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ABSTRACT

There have been profound changes within German culture and society in recent decades including the social reality and legal equality of same-sex couples and parents and an increased visibility of non-heterosexual individuals. Through my many years of formal education and as a teacher of English as a Second or Other language (TESOL) in Germany, I have not seen this reality represented in TESOL education in target language samples, textbooks, images or critical discussions. The aim of this thesis was to explore whether teachers and students on a TESOL language teacher education (LTE) programme at a Bavarian university are aware of issues of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity on their programme and in their classrooms. This fits well with the many other studies carried out internationally in this field over the past few years but looks specifically at a politically and culturally homogeneous part of Germany. By adopting a feminist poststructuralist and queer-theoretical approach to create, deliver and reflect on a course geared specifically towards troubling the silence and exclusion of sexual diversity in (language) teacher education, it investigates if and in what ways social change has manifested itself in a Bavarian LTE programme. Through the use of multiple data collection methods, a background questionnaire to situate the students in this Bavarian context, interviews with non-heterosexual staff and students, a troubling course-construction, delivery and recording, a researcher reflective journal, and participant exit interviews and reflective written assessments, this case study examines staff and students’ experiences of and attitudes towards heteronormativity in LTE and que(e)ries the potential for change. The findings reveal that there is initially little conscious awareness of the pervasiveness of heteronormative discourses in LTE TESOL classrooms or in language use, but that through que(e)rying materials, critical dialogue, reflection in interviews and classes, practice and active explicit analysis of taken-for-granted exclusions and silences, a heightened and critical awareness can be achieved.
It is not our differences that divide us. It is our inability to recognize, accept, and celebrate those differences.

Audre Lorde, *Our Dead Behind Us: Poems*
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1. Silences & Empty Spaces

The inspiration to undertake this research project has grown out of over 25 years of teaching students on initial Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Language Teacher Education (LTE) and in-service teachers' further education programmes as well as my own perception of having been excluded and silenced throughout my school and university education, including the programme leading to this thesis. I have often discovered that I have had to veer away from the given syllabus in order to include issues of diversity in language and culture. I have found that silences still abound, most particularly with respect to gender and sexual diversity although also class and race, despite the fact that my student body has often been highly diversified. This silencing of diversity issues is a central aspect of discriminatory practices that are often entrenched in curricula, teaching methods and materials. I am aware that the very notion of diversity in itself suggests there is sameness from which to be diverse. Airton (2009a) argues that in order to understand a term such as in ethnically diverse, a previous understanding of ethnicity is needed. With respect to cultural or sexual diversity, this means an understanding of culture, sexuality or sexual identity as defined and, arguably, fixed categories, which in turn creates a tension in a queer theoretical approach. It is nevertheless useful as a starting point in the process of que(e)rying categories per se, a linguistic shift away from binary discourses such as homosexual/heterosexual, normal/deviant in order to trouble and dismantle “the monolithic and unimpeachable” (Hill 2004: 87). I believe this is apposite in this particularly homogeneous society.
I wanted to explore in what ways students and staff understood discrimination and to what extent it was an issue that they thought they should address in their initial LTE. I wanted to design and teach a model course to address the issues and to try and raise awareness of them as intrinsic parts of a teacher’s remit in the TESOL classroom, not separate from their other LTE subjects, as "developing awareness is a process of reducing the discrepancy between what we do and what we think we do"(Knezedivc 2001: 10). I wanted to have class time to focus on difficult and controversial issues and for the students to question what they take for granted as normal/natural, as well as to investigate ways of creating inclusive lessons that would be just to all their future students. As Lewis & Simon (1996) point out, "learning how to listen, how to hear, how to see, and how to watch is a precondition to becoming fully aware" (cited in Leistyna et al. 1996: 269), a process which I hoped to set in motion.

As a linguist and experienced TESOL teacher/educator, I thought it would be most effective to begin the process exploration by looking in detail at language use and issues of discrimination in general. I had worked as an educator predominantly in initial teacher training in TESOL in Bavaria for 4 years and I had noticed that responses to my research on heteronormativity often received glazed, uncomprehending looks, similar to the trivialising of women's writing almost a century ago when Virginia Woolf expected and experienced ridicule as a response to her writing in *A Room of One’s Own* (1929), symptomatic of a more powerful construct of power discourses. Atkinson (2004: 58) speaks of the way in which investigating sexuality in education is often considered "frivolous" and "unimportant". My impression from classroom discussions was that Bavaria still seemed to consider sexuality and sexual identity to be absent from education (Epstein & Johnson 1998) and that such issues belonged within subjects such as religious studies or biology, as other, more general educational goals are considered a priority. What is missing in this approach, however, is that sexuality, sexual identity and sexual diversity are everywhere, at once all encompassing and yet systematically silenced. It seems to me that like the Emperor’s new clothes,
queering the privilege of heteronormative discourse can reveal what has hitherto been silenced and made invisible.

At a recent conference, I attended a lecture by someone whose sex/gender I could not determine. After the conference, a group of speakers including myself and this person went out eat together. I still could not say whether I was sitting across from a woman or a man or a transgendered person. I was absolutely fascinated at the innumerable points in the conversation in which I thought I would be able to categorise them, but nothing that was discussed pointed definitively to one sex or the other. At the end of the evening, I was no more the wiser than at the beginning. This encounter set a seed growing in my mind that it was clearly possible to interact with someone without knowing their sex/gender identification. It was in fact irrelevant to our delightful dinner conversation either on a professional or a personal level. It seemed to me that this would be a desirable goal in our TESOL classroom. If individual students were to be viewed as individuals with a variety of sexualities or gender identifications, heteronormative materials would lose their prescriptive weight and other materials which created inclusive worlds would be the status quo. The complexity of the issues render this somewhat a utopian vision, but I believe that que(e)rying the status quo in a LTE module by focussing on language use, imagery and omissions of otherness and, through discussion, raise awareness of the fluidity of identities and sex/gender categorisations, I might at least prompt critical reflection and by doing so, trouble heteronormative discourse and usurp absolute faith in the status quo. As a pragmatist pedagogue, I also aim to find confluences between theory and practice.

This investigation is a case study of one LTE programme in Bavaria but may contribute insights into LTE in Bavaria in general, but also LTE in general and especially the potential to extrapolate to other such homogeneous and/or conservative contexts. The LTE programme of the university in this project has the declared purpose to educate. Young people are being prepared to go out into schools and teach the next generations of children. Such preparation has a social and moral obligation as a university LTE programme to offer these students as
much preparation as possible to deal with the variety of issues they will confront at school. This includes not only subject matter but also the dynamics of the classroom and the social challenges of the individuals who will be their pupils. Those individuals may include young people who do not conform to expected norms but who need, nevertheless, to be treated equally and justly according to the remit of school and dictated by the German Constitution (cf. Article 3 stipulates that “All humans are equal before the law”) This means addressing issues such as gender and sexual diversity and raising awareness of heteronormativity in materials and teachers’ and students’ behaviours. It seems to me that a change in perspective could explode the myth that sexuality does not exist at school (Francis & Skelton 2001; Ferfolja 2007, 2008) and give voice to diversity in sexual orientation. Airton suggests the term anti-homophobia teacher education (AHTE) to address the question:

How can we separate working with future teachers to make visible the contingencies of subjectivity to make school cultures more open to the contingencies of otherness? (2009b: 131)

It is an approach already implemented by Jennifer Bryan’s Team Finch in the USA. She goes into schools and works with staff, parents and pupils to “provide dynamic opportunities for learning about Gender and Sexuality Diversity” (Team Finch: Our Approach) with very practical, hands-on teaching on how to understand and respond in real everyday school terms, especially by means of questioning status-quo assumptions about sex/gender characteristics, attitudes towards them and stereotypes.

Since the pre-service teachers in our courses will also be part of a school community, I also see it as part of LTE educators’ responsibility to remind them that they too have a right to be treated justly no matter what. If they themselves do not conform to the status quo with respect to sexual orientation, they also need to be assisted and mentored in strategies to deal with difficult or exclusionary staffroom dynamics. Those who do identify as heterosexual need to be aware of their responsibility in the staffroom in order to foster social justice for other staff members. Teachers are servants of the state, in many cases civil servants, and are
obliged to follow the constitution, whether they agree with it or not. As such, tolerance and respect for others should be present in their behaviour as professionals towards their pupils but also their colleagues (cf. Regulations for Teachers/Civil Servants) and this also means not prioritising any one value system.

2. My Position as Researcher

As a member of a community of others, as a woman, a not-heterosexual subject and as an artist, I have acquired many non-conformist ways of seeing. I intended to bring these perspectives, including that of a novice researcher, to this project to contribute to discourses exploding the myth of the necessity of heterosexist conformity in education. In an attempt to begin to address the difficult and highly complex issues that this lofty goal entails, I wanted to investigate students’ attitudes towards their future responsibilities as future English teachers, the experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, Transgendered and Intersexed (LGBQTI) students and staff on an LTE programme and integrate these findings in the design of a course specifically addressing gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity as social justice issues. The aims of the course are to query the status quo of gender understandings, raise awareness of diverse sexualities that may exist in the classroom and find ways of being inclusive of these in both materials and behaviours, as well as investigating heteronormative processes in the classroom.

The students will become teachers of English and as such need to learn the vocabulary and expressions necessary to foster equality and be inclusive in language terms. Additionally, teaching English also means teaching the culture(s) of English-speaking nations. This also requires the ability to teach in non-discriminatory ways. In the English LTE programme in this research site, there are no seminars on offer with these issues in their title. Silence is a noun meaning 'devoid of sound'; to silence, a verb meaning 'to cause to become silent; prohibit or prevent from speaking' and to keep silent, a phrase meaning 'to be secretive, uncommunicating'. These three terms illustrate the way in which issues of sexual
diversity are variously not addressed in this LTE programme. It has been well documented in the literature (Ferfolja 2008; Nelson 2009; Atkinson 2004; Vandrick 2001; DePalma & Atkinson 2006; Epstein et al. 2000 amongst others) that there is silencing in education where issues of sexual diversity or the reality of LGBQTI lives are concerned, whereby even the term LGBQTI excludes somebody (Airton 2009a). I use the acronym here as an aide-memoire of the ways of seeing “persons with either fluid or distinct self-identities around sexual orientation and gender” (Hill 2004:85). Non-visibility is a further aspect of the exclusion of LGBQTI realities in education in general and LTE in particular. Images in the classroom, in the university and in the curriculum design are absent from the LTE programme in this case study. It has been argued that seeing diversity is a key step to recognising discrimination (Eisen & Hall 1996; Nelson 2009). Textbooks now integrate multicultural imagery as a matter of course (e.g. textbooks such as Go Ahead 10 or specifically the standard Bavarian textbook Learning English, Green Line, Ausgabe für Bayern) and have multicultural imagery throughout. I would suggest that having a similar widespread visibility of sexual plurality would constitute a first step towards promoting more awareness of diversity.

I have chosen the title of this research project carefully. Initially the title read 'addressing' gender etc., however, as the project continued, it became clear that this was too neutral a term to describe the upheavals I experienced while carrying out the research. Since Judith Butler’s text Gender Trouble, I am aware that 'trouble' is used widely in the literature on gender, identity and sexuality issues. In the first instance, I use troubling to mean 'worry about' as it is worrisome to me that there is such deafening silence surrounding these issues in the university LTE programme I investigated. But these are also troubling issues per se, in that they do not have straightforward, singular interpretations. The second meaning is to 'disrupt', 'play havoc with' or 'throw into disarray'. By this, I mean to disturb the foundations of the status quo, the norms underlying educators’ and learners’ assumptions. I hope to create a disturbance, albeit a minor one, as Apple (1999) suggests, an "interruption of common sense" and a "destabilization of authoritative discourse" as a means of implementing change.
2.1 Rationale

In August 2001, the German parliament passed a law legalising civil partnerships. This means 2001, at the very latest, marked a turning point for the visibility of families with LGBQTI parents or children. German federal education policies explicitly state that the promotion of democracy, tolerance and equality are paramount as goals of education according to *The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany* (2009). Germany is also a signatory to the Amsterdam Treaty of May 1999, Article 13 of which promotes "appropriate action to combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation" (EC: The Treaty of Amsterdam 1999). Having taught on a number of German LTE programmes in the subject English, I have noticed that sexual diversity was absent as an aspect of inclusive teaching. There is, however, significant focus placed on dealing with intercultural communicative competence (Byram 1997) and ethnicities as means to foster equality in increasingly culturally heterogeneous classrooms. The Ministry of Education responsible for Bavaria (ISB, State Institute for Ensuring Quality in Education), where this research takes place, has quite clear and explicit guidelines on the need to be non-discriminatory with regard to sex, race, sexual orientation, gender and class as can be seen in the longterm commitment to the UNESCO study ‘*Learning with an open mind in a global network*’ (ISB UNESCO project). This led me to wonder why this area was not addressed in the university LTE programme.

English is a compulsory subject in German schools beginning in primary school and running through all levels of secondary school. Teaching English is not simply teaching a language but also new culture/s and ways of expressing identity and life situations in new linguistic form (Lin 1999). The so-called global village often uses English as a lingua franca and as such the most diverse range of expression must be taught to ensure individuals can express their cultural and sexual identity, their "ways of being" (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1995) in linguistic form. Despite great changes having been introduced into LTE programmes in German universities, such as the inclusion of cultural diversity and multiple heritages, an awareness of
the heterogeneity of both future teachers and their students with respect to sexual plurality or heteronormativity is rarely addressed explicitly. For this reason, it seems to me that there is a continuing need to address this exclusiveness by explicitly focussing on how this silencing functions and what critical strategies might be employed to make the classroom more just (Ferfolja 2007).

2.2 Significance

An interdisciplinary study such as this can offer insights into the web of structures and discourses that systematically perpetuate discrimination and exclusion in classrooms. In education, the issue of knowledge production and reproduction, the process of coming to know about the world and the culture one lives in cannot be reversed into a process of not knowing. If a child learns to read, in time, they cannot unlearn being able to read. Similarly, if a child learns that "that which is different, strange and other still has a place and can be taken seriously" (Osberg & Biesta 2010: 605), they can no longer unlearn the knowledge of differentiation. In Germany, everyone goes to school (homeschooling is not permitted), everyone has to learn English. Discourse means language, and teaching language means representing culture through target language samples (TLS). It follows that teaching teachers to teach language means making choices about what to teach in terms of TLS, cultural topics and imagery. The more complex and expansive the discourse becomes, the more natural and normative it becomes (Ibid).

German school norms have developed over centuries. For example, it is taken for granted that school begins around 8 a.m. and ends between 1 and 2 p.m. It is taken for granted that many Bavarian classrooms have a crucifix hanging on the wall (Koch 2009; Langenfeld, 2001). It is taken for granted that in secondary schools, pupils stay in one room and the teachers move from class to class and come to them. These structures are rarely questioned although contemporary lifestyles and economics are becoming increasingly affected by them. Economically, it is difficult to care for children when they finish school in the early afternoon. Few parents, single or not, have the means to be at home to supervise their children as economic necessity means that they need to work fulltime. These
norms might benefit from a general change in discourse in education, which privileges a more fluid stance than one that is taken for granted.

What is not known or hidden, and what is secret or deviant is also taken for granted and plays as important a role as what is publicly voiced, for example, in the classroom. As noted above, uncritical, unreflective approaches can have a far-reaching effect:

Traditional ways of dealing with issues of language, culture, and education tend to reproduce dominant cultural, linguistic, and educational notions and practices as neutral and unproblematic and, in this way, conceal relations of domination and subordination in the schooling system and the pedagogy of language teaching. (Lin 2004: 272)

Herein lies the transformational power of queering that which is usually taken as given. This is especially pertinent when looking at genderism:

an ideology that reinforces the negative evaluation of gender non-conformity or an incongruence between sex and gender. It is a cultural belief that perpetuates negative judgements of people who do not present as a stereotypical man or woman. Those who are genderist believe that people who do not conform to sociocultural expectations of gender are pathological. Similar to heterosexism, we propose that genderism is both a source of social oppression and psychological shame, such that it can be imposed on a person, but also that a person may internalize these beliefs. (Hill & Willoughby cited in Airton 2009a: 230)

With the many social changes in contemporary German society in the post-wall era, including federal law giving same-sex couples the right to marry, education needs to keep up with these real-life developments. The knowledge base of teacher education in Germany has indeed been undergoing substantial change over the past decade with an increase in focus on socio-cultural contexts (Johnson 2000, Troudi 2005). Issues of gender, heteronormativity and inclusiveness (Kluth & Colleary 2002) may now appear in course content, but they may not be scrutinised critically. I believe support of critically reflective practices (Wallace 1991) in language teaching and LTE needs to begin in initial teacher education at university. Thus the core research question in this research project is to explore if and how criticality can be promoted in LTE in a university course.
Gender bias in language teaching has clearly shown that language choices, such as a pseudo-generic *he*, influence the way we organise and think about our world. For example, speaking of doctors, astronauts, pilots etc. only with the pronoun referent *he* perpetuates a sense that these professions are only open to males (Mackay & Fulkerson 1979; Khosroshahi 1989; Sunderland 1994; Tannen 1996). Equally, heteronormativity in cultural target language samples (Skelton & Francis 2009; Nelson 1993) and exclusiveness in language and culture with respect to all kinds of Other (Slee 2001; Stromquist & Fishman 2009; Badger & MacDonald 2007) perpetuate a sense of *normalcy/naturalness* to these aspects of the socio-cultural context that teachers need to be aware of. I am convinced that education is the key to creating a better society, which can view individuals as differentiated subjects with fluid and shifting identities (Braidotti 1994; Butler 2004) and criticality can combat intolerance, bigotry and discrimination with knowledge being flexible and open to change (Paechter & Clark 2010).

3. Research Aims and Questions

3.1 Overarching Questions

- To what extent are respondents aware of heteronormative processes in Language Teacher Education?
- In what ways do participants see gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity?
- What experiences do not-heterosexual students and staff have?
- How might course content and structure contribute to raising awareness of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity as social justice issues?
- In what ways can such a course raise critical awareness and what limitations might arise?
3.2 Detailed Research Questions

1. Are the students who will be future English teachers aware of the issues of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity and do they want to deal with them as part of their degree course? [questionnaire]
   1.1 Are the students a homogeneous group with respect to cultural background and language?
   1.2 Are the students aware of bullying issues?
   1.3 Do students differentiate between discrimination for reasons of sexual orientation and other reasons?
   1.4 Have students experienced discrimination themselves or with others?

2. What are the specific experiences of LGBQTI students and teachers on this programme? [interviews]
   2.1 What experiences have LGBQTI students had as pre-service teachers?
   2.2 What experiences have LGBQTI teachers had teaching on the programme?
   2.3 What aspects of their programme would LGBQTI students wish to change?
   2.4 To what extent do LGBQTI students and teachers think it necessary to integrate sexual diversity as an issue to be discussed critically and learned about in their LTE programme?
   2.5 In what ways might this be carried out and what kinds of problems do they anticipate?

3. What are the classroom realities of addressing inclusiveness in these areas with respect to structure, preparation, content, delivery, student responses and evaluation? [class construction and delivery in a 15-week semester]
   3.1 In what ways can gender issues be addressed in class?
   3.2 In what ways can critical awareness of sexual diversity be promoted in class?
   3.3 In what ways can heteronormativity in materials be altered to be more just?
3.4 What skills/strategies/knowledge do pre-service teachers need to deal with these issues in their future classrooms?

4. In what ways would students attending such a class gain a greater critical awareness of the issues? [Class analysis through a reflective journal, reflective essays, exit interviews]

4.1 What kinds of problems are students aware of as inherent in exclusive language?

4.2 What kinds of problems are students aware of with imagery?

4.3 What kinds of critical strategies have students learned to deal with heteronormative materials and structures in the classroom?

4.4 In what ways do students feel able to integrate sexual diversity issues in their own classes?

4.5 In what ways do students feel they have gained a heightened critical awareness of sexual diversity as a social justice issue?

4. Definition of Terms

There are 6 terms which are key to this study: inclusiveness, gender, sexuality, sexual identity, sexual diversity and heteronormativity.

- **Inclusiveness** is still widely understood to apply to the integration of differently-abled individuals into mainstream classrooms (cf. the German government’s definition: [http://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/analysen/2012/Inklusive_Bildung.pdf](http://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/analysen/2012/Inklusive_Bildung.pdf)).

In this definition, there is explicit reference to including "all" pupils. I use this term to mean "not excluding any section of society or any party involved in something" (The New Oxford Dictionary of English). This means also including individuals with diverse sexualities, sexual orientations and lifestyle preferences, the latter referring to choices made irrespective of assigned sex/gender or sexual orientation. It also includes non-gender-conforming individuals (Cullen & Sandy 2009).
Gender is a term which expresses the contrast of the constructed with the biologically assigned sex. De Lauretis describes gender not only as the "representation of a relation" but also as constructing "a relation between one entity and another [...] and that relation is one of belonging" (1987: 4) This representation of a relation simultaneously constituting and constructing is echoed in Butler's (1990) theory of gender as performance, of "doing" rather than "being", and is crucial in deconstructing contemporary understandings of gender to reveal its social construction. The pairing of biological sex male/female with gender binaries masculine/feminine is restrictive in that gender can always only be "the forcible approximation of a norm one never chooses, a norm that chooses us" (Butler 1993: 126), which is also true of the meanings assigned to the category of sex.

Sexuality I understand this term to refer to an individual's desires and sexual practices, which are open to change, but are also impacted upon by social discourses condoning, regulating or judging those individual desires and practices. I do not see sexuality as being necessarily bound to any physical attributes or socially assigned sex/gender meanings.

Sexual Identity I understand this term to refer to an identification or sense of belonging to a particular group or groups who share specific objects of desire and sexual practices. Sexual identity may change over time and is also subjected to social discourses and categorisation. This notwithstanding, I believe it is necessary to accept certain definitional fixities temporarily as strategies to enable political and institutional reform (cf. Atkinson 2002b).

Sexual diversity I understand and use the term to refer to the many diverse understandings of the human body and its desires. This can mean lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, transgendered, or intersexed (I use the abbreviation LGBQTI), any mix of these terms, any race, class or heritage. I do not consider this term perfect in that it is contrasted with that which is not diverse, but it is useful as a tactical first step to fracturing binary definitions.

Heteronormativity I use the term following Warner's understanding (1993: xxi) that heteronormativity reflects the normalising processes which support heterosexuality "as the elemental form of human associations, as the very
model of inter-gender relations, as the indivisible basis of all community”. If “[c]olonialism is a practice of domination, which involves the subjugation of one people to another” (Kohn 2010), then one might argue that heteronormativity may also be seen as a form of colonialism in which the heterosexual majority excludes, silences and subjugates that which does not conform to the given norms.

5. Thesis Organisation

Chapter 2 will introduce the context of this case study: the “identifiable boundaries” (Gerring 2006) of LTE in Bavaria, with its specific and distinct sense of identity separate from the other areas of the country. This will be followed by a description of the way the term education is understood in the German context, how education is regulated and the policies that universities are subjected to in their LTE programmes. I will then outline the very specific cultural context of Bavaria and the dominance of Catholicism. Finally, I will present a brief overview of the structure of the LTE programme in Bavaria.

Chapter 3 will offer a review of the literature for this investigation and discuss the theoretical approach to the project and outline my ontological, epistemological and axiological approach. These will illustrate the ways in which criticality, reflection, feminist poststructuralism and queer theory can provide insights into understanding the interwovenness of gender identities, sexual plurality and heteronormativity as basis from which to create content which can be more inclusive of diversity and trouble heteronormativity. I will outline the difficulties which have been gleaned from other such investigations and why there is a need to continue to expand research in this area.

Chapter 4 will present the research methodology and how the project was designed. It will give a detailed description of the 4 phases of this case study and outline the multiple methods used to collect data including a questionnaire, interviews, course preparation, content and delivery,
recordings, evaluation, reflection and essays. I will address issues of validity and reliability, the data analysis process as well as ethical concerns.

Chapter 5 offers an analysis of the data in 5 sections and explicitly answers the research questions. This includes 3 key findings from the analysis of the questionnaire and a thematical analysis of the 3 sets of interviews reflecting specific critical incidents. The classroom recordings will be coded thematically according to key moments in classroom discussions relating to the process of raising awareness of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity.

Chapter 6 will extrapolate and discuss the findings and analysis from chapter 5. In 3 sections, I will discuss issues of visibility in discourses pertaining to institutions, knowledge, social and cultural relations and individual subjects. I will discuss the ways in which feminist poststructuralism and queer theory offer an understanding of the ways discourses function on both macro and micro levels and how this serves to perpetuate exclusion of (sexual) diversity in LTE.

Chapter 7 will address the implications of this case study and explore in what ways this research has contributed to offering a voice to trouble the silences alluded to in chapter 1. It concludes with the implications of this case study for my own practice and for the class of LTE in Bavaria in terms of language use in curriculum and policy, text books and materials, education in general and impetus for change. It suggests an outlook at possible future research studies in this field.
CHAPTER 2

Context of the Study

This study took place in the very particular setting of LTE in the southern German state of Bavaria over 1 university semester. In order to procure a “thick description” (Nisbet & Watt cited in Cohen et. al. 2007: 256) which is rich, vivid and holistic, it is crucial to see where and when the case is situated. Since Germany is often thought of as the home of great philosophers and thinkers such as Marx, Arendt, Hegel or Einstein, understanding the German context, its historical development and its place in Europe are similarly crucial to understanding contemporary educational policies. In addition, it is very much in keeping with the case study approach to seek an in-depth understanding of the “richness of the phenomena” being studied (Yin 2009: 2). I will focus on four aspects to illustrate in detail the background culture of this study: first, the meaning of the term used for education, second, the major changes affecting education, third, the role of Catholicism and fourth, how language teacher education is organised in Bavaria.

