

Chapter 3

Understanding Sexuality

Myths and misconceptions about sexuality:

- (1) Sexuality refers only to sexual behaviors.
- (2) Sexual orientation develops after puberty.
- (3) Sexuality is determined by one's sex.
- (4) There are professionally endorsed therapies that can permanently change a person's sexual orientation.

3.1 Introduction

Sexuality: it is a hot topic sure to spark controversy in any school community. Most teachers and administrators avoid the issue at all costs. Many parents also avoid the issue with their children due to their own discomfort. This absence of adult support leaves many young people without guidance and accurate information about relationships, physical development, sexual health, and important aspects of their identities. It also creates a school environment that is hostile for students who don't conform to the heterosexual social hierarchies of the school. This non-conformity can be for a wide variety of reasons: clothes, hairstyle, body size, makeup and accessories (too much, not enough, the "wrong" kind), and extracurricular interests. These behaviors are often connected to perceptions of a student's masculinity, femininity, or sexual orientation and often results in a student being excluded and/or targeted for bullying and harassment (California Safe Schools Coalition, 2004; Kosciw & Diaz, 2006; Meyer, 2006).

One of the most important things to remember when talking about sexuality is that everybody has one. Heterosexual, bisexual, gay, lesbian, queer, and asexual are some of the descriptors used when talking about sexuality. A person's sexuality and associated sexual identity intersects and interacts with other identities we may have such as gender, ethnic, class, dis/ability, racialized, and religious.

This chapter discusses important factors related to addressing sexual diversity in schools and begins by defining sexual diversity and several related terms that are important for education professionals to understand. The second section explores contemporary youth sexualities and some of the various identities embraced by

youth today. The next section gives a brief history of the stigma around sexualities in Western cultures and how this has been reflected in the institution of the school. Finally, the chapter will conclude by explaining the importance of having education professionals be able to address issues relating to sexual orientation accurately and sensitively.

3.2 What Is Sexuality?

Sexuality is a term that is used to refer to an individual's tendencies, preferences, and desires with respect to romantic partners and intimate relationships. Sometimes sexual orientation is used interchangeably with the term sexuality; however, sexuality can be used more broadly to refer to a wide variety of identities and behaviors as well. Since this book is written for the current or future professional educator, the focus will be on everyday issues that are already present in schools. We cannot separate ourselves from our identities and how our orientations influence these identities, nor can we ask students to do so. Therefore, identity and orientation will be the focus of this chapter, not behavior. This is an important distinction to make since most controversies surrounding school efforts to be more supportive of sexual diversity result from opponents mistakenly believing that explicit details of sexual behavior will be taught and discussed. This is generally not true. With the exception of some officially approved sexuality education programs, most initiatives on sexual diversity specifically address issues of respect, physical and emotional safety, friendships, family dynamics, and identity as well as the harmful impacts of inaccurate myths, stereotypes, discriminatory attitudes, and behaviors. There are four important terms that must be carefully explained to help educators understand various elements related to sexual diversity: *sexuality*, *sexual orientation*, *sexual behavior*, and *sexual identity*.

3.2.1 Sexuality

Sexuality is a term that has different meanings depending on the context of its use. As mentioned above, every person has a sexuality and this is often used to describe a range of internal identities and external behaviors. Many individuals have not reflected on their own sexuality because it has not caused them tension or struggle in their lives. However, many others have learned to be more aware of their sexualities as a result of exclusion or discrimination they may have experienced as a result of how their tendencies, predispositions, and desires (orientation) have impacted their sense of themselves (identity) and how they interact with others (behavior) (Blumenfeld, 1994). Each of these terms are explained in more detail below.

