Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

A Sexuality Education Discourses Framework: Conservative, Liberal, Critical, and Postmodern

TIFFANY JONES

Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

Sexuality education debates are layered with discourses based on markedly different constructions of sexuality. Rather than seeing these discourses as purely oppositional, this article frames them as complex and varied. It provides a new framework for understanding sexuality education which differentiates 28 discourses by orientation to education, whether conservative, liberal, critical, or postmodern. Their key assumptions, school-based approaches, sexuality frameworks, authorities, and methods are detailed. The article argues the value of considering multiple approaches and postmodern perspectives. This framework provides an introduction to sexuality education for those new to it and a fresh (re)conceptualisation of the field for other readers.

KEYWORDS Sexuality, education, discourses, conservative, liberal, critical, postmodern

"Sexuality" is a discursively specific term (Foucault, 1976; Halperin, 1995). Thus, "sexuality education" is a debatable concept. It can be used, for example, in a limited manner as referring to school-based lessons on reproduction or moral lectures on abstinence from the school chaplain. On the other hand, it may be broadened to include the learning that occurs during physical sexual interactions, casual conversations, or while catching beads at a Mardi-gras parade (to pick a few arbitrary examples). It is, therefore, unsurprising that speakers, papers, and books addressing *sexuality education* seem to be talking about entirely different topics and using completely different vocabularies—they often are.

Address correspondence to Tiffany Jones, Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health and Society, La Trobe University, 215 Franklin Street, Melbourne, 3000, Australia. E-mail: tiffany.jones@latrobe.edu.au

This article maps the key sexuality education discourses at work in American and international school-based sexuality education. It uses sexuality to include anything obliquely related to constructions of sexed and gendered bodies, identities, and behaviors; sexual feelings, desires, and acts; and sexual knowledge, skills, and information. Thus, *sexuality education* can be used as an umbrella term under which subtypes such as sex education, relationship education, and other related pedagogies fall. The decision has been made here to focus on official school-based discourses, that is, sets of ideological belief frameworks that directly inform practice in schools, education policies, and the debates surrounding them, rather than other sexual learning experiences. These are easier to qualify and more immediately useful in the initial planning of sexuality education lessons, programs, curriculum, policy, and school-based research. It is these particular approaches to (and retreats from) sexuality education that must first be outlined clearly if the field is to be clarified and its debates more easily understood by sexuality educators and researchers alike.

LIMITS OF EXISTING EXEMPLARS

Sexuality education literature offers varying "exemplars" (frameworks for categorization) of sexuality education approaches. At times, these are placed within a binary opposition, on a scale, or contextualized by time and place. Lamentably, the politics of the particular researcher often narrow these exemplars or archetypes. For example, many researchers describe a dichotomy between conservative sexuality education and a more liberal approach based more on scientific facts (Blair & Monk, 2009; Lennerhed, 2009; Swain, Warne, & Hillel, 2004). In such descriptions, the focus is on showing the "improvements" in factual knowledge over time. Similarly, Irvine (2002) and McLaren (1992, pp. ix–xiv) simplify the discursive field to three main discourses in their haste to identify "good" (nonhomophobic) and "bad" (homophobic) discourses. Other researchers uncover more variety but with little detail. Haffner and Carlson suggest four approaches (Carlson, 1992, pp. 34–58; Haffner, 1992, pp. vii–viii), with little description of classroom methods. Elia provides the broadest offering of eight approaches (Elia, 2005, pp. 785–789). However, little information about these discourses is provided (sometimes barely a line). Also, Elia mainly considered approaches in the United States and Sweden, with a bias toward Comprehensive Sexuality Education (other countries are considered in terms of their lack of this approach, not the alternatives they offer).

This article's wider review of the literature contributes a new Sexuality Education Discourse Exemplar with a more international breadth (see Table 1). It can be used in discursive analysis, planning and practice, reflection and debate, research and development, teacher education, sociology,

TABLE 1 Sexuality Education Discourse Exemplar

Orientation	Sexuality Education Discourses
Conservative Transmitting dominant sexualities	1. Storks and Fairies 2. None/Nonapproach 3. Physical Hygiene 4. Sexual Morality 5. Birds and Bees 6. Biological Science/Biological Essentialism 7. Abstinence-only-until-marriage Education 8. Christian/Ex-gay Redemption

Liberal
  Teaching sexuality skills and
    knowledge for personal
    choice/development
	9. Sexual Liberationist
	10. Comprehensive Sex Education
	11. Sexual Risk
	12. Sexual Readiness
	13. Effective Relationships/Relationships Ed
	14. Controversial Issues/Values Clarification
	15. Liberal Feminist

Critical
  Facilitating integrated student
    action based on alternative
    sexuality principles. Redressing
    marginalized sexualities
	16. State Socialist/Sexual-Politics
	17. Sexual Revolutionary Socialist/Radical Freudian
	18. Radical Feminist
	19. Anti-discrimination/Anti-harassment
	20. Inclusive/Social Justice
	21. Safe and Supportive Spaces/Caring Communities
	22. Gay Liberationist
	23. Postcolonial

Postmodern
  Theoretically exploring sex,
    gender and sexuality
    frameworks and positions
	24. Poststructuralist
	25. Postidentity Feminist
	26. Multicultural Education
	27. Diversity Education
	28. Queer

and so forth. It is the result of a literature review that drew on discourses from more than 300 (American and international[1]) sexuality education policy and curriculum documents; sexuality education pamphlets, books, and curriculum materials (including diagrams and CD ROMs); existing frameworks in journals and books; and historical information and taxonomies across the fields of sexuality education, sexology, and sociology. Criteria used to distinguish an official "sexuality education discourse" are that it manifests in primary sources such as education policies, curriculum or educative materials as part of a systematic or theorized approach to sexuality education in America or internationally. It must also be linked to legitimate, recognized sexuality education practices and not simply constitute unofficial learning (students viewing sexual graffiti on toilet doors) or a more general sexuality discourse in social phenomena (such as "Cougars and Toy-boys" discourse).

This framework is unique in that it uncovers 28 separate sexuality education discourses. Each discourse encompasses a distinct combination of assumptions about sexuality and sexuality education; the child; gay, lesbian, intersex, transgender, and queer people; and who the authorities are on

sexuality and appropriate school and pedagogical approaches. It differentiates these 28 discourses by their orientation to education and their key beliefs about the point of schooling on sexuality generally (see Table 1, first column). The exemplar applies the researcher's own revised version of Kemmis, Cole, and Suggett's (1983) model of education orientations categorizing the discourses as either conservative, liberal, critical, or postmodern (the "postmodern" orientation was included in Jones, 2007, 2009). This is the most essential and consistent defining feature throughout the discourses and draws together key differentiating factors in a new yet cohesive framework. The exemplar is expanded on below, and the discourses are numbered purely for ease of navigation. Description begins with the researcher's own analytical summary of an orientation (starting with "conservative") and is followed by descriptions of the discourses "within" that orientation (following the order they appear in the exemplar, Table 1). Where available, example programs are noted along with evaluations and critique for each discourse.

EXPANDING ON THE EXEMPLAR: APPROACHES & RETREATS

Conservative

The conservative orientation to education emerged throughout the late 1800s and the mid-1900s (although its influence continues), with schools and teachers taking an authoritative approach and inculcating students with the dominant values, beliefs, and practices of the time, and students seen as passive recipients of this knowledge (Jones, 2009). Education is understood as preparation for work (Kemmis et al., 1983), and discourses stemming from this orientation focus on preparing students to fit or follow the conventions of the social, civic, religious, or local community.

Precise sexuality education approaches vary, but all can be seen to transmit dominant sexualities. They can be based on religious or secular conceptions of sexuality, for example. However, sexuality frameworks are always predetermined by an exterior force—an authority—whether derived from the natural order of the universe, an omnipotent creator, or politically or culturally determined. The "sexuality problem" educated against is the perceived threat(s) to this privileged sexuality ideal. Authority figures are institutions and individuals from the status quo; religious organizations, schools, and academics; medical bodies and professionals; scientific institutions and psychiatrists; and parents or mothers.

Sex, gender, and sexuality exist in a fixed bi-polar opposition (one is either a feminine heterosexual female or masculine heterosexual male). Diversity beyond this model is negated: rendered invisible, pathologized, demonized, or declared a fallacy or a mistaken choice. Sexuality models vary, but legitimized sexual expression is always procreative and occurs within the

context of an established heterosexual marriage. Pedagogical methods are authority-centered and do not allow student agency. They range from censorship and rules, to lectures/sermons and storytelling, to use of hell houses and camps/clinics. Sexuality education discourses manifesting this orientation include: Storks and Fairies, None/Nonapproach, Physical Hygiene, Sexual Morality, Birds and Bees, Biological Science, Abstinence Education, and Christian/Ex-Gay Redemption.

Storks and Fairies

Stemming from Teutonic Germany and later general European folklore, this discourse has emerged in broader Western texts since the 1900s. Children are asexual and to be protected from sexual information, which is substituted with a pleasant fiction. A stork, fairy, or mythical occurrence brings fully formed babies to established family homes (e.g., pops it down the couple's chimney or leaves it on their doorstep). Pemberton (1948) links the specific use of the stork to its status as a good-luck symbol for superstitious farmers in Teutonic Germany (p. 3). As storks and babies were seen as lucky, and they nest near chimneys, births were linked to the favor of birds on top for the family below. Happy parents told children "the stork had brought them."

However, this discourse's use of storks is not essential; it can be replaced with any mystical account drawing on popular mythologies (e.g., fairies, cabbage patches). For example, in 1915 New Zealand children's author and teacher Howes combined this discourse with notions of fairies supervising reproduction in a magic garden in *The Cradle Ship* (Howes, 1915). The key indicator is the intentional replacement of the agreed hegemonic sexual "truths" of the time/culture with a mystifying fictional account. This discourse functions to abate childhood curiosity about reproduction.

Sexuality is invisible. However, this discourse frames the mystified reproduction and thus is a form of representational (hetero) sexuality, in a positive and idealized manner. It is literally a mystical gift or moral reward. It occurs only in two-parent established family settings and is always positive. Parents and local culture are the key authorities. Pedagogical methods include storytelling, viewing texts, and question-answer. Critique of this discourse has been fairly consistent over the century, denouncing the way it conflates innocence with ignorance and overlooks the consequences of sexual acts (Pemberton, 1948; Shryock, 1951a; Swain et al., 2004). Social puritan feminists have been concerned with the way it leaves girls unprepared for, and thus unprotected from, the possibility of rape or impregnation (Swain et al., 2004). Options of termination, not having children or other choices are obfuscated.

NONE/NONAPPROACH

Mobilized since before modern history throughout Europe, and popular since the 1800s to this day in some locations, this discourse sees sexuality content as the domain of an exterior authority (i.e., parents/the church) and as developmentally, socially, or morally inappropriate for schools to disseminate. Proponents in 1980s America included educational historian Diane Ravitch and anti-abortion activist James H. Ford (Moran, 2000, p. 204). While some concerned parent groups promote the nonapproach, Moran argues that "the public" or "community of parents" sex education opponents claim to represent are "more a rhetorical creation" (p. 195).

This discourse functions to officially negate sexuality outside the confines of heterosexual marriage (Haffner, 1992, pp. vii–viii; Irvine, 2002, p. 7). Irvine argues that this is the oppositional rhetorical mode through which the Christian right engages in sex education debates. Silencing sexual discussion is seen as the best way to preserve youth morality. Confining verbal sexualities in this way also creates a framework in which sexual vocabulary is limited to an institution controlled by governing and religious bodies (marriage), further cementing their role in the public and personal lives of all. Alternative sexual expressions must be erased or punished.

These discursive processes translate into an anti-education involving censorship of the materials, texts, activities, speech, and language used in schools. It may manifest in a school's rules and regulations, ranging from bans on sexual contact to specific requirements regarding the distance to be kept between students of the "opposite sex." It may be reflected in architectural structures that segregate the sexes. Critics argue conservatives speak more about sex while trying to restrict it (Irvine, 2002, p. 12). Also, they note the silences created by this approach are filled by inaccurate, unofficial "hidden sexuality curriculum" (Haffner, 1992, p. viii). Such alternative sources have alternately been evaluated as inaccurate, inadequate, and noninclusive (Allen, 2007; Elia & Eliason, 2010; Haffner, 1992; Shryock, 1951a; Swain et al., 2004).