1. Bildung – What should be taught, what should be known?

The German term Bildung is a noun commonly translated into English as education but in fact it subsumes a number of different meanings. Within the word Bildung, there lie the root meanings create, construct, build up, and form. The term is used and understood to mean educate, raise, inform but also incorporates nurture, decorum, care and breadth and depth of knowledge (Duden 1989). Bildung then encompasses all of these elements and is first used formally in the German education sector by Wilhelm von Humboldt (Benner 2003) in 1806. Humboldt may be seen as a liberal and humanist (Minter 1991) whose concept of education was holistic. Influenced by the values of the Enlightenment, he considered education a
process to develop the individual both intellectually and morally, and over which neither government nor economy should have influence.

Humboldt envisages education extending throughout an individual's life. Education would not be limited to the wealthy but would be available to all. The reform of the individual would then bring about the reform of the state by peaceful means. (Stubbs 1977: Abstract)

However, although this is a noble ideological stance, "emancipation does not follow automatically from Enlightenment" (Grundy 1987: 112). The curriculum functions as the state-wide institutional regulation of what knowledge is taught. And although Humboldt spoke of 'individuals' as though this were a neutral term, it echoes the disparity that exists between a formal curriculum and the hidden curriculum, which is covertly gendered, privileging of males, and exclusive of sexual diversity, as has been widely addressed by feminist scholars (Skelton & Francis 2009; Giroux 1983; Walkerdine & Lucey 1989). The curriculum that is written is not necessarily what happens in class and the knowledge the learners should know is not necessarily what they know, which I will address in more detail in chapter 3. Also, the question of whether learners can then act on their knowledge is affected by the context they are in (Dewey 2010). Nevertheless, Humboldt's ontology of education is still prevalent in Germany today and constitutes the epistemological basis of both school and tertiary institutions (ISB 2010). The curriculum is informed by Humboldtian theory and the unique series of historical, economic and socio-political events that have affected the country over the past century resulting in a praxis ideology: the goal of schooling is "self-determination, participation in society and solidarity" (Blömecke 2006: 320).

Germany used to have a Studium Generale approach to Higher Education dating back to the medieval period. It reflected the desire to learn and to inquire as well as seek breadth in knowledge and meant students could attend any class they wished, simply out of interest and not restricted to specific programmes. In its purest form, it mirrors a process-inquiry model (McKernan 2008: 95) whose curriculum "should specify a worthwhile process of teaching and learning without determining what the outcomes would be." This would mean students of literature
could attend a lecture on brain physiology or PE students could look in on a class on Arabic or Japanese. It still exists in some universities and students are still encouraged to broaden their outlook beyond their own subjects although the historically developed holistic aims of education are being displaced by a social market-economy view of education as product (Grundy 1987).

Teachers in Germany have relatively high incomes and status akin to Civil Servants in Great Britain, making it a highly desirable occupation. They also enjoy absolute job security in that they can only be fired if they commit a criminal act. Blömeke (2006: 316) postulates that Germany has enjoyed long-term stability in the teaching profession as a result of "historical, socio-economical and political" developments. She explains how Germany's strong philosophical tradition, school stratification and varying political interests have meant that regulation has been the remit of individual federal states, preventing centralised control and leaving universities with a high degree of autonomy and academic freedom. This has meant that the universities are completely free to decide what should be taught and how. Officially, ministries in each state set the state exams, giving the appearance of a degree of control over what they consider should be known by teachers and illustrating an outcomes-based approach (McKernan 2008). At the same time, the universities mark the exams and select grades as they see fit, demonstrating their complete autonomy but also one of the challenges of the system. Professors setting a curriculum at one university may view essential knowledge and skills differently from those at another university. This is a key aspect to understanding how LTE is regulated but also why resistance is problematic.

2. Change

The dramatic political, economic and social changes over the last two decades in Germany have had extensive ramifications in the field of education and LTE has also been affected. Politically and economically reunification has been extremely expensive. Unemployment has soared and the solidarity pact means, economically, wealthier states in the west are effectively subsidising the former
east. This has also led to a greater number of political parties and some on the extreme left and right wing have seats in some state parliaments, which also affects attitudes on funding for education. Bavaria has remained relatively unscathed by these upheavals (cf. Bavaria’s middle classes still doing well), maintaining both a political and social hegemony with the same party in government since 1946 (https://www.bayern.landtag.de/de/36.php Retrieved 12.9.2012). This constitutes another aspect of constancy in Bavaria, which strengthens the status quo and reflects the climate in which this study took place.

Nevertheless, streamlining programmes has become an economic necessity in education throughout the country since having students at university for 8-10 years or even longer is no longer affordable. Also, the 1999 Bologna Treaty meant that a certain internationalisation entered Germany's Higher Education institutions despite considerable resistance and warnings about the erosion of academic freedom (McKernan 2008). Increased calls for reducing university degrees to 6 semesters were common. The BA/MA degrees with attending credit points have now been introduced in order to allow easier exchange within the EU and have students in and out of university in 3 years. Teacher education programmes have been pressured into integrating these changes or risk losing federal government funding (Blömeke 2006). The current view of education as a product has added more demands for accountability and has brought about an objectives-based approach. The latter is invariably accompanied by a curriculum that is viewed as fact with a "life of its own" (Young 1989: 23). In turn, pressure to reproduce objectives and guarantee a product to a fee-paying clientele means teachers are disenfranchised from the curriculum as their purpose becomes achieving goals and tangible results, measurable, quantifiable and reproducible (McKernan 2008) and reflected in the emphasis on the results of the Pisa studies (Baumert et al. 2002, Pisa Results 2009 cf. OECD English summary report and also 2003 & 2006 PISA summary of the Länder). The outcome of education then is becoming a technical-rationalised object in which the interplay between curriculum and prior knowledge of the teachers (Golombek 1998), let alone training to develop criticality and foster learner autonomy (Cotterall 1995; Dam 1995; Bandura 1997), have little import. It
is problematic that the Anglophone trend in education brings with it a social market-economy ideology to the curriculum, atypical in Germany. Even the term credit points, which have to be earned, mirrors a countable, almost monetary element to knowledge.

In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. (Freire 2006: 72)

3. Catholicism in Bavaria

Globally, Catholicism is far from being homogeneous; however, it is common knowledge in Germany that Catholicism has very deep roots in the political, social and cultural psyche of Bavaria (Hastings 2010; Lee 1979) and as such is crucial to understanding the context of this case. As alluded to above, change is coming to education and in a homogeneous, conservative culture, this is a challenge.

Catholicism has a long tradition dating back to before the 10th century and Bavaria’s first pope Gregor V in 996 (History of Bavarian Catholicism) with numerous others to follow, most recently former Pope Benedikt. Catholicism is a fundamental part of Bavaria’s political, cultural and social identity (cf. Series of articles on Catholicism in Bavaria) and it is often referred to as a “pious, godfearing land” (süddeutsche.de 12.2.2013, Bayern nach Papst Benedikt {Bavaria after Pope Benedikt}), although in modern Bavaria, cracks are beginning to show and the recent spate of scandals surrounding cases of child abuse in church institutions has been one of the causes (Ibid). Nevertheless, the most recent elections in Bavaria increased the mandate of the Christian Social Union (CSU) party, a party unique to Bavaria, to 47.7% of the vote after a downturn in 2008. In a demographics analysis, 58% of those voting for the CSU stated they were Catholic (süddeutsche.de 16.9.2013). The CSU is highly significant in its influence on political, cultural and social life in Bavaria since it held an absolute majority in the Bavarian government between 1970 and 2008 (CSU History) and has not been out
of power since 1946. The CSU has more than 75% Catholic members according to a new group, the CSK (Christian Social Catholics), initiated by Thomas Goppel (17.5.2010 süddeutsche.de), but sanctioned by party head Klaus Seehofer, to promote Catholic values and discuss issues from a Catholic perspective, as for example, abortion or the right for same sex couples to adopt – a topical issue. Goppel rejects the latter saying same sex couples are people "who want to separate themselves from the normal (emphasis mine) route to family life" (süddeutsche.de 17.5.2010), a clear expression of the underlying exclusive discourse. The fact that a (Catholic) Bavarian politician feels no qualms about making such a comment publicly illustrates the lack of inhibition about voicing homophobic views despite being in a country whose constitution guarantees equality (in Article 3 of the German Constitution), as discussed above. I would argue that these factors: 65 years of government by a political party with a largely Catholic membership, 38 years with an absolute majority, and a largely homogeneous population (according to a Bavarian Census from 9.5.2011, of 12.397.614 inhabitants just over 1 million are not German nationals), has created a very specific form of Bavarian Catholicism. Having the same group in power over such an extended period of time is unique in Bavaria in comparison to the other German states and fundamentally informs the political, social, cultural and educational landscape. Meyer illustrates:

> Historically, schools have been institutions that have filled an important cultural role of teaching children to learn what has been deemed important by the people in power. As a result, children emerge from schools having learned only the language, history, and the perspectives of the dominant culture.  
> (Meyer 2007: 28)

The inescapable effect of Catholicism in education can be exemplified in the Bavarian ordinance that stipulated a crucifix should hang in every state school classroom (Koch 2009), which, inasmuch as Germany is a secular country, can be seen as a reflection of the depth of historically developed influence the Catholic church has there. Catholicism has dogma and doctrine and a belief system which is based on heterosexuality as a norm. It uses of the term sin to refer negatively to behaviours that are unacceptable in this belief system (Portmann 2007; Kliora 2009). Although it is a system, the writings and beliefs it follows are not universally
interpreted or expressed in the same ways (Ibid). This notwithstanding, there are many areas in which the discourses are the same, such as the understanding of the heterosexual family unit as a norm and this has had an influence on educational policy (cf. Analysis of sex education policy in Germany 2003).

In 1995, the obligatory crucifix ordinance above was contested in Germany's highest court - the constitutional court - which ruled that having a crucifix hanging in the classroom did indeed violate the rights of those who did not wish to be subjected to "learning under the cross" (Koch 2009:18). The court ruled that parents' complaints be upheld as displaying a crucifix "was held to be incompatible with article 4 and thus void" (Ibid).

The political reaction in Bavaria to the Constitutional Court's Crucifix decision (when the CSU had an absolute majority in government) was to pass a new law which arguably undermined the Court's ruling (cf. CSU and Catholicism: Krucifix Urteil erzürnt). This law stipulates that crucifixes will generally remain in Bavarian classrooms but that a compromise will be sought in cases where parents object to their presence. The political response of the CSU led government shows how entrenched and prescriptive Catholic norms are in education and exemplifies how dissent and resistance to the status quo are dealt with. Koch goes onto point out that "[a]s a result, on the occasion of the one year anniversary of the Crucifix judgment the crosses had only been removed from the classrooms of six Bavarian schools" (2009: 21); Additionally, Article 131(2) of the Bavarian Constitution itself leaves no doubt about the priority given to religious belief in schools. It reads "The paramount educational goals are reverence for God, respect for religious persuasion and the dignity of man [sic].'' For these reasons, the far-reaching influences of Bavarian Catholic discourses need to be taken into account in research in education in the Bavarian context (cf. again the Analysis of sex education policy in Germany 2003).

The homogeneity that results from both sharing the same religion and cultural heritage can be both advantageous and constrictive at the same time. Looking at
these aspects in general reflects the movement from a wide focus to a particular, narrow focus (Nisbet & Watt 1987), typical of case studies. Here the narrow focus is of one particular LTE programme and its staff and students.

The advantages of a shared cultural identity are clear. Students speak the same language variety, which means they are all aware of what topics may or may not be addressed openly; they are aware of cultural taboos and regulatory practices, which are not visible to outsiders, and they enjoy a high degree of confidence and security in the knowledge that they are part of a well-established dominant group. Within Germany, Bavaria has a reputation for having a strong, united but fiercely independent identity. Internationally, this subculture is often understood, stereotypically, as exemplifying all of Germany: the Dirndl, the Oktoberfest, the litre glass of beer, the Alps, Neuschwanstein Castle, all of which, however, are very much part of Bavarian culture. My experience of working in other states is that, at times, Bavaria is considered ultra-conservative and slightly unworldly. In language terms, the Bavarian dialects are immediately recognisable and sometimes considered unsophisticated and crude outside of the state. Within the state, however, a person not speaking dialect is immediately perceived as an outsider. In many cases, this creates a dynamic that is systematic in ostracising outsiders, which in an ironic Catch 22 scenario means that outsiders may not feel at home and move away (as the participants in this study reported), leaving the homogeneity intact. This homogeneous cultural identity is enhanced by the fact that Bavaria was a kingdom until only as recently as 1918 and consequently still today has a special status within the German federation of states (Freistaat Bayern = ‘free’ state of Bavaria), which means that it has greater political autonomy in some areas including legislation than the other states of Germany. This peculiarly Bavarian attitude and sense of self is also visible in the fact that Bavarians see no need to differentiate precisely in language terms for other Germans but call all non-Bavarian Germans – no matter where they are from – Preussen (= Prussians). The historically-structured and relatively static identity (Holtz & von Dahlerm 2010) in Bavaria and a concentration on separateness can mean that cultural innovation is
problematic, change can be very slow and the taken-for-granted pervasive presence of Catholicism can be suffocating for alternative lifestyles.

The large majority of participants in this study have grown up under the formative influence of an education system influenced by homogeneity in political, social and Bavarian Catholic discourses. With respect to investigating social justice in education in a secular state and taking into account a critical feminist poststructural and queer theoretical understanding of subjects and their sexualities as being in flux, a tension is bound to arise through opposing understandings of those subjects in this specific environment.

4. Language Teacher Education (LTE) in Bavaria

Historically, teachers and teaching have enjoyed a special status and stability in German society (Blömeke 2006) but the Bologna Treaty has meant that Germany’s LTE has had to implement a process of radical change and streamlining away from a more process orientated curriculum to a more product orientated one (Grundy 1987). These changes raise questions about the essence of LTE and if there is sufficient time and space for developing criticality:

- What content/training is being reduced to cater for a shortened degree?
- Who decides how and what LTE students need to know and how and what will be taught? (Freeman & Johnson 1998)

Studying to become a teacher in Germany takes place within the university system and, in contrast to many other countries, can take 7-8 years for secondary school teachers. LTE comprises two phases: first, general university education, regularly finished within 7-9 semesters, followed by a two-year practical training phase. The first phase aims at the "development of language knowledge and language teaching and learning" (Crandall, 2000: 34-35), and the second, teacher training, emphasizes "the development of skills to apply this knowledge in the practice of teaching" (Ibid). Subject knowledge, the methodology of teaching, classroom skills,
and techniques aim at short term, immediate goals, thus can be seen as a 'top-
down' approach (Bailey et al. 2001; Head & Taylor 1997; Richards & Farrell 2005).
It is also the period in which pre-service teachers are immersed in their teaching
context and learn the regulations and practices they are expected to conform to.

With respect to homogeneity, what is problematic is that in order to become a
teacher, one must go to the Gymnasium, however, in Bavaria the Gymnasium has
only a minority of students with migrant backgrounds. For example, there were only
7.2% pupils with a Turkish heritage at Bavarian Gymnasien in 2003/4 but 70.9% of
pupils at the far less academic oriented Hauptschule, which does not prepare for
university education, were from a Turkish background (Haldhuber 2009: 70). This
would suggest there is room for improvement of cultural diversity at the more
academic schools which may then introduce more diversity in teaching.

When choosing which programme to study, prospective English language teachers
have to choose which type of school (cf. Appendix A, also Germany School
system) they would like to teach at and need specific results in their school leaving
exams to be accepted onto a particular programme. In Bavaria, secondary schools
are stratified into a tripartite model (Baumert et. al. 2002: 206) in which the
Hauptschule aims at general education and manual apprenticeships, the
Realschule is geared toward those wishing to go into office jobs, technical skilled
employment or vocational training and the Gymnasium has the aim of preparing
pupils for university education (ISB 2010). English is a basic subject at all of these
schools and for students wishing to enter the programme for Gymnasium to later
become teachers of English, the level of language competence expected is very
high. The separation of pupils from primary schools according to aptitude takes
place at the age of 10. This is, in effect, social engineering and constitutes what
Apple (1990) terms ideological hegemony, which in the Bavarian context, with its
political, social and cultural and educational discourses profoundly influenced by
Catholic mores, is also heteronormative. Because such structures are left
unquestioned, since they have long traditions, and this is the case in Bavaria, they
are in effect engaged in the "continual making and remaking of an effective
dominant culture” (Williams in Apple 1990: 6) and as such are systematically silencing change. This is in line with a modernist theory of education with an intellectual-rationalist perspective (McKernan 2008). It focuses on mastery and dominance of a subject with extensive testing and assessment. Knowledge, as described above, is the product achieved by passing examinations. Bavaria's schools are very much focussed on measureable achievement as seen in the widespread praise of the 2009 Pisa results as alluded to above, where Bavarian candidates were second only to Saxony (Pisa Results 2009). There seems to be a disparity between what is addressed in school and what is happening in wider society. Change is taking place in the society as a whole, as for example the recognition of same-sex partnerships/marriage or more visibility of LGBTQI issues, but these changes are rarely integrated into LTE or school teaching materials. None of the grammar books used at the university in this study had examples of non-heterosexual individuals and the most common school books used in the tripartite system (Greenline & Red Line Ashford et. al. 2001) had no target language samples using non-heterosexual individuals whereas they do include multicultural perspectives (cf. Thomson & Maglioni 2007: LifeLike: Multicultural experiences in the English-speaking world). This research explores this disparity and investigates the ways in which addressing these issues explicitly as part of LTE course content affects future teachers' awareness. By carrying out this piece of research with a group of future English language teachers, involving them in a process of consciousness raising of issues rarely addressed in their curriculum, I would like to question the status quo (Apple 1999) of traditional LTE. Inclusive and critically reflective practices are crucial to ensure e/quality (Robinson & Ferfolja 2008) in contemporary classrooms, which is guaranteed by the German Constitution (Articles 1 & 7) As such, it seems vital that LTE teach the skills and knowledge needed to fulfil this goal.
CHAPTER 3

Literature Review

The exploration of LTE in this research is based on a critical feminist poststructuralist and queer theoretical approach. I focus on addressing gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity in education in general and LTE in particular in an interdisciplinary approach. The review comprises 3 parts, all of which I believe are necessary in providing a holistic view of the forces and processes impacting on the embodied teacher. Part 1 briefly analyses the knowledge bases for LTE including the impact of teacher/educators’ beliefs, how critical theory has been implemented, and how reflective practice has been used to trouble the linguistic status quo in the TESOL classroom. Part 2 will look in detail at critical feminist poststructuralist theories of gender, the teacher/student as embodied subject and gendered individual, and explore how heteronormative processes re/create sociocultural meanings of gendered subjects, how power and knowledge regulate the body of the teacher, and how language plays a central role in these processes. This provides the broad theoretical foundation I believe necessary for my approach and analysis of this case study. Part 3 addresses the roots of queer theory (QT) and shows how critical feminist poststructuralism paired with a queer theoretical approach might be used effectively in LTE and by doing so increase visibility and discourse surrounding the issue of sexual diversity both in initial teacher training and in schools.

1. Part 1 Language Teacher Education in Germany

As outlined in chapter 2, the epistemology, or knowledge base of LTE in Germany is changing from *praxis* to *product* (Grundy 1987) and an outcomes-based approach with a "Tylerian Rationale" whose positivist testing and accountability
approach Slattery (2006) contends has been the mainstay of much curriculum development since 1949. In LTE curriculum design, Roberts (1998: 102) highlights three vital questions:

- What is teaching?
- What do teachers know?
- How do people learn to teach?

1.1 What is teaching?

The question *what is teaching?* can be answered in many ways depending on the context in which the teaching is to take place but must also include the aspect of *what is learning?* Teachers in Bavaria are, historically, responsible for *Bildung* (cf. chapter 2), a holistic concept which incorporates the social aspect of knowledge as well as the practicable content aspect. This is undergoing a shift, however, becoming more in line with viewing the (LTE) teacher as an 'operative' who *delivers* the imposed curriculum rather than an independent professional 'problem solver' (Roberts 1998). This is due partly to the overhaul in degree programme constructs required by the *Bologna Treaty* which mandates transferable assessment criteria.

German universities’ unique freedom to decide what they deem crucial in an LTE programme is losing ground now that these issues of transferability especially within the EU are being prioritised. Nevertheless, with German LTE policy being the remit of the universities themselves, the implementation of the curriculum varies from state to state and university to university. Professors in each department usually dictate what the students in the LTE programme should learn, what content should ideally be covered. However, lecturers have a high degree of autonomy on how they go about teaching the content and how much of the desirable content they cover. In some cases this can lead to discrepancies in students' knowledge. One lecturer may favour reading and writing, another discussion and reflection, a third presentations and critical analyses. To some extent this is based on their own *beliefs* about what teaching and learning are,
which I will address below. Each department then assesses students in their own subjects. Final state examinations are set by a state exams' office on the basis of sample papers submitted by university staff, and students all have to pass the same written exams. Assessment is primarily based on students' content knowledge. Unfortunately, this can also be one of the main flaws in the system. A university professor may choose to disregard new methodologies, theories and research insights because they do not fit in with her/his beliefs. Since the professors have absolute power in their choice of exam topics and are also the assessing examiners, this leaves little choice in students' freedom to explore other areas, de facto regulating what knowledge they are given access to and silencing knowledge that is deemed unimportant. In this context then, teaching can be a variety of different approaches dependent on who has the power to decide.

In my experience, the Bavarian system very much reflects bell hooks' (1994) use of Freire's notion that education has become viewed as a "banking system" whereby knowledge is put in and stored for use later. She says that this does not allow for critical engagement as a dynamic process and disregards both teacher and student as holistic individuals. Considerable problems arise without dialogue and inquiry and

when students are not asked, or are not permitted, to bring their nonschool experiences into the classroom, they are able to insulate themselves, at least to some degree, from the shaping effects of education. (Nelson 2009: 138)

With respect to addressing sensitive LGBQTI issues that might feel uncomfortable to many students (and teachers), this can prove to be an effective avoidance strategy silencing non-conforming identities. Teachers and students whose identities are masked and edited are, in part, going through the motions of education only at the loss of some of the most effective teaching (and learning) which is often associated with the relationship to the teacher.

1.2 What do teachers know?

This aspect of teaching is perhaps the most contentious of the three areas of knowledge because it affects some very intimate aspects of the individual teachers'
identities and beliefs. Designing an LTE programme depends on what the curriculum states teachers need to know. Roberts (1998: 105) says that what teachers know can be seen as a system of knowledge bases:

- Content knowledge
- Curricular knowledge
- Pedagogic content knowledge
- Contextual knowledge
- General pedagogic knowledge
- Process knowledge

Bavarian university LTE addresses all of these areas at various times within various modules. Techniques and skills training can be found in process knowledge and general pedagogic knowledge. The first refers to enabling skills, such as teamwork, which help the teacher's development, the second to classroom management skills (Ibid) and are situated in the Didactics/Educational Science Modules. Content knowledge is, in English (Subject Module), knowledge of the language and how it works and pedagogic content, how to teach the language (Didactics Module). Curricular knowledge (Didactics/Educational Science Modules) pertains to the prescribed state curriculum for a specific school type and contextual knowledge (Educational Science Modules) is the knowledge of the types of learners teachers will encounter and an awareness of their specific social, cultural and economic contexts.

Conformity to the status quo is a high priority in the social context of Bavaria, where change is at times perceived as disruption of age-old tradition. A teachers' union Germany-wide questionnaire, for example, revealed the Bavarian attitude that if no one asked for teacher development classes on sexual diversity themes, then were was no perceived need to offer them (GEW 2002). Attitudes towards inclusiveness, gender, race, social status, the personal sense of identity of the teacher or the students may affect what is taught and how, but it is not explicitly part of the curriculum, which McKernan defines as:
a proposal setting out an educational plan, offering students socially valued knowledge, attitudes, values, skills and abilities, which are made available to students through a variety of educational experiences, at all levels of the education (2008:12)

But it is the term "socially valued knowledge" that is problematic in Bavaria, because, as argued above with university assessment procedures, it may be restrictive rather than open and tolerant, depending on the beliefs of the educators. The prominent status of the Catholic church, the political conservative homogeneity and the strong sense of Bavarian identity all serve to obscure issues associated with difference and plurality (Grumet 1988; Lather 1987; Ellsworth 1992). Thus the inextricability of religious, social, cultural, political and emotional processes which can affect beliefs and attitudes, I would argue, systematically inhibit development of innovation. Pajares (1992) defines beliefs as “existential presumptions” which “are perceived as immutable entities” (309), what one just knows. Nespor (1987) holds that beliefs have stronger “effective and evaluative components than knowledge” (309) and evidence has shown that beliefs do influence teacher attitudes and behaviour (Borg 2001; Calderhead 1995; Richards 1998; Wright & Bolitho 2007). Tattoo (1996) maintains that students come to teacher education programmes with “strongly ingrained” (155) beliefs and

that most teacher education, as it is currently structured, is a weak intervention to alter particular views regarding the teaching and management of diverse learners. (Ibid)

This is doubly true in this culturally and socially homogeneous context. I consider beliefs to be like faith – it develops over a long period of time and becomes second nature, an unquestioned given. From a pedagogical perspective, this means it is extremely difficult to effect change.

Freeman & Johnson (1998: 409) maintain that "language teaching cannot be understood apart from the sociocultural environments in which it takes place and the processes of establishing and navigating social values in which it is embedded." Learners arrive in LTE programmes bringing with them their beliefs, attitudes and assumptions, also termed personal practical knowledge (PPK), (Golombek 2009:155), about gender, sexual diversity and culture. They can be
entrenched and extremely powerful, so much so that learners will adapt what they are taught into their own system of beliefs no matter how illogical it may seem, as Dilts’ example shows:

There is an old story about a patient who was being treated by a psychiatrist. The patient wouldn’t eat or take care of himself, claiming that he was a corpse. The psychiatrist spent many hours arguing with the patient trying to convince him he wasn’t a corpse. Finally the psychiatrist asked the patient if corpses bled. The patient replied, “Of course corpses don’t bleed, all of their body functions have stopped.” The psychiatrist then convinced the patient to try an experiment. The psychiatrist would carefully prick the patient with a pin and they would see if he started to bleed. The patient agreed. After all, he was a corpse. The psychiatrist gently pricked the patient’s skin with a needle and, sure enough, he began to bleed. With a look of shock and amazement the patient gasped, “I’ll be darned … corpses DO bleed!” (Dilts, 2000)

What the learners bring to their LTE will affect the way they will teach (Richards 1998), what they consider worthwhile and, as they often rely on the teaching models they themselves have assimilated unconsciously over years in school, exclusive practises they may have internalised, especially regarding gender, sexual diversity and culture.

