2019). CSE is thus seen as "tainting" or "sexualising", and an "evil influence" on children and morality more generally. Church groups, parents, teachers, and politicians from the African Christian Democratic Party have been particularly vocal with such discourses (ACDP, 2019a and b). One member claimed "CSE takes away the moral values from children completely. It removes RIGHT AND WRONG […] CSE tries to call evil good and good evil."

'Traditional' or 'Africanist' discourses

Another popular discursive position reflects views held by many of the teachers in my sample group: that CSE – and concepts that it teaches like sexual diversity and inclusion – are foreign to 'African culture'. This takes 'African culture' as a homogenous and timeless idea which foreign inputs contaminate. Central to this discussion has been the role of the United Nations and

UNESCO in developing CSE materials like teaching children contextually appropriate norms about sexuality and gender (ACDP, 2019c). This is considered an interference or imposition of the West in so-called African affairs and mimics the widely held but misleading trope that "homosexuality is 'un-African'". One person posted: "this sex education is getting out of hand and this is the one place where the state has NO say at all…. it is NOT in our culture……" and another thanked King Zwelithini for being "against it [CSE]" and "sav[ing] our children from sex education".

As the ACDP puts it, this faction believes that:

> "one of the main objectives of the [DBE] with CSE is to change the sexual and gender norms of society – especially one like South Africa, that has strong traditional and religious beliefs. The curriculum seems intent on promoting a liberal agenda in our schools…" (2019c).

They go on to claim that "foreign agencies … seem intent on destroying the future of our children" and that the government must "apply African solutions" by "revert[ing] back to traditional sexuality education" (ACDP, 2019c).

An irony in all of the above discourses is that of funding and foreign-involvement. Research shows that the pro-family groups which constitute a large portion of the anti-CSE lobby are funded by the American Christian right (McEwan, 2017, 2019; Kaoma, 2012). So, while CSE is touted as foreign, unAfrican, and overstepping of the role of the state, foreign lobby groups are backing the campaign and 'interfering' with local affairs.[20]

While there are numerous local policies and regional commitments which illustrate that there are strong domestic and African commitments to CSE, could there be some validity to the protests' perceptions that CSE is 'foreign'? UNESCO maintains that any CSE material must be sensitive to local moral systems and the perceived 'imposition' of CSE on South African communities. But the international development industry, of which UNESCO is a component, and mainstream

[20] See Kaoma (2012) and Nyanzi (2015) for more research regarding the role of right-wing American Christian funding in Africa, and its impact on African policy-making.

Western/white feminist movements have both been critiqued for universalising their ideology, and essentialising non-Western societies as homogenous, 'Other' and backward (Chaudhuri & Strobel, 1992; Mohanty, 1988). In this case, where Western feminist activism informs the international development policies espoused by UNESCO, can we call CSE an imperialist intervention? I do not think so, but what is worth noting is that the DBE has made insufficient effort to equip and support local grassroots movements who work in the field of sexuality and gender. CSE initiatives can then *feel* like a universalizing imposition from "the top" – as Smangaliso put it in Chapter 4 – without due consultation with communities and in direct juxtaposition to their values.

Anti-state discourses

Both of the above discursive approaches link to another dominant voice in the anti-CSE lobby: that the South African state is encroaching on the rights of parents and individuals. This is based on classical liberal discourses of individual liberty, freedom of expression, freedom of religion and the sovereignty of the home outside of the reach of the state. An administrator of the group went so far as to claim: "the government wants your children, your property and your life!!! […] if we do not do something now, our liberty and future will be gone!".

The group has called the state "authoritarian" (de Haas, 2019); One member asserted:

> the government and the UN has no right to impose their choices on me or my child [...] the government wants to take away our rights to parent our children. The utter disrespect for our beliefs and freedom is under violation (sic)

The irony of this type of discourse is that it claims that CSE is infringing on individual rights, but CSE is directly aligned to constitutional and human rights commitments. Here, the constitutional rights to freedom of expression, religion and family are being used selectively and strategically to limit the involvement of the state in public education; the platform has spiralled into hate-speech – I have been the target of this personally when I co-authored an article in support of CSE, challenging the growing dogma of the anti-CSE lobby (Chaskalson et al, 2019).

In contrast, this group argues that the imposition of CSE is not constitutional, but is expressly ideological, aimed at denying the rights of freedom of expression, religion and creating a monolithic child.

None of this centres the voices and concerns of learners themselves (Davis, 2019). If the #LeaveOurKidsAlone group gets its way, learners will indeed be left "alone" - young people will be left in the dark about their sexual and reproductive health rights. All of the teachers in my sample conceded that sexuality education should be taught in schools, and all the teachers indicated that learners are very curious about sexual health issues. It appears, then, that this lobby is neglecting the needs of learners and the experiences of teachers in the sector. Having examined the discourses of the group at the current conjuncture, I now turn to what this moment represents for my research interest more broadly.

What does this moment mean for teachers and teacher-training processes for sexuality education?

While the #LeaveOurKidsAlone lobby may represent a diverse and large slice of South African society, this research report supports the new SLPs and the DBE's attempt to revise sexuality education. This research report joins a body of literature which recognizes the necessity of CSE in schools and the need for an overhaul of how South African young people think about gender, sexuality and power.

Indeed, my analysis in Chapter 6 has shown that the SLPs make some promising strides to that effect. The SLPs are much clearer in their analysis of consent, patriarchy and sexual and gender diversity than CAPS was. The SLPs are not based solely on "moralism" (Francis, 2010, p.318) or "disease, danger and damage" (Glover & Macleod, 2016, p.1) The SLPs (DBE, 2019c & d) challenge hegemonic constructions of sexuality, gender and the family for example. Furthermore, these texts clarify certain concepts and dispel myths around sexuality in ways which teachers in my sample might have found helpful; the glossary unpacking the LGBTQI+ acronym is one example of this. If my time with teachers in the Eastern Cape is anything to go by, many teachers struggle with distinguishing concepts like the difference between sex, gender and sexual orientation, and the teachers asked me to explicate the LGBTQI+ acronym in its entirety to help them understand better.

Over and above these conceptual improvements, the SLPs may well address a number of the issues reported in literature regarding the *teaching* of sexuality education. They contain detailed resources, readings and materials for learners and teachers, which relieves teachers of the burden of developing lesson materials – an issue which teachers that I spoke to felt strongly about, and felt under-supported in doing. The SLPs thus are responsive to the probability of an untrained teacher being tasked with delivering sexuality education; such teachers can use the 'script' of the SLP to deliver important sexual and reproductive health messaging. Teachers in my sample group had multiple administrative burdens and practical challenges to teaching LO, and many other stakeholders do not take the subject seriously or devote resources to it. Time, resources, teacher support and qualified teacher trainers are thus vital to the uptake of the SLPs.