3.2.2 *Sexual Orientation*

Sexual orientation describes who we are sexually attracted to and is generally determined at a very young age. The four main categories of sexual orientation include the following:

- (1) *asexuals* – not attracted to people of any sex
- (2) *bi-/omni-/pansexuals* – attracted to some members of both/all sexes to varying degrees
- (3) *heterosexuals* – primarily attracted to some members of another sex
- (4) *homosexuals* – primarily attracted to some persons of the same sex

Scholars disagree on whether sexual orientation is determined by biology, including genes and hormones, or sociology, mostly influenced by upbringing and environment. However, most researchers acknowledge that it is a result of the interaction of the two (Lipkin, 1999, pp. 25–28). Regardless of which factor exerts a larger force on one's sexual orientation, there is general agreement that sexual orientation is decided early in a child's life and cannot be changed. For example, one study found that gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB) youth report first becoming aware of their sexual orientation at age ten (D'Augelli & Hershberger, 1993) and another reported that gay adolescents report becoming aware of a distinct feeling of "being different" between ages 5 and 7 (Leo & Yoakum, 1992). Although there are some medical professionals and religious groups that claim to be able to change a person's sexual orientation, professional organizations including The American Academy of Pediatrics, The American Counseling Association, The American Psychiatric Association, The American Psychological Association, and The National Association of Social Workers do not endorse any form of counseling that is some form of "reparative therapy" or seeks to change a person's sexual orientation (Frankfurt, 1999).

3.2.3 *Sexual Behavior*

Sexual behavior is a term used to describe the types of sexual activities an individual actually engages in. There is a wide array of sexual behaviors people may engage in depending on what arouses them physically and emotionally. It is important to acknowledge that the sex of one's partner does not limit the types of sexual behaviors one can engage in. One can find as much diversity of sexual behaviors within a group of heterosexuals as there is between heterosexuals, bisexuals, and homosexuals. For example, in the late 1940s and early 1950s Alfred Kinsey and his colleagues conducted a series of interviews with men and women about their sexual desires and behaviors. In this study, they found the participants engaged in many types of sexual behaviors regardless of the sex of their partners. He also noted that

approximately 37% of adult males and 19% of adult females have had some same-sex erotic experience to the point of orgasm. In his report he noted that this number was most likely artificially low due to reluctance of participants to disclose about same-sex behaviors (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948, p. 623; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953, p. 453).

Sexual behavior is generally informed by one's sexual orientation, but not always. Since behavior can be chosen, people may choose to engage in certain behaviors and not others. These can also be influenced by one's culture, social group, and romantic partners. It is not uncommon for people who feel attracted to members of the same sex to engage in heterosexual relationships to avoid stigmatization and isolation from friends if they were to "come out" as gay or lesbian, nor is it uncommon for heterosexuals to engage in some same-sex behaviors. Orientation influences our behavior; it does not dictate it. However when orientation and behavior are in conflict it is difficult for an individual to develop a cohesive sexual identity and a healthy sense of self (Cass, 1984; Troiden, 1988).

3.2.4 Sexual Identity

Sexual identity is how a person chooses to describe himself or herself. This can include cultural and political labels as well as other identifiers that may connect a person with a community and a commonality to others who share their chosen identity. The identity formation process can be long and complex and many theories exist that use stage models to describe this process for individuals in Western cultures including the works of Sigmund Freud, Erik Erikson, and Jean Piaget. More recently, scholars have developed theories of identity development that seek to explain the shared experiences of youth who identify as gay, lesbian, queer, or same-sex attracted (Cass, 1979, 1984; Dube & Savin-Williams, 1999; Kumashiro, 2001; Troiden, 1988). Although these theories explain some of the commonalities individuals may experience, it is important to acknowledge that this process is shaped and influenced by factors such as friends, school, class, race, ethnicity, religion, and gender identity and expression (Rowen & Malcolm, 2002; Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1996). Some of the more widely recognized sexual identities embraced by contemporary youth are discussed at greater length in the next section.