We rarely recognize the extent in which our conscious estimates of what is worthwhile and what is not, are due to standards of which we are not conscious at all. But in general it may be said that the things which we take for granted without inquiry or reflection are just the things which determine our conscious thinking and decide our conclusions. (Dewey 2010: 23)

If the student body on the LTE programme is homogeneous in their backgrounds as is the case here, it could mean that they are unaware of the ways in which they may be unwittingly perpetuating discrimination.

Continuing in this vein, Schön (1983) argued in favour of the reflective practitioner, who learns to reflect on the knowledge accumulated in interpersonal contexts and lifetime experience. This would entail integrating the social/institutional context into the reflective process and exploring what precisely “socially valued knowledge” (McKernan 2008) is. With respect to inclusiveness, an effective LTE programme would ideally equip pre-service teachers with the knowledge and practical skills they need to critically reflect on their own preconceived notions, strategies to change them if needed, and confidence to carry on their reflection when at the
chalk face. Simply understanding the theoretical notion of the need to use inclusive language and incorporate all kinds of diversity both in linguistic TLS, imagery and texts in the abstract does not necessarily mean it will be implemented consistently in the classroom. It is here that theory and practice need to be linked. In their discussion of a critical curriculum for teacher education, Giroux & McLaren see teacher education as "cultural politics" (1996: 317). This means deconstructing what is being taught and looking critically at how, in this case, language "functions to 'position' people in the world, to shape the range of possible meanings surrounding an issue, and to actively construct reality rather than merely reflect it" (Ibid: 319). Also, integrating TLS and imagery which include diverse sexual identities makes them part of the classroom discourse and visible (Nelson 2009, Vandrick 2001). In fact, as Nelson points out:

Excluding from class curricula and discussions any mention of sexual plurality constitutes an insidious form of heteronormativity – and puts students and teachers alike in the difficult (and, from a language learning view, counterproductive) position of having to censor much of their day-to-day experiences. (Nelson 2009: 213)

Sadly, this is especially true for teachers, students and pupils who do not identify as heterosexual and, in essence enforces a return to the closet:

[F]or many gay people it is still the fundamental feature of social life; and there can be few gay people, however courageous and forthright by habit, however fortunate in the support of their immediate communities, in whose lives the closet is not still a shaping presence. (Sedgwick 1990: 68)

The idea of creating a course in this, and other conservative contexts, to have an impact on teachers’ beliefs in ways that may make them more open to knowledge of inclusiveness of diversity represents a significant challenge. There is already a successful body of research aimed at impacting on teacher beliefs, attitudes and judgements for example addressing gender (Simon-Maeda 2004; Renold 2006; Ó’Mócháin 2006 and the complete TESOL Quarterly 2004, 38(3) special issue) or cultural issues (Dogancay-Aktuna 2005; Ellis 1996). The evidence from these research areas have affected materials design so that it is now commonplace for school textbooks to include TLS and images of more non-white individuals and women in less stereotypical roles, although there is still vast room for improvement.
In LTE and schools in Bavaria, there is a strong emphasis on teaching intercultural communication.

Extensive research on gender and multiculturalism means that these issues are widely discussed as necessary knowledge in this LTE programme. The curriculum includes content on intercultural learning and the inclusion of multiple cultural heritages and identities in its knowledge bases, though not sexual diversity. Since sexual diversity conflicts with heteronormative power structures in Bavarian political, cultural and theological homogeneity, it is not dealt with explicitly in the curriculum and rarely criticised openly. In fact, I would argue that this LTE curriculum now reflects modernist values of fixedness, dominance, conservativism and control, which clash with postmodernist values of flux/fluidity, negotiation, eclecticism and change (Braidotti 1994; Miller 1982; and Slattery 2006). Also, despite the federal constitution guaranteeing equality, the knowledge of sexual diversity and teaching diversity remains excluded from classroom discourse in the hidden curriculum. Resistance to change comes in the Bavarian Constitution, which stresses first among the paramount goals of education in Article 131 “the reverence for God” (Bavarian Constitution) coupled with the presence of crucifixes in educational institutions, including state universities, and expressly rejected as unconstitutional (Koch 2009, Neue Juristische Wochenschrift (NJW), 2477-2483) is perhaps reflective of an enduring sense of independence in Bavarian identity and a clear idea about what constitutes teacher knowledge.

Malderez & Wedell (2007) describe the different knowledges that a teacher needs to become competent and confident in their field. These comprise knowledge about the subject (KA) they are teaching, knowledge of how (KH) to teach the subject and, perhaps most importantly, knowledge to do (KT) it.

Knowledge about English refers to the linguistic competence to differentiate, as English does, between gendered pronouns, express and name social relations, as well as different English-speaking cultures, and integrating non-sexist, non-stereotypical TLS. Some of the main research in applied linguistics in this area
begins with MacKay and Fulkerson’s (1979) seminal article on pronoun use, which made absolutely clear that the so-called generic he was in fact a myth. Using he to refer to preceding nouns meant understanding them as male and not inclusive of female. Khosroshahi’s (1989) analysis of Sapir’s and Whorf’s theories of linguistic relativity, i.e. how language affects thought and how the so-called generic he does tend "to suggest a male referent" (505). She suggests that there is the potential that by changing language, a change in thought might also occur. In LTE education, this would imply that changing TLS may change the way terms are understood e.g. mothering, fathering, irrespective of sex/gender, but more importantly, these and other linguistic findings illustrate a need for conscious reflection on TLS use and that TESOL incorporate a measure of reflection on inclusion or exclusion of specific TLS. Ehrlich & King’s (1994) (de) politicization of the lexicon and Bem’s (1993) notion of the lenses of androcentrism, gender and polarisation, and biological essentialism offer different ways of seeing, moving away from a predominantly male biased perspective, which can be useful in terms of language use. There are difficulties here, however, especially in the highly regulated educational sphere. Meyer says the

disruption and open discussion of previously taboo issues can be a very difficult one for teachers to navigate. A liberatory and queer pedagogy empowers educators to explore traditionally silenced discourses and create spaces for students to examine and challenge the hierarchy of binary identities. (2007: 27)

This might also be considered part of knowledge about English as English language cultures do comprise more than a binary model offers.

1.3 How do people learn to teach?

Knowing how to teach means that language teacher educators ought to model best practice and raise awareness, correct bias if it occurs and instruct in critical strategies for monitoring discriminatory practices. Kumashiro (2004) speaks of teachers needing to complicate what students know, of “learning to teach on uncertainty” (111). If the certainty of socially sanctioned identities is questioned, then what is known is no longer certain. Vandrick (2001) proposes sensitivity, not preaching, and advocating respect as a justice issue. Holden (2007) maintains that
teaching controversial issues helps promote tolerance, critical thinking and cooperation. She views discussion of controversy as a means to illustrate the multiple perspectives possible in any one group or community and through this realisation, students come to see differentially. Claire (2007) discusses diversity and ways of dealing with multiculturalism, racism and multiple identities and Keddie (2008) illustrates how critical literacy can explode ideas of male/female binaries as norms and transform “parameters from teaching-as-usual to teaching as ‘doing’ social justice through critical literacy” (580). These studies all involve teacher educators who are willing to “read against the grain of dominant discourses” (Ibid: 581) and in this way also act as role models for pre-service teachers.

In LTE the how to teach is usually incorporated in didactics/pedagogy modules with a focus on psychology. However, the number of courses, the amount of information and the short time period in which it has to be covered often precludes in-depth reflection or understanding (cf. chapter 2, section 4) as recommended by the research. Students often process information only on the basis of what is needed to pass the final exams. Knowledge to do means discussion, reflection, practice, and then more practice. The problem here lies in the time and supervision that is doable on an LTE programme in a large university or in the teaching phase after graduation, as became clear in this case study. With the recent overhaul of degree programmes in Bavaria (and Germany in general), this has been reduced even further.

2. Part 2 A Critical Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

2.1 Criticality

The very complex relations between criticality, feminism, poststructuralism, power and subjectivity require considerable unpacking in order to reveal the mechanisms at work in the educational context of this study. Criticality and its contribution to LTE knowledge is a key element in this. It is not only my own criticality as a researcher which is important, but also the aim of encouraging criticality from the
students and lecturers who took part in the study towards the subject matter, towards my teaching and towards their own teaching. Criticality in education can combat intolerance, bigotry and discrimination, and knowledge needs to be flexible and open to change (Paechter & Clark 2010). In education, Paolo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968/1974) served as an impetus for a liberatory movement in education, actively encouraging criticism, revealing oppressive structures through discourse and problematizing what is often taken for granted. Luke points out that this approach functioned as

a phenomenological and existential orientation toward the recollection and recovery of the self, with a focus on being and the ethics of care in the face of physical and symbolic violence, material oppression, and psychological repression. (2004: 23)

Addressing gender and sexual diversity in a heteronormative environment, making it visible, and integrating a discourse of inquiry means unveiling the existence of diversity and offering individuals, whether teachers, their students or teacher educators, the space to recover the self in education, a space for being and a disruption of potential sites for oppression. To be critical then is to look beyond the surface of the language structure and to investigate how and what language is used in what contexts and who the language users are. As Norton and Toohey indicate,

language is not simply a means of expression or communication; rather, it is a practice that constructs, and is constructed by the ways language learners understand themselves, their social surroundings, their histories, and their possibilities for the future. (2004: 1)

In the course of the development of criticality, Pennycook (2007) describes how various perspectives have surfaced in critical applied linguistics such as critical pedagogy (Leistyna et al. 1996), critical literacy (Wallace 2002) and critical discourse analysis (Fairclough 1995), all of which offer insights and strategies for developing criticality in the classroom and which have impacted on the realisation of this research.
2.2 Why Feminist Poststructuralist?

Beginning in the early 1990s, there has been vast growth in research and discourse in feminist poststructuralism (Butler 1990, 1993; Braidotti 1994, Ramazangolu 1993; Sawicki 1991; Spivak 1987). It developed from the theories of Jacques Derrida, Julia Kristeva and Michel Foucault, the latter being of central interest to feminists as his theory of the relations between power and discourse is crucial in understanding and deconstructing mechanisms which systematically disadvantage women and minorities. Critical feminist poststructuralism and queer theory (Lather 1991; Watson 2005; Sullivan 2003; Turner 2000) introduce the notion of flux and non-fixedness when investigating subjects and their behaviours, while keeping in mind the centrality of male privileging heteronormative power structures, which are inherent in educational institutions. As a critical feminist, it was important to me to investigate women's attitudes towards and experiences of including diversity issues, especially with respect to gender inequalities in the classroom and perceptions of 'Other' (Weiner 1998; Skelton & Francis 2009; Sunderland 1992, 1994; Johnson 2002). Considering that the large majority of teacher educators in the population in this case study are women, I wondered if they thought about the issue of inclusiveness including sexual diversity as part of their teaching, and from a poststructuralist viewpoint, if they encountered resistance when or if they tried to implement change. Resistance is of key importance in this particularly homogeneous and conservative context if change is to come about.

Investigating gender, its meanings in the social context and its construction, is central to revealing the heteronormative structures that underlie educational institutions. My focus as a poststructuralist researcher but also as a language teacher is on the way language both excludes and includes, silences, regulates and perpetuates norms. Language use also influences the way subjects are constituted and subjected to regulation in the systems of power relations in the communities in which they live and work. Pennycook (2007) argues in favour of a transgressive applied linguistics which is not fixed as a discipline, and moves beyond the boundaries of the given. Incorporating this idea of movement and
fluidity in gender, power relations, subjectivity, culture, and most importantly, language in an analysis of language in use introduces a potential for development. Thus, a critical feminist poststructuralist approach can be seen as a tool offering "a mode of knowledge production which uses poststructuralist theories of language, subjectivity, social processes and institutions to understand existing power relations and to identify areas and strategies for change" (Weedon 1987: 40-41).

2.3 Language, Poststructuralism and Power

In the pre-Enlightenment period, language was deemed simply a tool to be used to encode the thoughts people shared, irrespective of culture. At the very latest since Sapir’s (1929) and Whorf’s (1940) theories of linguistic relativity, it is clear that the relationship works both ways: language affects thought which affects culture. In the process of teaching the English language, the culture the language is embedded in has to be taken into account, which makes it one aspect of inclusiveness. If, as Halliday (1978: 242) contended, "(l)anguage is a realisation of cultural reality", then discriminatory language reflects a discriminatory culture. If the aim of education is to be inclusive, as current policy explicitly states, it stands to reason that using inclusive language and sexual and cultural diversity may serve to produce a more inclusive reality.

Language speakers are aware that their choice of language has specific effects or evokes particular responses. Parents teach their children not to use profanity and model this by not using it themselves. Speaking to one’s doctor requires different linguistic choices from talking to the local newsagent. This general knowledge of language often leads to the assumption that language is transparent, which it is not. The conceptual meanings of signs, according to Saussure (1974), must be agreed upon in communities so that communication can function. There is no meaning before the articulation and the meaning is bound to a specific historical and social context. This means what is appropriate in one social context at one particular time is not necessarily transferable to other contexts at different times. This becomes especially clear in research on gender and racism (Skelton & Francis 2009; bell hooks 1982, 1989). In a feminist poststructuralist approach to
language teaching, finding ways to question meanings and institute change is a key concern as exemplified in the use of *she/he/they* as pronouns or the shift in appropriate address from *Miss/Mrs* to *Ms*. Vigilance is nevertheless necessary in the field of TESOL pedagogy as there is, in German for example, widespread transference of a pseudo-generic *he* from the grammatical gender of all masculine nouns, e.g. *table* = *Tisch* (masc.) is referred to with the masculine pronoun *he* = *er* instead of *it* = *es*. In this case, it is necessary to find out whether this is a grammatical error, for example referring to a table with the pronoun *he*, or using a pseudo-generic *he* to refer to a teacher.

There has been considerable research into language use which systematically derogates and regulates women, for example, through terms such as *slag* (Lees 1986, 1997). The use of the word *slag* illustrates how the meaning of a word, although not clearly definable, can regulate and oppress by placing restrictive behaviours on those about whom the term is used as well as regulating behaviour to avoid the danger of being termed a *slag*, a problematic endeavour as the meaning is not clear and what exactly might be construed as *slag*-like behaviour is also unclear:

> The term *slag* can be seen as part of a discourse about behaviour as a departure, or potential departure from, in this case, male conceptions of female sexuality which run deep in the culture [...]. The term *slag* therefore applies less to any clearly defined notion of sleeping around than to any form of social behaviour by girls that would define them as autonomous from the attachment to and domination by boys. (Lees 1997: 23)

From a critical feminist poststructuralist standpoint, this also offers insight into the way "many women tolerate social relations which subordinate their interests to those of men and the mechanisms whereby women and men adopt particular discursive positions as representative of their interests" (Weedon 1987: 12). It is indeed women and girls themselves who are instrumental in monitoring each other's behaviour by using the word *slag* or a range of other derogatory terms. This is also true for the regulatory use of *fag* and *dyke* to control perceived feminine behaviours by boys or masculine behaviours by girls (Pascoe 2007; Hendricks & Oliver 1999).
The fact that many derogatory terms for women have no male equivalent has been widely discussed by linguists (Schulz 1975; Bolinger 1981; Cameron 1995; Talbot 1998) as has the notion of inclusiveness in language, which has been the focus of a substantial body of feminist linguistic research (Romaine 1999; Maggio 1991; Cameron 1992; Burkette & Warhol 2009; Baxter 2003; Tannen 1996). In fact, it is interesting to note that use of terms for women – old woman or simply girl – are often used to humiliate boys whose (hetero)masculinity is in question. Therefore, when teaching ESOL LTE programmes, learners must be made aware of the semantic distinction that is perceived between he and she as part of their linguistic competence as well as the power that use or non-use of inclusive TLS relating to sexual and cultural diversity and lifestyles has. Ehrlich & King’s (1994) (de) politicization of the lexicon, Bem’s (1993) notion of the lenses of androcentrism, gender and polarisation, and biological essentialism as well as other feminist (Butler 2004, MacKinnon 1993), and poststructuralist research (Weedon 1987, Harstock 1990) have left no doubt that not differentiating gender, or using exclusively male or heteronormative TLS, serves to perpetuate a status quo of discrimination. The course design in this case study began with a critical reflection on this premiss. I shall now turn to the body/ gender/subjectivity of the speaker/s in the language learning context.

2.4 Gender and Subjectivity

The issue of the subject as a stable entity is problematic with respect to the tension between QT and a social justice agenda. Youdell says that with QT

a tactical politics is in play when we hold onto and assert queer even as we know that queer may have already been recuperated by the binary thinking and unitary subjects of identity politics and been redeployed to demarcate and define yet more insider outsider locations. (2010: 89)

Nevertheless, I have chosen to view the subjects in this study as temporarily recognizable as belonging to specific identities. I employ a critique of the language used to categorise those identities in binary terms as a means of revealing the discourses that have shaped them and could thus also disrupt them, creating the “possibility of rethinking society” (Aitkinson 2002b: 77). The question of how binary
understandings and cultural meanings associated with a particular gender or body are connected to heteronormativity is important in LTE because the student teachers being educated are not neutral bodies in a vacuum, neither are the bodies of the pupils they will stand in front of. When thinking about the teacher standing in front of a classroom, and thinking about my teaching/educating young people to be that teacher, I have often found myself thinking how differently my students respond depending on their gender and depending on the cultural context. In Judith Butler's preface to *Bodies That Matter*, she asks herself "What about the materiality of the body, Judy?" (Butler 1993: ix) to make her think about "a bodily life that could not be theorized away" (Ibid). Butler's point is that the body and its becoming gender are predetermined by understandings, conceptualisations and interpretations of that sex in the culture and the time in which it comes into being. Gender understandings are based on the binary opposition of male and female. Identifying as female or male is formed by regulatory practices beginning with language: *is it a boy or a girl?*; colour coding pink for female and blue for male, sometimes even before birth; behavioural expectations often presume boys as adventurers and girls as nurturers, all of which has been widely documented (Walkerdine & Lucey 1989; Connell 1987, 1995; Tannen 1996). The definition of subjectivity per se demands that it be seen in relation to others. As Sandra Bartky comments:

> To overlook the forms of subjection that engender the feminine body is to perpetuate the silence and powerlessness of those upon whom these disciplines have been imposed. (Bartky 1986: 4)

Foucault (1978) would have individuals as passive bodies who are the (universal) subjects of dominating power structures. However, as Lois McNay argues, the body and consequently the subject is never universal:

> On a fundamental level, a notion of the body is central to feminist analysis of the oppression of women because it is upon the biological difference between the male and the female bodies that the edifice of gender inequality is built and legitimized. (McNay 1992: 17)

From the moment of conception and the discovery of a pregnancy, asking if *it* is a boy or a girl reflects a profound social and cultural need for the categorisation of
the subject in order to fit the new individual into already existing parameters of existence. The problems which arise for parents of children who are born without a definitive gender, as expressed in the appearance of their genitalia, are exemplary in this point (cf. Bing & Bergvall 1996: 1-30). However, this lack of categorisation is not only unsettling for parents, the difficulty which individuals and society as a whole have in the encounter with a person with no definitive sex category is well documented (http://www.gender.org.uk/about/04embryo/48_stats.htm, Dreger 1998; Holmes 2008, 2009; Harper 2007; Sytsma 2006; Preves 2003 amongst many others).

Interpretations of the physical body are themselves historically conceptualised and thus constituted within pre-existing structures but also open to re-conceptualisation and re-constitution.

'Sex' not only functions as a norm, but is part of a regulatory practice that produces the bodies it governs, that is, whose regulatory force is made clear as a kind of productive power, the power to produce – demarcate, circulate, differentiate – the bodies it controls. [...] In other words, 'sex' is an ideal construct which is forcibly materialized through time. (Butler 1993: 1)

The pairing of biological sex (male/female) with gender binaries (masculine/feminine) is restrictive in that gender can always only be "the forcible approximation of a norm one never chooses, a norm that chooses us" (Butler 1993: 126) and it suggests a fixedness and stability that is deceptive. Both teacher and pupils in the classroom are constituted as gendered subjects through the process of subjection to already existing and regulative social norms (Foucault 1980). They do not have a "unified self" (Rodriguez 2007: 283), but rather are constantly becoming (Braidotti 1994), a dynamic and ongoing process situated in power discourses. "The individual is an effect of power [...] The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle" (Foucault 1980: 98).

The presumption of heterosexuality is presented as the basis, in psychoanalytical terms, from which all other sexuality deviates. In addition, within this heterosexuality, the male is the norm and the female is the non-norm or 'Other':

Foucault's thesis that power relations are constitutive of the social realm, and that they operate principally through the human body, provides a way for
feminists to show how the construction of gender inequality from anatomical difference is central to the creation and maintenance of social hierarchies. (McNay 1992: 46)

Further, as Butler states (1990), the iterability, or constant replication and reproduction of performances of genders, allows historical definitions of femininity to be perpetuated under patriarchally constructed power mechanisms, as is the case in Bavarian schools with unchanged traditions such as the crucifix in the corner of the room and outdated exclusive teaching materials. Power structures in place in society control that which is considered the acceptable performance of feminine and that which is not (cf. the discussion of slag above and Airton 2009a). According to theories of subjectivity and Althusser’s (1977) notion of interpellation, i.e. that one only becomes a subject when recognised from the outside, as well as Butler’s (1997: 1-13) extensive development of Althusser’s notion, this recognition includes expectations for the performance of gender, but also immediate punitive responses if the performance is not recognised (Airton 2009a). In a classroom context, there have been occasions in which I have not recognised the gender of a student according to these expectations, revealing that they are not completely reliable. This again constitutes a challenge when using subject identities to argue for more social justice.

The category of gender is one marker influencing the constitution of the subject as is race, able-bodiedness or class as Alsop et al. reveal:

[T]he different aspects of subjectivity become constituted not as a series of additions, but in relation to the other. As a consequence gender loses the foundational place which psychoanalytic theory gave it. Gender is part of an identity woven from a complex and specific social whole, and requiring very specific and local readings. (2002: 86)

The importance of the understandings of the subject in this specific cultural context is crucial to interpreting how the teacher's (and student's) body and gender are understood. In a cultural context which has a high degree of homogeneity, such as Bavaria (cf. chapter 2), the interpretations ascribed to specific genders are historically developed and informed by long held traditional values. Catholicism's prominent place in Bavarian identity and culture constitutes a particular female
subjectivity within the particular Bavarian understandings of traditional Catholic values, which are heterosexual (Hastings 2010; Lee 1979; Ardagh & Ardagh 1995; Kolinsky & van der Will 1998 and also Katholizismus in Bayern süddeutsche.de 19.5.2010 Retrieved 21.9.2013). Weedon (1987) describes traditional Catholic understandings of female subjectivity as "implicitly masochistic" (96) as it expects the assimilation of norms of "selflessness" which imply compliance to and fulfilment of the wishes and the needs of husbands and children, wishes and needs which Catholicism also defines" (Ibid). The assumption of 'husbands' also systematically excludes the notion of sexual diversity. She goes on to analyse how these rigid and fixed subject positions are based on the discourse of Catholicism which insists "on the singularity of meaning, including the meaning of gender" (97). The historical development of the various juridical mechanisms based on Christian ideology of morally acceptable and inappropriate behaviour for women is discussed extensively in Carol Smart's (1992) Regulating Womanhood. From a feminist poststructuralist perspective, this understanding of female subjectivity is problematic as it excludes the many other subject positions which are visible in society, and resistance by those within the Catholic community will likely bring with it the risk of conflict. The presence of Catholic discourse in education, for example through the ubiquitous crucifix, morning prayers in school, prioritising the "reverence for God" (Article 131 Bavarian Constitution), means educational institutions will likely encounter fundamental difficulties accepting subject positions which are fluid and trouble a singularity of meaning.

A feminist poststructuralist approach takes as given that a subject "is discursively produced in social institutions and processes" (Weedon 1987: 50) and, as such, is constituted in already existing male-dominated power structures. Butler's (1990) theory of gender as performance, of "doing" rather than "being", is crucial in deconstructing contemporary understandings of gender to reveal its social construction. When a child is born, it's/he is immediately named, categorised and labelled by sex. In fact in Bavaria, and Germany as a whole, a child cannot be named in such a way as to obscure their gender, which means all parents have to choose names accepted by the registry officials as clearly marked for gender (cf.
Regulations for the naming of children). Social networks of power/knowledge structures constitute the child. In order to resist hegemonic discourses (such as Bavarian Catholicism), the subject has to trouble them (Caldas-Coulthard & Iedema 2008). Butler in fact questions the very term to "have" a gender or to "have" a sexuality (Butler 2004:16). She says of subjects:

[T]he "I" that I am finds itself at once constituted by norms and dependent on them but also endeavors to live in ways that maintain a critical and transformative relation to them. This is not easy, because the "I" becomes, to a certain extent unknowable, threatened with unviability, with becoming undone altogether, when it no longer incorporates the norm in such a way that makes this "I" fully recognizable. (2004: 3)

One question then is how the 'I' of the future teacher, whose subjectivity is constituted and embedded in Bavarian culture with its concomitant Catholic values, can integrate sexual diversity with many different subject positions into language education.