PHYSICAL HYGIENE

Most official school-based sexuality instruction in the early 1900s focused on the physical hygiene aspects of sexual functioning, initiated in part by educational theorist G. Stanley Hall (Elia, 2005, p. 786). Other proponents include the American Society of Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxia in 1905 (Carlson, 1992, pp. 36–40) and a range of vested Western companies promoting deodorants, douches, tampons, and napkins during the 1940s–1990s (M. H. Martin, 2004). Aspects of this discourse also operate in puberty programs such as *Growing Together* (Girls Incorporated, 2001a).

A core concept is that (hetero)sexual sublimation beyond marital sex is necessary to maintain hygiene; deviation leads to loss of masculine power, female hysteria, disease, and degeneration. Unhygienic deviation includes masturbation, solicitation, prostitution, homosexuality, promiscuity, premarital sex, excessive sex, sex with the diseased or "feeble minded," having unclean friends, not taking "precautions" in public toilets, and engaging in alternative sexualities (Carlson, 1992). Martin argues that this discourse promotes the child as having a dirty, unpredictable body that should be a source of secrecy, shame, and management through products (M. H. Martin, 2004, pp. 135–154); vaginas are unclean and odorous, and penises could erupt at any time. Disease is cast as moral punishment (Carlson, 1992); modern permeations use AIDS in this way.

Part of the ideological project is to eliminate erotic content from courses, books, and general schooling. Authorities are mothers, churches, psychology, and private hygiene-related companies. Information is transmitted directly to segregated sexes and sends the message that sexual matters are shameful, sexed body/gender-specific, and should be kept secret in a conspiratorial manner from the "opposite sex" (Pearce, 2004). Puberty education (particularly on menstruation for girls) is a key theme. Pedagogy mainly involves parent-child talks, school- or church-based "parent-student nights," lectures, dissemination of pamphlets, and products from private companies. Carlson attacks this discourse as limiting female sexuality and STD prevention efforts (1992). It is also problematic due to its homophobic, body-phobic, and consumerist messages.

SEXUAL MORALITY

Carlson sees this discourse of sexual sin as dominant in the early decades of the 20th century (Carlson, 1992, pp. 36–40). Foucault amalgamated this ideology with "Victorian Puritanism" (Foucault, 1976, p. 22), although it is by no means purely historic; it is active in some U.S. schools where teachers are forbidden from even uttering the word "homosexual" (Earls, Fraser, & Sumpter, 1992; Elia, 2005). Advocates include some key leadership within the Judeo-Christian Faith, Islam, and conservative activists such as John Cowan (Carlson, 1992). Yet it is important to note that political conservatives and religious people take a range of positions on sexuality and may not endorse this approach. It is combined with the Nonapproach in *Directives for Christian Education in Sexuality* (Catholic Education Office Melbourne, 2001).

The core precepts in this discourse uphold a moralistic conception of sexuality and sin rooted in dogma, combined with modern scientific and economic perspectives supporting sexual Puritanism. It endorses asceticism (self-disciplined renunciation of bodily pleasures) based on body-mind and flesh-spirit dichotomies. The body is seen as corrupt and tempting the spirit

from its "true path," while the mind is seen as guarding the spirit for eternal life. Sexual activity is affirmed only within the context of marriage for childbearing; nonprocreative sex is negated (as "adultery," "sodomy," etc.). Patriarchal structures such as the church and the family are seen as "under threat" from "modern influences"; a return to clearly defined gender roles is called for (males as dominant leaders and providers, females as subservient homemakers).

Alternative sexual and gender expressions represent temptations of the body, to be controlled by the mind for the purity of the spirit. Such acts or identities constitute sinful choices and are not innate. They will be punished in the afterlife. Religious institutions and texts become the privileged experts on sexuality, and an entire Christian sexuality industry exists with books, videos, tapes, pamphlets, therapy sessions, and seminars throughout America (Irvine, 2002, p. 12). Pedagogy includes viewing religious texts, sermons, religious services, parent-child talks, parent nights, lectures, virginity pledges, hell houses, school rules, and regulations. Irvine (2002) critiques the irony of this highly commercialized approach to sexuality education (considering the way it denounces material pleasures) and its promotion of shame. Vojak (2006) evaluated this approach as leading to a lack of knowledge about contraceptives and other topics in the "child's interests."

BIRDS AND BEES

This discourse arose in Western countries such as Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and United States from the late 1800s to the early 1900s onwards. Proponents include Australian Maybanke Anderson in her 1895 columns in the Australian journal *Woman's Voice* (Swain et al., 2004), New Zealand naturalist Howes (1915), and a variety of American naturalists. Sexual interaction is considered natural. A key premise is that natural reproductive metaphors protect childhood purity but satisfy curiosity. Thus, if youth are taught about the reproduction of birds, flowers, and bees (the most popular examples, although other flora and fauna may be used), they can understand human sexuality without being exposed to any explicit information.

In this discourse sexuality is seen as similar to the contact of bees with flower pollen and cross-pollination processes, or the fertilization of bird eggs (Swain et al., 2004). Sex is a technical, reproductive process, yet it may be embedded in awe over "natural miracles." There is a focus on the mother animal and its care, although parenting in general is important and seen as an innate urge and role. Sex, if named at all, is called "mating." This exclusionary construction of sex as reproduction overlooks all nonreproductive sexuality and suggests it as unnatural. Homosexuality and gender diversity can be understood here as a misfired or failed reproductive aim. For example, in Howe's *The Cradle Ship* (1915), the metaphor is expressed as Bees entering

"the back door" of flowers, in such a manner as to incorrectly pollinate the flower, leading to destruction and corruption of the garden/flower species.

Authorities can include nature, parents, naturalists, and scientists. Pedagogy includes lectures, discussion, private reflection, and texts, with an emphasis on the use of sustained natural metaphors and similes. Criticism of this approach focuses on the way in which the natural metaphors used (particularly floral reproduction) can be valueless as information about human sexualities, particularly nonreproductive expressions (Pemberton, 1948). It also ignores the range of (nonreproductive, nonheterosexual) sexual expressions among animals.

Biological Science/Biological Essentialism

In the United States, this approach prevailed in the mid-1900s (Elia, 2005) and has subsequently affected a variety of Western sexuality education and policies, such as Britain and Wales (Blair & Monk, 2009). It derived from the work of G. Stanley Hall, Max Exner, and Thomas Galloway and also has Darwinian roots (Moran, 2000). Moran states that Hall and his contemporaries created "adolescence" and argued about the "sex instinct," and were thus "bound to manage" these (p. 22). There was an initial sense that this discourse resulted in "control of sensuality found in "primitive races," and less polygamy, promiscuity, and incest (Moran, 2000, p. 14). It is still strongly aligned with conservative scientific understandings of biological reproduction of the human species, with distinct foci on reproductive anatomy, physiology, and disease prevention (Elia, 2005, p. 786). *Education for Sexuality* (Burt & Brower Meeks, 1987) provides examples of programs using this approach.

The main precept in this discourse is the teaching of scientific "facts" about how sexual intercourse leads to the reproduction of human life to promote understanding about the "correct" functioning of the body (such as in De Schweinitz, 1939). This may be embedded in broader study of bodily systems, human life cycles, animal reproduction, or genetics. A focus on scientific "sperm and egg" detail, research findings and systematic inquiry distinguishes this approach from the mystification or "awe" regarding nature in Birds and Bees Discourse. There is an attempt to separate notions of eroticism from biological descriptions of sex acts.

The sexuality framework is essentialist; people are assumed to be an innately masculine male or feminine female with a predestined social and reproductive role based on their "corresponding" genitalia (and, more recently, chromosomes; although combinations beyond "xx" or "xy" are viewed as medical disorders rather than legitimate variations). Some texts drawing on biological science (amongst other discourses) used theories of sexual development to portray homosexuality as an expression of thwarted hormonal

development or frustrated (hetero) sexuality (perhaps due to a traumatic event such as rape) (Pemberton, 1948; Shryock, 1951a, 1951b). Authorities include approved scientific bodies and school science text books. Pedagogical methods may include lectures, viewing of texts, study and labelling of anatomical diagrams and props and use of academic tests. It is critiqued as "sex negative," heterosexist, and essentialist (Elia, 2005, p. 786).

ABSTINENCE-ONLY-UNTIL-MARRIAGE EDUCATION

Abstinence has been promoted throughout modern history. In Australia this discourse particularly surged in 1950s sex education manuals, during and after the Second World War (Pearce, 2004). In America it is linked to the 1981 Adolescent Family Life Act (AFLA) federal law which came to be known as the Chastity Act, denying funding to most programs or projects around abortion and mandating abstinence education and units promoting "self-discipline and responsibility in human sexuality" in the pedagogy it did fund (Moran, 2000, p. 204). It is a notorious mainstay in middle and southern states. An example of a program manifesting this discourse is *Managing Pressures Before Marriage* (Howard & Mitchell, 2003).

This discourse calls for students to be officially taught to abstain from sexual activity until marriage and that prior sexual activity results in harm. This harm may include depression, shame, guilt, sexually transmitted infections, and loss of relationships (Elia, 2005, p. 787). Other contraceptive and abortive options are negated on varying bases, if covered. Some basics about the physiology of heterosexual genital intercourse, within the context of marriage and procreation, may be imparted. Overall, however, the framework for sexuality is that it involves impulses that in most contexts are harmful on multiple levels and should thus be controlled.

Authorities include religious and state bodies. Methods range from parent-child talks, parent nights, lectures, and sermons through to mass public virginity pledges. Critique of this discourse looks at its unrealistic aims for some groups of sexually developing youth (Lichenstein, 2000), its negative construction of sexuality (Ashcraft, 2006; Haffner, 1992), and noninclusive content (Elia, 2005; Elia & Eliason, 2010; Haffner, 1992). Some evaluations have found that theory-based abstinence education can be as effective as a comprehensive sex education and more effective than sexual risk in reducing students' self-reported sexual involvement (Jemmott, Jemmott, & Fong, 2010). Others have found abstinence-only programs have no significant effect on sexual behavior (Kirby, 2007; Kohler, 2008). Furthermore, other evaluations found students receiving a strong abstinence message are slightly more likely to divorce, have reduced educations and lower incomes or reduced knowledge of contraception and disease transmission (Elias, 2007; Vojak, 2006).

CHRISTIAN/EX-GAY REDEMPTION

This discourse is one of the most recent within the conservative orientation to gain momentum, launched in the early 1970s but manifesting more in current decades (Cloud, 2005; Hardisty, 1999; Irvine, 2002). The ex-gay movement in America involves both a significant network in the Christian Right's infrastructure and grass-roots ministry. There have been smaller offshoots within Australia, England, and other countries. Advocates include ministries such as Exodus International (Scott Davis and Exodus Youth), Inqueery, HOPE Ministries, P-Fox, and Love in Action. The programs, speakers, and materials promoted through Exodus Youth (www.exodusyouth.net) and P-Fox (www.pfox.org) propound this discourse.

In this discourse, there is an objective of making Christianity more appealing to gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender youth so as not to "lose" them through judgment—of couching ideas in discursively rich terms such as "pride" to initially appear more accommodating toward them (Cloud, 2005). Such youth are slowly encouraged to renounce their lifestyle and attractions and become "ex-gay" identified (APA Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation, 2009; Beckstead & Morrow, 2004). Conversion processes help manage what are termed "the most annoying and discouraging aspects of homosexuality"; these entail a convoluted lifestyle overhaul including "gender-appropriate clothes, appearance, talk and behaviour" (Consiglio, 1991, p. 87). The assumption here is that gay people exhibit sex-role confusion and require sexual "reorientation."

Specific sexual frameworks vary; sexual preference can be represented as fixed with sexual action seen as a choice (so that the "cure" mimics the case of nonpracticing alcoholics), or as changeable through exertion of willpower and the control of environmental influences, or as innately heterosexual. All frames portray the Christian God as privileging and rewarding heterosexual practice, marriage, and reproduction. Alternate sexualities, gender expressions, and sexual acts are "not part of God's plan." Authority is thus ascribed to God, Christian texts, the particular church or ministry, and specific Christian therapists. Educational techniques include lectures, sermons, residential clinics and youth programs, counseling sessions, and exposure to testimonies by "successful" converts. There is much critique of the effect of this discourse on youth and evaluations by the American Psychological Association (APA), and others denounce the safety and effectiveness of conversion attempts (APA Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation, 2009; Arriola, 1998; Beckstead & Morrow, 2004; Molnar, 1997).