3.3 Understanding Diverse Sexual Identities

In conversations of sexual orientation, the realities and experiences of heterosexual-identified, or straight, individuals are often ignored. This is a common error in diversity work where the focus is on the marginalized "other" rather than on understanding the perspective and experiences of those in the dominant group. It is important to discuss heterosexuality especially in terms of heterosexual privilege and how it works to make some people's relationships and experiences more valued

than others. One valuable pedagogical tool available to help students explore heterosexual privilege is a short quiz called, “The Heterosexual Questionnaire.” This activity was created by Martin Rochlin, Ph.D., in 1977 and has been adapted for use in anti-homophobia trainings around the world. Sample questions from this activity include the following:

- (1) What do you think caused your heterosexuality?
- (2) When and how did you first decide you were heterosexual?
- (3) Is it possible that your heterosexuality is just a phase you may grow out of?
- (4) If heterosexuality is normal, why are so many mental patients heterosexual?
- (5) The great majority of child molesters are heterosexual males. Do you consider it safe to expose your children to heterosexual teachers?
- (6) Would you want your children to be heterosexual, knowing the problems they would face, such as heartbreak, disease, and divorce? (Advocates for Youth, 2005)

These questions may then stimulate the reader to reflect on social assumptions about heterosexuality and the related stereotypes and stigmas attached to homosexuality. Although there can be controversy if this tool is not used in the proper context or the conversations are not well facilitated (Rasmussen, Mitchell, & Harwood, 2007), it often leads to a greater awareness on the part of heterosexuals with regard to how heteronormativity and heterosexism, also known as heterosexual privilege, function.

The terms “gay” and “lesbian” are the preferred terms to use when speaking about people who identify as homosexual. Although the term “homosexual” is widely used in the medical and psychological professional communities, it has a very specific history and meaning. When using the term “homosexual” these professional organizations are generally referring to individuals who engage exclusively in same-sex sexual behaviors. This does not necessarily mean that these individuals choose to identify as gay or lesbian. The term “gay” came into wider use to describe men who engage in same-sex relationships during the gay liberation movement that erupted after the famous police raid at The Stonewall Inn on June 27, 1969, in New York City (Jagose, 1996). Although the word “gay” can be used to describe women as well, many women prefer the term “lesbian.” This word also has a political history attached to the women’s liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s and is often associated with the concept of lesbian-feminists. Some of these activists considered themselves separatists and chose to live and work independently and separate from men (Jagose, 1996). It is no mistake that these terms both gained wider use during this era of important political changes. The concept of identity politics asserts that “coming out” and publicly identifying as gay or lesbian was an important step to achieving public visibility, reducing negative stereotypes, and therefore securing greater social equality (Weeks, 1985). Due to the historical specificity and cultural stereotypes that have grown up around these terms, many individuals who engage in same-sex behaviors and relationships may choose to use different words to identify themselves.

For people who do not identify as heterosexual, the terms gay and lesbian are not the only ones they may choose to describe themselves. Many adolescents and young adults prefer terms such as bi-curious, fluid, hetero- or homo-flexible, open, omni-sexual, pan-sexual, polyamorous, questioning, or queer (Driver, 2007, pp. 42–43; Meyer, 2008). Although the term *queer* has changed over the years from meaning odd or strange to being an insult for gays and lesbians, it is now being reclaimed as a powerful political term by the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community (Jagose, 1996; Meyer, 2007). When used as a source of pride and with a sense of inclusivity, “queer” can be a very empowering term. However, if used to insult and exclude it still has the power to wound deeply. As Driver explains in her book *Queer girls and popular culture*, “queer as a strategically chosen term works against the foreclosure of desires and the imposition of controlling assumptions; it is deployed by girls as a way of enabling possibilities rather than guaranteeing identity or knowledge about identity” (Driver, 2007, p. 43). There are many individuals who reject static labels and choose not to identify their sexuality in any way. This demonstrates a move away from the identity politics of the gay and lesbian rights movement, and the postmodern tendency for young people to create new identities and communities that are fluid and shifting and more authentically represent their experiences.