Although different anatomical bodies may perform gender and sexuality irrespective of their anatomy, considering social concepts and contexts of gender in general, the anatomical element of the body becomes part of a subject's gender identity. The perceived need for Male To Female (MTF) transsexuals, for example, to alter the body surgically to make it be and not just appear female is a case in point (Reddy 2005, Transsexuality 2013). The physical attributes of bodies constitute, to a certain extent, the subject's gendered identity, as bodies are given subjectivity by being subjected to the social norms. It is also the basis from which subjects become recognisable and thus hailed. However, society also comprises individuals who feel the anatomy of the body they inhabit is not in tune with their subjective sense of their gender or who reject heteronormative gender expectations. These individuals will also people schools and LTE programmes. If one agrees with Butler that sex is not prediscursive, then the cultural meanings given to the anatomical female body also have no meaning outside culture. If both body/sex and gender are constructed, then changing an individual's anatomical sex is of some consequence for the recognition of the gendered subject in the social
context, or social understandings of the body and its “subject contingencies” has to change (Airton 2009b).

This notwithstanding, sexual difference posits an underlying structure and organisational function in society and especially as regards reproductive capability. While it seems tenable that the matter of the body is sexed within pre-existing cultural terms, sexual difference remains as anatomical variance. This does not mean, however, that definitions of what may constitute subjects above and beyond this difference is not open to a multiplicity of differing interpretations, or that binary oppositions should be upheld, or that any such interpretations are fixed and not open to change. On the contrary, the many different possibilities open to sexual differences have not yet been fully explored. Braidotti (2002: 26) discusses the importance of sexual difference in feminist theory and points out how "the feminine as experienced and expressed by women is as yet unrepresented, having been colonized by the male imaginary". Moving beyond the theories of Deleuze and Irigaray, she uses the term "becoming-woman" to describe the way in which she sees the body.

The embodiedness of the subject is a form of bodily materiality, not of the natural, biological kind. I take the body as the complex interplay of highly constructed social and symbolic forces: it is not an essence, let alone a biological substance, but a play of forces, a surface of intensities, pure simulacra without originals. This ‘intensive’ redefinition of the body situates it within a complex interplay of social and affective forces. This is also a clear move away from the psychoanalytic idea of the body as a map of semiotic inscriptions and culturally enforced codes. I see it instead as a transformer and a relay point for the flow of energies: a surface of intensities. (Ibid: 21)

This definition reflects a dynamic view of the embodied subject and the paradoxical tensions of searching to understand and identify with a physicality that is viewed in a mirror through lenses of meaning constructed before its existence. The meanings accorded specific bodies become clearer when subjects transgress that which is considered appropriate for those bodies. I shall return to the notion and importance of transgression as impetus for change below.
2.5 Sexual Identity

Sexual identity and sexuality are often considered to have no place in the (TESOL) classroom as they are perceived to be private matters only to be discussed in the home (Meyer 2010; Nelson 1993). The classroom, however, is not a social vacuum, but a site of discourse between bodies and the constitution of subjects as well as the dissemination of knowledge. One aspect of subjectivity is sexual identity and educational institutions are suffused with sexuality in the form of heterosexuality, but this is often rendered invisible (Epstein et al. 2000; Nelson 1999; Meyer 2007, 2010; Ferfolja 2008). Those working in education are often blind to the ubiquitous expressions of heterosexuality in textbooks, curricula, school policies and interpersonal conversations both in staffrooms and classrooms (Meyer 2010; DePalma & Atkinson 2009b; Robinson & Ferfolja 2007; Johnson 2004; Kehily 2002; Paechter 2011) and it is here that a critical queering process may be effective. Epstein & Mellor contend that despite the widespread political and common-sense support for the notion that education can and should take place without sexuality, many aspects of education are, in practice, concerned with education for (hetero)sexuality. (Mellor & Epstein 2006: 381)

This can be distressing or even traumatising for LGBQTI individuals, who must constantly decide whether to be seen or silenced (Nixon & Givens 2004, 2006; DePalma & Atkinson 2009b; Allan et al. 2008; Kehily 2002).

Grosz's (1994) use of the analogy of the Möbius strip (see thesis cover) with its confluence of outside and inside demonstrates that the materiality of the body cannot be reduced to biological essentialism. Butler's unrecognizable 'I' (cf. p. 56 above) is the interior which interacts with the exterior (matter) and both are in constant negotiation in the creation of subjectivity. Thus sexual identity cannot be separated from gender or sex or any other aspect of subjectivity. Sexual identity constitutes as much a part of individuals' subjectivity as their ethnicity, age or cultural heritage. The presumption of heterosexuality is presented as the basis from which all other sexuality deviates (Foucault 1978, 1995; Butler 1990). Yep contends that
normalization is a symbolically, discursively, physically, psychologically, and materially violent form of social regulation and control [...]. Heteronormativity makes heterosexuality hegemonic through the process of normalization. (2003: 18)

The next question then is how heterosexuality becomes the norm. Deconstructing the assumptions that perpetuate the heterosexual matrix (Butler 1990) can serve to shed light on the power mechanisms, knowledge and language base that uphold this hegemony and regulate non-conforming sexual identities.

2.6 Power/Knowledge/(Hetero)Normativity

Power is productive. Its mechanisms can be found in all areas of society: in institutions, in individual homes and in forms of resistance. It functions, according to Foucault (1995), most successfully when its regulatory discourses are masked.

Figure 3.1: Stateville, IL – Seeing is Power (Andreas Gursky)

He employs Jeremy Bentham’s idea of the Panopticon to illustrate the concept of the all-seeing eye of power. The prison guard stands at the centre of a ring of cells, able to see into each cell as they contain windows on both their outside and inside walls and can thus monitor every inmate’s behaviour. Andreas Gursky’s impressive
prison photograph (cf. figure 3.1 above) captures some of these aspects. The objectification of the inmates can then develop into self-monitoring, whereby the simple knowledge that one is being supervised/watched internalises the supervisory eye so that, in fact, the guard no longer even needs to be present because the inmates exert their own supervision internally. In contemporary society, this phenomenon can be seen in the behaviour of drivers at red lights. In the middle of the night, with no other traffic in sight and no one watching, a driver will still most often stop at a red traffic light. The knowledge of the all-seeing eye is still present and exerting control. I would argue that the crucifix in Bavarian classrooms fulfils this function of the all-seeing eye, a reminder of state, social and religious regulation.

Bartky (1990) discusses women's self-surveillance of their own bodies, their movement, their posture and behaviour and points out how women police themselves and thereby help in upholding and reinforcing the power mechanisms which oppress them. She argues how regulation at the individual level can take the form of innumerable small and pervasive practices from shaving legs and plucking eyebrows to the more serious cosmetic surgery (see also Greer 1999). Connell (1995) posits similar arguments for the self-regulation of masculinities. In schools, this has been widely researched, for example, in the collection of case studies by Maher & Ward (2002) in which they argue poignantly for reflection in teaching as a means to reveal and address the unconscious assumptions with respect to gender, race, class and culture that teachers, educators and students bring to their classrooms (cf. also Francis & Skelton 2001 and Skelton & Francis 2009).

Foucault's genealogy of the power relations in discourses about sexuality provides insights into the way discourses are perpetuated, strengthened and resisted. He says of power:

> It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization; as the process which, through ceaseless struggles and confrontations, transforms, strengthens, or reverses them; as the support which these force relations find in one another, thus forming a chain or a system, or on the contrary, the disjunctions and...
contradictions which isolate them from one another; and lastly, as the strategies in which they take effect, whose general design or institutional crystallization is embodied in the state apparatus, in the formulation of the law, in the various social hegemonies. (Foucault 1990: 92-3)

Foucault's analysis elucidates how power mechanisms in societies function and reveals the power structures that underlie the oppression of individuals subjected to those mechanisms in order to argue for change. His seminal text *The History of Sexuality* (first published in 1978) describes the dissemination of power through discourses, which apply language as a tool and through language, discourses maintain, perpetuate and develop social structures and power relations. With respect to the discourses on sexuality, the means by which sexuality was and is regulated specifically illustrates the binary construction normal/abnormal or criminal or natural/unnatural for sexual behaviours. I again call on the image of the Möbius strip to illustrate: normal has no meaning without its counterpart abnormal. This is also true of the way in which masculinity and femininity are defined. Foucault describes language as a tool of power. In his examples, the way medical discourse defined terms such as deviant, perverse, normal and abnormal also exerted regulatory control over sexual behaviour (Foucault 1990: 30-5). The incorporation of scientifically based discourses which categorise and define, can be regarded as tools which create, replicate and perpetuate parameters for masculinity and femininity and explain the convictions that confidently categorise normal/deviant sexual identity. Foucault, however, did not consider the different ways subjects are engendered as De Lauretis (1987: 3) points out that

by ignoring the conflicting investments of men and women in the discourses and practices of sexuality, Foucault's theory, in fact, excludes, though it does not preclude, the consideration of gender. (1987: 3)

In an interview in *Power and Knowledge* (Gordon 1980), when asked about whether he thought he had paid sufficient attention to the differences between the sexes, Foucault admits that "the differences prior to the nineteenth century seemed slight" to him (217). However, Harstock (1990) maintains that Foucault's arguments on power mechanisms originate from his position as colonizer and from his dominant position which render him unable to see the power relations which subjugate women so effectively: "Domination, viewed from above, is more likely to
appear as equality” (168). Using QT, it is possible to question who subjects are, what contexts, language and behaviours are used to define them and why, but also why the researcher wants to. The discourses of law and policing serve to implement normal/deviant categories in society and the discourse of education regulates by systematically perpetuating this knowledge for example by dictating gendered uniforms, separating children according to gendered understandings for example boys play football, girls learn to sew, or in textbooks, presenting images of male managers, firemen, soldiers and female hairdressers, beauticians or nurses.

In her seminal work *The Second Sex* (first published in 1949), Simone de Beauvoir was among the first to reveal and criticise the use of male to mean human as a typical characteristic of male-dominated cultures:

[M]an represents both the positive and the neutral, [...] whereas woman represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, [...]. It amounts to this: [...] there is an absolute human type, the masculine. Woman has ovaries, a uterus; these peculiarities imprison her in her subjectivity, circumscribe her within the limits of her own nature. [...] Thus humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being. [...] She is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute – she is the Other.(1997: 15-16)

Even before de Beauvoir, Charlotte Perkins Gilman in her book *The Man-Made World or our Androcentric Culture* (published in 1911) elaborated on the universal nature of the male subject and a "sub-species" thereof (i.e. the female) by introducing the concept of androcentrism:

Real written history only goes back a few thousand years, [...]. During this period we have had almost universally what is here called an Androcentric Culture. The history, such as it was, was made and written by men. [...]. We have, so far, lived and suffered and died in a man-made world. So general, so unbroken, has been this condition, that to mention it arouses no more remark than the statement of a natural law. We have taken it for granted, since the dawn of civilization, that 'mankind' meant men-kind, and the world was theirs. Women we have sharply delimited. Women were a sex; 'the sex', according to chivalrous toasts; [...] and the woman – a strange, diverse creature, quite disharmonious in the accepted scheme of things – was excused and explained only as a female. She has needed volumes of such excuse and explanation; also, apparently, volumes of abuse and condemnation. The task here undertaken is of this sort. It seeks to show that what we have all
this time called 'human nature' and deprecated, was in great part only male nature, [...] that what we have called 'masculine' and admired as such, was in large part human, and should be applied to both sexes; that what we have called 'feminine' and condemned, was also largely human and applicable to both. Our androcentric culture is so shown to have been, and still to be, a masculine culture in excess, and therefore undesirable. (1970: 17-22)

A critical feminist perspective must clearly distinguish between actual biological differences between the sexes and the exploitation of these differences as justification for social inequalities as well as their implementation in psychological interpretations of both female and male behaviour. The issue of sexual difference is a crucial factor for feminists and while in philosophical terms, it is important to destabilise categories of sexual difference which have hitherto been used as a means to subjugate women and minorities, it cannot be allowed to obscure the fact that real women's bodies in real social structures are still subjected to real (heteronormative) oppression. In this respect, a feminist perspective as a strategy can also be useful to reveal all kinds of discrimination especially in the context of education with respect to sexual diversity. In the TESOL classroom, the use of male TLS as default, the use of male protagonists, male-authored texts, stereotypical images of girls and women and the continued use of a pseudo generic he bear witness to the continued need for vigilance in the regulation of gender through sexist discourses.

2.7 From Knowledge of Gender to Heteronormativity

The discourses which regulate gender, as discussed above, also regulate (hetero)sexual relations with the knowledge of norms as a guiding factor. In education, the issue of knowledge production and reproduction, the process of coming to know about the world and the culture/s one lives in cannot be reversed into a process of not knowing. If a child learns to read, in time, they cannot unlearn being able to read. Similarly, if a child learns that "that which is different, strange and other still has a place and can be taken seriously" (Osberg & Biesta 2010: 605), they can no longer unlearn the knowledge of differentiation. In order to address issues of discrimination and exclusion as part of LTE, it seems to be self evident that investigating what processes produce and reproduce knowledge and
how these processes might be influenced to include issues of sexual diversity will render a more comprehensive picture.

In Bavaria (as in all German states Article 7(1) of the constitution stipulates: The entire school system shall be under the supervision of the state.), it is the Ministry of Education which governs policy and disseminates regulatory power. In schools, knowledge about sexual diversity is rarely taught as it may conflict with religious sensitivities on the one hand, and is considered extraneous in the teaching of language on the other (cf. Analysis of sex education policy in Germany). The key approach to teaching about sexuality in Bavarian schools focuses on marriage and the (heterosexual) family. A number of criticisms have been made about this policy on a federal level (Ibid: 43-49): there is no explicit discussion of masturbation; there is no explicit acceptance of the existence of youth sexuality only sexuality in marriage; the discussion of contraception is held under the topic heading "Sexuality and Family life" and of abortion under the heading "Protecting the unborn child" and finally; the topic of "homosexuality" comes directly after the topic "The problems of prostitution" leaving a sense, it is argued, that it too is a problem. Finally, within federal education guidelines, human sexuality should be taught taking into account different value systems, however, in Bavaria, the policy demands sexuality be taught according to Christian values, which disregards federal law (Ibid).

Foucault’s genealogical study of sexuality and sexual identity reveals, however, that not only are both discursively constructed, but also that heterosexuality can only be seen as the norm when contrasted with the understanding of not-heterosexuality as deviant or unnatural (Foucault 1990). The term 'heterosexual' is juxtaposed with 'homosexual', whose "invention, use and distribution […] helped to produce the social existence and historical reality of the sexual relations so named" (Katz 1995: ix). It disposes with the messiness of the fluidity and plurality of sexual identities. It offers certainty, clarity and reliability and as such a stability that is comforting. Foucault describes the process of how power produces knowledge, how both are discursive, and how they
Talking about sexuality, sexual identity, and sexual diversity in schools means finding ways of describing them, what is acceptable and what is not. This affects students' linguistic competence in all areas. Foucault uses the term *dispositif* to identify how power and knowledge are inextricably bound and McNay translates this as a *discursive formation* which "consists of practices and institutions that produce knowledge claims that the system of power finds useful" (MacNay 1992: 148). In the field of education and LTE, systematically not using language samples or topics that address sexual diversity constitutes a *dispositif*. Equally, what is not known, what is secret or deviant play as important a role in this discursive formation as what is publicly voiced, for example in the classroom. As noted above, uncritical, unreflective approaches "reproduce dominant cultural, linguistic, and educational notions and practices as neutral and unproblematic" (Lin 2004: 272), which they clearly are not. Opening up discourse through the implementation of terms such as *sexual diversity*, which implicitly includes a range of sexual identities and subject positions, means opening conceptual *spaces* (Luke 2004) through language in which different ways of being might be possible and thereby troubling the *dispositif*. However, this also constitutes a destabilisation of the status quo which goes hand in hand with instability, uncertainty and more questions than answers, all of which are uncomfortable and likely to be met with considerable resistance. Youdell says that such queer theoretical practice can bring “tensions that are productive in their irresolvability and can be usefully augmented […] in the pursuit of an uncomfortable reflexivity” (2010: 88). Addressing sexual diversity in LTE means making it visible and giving it language.

Because these disqualified knowledges arise out of the experience of oppression, resurrecting them serves a critical function. Through the retrieval of subjugated knowledge, one establishes a historical knowledge of resistance and struggle.

(Heterosexual ontology relies on Cartesian dualism with heterosexual/homosexual and normal/deviant as binary oppositions (Butler 2004). Power structures in place
in society control and regulate that which is considered the acceptable performance of masculinity/femininity and that which is not (Greer 1999; Curran 2006; O’Mochain 2006). Butler (1990) contends that iterability of such performances of genders allows historical definitions of masculinity and femininity to be perpetuated. In Foucault’s analysis of subject-formation above, he describes how regimes of power, such as schools, inscribe "identity onto the very bodies of those subject to them" (Andermahr et al. 1997: 217). This social and institutional regulation may explain in part why so many young girls’ attitudinal beliefs bias their success in computer science, natural sciences and mathematics (Sanders 2006; Boaler & Sengupta-Irving 2006; Calabrese Barton & Brickhouse 2006). But it also locates the interrelatedness and complexity of subjectivity formation in heteronormative discourse in education that critical feminist research addresses.

Civil rights movements and second wave feminism highlighted issues of social justice and equality with respect to class, race and gender in many areas of society and Adrienne Rich’s (1980) article on "compulsory heterosexuality" was groundbreaking in introducing the aspect of sexual diversity into the fight for equality. Research into heteronormative and heterosexist discourses in education has gathered pace over the past two decades (Blackburn & Buckley 2005; Sumara & Davis 1999; Green 1996; Liddicoat 2009; Dalley & Campbell 2006, among others), and although multiculturalism and gender equality have become far more visible in curriculum, textbooks, and classroom discourse, the issue of "compulsory heterosexuality" is still accorded little attention in TESOL and other classrooms (Nelson 2009; Kissen 2002; Meyer 2010). In fact "voicing one’s negative feelings about homosexuality is one of the last bastions of socially acceptable prejudice" (Loutzenheiser 1996: 2; see also Freeman 2012).

Foucault (1990: 86) points out that "power is tolerable only on condition that it mask a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms." The power of heterosexuality functions by masking its heteronormative mechanisms. It is for this reason that troubling heteronormative
discourse, unmasking the illusion of *hetero-norm* as a delusion, might be seen as the key to enabling more social justice in education.

So what exactly is heteronormativity? The arguments above posit an understanding of gender and subjectivity as being socially and historically constructed. Also, heterosexuality, whose meanings are similarly constructed, is based on the binary male/female, masculine/feminine. Heterosexuality has no meaning in itself but only on the basis of sexual desire of the opposite sex. Heteronormativity defines the position of heterosexuality as the norm in the binary construct heterosexuality/homosexuality, whereby the latter is the deviation from the norm. Social, cultural and historical, medical and legal discourse is constituted based on the presumption of heterosexuality, such is the extent of normative processes. Why this is the case is unclear. Sedgwick points out that historically there was a myriad of genital activity between individuals and why specifically "the gender of the object of choice" (1990: 8) is now given such momentous importance is baffling. The problem now lies in heterosexuality being privileged to the exclusion of all other diversity, which in today's global arena of humanity, appears sectarian. Monique Wittig, cited in Warner (1993: xxi), describes this privilege as a social contract: "[T]o live in society is to live in heterosexuality […]. Heterosexuality is always already there within all mental categories. It has sneaked into dialectical thought (or thought of differences) as its main category." In order to disrupt heteronormative discourse, especially in education, it seems expedient to employ a consciousness raising strategy in which the very normative processes are questioned and problematized and one approach can be through the use of queer theory.

3. Part 3 Que(e)rying and Sexual Diversity in LTE

In this case study analysis, I use queer theory (QT), which espouses a process of inquiry and employs a variety of strategies when investigating identity formation (Watson 2005; Warner 1993; Warner 2000). It challenges and disrupts normative and categorical or taken-for-granted assumptions. It is in constant flux. In fact it
"would be a decidedly un-queer thing to do" (Sullivan 2003: 43) to try and create a fixed definition. Turner's (2000) *Genealogy of Queer Theory* traces the origins back to a conceptual break after the Second World War, a sense of disillusion. He maintains, like Sullivan, that the definition, continues to be "conceptually slippery" (Ibid: 3). Nevertheless, he describes QT as emerging from a range of developments in philosophy, feminism, poststructuralism, civil rights movements, postmodernism to which I would add the communications' revolution through the internet and technological advances. I find Halperin's definition, cited in Sullivan (2003:43), the most fitting:

> Queer is by definition whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant. *There is nothing in particular to which it necessarily refers.* It is an identity without essence. 'Queer' then, demarcates not a positivity but a positionality *vis-à-vis* the normative. (Halperin in Sullivan 2003: 43)

In this study, the interrelatedness of three highly complex social discourses is central to the process of exploration and queering of heteronormativity: gender and subjectivity, sexual identity and the body, and power/knowledge relations re/producing heteronormative discourses. Addressing these issues in the LTE classroom means addressing social justice, and teaching strategies for inclusive teaching which includes all students regardless of their sex/gender or sexual identities.

QT contends that there is no essential natural sexual subject (Rodriguez 2007). What is problematic about the queering of gender and subjectivity is that norms offer safety, reliability, predictability and social recognition. A feminine girl who incorporates the attributes expected of her such as wearing make-up, loving shopping and dressing to please boys can enjoy the apparent stability such femininity offers. Similarly, the masculine boy knows what acceptable behaviour is and what must be avoided (Skelton 2001; Gard 2002) in order not to be considered feminine/homosexual, for example, he must not like high heels or pink clothes. I follow Blaise (2005), who uses the term hegemonic masculinity in its definition as a "dominant form of masculinity that governs and subordinates other patterns of
masculinity and femininity" (2005: 86) and "emphasized femininity" as femininity which is compliant and subordinated.

Using QT to trouble heterosexuality as a discourse and not a fixed ideology reveals the latter's restrictions and allows for new conceptualisations and new ways of behaving (Rodriquez 2007). This is a considerable challenge in this homogeneous context. QT inquires into "whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant" (Halperin in Sullivan 2003:43). For example, visibility of sexual diversity is important in that it functions to proffer identification models for students and fosters inquiry by challenging the hegemony of heterosexuality (Straut & Sapon-Shevin 2002; Summerhawk 1998; Weiss 2001). However, it is rare in TLS or images in textbooks in schools. By not only excluding images of not-heterosexuals, but also not teaching the linguistic forms to render students in a position to question and inquire, in effect makes the silencing all encompassing, which is highly problematic in an institution professing a commitment to democracy and tolerance. "In a world where language and naming are power, silence is oppression, is violence" (Rich, 1979: 204).

In education (and TESOL), power/knowledge discourses are regulated, policed and silenced through multiple discourses such as the (hidden) curriculum, school policies and procedures, cultural context, age of pupils, sites of school and universities (e.g. what knowledge is not included in Bavarian LTE), access to subject knowledge and staff attitudes (Nelson 2009). In the UK, the No Outsiders project was a groundbreaking critical social action research project which addressed these heteronormative discourses and involved a collaboration between researchers and teachers in primary schools to explore the ways in which LGBT equality could be addressed (Allan et al. 2008). It aimed at contributing to "educational transformation" (DePalma & Atkinson 2009a: 83) by challenging heteronormativity and trying to find strategies that would effectively address sexual equality in schools, for example, by introducing texts dealing with non-heterosexual families. Some of the key findings showed that combating isolation (of teachers) with support networks, extensive discussion and reflection, and providing
resources and training helped participants and researchers alike to understand homophobia and heteronormative processes in primary schooling so that resistance and transformation became a possibility. It was not, however, without considerable resistance (Atkinson & DePalma 2007; DePalma & Atkinson 2009a; DePalma 2010).