Liberal

Popularized in the 1960s, the liberal orientation involves teachers acting as facilitators in students' development of knowledge and skills, particularly

relating to inquiry and decision making (Jones, 2007, 2009). This orientation looks at the "whole" student in preparation for "life rather than work" (Kemmis et al., 1983) and promotes sexuality skills and knowledge for personal choice and development. The "sexuality problem" educated against is the individual's lack of the perceived requisite knowledge and skills essential in protecting their self-interests (e.g., bodily, medically, socially, emotionally). Authority shifts more to the individual, who is informed and influenced by teachings within sexology, science, medicine, education, and cultural/political theory but nevertheless makes their own choices.

Sex, gender, and sexuality primarily exist in a fixed bi-polar opposition, but diversity beyond this model does exist. Such alternatives do not disrupt the model altogether; they are simply choices that show a more fluid understanding of the relations in the model (regarding sexual experimentation, gender roles, and sexual desire). Sexual orientation is seen as fixed, but behavior and roles are more optional. What is "best" for the individual may pertain to issues of pleasure, personal preference, safety, readiness, equality, engagement in relationships, or values. Ideals are understood as developmentally progressive with increasing choice available at different stages in an individual's maturity.

The various approaches share an emphasis on students understanding the impact of sexuality on the self, in relation to their own personal agency and individual constructions of knowledge and valuing processes. The affective domain is engaged along with the cognitive domain, students can openly express diverse opinions and active curiosity. While some positions regarding sexuality are implicitly placed above others (such as the dominance of heterosexuality, or the idea of sex as potentially harmful), individual choice is crucial. This is because, in these approaches, sexuality is part of the process of self-actualization; the aim is the weighing of values, possible outcomes, and responsibilities so as to encourage the development of a consistent code of personal sexuality. Where social issues and structures are critiqued (such as marriage, abortion, and same-sex relationship status), such consideration reflects an individualistic rather than a social process.

Common features of schools include the establishment of more democratic settings, and teachers acting as facilitators. Pedagogical methods privilege democratic models in which an authority outlines possibilities from which individuals choose. For example, information may come from teacher-led lectures, guest speakers, media texts or films/pamphlets, or consideration of personal experiences and opinions. Classroom methods include individual and group work, discussion, debates, demonstrations, role-plays, question and answer sessions, and self-analysis. There is use of the instrumentalist pedagogy with testing of knowledge, skills, and outcomes. Liberal sexuality education discourses include Sexual Liberationist, Comprehensive Sex Education, Sexual Risk/Progressive, Sexual Readiness, Effective Relationships, Controversial Issues/Values Clarification, and Liberal Feminist.

SEXUAL LIBERATIONIST

This approach first became popular in some American college courses in the 1960s, as these institutions responded to new findings in social science and sexology. The work of researchers such as Magnus Hirschfield, Alfred Kinsey William Masters, and Virginia Johnson were influential (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953; Masters & Johnson, 1966, 1970). Their research revealed much more diverse ranges of sexualities, acts, and expressions than the morality of the time demanded (Elia, 2005). It was in these reports that the terms sexual "outlets" and "frequency" emerged (Moran, 2000, p. 156). Thus, sexuality becomes quantitatively framed. Approaches assume sexual knowledge can and should be created and expanded through research, both empirical and personal/experimental. The *Sex & Ethics Program* (Carmody, 2009) in the Australian States of NSW and QLD is an example.

This discourse rejects framings of sexuality as existing in binary oppositions of vice and virtue. Key concepts include a libertarian ideology of sexual diversity and individual sexual rights, with individuals deciding what is right for their own behavior (Carlson, 1992, pp. 50–55). There is a sense of "freeing" of sexuality from social utilitarianism or political purpose and celebrating it. This sexual framework privileges an ethics of reciprocity and consensuality: the freedoms one demands, one must give. Pleasure is emphasised, alongside fun, choice and negotiation skills.

Yet sweeping or cohesive social change is not (directly) the aim. Instead, the real goal is for more understanding, individualized satisfaction, and self-care, and in this sense social science, sexologists, and (through self-knowledge) the individual are the primary authorities. Pedagogical methods include the use of some research and measures to aid students in personal exploration, choice, and discovery. Pedagogy that aims at decreasing guilt about sexual matters can involve increasing students' comfort with sexual vocabulary (Halstead & Reiss, 2003, pp. 140–142). Students may learn to negotiate sexual experiences and interpret other people's body language or discomfort. Evaluation has found that small group discussions in combination with lectures can reduce students' sexual guilt and encourage more tolerant sexual attitudes (Wanlass, Kiimann, Beila, & Tarnowski, 1983). Yet even proponents such as Carlson (1992) admit the individualist focus deflects attention from broader social activism.

COMPREHENSIVE SEX EDUCATION

Comprehensive sex education is traced to educators and parents who wished to "get troubling concepts into the open" in the 1960s (Irvine, 2002, p. 6). For example, the state of New Jersey is noted for having early support of the comprehensive sex education approach in response to a perceived "epidemic" of

teenage pregnancies (Moran, 2000, p. 209). It manifested more widely in the United States until the 1980s and had a strong influence in Sweden, Canada, France, Great Britain, and some African countries (Elia, 2005; Irvine, 2002). The Sexuality Information Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), founded in 1964 by Dr. Mary S. Calderone, is its key institutional voice. It aims to combat the lack of "accurate" sexuality education for both young people and adults that Calderone witnessed during her tenure as the Medical Director for the Planned Parenthood Federation (SIECUS, 2008). Key examples are SIECUS's guidelines (2005) and *Streetwise to Sex-Wise* (Brown & Taverner, 2001).

This approach provides wide-ranging information on sex: sexual anatomy and physiology, reproduction, contraception and abstinence, sexually transmitted infections, sexual communication, relationship development and maintenance, masturbation, and homosexuality may be covered (Elia, 2005; Haffner, 1992; Irvine, 2002). The concept of "age-appropriate information" is part of its vocabulary (Irvine, 2002), implying that the possession of certain sexual knowledge and skills is not only acceptable but also necessary for overall maturation. Thus, core topics may be introduced in a basic manner for students at a lower level and expanded upon in increasing detail at higher levels (in a "spiral" model).

Sexuality is framed as positive and healthy and yet developmentally staged—its ideal expression is within "less fraught" behaviors early on (such as solitary masturbation or kissing). A heteronormative model of the sexes is favored. Initially, authorities include sex experts and family planning clinics, etc., yet the increasingly informed individual incrementally becomes the authority. Pedagogy includes lectures, parent-child nights, general classes, guest speakers and experts, demonstrations of paraphernalia (such as "condoms on bananas"), question and answer sessions, and so forth. Approaches are evaluated as effective in reducing the students' number of sexual partners and teen pregnancy and encouraging condom use (Jemmott et al., 2010; Kirby, 2007; Kohler, 2008). Failure to redress social issues such as homophobia can be an issue (Elia, 2005).

SEXUAL RISK

Sexual risk has arisen at various points in time where institutional needs to manage sexual dangers have increased due to disease or pregnancy epidemics. One example is the 1930s–40s war on venereal disease in the West (Carlson, 1992; Moran, 2000). Another example is during the 1970s, when progressives and proponents such as SIECUS aimed to combat teen pregnancy (Moran, 2000, p. 200). It gained further impetus in many countries in the 1980s in response to AIDS epidemics (Moran, 2000, p. 205). Proponents include public health officials and the Centers for Disease Control.

The United Nations' international sexuality education framework *International Technical Guidance on Sexuality Education: An evidence-informed approach for schools, teachers and health educators* (UNESCO, 2009) strongly features this discourse.

Sexual risk is primarily concerned with the dangers of sex: disease transmission, infection and infestation, impregnation of women, and to a lesser extent emotional/psychosocial risks (e.g., heartbreak, exclusion, regret). All risks are portrayed negatively, including teen pregnancy. Development is seen as "open" and prone to maladjustment if not guided. This provides a powerful rationale for policy and mandating sexuality education (Carlson, 1992, p. 41). Privileged topics include disease characteristics, contraceptive, and protective options.

The sexuality framework dichotomises all aspects of sexuality in terms of risk or safety. Key concepts include "safe sex" and "safer sex." There can be research-based associations made between assorted sexual acts and disease transmission risks, classification of sexual behaviors according to risk (e.g., frequency, number of partners), and association of identities with risk increase, particularly for homosexual males. Authorities include researchers in health and social science, government bodies, and informed individuals. Methods include general classes, guest speakers, research projects, condom demonstrations, parenting deterrents, viewing data, and knowledge tests. Studies have found that knowledge of sexual risks *can* be increased through education but that lessons on sexually transmitted diseases also need "most development with regard to effectiveness of knowledge change" (Song, Pruitt, McNamara, & Colwell, 2000, p. 416). This discourse is critiqued for emphasising conformity to sexual norms (Carlson, 1992), portraying sexuality negatively (Haffner, 1992), and creating anxiety about protecting "innocent victims" in a manner that creates a dual notion of "guilty victims" (Patton, 1996). Also, certain sexual identities can be overlooked (e.g., lesbians) or burdened with risk in this approach (e.g., gay men).

SEXUAL READINESS

This discourse has its origins in the 1960s when the developmental psychology of Piaget, Vygotsky, and others became popularized. Such theorists posit that children develop in stages and yet in individualized ways (Piaget, 1969; Vygotsky, 1978; Woolfolk, 2005). The belief that sexual "readiness" mimics such individualized staged models has become increasingly pervasive in the West, and Ashcraft describes the implementation of this type of curricula in modern classrooms (Ashcraft, 2006). *Will Power/Won't Power* (Girls Incorporated, 2001b) lessons promote this discourse.

In this discourse, sexuality educators do not aim to directly tell students when to have sex but rather to give them the skills and information to determine when they are ready themselves, "no matter when that is" (Ashcraft,

2006, p. 334). Being "ready" or "not ready" for sex shapes all understandings of sex. However, there is a greater focus on what is "not readiness." Readiness cannot be defined by another individual or group (particularly peers) or, for girls, their boyfriends. All virginity is mystified in the approach, especially female virginity (Ashcraft, 2006; Lichenstein, 2000). It should be exchanged for an ideal relationship.

Unready individuals reap negative consequences from the complexities of sex. Sexual mistakes, maltreatment, or even the end of sexual relationships are all seen as issues of "not being ready," rather than relational, social, or cultural problems. Yet there is an assumption that negative consequences will not happen to the "ready" individual. Readiness involves but is not limited to almost incommunicable aspects (private feelings), relational aspects ("who to be with"), technical aspects (getting tested for diseases, using birth control), and socio-political barriers (parents, funding).

Individuals are the authorities on their own sexuality. Thus, most of the pedagogy focuses on technicalities. There is use of storytelling and guest speakers who suffered the consequences from being sexually unready; self-doubt, regret, relationship breakdown, and so forth. Lichenstein (2000) argues this discourse ignores how socio-cultural conditions limit girls' sexual choices, regardless of "readiness." Ashcraft (2006) rejects the mystification of a "ready" state, such as its correlation with an ability to correctly anticipate a sexual partner's continuing affections (which can be fluid, subjective, and unknowable).

EFFECTIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Alternately known as effective relationships, marriage education, relationship education, or couple education, this discourse derives from family and relationship psychology (Markman & Halford, 2005). America has been one of the more active countries in pursuing pro-marriage education policies (Markman & Halford, 2005). The state of Florida most strongly promoted this discourse since 1998, when then-Governor Jeb Bush passed the Marriage Preparation and Preservation Act, mandating relationship skills courses for all students (Halpern-Meekin, 2008). The function of this discourse is to challenge high incidence of divorce and single-parent families. The National Extension Relationship & Marriage Education Network (NERMAN) is a key proponent. *Relationship Smarts* (Pearson, 2007) is a program example.

The discourse assumes most people desire to be in a happy marriage (Markman & Halford, 2005), which may be linked to evolutionary imperatives. The goal is to teach individuals the skills and principles that research and theory associate with satisfying, supportive, and stable relationships (Markman & Halford, 2005). In this approach's sexuality framework, sexuality is essentially a relational tool. Its use is in communicating affection,

desire, appreciation, and love. It is thus best expressed in the context of a stable and monogamous romantic relationship, ideally marriage. Alternative contexts (e.g., single life, single parenting, divorce, dating widely, one night stands, polygamy) are possible. However, such choices are implicitly devalued.

Authority is initially held by relationships experts (i.e., psychologists, researchers, therapists) but in part transferred to the "up-skilled" individual. However, the experts may potentially be (re)turned to if the individual or (future) couple "fails" in practice. Typical pedagogical methods include skill surveys, role-play, and group work where communication and negotiation skills are practiced, paired problem solving, discussing relationship hypotheticals, and case studies. In the United Kingdom, an evaluative study found that coverage of relationships as a general topic occurred more, while homosexuality and the negotiation of relationships and sexual encounters were rarely covered (Strange, Forrest, Oakley, & Stephenson, 2006). Another issue is that the idealization of relationships could cast being unmarried or divorced as "failure."