The DBE maintains in the foreword to the Educator Guide that "SLPs… will be complemented by appropriate Learning and Teaching Support Material (LTSM) and teacher-training and development programmes to facilitate optimum teaching and learning" (2019, p.3). My hope is that the lesson plans, as promising they may be, are therefore not seen as a job well-done *yet*. Although South Africa meets international benchmarks by offering teacher-training for sexuality education at some tertiary institutions (UNESCO, 2015), this response needs to be strengthened to ensure that all universities offer compulsory instruction regarding sexuality education for LO student teachers. The state must uphold its promise to accompany the SLPs with teacher-training and teacher support materials. The DBE has not published an implementation plan for this process, or what the process of teacher-training might look like. Given my participants' assertions in Chapter 4 that LO workshops are held infrequently or not at all, the capacity of the state to roll-out teacher-training for the SLPs is in question. Indeed, unless teachers are properly trained to deliver the texts through pre-service and continued in-service teacher education, the SLPs may not be impactful and teachers are likely – as Smangaliso explained – to be "short-circuited" and under-prepared to deliver the content. One finding of this research is that regular in-service training must be strengthened.

Central to any training drive by the state must be the conscientization and ownership of the values and concepts in the SLPs' messaging. My sample group expressed a feeling that CSE had been "imposed on them" from the "top-down" without due consultation, training or participation by the

groups involved. The current backlash to CSE expresses similar concerns. South Africa is in an unusual position where the state is enforcing an arguably feminist intervention at the discontent of much of its population. Elsewhere around the world, the state has often only committed to progressive gender and sexuality agendas at the behest of grassroots feminist movements. Here, instead, the dominant grassroots response seems to be far more conservative than a seemingly progressive state. This paradox suggests that the state needs to embark on a broader process of collective conscientization, consensus-building, and 'buy-in' if the concepts taught in SLPs are to effect meaningful change in the status quo of gender and sexuality in South Africa.

Beyond this moment

My analysis indicates that the tertiary sector is currently very limited in its support of teacher-training for CSE. Neither of the universities where I undertook field research knew about the SLPs. University curricula now need to be updated to reflect the latest developments in CSE in South African schools. Along with civil society and non-governmental interventions, the tertiary education space could step up to support the implementation of the SLPs and avail resources and teacher trainers to the process. This report is sensitive to the context of economic austerity and increased financial pressure on universities, and so any collaborations would require careful and creative thought. In an ideal world, with access to resources and human capital, such a collaboration could entail the monitoring of the delivery of SLPs, assisting with teacher-training roll-out, adapting pedagogy instruction and working with in-service teachers to develop new scholarly research on CSE in South Africa. Institutional gate-keeping mechanisms must be removed if such collaboration and future scholarship on teacher-training for sexuality education are to be possible.

There are a number of angles for future research: while I focused on in-service teacher-training, pre-service training for LO teachers is of interest; analysing other educational phases' SLPs for sexuality education is pertinent; and exploring the state teacher-training process through in-service subject workshops could offer valuable insights into state discourses and teacher instruction. Within the time-frame of a one year programme, despite originally intending to, I did not have the time to observe teacher-training sessions and so my discussions centred around teachers' experiences of teaching, attitudes towards sexuality and gender, and needs from training generally.

Observing the delivery of training – and examining the university's curriculum for that training process – is of scholarly interest when thinking about the tertiary sector's role in furthering adolescent sexual and reproductive health rights messaging.

This research report has attempted to investigate teacher-training processes for sexuality education in light of a particular historical conjuncture of discourses surrounding CSE more broadly. Several elements make it unique and a contribution to wider literature. First, its contemporaneousness is worth noting; this research report is written at a highly debated conjuncture surrounding sexuality education and emphasises the importance of teachers and teacher-training to the uptake of the new CSE messaging. Furthermore, my research focused on what practising teachers need from training itself. Findings from my research reiterated literature which shows that LO teachers hold a number of roles while being under-supported and overworked and that teacher-training offers an important avenue of support for teachers. The important role of the university in transmitting discourses and developing pedagogical capacity in teachers was explicated. Most teachers needed assistance working through complex concepts relating to sexual and gender diversity, and also linking the curriculum to sexual and reproductive health services. The responsibilities of the tertiary sector in developing training programmes sensitive to these issues is critical.

Finally, this report's localised analysis shows how the constitution of discourses pertaining to sexuality, gender and power is highly situational and affected by context, culture, location and identity. Although not homogenous, the dominant discourses of the participant teachers demonstrated deep-seated investments in 'culturally' appropriate expressions of sexuality, as mandated by prevailing socio-linguistic conditions. These discourses centred a hetero-patriarchal sexual framework where the logics of biology, sexual orientation and gender were seen to be mutually constitutive. Sexuality education, as my research shows, turned out to be a touchstone for a number of different concerns operating within and around classroom experiences. Teacher training processes, it was argued, must be sensitive to local understandings of, and anxieties about, gender and sexuality while challenging teachers to question these standpoints and encourage inclusivity and tolerance. Reconciling local understandings, experience and attitudes towards sexuality, gender and power with rights-and evidence-based discourses is necessarily a challenging task, and greater buy-in to the process from institutional stakeholders could go a long way in

making these conversations possible and fruitful. The SLPs, this report showed, offer some useful insights on this.

The SLPs then offered me a novel source of discourse transmission from the state with respect to gender, sexuality and power. They went some way in challenging certain stereotypical or prejudicial views which were expressed by participants in my study. The SLPs are sensitive to the ways in which the content may be challenging to teachers and learners, but are also firm in terms of their positive messaging surrounding sexual health, diversity, consent and patriarchy. There are some problems with the SLPs, but they also represent an impressive step forward form the state with respect to operationalizing its commitments to adolescent sexual and reproductive health rights.

Particularly because of the dogmatic backlash to the SLPs, the next step, as I see it, is to move towards greater conscientization and ownership of the values espoused in the new curriculum. The role of civil society through grassroots mobilisation and education will be key to this, as is the work of further academic scholarship. And, as this research has tried to show, if any conscientizing process is to be successful, teachers and teacher-training programmes must be central.

Bibliography

Academy of Science of South Africa. (2015). *Diversity in Human Sexuality: Implications for policy in Africa*. Pretoria: Academy of Science of South Africa ASSAF.

African Christian Democratic Party (ACDP). (2019a, August 17). ACDP march against Comprehensive Sexuality Education, which encourages children to engage in oral, anal, homo and heterosexual practices, among other horrific sexual teachings. [Facebook]. *Facebook Post*. https://www.facebook.com/african.christian.democratic.party/photos/a.10151632118061820/10156307069406820/?type=1&theater

ACDP. (2019b, October 26). "Don't impose your immorality on our children" [Facebook]. *Facebook Post*. https://www.facebook.com/african.christian.democratic.party/photos/a.10151632118061820/10156463596921820/?type=1&theater

ACDP. (2019c, November 13). ACDP Statement In Response To Basic Education Minister Angie Motshekga's Statement That Parents Can Opt Out Of Comprehensive Sexuality Education Curriculum [Facebook]. *Facebook Post*. https://www.facebook.com/african.christian.democratic.party/posts/the-leader-of-the-acdp-rev-kenneth-meshoe-mpacdp-statement-in-response-to-basic-/10156510168556820/

Adams, N. (2019, November 13). Sex education: 'Parents left out'. *Weekend Argus*. https://www.iol.co.za/weekend-argus/news/sex-education-parents-left-out-37128401

Adams Tucker, L., George, G., Reardon, C., & Panday, S. (2017). Sexuality education in South African schools: The challenge for civil society organisations. *Health Education Journal*, *76*(1), 77–88.