Research in TESOL has also addressed the issue of heteronormativity by investigating how it functions in the classroom, what effects it has on individuals and why it has remained so stubbornly resistant to change (Meyer 2010; Rodriguez & Pinar 2007; Robinson & Ferfolja 2008; Kissen 2002; Skelton, Francis & Smulyan 2006). The interrelatedness and complexity of these discourses, their embeddedness in the social context, and the hegemony of heterosexuality often hamper resistance, as the No Outsiders project made clear. Kissen's 2002 Getting Ready For Benjamin, Rodriguez & Pinar et al.'s 2007 Queering Straight Teachers and Nelson's 2009 Sexual Identities are similar attempts to inform in order to transform praxis in education, language education and teacher education. Kissen's anthology covers a wide range of issues currently being researched in teacher education - surveying the theoretical background to the field in general, looking at new research and giving an overview of some of the everyday problems individual teachers have encountered. Key questions which are addressed in this collection, which are also central to other research projects on sexual diversity, are:

- How can teachers learn to recognise their own exclusionary behaviours or language?
- How can teachers be taught how to teach about sexual diversity?
- How can teachers be taught how to deal with homophobia in their classrooms?
- Should teachers include materials which address sexual diversity and what responses have they had?
- Should teachers come out to their students or not and what repercussions are there?
Straut and Sapon-Shevin and the other authors in this anthology point out that "faculty often assume that all of the students who sit before them in their teacher education classes are heterosexual" (2002: 31), as do students themselves, which then provokes a typical reaction/resistance that those addressing sexual diversity (or race, religion, class) issues in the classroom have some kind of personal invested interest that they wish to promote (see also DePalma & Atkinson 2009b). This derives from the pervasiveness of hegemonic heterosexuality which, when contested, Straut and Sapon-Shevin say, results in either "invisibility or hyper-visibility" (Ibid: 33). They suggest that 3 strategies for dealing with sexual diversity include increasing students' knowledge about the issues for example assumptions about gender, numbers of LGBTQI individuals in society, encouraging them to be courageous and see not tolerating implicit exclusion as a development and improvement in education and as an ongoing process in which their skills will improve. Their third point is to teach pre-service teachers to examine their own assumptions and promote respect for difference by "stimulating, respectful dialogue about issues beyond students' immediate experiences, and guiding students to consider the voices of those who have been silenced" (36). Simone (2002) also promotes a critically (self) reflective approach as a key strategy to queer entrenched opinions on an individual basis and suggests connecting the theoretical with the personal and practical through a "Personal Process Transformation Exercise" (147) which she tried out successfully with her pre-service teachers. The aim here was to gain "a deeper understanding and resonance with the topics at hand. The overall goal was to help them get to the heart of diversity in their own lives so they could be more responsive (rather than reactive) to situations that made them uncomfortable and unproductive as students and teachers" (Ibid: 149). What is problematic here is that there is little indication of how to proceed if students refuse to carry out such assignments with due diligence as they may not be capable of being critical if they have had "no experience of being Othered" (Luke 2004: 27). If they are not compulsory to gain credit for a course, it may be difficult to persuade students to overcome their resistance.
The issue of coming out or not in the classroom, both as teachers or as students, is a highly complex one with far-reaching repercussions. Coming out can be met with homophobia, ostracising, being seen solely in terms of their sexual identity rather than as teachers/educators, or even loss of employment (Conrad & Crawford 1998; also Nixon & Givens 2006). The fear of these consequences often leads to teachers and students remaining invisible and silenced as they know about the attitudes and beliefs of the social context they live in, which are often quite freely voiced, such as "males who are close to children are gays or paedophiles" (Berill & Martino 2002: 60), where the term gay is on a par with paedophile as abject. It is well documented in this anthology (Kissen & Phillips; Rofes; King & Bridley; Jiménez) and elsewhere (Epstein & Johnson 1994; Atkinson 2004; Pinar 2007; Ferfolja 2007; Jackson 2009; Crookes 2009 among others) that self-preservation is often the result of this knowledge and an absence of their existence in image or language. This results in teachers creating two distinct lives: one is the professional persona teacher, educator, assumed heterosexual who passes and covers (Griffin 1991) by adopting behaviours and strategies that reinforce heterosexual assumptions, and the other the private and personal existing outside of education (Sparkes 1994; DePalma & Atkinson 2009b; Nixon & Givens 2004, 2006). This is a reality for many individuals in institutional contexts comprising restrictive religious cultures or traditions which are both politically and socially heteronormative. It is paradoxical, however, that coming out may in fact solidify the binary hetero/homosexuality and create the not-heterosexual as Other. DePalma & Atkinson (2009b: 882) cite Patai’s notion of surplus visibility as the result of coming out; in linguistic terms, it is markedness, whereby unmarked is the norm. Individuals are immediately seen as Other, with any or all stigma that may be associated with it. Heterosexual individuals enjoy what they call "simple visibility" and an "ordinariness" (Ibid: 887), often unaware that their sexual orientation is affirmed and reaffirmed constantly and in all kinds of contexts e.g. wedding rings, stories about home activities or celebrations where husbands wives or plus ones are invited. DePalma & Atkinson see surplus visibility as part of a process which may lead to simple visibility for not-heterosexuals contending
to be visible, simply visible, they must be talked into a state of ordinariness. And since this is particularly difficult for lesbian and gay teachers to do, straight teachers must be willing to collaborate. (Ibid: 884)

Barnard (1994) suggests it is important on the one hand that non-heterosexual teachers come out to function as positive role models and heterosexual teachers do not because in this scenario, students can no longer see the teacher as "one of us" in the assumption of uniform heterosexuality. This can have the effect that students' status quo is thrown into disarray and everything they take for granted is thrown into flux. While this can be creative, it seems to me that learners might spend a great deal of time wondering about the teacher's sexual orientation rather than focussing on diversity per se defeating the purpose of the non-disclosure (Sparkes 1994; Conrad & Crawford 1998). Also, as language educators, seeing diversity in linguistic terms means teaching a range of target language and trying to move beyond binaries. Whatever the teacher chooses, it will be problematic.

Rodriguez & Pinar's (2007) collection also addresses the issue of the collaboration of heterosexual teachers by offering insights into strategies for both LGBQTI and straight teachers/student teachers to find ways of disrupting heteronormativity and thereby introducing a more socially just educational environment. The espoused goal of the eponymous title Queering Straight Teachers is to "explore the range of possibilities for what it might mean in theory and/or in practice to queer straight teachers [sic]" (ix). This collection, however, is also part of the development of a way of thinking about the wider effects of "straight" not only in education, but as an organisational principle for our world. Pinar writes of our "polarized political landscape" (9) and comments on parallels between "misogyny and the rape of the earth" (Ibid) and that "straightness – not degeneracy - is the inversion of sustainability" (Ibid). To queer then is to enter into a discourse that dismantles what has been taken as given, that shreds the heteronormative and that disassembles the ostensibly natural construct of binarity. To queer with the aim of seeking greater straight/forward social justice is a philosophically tricky business. There must exist a tension between the deconstructive momentum of the queering process which, by definition, disrupts the very binary categories of justice/injustice and a social justice agenda. If QT deconstructs, then there are no binaries and no
fixed identities on which to base a quest for social justice, which, in turn, needs the very static, fixedness of subject identity to argue for equity in justice for a clearly defined group.

In a special issue of research papers dealing with the notion of “after-queer”, Talburt & Rasmussen argue in favour of a pursuit of queer, exhibiting our desire to run after queer projects in research, while recognizing that the ‘queer’ project is necessarily incomplete, even unrealizable. (2010: 2)

They explain that after-queer is not understood as a temporal aspect as in the sense of “post” but as a “progression”(Ibid) in the discipline, a way forward, especially with respect to encouraging cross-disciplinary dialogue. While I agree that there is an “ambivalence about ‘proper subjects’ and ‘proper locations’” (Ibid: 10) in queer educational research, as a pragmatist teacher/educator, I am in the business of dealing with teaching individuals/subjects to implement a queer stance at the chalk face as a means to invite que(e)rying of materials, colleagues, institutional biases and their own subjectivity. While I consider a progression in theoretical terms in the realm of academia an interesting and important endeavour, I believe that like racism, feminism and heterosexism, there is much that needs to be changed on the ground before complacency and ennui can take root. Talburt & Rasmussen cite McKee (Ibid: 5), who questions whether one can be excited by the way QT can “deconstruct the binary categories by which heterosexuality sustains and reproduces itself” (Ibid: 5). In this case study, in this conservative context in which QT had never been heard of, let alone taught as part of a LTE programme, there was very clear enthusiasm in the process.

In her critical argument against the idea of dismantling into nothingness as an aspect of postmodern discourse, such as QT, Atkinson (2002b) advocates a perspective which sees deconstruction as a means of destabilizing certainty, a tool which “creates social critique and forces change”(76). She maintains that it is not necessary to equate deconstruction with destruction but rather
If contemporary change occurs through the dissemination of power via networks of control, the opening up of these networks and the examination of their textual silences is a powerful force for social change. (Ibid: 81)

There is a growing body of research and resources on LGBTQI issues in education which highlights the shortcomings in many institutional contexts as the Global Alliance for LGBT Education (GALE 2012) reports illustrate, both in terms of legal and social discrimination. In his introduction to the collection, however, Pinar also makes it clear that the use of QT in education is still problematic:

The status of queer theory within the academic field of education is an ongoing scandal. In a profession presumably dedicated to diversity and equal opportunity, queers remain the last legitimate target of "straights". (2007: 2)

This text investigates bullying, scientific explanations of homo/heterosexuality, how heterosexuality is systematically performed and maintained, how education promotes and privileges heterosexual males and how these mechanisms might be resisted, as well as what queering actually means especially when attempting to change curriculum and institutionalised heteronormativity. Ruffolo (in Pinar 2007: 255) talks about the "negotiations of differences, rather than similarities" as being a change in perspective in queer discourse, which results in the dissolving of the very category of straight teacher. Following Butler's argument, as well as a poststructuralist understanding of the instability of the self (cf. section 2.4 Gender and Subjectivity pp. 51-57 above),

how the "I" comes into being through subjectivation: the intelligibility of a "straight" teacher as a completely coherent an fixed subject is an idealistic impossibility."

(Ruffolo in Pinar 2007: 266)

If there is no straight and no gay, there is only fluidity and plurality. Ruffolo speaks of the "third space outside of binary ideologies" (270) which is a dynamic space in which diversity moves and becomes, elusive, unfixed. It is a space which may appear utopian but in which many individuals and groups already live and move as subjects thus straddling the notions of a denied identity and an affiliation with a recognised group identity to argue for more social justice. It is a space which offers a different way of seeing, a queer way, which can be learned by others.
Nelson's (2009) *Sexual Identities* focuses specifically on how queering can be employed in the TESOL field, particularly English Language classes, giving suggestions on ways to think "through the challenges and complexities of teaching English in ways that take into account sexual diversity" (ix). It can be seen as a resource for teachers and teacher educators in the TESOL field, whether in immersion courses or higher education LTE programmes. It provides a holistic insight into how theory can be brought together with practical teaching situations. As an empirical study giving voice to a large number of teachers and learners, it integrates how to deal with problems such as homophobic reactions in the classroom, teachers' and students' insecurities, dealing with explicitly gay and lesbian texts and topics and the ubiquitous issue of coming out or not – what implications this may have for students or teachers, what problems may arise in different institutional and cultural contexts and crucially, what consequences there may be and how one can deal with them. This text constitutes a comprehensive guide for teachers and researchers interested in combating heteronormativity. The final section offers five key strategies gleaned from this project as well as findings from other research on language, subjectivity, sexuality, gender, and heteronormative processes (see also Britzman 1995; Canagarajah 2006; Curran 2006):

1. Recognizing that Sexual Literacy is Part of Linguistic/Cultural Fluency
2. Facilitating Queer Inquiry about the Workings of Language/Culture
3. Unpacking Heteronormative Discourses for Learning Purposes
4. Valuing Multisexual Student and Teacher Cohorts
5. Asking Queer Questions of Language-Teaching Resources and Research

(Nelson 2009: 205-18)

With all three texts, one problem stands out: the issue of resistance both by teachers and learners. Lehr (in Kissen 2002) points out how rigid social and political norms may offer students such solid ground for resistance that a queer approach is thwarted before it begins. Lecturing in science as well as *Social Foundations of Education* at Virginia Tech, she distributed readings and questions for discussion on heterosexuality, heterosexism, and the silencing of
homosexuality issues with the aim of preparing a discussion. Students, however, responded by arguing for the condemnation of homosexuality and used religious and biological reasoning to prove the "unnaturalness" (39) of it. She says

[b]y the end of the class, the vocal critics of homosexuality did not appear to be moved. They still did not see the place for even a discussion [sic] of sexual orientation in any class, including this one. (Ibid)

To engage in discourse presumes a willingness on the part of the learners, it presumes flexibility in curriculum, course content and construction, it also presumes some kind of leverage to inveigle students to suspend resistance momentarily to allow the seed of an alternative perspective to germinate and Ruffolo’s third space to come into being. Even in the context of university education, this is not always a given.

A critical perspective involves seeing knowledge as a social construction bound to power and ideology (Tierney 1996). Thus questioning what knowledge is taught, where, when and to whom, as discussed above in the context of Bavarian LTE, might divulge hidden structures that obstruct learning to see queerly. Discourses of sexuality and power are interlinked and perpetuated, on the whole unknowingly, through the tool of language. Individuals in these classrooms are constituted throughout their school careers by their subjection to the knowledges they interact with, including adherent silences and taboos such as sexual diversity. I would add to this discussion that the female gendered subject is doubly disadvantaged. Within educational institutions, the dominance and privileging of hegemonic masculinity means that while discriminatory structures exclude non-heterosexual identifications, closeted males will still enjoy the privileges of the male hegemony not accessible to female teachers, students or pupils and thus a feminist approach must continue to highlight these inequities (Skelton & Francis 2001, 2009; Cameron 2006; Walkerdine & Lucey 1989). I am convinced that education is the key to creating a better society, which can view individuals as differentiated subjects with fluid and shifting identities (Braidotti 1994; Butler 2004). As argued above, a crucial aspect of the que(e)rying process is language as the foundation of communication and
discourse. As a language teacher educator, it seems to me that LTE is a good starting point.

By queering where/when the embodied teachers are, who they are, what they teach, how and to whom, as well as what they do not teach and why, they may become aware of the pervasiveness of exclusion, but also how to disrupt it. Exploring processes constituting gender, subjectivity, sexual plurality and the power structures regulating them in LTE, this critical study will contribute to a better understanding of how LTE (in this context) can be improved.
CHAPTER 4

Research Methodology

1. Introduction

This chapter will outline the project’s research design as a case study and discuss the ways in which the exploration constituted a unique insight into the ways real staff and students dealt with the issues in a real-life LTE programme. It will present the multiple methods used for data collection and analysis, the tracing of the process (Gerring 2007) of carrying out the research and the challenges both participants and I faced in dealing with these issues. Further, I will address the methods used to analyse the findings, ensure validity and reliability as well as the ethical considerations and issues of confidentiality involved in such a sensitive research topic.

2. Research design

There were a number of reasons to choose a case study research design: it would do justice to the chronological/diachronic nature of the project, it would focus on the participants and attempt to view and understand the issues from their perspectives, and it would offer a rich and detailed description and analysis of the events and issues in the case (Hitchcock & Hughes cited in Cohen et al. 2007). Because the aim of this research was to investigate the awareness of issues of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity in this specific Bavarian university LTE programme (as well as the potential for raising awareness of these issues), and because there are many highly complex factors such as personal and professional identity, cultural and religious heritage and social and institutional conformity that impact on these issues, both consciously and unconsciously, and
over which the researcher has no control, the case study design is a perfect fit for the purpose of observing the effects of these factors in this real context (Cohen et al. 2007).

My role in the study was both participant, observer and analyst and as such, I played an integral part of the process. This was not without many difficulties, which I will address below. Gerring & Dermott (2007a: 688) say: “The case study is a form of analysis where one or a few units are studied intensively with an aim to elucidate features of a broader class of—presumably similar but not identical—units.” The class to which this study unit belongs is that of LTE per se, particularly LTE in Bavaria (which I outlined in chapter 2), which is representative of a conservative and often restrictive environment for diversity issues in education. This case is also a kind of heuristic in that the participants were challenged to discover for themselves their own exclusive and silencing behaviours. I used a multiple (mixed) methods approach (Creswell 2003), incorporating a significant measure of reflexivity (Hammersley & Atkinson 1995) and sensitivity (Maxwell 2005) throughout the design process. I hold with Gerring (2007b) that both quantitative and qualitative methods can be useful in a case study assuming they all contribute to the same ends of providing a richness of description. As a real-life context, an LTE programme is preparing real students to become real teachers and responsible for generations of pupils and thus I believe warrants close scrutiny.

Jürgen Habermas of the Frankfurt School defined three motivations that drive research: the desire to predict and control (scientific), the desire to understand (practical interpretation) and the desire to change society for the better (critical) (Ernest, 1994: 71). Employing a queer theoretical approach, this research is very much part of the critical paradigm although as an exploratory study, it can only point out areas for change, not necessarily instigate it. It adopts an ontological position which is anti-foundationalist i.e. that the world does not exist outwith our knowledge of it (Grix 2004), with a stance that deems the construction of subjects and subjectivity as inextricably bound to the social, cultural and historical moments
in which they are constituted. Since it is an investigation of LTE, knowledge of language and how language functions at any given moment is a key aspect of the investigation, as is the use of discourse as a consciousness raising tool. Sapir holds that it is

an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact is that the 'real world' is to a large extent unconsciously built up on the habits of the group.(Sapir 1985: 162)

If the group is exclusive, it follows that the language will reflect this exclusiveness and investigating and problematizing language use may be seen as a means to question that exclusiveness. Whorf develops this further positing that we "cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way" (Whorf 1956: 213). The questions in this research derive from the understanding that there are members in the group whose very existence is not conceived of in the classroom but to whom significances are ascribed which do not necessarily reflect their reality. For example, what knowledge do teachers present in class about non-heterosexual individuals, which TLS are there and what images? Are there images or texts about not-heterosexual families, or language examples about same-sex couples? This, in turn, can be seen as a description of the heteronormative dynamic dominating classroom (and in many cases general educational) discourse (Greene 1996, Nelson 2011, La Pastina 2006).

My understanding of language as the foundation of discourse and discourse as the means to organise how we understand the world constitutes the foundation of my epistemological and ontological underpinnings (Alexander 2006). Employing an interpretative methodology means looking at the particular in order to generate knowledge about the whole and in this context, looking at the individual teacher, student and classroom topic helps explore the whole learning field. This is very much in line with the aim of carrying out a case study. It is not a question of objectively identifying 'what is' but of studying the way subjects interpret and find meanings in different situations, which is also interdependent on the context and
historical time in which those meanings are found. An interpretive approach seeks to explore, understand, and perhaps explain (Bryman 2004; Angen 2000) why sexual diversity is excluded from the classroom. Using a variety of methods to gain what Ernest terms a "rich" description (Ernest 1994: 25), which offers different perspectives from real human beings on their real experience, seems to be the most expedient means of interrogating highly complex processes such as those at play in the field of education in general and LTE in particular. Exploring these processes means exploring social interactions between individuals and as such falls in the realm of socio-behavioural inquiry (Lincoln & Guba 1985; Guba & Lincoln 1994).

Investigating gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity means investigating equity, exclusionary and justice issues. Insights gained though seeing the world through the eyes of the colonized, the view of the Other, insights into the mechanisms of power and its systematic reproduction – all of these approaches offer a differentiating queer(y)ing ontological position in which the subject is sited in a particular context, influenced and regulated by forces in that context and given or denied access to a specific reality (Crotty 1998; Bartky 1990; Braidotti 1994; Foucault 1975, 1980; Clack 1999). As there are so many perspectives to consider, the use of an interdisciplinary approach employing a range of methods seems to be fitting.

Butler’s (1993) term hegemonic heterosexuality describes the interdependencies of understandings of sex, gender and sexuality. It reflects a sense of dynamic processes of leading and dominating, but also of having constantly to repeat itself so that the understandings are maintained. Butler suggests that this

heterosexual performativity is beset by an anxiety that it can never fully overcome, that its effort to become its own idealizations can never be fully achieved, and that it is consistently haunted by that domain of sexual possibility that must be excluded for heterosexualized gender to produce itself.

(Ibid: 125)

The moments in which this performativity fails provide spaces for the processes of resistance and are discussed by Britzman (1995), who postulates that learners
may not always be willing to accept knowledge, that there are things that "students and teachers cannot bear to know" (Ibid: 158). She highlights the use of queer theory (QT) as a method to critique "the repetitions of normalcy as a structure and as a pedagogy" (153). Also, the way in which individuals are complicitous in their own domination is captured in Gramsci's notion of hegemony and organised consent (1971). Like Foucault, he wrote of how power is exerted through institutions, such as in education, and how these were both coercive, for example via the curriculum, and not coercive as seen in the hidden curriculum. Teachers do have room to choose whether to consent and conform to the regulation or resist it. Foucault's use of the metaphor of the self-monitoring and self-regulating Panopticon (cf. p. 59) is also reminiscent of Gramsci's organised consent. In language terms, the systematic use of the term slag as a regulation of girls' behaviour, as discussed in chapter 3, also reflects organised consent. In order to exploit the moments of resistance which might be possible in the sometimes rigid institutional structure of education, it seems to me that a queer theoretical approach within a course can question definitions of words such as masculine/feminine, male/female/other, marriage, woman/man, identity, knowledge and education and so on and by doing so, trouble the meanings through classroom discourse. Additionally, discussing the meanings and questioning the status quo through interviews reveals to both students and researcher how language is understood by participants. Revealing what is not seen or known, but also learning how to see from a different perspective and thus disrupting taken-for-granted knowledge means "violating the sacred order of heteronormative intelligibility" (Atkinson & DePalma 2009: 23).

A queer theoretical basis for the design of this research fits well with the critical paradigm, which has praxis or action as a central tenet and goes beyond predicting and interpreting (Cohen et al. 2007; Carr & Kemmis 1986) It offers a worldview which is critical of the ideology of the status quo, in this case hegemonic heterosexuality, and aims at transforming it to bring about a more just world with greater equality for all. The epistemology of this paradigm is informed by relativism: the truth is relative and unstable and knowledge is dependent on the knower
(Ernest 1994). This does not mean that socially constructed reality is not just as real (Crotty 1998: 63) or that it does not discriminate. I believe that social justice is a question of humanity and not doing harm. I hold with Rorty (1979) who rejects the notion that relativism means “every belief on a certain topic, or perhaps about any topic, is as good as every other” (166). The socially constructed beliefs of the necessity of female genital mutilation or China’s footbinding are inhuman crimes against certain disempowered groups. My understanding of social justice is that individuals have the right to have autonomy over their body and not be subjected to social, physical, economic or emotional harm because of that bodily morphology, regardless of culture. If real social, economic and political power structures affect and effect meanings and understandings of class, race, sex, gender, age, and sexual diversity in education, then they play a role in the generation of knowledge (Foucault 1980; Clack 1999) or resistance to that knowledge in the form of ignorance (Britzman 1995).

The methodology that best serves this theoretical approach is a multiple (mixed) methods approach, which can answer a variety of questions and proffer a range of perspectives, thus integrating both the 'what is' of quantitative study by means of a questionnaire with the 'why' gleaned from qualitative subjective interpretations from class discussions, interviews, reflective essays and research notes. Combined and in keeping with the focus of the case to produce multiple perspectives on Bavarian LTE, these data can then offer multilayered analyses on which potentially transformatory or emancipatory action could be based (Lather 2006; Somekh & Lewin 2005), which will be discussed in detail in chapter 6. However, as a case study, it first and foremost aims at obtaining a detailed perspective of the status quo is and then finding out how participants might interpret and trouble this status quo. Following Casebeer and Verhoef’s (1997) notion, “we should view qualitative and quantitative methods as part of a continuum of research with specific techniques selected based on the research objective” (in Plano Clark & Creswell 2008: 367). In order to “recognize the ‘embeddedness’ of social truths” (Cohen et al. 2007: 256), it was crucial to survey who the participants were in the context, how they fit into the social reality of the geographical area and look at their
attitudes towards the issues under investigation as well as the regulative forces they were subjected to.

The research was designed to take place over 4 months, (with a pilot study to test out the questionnaire 6 months in advance) and comprised 4 phases with the following overarching questions:

- To what extent are respondents aware of heteronormative processes in Language Teacher Education?
- In what ways do participants see gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity?
- What experiences do not-heterosexual students and staff have?
- How might course content and structure contribute to raising awareness of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity as social justice issues?
- In what ways can such a course raise critical awareness and what limitations might arise?

3. Sample/Participants

I began this study by visiting a secondary school English class to see what kinds of materials were used and gain an initial insight into TLS used, and the presence of diversity. Following this, I carried out an initial pilot study with a random group of 120 students in the first three semesters of their LTE programme. A questionnaire was distributed to elicit students awareness of inclusiveness as an issue that needed to be explicitly addressed in their LTE programme and what challenges they foresaw. The questionnaire was then reworked with more open questions to render more qualitatively insightful data.

The participants in the study proper comprised individuals who were taking part in or teaching on the LTE programme of an urban university in Bavaria in the south of Germany. There were four groups of participants:
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**Group 1**: Students at the beginning of their LTE programme (122)

**Group 2**: Students on the LTE who identified as not-heterosexual (4)

**Group 3**: Lecturers on the LTE, 2 of whom identified as not-heterosexual (3)

**Group 4**: Participants on an LTE course on social justice in education (4)

Students in *group 1* were a random sample of 122 students enrolled in the beginning (1-3 semesters) of the LTE programme for English (according to intake statistics this constitutes 67% of the average of 182 students over 3 terms). The students’ ages usually range from between 18 and 22. Students in *group 2* (cf. tabular biographies groups 2-4 Appendix E 1) comprised students at various stages of the LTE programme to become English teachers in the German school system and volunteered to be interviewed after seeing a flyer advertising the project in the university (cf. Appendix O). *Group 3* comprised 2 highly experienced lecturers teaching language and culture classes, including speaking and writing skills, on the LTE programme in English, who volunteered to be interviewed and a third (German) English teacher from a local high school (*Gymnasium*), who was simultaneously responsible for supervising pre-service teachers in their practical training phase, post graduation. He too is a highly experienced educator who teaches these teachers to deal with practical everyday classroom and school issues, including disciplining, teaching methods, methodologies, coping strategies and pedagogy. The final group, *group 4*, comprised the participants who signed up and participated in a course called *Social Justice in Education* which took place over one semester, meeting for 90 minutes once a week.

4. Researcher

The many subjectivities that I bring to the research process necessarily impact upon both the process itself, especially in the teaching phase, but also the results (Burman 1992). I have been teaching TESOL in university teacher education for 15 years and it is clear that my own subjectivities as lecturer, researcher, not-heterosexual woman, former dancer, multilingual speaker, political activist, feminist, disabilities advocate and many other subjectivities have informed my own
ontological, epistemological and axiological positions, which in turn formed but also informed the study. From a queer theoretical perspective, I hold that these subjectivities are in constant flux and as such may or may not appear at different points in the research process, thus constant vigilance and reflection are required. My position as researcher was difficult to separate from my positions as not-heterosexual woman, colleague/academic and teacher/educator and the various power constructs and biases that went along with these positionings. The dynamic tension and multidirectional influence that exists between researcher and participant subjectivities is also a crucial aspect informing the process and the analysis as a whole.