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES/VALUES CLARIFICATION

This discourse arose in the 1960s, with advocates such as Sally Williams, Paul Cook and the Anaheim school's Family Life and Sex Education Model in America. It can be found in educational policy that deals with the handling of "controversial issues" particularly in Australia (Northern Territory Government, 1998; NSW Government, 1983) yet has its roots in specific values clarification approaches and programs developed primarily by Raths, Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum (Halstead, 1996). The aim is to provide students with the skills and opportunities for rational thinking (Dune, 1997; Jones, 2009; Mikulics, 1998) and to protect schools from lawsuits by foregrounding student choice (Dewhurst, 1992).

Schools are not seen as arenas for student recruitment into partisan groups. They are places where students are preparing for informed and reasoned involvement in community life, including its politics, by calm study of social issues. Discussion of controversial or values-laden issues, particularly sexual ones, is acceptable only when it clearly serves the educative purpose and is consistent with curriculum goals (Dewhurst, 1992). There is an emphasis on gaining parental permission to avoid trouble. Educators occupy a privileged position and must be objective to avoid distorting discussions.

The sexuality framework for this discourse considers the sexual in terms of levels of controversy. The more controversial a matter is, the less likely it is to be covered without parental permission. Abortion, gay marriage, and transgender issues are often framed in this way. The individual student is cast as the primary authority, and their opinions on sexual matters must

not be directly negated. The approach calls for use of staged values clarification processes from particular models, student presentations of a variety of arguments on an issue, debates, and argumentative essays. Early proponents have admitted that approaches can be implemented erratically, in a superficial manner (Kirschenbaum, 1992). If executed poorly, approaches can suggest that any stance on a sexual issue may be taken arbitrarily. Also, the most vocal students' views may be privileged.

LIBERAL FEMINIST

The best-known type of feminism, this discourse grew out of the liberalism that originated in the 18th century in the West (Tuttle, 1986, p. 182). Mary Wollstonecraft and John Stuart Mill were key early proponents, and the promotion of more education for women was an initial focus. The introduction of the contraceptive pill in the 1960s allowed women greater freedom in their sexuality. By the 1970s social conditions had changed enough in the West so that the focus shifted to the curriculum and its replication of traditional sex roles (Moran, 2000, p. 196). *Family and Reproductive Rights Education Program* (Victorian Department of Human Services, 2003) for populations of girls at risk of genital mutilation uses this discourse.

At the heart of this discourse is the belief that a woman is first a human being and then a female. Her opportunities, experiences, and treatment should reflect this. Discrimination against a woman is understood as judgment based on sexual stereotypes rather than assessment according to the individual's merits. The basic concern of this discourse is ending such discrimination. Changes are made within systems and institutions as opposed to abandonment of these structures.

The sex of the body is seen as biologically determined. However, the related gender role—masculinity or femininity—is seen as "learned." The pathological nature of society's traditional sex roles are emphasized, which push women into passivity and underachievement (Moran, 2000, p. 196). The "corrective" strategy used is to promote more "neutral" gender roles for women. By becoming the (gender) neutral, a woman can be liberated from her body in theory and practice and no longer destined solely for reproduction, child rearing, and a secondary position in relation to a man. A woman can, with contraceptive options, enjoy sex as much as a man and in the same ways without inequitable consequences. Lesbians are tolerated but generally invisible. There is discomfort around transsexuals, who are tolerated as mutilated victims of patriarchy, but not recognized as their desired sex (Tuttle, 1986, p. 326). Women have the right to partake in or refuse sexual acts; the individual is the authority.

Pedagogy ensures women's issues are incorporated into all subjects, treats female students equally, presents positive images of women, promotes

equitable employment for women, and recognizes and endorses female sexual pleasure and desire (Moran, 2000; Tuttle, 1986). Second-wave feminists critique the neutral, disembodied ideal as a poor copy of a male original (Hekman, 1999). Other critics such as Hoff Sommers (2008) attack what they term the "myth of short-changed girls" as causing educational disadvantage for boys.

Critical

The critical orientation propounds facilitating integrated student action based on alternative principles. It came into education movements in the 1970s and is linked to the rise a host of other reform pushes such as feminism, gay liberation, and postcolonialism, aiming to engage students more actively in social issues and action (Kemmis et al., 1983, p. 129). This educational framing allows students to actively respond to society's privileging of particular sexualities and sexual identities; students identify and question values and practices that are unjust or inequitable and undertake actions to lead to a more equitable society. The "sexuality problem" education meets is social inequity and the perceived repression or marginalization of nondominant groups. Student-centered, action-based curricula are favored, with teachers and community members acting as facilitators of this action (Jones, 2009). Traditional accounts of sexuality are not privileged; instead they are either actively critiqued and supplemented or challenged by an alternative account focused on a formerly marginalized group(s). Whole-school bodies, teachers, and particular education action groups may model, train in, or seek to embody and promote these equity concerns. Methodologies include greater opportunities for participation in real-world community processes and structures and interaction with community members and organizations.

There can be an interest in the repressive qualities of power in the forms of sexism, heterosexism, and homophobia or in empowerment possibilities. The particular power dynamic explored varies among models and may pertain to class, sex and gender, ability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity. The aspect of so-called "difference" may be understood as innate or as socially determined but also tends to form an integral part of identity and identity politics, and exists in perpetual relation to a traditional "norm." Education is for, about, or against the privileging of the "difference" (Kumashiro, 2002). Sex, gender and sexuality primarily exist in a fixed bipolar opposition, but particular aspects of diversity beyond this model are actively supported depending on the discourse. Such alternatives are seen as equal to the traditional model, and as requiring extra educational investment to ensure equitable treatment. Sexuality models rethink the body. It is not solely a source for procreation or traditional intercourse, or envisioned in spiritual or puritan terms. The body is political, and its desires, pleasures,

activities, and relations exist within a power dynamic. Having sex for different reasons and in different ways can affect social conditions and group positions in the power dynamic. The personal is political.

Pedagogical methods may include viewing of alternative texts, lectures, and guest speakers from marginalized groups, activisms within and beyond the school (e.g., creation of posters, plays, speeches), through to camps and ceremonies. Discourses manifesting this orientation are State Socialist/Sexual-Politics, Sexual Revolutionary Socialist/Radical Freudian, Radical Feminist, Anti-Discrimination/Anti-Harassment/Equity, Inclusive/Social Justice, Safe and Supportive Spaces/Caring Communities, Gay Liberationist, and Postcolonial.

State Socialist/Sexual Politics

The "Sex-Pol" movement occurred in 1930s Germany and Soviet Russia (Carlson, 1992; Rabinbach, 1973; Sauerteig & Davidson, 2009), and its key concepts can also manifest in Italy and France (Caplan, 1979). Key theorists are Wilhelm Reich and Herbert Marcuse. Reich draws on Freud to argue that sexual and neurotic disturbances result from rigid adherence to conventional morality. He posits that repressed sexual energy is channeled into supporting political subordination (Reich, 1931, 1945, 1971). He concludes that the "natural morality" of matriarchal clans in which people had "sexual freedom based on gratification" is superior to repressive patriarchal capitalist structures that demand compulsory monogamy (Carlson, 1992, pp. 146–147). Therefore, in this socialist view sexuality should become less repressed. Reich's 1932 text *The Sexual Struggle of Youth* (in Reich, 1972) and his programs in Vienna and Germany (Grossman, 1997; Livingstone Smith, 1999) are key examples.

Monogamy is seen as an "unnatural" structure that maintains class hierarchy by ensuring that men can identify their offspring, and thus leave their wealth to their children (and no-one else's) (Reich, 1971, p. 147). Therefore, this "revolutionary" sexual education idealizes a society in which wealth, child-rearing, and sexual pleasures are shared. It accepts adolescent sexuality, nonmonogamy, and bearing children out of wedlock. It is believed where such "natural" sexualities are repressed, social tensions and repressive class structures arise. Desire then takes aberrant forms; the rigidly armored personality or homosexuality. Thus, in this framework homosexuality is a "tolerated perversion," seen as "unnecessary," where nonmonogamy is supported. Students are openly informed about procreation, contraception, and abortions. "Genital gratification" and sex equality are emphasized.

There is an inherent authorisation of political theorists. There is an attempt to move authority from the dominant classes to the working people in this discourse through the reclaiming of sexuality. Pedagogy involves frank

discussion of sexual issues and processes, and students theorizing their own sexual practices. Educators are to express "explicit and unmistakable affirmation of infantile love life," to counter damage to student ego structures from sex-negative rhetoric (Reich, 1971, p. 7). This theory of class as affecting and affected by sexuality is useful yet crudely done (e.g., it presupposes a universal polyamorous heterosexual desire). Some proponents call for greater attention to the role of women (Macciocchi, 1979).

SEXUAL REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST/RADICAL FREUDIAN

A later radical Freudian ideology of nonrepressive sexuality and postcapitalist society also influenced 1960s and 1970s schooling in the West, reframing the concepts of class and pleasure from Sex-Pol (Carlson, 1992, pp. 46–50). In particular, Marcuse's work was more attuned to American counterculture in the 1960s and 1970s and the New Left. However, it has had less impact on specific school programs despite the encouragement from key sexuality education researchers (Fields & Tolman, 2006; Fine & McClelland, 2006) and greater impact on students and teachers, college courses, free-love cultures, and communal home-schooling movements (Allyn, 2001).

Marcuse (1966) reappropriates Freud's pleasure principle, arguing that a good deal of repression and sublimation has been previously necessary to build "civilization" to its "current advanced level." However, this previous repression has led to the preconditions for the gradual abolition of repression supported by free society (rather than won by a struggle or revolution as such). New technologies and automated production prevent the need for drudgery. The body, no longer dominated by labor, can be resexualized in a "resurgence of pregenital polymorphous sexuality and a decline of genital supremacy" (Marcuse, 1966, p. 201). Alternatives to traditional family structures can be explored.

The sexuality framework at the heart of this discourse allows for a diversity of relations, experiences and embodied desires in all of their forms (Fields & Tolman, 2006; Fine & McClelland, 2006). These can be pansexual, genitally, or otherwise focused—as with fetishes or sado-masochism (Marcuse, 1966, p. 202). The uniting aim is pleasure and freedom. However, this aim is collective rather than individual. Rather than just the working class, it also aims at liberating all people. Sexual acts are understood in terms of their potential to liberate the collective consciousness and promote peace. Thus, more experimental or group acts are "more liberating." Sexual learning is based on experimentation and communal reflection. There is frank discussion of sexual theories and experiences. This ad hoc approach has not attracted structured evaluation. A key criticism is the impracticality of its eroticism and anti-establishment flavor for schools. It can be seen as attacking institutionalised power (Carlson, 1992). Yet Fine and McClelland

(2006, p. 327) argue that youth report that school is precisely the place they wish to learn about desire.

RADICAL FEMINIST/CULTURAL FEMINIST

Radical feminism grew out of the women's liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s in the West (Tuttle, 1986). In education, proponents include some teachers, women's education groups and associations, rape crisis centres, date rape education networks, and academics. Radical, cultural, or second-wave feminism aims to "valorise the general category "woman"" (Hekman, 1999, p. 17). Information on typical programs and lessons is found in *Learning Our Way* (Bunch & Pollack, 1983).

Reforms in the public sphere are seen as surface equality, leaving deeper oppression unaffected. Thus, radical feminists declare the "personal is political" and critique "the way human reproduction is controlled and socialized through such institutions as marriage, compulsory heterosexuality and motherhood" (Tuttle, 1986, p. 267). The aim is to overhaul social structures and create an entirely new social system that caters to female and feminine bodies, pleasures, knowledge, skills, arts, spirituality, goals, and cultures. There is an emphasis on shared female power and grass roots, contextually specific approaches. Stereotypes about female desire and sexual behavior are challenged, and there is advocacy for women's reproductive rights (Elia, 2005, p. 788). In this framework, the ability of women to live and gain sexual pleasure autonomously from men is emphasized: whether as self-fulfilling individuals, within lesbian relations, or through more equitable models of sexual partnering with men where they retain their personal power.