Ahmed, N., Flisher, A. J., Mathews, C., Mukoma, W., & Jansen, S. (2009). HIV education in South African schools: The dilemma and conflicts of educators. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *37*(2_suppl), 48–54.

Bailey, J. M., Vasey, P. L., Diamond, L. M., Breedlove, S. M., Vilain, E., & Epprecht, M. (2016). Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *17*(2), 45–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100616637616

Baxen, J., Wood, L., & Austin, P. (2011). Reconsidering and Repositioning HIV and AIDS Within Teacher Education. *Africa Insight*, *40*(4). https://doi.org/10.4314/ai.v40i4.65925

Bernardo, L. (2019). *Sign the Petition*. Change.Org. https://www.change.org/p/department-of-basic-education-stop-comprehensive-sexuality-education-in-sa-schools

Bhana, D. (2016). *Childhood sexuality and AIDS education: The price of innocence* (First edition). New York: Routledge.

Bhana, D., Crewe, M., & Aggleton, P. (2019). Sex, sexuality and education in South Africa. *Sex Education*, *19*(4), 361–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2019.1620008

Bhana, D., & Pattman, R. (2009). Researching South African Youth, Gender and Sexuality Within the Context of HIV/AIDS. *Development*, *52*(1), 68–74. https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2008.75

Brown, J. (2013). *Attitudes and experiences of teachers and students towards life orientation: A case study of a state-funded school in Eldorado Park, South Johannesburg.* [Thesis, University of Witwatersrand]. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/12985

Burns, C. (1996). Sex Lessons from the Past? *Agenda*, *29*(79), 79–91. https://doi.org/10.2307/4065805

Butler, A. (2005). South Africa's HIV/AIDS policy, 1994–2004: How can it be explained? *African Affairs*, *104*(417), 591–614. https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adi036

Butler, J. (1988). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, *40*(4), 519–530. https://doi.org/10.2307/3207893

Cameron, E., & Gevisser, M. (2013). *Defiant Desire: Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa*. Oxford: Routledge.

Campbell, C., & MacPhail, C. (2002). Peer education, gender and the development of critical consciousness: Participatory HIV prevention by South African youth. *Social Science & Medicine*, *55*(2), 331–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(01)00289-1

Chaskalson, J. (2018). *The Limitations of Sexuality Education in the Life Orientation Curriculum: Lessons from local and international frameworks for reforming comprehensive gender and sex education in South Africa.* [Unpublished Honours Thesis]. University of Witwatersrand.

Chaskalson, J., Bhana, D., Brouard, P., Hodes, R., Ngabaza, S., Silbert, P., & Zungu, N. (2019, November 26). Knowledge is power: The case for Comprehensive Sexualities Education in South Africa. *Daily Maverick*. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-11-26-knowledge-is-power-the-case-for-comprehensive-sexualities-education-in-south-africa/

Chaudhuri, N., & Strobel, M. (1992). *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Chege, F. (2006). Teachers gendered identities, pedagogy and HIV/AIDS education in African settings within the ESAR. *Journal of Education*, *38*(1), 25–44. https://journals.co.za/content/joe/38/1/AJA0259479X_54;jsessionid=d1I0hOR83yFY2NqktEoU2wXw.sabinetlive

Cohen, S. (1972). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. New York: Routledge.

Crowley, H., & Himmelweit, S. (1992). *Knowing Women: Feminism and Knowledge*. New Jersey: Wiley.

Davis, R. (2019, November 15). ANALYSIS: Schools sex-ed row part of a wider culture war in which SA kids are pawns. *Daily Maverick*. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-11-15-schools-sex-ed-row-part-of-a-wider-culture-war-in-which-sa-kids-are-pawns/

Delius, P., & Glaser, C. (2002). Sexual Socialisation in South Africa: A Historical Perspective. *African Studies*, *61*(1), 27–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/00020180220140064

DePalma, R., & Francis, D. (2014a). The gendered nature of South African teachers' discourse on sex education. *Health Education Research*, *29*. https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyt117

DePalma, R., & Francis, D. (2014b). South African Life Orientation Teachers: (Not) Teaching About Sexuality Diversity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *61*(12), 1687–1711. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.951256

Amended National Norms and Standards for School Funding in terms of the South African Schools Act, 1996, No. 29179 (2006). https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201409/29179.pdf

Department of Basic Education. (2011). *Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement, Grades 10-12—Life Orientation [further Education and Training Phase]*. Pretoria: Department of Basic Education. http://curricula-depot.gei.de/bitstream/handle/11163/1350/780000579_2011_A.pdf?sequence=2

DBE National Policy on HIV, STIs and TB for Learners, Educators, School Support Staff and Officials in Primary and Secondary Schools in South Africa, 1 (2017). https://serve.mg.co.za/content/documents/2017/06/14/dbehivtbpolicyfinaljune2017cabinetapproved.pdf

Department of Basic Education. (2018, June 1). Minister Motshekga launches History Ministerial Task Team Report. *Thutho*. https://www.education.gov.za/Portals/0/Documents/Publications/Thuto%20Volume%20189.pdf?ver=2018-06-06-090526-283

Department of Basic Education. (2019a, October 30). *Dep. Basic Education on Twitter: '[READ] #DBENews Basic Education Department concerned about continued misleading reports on Life Orientation curriculum: https://t.co/ZHgJX5c84o @ElijahMhlanga https://t.co/ox8a8wl6rj' / Twitter*. Twitter. https://twitter.com/DBE_SA/status/1189552945047756802

Department of Basic Education. (2019b). *Sexuality education in life orientation: Scripted lesson plans. Grade 10 Educator Guide*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Basic Education. (2019c). *Sexuality education in life orientation: Scripted lesson plans. Grade 10 Learner Book*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Department of Basic Education, Panday, S., Makiwane, M., Ranchod, C., Human Sciences Research Council, & UNICEF. (2009). *Teenage pregnancy in South Africa: With a specific focus on school-going learners: executive summary*. Pretoria: Department of Basic Education.