All of these identity categories are complicated and formed over an individual’s lifetime. Although some people argue that sexuality is an inappropriate topic to discuss with younger children, their lives are impacted by sexual diversity. In addition to their own developing sense of themselves, they are influenced by the lives of the adults around them. Many educators who work in early childhood and elementary education believe that discussions of sexual diversity have no place in their schools. However, most families in Western cultures are based on relationships created out of romantic love; thus children’s home lives and family structures tend to reflect the sexualities of their parents and caregivers. Recent studies on the experiences of children of gay and lesbian parents indicate that they experience increased harassment at school and their parents were often excluded from school life (Kosciw & Diaz, 2008; Ray & Gregory, 2001). For these reasons it is important for educators to address diverse family structures and be inclusive of sexual diversity when addressing diversity issues with students of all ages. *It’s Elementary: Talking about gay issues in schools* is an excellent film that provides models of how to do this appropriately and effectively with younger students (Chasnoff, 1996). In addition to developing a better understanding of sexual diversity and how it impacts individual’s lives, it is important for educators to be aware of the myths and misconceptions surrounding sexual orientation and how various institutions, including the school, have worked to perpetuate homophobia and heterosexism.

3.4 The History of Homophobia and Heterosexism

Historically, Western cultures have constructed homosexuality as an illness, a deviance, and a sin. This negative bias was created through psychological research, religious ideologies, and the political and financial privileging of heterosexual

monogamous family structures by the state through marriage. This bias has been disrupted and challenged by the gay rights movements that gained momentum in the 1960s and 1970s. Many authors have examined the social, historical, and political forces that have worked together to construct the idea of the homosexual and then demonize it (Bem, 1993; Foucault, 1980; Jagose, 1996; Sears, 1998; Weeks, 1985).

Foucault traced the birth of the modern idea of the “homosexual” to the 1870s to an article by Westphal on “contrary sexual sensations” (1980, p. 43). Although sexual practices labeled as “sodomy” had been criminalized in Europe as early as 1477 (Sullivan, 2003, p. 3), individuals who had engaged in such behaviors had never been categorized as a class of persons. As Foucault explains, “The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species” (1980, p. 43). It was during the late 1800s that a public discourse around homosexuality emerged and lawyers (Karl Heinrich Ulrichs), psychiatrists (Richard von Krafft-Ebing, Sigmund Freud), and sexologists (Havelock Ellis, Carl Westphal, and Magnus Hirschfeld) began to define the terms that were used to view homosexuality as a perversion, illness, pathology, or abnormality (Sullivan, 2003, p. 7). Although many of these men were working with the goal of reducing the persecution of (male) homosexuals, the terms in which they framed the debate were used to help justify the criminalization, medical treatment, and institutionalization of individuals identified as homosexual.

The main focus on male sexuality underlines the phallogentric construction of sexuality in Western European cultures, but Lillian Faderman examined the impacts of this work on women’s lives in her work *Surpassing the Love of Men*. She asserts that before this time period, “romantic friendships” between women were socially sanctioned and it was the concurrent emergence of first-wave feminism in the early 1900s that produced this change in attitude. Faderman explains, “the sexologists’ theories frightened, or attempted to frighten, women away from feminism and from loving other women by demonstrating that both were abnormal and were generally linked together” (cited in Jagose, 1996, p. 14). The emergence of the identity category “homosexual” during this era led to the new term “heterosexuality” to define opposite-sex identities. Without the exploration of same-sex desire and behavior, the dominant way of being, heterosexuality, had never been named or examined. The fact that heterosexuality was created to describe behaviors and identities that were not homosexual is an important fact to consider when examining issues related to sex, gender, and sexual orientation in contemporary Western society.

Heterosexism, compulsory heterosexuality (Rich, 1978/1993), the heterosexual matrix (Butler, 1990), and gender polarization (Bem, 1993) are all different terms that seek to explain the social construction of opposite-sex attraction and sexual behavior as dominant and “normal.” The concept of homosexuality and subsequently heterosexuality is just over a century old (Jagose, 1996, p. 17). The resulting prejudice against those who deviate from the heterosexual social script has been carefully developed by institutional heterosexism through organized religion, medicine, sexology, psychiatry, and psychology (Bem, 1993, p. 81). Sandra

Bem explains how the cultural lens of *gender polarization* works to reinforce heterosexuality by serving two major functions:

first, it defines mutually exclusive scripts for being male and female. Second, it defines any person or behaviour that deviates from these scripts as problematic. . . taken together, the effect of these two processes is to construct and naturalize a gender-polarizing link between the sex of one's body and the character of one's psyche and one's sexuality (1993, p. 81).