Methods include critical analysis, discussions, textual analysis, analytical essays, research projects, group work, and critical rape education where gender is deconstructed. School-, Internet-, and community-based activisms may occur such as raising the profile of feminine crafts, skills, and interests; creating girls-only "safe" spaces or rooms; or creating posters that challenge sexisms. An evaluation found that as both girls and boys are affected by rape myths and gender socialization, both need to take responsibility for victimization of women (Feltey, Ainslie, & Geib, 1991). Conservative groups can find the rejection of heterosexuality and sex roles alarming. Essentialist understandings of femaleness can rely heavily on sex binaries in ways that are exclusionary to transgender people and further entrench sex determinism. Postmodern feminists reject this binary view of sexuality (Baber & Murray, 2001; Hekman, 1999).

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION/ANTI-HARASSMENT/EQUITY

This discourse has its early roots in civil rights movements, and it retains a vocabulary of citizenship and human rights. It is also affected by movements for people with disabilities and Goffmann's work on stigma and disability in

the early 1960s (Goffmann, 1963). The United Nations is a key proponent, with its convention of 1969 against discrimination on the basis of a variety of grounds. This is being extended to include sexual orientation and gender identity (Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2008). Specific anti-discrimination laws have also emerged in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia France, Canada, New Zealand, and China. *The GLSEN Lunchbox* (GLSEN, 2005) incorporates this discourse, among others.

Discrimination is a social, economic, political, or legal distinction made between individuals or groups such that one has the power to treat the other unfavorably. In this discourse, it is understood as intrinsically negative and based on stereotyping. It occurs against some minorities and sometimes majorities. It can be direct or indirect (Lunt & Thornton, 1994, p. 228). The focus is not on an individual's negative experiences but rather on social issues (e.g., sexism, homophobia, transphobia). The sexuality framework is one of social equity: All people are assumed to possess fixed definable sexual identity traits (e.g., sex, gender identity, orientation), and the variation in these traits is seen as nonhierarchical and irrelevant to one's "social value." Thus, a person's sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation should not have an impact on how they are treated, their access to services or institutions or physical locations, and their economic or occupational opportunities. Furthermore, all people have the innate human right to express their sexuality, sex and gender identity freely.

Authorities in this discourse are "natural law," the declared law, and the critical society itself. Pedagogy tends to be student-centered and involves exploring sexuality discrimination, legislation, anti-bias activities, or facilitated activisms (such as Web site campaigns, petitions, or poster creation). This approach can focus too much on top-down control of social issues. Requirements of sexual tolerance can send the message there is "something to be tolerated" about a sexuality/gender identity without examining the system that made it appear intolerable. Therefore, while anti-discrimination policies can protect students from anti-gay peer harassment (D'Augelli, 1998; Lipkin, 1994; Macgillivray & Jennings, 2008) and prevent lawsuits (Buckel, 2000), they cannot ensure students are warmly included. Further, theories of multiple discrimination need to go beyond "simplistic additive models" (Sayce, 1998, p. 337).

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

In most Western Organization for Economic Co-ordination and Development (OECD) countries, including Australia, England, the United States, and New Zealand, education policies based on the notion of "inclusion" are in place (OECD, 2003). The aim is to supply equitable provision for diverse students. The major impetus for inclusive education was the 1994 World

Conference on Special Needs Education in Salamanca (Magrab, 2003). This discourse maintains that to be excluded is to be disempowered and constituted as "abnormal" (Barton, 1997, p. 233). *Canadian Guidelines* (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2008) and parts of the Christian curriculum *Our Whole Lives* (Casparian, Goldfarb, Kimball, Sprung, & Wilson, 1999) feature this discourse.

There is a belief that segregated schooling should not exist, including special schools that deal with physical or mental disabilities, or schools such as "Harvey Milk High" that cater specifically for sexually diverse students. Such schools are seen as furthering stereotyping, creating divisions, and preventing democratic participation. In this discourse, sexually diverse students and gender diverse students are seen as "at risk of educational failure" if their needs are not met in the regular classroom (McWhirter, McWhirter, McWhirter, & McWhirter, 1998). These needs may involve greater representation in class materials, minimisation of homophobia in the classroom, counselling, social inclusion, and so forth (Elia & Eliason, 2010). The sexuality framework incorporates sexual "others" to prevent these others becoming "at risk," such as representing diverse families in early childhood (Robinson, 2002, p. 428).

Authority in this discourse is spread among a variety of stakeholders from inclusion training providers through to students and their families. Pedagogy should be adapted to the needs of specific student groups so *those* students feel included. Thus, an educator may aim to cover sexual issues relevant to specific students with particular disabilities or orientations in a sex education talk, choose a film featuring a bisexual historical figure in class materials, or actively work to ensure a transgender student has some friends to sit with at lunch. Invitations to school proms or parent dinners may be worded to include same-sex couples. Inclusion is critiqued as stressful for regular teachers (Forlin, 2001; Forlin, Hattie, & Douglas, 1996). Also, as student sexualities can be "invisible," educators may not grasp the need to include them.

SAFE AND SUPPORTIVE SPACES/CARING COMMUNITY

This discourse emerged in some American and Australian education polity in the 1990s. It derives from the work of Noddings, Mayeroff, Buber, and Gilligan on "Caring Communities" (Noddings, 1984). Proponents include the California Safe Schools Coalition and various levels of Australian Government. It emphasizes the ethic of care. Caring Communities (or safe and supportive spaces/environments) constitute integrated, whole school family-style models. Nurturing and supportive relationships are considered essential to students' development. The influence of school staff and teachers stems from their caring relationships with students. Policy examples include *Safe Schools are Effective Schools* (VIC Government, 2006) and proposed

requirements for anti-bullying education on sexual orientation and gender identity under the *Safe Schools Improvement Act* (OpenCongress, 2010).

School is seen as a potentially dangerous environment for youth. Measures need to be taken to make it physically, psychologically, and emotionally a safe space. Dangers include verbal, physical, emotional and sexual abuse, and discrimination. Agreed definitions of bullying, harassment, and suitable consequences are created. Students are empowered to identify and report sexual abuse or discrimination against themselves or others. Bullying is seen as stemming from a lack of compassion. Thus, students are not rewarded for "empathic actions"; these instead become the classroom culture's "norm" (Joseph & Elfron, 2005; J. R. Martin, 1992).

Sexuality is framed as an identity aspect that can increase a group's risk of abuse due to sexual difference (particularly sexual orientation). It is also a potential field of abuse for all youth generally. These potential sexual abuses and problems must be minimized by protections in the schools system for dealing with staff and reporting processes. Overall, the aim is to make school a place where all students are safe from any kind of problematic or negative treatment of their sexuality.

Authority includes the law and the school community. Key pedagogical methods are student-centered rule-setting sessions, lectures on recognizing and reporting sexual abuse, sexual bullying intervention role-play, facilitated student action on sexual bullying and homophobia (e.g., speeches, peer support, posters), and empathy-building activities. Evaluation has found links between same sex attracted youth's perception of their school climate and academic achievement (Mikulsky, 2005). In critique, there is a negative framing of sexuality as generally related to abuse. Another problem is that a space "safe" for one type of student can necessitate silencing the views of another (making *them* feel "unsafe") (Holley & Steiner, 2005).

GAY LIBERATIONIST

This discourse gathered strength throughout the late 1960s and the 1970s and has made impact particularly in Canada; U.S. states such as Massachusetts and California; and parts of Australia, Sweden, Denmark, and Britain (Angelides, 2008; Cloud, 2005; Moran, 2000). American gay activism gathered a new militancy triggered by the 1969 "Stonewall rebellion" in New York City, when for the first time various patrons at a gay bar fought back against police harassment and started a series of street protests (Moran, 2000). Cloud (2005) aligns gay liberation discourse in America with "Gay Straight Alliances" (GSAs) and the Point Foundation. In Australia, the Melbourne Gay Teachers and Students Group's 1978 publication *Young Gay and Proud* is a prime early textual example of this approach (Angelides, 2008).

Gay and lesbian people are seen as a marginalized group within society that need to be acknowledged, protected, and supported. This marginalization is seen as stemming from systemic and social homophobia; a fear, hatred, and denial of homosexuality. This discourse emphasises the right to free expression and enjoyment of same-sex attraction and gender diversity. It privileges the idea that organized efforts could eventually liberate this group from oppression. Youth versions of this discourse are more complex and inclusive of straight students and mainstream culture.

Sexuality is framed as biologically determined, such that no pedagogy can change it (Moran, 2000). It has an "orientation" towards a sexual object (e.g., male, female, both) and is construed as an identity trait like race or sex. This may be innately known to the individual or may be discovered. Repressing it is considered harmful. Sexual acts are framed around self-affirmation and mutual pleasure (Angelides, 2008) rather than reproduction. Authority lies in the social "knowledge" of alternative communities. Pedagogy includes the act of "coming out" by education workers, anti-homophobia education or a focus on representing marginalized sexualities in curricula, and rules or activisms against homophobic slurs. There is critique from conservative groups who accuse advocates of attempting to "convert" children (Angelides, 2008). Further, Cloud (2005) suggests the movement encourages gay students to focus on their experiences of rejection and being marginalized instead of resilience.

POSTCOLONIAL/CULTURAL HERITAGE/INDIGENIST SEX EDUCATION

Postcolonial discourse has been recently mobilized within American Indian and Alaskan Native (AIAN) tribes and urban communities for HIV/AIDS prevention programs and sexuality education (Duran & Walters, 2004); in some Australian Aboriginal values education (Jones, 2009); in New Zealand's cultural education programs and elsewhere. It is based on postcolonial studies—an interdisciplinary field that examines the "global impact of European colonialism, from its beginnings in the 15th century up to the present" (Leitch et al., 2001, p. 25). Key polity includes the 1975 American Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act and other country-specific documents. A program example is *We are all Related: Relationships in Perspective—A Guide for Native American Youth* (Paulson, 2001).

The postcolonialist view understands the historical and socio-cultural colonization of a country from the perspective of its original inhabitants. In sexuality education, the aim is to change negative stereotyping and reclaim indigenous sexuality knowledge (Bhabha, 1983; Duran & Walters, 2004; Spivak, 1990). Parents, elders, and cultural leaders educate children within and beyond school, promoting a deep understanding of and participation in cultural arts and ceremonies. These models thus foster an integrated approach to identity, morality, and sexuality.

The sexual framework stems from the particular indigenous culture being explored. The authorities promoted by this discourse include contextually specific elders, indigenous groups, communities, and teachings. Pedagogical methods may include use of oral histories, storytelling, camps and excursions, guest speakers, engaging in traditional activities or other ceremonies. Duran and Walters (2004) argue that there is yet not enough literature and evaluative research on these approaches. They also point out that "the truth" has to be carefully negotiated when considering conflicting Western and native concepts of sexual health.

Postmodern

The postmodern orientation is the most recent, and involves analysis of concepts of truth, authority, and reality (Jones, 2009). Various sex, gender, and sexuality frameworks and positions are explored. Students can deconstruct and co-construct these but also must be self-reflexive. Multiple perspectives on issues and knowledge are taught, and a critical deconstructive approach is taken such that the hegemony or discursive truths/assumptions of any given time or culture are revealed. The "sexuality problem" educated against is the perceived trap of hegemonic cultural truths. Authorized accounts and positions are questioned.

Teachers may "play devil's advocate" in relation to the student, acting as a "deconstructor, not a mere supporter in the traditional sense of the word" (Morton & Zavarzadeh, 1991, p. 11). In doing so they hope to develop in students a critical oppositional position in relation to the dominant order such that the partisan subject self-reflexively acknowledges their own partiality, in the spirit of what Morton and Zavarzadeh term "both incompleteness and committedness" (1991, p. 12). In acknowledging their split or partial nature, the denaturalized student sees themselves as constituted by a set of incoherent subject positions produced by cultural discourses, and makes visible the arbitrariness of all seemingly natural meanings and cultural organizations (Jones, 2009). Although a sense of essential or secure identity is erased, the space of culture is opened up for reorganization and creative change. Teachers facilitate study, debate, and individual and group exploration of frameworks, supporting diverse students and creating a sense of equality without basing this on an ideal "original" model (that other models must relate to).

Pedagogical methods may include the teacher playing conceptual tricks on students/deconstructing them, student engagement in a range of theoretical and historio-cultural perspectives on an issue, class theorizing, vocabulary invention and conceptual play, exploring multiple cultural activities, and dress coding. Guest speakers and excursions offer insight into one of the many theoretical or cultural perspectives being explored. The difficulty of

intellectual challenge in these approaches can be a factor for consideration; however, they confront, rather than dismiss, the complex and multifarious nature of sexuality. They further allow opportunities for an interesting and evolved study of other approaches and knowledge types presented in the exemplar and embrace conceptual play. They include Poststructuralist, Post-identity Feminist, Multicultural Education, Diversity Education, and Queer Theory.