Department of Basic Education, & Reginah, M. (2019, September 17). *Comprehensive Sexuality Education Provision in Schools: Presentation to the Portfolio Committee on Basic Education* [Parliament]. https://pmg.org.za/files/190917CSE.pptx

Department of Basic Education, Watson, P., Eduscript, R., & Grey, J. (2010). *Speak Out: Youth Report Sexual Abuse (A handbook for learners on how to prevent sexual abuse in public schools).* [Handbook]. Pretoria: Department of Basic Education. https://www.education.gov.za/Portals/0/SPEAK%20OUT%20eBOOKLET.pdf

Department of Education. (1997). *Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the 21st Century*. Pretoria: Government Printer. https://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv%3A7990

Department of Health and Department of Basic Education. (2012). Integrated School Health Policy, 1 (2012). Pretoria: Government Printer. https://serve.mg.co.za/content/documents/2017/06/14/integratedschoolhealthpolicydbeanddoh.pdf

Department of Social Development. (2015). National Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Framework Strategy, 2014-2019, 1 (2015). Pretoria: Government Printer. http://www.dsd.gov.za/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=578&Itemid=39

Department of Social Development, & National Population Unit. (2014). *Factors Associated with Factors Associated with Teenage Pregnancy in Teenage Pregnancy in South Africa* (pp. 1–65). Department of Social Development. https://www.sexrightsafrica.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/National_Teenage_Pregnancy_Report_Version_August_2014-copy.pdf

Dickinson, D. (2014). *A different kind of AIDS: Folk and lay theories in South African townships*. Johannesburg: Fanele Auckland Park.

Dipa, K. (2019, November 16). 'We won't teach sex lessons to kids', teachers say. *Saturday Star*. https://www.iol.co.za/saturday-star/news/we-wont-teach-sex-lessons-to-kids-teachers-say-37312708

Dovey, K., & Mason, M. (1984). Guidance for Submission: Social Control and Guidance in Schools for Black Pupils in South Africa. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *12*(1), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/03069888408253763

Duff, S. (2015). 'Facts about Ourselves': Negotiating Sexual Knowledge in Early Twentieth-Century South Africa. *Kronos*, *41*, 215–235. JSTOR. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43859440

Duff, S. (2017, October 26). Race, Sex Education, and the Age of Consent in South Africa. *Nursing Clio*. https://nursingclio.org/2017/10/26/race-sex-education-and-the-age-of-consent-in-south-africa/

Duff, S. E. (2015, May 25). Let's talk about sex education: Race and shame in South Africa. *The Conversation*. http://theconversation.com/lets-talk-about-sex-education-race-and-shame-in-south-africa-41390

Educational Development Centre. (2016, October 11). *Expanding Education to Reduce HIV, Teen Pregnancy in South Africa | EDC*. https://www.edc.org/expanding-education-reduce-hiv-teen-pregnancy-south-africa

Educational Development Centre. (2019). *South Africa School-Based Sexuality and HIV Prevention Education Activity | EDC*. https://www.edc.org/south-africa-school-based-sexuality-and-hiv-prevention-education-activity

Epprecht, M. (2008). *Heterosexual Africa?: The History of an Idea from the Age of Exploration to the Age of AIDS*. Athens: Ohio University Press. https://muse.jhu.edu/book/7004

Erlank, N. (2004). 'Plain Clean Facts' and initiation schools: Christianity, Africans and 'sex education' in South Africa, c. 1910–1940. *Agenda*, *18*(62), 76–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2004.9676204

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Essex: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1993). *Discourse and Social Change*. New Jersey: Wiley.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: SAGE.

Fajardo-Heyward, P. (2016). Comprehensive Sexual Education in Latin America: Human Rights Education and Women's Rights. *The Global and the Local*, 31–52. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789463006545_004

Family Watch International. (n.d.). CSE Exposed Menu. *StopCSE.Org*. Retrieved 13 November 2019, from https://www.comprehensivesexualityeducation.org/cse-exposed/

Fine, M. (1988). Sexuality, Schooling, and Adolescent Females: The Missing Discourse of Desire. *Harvard Educational Review*, *58*(1), 29–54. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.58.1.u0468k1v2n2n8242

Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality* (R. Hurley, Trans.; 1st American ed, Vols 1–3). New York: Pantheon Books.

Francis, D. (2010). Sexuality Education in South Africa: Three Essential Questions. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *30*(3), 314–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2009.12.003

Francis, D. (2012). Teacher positioning on the teaching of sexual diversity in South African schools. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *14*(6), 597–611. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2012.674558

Francis, D. (2013). Sexuality education in South Africa: Whose values are we teaching? *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, *22*(2), 69. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjhs.2013.2199

Francis, D. A. (2017). "I think we had one or two of those, but they weren't really": Teacher and Learner Talk on Bisexuality in South African Schools. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *17*(2), 206–224.

Francis, D., & DePalma, R. (2014). Teacher perspectives on abstinence and safe sex education in South Africa. *Sex Education*, *14*(1), 81–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2013.833091

Francis, D., & DePalma, R. (2015). 'You need to have some guts to teach': Teacher preparation and characteristics for the teaching of sexuality and HIV/AIDS education in South African schools. *SAHARAJ: Journal of Social Aspects of HIV/AIDS Research Alliance / SAHARA, Human Sciences Research Council*, *12*, 30–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/17290376.2015.1085892

Francis, D., & Msibi, T. (2011). Teaching About Heterosexism: Challenging Homophobia in South Africa. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *8*(2), 157–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2011.553713

Gibson, R. (2019, May 12). An American in Mzansi: Reflecting on Sex Education, Positionality, and the Role of Research. *DSBS Fieldnotes*. http://www.dsbsfieldnotes.uct.ac.za/news/american-mzansi-reflecting-sex-education-positionality-and-role-research

Giroux, H. A. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling; a critical reader*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Glover, J., & Macleod, C. (2016). *Rolling out comprehensive sexuality education in South Africa: An overview of research conducted on Life Orientation sexuality education* (pp. 1–8) [Policy Brief]. Rhodes University Critical Studies in Sexualities and Reproduction Research Programme. http://srjc.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Life-Orientation-Policy-Brief_Final.pdf

Govender, P. (2019, May 12). Sex lessons for modern grade 4s in new life orientation curriculum. *Sunday Times*. https://www.timeslive.co.za/sunday-times/news/2019-05-12-sex-lessons-for-modern-grade-4s-in-new-life-orientation-curriculum/

Government of South Africa. (1996). South African Schools Act (No 84), 17579 (1996). Pretoria: Government Printer. https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201409/act84of1996.pdf

Government of South Africa. (2019, May 13). *Basic Education distances itself from Sunday Times article*. https://www.gov.za/speeches/disturbed-13-may-2019-0000

Government of South Africa, South African National AIDS Council, & Phila. (2018). She Conquers. *Sexual and Gender-Based Violence*. http://sheconquerssa.co.za/sexual-gender-based-violence/

Grant, M. J., & Hallman, K. K. (2008). Pregnancy-Related School Dropout and Prior School Performance in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Studies in Family Planning*, *39*(4), 369–382. https://doi.org/10.1111/%28ISSN%291728-4465/issues

Green, A. (2018, January 22). Tackling rape culture in schools. *Health-e*. https://www.health-e.org.za/2018/01/22/tackling-rape-culture-schools/

Hall, S. (2000). *Without Guarantees: In Honour of Stuart Hall*. London: Verso.