These powerful social discourses are generated through various institutions including schools. As Foucault argues, institutions contributed to the creation of multiple sexualities in their attempts to control and regulate them.

Educational or psychiatric institutions, with their large populations, their hierarchies, their spatial arrangements, their surveillance systems, constituted, alongside the family, another way of distributing the interplay of powers and pleasures; but they too delineated areas of extreme sexual saturation, with privileged spaces or rituals such as the classroom, the dormitory, the visit, and the consultation. The forms of a nonconjugal, nonmonogamous sexuality were drawn there and established (1980, p. 46).

The ideological power of schools is significant due to their role in teaching what the culture has deemed as important and valuable to future generations.

Ministries of Education, textbook publishers, and teachers determine what lessons are passed on to students and whose knowledge or "truth" is valued (Apple, 1990, 2000). Subsequently, schools are important sites that contribute to the normalization of heterosexual behavior. In Richard Friend's article, *Choices not closets*, he exposes two ways that such lessons are passed on in schools through the processes of systematic inclusion and systematic exclusion. Systematic inclusion is the way in which negative or false information about homosexuality is introduced in schools as a pathology or deviant behavior. Systematic exclusion is "the process whereby positive role models, messages, and images about lesbian, gay and bisexual people are publicly silenced in schools" (Friend, 1993, p. 215). Ironically, schools make efforts to de-sexualize the experience of students while they simultaneously, subtly yet clearly, affirm heterosexual behaviors and punish those who appear to deviate from it. Epstein and Johnson explain,

Schools go to great lengths to forbid expressions of sexuality by both children and teachers. This can be seen in a range of rules, particularly those about self-presentation. On the other hand, and perhaps in consequence, expressions of sexuality provide a major currency and resource in the everyday exchanges of school life. Second, the forms in which sexuality is present in schools and the terms on which sexual identities are produced are heavily determined by power relations between teachers and taught, the dynamics of control and resistance (1998, p. 108).

These acts of surveillance are rooted in Foucault's (1975) concept of the Panopticon – an all-seeing, yet completely invisible source of power and control. This type of surveillance and control is particularly effective because we all unknowingly contribute to it unless we actively work to make it visible by questioning and challenging it. This is one of the most powerful ways that schools reinforce heterosexism. Through the surveillance and policing of bodies and language, school

structures mandate hyper-heterosexuality using the curriculum and extracurricular activities.

The heterosexuality of the curriculum is invisible to many due to its unquestioned dominance in schools and communities. Some examples include the exclusive study of heterosexual romantic literature, the presentation of the “nuclear” heterosexual two-parent family as the norm and ideal, and teaching only the reproductive aspects of sex or abstinence-only sex education. Other forms of relationships and the concept of desire, or *eros*, are completely omitted from the official curriculum (Britzman, 2000; Pinar, 1998). Extracurricular functions that also teach this compulsory heterosexuality include Valentine’s Day gift exchanges, kissing booths at school fairs, and prom rituals that include highly gendered formal attire (tuxedos and gowns) and the election of a “king” and a “queen.” This prom ritual has begun to be subverted by alternative proms often organized by gay–straight alliances or community youth groups. At these events there may be two kings (a male king and female “drag king”) and two queens (a female queen and a male “drag queen”).

Art Lipkin’s (1999) groundbreaking work, *Understanding homosexuality, changing schools*, provides in-depth accounts of the discrimination experienced by gay, lesbian, and bisexual educators as well as the painful and enduring stories of students who were emotionally and physically harassed for their perceived or actual non-heterosexual, non-gender conforming performance of identity. In other words, schools are not safe for “guys who aren’t as masculine as other guys” or “girls who aren’t as feminine as other girls” (California Safe Schools Coalition, 2004). Although the people in control of the school are not directly inflicting the harassment and harm on the non-conforming students (in most cases), it is their lack of effective intervention in cases of homophobic and sexual harassment (Epstein & Johnson, 1998; Mac an Ghaill, 1995; Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2003) along with the invisible scripts of the school that are reinforced through surveillance and discipline that sends the message that these identities are not valued or welcomed.