POSTSTRUCTURALIST

Originally a vanguard movement of French literary intellectuals and philosophers who were critical of structuralism and came into prominence during the 1960s and 1970s, poststructuralism quickly spread to intellectuals around the globe and became the leading edge of postmodernism (Carlson, 2005, p. 635; Leitch et al., 2001, p. 21). It began affecting sexuality curricula in disparate parts of the West during the 1990s and at the turn of the millennium, sometimes relying on individual teachers' interests and capabilities. Central theorists drawn upon include Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Paul de Man, Roland Barthes, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek. Paulsen (1999) provides an example of this approach for dealing with masculinity.

   Poststructuralist discourse views social reality as constituted or produced by discourses or the language we use to "name" the world (Carlson, 2005, p. 636). It is linked to French structuralism's concern with language or discourse and the way one inhabits language (langue) to engage in a speech act/utterance (parole) (Carlson, 2005). Unlike structuralism, however, it problematizes linguistic referentiality. As language cannot escape socio-historical context or the general archive of culture, meaning in general is understood as sliding, abyssal, and unknowable. This leaves the "truth" or "reality" of a text, concept, or experience under question.

   McLaren (1992) encourages teachers to explore the terrain of contemporary theories of sexuality and gender, the possibility of multiple subjectivities as opposed to unitary identity, and whether sexuality is preexisting or postlanguage. One key process is the analytic procedure of deconstruction developed by Derrida, a historian of philosophy (Leitch et al., 2001). A second key process is renaming. McLaren (1992) promotes the process of renaming sexuality and gender as a way to destabilize their current descriptive features and "open their patriarchal and heterosexist anchor points to hegemonic rearticulations" (p. x).

   The sexuality framework applies the deconstruction process to expose binary oppositions within (various) hegemonic understandings of sexuality, desire, the body, sex, and gender. The hegemonies under investigation may come from contemporary popular cultures (as reported through reflection on experiences or through their emergence in texts) or other historio-cultural

contexts (through study of primary and secondary sources). One inherent or "true" model of desire, sex, or gender is thus not offered as such; rather, preexisting models are called into "crisis" (Kumashiro, 2002). However, it is important to note that such models are not entirely rejected; they are uncovered neither as true nor false but as one of many possible perspectives on "lived experience." They are instead deemed more or less compelling, productive, or useful.

Poststructuralist accounts trouble notions of "authority." Pedagogy requires educators to recognize how language constructs reality (Giroux, 1993; McLaren, 1992). Methods include categorization games, analysis of texts, deconstructive essays, debates, and group reflection. Poststructuralist approaches are useful for extending students but may also be too difficult for some groups. They can be too theoretical or overlook affective and physical aspects of sexuality (McLaren, 1992).

POSTIDENTITY FEMINIST

Postidentity feminist discourse combines the reaction against second-wave feminist constructions of "woman" and identity politics with postmodernist and poststructuralist concerns (Hekman, 1999, p. 18). While it emerged within education theory and research in the 1980s and 1990s, its impact on sexuality curricula appears to be in discrete parts of the West during the 1990s and at the turn of the millennium, mainly via individual teachers. It is based on the work of feminist theorists such as Wendy Brown, Iris Young, Judith Butler, Susan Hekman, and Julia Kristeva. Proponents include education theorists Debian Marty and Mary Margaret Fonow. Baber and Murray (2001) provide guidelines and examples for this type of program.

A key belief is that identity is malleable, unfixed, and episodic (Baber & Murray, 2001). Essentialist understandings of identity are questioned (Ussher, 1994) and its constructed nature revealed or brought to the fore if a particular identity is asserted or discussed. This can be achieved through the use of inverted commas or through discussing identity "construct/ion/s" or "version/s," or using other vocabulary that questions "truth." The sexuality framework sees sex and gender as social and historical constructs (Fonow & Marty, 1992; Laumann & Gagnon, 1995; Laws, 1980). Students are encouraged to explore exactly what these constructs entail and how they occur so that they can move beyond such limitations. Sex, gender identity, orientation, culture, race, and class cannot consistently explain any individual or group (Harding, 1998). To foreground multiplicity, the concept of "sexualities" can replace "sexuality" (Baber & Murray, 2001; Daniluk, 1998). Physical arousal is assumed "real," but the meanings attributed to sexual desire, objects, relationship dynamics, and experiences are seen as wrought by culture (Baber & Murray, 2001; Dworkin, 1987).

Authorities within the discourse include the feminist theorists studied and at times the students in their critique of various constructs. Pedagogical methods include discussion of texts about socialization, deconstruction of the normalization of heterosexuality in popular culture, and use of lesbian and heterosexual community panels (Fonow & Marty, 1992). Baber and Murray (2001) suggest exercises for older students to interrogate the "prevailing sexual scripts" for men and women in their culture. There is the risk of overlooking those experiential aspects of identity and self-discovery central to both teenagers' and feminists' understanding of sexuality (Hekman, 1999; McLaren, 1992).

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Multicultural education discourse grew out of the U.S. civil rights movements of the 1950s and 1960s and the ethnic revivals of the 1970s (Mayo, 2005). Parents and youth of color insisted that programs of study more accurately corresponded to their various cultural backgrounds. Thus, this discourse generally functions to ensure schooling equitably educates diverse populations (Mayo, 2005, p. 561). Yet according to Moran, the move towards a focus on sexuality within this discourse since the 1980s also functions as another response to the AIDS epidemic in the United States, with rising incidence among African American teens (Moran, 2000, p. 210). Unlike in postcolonial discourse, all students (regardless of a nonindigenous background) are assumed to gain from being educated about multiple sexual cultures. Compton gives some guides and examples for programs of this kind (Compton, 1989).

A central belief is that multiple cultures can co-exist peaceably, with people experiencing the world through different frames of understanding. There is a theoretical and practical relinquishing of monoculture (Grant & Lei, 2001; Grant & Sleeter, 2002). A range of sexual traditions, sexual lifestyles, and cultural views on sex are seen as equally valid. This approach's sexuality framework recognizes multiple cultural understandings of sexuality that students may be subject to and operate within. These intersect in differing ways for individual students. Factors such as race and cultural beliefs are understood to shape one's sexual "choices" or ability to be "assertive" in exercising them (Lichenstein, 2000). Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT)-inclusive multiculturalism usually looks at the issue of "family structure" such as adoptive families and single-parent families, or examines framings of homosexuality and gender identity across many cultures (Mayo, 2005, p. 562).

Authorities are relative to different cultures. Pedagogical approaches include educating the students about their group, culture, or gender's history to fill in absences in traditional curriculum; emphasising inter-group relations and cultural exchange; and exploring diverse student backgrounds through

food fairs, cultural stories, and histories. Teaching may occur in multiple languages or multiple modes. There is an effort to educate students about sexuality using perspectives they are familiar with, as well as those they may come across within a multicultural society.

This approach is critiqued on the basis that the versions of group or culture identity represented within it can sometimes be simplistic, neglecting the complexity of identity and the influence of subcultures (Mayo, 2005, p. 562).

Diversity Education/Celebrating Diversity

Blackmore (2006) broadly links discourses of diversity in "most Anglophone nation states" in recent decades to attempts at capitalizing on diversity within the corporate world. This outlook celebrates the opportunity to capitalize on and gain from a context of differentiation. Diversity is conceived as one broad outlook covering all variation (O'Malleya, Hoyt, & Slattery, 2009), based on the theoretically endless possible differentiation of identity aspects. There is, as in other postmodern permeations, no assumed "norm." However, all variation is regarded as less stable than, for example, multicultural education's version of ethnicity. This is because inconsistency in identities and within identities is highlighted. Thus, diversity is concerned with the ever-present potential for differentiation and multiplicity rather than a specific range of differences or groups. Aspects of this discourse appear in *Celebrating Diversity in Schools* (Gay and Lesbian Youth Project, 2009).

Experience of differentiation among students, staff, and leaders is seen as beneficial for all, leading to creativity, open-mindedness, decreased bullying, and social cohesion (Covich, 2003; Gay and Lesbian Youth Project, 2009). It is thus to be celebrated. Differences are of interest and value whether or not they manifest within a particular student body. Indeed, diversity becomes its own assumption; the student body is treated as if it contains, could contain, or may benefit from considering a broader range of perspectives (Covich, 2003; Gay and Lesbian Youth Project, 2009). Moreover, this approach can conceptually investigate issues of racism, sexism, and homophobia without the reliance on identities, portraying these as harmful to everyone rather than simply harmful to one section of society (Gay and Lesbian Youth Project, 2009).

The sexuality framework at the heart of this model stresses multiplicity. Sexuality is externally diverse in that it involves many types of bodies, sexes, genders, and attraction types. Also, there may be inconsistencies or changes in an individual's attractions throughout time—sexuality is thus also internally diverse. Because of this, a variety of relationship types, family structures, and individual expressions are valued (O'Malleya et al., 2009). Reproduction is also conceived in varying ways; it may result from male-female sexual intercourse, from fertilization treatments, adoption processes, and so forth.

The emphasis is ideally on promoting the range of conceptual and practical possibility rather than on promoting any one lifestyle model.

Empirical research on diversity is given authority. In classroom pedagogy, teachers expose students to a broad range of relationship and family types, subject possibilities, lifestyle, and sexual concepts through a combination of theories, pop culture, viewing of texts, and analysis of "real world" experiences/phenomena. Homophobic, transphobic, heterosexist, racist, sexist, and other culturally limiting assumptions and vocabulary are challenged. The intention here is to encourage students to start playing devil's advocate or simply pick up on such assumptions in their own lives and social circles. Students are encouraged to explore conflicting and fluid aspects of identity in their own experiences and in texts. Practitioners claim better results from class atmospheres where diverse autobiographies and a multiplicity of viewpoints are affirmed, but warn of less success when sexuality terms are not clarified and religious or personal conflicts are allowed to erupt without resolution (O'Malleya et al., 2009). There can be conservative critique of the celebration of diverse sexualities and tolerance of lifestyles deemed immoral by various religions (Shornack & Shornack, 1982).

QUEER THEORY

Queer most strongly emerged in Western academia during the early 1990s and the turn of the millennium. It stems from poststructuralist theoretical perspectives and reinforces the notion that identities are not fixed or stable but rather are shifting, contradictory, dynamic, and constructed (Jagose, 1996; Robinson, 2005). Significant theorists are Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgewick. Key education texts include Pinar (2005), Duggan (1992), Britzman (1995), Bryson and De Castell (1993), and Talburt and Steinberg (2000). These discuss approaches to "queer pedagogy," the "queerying" of education or teaching queer theory as a subject.

Queer is concerned with exposing the historic policing of what Butler (1990) termed the "heterosexual matrix," that is, the (re)production of heterosexuality through (re)presentation of bipolarized oppositions of sex, gender, and sexuality as "the norm" (feminine female heterosexuality and masculine male heterosexuality). It also dramatizes incoherencies in these (re)productions. Thus, queer theorists ". . . investigate the historical developments of such categories as (. . .) woman and man, stressing (their) socially constructed character" (Leitch et al., 2001, p. 25). A key queer perspective upholds that all identities are performative (Butler, 1990), a complex interaction among performance, cultural (re)citation, and embodiment.

However ironically, queer also offers the assertion of a particular identity or sexuality framework. "Queer" identity includes all nonheteronormative conceptions of identity (including those who see themselves as heterosexual

in an "untraditional" way). To claim a consistent heterosexual, gay, male, or female identity is highly problematic. It requires impossible erasures of contradictory elements and potentials across cultures, iterations, and perceptions. To even claim a male-to-female transsexual identity (or vice versa) could also be problematic, as the locations that have apparently been travelled across are not stable positions anyway. Queer is the least problematic identity in that it "owns" its unqualifiable and limitless nature.

Queer pedagogy, informed by queer theory, thus undertakes to critically examine what is considered to be the natural order of things in terms of gender and sexuality. It is primarily about disrupting and destabilizing the cultural binaries (such as "male-female" and "heterosexual-homosexual") in these normalizing discourses that operate to constitute and perpetuate artificial hierarchical relations of power between their constructed polarized opposites (Robinson, 2005, pp. 25–26).