Helleve, A., Flisher, A. J., Onya, H., Mukoma, W., & Klepp, K. (2009). South African teachers' reflections on the impact of culture on their teaching of sexuality and HIV/AIDS. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *11*(2), 189–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050802562613

Heywood, M. (2009). South Africa's Treatment Action Campaign: Combining Law and Social Mobilization to Realize the Right to Health. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, *1*(1), 14–36. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhuman/hun006

Hlengani, A. (2019a, November 14). #LeaveOurKidsAlone: Leader of anti sex ed group says they'll bring the country to a standstill. *Parent24*. https://www.parent24.com/Learn/Learning-difficulties/leaveourkidsalone-anti-sex-ed-group-gathers-over-50-000-fb-members-in-just-two-weeks-20191113

Hlengani, A. (2019b, December 2). Leader of anti sex-ed group says government is sexually harassing children. *Parent24*. https://www.parent24.com/Learn/Learning-difficulties/leader-of-anti-sex-ed-group-says-government-is-sexually-harassing-children-20191127

Hodes, R., & Gittings, L. (2019). 'Kasi curriculum': What young men learn and teach about sex in a South African township. *Sex Education*, *19*(4), 436–454. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2019.1606792

Jacobs, A. (2011). Life Orientation as experienced by learners: A qualitative study in North-West Province. *South African Journal of Education*, *31*(2), 212–223. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v31n2a481

Jager, N. de. (2019, November 28). Sex education raises questions about the role of the state in South Africa. *The Conversation*. http://theconversation.com/sex-education-raises-questions-about-the-role-of-the-state-in-south-africa-127151

Jager, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: SAGE.

Jarvis, J. (2014). Reflections on gender identity in a safe space for transforming classroom praxis. *Journal for the Study of Religion*, *27*(1), 169–191.

http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_abstract&pid=S1011-76012014000100010&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=es

Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., & Christofides, N. (2009). Empowering teenagers to prevent pregnancy: Lessons from South Africa. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *11*(7), 675–688. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050902846452

Jochelson, K. (2001). *The Colour of Disease: Syphilis and Racism in South Africa, 1880-1950*. New York: Springer.

Johannes, L.-A. (2019, October 29). Leaked 2020 life orientation curriculum has educators up in arms over grossly insensitive sex education material. *Parent24*. https://m.parent24.com/Learn/Learning-difficulties/leaked-2020-life-orientation-curriculum-has-educators-up-in-arms-over-grossly-insensitive-sex-education-material-20191029

Jones, T. (2019). South African contributions to LGBTI education issues. *Sex Education*, *19*(4), 455–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2018.1535969

Karim, Q. A., & Baxter, C. (2016). The dual burden of gender-based violence and HIV in adolescent girls and young women in South Africa. *SAMJ: South African Medical Journal*, *106*(12), 1151–1153.

Kaunda Selisho. (2019, May 13). DBE slams reports on masturbation lessons for grade 4s. *The Citizen*. https://citizen.co.za/news/south-africa/education/2130044/dbe-slams-reports-on-masturbation-lessons-for-grade-4s/

Ketting, E., & Ivanova, O. (2018). *Sexuality Education in Europe and Central Asia: State of the Art and Recent Developments (An Overview of 25 Countries)* (pp. 1–232) [Assessment Report]. Federal Centre for Health Education, BZGA and International Planned the Parenthood Federation European Network, IPPF EN. http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/379054/BZgA_IPPFEN_ComprehensiveStudyReport_Online.pdf?ua=1

Khuzwayo, Z., & Morison, T. (2017). *Resisting Erasure: Bisexual Female Identity in South Africa*. Pretoria: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group UNISA Press.

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative Research: Introducing focus groups. *BMJ*, *311*(7000), 299–302. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299

Koffman, O., & Gill, R. (2013). 'the revolution will be led by a 12-year-old girl': Girl power and global biopolitics. *Feminist Review*, *105*(1), 83–102. https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2013.16

Koffman, O., & Gill, R. (2014). 'I Matter and so Does She': Girl Power, (Post)feminism and the Girl Effect. In D. Buckingham, S. Bragg, & M. J. Kehily (Eds.), *Youth Cultures in the Age of Global Media* (pp. 242–257). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137008152_15

Kubheka, A. (2019, September 16). Department's new school sex education plan aims to reduce HIV infections and pregnancy. *IOL Daily News*. https://www.iol.co.za/dailynews/news/kwazulu-natal/departments-new-school-sex-education-plan-aims-to-reduce-hiv-infections-and-pregnancy-33062844

#LeaveOurKidsAlone. (n.d.). *#LeaveOurKidsAlone*. Retrieved 27 December 2019, from http://www.leaveourkidsalone.co.za/WWF.html

#LeaveOurKidsAlone, L. (2019, October). *#LeaveOurKidsAlone*. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/groups/leaveourkidsalone2020/photos/

Lemmon, G. T., & ElHarake, L. S. (2014). *Child Brides, Global Consequences: How to End Child Marriage*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.

MacEntee, K. (2016). Girls, Condoms, Tradition, and Abstinence: Making Sense of HIV Prevention Discourses in Rural South Africa. In C. Mitchell & C. Rentschler (Eds.), *Girlhood and the Politics of Place* (pp. 315–332). Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Macleod, C. (2009). Danger and Disease in Sex Education: The Saturation of 'Adolescence' with Colonialist Assumptions. *Journal of Health Management*, *11*(2), 375–389. https://doi.org/10.1177/097206340901100207

Macleod, C. (2016, May 25). Why sexuality education in schools needs a major overhaul. *The Conversation*. http://theconversation.com/why-sexuality-education-in-schools-needs-a-major-overhaul-58176

Macleod, C., Moodley, D., & Young, L. S. (2015). Sexual socialisation in Life Orientation manuals versus popular music: Responsibilisation versus pleasure, tension and complexity. *Perspectives in Education*, *33*(2), 90-107.