As a non-native German speaker and TESOL lecturer, my cultural background was different (with the exception of 2 staff members) from that of the respondents, who were native German speakers. On the one hand, it is sometimes easier to speak about sensitive issues to a stranger in a foreign language, on the other hand, I was a stranger and much older than the students and the issue of my strangeness and authority as a university educator may have influenced how freely they gave information (Kehily 2002). This meant that in the interviews, I sometimes had to decide spontaneously how much information about myself I should reveal. Another factor was my own identity as a not-heterosexual woman. Problematizing the issue of sexual diversity in an interview with openly LGBQTI students may be affected by whether the researcher is also open about her sexuality or not. Following Wood's (2005) essay about the difficulties involved in being and speaking with the voice of a not-heterosexual identity within education, and particularly a conservative educational arena, I, too, was at times faced with a dilemma and a paradox. It is a dilemma that as an advocate of QT holding a stance of interrogation and disruption of the status quo, I was constantly faced with the question of whether to speak out and risk that my teaching be understood as a personal agenda, or not to speak out and thus to be complicit in the presumption of heterosexuality (see also DePalma & Atkinson 2009b), but simultaneously to perhaps be more effective as an educator or interviewer. As a researcher, I attempted to create a sensitive and neutral atmosphere in the interviews and the classroom, but found it extremely challenging
when facing openly homophobic comments and sometimes was not able to speak. This is a weakness of my own bias towards justice issues where my ability to perform what Wood terms "critical pedagogy in drag" (Wood 2005: 434) was not always effective. Woods cites Kopelson, who argues that progressive pedagogues have to be “sneakier” (Ibid.) and sometimes have to implement a “performance of neutrality” (Ibid) to combat students’ resistances, something that does not come naturally to me. Arguably, I may have been able to keep Wendy (cf. Appendix E 1) in class if I had been more adept at this.

I found it easier to interview the LGBQTI students, whose experiences I could identify with, than the course participants, feeling more of an insider and member of the former community. I spoke openly as a not-heterosexual woman to these individuals if it came up naturally in the conversation or was necessary to help them feel at ease, which it did only with Toby and Mathew. In the participant interviews, I had a far more neutral positionality as lecturer/educator, non-German and from a different generation to the students, but also not openly not-heterosexual. I chose not to be out in this group as pedagogically, I considered it more advantageous in class to queer the whole issue of everyone’s sexual identity, to posit an unstable category and to have them wonder (Nelson 2009; Conrad & Crawford 1998). As a relatively novice researcher, I found it difficult to uphold my stance as listener and facilitator with "strategic and technical detachment" (Holliday, 2007: 178) in the interviews when faced with certain homophobic comments or lack of awareness of extreme heteronormative statements. Nevertheless, I was convinced that the knowledge being produced was part of the overall queer discourse which was taking place in the classroom as well as the interviews. My fluid subjectivities and those of the interviewees and participants were an intrinsic part of the investigation as was where and when this LTE programme was taking place.

5. Detailed Research Questions

The following detailed questions outline the aims of this study:
1. Are the students who will be future English teachers aware of the issues of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity and do they want to deal with them as part of their degree course? [questionnaire]
   1.1 Are the students a homogeneous group with respect to cultural background and language?
   1.2 Are the students aware of bullying issues?
   1.3 Do students differentiate between discrimination for reasons of sexual orientation and other reasons?
   1.4 Have students experienced discrimination themselves or with others?

2. What are the specific experiences of LGBQTI students and teachers on this programme? [interviews]
   2.1 What experiences have LGBQTI students had as pre-service teachers?
   2.2 What experiences have LGBQTI teachers had teaching on the programme?
   2.3 What aspects of their programme would LGBQTI students wish to change?
   2.4 To what extent do LGBQTI students and teachers think it necessary to integrate sexual diversity as an issue to be discussed critically and learned about in their LTE programme?
   2.5 In what ways might this be carried out and what kinds of problems do they anticipate?

3. What are the classroom realities of addressing inclusiveness in these areas with respect to structure, preparation, content, delivery, student responses and evaluation? [class construction and delivery in a 15-week semester]
   3.1 In what ways can gender issues be addressed in class?
   3.2 In what ways can critical awareness of sexual diversity be promoted in class?
   3.3 In what ways can heteronormativity in materials be altered to be more just?
   3.4 What skills/strategies/knowledge do pre-service teachers need to deal with these issues in their future classrooms?
4. In what ways would students attending such a class gain a greater critical awareness of the issues? [Class analysis through a reflective journal, reflective essays, exit interviews]

4.1 What kinds of problems are students aware of as inherent in exclusive language?

4.2 What kinds of problems are students aware of with imagery?

4.3 What kinds of critical strategies have students learned to deal with heteronormative materials and structures in the classroom?

4.4 In what ways do students feel able to integrate sexual diversity issues in their own classes?

4.5 In what ways do students feel they have gained a heightened critical awareness of sexual diversity as a social justice issue?

6. Methods and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Exploratory questionnaire</th>
<th>Course design/structuring of course content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative/Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Staff interviews</th>
<th>LGBQTI student interviews</th>
<th>Course delivery/recordings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Delivery of course &amp; researcher's reflective journal</th>
<th>Exit interviews of participants</th>
<th>Students' reflective essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Email dialogue with student interviewees for triangulation</th>
<th>Email dialogue with course participants for reflection on course effects</th>
<th>Email dialogue with staff interviewees for triangulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.2:** Research Phases & Data Collection Tools

**Figure 4.2** above illustrates the 4 sequential phases of the research project as well as the attendant methods used. **Phase 1** comprised two parts: Part 1 consisted of a questionnaire to find out specific background information from the student body, their awareness of the issues and their attitudes towards integrating these issues both into their own education and their future teaching (cf. Appendix D 2). Part 2
comprised using the results of this questionnaire to extrapolate areas for further investigation and devise and structure course content which might address social justice issues as part of a practical language skills module.

**Phase 2** had three parallel elements:

i. 3 interviews with staff members on the programme  
ii. 4 interviews with LGBQTI students on the programme  
iii. delivery of the class content, recorded discussions with the participants and amendment of course materials in dialogue with the interview findings, as the class progressed

**Phase 3** comprised the delivery of the course, my own reflective journal, participants writing a short reflective essay (Appendix Q) and my conducting exit interviews with them individually at the end of the semester. Finally, **phase 4** of the project took place via email with the individual interviewees in order to explore any insights or changes of opinion 6-12 months after the project completion.

![Figure 4.3: Process](image)

The way in which the first three phases of the design interacted with each other can be illustrated in **figure 4.3** above. This shows how the findings from the
questionnaire impacted on the questions formulated for semi-structured interviews and how there was constant dynamic conflation of interview findings, the way the course was delivered (including changes in materials used and topics for discussion) as well as my own reflective journal, which I recorded after each teaching session in order to add more detailed reflections on behaviours, silences, looks or quiet comments which would not be picked up by the recording.

7. Phase 1

Quantitative research uses empirical data to reveal patterns and causes. Cohen et al. (2007: 15) hold that the key aspect of this scientific approach is its "empirical nature" and a "set of procedures which show not only how findings have been arrived at, but are sufficiently clear for fellow-scientists to repeat them". According to McDonough & McDonough, quantitative research utilizes

a precise question, experiments and quasi-experiments, explicit sets of variables, explicit tasks, sufficient participants to enable statistical inferences to be made, controls and counterbalances to eliminate rival interpretations and a means of ensuring the relevance of the results to the question. (1997: 158-9)

The quantitative researcher is often operating on the basis of assumptions and hypotheses, which may or may not be confirmed. Clearly, if the researcher is looking for absolute truth, an objective reality, or for causes and effects, as the positivist researcher often is – based on an ontological position of an objectifiable, value-free investigation – this calls for a different methodology than one looking for subjects' interpretations of their reality and experience, as the constructivist/interpretivist researcher is. Grix (2004: 66) argues in favour of a "directional relationship", whereby the researcher's ontological stance and epistemological assumptions underpin the methodologies and methods that are best suited to answer the research questions posed. This means that different methods are used for different purposes, as is the case in this study. The choice of a mixed methods design offers an element of the quantifiable and implements this to construct a more detailed search for explanations of the phenomena found.
7.1 Quantitative Data Collection

Part 1 of phase 1 comprised constructing a questionnaire (cf. Appendix D 1), revised from the findings of a pilot questionnaire, with the aim of gaining insights into the background of the student body, their awareness of discrimination issues and attitudes towards these issues as part of their LTE programme. This phase was crucial to creating a foundation from which to glean a sense of the status quo of the student body and the context. The pilot questionnaire used a Likert-like scale to gauge responses, however, I found the answers to be less informative than I had hoped and so amended the questionnaire design. The new questionnaire comprised 15 questions which contained a mixture of closed and open questions. The closed questions aimed at information on the gender, background and religious affiliations of participants whereas the open questions, following Bailey (1994), were chosen to cater for the many varied responses that I considered possible on the issues of diversity and discrimination. The hope was to offer respondents the opportunity to expand on their responses at the risk of being given "irrelevant and redundant information" (Cohen et al. 2007: 322). The questionnaire was structured so as to gather unthreatening information first, second to explore general understandings about what discriminatory issues are, and moving on to a third section aiming at exploring attitudes towards and personal experiences of discrimination, especially with respect to sexual diversity. The final section aimed at eliciting the perceived need to integrate these topics into classroom discourse and LTE.

I chose to follow Cohen et al. (Ibid) to self-administer the questionnaire as my experience of working with students was that they would be more likely to participate if the researcher was present and available for questions, and if they were given a section of time off in a class to fill in their answers. The questionnaire was distributed to approximately 130 students in a mandatory introductory lecture in the initial English LTE teaching programme at the university. The lecturer agreed to stop early to give me a chance to hand out the questionnaire so to speak to a captive audience. The respondents were informed about the project being part of an investigative piece of research into LTE and given the choice to leave the
lecture theatre or fill in the questionnaire. Some students left. 122 filled in and returned the questionnaire, some left omissions. The questionnaire was completely anonymous of which the students were assured from the outset.

My hypothesis for the questionnaire in **phase 1** was:

> These students are a homogeneous group with respect to cultural heritage and will consider it desirable to have a course on dealing with social justice issues in their LTE although some students will consider sexuality/sexual orientation not a suitable subject in the ESOL classroom.

The questionnaires were collected in envelopes anonymously and later analysed and coded. I will analyse and discuss the findings thoroughly in chapters 5 and 6.

### 7.2 Qualitative Data Collection

#### Course Content (cf. Appendix P)

Part 2 of **phase 1** comprised preparation of a course within a speaking skills segment of the university English LTE programme and covered the same issues addressed in the questionnaire, however, in more detail. The findings from the questionnaire, especially questions 1-5 & 7, showed that there was homogeneity in the group and they would reject discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation. Further, they confirmed that there was interest in dealing with these issues as part of their LTE programme (cf. Appendix D 2).

The findings from the questionnaire made me confident that students were aware of discrimination issues, were socially motivated to be just teachers and would be interested in the course I wanted to teach. In the preparation of the course, I followed Plummer (2011), who argues in favour of a queer methodology which posits the view that sexuality is everywhere and that using QT focuses on analysing and problematizing the way in which gender and sexuality are normally viewed as stable categories, as well as findings from similar work especially by Kissen (2002), Rodriguez & Pinar (2007), and Nelson (2009, 2010, 2011). As such, I proposed course content which would create a dynamic learning platform based on a queer theoretical approach, with a dialogue of inquiry that would challenge the
presumed stability and fixedness of categories such as sex, gender and sexuality. The following overarching objectives guided course content and aims:

- to encourage inquiry and questioning of all kinds of diversity (McKernan 2008; Warner 1993; Airton 2009a)
- to promote criticality and reflective practice (Schön 1983; hooks 1994)
- to reveal the hidden curriculum (Rios et al. 2010) and exclusionary practices as influenced by political, educational, social and economic norms
- to promote the disruption of (hetero)normative, categorical and taken-for-granted assumptions with respect to gender and sexual diversity (Watson 2005; Sullivan 2003)

The course was called Social Justice in Education and advertised in the university course catalogue for the LTE programme as follows:

**Social Justice in Education and TESOL** - As a language practise course, this class aims at promoting discussion of a variety of issues to do with social justice in the classroom. We will look at textbooks used in school, at what is included and excluded from the curriculum, how equity issues can be dealt with in class and problems that new teachers may face. While there is some theoretical reading, the concept of the class is to critically address a variety of issues through discussion and, through self-reflection, find strategies that might be helpful in students’ own future teaching.

As a linguist and experienced lecturer, I considered carefully how to deal with some key problems that I expected to arise when dealing with such a sensitive set of topics. Knowing the context and the homogeneity that I could expect amongst participants (from the questionnaire findings), it would be a significant challenge to deal with issues which affect subjects’ identities without alienating them. The course was designed to take place over a 15-week semester, meeting in 90 minute sessions once a week. My aim was to offer pre-service English teachers the time and space to analyse a variety of issues relating to gender, sexuality and sexual identification as well as other normative categories, which would impact on their future everyday lives as TESOL teachers, and to nudge them into a critical awareness of how to deal with them as well as considering strategies that may help in que(e)rying their own future classrooms. My hope was that the knowledge
and critical awareness gained through the course could be transferred to many other facets of the participants' LTE courses whether linguistics, didactics, literature or language competence and therefore, there was a high degree of immediacy and authenticity. However, as discussed in chapter 3, learners arrive in LTE programmes bringing with them beliefs, attitudes and assumptions about gender, sexual diversity as well as appropriacy for topics for the classroom. Nevertheless, the findings from the questionnaire persuaded me that students would be open to these discussions as they reported being aware of discrimination issues and being socially motivated to become teachers (cf. Figures 5.6 & 5.7 Appendix D 2). With ever current discussion in educational fields on how to use classroom time most effectively, teacher/student beliefs are significant in that they will impact on how inclusive the classroom discourse is. Learners have lived in a particular culture, have been susceptible to particular influences - social, religious, economical, meanings about gender and race – which will have informed their beliefs and assumptions. As newly qualified teachers, beginners often rely on their own school experiences and exclusive practices, especially with respect to heteronormativity. This knowledge played a role in designing course content, influencing the search for materials which students could relate to their own everyday lived experience as well as questioning their taken-for-granted norms in non-threatening ways. I designed a course with group discussions, readings, games, critical awareness tasks, and tasks to promote reflection on their own teaching materials (Schön 1983) on issues of gender, sexual diversity and discrimination.

8. Phase 2

Phase 2 of the investigation lasted 15 weeks and comprised the interviewing process as well as the teaching process. This marked a move from the quantitative/qualitative to a solely qualitative phase and constituted the most challenging aspect of the study.
8.1 Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative research tries to interpret the way the world is viewed by individual subjects and groups. Shank & Brown (2007: 59) describe how the search for "meanings in the world" adheres to the quantitative study of truth and "meanings in the person" to the qualitative. Qualitative research then interrogates why things are as they are. It takes into account fluidity and change and deems the subject in the study an active agent as opposed to passive object (Cohen et al. 2007). Whereas positivist analysis is based on statistics, scales and experimental designs, interpretivist analysis is based on description and categories or classes (Alwan 2007). It aims to find commonality from the particular not to predict on the basis of standard deviations, averages or correlations. As the particular is unpredictable, the interpretivist researcher gathers data in what Richards (2003: xxiii) terms the three "core data collection methods: observation, interviews, and the analysis of spoken interaction." This data gathering can occur in many different ways, and in this study, I chose to use interviews of different types of participants representing different aspects of the LTE programme, reflective essays and a reflective journal based on analysis and interpretation of classroom discussions. Exploring the commonalities between these diverse groups of individuals and areas of knowledge, it was hoped, would offer a similarly diverse picture. In doing so, the investigation would provide sufficient data to draw conclusions and answer the research questions that prompted the study in as holistic a manner as possible (Cohen et al. 2007). It is primarily for this reason that I chose this variety of methods and a focus on interviewing as tools for this study.

8.2 Interviews

Richards (2003) describes the interview as a structured event, which needs considerable training and skill and points out how questionnaires "will only take us so far […], they are not designed to explore the complexities and conundrums of the immensely complicated social world that we inhabit" (8). Kvale (1983) defined 12 aspects underlying the understanding of the qualitative interview:

- It is: 1) centered on the interviewee's life-world; 2) seeks to understand the meaning of phenomena in his [sic] life-world; it is 3) qualitative, 4) descriptive,
and 5) specific; it is 6) presuppositionless; it is 7) focused on certain themes; it is open for 8) ambiguities, and 9) changes; it depends upon the 10) sensitivity of the interviewer; it takes place in 11) an interpersonal interaction, and it may be 12) a positive experience. (1983: 174)

Kvale (2007: 1) sees it as an "inter-view", a dialogue between views and says it "attempts to understand the world from the subjects' point of view, to unfold the meaning of people's experiences, to uncover their lived world prior to scientific explanations" (Ibid: xvii). This intersubjective nature of the interview process means that the individuals will create a unique interview situation each time even though the topics addressed are broadly similar. This discourse creates knowledge in situ (Cohen et al. 2007). The extent of the structure can vary from highly structured, questionnaire-type interviews, which are also used in the scientific tradition, to semi-structured, where follow-up questions may be asked, to open-ended interviews, which have a plan but are open to an organic development (Perry 2005; Shank & Brown 2007). I chose the semi-structured interview for this study (cf. Appendix E) as my goal was to gather a variety of perspectives, attitudes and beliefs about diversity from respondents, which were as undistorted as possible through the interviewing event itself although a variety of factors made this difficult – which I will address below – including the very nature of addressing the highly sensitive issue of sexual diversity, my positionality as educator/researcher and our shared knowledge of the homogeneity of the cultural context, the shared knowledge of the influence of the Catholic church, the knowledge of the sense of disparity between German and Bavarian identity and the knowledge of the exclusion of the discourse of sexual diversity in education. The interview questions were slightly amended depending on whether the interviewees were staff or students (cf. Appendices E 2 & 3).

Kvale (2007: 102) also points out that the interview process itself produces knowledge and through the dialogues subjects may "see new meanings in what they experience and do so on the basis of their spontaneous descriptions". As part of a critical approach, this outcome is highly desirable. Through the process of the interview, it is not only the subjects who see new meaning, the very "selves" of both interviewer and interviewee are negotiated and simultaneously reflected within
the discourse of the interview process (Holstein & Gubrium 2003; Gale & Wyatt 2006, 2007).

The interviews were held exclusively in English, although I did offer translations if participants seemed to be searching for words. The majority of student interviews took place in my office and lasted between 45 minutes and an hour. Some student interviews took place off campus at a venue of their choice. I recorded the interviews on a digital recorder and transferred the data to my computer, which was password protected. Interviews with staff took place in their offices or place of work and lasted approximately one hour. All interviews were transcribed using the University of Wisconsin-Madison Transana programme. These transcriptions were emailed to all interviewees to revise, amend or otherwise comment on. They were free to veto content or add comments that may have occurred to them with hindsight.

Using data collection methods from both quantitative and qualitative methodologies with different ontological and epistemological stances requires rigorously formulated aims, which I have aspired to provide and use as guidance. Mixed-methods research illustrates a more pragmatic approach in the search for knowledge in a world full of multiplicities (Lather 2006; Plano Clark & Creswell 2008) including what Grix terms cross-fertilisation (2004: 98). What differs between the approaches however, as discussed above, is the purpose of the data and the ways in which they are analyzed, and, in this project, with a diachronic design, information from the quantitative findings feeds into the qualitative ones.

9. Phase 3

Phase 2 and phase 3 overlapped somewhat due to the interview schedule. As it was not possible to hold all the interviews at once, they took place over the same teaching period as the course, which meant that there was a dialogic element between both processes (cf. figure 4.3 above). I fed some of the information which came out of the discussions, especially with the LGBQTI students into discussions
in the class, for example that none of them felt “seen” as who they were in their LTE seminars.

**Phase 3** comprised the delivery of the course over a full university term comprising 15 teaching weeks, 2 introductory classes, 1 reading day and 2 assessment classes. The course took place once a week for 90 minutes in a university classroom. I recorded each session and afterwards recorded and wrote up a reflective journal on issues which had crystallized from class discussions and seemed of particular significance, such as silences, the lack of responses to topics or body language, and other behaviours which would not be caught by the audio recordings. The central method used in the class was discussion. Students were asked to prepare to discuss readings handed out in advance. There were some question and answer sessions as well as interactive activities and general theory input sessions, whereby part of the session was a presentation by me and discussed with questions with specific focus. There are a number of reasons for choosing to set this phase of the project within a classroom: first, the students taking the class are studying to be English teachers in the *Gymnasium* (cf. Appendix A) secondary school and will be teaching English language and culture to future generations of students. Second, the investigation aimed at finding out what kinds of awareness these future teachers had of diversity issues and in what ways heightened awareness could be promoted through classroom discourse. Third, could the students devise strategies, on the basis of their previous practical training periods in school as well as their own school experience, to open up materials in order to plan lessons to be more inclusive. There was an action research element to this process of reflection in that students used the same materials they would be teaching from when qualified. I hoped this would add authenticity and prepare them to reflect critically on future teaching materials. The class was prepared and delivered according to five key strategies outlined by Nelson (2009: 205-16) below as a framework for addressing sexual diversity in the classroom in general and LTE programmes in particular:

1. Recognizing that Sexual Literacy Is Part of Linguistic/Cultural Fluency (206)
2. Facilitating Queer Inquiry about the Workings of Language/Culture (208)
3. Unpacking Heteronormative Discourses for Learning Purposes (211)
4. Valuing Multisexual Student and Teacher Cohorts (213)
5. Asking Queer Questions of Language-Teaching Resources and Research (216)

The course was divided into 4 main areas: first, gender issues in language, culture and materials; the second, sexual diversity issues; the third, heteronormativity and the fourth, guided reflection on these issues. The content in classes under the heading Gender would address Nelson's first two strategies of que(e)rying language use, the use of the pseudo-generic he, the use of male TLS, predominantly male images or grammar sentences containing a male default. Additionally, this section addressed the social normative functions of understandings of gender and que(e)ried in what ways sexuality is expressed in the classroom, what forms of sexuality are excluded and in what ways it could be part of classroom discourse in TESOL. I was aware that when addressing such sensitive issues, one of the greatest challenges for me as teacher of the course would be to create an atmosphere of trust and semi-formality to facilitate discussion and the que(e)rying of the status quo. As I have shown (chapter 2), students have to accumulate credit points and the challenge in this course was to find a means of assessment which would both do justice to the requirements of their programme but simultaneously allow them to not worry about pandering to what they thought I wanted to hear. I resolved this issue by reassuring the students they would all receive an A if they participated, which I defined as the necessity of actively taking part in discussions, completing the reading, and writing 2 assessment essays on elements of the discussions. The first 5 weeks were the most problematical in the course design and delivery as I will address in more detail below (11.1).

The second topic area took place from week 7 to 11 and focussed on issues under the heading Sexual Diversity, Nelson's strategies 3 and 4. These classes focussed on how this term is understood, what place it has in the classroom and what kinds of new materials students could create or how they might expand on existing materials to include sexual diversity. Most importantly, this topic contributed to the
ongoing queering of understandings of sexualities, their construction, function and social meanings, masculinities and femininities and in what ways these issues are or should be addressed in their classrooms. The discussion also aimed at students' own experiences of discrimination and how they might deal with the topic in their own future classrooms.

The final area which was discussed, weeks 12-14, followed Nelson's strategies 3-5 above closely and troubled the issue of *Heteronormativity*. It took into account textbooks, students' own experiences and addressed strategies that might disrupt the normative strength of heterosexist discourse. This final phase of the course aimed at que(e)rying assumptions about what constitutes norms, their social, political, economic and cultural functions, in what ways they are regulated and enforced and our own complicity in the processes, in what ways they can be resisted as well as whether they should be. It highlighted the exclusion of real pupils, students and teachers, and the subtle but systematic discrimination perpetrated through unconscious use of language, TLS, images and topics in the classroom and challenged participants to find ways to amend materials to be more inclusive.

Using course content (cf. Figure 5.11 p.138) geared specifically towards raising awareness of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity, as well as reflecting on processes through explicit classroom discourse, counteracts processes which were already making sexual diversity invisible (Atkinson 2004). Nelson maintains that "there is little recognition that refusing to engage with sexual diversity is an act of exclusion" (2009: 47) and for this reason, it seems expedient that future teachers be persuaded, from within the relative safety of the university classroom, to venture outside of their comfort zone (Pavlenko 2004) in order to see inclusivity as relating to many different aspects of diversity, including sexual diversity. Lin (2004) holds the view that it is important that prospective teacher/educators realise how the power mechanisms in their environment function and that they themselves are instrumental in reproducing them. It is often the case that those in positions of
power find it difficult to see, let alone acknowledge, that their dominance has a detrimental effect on those dominated (Mayo 2002).

Malderez and Wedell (2007: 86) refer to modelling as one of many key roles teacher educators and mentors fulfil and point out the importance of showing rather than simply telling learners what to do. As a teacher/educator myself, I saw this modelling of self-reflection/reflective teaching as part of my role in this project. Further, it seemed to me that facilitating the queering of classroom discourse to destabilise entrenched structures and encourage students to reflect on what they do and critically analyse what is in need of change meant to increase diversity visibility. Because the students would soon themselves be in the position of role model, I considered it crucial for them to que(e)ry their own positions as teacher/educators, their beliefs and attitudes (Breen et al. 2001) as they also clearly play a role in whether their language is inclusive. This is especially true of heteronormative language and activities, text choice and critique in the classroom. Kramsch and Hoene (2001) point out the importance of preparing new teachers to deal critically with these issues in their classrooms as well as being aware of their own attitudes. They maintain the EFL/ESL classroom is a special site which offers unparalleled opportunities for teachers to engage with cross-cultural differences and the social construction of gender and sexuality, and thus to help students develop linguistic and intercultural competence, or multivoiced consciousness. (cited in Norton & Pavlenko 2004: 509)

Time is a key issue here. The process of reflection means practising, reviewing, discussing and practising again. Edwards and Thomas (2010) warn against recent developments which imply reflective practice is a kind of quick-fix toolkit. They say this constitutes regression to a notion of reflection as a mechanical skill, which can simply be taught, which they maintain it is not. The aspect of inclusiveness in reflection is also vital. Dewey's definition of reflection is "active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or practice in light of the reasons that support it and the further consequences to which it leads" (in Zeichner & Liston 1996: 9). To expand on the topics student teachers are made aware of means addressing issues that are not normally part of the class content. Teachers can introduce
topics "as a means of recognising diversity and achieving parity and inclusiveness" (Norton & Pavlenko 2004: 510). Pennycook says of this approach that it constitutes a "transgressive applied linguistics" (2007: 37) whose aim is to question, to move and remain unfixed.