Heterosexism and its more overt partner, homophobia, are clearly linked to cultural gender boundaries and are informed by misogyny. Misogyny is the hatred or devaluing of all that is female or “feminine.” For example, the most effective challenge to any boy’s masculinity is to call him “gay,” “homo,” “fag,” or “queer” (Brown, 2003; Duncan, 2004). What is being challenged is his masculinity – his gender code – but it is being done by accusing him of being gay which is equated with being “feminine.” Girls are also subject to similar kinds of policing, but research shows that it is much more prevalent among male students (Harris Interactive, 2001; California Safe Schools Coalition 2004). It is for this reason that some activists and educators are pushing for a deconstruction of gender codes and de-labeling of sexual orientations. By continuing to live within narrow boundaries of language and behavior, the hierarchical binaries of male–female and gay–straight remain unchallenged. This work of dismantling socially invented categories is necessary to create educational spaces that liberate and create opportunities as opposed to limiting and closing down the diversity of human experiences. We must move

toward understanding identities and experiences as falling on a continuum of gender expressions and sexual orientations. Fortunately, there are many opportunities for educators to open up spaces in their classrooms and schools to support and value sexual diversity.

3.5 Creating Schools That Value Sexual Diversity

While overt acts of discrimination are difficult for schools to ignore, daily acts of covert discrimination persist and impact students' lives in ways that many teachers and administrators fail to acknowledge. When bias against an identifiable social group is present throughout an institution, the entire school is implicated and the culture must shift. In order to transform ignorance of and intolerance for forms of sexual diversity all stakeholders in the community must be involved in the process: students, families, teachers, administrators, and school board personnel. The tone must be set by the leadership, but everyone must be engaged in changing the culture of the institution. Specific strategies for school change are addressed in greater depth in Chapter 7. However, it is important to address why it is important for educators to be supportive of sexual diversity within the existing structures of their school for reasons of ensuring student safety, teaching human rights, and valuing family diversity.

First, educators are responsible for the physical and emotional safety of the students in their classroom and school. If they are not able to address forms of discrimination and harassment appropriately, they will not be able to create this safe and supportive learning environment.

Second, schools are given the responsibility of educating future leaders and engaged citizens and must model the values and behaviors they seek to instill in their students. Understanding and respecting human rights is an important aspect of citizenship. In addition to teaching students essential academic skills, educators cannot ignore the citizenship and interpersonal skills that students will also need as they mature into adults.

Finally, with the changing demographics of modern society, the two-parent heterosexual nuclear family is more and more rare. In order to value the true diversity in student's home lives and honestly explore the different family structures that exist in North America, educators must be able to speak frankly and openly about love, family, and relationships with their students.

In addition to developing a better understanding of sexual diversity and how it impacts individual's lives, it is important for educators to be aware of the various curricular, extracurricular, legal, and safety issues involved that relate to the topic of sexual diversity in schools. These topics, along with suggestions for improving school cultures are addressed in Part II of this book.