Madlingozi, T. (2017). Social justice in a time of neo-apartheid constitutionalism: Critiquing the anti-black economy of recognition, incorporation and distribution. *Stellenbosch Law Review*, *28*(1), 123–147. https://journals.co.za/content/journal/10520/EJC-8b260f796

Makou, G. (2017, July 13). Femicide in South Africa: 3 numbers about the murdering of women investigated. *Africa Check*. https://africacheck.org/reports/femicide-sa-3-numbers-murdering-women-investigated/

Maluleke, R. (2018). *Crime against Women in South Africa, 2018* (Report 03-40-05; p. 27). Stats SA. https://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/Report-03-40-05/Report-03-40-05June2018.pdf

Mamacos, E. (2019, November 15). See for yourself: The Comprehensive Sexuality Education curriculum is here. *Parent24*. https://www.parent24.com/Learn/Learning-difficulties/see-for-yourself-the-comprehensive-sexuality-education-curriculum-is-here-20191114

Maqhina, B. (2019, November 11). Don't close door on sex curriculum, says DA. *IOL Daily News*. https://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/dont-close-door-on-sex-curriculum-says-da-37016840

March for your child. (2019). *March for your child—Stop CSE in South Africa—Posts*. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/pg/StopCSEinSA/posts/?ref=page_internal

Matshili, R. (2019a, August 19). ACDP march against sex education plan. *IOL Pretoria News*. https://www.iol.co.za/pretoria-news/acdp-march-against-sex-education-plan-30970782

Matshili, R. (2019b, October 29). Uproar over Comprehensive Sexuality Education. *IOL Pretoria News*. https://www.iol.co.za/pretoria-news/uproar-over-comprehensive-sexuality-education-36192973

Matshoba, H., Rooth, E., & Umalusi. (2014). *Living up to expectations?: A comparative investigation of life orientation in the National Senior Certificate and the National Certificate(vocational)*. Pretoria: Umalusi. https://www.umalusi.org.za/docs/assurance/2014/lifeorientation.pdf

Mbembe, A. (2015). Apartheid futures and the limits of racial reconciliation. *Public Positions*.

McEwan, H. (2019, November 11). America's right is lobbying against South Africa's sex education syllabus. *The Conversation*. https://theconversation.com/americas-right-is-lobbying-against-south-africas-sex-education-syllabus-126356

McEwen, H. (2017). Nuclear power: The family in decolonial perspective and 'pro-family' politics in Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, *34*(6), 738–751. https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2017.1318700

Mercury, R. (2019, November 11). Petition to oppose changes to life orientation subject content. *The Mercury*. https://www.iol.co.za/mercury/news/petition-to-oppose-changes-to-life-orientation-subject-content-37024729

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: SAGE.

Mhlahlo, A. P. (2009). *What is manhood?: The significance of traditional circumcision in the Xhosa initiation ritual* [Thesis, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch]. https://scholar.sun.ac.za:443/handle/10019.1/2699

Mohanty, C. T. (1988). Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. *Feminist Review*, *30*(1), 61–88. https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.1988.42

Mohanty, C. T., Russo, A., & Torres, L. (Eds.). (1991). *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Fourth Printing edition). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Molosokankwe, B. (2019, November 14). Sex education will normalise lesbianism, sodomy, promiscuity—Christian groups | The Star. *The Star*. https://www.iol.co.za/the-star/news/sex-education-will-normalise-lesbianism-sodomy-promiscuity-christian-groups-37186239

Morgan, D. L. (1997). *The focus group guidebook* (Vol. 1). New York: SAGE.

Morrissey, M. E. (2013). Rape as a Weapon of Hate: Discursive Constructions and Material Consequences of Black Lesbianism in South Africa. *Women's Studies in Communication*, *36*(1), 72–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2013.755450

Msibi, T. (2019). Passing through professionalism: South African Black male teachers and same-sex desire. *Sex Education*, *19*(4), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2019.1612346

Msimang, S. (2013, June 12). Our unfinished business: Race and reconciliation. *Daily Maverick*. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/opinionista/2013-06-12-our-unfinished-business-race-and-reconciliation/

Muholi, Z. (2011). *Reclaiming the L-Word: Sappho's Daughters Out in Africa*. Johannesburg: African Books Collective.

Ndlazi, S. (2019, October 21). ACDP slams plans to introduce sex lessons in school. *IOL Pretoria News*. https://www.iol.co.za/pretoria-news/acdp-slams-plans-to-introduce-sex-lessons-in-school-35492796

Ndlovu, S., Lekgoathi, S., Esterhuysen, A., Mkhize, N., Weldon, G., Callinicos, L., & Sithole, J. (2018). *Report of the History Ministerial Task Team for the Department of Basic Education* (pp. 1–156) [Report]. Department of Basic Education. https://www.education.gov.za/Portals/0/Documents/Reports/Report%20of%20the%20History%20Ministerial%20Task%20Team.pdf?ver=2018-06-07-154241-410

New Zealand Ministry of Education. (2015). *SEXUALITY EDUCATION: A guide for principals, boards of trustees, and teachers* (pp. 1–47) [Guide]. New Zealand Ministry of Education. https://health.tki.org.nz/Teaching-in-HPE/Policy-guidelines/Sexuality-education-a-guide-for-principals-boards-of-trustees-and-teachers

Ngabaza, S., & Shefer, T. (2019). Sexuality education in South African schools: Deconstructing the dominant response to young people's sexualities in contemporary schooling contexts. *Sex Education*, *19*(4), 422–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2019.1602033

Ngabaza, S., Shefer, T., & Macleod, C. (2016). "Girls need to behave like girls you know": The complexities of applying a gender justice goal within sexuality education in South African schools. *Reproductive Health Matters*, *24*(48), 71–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rhm.2016.11.007

Nyanzi, S. (2013). Dismantling reified African culture through localised homosexualities in Uganda. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *15*(8), 952–967. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2013.798684

Oyewumi, O. (2002). *Conceptualizing Gender: The Eurocentric Foundations of Feminist Concepts and the Challenge of African Epistemologies*. http://awdflibrary.org:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/582

Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2017). *Bisexuality in Education: Erasure, Exclusion and the Absence of Intersectionality*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Parent24. (2019, May 21). South African Teachers Union threatens to boycott Grade 4 curriculum. *Parent24*. https://www.parent24.com/Child_7-12/Development/south-african-teachers-union-threatens-to-boycott-grade-4-curriculum-20190521

Parker, D. A. (2014). *Sex, cells, and same-sex desire: The biology of sexual preference*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Parveen, N. (2019, March 4). Birmingham school stops LGBT lessons after parents protest. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/mar/04/birmingham-school-stops-lgbt-lessons-after-parent-protests

Perlman, H., Usdin, S., & Button, J. (2013). Using popular culture for social change: Soul City videos and a mobile clip for adolescents in South Africa. *Reproductive Health Matters*, *21*(41), 31–34.