Queer is often mistaken as purely deconstructive, but it offers co-constructive projects that are useful for students. Butler (1990) offers three key queer projects: overplay, transference, and erasure. Overplaying the gendered and sexed norms of the heterosexual matrix to the point of ridiculousness reveals how constructed, fake or forced they are. This strategy offers fun possibilities to students—creative writers may create male characters as ridiculously butch and unfeeling supermen, actors in the class could dramatize females as completely unable to open doors for themselves, and so forth. Transferring the production of femininity or masculinity onto untraditional bodies also disrupts the sense that gender is "natural"/innate, and this is why some classroom practices include drag shows and dress-up games. Finally, erasing any definitions or words associated with sexuality, gender or sex can be useful for creating new perspectives… asking students to consider other ways of looking at sexuality that do not rely on being male or female offers creative possibilities.

Queer theorists offer starting points, but even their own "authority" is questioned (Kumashiro, 2002, p. 200). Structured "evaluations" of this approach are not available (or in keeping with its paradigm). However, the potential for student and teacher decisions and interactions to alter the course of the curriculum has been affirmed through case vignettes (Jiménez, 2009; Kumashiro, 2002). A key critique of queer is that it can be, and is in some ways, purposely irritating for teenagers. On the other hand, queer can appeal to their rebellious side. They may find it intensely liberating, funny, and exciting to challenge all accepted notions of sexuality, subvert social and literary traditions, and be given the conceptual freedom to speak about sexuality in new ways. The approach's inherent subversiveness can make it entirely unpalatable to more conservative educators, yet educators from a gay liberationist frame can equally resist Queer's relinquishing of binaries and labels (Bacon, 2006).

CRITIQUES AND CONCLUSIONS

A key point about sexuality education that comes through in exploring the discourse exemplar is that it occurs in many different areas, not just in specifically allocated "sexuality education lessons." School policies, structures, staffing, rules, uniforms, approaches to bullying, and morality education are all discursive sites where messages about sexuality are imbued. The posters a school displays (or does not), the books in its library (or those banned from it), the essay questions used to examine a text in English can all be implicated. The discourses activated in these areas have varied over time yet remain active in contemporary education (to varying degrees). The importance of being aware of (and naming) the discourses being drawn upon, and the messages being sent in such approaches, cannot be underlined enough.

Each discourse has contributed to the richness of vocabulary and possibility within sexuality education. Yet, as noted throughout, there is critique for each. There is certainly no flawless, universal sexuality education that would suit every student and context. However, there are approaches that are more or less damaging to particular students and social groups. The potential for Christian/ex-gay redemption discourse to damage gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and queer students, for example, is alarming. Yet postmodern sexuality educations could certainly be used to engage with diverse sexualities in academically valid and interesting ways. They also reposition *students* as more empowered and active participants, such that the insights *they* might have to offer are not overlooked. However, such discourses may be too "complex" for some students (and many educators).

Clearly, some education orientations (particularly critical and postmodern) are underrepresented in education and research. Others (particularly conservative) are perhaps overly represented. Abstinence-only education, comprehensive education, and sexual risk have been more dominant in America compared to more academic and diversity-endorsing approaches. Yet the 28 approaches are not all mutually exclusive, and aspects of a few discourses may be combined to avoid the pitfalls and inherent biases of being limited to just one. For example, sexual risk discourse incorporates what many educators would see as "essential" information for protecting students and society in general from sexually transmitted diseases. Yet it provides quite a negative view of sexuality that could (and should) be balanced by other perspectives. Similarly, while diversity education offers quite an affirming view of all students and their families, it needs to be balanced by more practical sexual advice.

The key is being aware of the inherent flaws and limitations of taking any one perspective and considering students' needs from many angles. Sexuality education is not, and should never be, cast as a simple field. Like any subject (such as math or science) learning in this field should aim

towards increasingly complex and varied learning rather than repetitive or exclusionary content. Similarly, its different schools of thought must be made explicit if they are to be properly debated. This needs to be achieved clearly and concisely in the framing of research projects, theoretical arguments, and policy and curriculum materials. It also can and should be achieved in the framing of direct statements made by educators to students. For example: "I'll be talking to you about sexual acts from a sexual risk perspective today . . ." or "This week we will consider a range of views on sexuality, including. . . ." This equally qualifies the perspective drawn on, and acknowledges what is "left out" in a way that respects both the field of sexuality education, and its audience.

A final point: The aims of these discourses are so different that comparative studies on their "effectiveness" can seem redundant. What approaches aim to be effective at differs! Abstinence-only education has been repeatedly compared to sexual risk and other approaches (as cited in its summary), yet the former is concerned with preventing sexual contact before marriage while the latter may be concerned with preventing a particular disease epidemic. The differences between discourses are not minor or arbitrary. Their conceptualizations of sexuality are worlds apart. Comparison is better achieved through asking: Which aims and frames are superior? Which offer relevance to particular school communities? Which will advance the field? Do we accept current sexuality authorities and theories, or should we develop new approaches? These questions suggest new directions for research and practice alike.

NOTE

1. Including African and Asian countries, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and others, plus international policies from bodies such as UNESCO.

REFERENCES

Allen, L. (2007). Examining dominant discourses of sexuality in sexuality education research. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *17*(1/2), 163–180.

Allyn, D. (2001). *Make love, not war: The sexual revolution, an unfettered history.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Angelides, S. (2008). "The continuing homosexual offensive": Sex education, gay rights and homosexual recruitment. In S. Robinson (Ed.), *Homophobia: An Australian history* (pp. 172–192). Sydney, Australia: The Federation Press.

APA Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation. (2009). *Report of the Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Arriola, E. R. (1998). The penalties for puppy love: Institutionalized violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *The Journal of Gender, Race, and Justice*, *429*, 1–43.

Ashcraft, C. (2006). Ready or not … ? Teen sexuality and the troubling discourse of readiness. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *37*(4), 328–346.

Baber, K. M., & Murray, C. I. (2001). A postmodern feminist approach to teaching human sexuality. *Family Relations*, *50*(1), 23–33.

Bacon, J. (2006). Teaching queer theory at a normal school. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *52*(1-2), 257–284.

Barton, L. (1997). Inclusive education: Romantic, subversive or realistic? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *1*(3), 231–242.

Beckstead, A. L., & Morrow, S. L. (2004). Mormon clients' experiences of conversion therapy: The need for a new treatment approach. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*, 651–690.

Bhabha, H. (1983). The other question—the stereotype and colonial discourse. *Screen*, *24*(6), 18–36.

Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructing diversity discourses in the field of educational management and leadership. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, *34*(2), 181–199.

Blair, A., & Monk, D. (2009). Sex education and the law in England and Wales: The importance of legal narratives. In L. D. H. Sauerteig & R. Davidson (Eds.), *Shaping sexual knowledge: A cultural history of sex education in twentieth century Europe*. London, England, and New York, NY: Routledge.

Britzman, D. (1995). Is there a queer pedagogy? Or, stop reading straight. *Educational Theory*, *45*(2), 151–165.

Brown, S., & Taverner, B. (2001). *Streetwise to sex-wise: Sexuality education for high-risk youth*. Morristown, NJ: Planned Parenthood of Greater Northern New Jersey.

Bryson, M., & De Castell, S. (1993). Queer pedagogy: Praxis makes im/perfect. *Journal of Education*, *18*(3), 285–305.

Buckel, D. (2000). Legal perspective on ensuring a safe and nondiscriminatory school environment for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered students. *Education and Urban Society*, *32*(3), 390–398.

Bunch, C., & Pollack, S. (Eds.). (1983). *Learning our way: Essays in feminist education*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.

Burt, J., & Brower Meeks, L. (1987). *Education for sexuality: Concepts and programs for teaching* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Publishing.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London, England: Routledge.

Caplan, J. (1979). Introduction to "female sexuality in fascist ideology." *Feminist Review*, *1*(1), 59–66.

Carlson, D. L. (1992). Identity conflict and change. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Sexuality and the curriculum: The politics and practices of sexuality education* (pp. 34–58). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Carlson, D. L. (2005). Poststructuralism. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Youth, education, and sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (pp. 635–638). London, England: Greenwood Press.

Carmody, M. (2009). *Sex & ethics: The sexual ethics education program for young people*. Melbourne, Australia: Palgrave Macmillan.

Casparian, E., Goldfarb, E., Kimball, R., Sprung, B., & Wilson, P. (1999). *Our whole lives sexuality education curricula series*. Boston, MA: Unitarian Universalist Association.

Catholic Education Office Melbourne. (2001). *Directives for Christian education in sexuality*. Retrieved from http://web.ceo.melb.catholic.edu.au/index.php?sectionid=10

Cloud, J. (2005, October 2). The battle over gay teens. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1112856,00.html

Compton, A. Y. (1989). Multicultural perspectives on sex education. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, *4*(1), 75–85.

Consiglio, W. (1991). *Homosexual no more*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.

Covich, S. (2003, Term 4). Safe schools: Celebrating diversity. *New South Wales Education Magazine*, pp. 16–18.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1998). Developmental implications of victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths. In G. M. Harek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 187–210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daniluk, J. C. (1998). *Women's sexuality across the life span: Challenging myths, creating meanings*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

De Schweinitz, K. (1939). *Growing up. The story of how a baby is born*. Sydney, Australia: Angus and Robertson.

Dewhurst, D. (1992). The teaching of controversial issues. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *26*(2), 153–163.

Duggan, L. (1992). Making it perfectly queer. *Socialist Review*, *22*(1), 11–13.

Dune, J. (1997). *A critique of research evaluating moral education interventions*. Pomona, CA: Polytechnic State University.

Duran, B., & Walters, K. L. (2004). HIV/AIDS prevention in "Indian country": Current practice, indigenist etiology models, and postcolonial approaches to change. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, *16*(3), 187–201.

Dworkin, A. (1987). *Intercourse*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Earls, R. F., Fraser, J., & Sumpter, B. (1992). Sexuality education—in whose interests? In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Sexuality and the curriculum: The politics and practices of sexuality education* (pp. 300–324). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Elia, J. P. (2005). Sexuality education. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Youth, education, sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (pp. 785–789). London, England: Greenwood Press.

Elia, J. P., & Eliason, M. (2010). Discourses of exclusion: Sexuality education's silencing of sexual others. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *7*(1), 29–48.

Elias, V. L. (2007). *Long-term consequences of abstinence education*. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University.

Feltey, K. M., Ainslie, J. J., & Geib, A. (1991). Sexual coercion attitudes among high school students: The influence of gender and rape education. *Youth & Society*, *23*(2), 229–250.

Fields, J., & Tolman, D. (2006). Risky business: Sexuality education and research in U.S. schools. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy: Journal of NSRC*, *3*(4), 63–76.

Fine, M., & McClelland, S. (2006). Sexuality education and desire: Still missing after all these years. *Harvard Educational Review*, *76*(3), 297–338.

Fonow, M. M., & Marty, D. (1992). Teaching college students about sexuality from feminist perspectives. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Sexuality and the curriculum: The politics and practices of sexuality education* (pp. 157–170). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Forlin, C. (2001). Inclusion: Identifying potential stressors for regular class teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, *43*(3), 235–245.

Forlin, C., Hattie, J., & Douglas, G. (1996). Inclusion: Is it stressful for teachers? *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, *21*(3), 199–217.

Foucault, M. (1976). *The history of sexuality: Volume one, the will to knowledge*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Gay and Lesbian Youth Project. (2009). Celebrating diversity in schools [CD]. Melbourne, Australia: Same Sex Attracted Eastern Action Group.

Girls Incorporated. (2001a). *Growing together: A sexuality education program for girls ages 9–11 and their parents*. Indianapolis, IN: Girls Incorporated National Resource Center.

Girls Incorporated. (2001b). *Will power/won't power: A sexuality education program for girls ages 12–14*. Indianapolis, IN: Girls Incorporated National Resource Center.

Giroux, H. (1993). *Border crossings: Cultural works and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

GLSEN. (2005). *The GLSEN lunchbox 2, revised edition: A comprehensive training program for ending anti-LGBT bias in schools*. New York, NY: Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network.

Goffmann, E. (1963). *Stigma: Some notes on the management of spoiled identity*. London, England: Penguin.

Grant, C. A., & Lei, J. L. (2001). *Global construction of multicultural education: Theories and realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (2002). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Grossman, A. (1997). *Reforming sex: The German movement for birth control and abortion reform, 1920–1950*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Haffner, D. W. (1992). Sexuality education in policy and practice. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Sexuality and the curriculum: The politics and practices of sexuality education* (pp. vii–viii). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Halperin, D. M. (1995). *Saint = Foucault. Towards a gay hagiography*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Halpern-Meekin, S. (2008). *School-based marriage education: An evaluation of Florida's high school relationship education requirement*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting. Retrieved from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p241808_index.html

Halstead, M. J. (1996). Values and values education in schools. In M. J. Halstead & M. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Values in education and education in values*. London, England: The Falmer Press.