Of course, teaching class content which constantly and systematically queers the status quo and transgresses the given is problematic for students, who are in the insecure position of being learners without a teacher's (qualified) authority and who live in a social context with powerful regulative discourses. Mayo (2002) makes clear how the dynamics work in homogeneous societies, such as Bavaria, in which "civility" (82) and good manners are key to being accepted as a member of the community. However, civility as a term is defined as being "kind, respectful and tolerant without specifying to whom they are being kind, respectful and tolerant" (Ibid). This is problematic insofar as good manners and civility exclude certain topics being discussed in public as they are considered "uncivil or distasteful" (Ibid). This creates a paradoxical situation for those whose very identity falls within the realm of the "uncivil or distasteful". Sexual diversity cannot be discussed in public, but if it is not, it is silenced. Ferfolja's (2008) respondent teacher Kay commented that it constituted a "dirty little secret" in her Catholic school context, an apposite choice of vocabulary. If a not-heterosexual individual demands their existence have a voice, this is considered uncivil and disrespectful and they may face exclusion. As discussed above, this apparent paradoxical intransigence is often present in education (Ferfolja 2007), especially in textbooks and materials. Exclusion of sexual diversity and the perpetuation of heteronormative discourses in ESL textbooks or classrooms is tantamount to a silencing and othering of sexual diversity (Vandrick 2001). Silencing is not a singular act but rather "an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses" (Foucault 1978: 27). Historical investigations of textbooks and school policies show unchecked racism and sexism. Adams (1996) discusses how textbooks from the 60s excluded non-white individuals, or depicted stereotypical heterosexual relationships with men working outside and women in the home. If African Americans did enter the textbook, they were often in negative, sometimes criminalised roles. In their
extensive study of discourse roles in textbooks, Jones et al. reveal how important dialogues are "in developing knowledge of the language being learnt on the level of vocabulary, structure and language use" (1995: 6) and criticises older textbook dialogues for imbalance and sexism with respect to gender.

Textbooks in the new millennium are careful to address the race/gender imbalance of previous textbooks and integrate multicultural imagery and topic choice, giving a voice to the cultural diversity in the English-speaking world and this is also the case in Bavaria. However, this is not the case with sexual diversity and thus troubling precisely this issue constitutes a major driving force for this exploration. Addressing sexual diversity, only as a focus of a particular class as is often the case, for example biology or religion, renders it a status of 'particular', often pathologized and deviant from the norm (Meyer 2010; Young & Middleton 2002; Fifield & Swain 2002; Saltmarsh 2007).

Further to Mayo's discussion on civility above, Straut and Sapon-Shevin (2002) highlight Nelson's strategies 4 and 5 above in that they discuss the way in which heteronormativity serves to present the appearance that everyone is taken for granted as being heterosexual. Queering this in class is an important aspect of validating diverse identities, and revealing structures which render them invisible is a means to raise awareness of what is hidden and what part each individual, whether teacher or student, plays in reproducing this exclusion. Visibility of sexual diversity functions to proffer identification models for students and fosters inquiry by challenging the hegemony of heterosexuality (Straut & Sapon-Shevin 2002; Summerhawk 1998; Weiss 2001). However, it is rare in images in textbooks. Excluding images of not-heterosexuals and not teaching the linguistic forms to render students in a position to question and inquire without heteronormativity in effect makes the silence all encompassing, which is highly problematic in an institution professing a commitment to democracy and tolerance. Lewis and Simon contend:

We must beware of discursive forms that colonize and silence bodies – all bodies. Forms of discourse that do not allow an answer to the question, "where is my body in that text?" silence us. (1996: 266)
10. Phase 4

The final phase 4 of the project was initially intended to be part of phase 3. Due to personal circumstances, however, there was a gap between the interviews and the triangulation process. When I did contact each individual interviewee via email to review the transcripts, I asked them if they had any further comments after reading them (cf. Appendix N), if they wanted anything removed or if they had had any insights, for example, on the course content. This took place over a period of 6 months, 6 months after the end of the project. The responses varied in length and detail. I believe that these insights, which came with a lengthy delay and arguably provided time to think and reflect further, offered an additional dimension to the findings in that the respondents did have comments to make and thus this contact was a useful tool. I have added sample transcripts, which I emailed to respondents for triangulation purposes, and others including the thematic coding, which will be discussed in more detail in chapter 6. I have chosen to exclude the interviewees’ comments which I felt they would breach their confidentiality.

10.1 Reliability and Validity

The terms reliability and validity stem from the terminology of quantitative scientific procedures, which seek to predict, develop laws and generalize (Cohen et al. 2007). Internal validity (cf. Figure 4.4 below) gives information about the credibility of results within an individual experiment. External validity determines the ability to generalize from these results (Ibid). Reliability and replicability are means to guarantee that the results will remain unchanged, i.e. consistent, no matter who conducts the experiment. A further element of reliability is both choice and size of sample. This will determine whether the ensuing data can be generalized. In the case of my questionnaire, the internal validity is assured in that the aim was to find out about the background, attitudes and awareness of discrimination issues from Bavarian LTE students, which it did. The external validity is given in that the data could be collected in the same way from any LTE cohort of students and provide the same reliable foundation for similar case studies. Incidentally, students in the qualitative section of the study gave the same background information. Objectivity is also given by the fact that the researcher had no interaction with the
respondents, who answered the questions anonymously in a neutral setting. The respondents placed their forms into neutral brown envelopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying concept</th>
<th>Rationalist criterion</th>
<th>Naturalistic criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truth value</td>
<td>Internal validity</td>
<td>Credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicability</td>
<td>External validity</td>
<td>Transferability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Dependability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrality</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Confirmability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4:** Developments in Terminology (Lincoln & Guba in Edge & Richards 1998: 345)

The goal of qualitative research not to reproduce experiments and obtain the same results as other researchers, the aim is to collect data in many different situations to develop theory or find commonalities. Therefore, the terms reliability and validity do not do justice to this type of research (LeCompte & Preissle 1993). Lincoln and Guba (in Edge & Richards 1998: 345) suggest a basis of *trustworthiness* for qualitative research findings with respect to their truth value, as shown in **figure 4.4** above and it is their terms *credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability* that I shall use for the analysis of the qualitative data.

Credibility addresses the issue of the data being in itself credible, which means that the respondents do represent the case under investigation as with the LTE students and staff interviewed here. When data are transferable, it means that other researchers may see patterns in the rich descriptions given, which might be applied to similar situations (Lincoln & Guba 1985; LeCompte & Preissle 1993; Cohen et al. 2007) as could be seen in other LTE programmes in Bavaria or Germany per se. If a study is to be considered dependable, a variety of strategies are required such as prolonged engagement, reflexive journals, and triangulation with reciprocity between researchers and participants as means to ensure multiple perspectives and a more holistic interpretation of the data (Creswell 1998; Lincoln & Guba 1985), all of which are intrinsic to this research design. Finally, the confirmability of a piece of research refers to the precise documentation of the way the research was carried out so that the process can be reconstructed and confirm
“the presence of the data according to the perspective, standpoint, or value-system espoused by the researcher” (Edge & Richards 1998: 345). All of these criteria have been scrupulously adhered to in this investigation.

10.2 Validity

I use the term validity only as it relates to the quantitative findings in this project, however, the issue of validity is highly problematic in any qualitative research. There is no essential truth to be found in an approach informed by feminist poststructuralism (Lather 1991) or QT so that self-reflexivity before, during and after the research process is imperative. I kept a journal of the process, and especially after each of the teaching sessions, which allowed me to compare my impressions before and after the different classes and interviews in a critical way. I also used these reflections to amend my discussion topics in class and the ways I interacted with the students and interviewees. Also, maintaining awareness of my own bias and being self-critical of my own attitudes towards feminist poststructuralism and QT helped create a research design which I consider, in Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) terms, trustworthy. This included interviewees’ monitoring of the transcripts, which added a measure of reciprocity to my own self-reflexivity as an additional means of guarding against a singular interpretation and in line with a feminist approach (Harrison et al. 2001). Seeing reciprocity as the give and take of the researcher-researched relationships and attempting to address the imbalance of power between these is a means of ensuring trustworthiness from a feminist ontological stance (Ibid). It was not without difficulty, which I will address below. This is also the reasoning behind using exit interviews with course participants in that they had an opportunity to comment and discuss their experiences, complaints and impressions irrespective of any assessment requirements, which had by this time been completed. The later email contact offered interviewees the option of commenting further, in retrospect and after reading their transcripts, on any issues that might have struck them after the class and interview had ended. This offered me some further insights into how the process had affected them a year later, adding further to the overall trustworthiness of the design.
10.3 Challenges and Limitations

The principal challenge in the undertaking of this project lay in the choice of topic and site for the exploration. Exploring sexuality, sexual identity, university teacher education and social justice issues meant entering an extremely sensitive field. Exploring these issues in a social and cultural setting which is dominated by the mores of Catholicism and conservativism meant having to tread very lightly in order not to alienate the academic community which was allowing me to carry out the study.

The respondents to the questionnaire would be completely anonymous and both they and I would know that we would probably never see each other again; as such I anticipated no significant issues with collecting responses. The opposite was true in the gathering of the interview data. I suspected the three different groups would produce different and unique challenges. The main concerns were student numbers, the sensitive topics, assessment issues and how to not overly destabilise the students/staff own sense of identity.

The issue of finding volunteer interviewees from the English LTE LGBQTI student population would be a great challenge in this university. I posted 100 flyers around the university campus explicitly asking for this group's participation and received 4 responses. Thus, I believed group 2 would perhaps be the most problematic group to deal with. I did not know these students, although they were all on the LTE programme that I taught on, and the issues of building rapport, addressing the sticky issue of sexual identity and asking for personal attitudes and perspectives on their own LTE, including experiences with fellow students and professors, I anticipated, would be difficult in the short period of time I had available for the interview. In addition, there was the fact that I was not only not from their homogeneous cultural background, but from a completely different culture. Further, there would be a generational problem in that I was significantly older than these students, as well as the disparity of power. In the decidedly hierarchical tradition of relations between students and lecturers in German university culture (Krais 2002; Pritchard 2007), especially in Bavaria, the challenge would be to create a semi-
formal rapport in which the students might suspend their knowledge of this hierarchy and see me as a researcher interested in their perspectives, validating them and their community.

I anticipated that group 3 interviewees would pose fewer challenges in that we knew each other as colleagues, all taught on the same programme, and would thus all be aware of the various shortcomings and exclusions in the curriculum. However, I saw that this may also be a limitation in that the Hawthorne effect (Cohen et al. 2007: 188) may influence their responses: “the presence of the researcher alters the situation as participants may wish to avoid, impress, direct, deny, or influence the researcher.” The fact that this group would also continue to work with me within the LTE programme may also mean that they might limit their criticism of the lack of inclusion of sexual diversity anticipating possible inhibition in future course content meetings by the knowledge that I, as a colleague, would now know what they really think.

I was acutely aware that finding participants to attend the course and fulfil the attendance requirements would be the most significant challenge of the entire research project. These students would participate in the course and be asked to reflect and criticize it if necessary in exit interviews. The generational aspect and the cultural aspect would most likely cause the same problems or inhibitions as with group 3. However, group 4 would perhaps provide the most challenging interviews because at the end of the course, after 15 weeks together, these students would be asked to be absolutely blunt, assured of their anonymity and the safe credit, about both the issues, their attitudes and whether they consider the course at all worthwhile. Again the Hawthorne effect may influence their responses.

All of the respondents knew I was exploring the concept of inclusiveness especially with respect to sexual diversity, and as educators and future educators, they might want to fulfil my expectations, which might lead them to respond at times in politically correct ways rather than being frank, especially in the course of the
teaching phase, although, this is true for both data collection methods. The fact
that the questionnaire was completely anonymous was a means to combat this and
the written reflective essays at the end of the course offered participants another
forum to be critical if they chose to.

The size of the project is clearly a limitation. It was extremely difficult to persuade
students that the course could be beneficial to them as future teachers. While the
course was part of a mandatory list, it was in competition time-wise with a film
course. Additionally, the course was set for a Friday afternoon, which in a winter
term is a difficult slot to fill. Of the 9 students who signed up, 6 came to the first
class and 4 to the second. Even after hanging up flyers throughout the department
and having colleagues advertise the course in their own courses, the responses
were minimal. The course title may also have affected students' choices in that, as
one student and a colleague confirmed, 'it sounds really serious' and thus not so
very attractive for a Friday afternoon. Unfortunately, I had no control whatsoever
over the time or place assigned to the course, but this might be an aspect to be
considered for future studies. I would also try to have the course included as a
mandatory course to ensure sufficient numbers.

With respect to the questionnaire, gathering responses from the whole of the LTE
English section may offer the opportunity to generalise the outcomes more fully
over the whole LTE population in Bavarian LTE programmes. This was not
possible for reasons of time and access. Finally, interpretative data are always
biased in that I as researcher have chosen a specific focus, and in the interviews,
the interviewees will have responded to my questions and responses to their
answers. My subjective interpretation of the data will always be limited by my own
ability of conscious self-reflection. Further factors affecting findings are my position
as researcher/academic producing a certain reticence in responses from student
interviewees as well as the fact that I was seen as an authority figure for students
who needed course credit, as noted above, and the final assessment exercise was
to be considered an opportunity to reflect on what they had learned. A final
limitation that I should like to point out at this point is that the culture of
conservative attitudes in Bavaria was present in all of the discourses. It was clear to me from the outset that as a non-Bavarian and non-German, I was often viewed with skepticism, which at times affected students’ willingness to discuss certain issues no matter how varied my attempts were to counter this.

11. Ethical Considerations

Carrying out a study which can evoke powerful emotional responses is a highly delicate matter. In my thirty years of teaching, I have had a number of students confide their sexual identity to me in class or in my office and as such, I was also prepared for this eventuality in this course. But I have also had to use considerable sensitivity in the past to deal with tricky silences in class when students are confronted with their own complicity in exclusive behaviours or language, or were embarrassed at discussion topics which are normally taboos and these were considerations I discussed with colleagues and friends in advance. I had developed strategies of listening over my teaching years and of encouraging students to speak by validating their perspectives. I also had to consider that the students would participate in the discussions only on a superficial level and I would be challenged to create a sense of intimacy and safety from judgement but that this would be tricky without including my identity as a not-heterosexual woman, which I had decided not to do (cf. p88). However, withholding this information and my own values might endanger the open rapport I hoped to develop with the participants (cf. Harrison et al. 2001).

11.1 Informed Consent

Before undertaking the project, I signed and submitted an ethics form outlining my project, which was approved by the ethics committee of the Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter (cf. Appendix C). In the lecture theatre, I asked for participation for the questionnaire, but students were told that if they did not wish to take part, they could simply leave. Additionally, each interview and course participant was informed about the aims of my thesis project, my own responsibilities for preserving their anonymity as well as the absolute assurance of
confidentiality of the information given. They all signed a consent form (cf. Appendix B) and were made aware of the possibility of withdrawing from the study at any time.

11.2 Confidentiality

Gubrium and Holstein (2001) discuss the many pitfalls involved in analysing interview data as well as the ethical issues, such as consent and sensitivity to respondents' privacy that must be considered before data is made public. In this exploration, conversations about sexuality, subjective criticism of the university programme and curriculum and of students' professors meant that this is highly sensitive research, which Lee (1993: 4) defines as that "which potentially poses a substantial threat to those who are involved or have been involved in it". Several of the LGBQTI students made it clear that their sexual orientation was not known in their student and university communities and they felt that the culture of hegemonic heterosexuality at the university made it difficult for them to publicise this. All participants were assured of absolute confidentiality; that all recordings, transcripts and other data would be kept safe in a password protected computer. All participants' names were changed. They were offered the option of choosing a pseudonym themselves or my giving them one. A further measure that was taken was the triangulation of the transcripts with the interviewees, whereby they were informed that they could veto any information they felt uncomfortable with being made public. Cohen et al. (2007) speak of how sensitive research can offer a voice to those who are silenced or excluded. This is precisely what this study attempts to do.

Because the interviews addressed extremely difficult and challenging topics, I, too, was faced with the problem of how to initiate this very sensitive conversation but also to be prepared for interviewees responding emotionally (cf Ahmed 2004). If their experiences of silencing in the past had caused trauma, talking about these memories could turn out to be extremely painful. Both of the LGBQTI teachers and all of the LGBQTI students interviewed had experienced significant discrimination and were profoundly affected by it. I had decided to share my own experiences
with them as a show of solidarity, as strategic embodiment (DePalma & Atkinson 2007) using my own lived experience as a means to justify my approach, and in the interests of reciprocity. I also agree with Gallop "that identity in the classroom is performatively constituted...and locates teacher and student bodies in a political, social, and historical context" (1995: 261). Investigating this context in detail was also problematic in that it would be the site of their future lives as teachers and revealing the underlying discriminatory structures they would be working in as difficult to change would present a substantial challenge to the ways they might perceive their careers. On the other hand, gaining greater insights into the workings of these structures could serve as tools for them to find their own means of transgression.

12. Data Organisation and Analysis

The data collection process outlined in detail in chapter 4 offered an initial structure for the data analysis. I began by analysing the questionnaire to find out who the students on the LTE programme were, what kinds of experiences they shared and their attitudes towards sexuality as a topic in school and LTE. The results then helped to guide the construction of semi-structured interview questions (cf. Appendix E). The design of this study rendered a great deal of data to sift through and organise. I did this in three main steps:

1. I used the research questions and the responses to the questionnaire, which aimed at producing background information to set the project in context – a crucial aspect of this case study - which contributed to designing both interview focus and themes for course construction and content.

2. By devising the semi-structured interview questions according to these themes, I then explored the transcription data by carrying out a content analysis using a detailed coding process. From this basic exploration, I was able to develop an idea of key patterns in the responses (Richards 2003). The literature from previous studies helped me to manage the coding process in that I was exploring themes which others had also addressed such as coming out or not, problems with homophobia or the heteronormativity of TLS in textbooks and topics. Simultaneously, I was aware that my own interpretations were only one
of many and may also be influenced, no matter how meticulously I strived to be neutral, by my own positioned approach and ontology. I used the semi-structured interview questions to create key word groups (cf. Appendix H, J, L) located in the responses to find recurrent themes which were awareness, experience and change. I only used these themes to derive the various headings for the overall analysis.

3. I allowed the interview responses on these themes to guide some of the discussions in the course by queering participants’ comments on their experiences and strategies for change in their own future classrooms, but also focussing on discussions of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity. I used this same procedure of detailed coding while listening to and transcribing the class recordings extrapolating from repeated key word groups until recurrent themes crystallised. As a means of keeping track of other classroom dynamics and events, as well as my own position as researcher, I recorded a journal after each class and then at the end of the course compared my reflections with the recordings again creating key word groups from this data for the analysis. I also used the students’ written assessments as an additional means to explore their views and compare these with classroom discussions. I was aware at all times that my analysis could represent only a very small aspect of what was happening in the classroom and therefore can only minimally be viewed in the macro perspective of the LTE programme.

The whole process was carried out over 18 months and through email contact (cf. Appendix N), it was possible to collect participant responses to their transcriptions one year later. I used these data to help in analysing the long term effect, if any, of the course.
CHAPTER 5

Data Analysis

This chapter will analyse both the quantitative and qualitative data collected in this study in 5 sections. While the data are all interwoven in that they address the same overarching issues, the focus will be predominantly on the qualitative data, structuring the analysis according to the detailed research questions (RQ). The different sections will offer more clarity as the overall aim was to explore a variety of perspectives. As a sequential piece of research, the study began with a collection of context and background data from a questionnaire, the results of which will be addressed briefly in section 1. Section 2 will discuss the perspectives, experiences and attitudes of staff teaching on the LTE programme in this university and the third section will look at the perspectives of non-heterosexual students in the programme, their experiences as individuals, as trainee teachers and as students. Section 4 will analyse the course which I taught and in what ways the materials chosen fulfilled the aim of raising awareness of gender and sexual diversity as social justice issues in the classroom. Finally, section 5 will appraise the course participants’ perspectives including in what ways they considered the course to have succeeded in raising their awareness. All names given for interviewees are pseudonyms.

1. Section 1 – LTE Students' Backgrounds & Context

1.1 Analysis of Background

RQ 1: Are the students who will be future English teachers aware of the issues of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity and do they want to deal with them as part of their degree course?
Having worked in this region for several years, I had a sense of substantial homogeneity in the student and teaching body. In order to see whether my interviewees conformed to this as a unit in the larger class of the university LTE programme, I constructed a questionnaire to explore in detail who the students were and what their attitudes and experiences of discrimination were, offering a wider background picture for the case study. There were 15 questions comprising partly yes/no responses and partly open responses. It was sub-divided to cover 3 areas: background, discrimination issues and the LTE programme (cf. Appendix D 1).

Questions 1-6 investigated background information about who the students on this LTE programme were; questions 1-5 elicited yes/no responses with question 6 having an open ended response aiming at exploring general motivation for their becoming teachers. Question 7, examined students’ attitudes towards discrimination in general, for example, comments that they would not tolerate, and in questions 8-10, the aim was to find out students’ attitudes towards and experiences of discrimination with both, their friends, family and acquaintances and themselves as individuals. Questions 11-15 explored students’ experiences, awareness and attitudes to integrating these issues, including sexual diversity, into LTE programmes and school ESOL classes (cf. Appendix D 2 for a detailed breakdown of responses).

There are 3 key findings from the quantitative data which supplied a foundation for the themes for the focus of the interviews as well as the course design: the first was that the respondents to the questionnaire were a homogeneous group as were the interviewees in the qualitative section; the second was that they rejected discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation above all else and thirdly, that not only did the majority consider it necessary to deal with these issues at school and on their LTE programme, but they reported they would attend a class on the topics (cf. Appendix D 2, Figures 5.7, 5.9, 5.10).
2. Section 2 – Staff Voices

RQ 2: What are the specific experiences of LGBQTI students and teachers on this programme?

This section examines 3 elements of staff teaching on the LTE programme: personal/professional experience, awareness of the issues being discussed and attitudes towards these issues as well as suggestions for change. 2 of the staff are lecturers in the university (cf. Appendix E 1, Table 1 Marcello and Delesi), 1 is a supervisor for pre-service postgraduate English teachers (Mr. Stevens) in the post university school teaching phase. The data were gathered in 3 interviews lasting approximately 1 hour, which were transcribed using Transana and thematically coded. The 2 university lecturers also identified as not-heterosexual. The interviews aimed at exploring their experiences as teachers per se and as educators in this university. Further, as 2 of the interviewees identified as not-heterosexual, I wanted to find out about their experiences in this respect both in the university community, with colleagues, as well as the classroom, but also as individuals in the community they lived in in Bavaria.

After transcribing the interviews, the coding process involved exploring interviewees' responses to 2 areas of semi-structured questions (cf. Appendix E 2), covering general personal and professional experiences and specifically experiences of and attitudes to the LTE programme they were involved in. Using Transana, I identified and created an index of key words (cf. Appendix H) and then extrapolated a variety of themes, which, on closer inspection, resulted in the three main thematic areas: experience, awareness and attitudes. These themes related to the staff's personal and teaching lives.

2.1 Experience

The interviewees were highly experienced teachers in TESOL and had decades of teaching experience, Marcello and Delesi at the university and Mr. Stevens at school. Mr. Stevens spoke of his extensive personal experience at school and commented on homophobic remarks and ridicule that are often voiced in his
classrooms. Sex education continues to be a taboo topic and is taught by non-staff members:

Mr. Stevens: What concerns things like homosexuality is very very difficult. Em...for instance, we have em...we don't even teach em...the basics, the biological basis are not actually taught in biology lessons (...) because many parents don't want that. (...). They are taught it, but they are taught by people from outside, so we have somebody coming in, talking about the biological basics, but I think as far as I know also about sexual orientation. (...). Sex education in general. Why all the other problems are not being discussed I don't know. I find it quite difficult er...because...er...particularly boys tend to be very negative when it comes to discussing homosexuality in a way... The other problem is of course that many of these young people themselves do not really have a...mostly are not in touch with homosexuals, for instance, so they themselves have no clear idea what it's all about. (0:06:55)

His comments on boys’ censoring of each other's behaviour reflect the analysis of the ways in which gendered subjectivity is regulated by heteronormative power discourses and fixed definitions of masculinity (cf. chapter 3, 2.4). He emphasised that it was important to integrate sexual diversity as part of another topic such as literature, rather than presenting it as Other:

Mr. Stevens: As a teacher I think you must be someone who should be able to tell these kids that these homosexuals or any kind of person is simply a person good or bad. You have a bad homosexual, you have a bad straight person. That's not the problem; you have to look at the person. (0:24:19)

Although using "good or bad" as options tends to leave the rigidity of a dichotomy in place rather than promoting diversity as multifaceted, Mr. Stevens did speak enthusiastically of his own sense of the breadth of diversity and of his personal relations to not-heterosexual individuals, a cousin for example, and of a number of young teachers who are very successful at his wife's school. He added however:

Mr. Stevens: So I have no problems whatsoever, but I know of homosexual teachers, younger teachers, who would never want to em...to come out. Never, because simply of all kinds of problems. (0:07:52.0)

He went on to add that they were out in the staff room but not to the students. The reasons for this reluctance, he contended, lay in the fear of the Bavarian Ministry of Education reprisals and the reactions from parents in a social culture dominated by Catholicism. This aspect of control and regulation on a macro level by institutions
similarly illustrates Foucault’s analysis of the ways subjects are regulated by power discourses (cf. chapter 3, 2.3) He did not mention any of his own colleagues or students that might identify as not-heterosexual. The main problem of dealing with sexual diversity in class, he maintained, was the matter of time and the pressure on him as a supervisor of pre-service teachers to incorporate as much about the practical matter of everyday teaching as possible and that he felt there is no time to discuss controversial issues.