References

- Advocates for Youth. (2005). The Heterosexual questionnaire. Retrieved March 2, 2008, from <http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/lessonplans/heterosexual2.htm>
- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and the curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Bem, S. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Blumenfeld, W. (1994). Science, sexual orientation, and identity: An overview. Unpublished research paper. Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network.
- Britzman, D. (2000). Precocious education. In S. Talburt & S. Steinberg (Eds.), *Thinking queer: Sexuality, culture, and education* (pp. 33–60). New York: Peter Lang.
- Brown, L. M. (2003). *Girlfighting: Betrayal and rejection among girls*. New York: New York University Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- California Safe Schools Coalition. (2004). *Consequences of harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender non-conformity and steps for making schools safer*. Davis: University of California.
- Cass, V. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 4, 219–235.
- Cass, V. (1984). Homosexual identity formation: Testing a theoretical model. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 20, 143–167.
- Chasnoff, D. (Writer) (1996). It's Elementary: Talking about gay issues in school. In H. S. Cohen & D. Chasnoff (Producer). San Francisco, CA: Ground Spark.
- D'Augelli, A. R., & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth in community settings: Personal challenges and mental health problems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 21, 421–448.
- Driver, S. (2007). *Queer girls and popular culture: Reading, resisting, and creating media*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Dube, E., & Savin-Williams, R. (1999). Sexual identity development among ethnic sexual-minority male youths. *Developmental Psychology*, 35(6), 1389–1398.
- Duncan, N. (2004). It's important to be nice, but it's nicer to be important: Girls, popularity and sexual competition. *Sex Education*, 4(2), 137–152.
- Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling sexualities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et Punir: Naissance de la Prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *The History of sexuality, Vol. I: An introduction*. New York: Random House.
- Frankfurt, K. (1999). *Just the facts about sexual orientation and youth: A primer for principals, educators, and school personnel*. New York: GLSEN, National Education Association, American Psychological Association, American Federation of Teachers, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the National Association of Social Workers.
- Friend, R. (1993). Choices, not closets: Heterosexism and homophobia in schools. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools* (pp. 209–235). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Harris Interactive. (2001). *Hostile hallways: Bullying, teasing, and sexual harassment in school*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.
- Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders Company.
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., Martin, C., & Gebhard, P. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders Co.
- Kosciw, J., & Diaz, E. (2006). *The 2005 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York: The Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network.

- Kosciw, J., & Diaz, E. (2008). *Involved, invisible, ignored: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender parents and their children in our Nation's K-12 schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- Kumashiro, K. K. (Ed.). (2001). *Troubling intersections of race and sexuality: Queer students of color and anti-oppressive education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Leo, T., & Yoakum, J. (1992). Creating a safer school environment for lesbian and gay students. *Journal of school health (September)*, 37-41.
- Lipkin, A. (1999). *Understanding homosexuality, Changing schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mac an Ghail, M. (1995). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities, and schooling*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Martino, W., & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). *So what's a boy? Addressing issues of masculinity and schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Meyer, E. J. (2006). Gendered harassment in North America: School-based interventions for reducing homophobia and heterosexism. In C. Mitchell & F. Leach (Eds.), *Combating gender violence in and around schools* (pp. 43-50). Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Meyer, E. J. (2007). But I'm not gay: What straight teachers need to know about queer theory. In N. Rodriguez & W. F. Pinar (Eds.), *Queering straight teachers* (pp. 1-17). New York: Peter Lang.
- Meyer, E. J. (2008). Lesbians in popular culture. In C. Mitchell & J. Reid-Walsh (Eds.), *Girl culture: an encyclopedia* (Vol. 2, pp. 392-394). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Pinar, W. F. (1998). Understanding curriculum as gender text: Notes on reproduction, resistance, and male-male relations. In M. M. William F. Pinar, M. A. Doll (Ed.), *Queer theory in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rasmussen, M. L., Mitchell, J., & Harwood, V. (2007). The queer story of The Heterosexual Questionnaire. In N. Rodriguez & W. F. Pinar (Eds.), *Queering straight teachers: Discourse and identity in education* (pp. 95-112). New York: Peter Lang.
- Ray, V., & Gregory, R. (2001). School experiences of the children of lesbian and gay parents. *Family matters*, 59, 28-34.
- Rich, A. (1978/1993). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. In H. Abelow, D. Halperin & M. A. Barale (Eds.), *The lesbian and gay studies reader* (pp. 227-254). New York: Routledge.
- Rowen, C. J., & Malcolm, J. P. (2002). Correlates of internalized homophobia and homosexual identity formation in a sample of gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43(2), 77-92.
- Sears, J. T. (1998). A generational and theoretical analysis of culture and male (Homo)sexuality. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Queer theory in education* (pp. 73-105). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Sullivan, N. (2003). *A Critical introduction to queer theory*. New York: New York University Press.
- Troiden, R. R. (1988). The formation of homosexual identities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 17(1/2), 43-74.
- Waldner-Haugrud, L., & Magruder, B. (1996). Homosexual identity expression among lesbian and gay adolescents: An analysis of perceived structural associations. *Youth and Society*, 27(3), 313-333.
- Weeks, J. (1985). *Sexuality and its discontents*. New York: Routledge.