Halstead, M. J., & Reiss, M. J. (2003). *Values in sex education: From principles to practice*. London, England: Routledge Falmer.

Harding, J. (1998). *Sex acts: Practices of femininity and masculinity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hardisty, J. (1999). *Mobilizing resentment*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hekman, S. (1999). Identity crises: Identity, identity politics, and beyond. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, *2*(1), 3–26.

Hoff Sommers, C. (2008). *The war against boys: How misguided feminism is harming our young men*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Holley, L. C., & Steiner, S. (2005). Safe space: Student perspectives on classroom environment. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *41*(1), 49–64.

Howard, M., & Mitchell, M. E. (2003). *Managing pressures before marriage*. Atlanta, GA: Adolescent Reproductive Health Center Grady Health System.

Howes, E. (1915). *The Cradle Ship*. London, England: Cassell and Company Ltd.

Irvine, J. (2002). *Talk about sex: The battles over sex education in the United States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Jemmott, J. B., Jemmott, L. S., & Fong, G. T. (2010). Efficacy of a theory-based abstinence-only intervention over 24 months: A randomized controlled trial with young adolescents. *ARCH Pediatrics Adolescent Medicine*, *164*(2), 152–159.

Jiménez, K. P. (2009). Queering classrooms, curricula, and care: Stories from those who dare. *Sex Education*, *9*(2), 169–179.

Jones, T. (2007). Framing the framework. In R. Brown, G. Finger, & C. Rushton (Eds.), *Education research: Who needs it?* (pp. 47–70). Teneriffe, Australia: Post Pressed.

Jones, T. (2009). Framing the framework: Discourses in Australia's national values education policy. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, *8*(1), 35–57.

Joseph, P. B., & Elfron, S. (2005). Seven worlds of moral education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *86*(7), 525–534.

Kemmis, S., Cole, P., & & Suggett, D. (1983). *Orientations to curriculum and transition: Towards the socially critical school*. Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Institute of Secondary Education.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. R., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. R., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.

Kirby, D. (2007). *Emerging answers 2007: Research findings on programs to reduce teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases*. Paper presented at the The National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy, November, Washington, DC.

Kirschenbaum, H. (1992). A comprehensive model for values education and moral education. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *73*(10), 771–776.

Kohler, P. (2008). Abstinence-only and comprehensive sex education and the initiation of sexual activity and teen pregnancy. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *42*(4), 344–351.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and anti-oppressive pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Laumann, E. O., & Gagnon, J. H. (1995). A sociological perspective on sexual action. In R. G. Parker & J. H. Gagnon (Eds.), *Conceiving sexuality: Approaches to sex research in a postmodern world* (pp. 183–213). New York, NY: Routledge.

Laws, J. L. (1980). Female sexuality through the life span. In P. B. Baltes & G. Brim (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior* (Vol. 3, pp. 207–252). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Leitch, V., Cain, W., Finke, L., Johnson, B., McGowan, J., & Williams, J. (2001). *The Norton anthology of theory and criticism*. New York, NY: Norton.

Lennerhed, L. (2009). Taking the middle way: Sex education debates in Sweden in the early twentieth century. In L. D. H. Sauerteig & R. Davidson (Eds.), *Shaping sexual knowledge: A cultural history of sex education in twentieth century Europe* (pp. 19–36). London, England, and New York, NY: Routledge.

Lichenstein, B. (2000). Virginity discourse in the AIDS era: A case analysis of sexual initiation aftershock. *NWSA Journal, 12*(2), 52–69.

Lipkin, A. (1994). The case for a gay and lesbian curriculum. *High School Journal, 77*(1), 95–107.

Livingstone Smith, D. (1999). *Approaching psychoanalysis*. London, England: Karnac Books.

Lunt, N., & Thornton, P. (1994). Disability and employment: Towards an understanding of discourse and policy. *Disability & Society, 9*(2), 223–238.

Macciocchi, M.-A. (1979). Female sexuality in fascist ideology. *Feminist Review, 1*(1), 67–82.

Macgillivray, I., & Jennings, T. (2008). A content analysis exploring lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender topics in foundations of education textbooks. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(2), 170–188.

Magrab, P. (2003). *UNESCO open file on inclusive education: Support materials for managers and administrators*. Paris, France: UNESCO.

Marcuse, H. (1966). *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Markman, H. J., & Halford, W. K. (2005). International perspectives on couple relationship education. *Family Process, 44*(2), 139–146.

Martin, J. R. (1992). *The schoolhome: Rethinking schools for changing families*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Martin, M. H. (2004). "No one will ever know your secret!" Commercial puberty pamphlets for girls from the 1940s to the 1990s. In C. Nelson & M. H. Martin (Eds.), *Sexual pedagogies: Sex education in Britain, Australia, and America, 1879–2000* (pp. 135–154). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Masters, W. H., & Johnson, V. E. (1966). *Human sexual response*. Boston, MA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins Publishers.

Masters, W. H., & Johnson, V. E. (1970). *Human sexual inadequacy*. Boston, MA: Bantam Books.

Mayo, C. (2005). Multicultural education. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Youth, education and sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (pp. 561–565). London, England: Greenwood Press.

McLaren, P. (1992). Border anxiety and sexuality politics. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Sexuality and the curriculum: The politics and practices of sexuality education* (pp. ix–xiv). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

McWhirter, J. J., McWhirter, B. T., McWhirter, A. M., & McWhirter, E. H. (1998). *At-risk youth: A comprehensive response*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brookes/Cole.

Mikulics, M. (1998). *A systematic classification of approaches in values/ethics/moral/ character education*. San Diego, CA: United States International University.

Mikulsky, M. J. (2005). *Investigating the relationship between "school climate," school-related outcomes and academic self-concept for Australian, secondary school-aged same-sex attracted youth (SSAY)*. Sydney, Australia: University of Sydney.

Molnar, B. E. (1997). Juveniles and psychiatric institutionalization: Toward better due process and treatment review in the United States. *Health and Human Rights*, *2*, 98–116.

Moran, J. P. (2000). *Teaching sex: The shaping of adolescence in the 20th century*. London, England: Harvard University Press.

Morton, D., & Zavarzadeh, M. (1991). Theory pedagogy politics: The crisis of "the subject" in the humanities. In D. Morton & M. Zavarzadeh (Eds.), *Theory/pedagogy/politics: Texts for change* (pp. 1–32). Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Northern Territory Government. (1998). *Principles for dealing with controversial issues in schools*. Retrieved from http://www.det.nt.gov.au/corporate/policies/ schools_policy_handbook.shtml

NSW Government. (1983). *Controversial issues in schools*. Retrieved from www.det. nsw.edu.au/policies/curriculum/schools/cont_issue/PD20020045.shtml

O'Malleya, M., Hoyt, M., & Slattery, P. (2009). Teaching gender and sexuality diversity in foundations of education courses in the United States. *Teaching Education*, *20*(1), 95–110.

OECD. (2003). *Diversity, inclusion and equity: Insights from special needs provision*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2008). *Office of the high commissioner for human rights 2008 report activities and results*. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations.

OpenCongress. (Ed.). (2010). *H.R.2262—safe schools improvement act of 2009*. New York, NY: Participatory Politics Foundation.

Patton, C. (1996). *Fatal advice: How safe-sex went wrong*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Paulsen, M. (1999). Deconstructing hegemonic masculinity: An approach for high school students. *Youth Studies Australia*, *18*(3), 12–17.

Paulson, S. (2001). *We are all related: Relationships in perspective—a guide for Native American youth*. Bismarck, ND: Native American Training Institute.

Pearce, S. (2004). Molding the man: Sex-education manuals for Australian boys in the 1950s. In C. Nelson & M. H. Martin (Eds.), *Sexual pedagogies: Sex education in Britain, Australia, and America, 1879–2000* (pp. 73–95). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pearson, M. (2007). *Relationship smarts PLUS*. Berkeley, CA: The Dibble Institute for Marriage Education.

Pemberton, L. (1948). *The stork didn't bring you. Sex education for teenagers* (14th ed.). New York, NY: Thomas Nelson & Sons.

Piaget, J. (1969). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. New York, NY: Viking.

Pinar, W. F. (2005). Queer and queer theory. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Youth, education, and sexualities: An international encyclopedia* (pp. 673–675). London, England: Greenwood Press.

Public Health Agency of Canada. (2008). *Canadian guidelines for sexual health education*. Ottawa, Ontario: Infectious Disease and Emergency Preparedness Branch, Public Health Agency of Canada.

Rabinbach, A. G. (1973). The politicization of Wilhelm Reich: An introduction to "the sexual misery of the working masses and the difficulties of sexual reform." *New German Critique*, *1*, 90–97.

Reich, W. (1931). *Internationale Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse*. Wien: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.

Reich, W. (1945). *Character-analysis: Principles and technique for psychoanalysts in practice and in training*. New York, NY: Orgone Institute Press.

Reich, W. (1971). *The invasion of compulsory sex-morality*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Reich, W. (1972). *Sex-pol: Essays, 1929–1934*. New York, NY: Random House.

Robinson, K. H. (2002). Making the invisible visible: Gay and lesbian issues in early childhood education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, *3*(2), 415–434.

Robinson, K. H. (2005). "QUEERYING" GENDER: Heteronormativity in early childhood education. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, *30*(2), 19–28.

Sauerteig, L. D. H., & Davidson, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Shaping sexual knowledge: A cultural history of sex education in twentieth century Europe*. London, England, and New York, NY: Routledge.

Sayce, L. (1998). Stigma, discrimination and social exclusion: What's in a word? *Journal of Mental Health*, *7*(4), 331–343.

Shornack, L. L., & Shornack, E. M. (1982). The new sex education and the sexual revolution: A critical view. *Family Relations*, *31*(4), 531–544.

Shryock, H. (1951a). *On becoming a man. A book for teenage boys*. Warburton, MA: Signs Publishing Company.

Shryock, H. (1951b). *On Becoming a Woman. A Book for Teen-age Girls*. Warburton, Australia: Signs Publishing Company.

SIECUS. (2005). *Guidelines for comprehensive sexuality education, kindergarten–12th grade* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS).

SIECUS. (2008). History. Available from http://www.siecus.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.viewPage&pageId=493&parentID=472

Song, E. Y., Pruitt, B. E., McNamara, J., & Colwell, B. (2000). A meta-analysis examining effects of school sexuality education programs on adolescents' sexual knowledge, 1960–1997. *Journal of School Health*, *70*(10), 413–416.

Spivak, G. (1990). *The postcolonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogue*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Strange, V., Forrest, S., Oakley, A., & Stephenson, J. (2006). Sex and relationship education for 13–16 year olds: Evidence from England. *Sex Education*, *6*(1), 31–46.

Swain, S., Warne, E., & Hillel, M. (2004). Ignorance is not innocence: Sex education in Australia, 1890–1939. In C. Nelson & M. Martin (Eds.), *Sexual pedagogies: Sex education in Britain, Australia, and America, 1879–2000* (pp. 33–52). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Talburt, S., & Steinberg, S. (2000). *Thinking queer: Sexuality, culture and education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Tuttle, L. (1986). *Encyclopedia of feminism*. London, England: Arrow Books.

UNESCO. (2009). *International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence-informed approach for schools, teachers and health educators. (Vol. 1)*. Paris, France: UNESCO Section on HIV and AIDS, Division for the Coordination of UN Priorities in Education, Education Sector.

Ussher, J. M. (1994). Theorizing female sexuality: Social constructionist and post-structuralist accounts. In P. Choi & P. Nicolson (Eds.), *Female sexuality* (pp. 100–124). New York, NY: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.

VIC Government. (2006). *Safe schools are effective schools: A resource for developing safe and supportive school environments*. Retrieved from http://www.education.vic.gov.au/healthwellbeing/safety/bullying/default.htm

Victorian Department of Human Services. (2003). *The family and reproductive rights education program (FARREP)*. Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Department of Human Services.

Vojak, C. (2006). *Examining children's interests in light of parent-centered trends in education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental process*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wanlass, R. L., Kiimann, P. R., Beila, B. S., & Tarnowski, K. J. (1983). Effects of sex education on sexual guilt, anxiety, and attitudes: A comparison of instruction formats. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 12*(6), 487–502.

Woolfolk, A. (2005). *Educational psychology: Active learning edition* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.