Phaladi, D. (2019, September 7). #NotWithOurChildren protest [Facebook]. *Facebook Post*. https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=2512625932354509&set=pb.100008213800927.-2207520000..&type=3&theater

Phelps, S. M., & Wedow, R. (2019, August 29). Opinion | What Genetics Is Teaching Us About Sexuality. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/29/opinion/genetics-sexual-orientation-study.html

Pillay, J. (2012). Keystone Life Orientation (LO) teachers: Implications for educational, social, and cultural contexts. *South African Journal of Education*, *32*(2), 167–177. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v32n2a497

Plataforma LAC. (2017, April 3). 70% of students in Latin America do not have comprehensive access to sexual education. *Plataforma LAC*. https://plataformalac.org/en/2017/04/70-of-students-in-latin-america-do-not-have-comprehensive-access-to-sexual-education/

Prinsloo, E. (2007). Implementation of life orientation programmes in the new curriculum in South African schools: Perceptions of principals and life orientation teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, *27*(1), 155-170–170. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/saje/article/view/25104

Rall, S.-A. (2019, May 16). Sex education debate: Religious leaders, experts weigh in. *The Mercury*. https://www.iol.co.za/mercury/news/sex-education-debate-religious-leaders-experts-weigh-in-23322422

Reygan, F., & Francis, D. (2015). Emotions and pedagogies of discomfort: Teachers' responses to sexual and gender diversity in the Free State, South Africa. *Education as Change*, *19*(1), 101–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2014.943259

Rotherham, S. (2019, October 30). SA Teachers Are Freaking Out About the New Sex Education Curriculum – 2oceansvibe.com. *2OceansVibe*. https://www.2oceansvibe.com/2019/10/30/sa-teachers-are-freaking-out-about-the-new-sex-education-curriculum/

SABC. (2019, October 30). Union threatens to boycott life orientation curriculum amendments. In *SABC News—Breaking news, special reports, world, business, sport coverage of all South African current events. Africa's news leader.* SABC. http://www.sabcnews.com/sabcnews/union-threatens-to-boycott-life-orientation-curriculum-amendments/

Sanders, A. J. G. M. (1997). Homosexuality and the law: A gay revolution in South Africa? *Journal of African Law*, *41*(1), 100–108. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855300010007

Saville Young, L., Moodley, D., & Macleod, C. I. (2019). Feminine sexual desire and shame in the classroom: An educator's constructions of and investments in sexuality education. *Sex Education*, *19*(4), 486–500. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2018.1511974

Shah, Z. (2012). *Professional development of educators: An illuminative evaluation of INSET for life orientation.* [Master of Education Thesis, University of Witwatersrand]. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/11376

Shefer, T., Bhana, D., & Morrell, R. (2013). Teenage pregnancy and parenting at school in contemporary South African contexts: Deconstructing school narratives and understanding policy implementation. *Perspectives in Education*, *31*(1), 1–10.

Shefer, T., & Ngabaza, S. (2015). 'And I have been told that there is nothing fun about having sex while you are still in high school': Dominant discourses on women's sexual practices and desires in Life Orientation programmes at school. *Perspectives in Education*, *33*(2), 63–76. https://journals.co.za/content/persed/33/2/EJC171666

Simelela, N. P., & Venter, W. D. F. (2014). A brief history of South Africa's response to AIDS. *South African Medical Journal*, *104*(3), 249. https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.7700

Smrithi, A. (2019, April 14). From Kerala To Gujarat: How Rightly Portrayed Is Sexuality in Indian Textbooks? *Feminism in India*. https://feminisminindia.com/2019/04/15/sexuality-indian-textbooks/

South African National AIDS Council. (2017). *Let Our Actions Count: South Africa's National Strategic Plan for HIV, TB and STIs 2017-2022* (pp. 1–132) [National Strategic Plan]. South African National AIDS Council. https://sanac.org.za//wp-content/uploads/2017/06/NSP_FullDocument_FINAL.pdf

South African Police Services. (2018). *Annual Crime Report 2017/2018* (299/2018). SAPS. saps.gov.za/services/annual_crime_report2019.pdf

Stein, N., & SECTION27. (2017). Chapter 11: Language in Schools. In *Basic Education Rights Handbook*. Johannesburg: SECTION27.

StopCSE.org. (n.d.). South Africa. *StopCSE.Org*. Retrieved 18 November 2019, from https://www.comprehensivesexualityeducation.org/international-map/southafrica/

Suid Afrikaanse Onderwys Unie. (2019, May 21). *SAOU: SAOU media statement re inclusion of sex education in the curriculum*. Polity.Org.Za. https://www.polity.org.za/article/saou-saou-media-statement-re-inclusion-of-sex-educatioon-in-the-curriculum-2019-05-21/searchString:

Swarr, A. L. (2012). *Sex in transition: Remaking gender and race in South Africa*. New York: Suny Press.

Szydlowski, M. B. (2015). *Sexual Health Education: Research and Results* (pp. 1–4). Advocates for Youth. https://advocatesforyouth.org/wp-content/uploads/storage//advfy/documents/school-health-equity/sexual-healthed-research-and-results.pdf

Thamm, M. (2019a, September 5). Women protest against rape and femicide – SAPS arrest marchers, use stun grenades and turn water cannon on crowd. *Daily Maverick*. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-09-05-women-protest-against-rape-and-femicide-saps-arrest-marchers-use-stun-grenades-and-turn-water-cannon-on-crowd/

Thamm, M. (2019b, September 10). Rape & Femicide Crisis, RSA: Keep up the pressure, urge activists – we all have a role to play. *Daily Maverick*. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-09-10-rape-femicide-crisis-rsa-keep-up-the-pressure-urge-activists-we-all-have-a-role-to-play/

Theron, L., & Dalzell, C. (2006). The specific Life Orientation needs of Grade 9 learners in the Vaal Triangle region. *South African Journal of Education*, *26*(3), 397-412–412. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/saje/article/view/25078

Thom, A. (2019, September 5). MAVERICK CITIZEN: A REFLECTION: Perhaps the Spring of 2019 will mark the moment when women said it was truly enough. *Daily Maverick*. https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-09-04-perhaps-the-spring-of-2019-will-mark-the-moment-when-women-said-it-was-truly-enough/

Tucker, A. (2010). Shifting Boundaries of Sexual Identities in Cape Town: The Appropriation and Malleability of 'Gay' in Township Spaces. *Urban Forum*, *21*(2), 107–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12132-010-9075-8

UNESCO. (2013). Ministerial Commitment on Comprehensive Sexuality Education and Sexual and Reproductive Health Services for Adolescents and Young People in Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA), 1 (2013). https://hivhealthclearinghouse.unesco.org/sites/default/files/resources/ESACommitmentFINALAffirmedon7thDecember.pdf

UNESCO. (2015). *Comprehensive Sexuality Education in Teacher Training in Eastern and Southern Africa* (pp. 1–232) [Situation Analysis]. Johannesburg: UNESCO. https://hivhealthclearinghouse.unesco.org/sites/default/files/resources/cse_in_teacher_training_in_esa.pdf

UNESCO, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, UN Women, & WHO. (2018). *International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence-informed approach* (Revised Edition). Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000260770

UNESCO, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF, & WHO. (2009). *International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence informed approach for schools, teachers and health educators*. Paris: UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000183281

United Nations Population Fund Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office. (2016). *How Effective is Comprehensive Sexuality Education in Preventing HIV?* (pp. 1–8) [Evidence Brief]. United Nations Population Fund Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office. https://esaro.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/CSE%20A4%20FA%20low%20res%20pages.pdf

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). (2015). *Incorporating Comprehensive Sexuality Education within Basic and Higher Institutions of Learning in KwaZulu-Natal* (pp. 1–42) [Assessment Report]. UNFPA. https://southafrica.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/UNFPA_CSE_report_web.pdf

van Deventer, K. (2009). Perspectives of teachers on the implementation of Life Orientation in Grades R-11 from selected Western Cape schools. *South African Journal of Education*, *29*(1), 127–145. http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_abstract&pid=S0256-01002009000100008&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=pt

Vance, C. (1992). Social Construction Theory: Problems in the History of Sexuality. In H. Crowley & S. Himmelweit (Eds.), *Knowing Women: Feminism and Knowledge* (pp. 132–145). London: Polity Place.

Veriava, F., Thom, A., & Fish Hodgson, T. (2017). *Basic education rights handbook: Education rights in South Africa*. Johannesburg: SECTION27.

Vincent, L. (2008). 'Boys will be boys': Traditional Xhosa male circumcision, HIV and sexual socialisation in contemporary South Africa. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, *10*(5), 431–446. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050701861447

Walker, C. (1990). *Women and Gender in Southern Africa to 1945*. Cape Town: New Africa Books.

Warwick, I., & Aggleton, P. (2004). Building on Experience: A Formative Evaluation of a Peer Education Sexual Health Project in South Africa. *London Review of Education*, *2*(2), 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/1474846042000229476

Weiss, R. S. (1995). *Learning From Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: The Free Press.

Whitlock, J. (2019, June 3). South Africa seems to be sex-obsessed. *The Star*. https://www.iol.co.za/the-star/opinion-analysis/letters-south-africa-seems-to-be-sex-obsessed-24844040

Wilmot, M. (2013). *'Keeping Things Straight': The Construction of Sexualities and Sexual Identities in Life Orientation Textbooks.* [Master of Arts Thesis, University of Witwatersrand]. http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/12266

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about—A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: SAGE.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: SAGE.

Wolpe, H. (1972). Capitalism and Cheap Labour-Power in South Africa: From Segregation to Apartheid. *Economy and Society*, *1*(4), 425–456. https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147200000023

Wood, L. A. (2009). 'Not only a teacher, but an ambassador': Facilitating HIV/AIDS educators to take action. *African Journal of Aids Research*, *8*(1), 83–92.

Young, L. S., Moodley, D., & Macleod, C. I. (2019). Feminine sexual desire and shame in the classroom: An educator's constructions of and investments in sexuality education. *Sex Education*, *19*(4), 486–500. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2018.1511974

Appendixes

Appendix I – Table showing demographic data of teacher participants and their schools

Name	Gender	Age	Years of teaching experience	Where school is situated	Location	Quintile
Nomzamo	F	50-60	30	Sterkspruit	Rural	2
Zintle	F	50-60	30	Mthata	Urban	3
Smangaliso	M	45-55	18	Matatiele	Peri-urban	1
Zukiswa	F	30-40	13	Matatiele	Peri-urban	4
Ntyatyambo	F	26	2	Lusikisiki	Rural	1
Nomalanga	F	51	30	King Williams Town	Urban	2
Anele	F	52	32	Keiskammahoek	Urban	3
Simnikiwe	F	48	20	Bathurst	Peri-urban	3
Lindelwa	F	53	27	Grahamstown	Urban	4
Sive	M	39	12	Dutywa	Rural	3
Lwazi	M	52	25	Lady Frere	Urban	2
Nandipha	F	40-50	13	Elliotdale	Urban	3
Mandla	M	40-50	13	Butterworth	Peri-urban	2
Babalwa	F	40-50	14	Lusikisiki	Rural	1
Athenkosi	M	40-50	15	Ngcobo	Urban	1

Appendix II – anonymous question exercise with teacher trainers, detailing questions that they personally had regarding sexuality education (a) and questions that learners frequently ask them (b).

(a)

TEACHERS' QUESTIONS

1.
    a. How can I be helped when I personally do not understand or accept the gay/lesbian issue because I have this strong Christian conviction that God never created a man in a woman's body and vice versa?
2.
    a. If someone in the family is HIV positive, one would find that almost the family can be affected, what is the reason for that? Can the medical research council research that
    b. Could this of becoming lesbian/gay be hereditary?
    c. What could be the reason for older years/days people were not exposed to these behaviours?
3.
    a. How to treat gays and lesbians at school and in the society
    b. What do you do if you want to teach about sex and sexuality in order to be confident during the LO lesson
4.
    a. Is the subject assisting the society on social ills?
    b. Why are we having so high rate of teen pregnancy in our school?
    c. Why are we given 2 periods per week
5.
    a. How to teach sexuality/sex education?
    b. How to involve parents in education on sex/sexuality
    c. Would it be proper to teach girls + boys separate - to make them more comfortable
6.

a. How do I as a teacher get involved when there is a family dispute including a learner?
b. When is the right age/time to tackle sexuality?
c. How do I properly link LO with real life situations in a correct manner?

7.

a. How to deal with gay sexuality learner where you do not support it?

8.

a. What happens in a gay partner's bedroom?

9.

a. Define the term gender imbalances.
b. What are the effects of gender balance?

10.

a. Does god exist?
b. Explain the LGBT…

(b)

LEARNERS' QUESTIONS

1. How do you live with a person who is HIV positive?
2. What happens when you get pregnant but HIV positive?
3. Is it true that a person who sleeps with a baby can be cured?
4. When is the right time to start having sex?
5. Does god exist?
6. How does one decide to be gay/lesbian?
7. How to deal with a parent who does not believe that you were raped?
8. Difference between lesbian and gay
9. Gay or lesbian it in a it happens natural
10. When is the right time to have sex?
11. Why do people hate gays and lesbians?
12. When is the right time to date/have sex?
13. Would you accept your child if he/she is gay/lesbian mam?
14. Why do they menstruate?

15. Do females get wet dreams?
16. Why condoms are not distributed to learners
17. Why pregnant learners are allowed to come to school?
18. Why pregnant learners are forced to bring their parents in the school premises
19. Why the department can provide schools with condoms
20. Do boys also get raped? By whom, why?
21. When do we start to have sexual intercourse
22. What causes HIV and AIDS
23. How does a morning after pill work?
24. What causes a drop?
25. Is it a sin to have an abortion?
26. Is it normal to hate your parents?
27. Is it safe to masturbate?
28. When is the right time to start having sex?
29. Is it safe to have sex during menstruation?
30. Do dressing style a symbol of sexual orientation ie if the girl always dress in Men's section? Or men always choose girls' styles and colours?
31. What do I do when I feel like I want to have an intimate relationship with a boy and I am not ready to get pregnant?
32. What do I do if my boyfriend wants to have sex with me and I am not ready - when I tell him that I am not ready for sex he tells me he will dump me - and I don't want to lose him
33. How can I help my mother who is in an abusive relationship and does not want to get out nor seek help/want to report/speak out