The personal and professional experiences of the other 2 interviewees bore out some of Mr. Stevens’s experiences and observations from school. Both Delesi and Marcello had experienced considerable reprisals and open homophobia in their own early teaching years in Thatcherite England in the 1980s at the height of the AIDS panic and the passing of Section 28. Both identify as not-heterosexual, one a games teacher at a private boys’ school, the other a drama teacher at a comprehensive. Delesi recounted the period as "extremely fearful" and was so traumatized by the discrimination he encountered at school that he left the occupation altogether.

Delesi: But I remember one day I was brainstorming a workshop, actually a project with the 5th form drama group. (...) And they were brainstorming ideas and things about old age care and then of course sexuality came up. And the headmaster, curiously, happened to stroll in and observe this little discussion process…. And I could sense him broiling at the back of the room and em… before he strutted out after about 15 minutes; he said ‘Please come to see me in the break’. So, I went to see him in the break and he virtually read me the riot act, he said ‘I saw you had all these topics on’ and he went ‘Why?’ …he said ‘Why are we talking about that! Why was sexuality…?’ And I told him and he said ‘if…’ and he virtually made everything that we were talking about off limits† apart from dealing with old age people (...) and he said ‘why were you talking about sex…’ and I said ‘I’m aware of the need and the insecurity and we’re living in a time of HIV, people need to talk about it and discuss…’ he said, ‘if there is anything to be done on sex education, it would be done in 3rd year Biology and certainly not by you Mr…’. I had come out to staff fairly early on in staff meetings. You know it was just…and I just realised I was on a collision course right from that point, right from that moment on.  

It is notable that the policy presented to Delesi mirrors that reported by Mr. Stevens almost 25 years later. Marcello’s experiences of the restrictions he felt as a gay
teacher, while not so dramatic, were from the same period. He chose not to be open in school. I asked if he had ever been asked about being married:

Marcello: Whooh…it's a long time ago. As far as I remember I don't think it was actually asked, I don't think it was asked but I know...let me think now...there might have been one or two situations, I really can't remember...I'm sure there have been one or two situations where I have actually...em...not lied but just kept it a secret.
I: just covered it up↑
Marcello: just covered it up yeah. (0:08:8)

All of these teachers have experienced the lack of tolerance of sexual diversity in school and whereas Marcello and Delesi's experiences stem from the late 1980s, Mr. Stevens was speaking very much of the present day. This seems to suggest that experiences of exclusion on the grounds of sexual orientation are still a dark cloud above the heads of not-heterosexual students and pre-service teachers.

Within the 'ivory tower' that is the university, both Marcello and Delesi reported they had experienced no homophobia at all. Not only did they maintain that students in their classes were extremely tolerant, but they were also open to discussing and offering oppositional views on the issue if it came up in class. Where Mr. Stevens reported his pupils being decidedly unwilling to openly criticize sexual diversity in class, which he attributes to their knowledge of it being un-PC, neither Marcello nor Delesi thought this was the case with their students' responses. In fact Delesi affirmed the sense of acceptance and tolerance he felt throughout the institution of the university, which stands in stark contrast to his early teaching experiences, when I asked him if it was heteronormative:

Delesi: Well...er no. I wouldn't assume so, there's nothing...em...when it comes to the institution itself, there's nothing that implies that↑ Emmm...it's a very open and free and broad and all-embracing institution, happily, and em...so from that point of view I think there's nothing straight-jacketed about it (0:12:05.7)

2.2 Awareness and Criticality

There were 2 aspects of awareness which crystallised from the data. The first was the awareness of discrimination of gender, and sexual orientation in language terms, and the second, the awareness or lack of critical awareness of the
heteronormative processes at work in education both at school and on the LTE programme at the university, which systematically exclude sexual diversity.

Overall, the 3 interviewees exhibited a keen awareness of issues of discrimination, including culture, religion, sexual diversity and gender. Mr. Stevens, however, consistently used the pseudo-generic *he*, illustrating a lack of awareness of this transference of male default from German, but Delesi spoke of his correction of this *he* in his classes as a matter of course. This seems to indicate that there is a chance that the next generation of teachers may have a heightened awareness of gender neutral pronoun use. Mr. Stevens also reported that the issue of culture was a central focus in school English lessons and efforts are made in materials, topics and textbooks to raise awareness of the cultural diversity of English language speaking cultures, as well as the heterogeneous cultural backgrounds of students in the classroom. This was echoed in comments by both Delesi and Marcello that university English language courses also aim at addressing the breadth of English language speaking nations and language teaching also makes a point of addressing gender equality.

Mr. Stevens commented on the awareness of including diversity but pointed out that it was highly regulated in the curriculum to include disabilities, heritage and culture, but exclude sexual diversity:

> Mr. Stevens: When we talk about *Inklusion* [here he used the German word] we actually talk about handicapped people or in a wider sense, people with a different language, so migrants. What we do not talk about of course are any other gender problems or whatever - gender problems yes, but not homosexuality, that's out of the question (...). I think it's all over Germany, I think it's not being discussed at school and if so, it would be discussed either in religious classes or ethics classes.
> I: And what do you think of that? Do you have an opinion on that?
> Mr. Stevens: ••uhh, I have no real opinion (...). What we teach is intercultural learning, so that's actually what the emphasis is put on. It might include also, of course, em...dealing with diversity of any kind. (0:04:24)

In contrast, Delesi and Marcello reported having no awareness of exclusion at the university level. Delesi talked about having openly gay students in his classes on occasion who have
Delesi: been out and in certain groups there have been lesbian or gay people and they've...in my view, they've felt fairly relaxed about it...being who they are. (0:10:43.9)

When I asked if he was aware of heteronormative processes excluding sexual diversity, he said no and further, when asking about whether students who identify as not-heterosexual would feel comfortable, he was quite clear:

Delesi: I...I would assume so↑...there's nothing to have led me to think the opposite. (0:13:30)

In summary then, Delesi presents an institutional environment and LTE programme which he sees as tolerant, open and non-discriminatory. Marcello confirms this perspective and was unaware of any homophobia or exclusion:

Marcello: No. Nothing from the students, nothing one would actually...in particular...any discussions that we have had where it had been an issue have been because we actually had a discussion topic. (...) that was the chance for me to bring in particular topics, like gender equality for example, em...where homosexuality was a topic which was discussed and I felt, generally, whenever it has been a discussion point, that there has been a lot of openness and certainly no negative feedback or negative comments. (...). In fact one thing that surprised me a little was, of course I don't know whether they are heterosexual or homosexual, I can assume of course, from conversations of course if they're talking about girlfriends/boyfriends. One thing that surprised me was the openness particularly from the female students, er...sometimes quite...what's the right word in English↑ em...a very forceful, a very strong opinion about homosexuality, in a positive sense. (0:13:31)

These perspectives contradict the students’ experiences of discrimination (cf. section 3 below). With respect to the third aspect, the issue of an awareness of heteronormativity within the programme, Mr. Stevens made clear that the school is systematically exclusive both in materials, policy and topics for discussion. He spoke of pupils who identify as not-heterosexual being referred to their in-house school psychologists:

Mr. Stevens: We tend very much tend to send students who might have problems of any kind, also with sexual orientation,...we tend to send them to the psychologist, simply not...because we believe that we are not able to deal with that problem (my emphasis) really. (0:13:11.1)

What is problematic here is that the pupil then is given the message that s/he has a "problem" if s/he does not identify as heterosexual. This implicitly conveys the idea
that there is not a culture of tolerance of diversity but perhaps more of seeking solutions to the problems that difference creates.

Within the university section of the LTE programme, both Marcello and Delesi spoke of not being aware of heteronormative processes. Delesi commented that students "express themselves in all sorts of different ways, so there's no dominant way of being, I never sense that at all" (0:14:38:3). Marcello thought that addressing heteronormativity was not in his remit as a lecturer as there were so many other things he had to teach. He felt that it would be like "thrusting it down their throats" or "in our faces" (cf. Givens & Nixon 2006) to address sexual diversity specifically and promoted an integrative approach, not something to be focussed on or in need of "special attention". Having said this, it did occur to him towards the end of the interview that he had in fact been annoyed when proofreading the examples for the year-end grammar exam, that they were so exclusively heterosexual. He commented that the interview itself had made him aware of how exclusive he felt this to be, that he was rendered invisible and was himself complicit in this invisibility because he had not changed any of the sentences to be more representative of diversity.

Marcello: I mean just within this last 3/4 of an hour it's started me thinking, because to be quite honest, perhaps I should be a little bit ashamed as well, but as a homosexual teacher, it's something that has never really occurred to me before. I always...I haven't ignored it, it just hasn't been present to me and now I've started thinking and for example, em...having talked to you this last 3/4 of an hour and thinking back to this situation where I got really annoyed with these examples, I'm sure I took them over as they were, but I think in future, I will probably change them and prepare my own examples, where there perhaps is a homosexual couple. (...) In fact I definitely will, you know, because to me, it was just an example and it annoyed me but I didn't think to the next step - well shouldn't we actually be preparing them and so yes! Definitely! (...). I'm sure my other colleagues, if I, as a homosexual teacher, aren't really, not aware of this, I'm sure my heterosexual colleagues aren't either and we all need educating. (0:40:27)

This last comment hints at the way in which the awareness of the status quo of exclusionary practices in language teaching is often taken for granted especially since it is often perceived to be a matter for which there is insufficient time. The strength and extent of heteronormative processes seemed to not always be clear
to the interviewees illustrating the ways power functions best when masked (Foucault 1980; McNay 1992). This invisibility of heteronormativity is reminiscent of the invisibility of the exclusion of female in the pseudo generic pronoun *he*. There was a sense that in school not only is there not enough time to address and discuss sexual diversity critically, but it is, through institutional and political pressure, systematically excluded in all but religious instruction, biology and ethics classes. Mr. Stevens felt his hands were tied. In the university context, while there is discussion, there is also a sense of time pressure to get students through exams. What these teachers suggested as a means to address this exclusion critically will be reported below.

### 2.3 Attitudes

All 3 of these interviewees were very passionate about their teaching and about improving education in general. Each teacher made efforts to be integrative and inclusive of all diversity. Mr. Stevens acted as a role model by choosing literature on not-heterosexual themes, for example *My Beautiful Laundrette*, and through role-play specifically focusing on discrimination issues, in effect *forcing* his students to confront the topics. Delesi reported explicitly coming out in his class if the topic arose in general discussions, for example *gay marriage*, and Marcello said he addressed topics which could lead to discussions on the issues. Marcello was the most tentative in his willingness to explicitly deal with sensitive issues and it was not surprising that Mathew (a student interviewed later) maintained that it was not clear to other students that Marcello was not-heterosexual. I would argue that he voiced an openness towards discussing heteronormativity but shied away from actually ‘coming out’ with this opinion in class citing a fear of getting bogged down in discussion and a lack of time to get through what he had to.

Mr. Stevens spoke of the difficulty inherent in dealing with these topics with teenagers albeit easier than in past years because the students watch so many American soap operas in which sexual diversity and diversity per se are often mainstreamed. This means the pupils are already sensitised to cultural settings in which diversity is not the central focus of the soap but simply another aspect of the
story (cf. *Glee* on FOX television). He stated that questioning the status quo in ways which were distanced from personal issues, for example in discussions of literature or TV soaps, might be a way forward. He contended that this distancing process might mean students would create a space in which to temporarily suspend belief about their own taken-for-granted assumptions or beliefs. This attitude reflects a queer theoretical approach in that a questioning stance makes individuals feel they can extrapolate from their own personal issues (Britzman 1995), without destabilising their identity. In addition, Mr. Stevens suggested that textbooks need to change. He described how they had noticeably integrated different cultures and gender equality, however, sexual diversity was invisible. One of the main problems, in his view, was the influence of family and religion on schooling. While he believes that sexual diversity should be present, he thinks that the only way to do this in English is to integrate it by choosing texts or topics that address this issue. Marcello also commented on this:

Marcello: Publishers should be well...or the people who write these exercises should perhaps be made aware of this issue, this problematic if you like and include other examples. One thing that I can imagine happening which again, I think it would be a good thing, but at the same time it's the problem of the system if you like, what are we actually preparing our students to do, are we training them to pass an exam or are we educating them at the same time? And if that example, let's say I had a list of 10 grammar sentences and half were heterosexual, some of them wouldn't include any couple problems at all, but if there were 2 or 3 sentences that were visibly gay, of course... I'm sure it would actually provoke some sort of discussion, which I would see as very positive, a very, very positive thing, but at the same time, would I then start worrying actually I've got to get through the grammar point, because it's a grammar lesson. Do you see what I mean? (0:35:56)

Mr. Stevens was clear that pre-service teachers need to be taught how to approach and deal with diversity in class, the problem, he says, is that there is so little time. The students present in his class with deficits in methodology and didactics and he does not know how to teach them everything they need in the short time that he has them. With class sizes of around 32, these pre-service teachers have first and foremost to learn about how to maintain discipline and get through the required material. Mr. Stevens has a clear notion that empathy is the key to changing entrenched heteronormative attitudes. Teaching teachers to listen and trying to see and understand individuals as they are is a key aspect to
promoting this empathy, in his view. He concedes that there are barriers to its success in the form of resistance from colleagues who are simply not interested in the issues and shy away from them since they believe "morals should be taught at home" (0:37:34). Also the lack of jobs for newly-qualified teachers means that many of his pre-service teachers think they may have to find other jobs and are consequently not passionate about learning to deal with diversity critically. On a final optimistic note, Mr. Stevens concluded that there are many new young teachers coming into the system for whom diversity is the norm and he believes this will have a knock-on effect in the long run (cf. DePalma & Atkinson's notion of simple visibility, 2009b). Clearly, the challenges inherent in the school structures, including parental influence, social mores and religion, mean that both supervising pre-service teachers and integrating sexual diversity in a rather prohibitive heteronormative climate is not always an easy task.

Within the university LTE programme, neither Marcello nor Delesi had a sense that their students were discriminatory or withheld their opinions, even controversial ones. Delesi said:

Delesi: I have the feeling that that difference of all kinds is being addressed...we were just...Friday we had a wonderful discussion that has come up a number of times, dealing with disabilities, different notions who people are, different ability levels and enormous sensitivity came up, you know! And I often see signs of people being so sensitive to different cultures, different races, you know, things like that, seem to suggest to me that our students are aware of difference and are extremely tolerant and open and so...you...again...whenever specific homosexuality comes up again, I've always sensed that there is openness and breadth, respect and value. (0:46:06.7)

He admitted that he had had no "particular religious hurdles or tricky bits" to deal with, but felt strongly about confronting language or cultural issues critically, such as perpetuating a heteronormative image of family. He believed that challenging the students and promoting and encouraging critical thinking would be the way to do this and should constitute the very foundation of university education.

Delesi: That's the most important foundation. If they have the strength to look at whatever it is they're looking at, to be critical about it, objective, pursuing...and then to be able take their stand on a particular issue, that's the
really important foundation that I think that they require, and that conviction that to stand up wherever they go. (...) we’re hopefully providing the emotional, psychological, intellectual ability for those individuals. (0:43:58)

Delesi had written his own MA dissertation on gender and sexuality and felt that he promoted tolerance in his teaching all the time although he did feel that addressing sexual diversity as a broader issue would be better dealt with in the LTE sociology course than in English even though he, himself, had offered a course on gender and sexuality in his 1st semester at the university, which seems slightly contradictory. I did sense that Delesi was involved in the everyday battle with diversity in his courses but also that he had hung up his activist shoes to just live diversity, but because of the very supportive and accepting staff around him, was slightly blinkered as to the reality for the students who still felt invisible. He later reported to me, after I had submitted the thesis, that he had been very happy about my thesis topic as he felt it was still very necessary to keep activism alive and thought that even Bavaria could change. Similarly, Marcello reported post-thesis that a student had tentatively asked if he might use “gay marriage” as a topic for his final exams to which Marcello responded that since two of the examiners were gay, they would definitely have no objections. This signifies a positive development for this particular LTE programme and certainly a positive message for the student in question. Also the fact that Marcello made his own identity open is a shift in his previous stance.

Delesi’s attitude to the LTE programme and what could be changed was, on the one hand, that it was always in process and there is always room for improvement and, on the other hand, that

Delesi: we sometimes are more effe...we do more when we are provoked, in other words going into a school where you...you come across that kind of homophobia, you’re prompted to actually make an issue of it and deal with it. (0:40:53.)

This is an interesting comment as Delesi had encountered considerable homophobia as a young teacher resulting in his leaving teaching. Also, he had worried about the message this swift exit might send to his former pupils. This seems to be contradictory. Delesi left because he could not cope with the
homophobia, and yet maintains that his students may do well if provoked in this way, even if they are not prepared in university to deal with it.

Marcello’s attitude to changes needed was that he felt discussions in class needed to be open, textbooks needed to change to integrate sexual diversity and a changing cultural landscape and he believed this would best be achieved beginning at primary school level, echoing the *No Outsiders* (cf. chapter 3 p.69, DePalma & Atkinson 2009a) project aims. His own experiences with children, being one of a couple of "two uncles" convinced him that seeing diversity as a norm is best learnt when children are beginning to learn about social relations per se.

It is well documented (Jagose 1996; Jagose & Kulick 2004; Lehr 2006, 2007; Nelson 1993, 1999, 2006, 2009; Rich 1980; Rodriguez & Pinar 2007; Warner 1993; Summara & Davis 1999 and many more) that heteronormative processes are often taken for granted as a norm which is accepted without question. The interrelatedness between attitudes to teaching, heteronormative discursive practice and the lack of inclusiveness of sexual diversity is difficult for these interviewees to tackle on the basis of the given restraints either through the Ministry of Education, parents, time and density of material to be covered. Marcello’s realisation at the end of the interview, described above, to make a concerted effort to integrate sexual diversity in language exams is a step forward.

3. Section 3 – LGBQTI Students’ Voices

RQ 2: *What are the specific experiences of LGBQTI students and teachers on this programme?*

This section will explore and examine the perspectives of not-heterosexual students on the LTE programme, their experiences as individuals, as trainee teachers and as students in this university. There were 4 interviewees: Marion, Emma, Tobey and Mathew (cf. Appendix E 1, Table 2). Each interview lasted...
approximately 1 hour, was transcribed using Transana and thematically coded. The coding process mirrored that of the staff interviews. Interviewees reviewed and commented on the transcripts and added their comments via email approximately one year after the interview. As with the lecturers, I was interested in exploring their perspectives and experiences as LGBQTI students in the university community, in the classroom as both students and pre-service teachers, but also as individuals in the community they lived in. The interviews were semi-structured (cf. Appendix E 3) to cover the more general perspective as LGBQTI students as well as their lives outside of the university and secondly, their lives as trainee teachers having already had training slots in school. I identified and created an index of key words (cf. Appendix H) and extrapolated a variety of themes: awareness of visibility and exclusion, experience and feelings about invisibility and exclusion, and suggestions for change both in the LTE programme and school.

3.1 Awareness and Criticality

There has been extensive research on exploring LGBQTI students' and teachers' awareness of their visibility and exclusion in both public and private contexts (Atkinson 2004; Britzman 1995; Givens. & Nixon 2006; DePalma & Atkinson 2009b; Rodriguez & Pinar 2007; Sparkes 1994 and many others). All of the interviewees here were keenly aware of the innumerable decisions they had to make on a daily basis about whether to reveal their sexual orientation or not. Simple conversations about weekend or evening activities or the informal chat before class invoke this decision-making process. In contrast to a critical awareness of race and, in many cases cultural heritage, which is often clearly visible, sexual diversity is often disregarded:

Marion: Because it's not visible, it's not an issue and because it's not an issue, everyone goes about their business as usual and if you're not…if you're not, if you're straight you don't have any…if you're not aware of the problem, you'll just go on like being heteronormative. (0:18:57)

With respect to language, the interviewees were aware of the lack of TLS including not-heterosexual individuals. In textbooks and materials, they had found nothing representing their reality. Tobey said that gender was often a topic and sometimes
not-heterosexuality came up as an issue in an English class, but this was not shared by the other 3 students. None of the students had ever heard a teacher in school address this issue or mention it in any form. None of the students had encountered a teacher at a school or other students/pupils who openly identified as not-heterosexual. They had all encountered homophobic language use, especially the use of the German term *schwul* meaning gay. Emma had encountered homophobia in both Canada during her year there as a High School student and in her Catholic school in Bavaria. Marion had encountered this at the university and Mathew at his job as a waiter. All of the interviewees were quite adamant that this has to be addressed immediately and best through questioning the speakers on how they think such comments or remarks make them feel as individuals identifying as not-heterosexual. Both Mathew and Marion commented on their own lack of awareness of discriminatory language use. Mathew also discriminated against not-heterosexuals before he realised he belonged in this group and Marion commented on her unconscious use of discriminatory language pertaining to disability, unconsciously using the derogatory term *spacko* (spastic). Only when they were confronted with what they were saying by others did they realise that this was inappropriate. As such, they felt that much discrimination is unthinking rather than absolute rejection. The implication is that attitudes will be changed by becoming aware of discriminatory language. If this were the case, the use of the pseudo-generic *he* would have disappeared, gender neutral forms would have long been taken up into language use and using male default forms would be antiquated. I would argue there is a need not only for discussion, but more importantly for practice, and self-reflection to bring about change. This resembles the disparity between understanding a theory and implementing it in context. Nevertheless, the optimism for change expressed in the students’ opinions was encouraging.

One area of awareness which all of the students commented on was the restriction, rigidity and regulation exerted on social, cultural and educational environments by the Catholic Church. All of these students came from strict Catholic backgrounds and small Catholic towns and had moved to the city to
escape the oppression they had felt there. The interviewees used terms like “quite Catholic” (Mathew) or “very, very Catholic” (Tobey) or Emma spoke of coming from a Catholic village. I myself lived in a Catholic village and should have asked exactly what they understood by this, but I too shared the taken-for-granted assumption of what these attributive adjectives meant according to Grice’s (1991:39) *conversational implicature*, which holds that there are certain implicit understandings in conversations which we expect to be true in an utterance and we understand them even though they are not made explicit, and I didn’t ask for more detail. In the context of Bavarian Catholicism, I understood being “very, very Catholic” to mean more restrictive and conservative than Catholicism elsewhere and not accepting of LGBQTI identities. Mathew volunteered one example when talking about how his sister did not want it known in her village that he was gay and worried about him visiting with his partner, or telling her children about his life because of what the neighbours in her Catholic village might think:

Mathew: Well actually I come from the countryside and it's quite Catholic and conservative and for them it's quite important, not for me anymore, what the neighbours think about them and friends, (0:17:44.2) and it's not something important for me anymore.

Tobey described growing up in a "very, very Catholic area". He considered the university to be an extremely tolerant and free environment in contrast to the restrictions he had experienced at school. Emma spoke extensively about warnings she had been given by teachers about pupils' parents and how they resist inclusiveness in the schools she had done her practica in. Their resistance is based on Catholic mores, which are not inclusive of sexual diversity. She said:

Emma: Well, I mean there definitely has to be a place to talk about the not traditional families, to make the kids aware that that's normal as well and not like super special or weird or whatever. (…) Yeah, the thing I'm afraid of is is the parents at some point. (…) Well that they're feeding their kids with prejudice. (0:36:30.7)

The interviewees were all aware that maintaining heteronormativity both in the classroom and in their LTE as pre-service teachers was problematic for them. They felt that this was no longer in tune with social developments outside the classroom and agreed that it would be socially and culturally irresponsible to continue to teach
excluding sexual diversity. Emma had had 3 semesters LTE programme in which sexual diversity was invisible. This heteronormativity, she said, was untenable:

Emma: Em, with all the school books I've been looking through, there's nothing ever mentioned and it's still pretty, kind of old school, yeah the father earns the money, mom's doing the household, that's what the books for kids are like, now ↑That's just wrong. We're like over that. (...) I would definitely raise people's awareness more because it's it's people pretend the topic or the...yeah they pretend it's not there. (0:14:31.3) (0:45:43.8)

3.2 Experience/Feelings

These students' experiences of homophobia and/or exclusion and invisibility offer a different perspective to that of their lecturers. 3 of the students were in semesters 2-5 and one in the 10th and close to finishing her university LTE. While the beginner students spoke of the invisibility of their lives in the materials on the programme, Tobey did mention he had encountered the topic of homosexuality in a literature lecture, albeit dealing with the Renaissance, and in a class on Corpus Linguistics. Mathew spoke of how sexual diversity had been mentioned only briefly in one class. On the whole, all 4 students felt that sexual diversity was invisible. They had not heard any language used referring to the possibility of sexual diversity and had no contacts and no awareness of other not-heterosexual students or staff. None of the students knew if other students or staff knew they identified as not-heterosexual. At the same time, they felt that the LTE programme was not homophobic and neither were their fellow students, but they all commented on using covering strategies and allowing a presumption of heterosexuality to stand in conversations in class or outside class. This seems to indicate that far from being unaware of the heteronormative discourse at work, the students (and arguably staff) had internalised these discourses as norm, navigating around them in the same way that the ubiquitous crucifix is left unquestioned. Both Mathew and Tobey described how they felt secure in their identity and did not want it to be given a special status in their classes, but at the same time felt that it should not be made a secret; there are clear contradictory challenges here in that coming out meant risking being defined by their sexual orientation and potentially having views disregarded as a personal agenda, again Sedgwick’s "shaping
presence” of the closet (1990: 68). It also echoes what Marcello and Delesi said about not creating the Other unnecessarily, not giving sexual diversity special attention but at the same time not making it invisible simple versus surplus visibility (DePalma & Atkinson 2009b). Mathew said

Mathew: Well, I always worked in companies or surroundings which...were very tolerant. Like I was in PR agencies and was not the only gay there. Or I worked for musicals in (...) and many many people there are also gay. So it was never anything special for me being gay, it was just normal. And now maybe it's a bit more special, but the more I think about it, I think the more I think I should not hide it.  (0:23:59.5)

Mathew is a mature student embarking on a new career at university and has an established circle of friends outside the university thus separating his student life from his private identity as a gay man. Marion, Emma and Tobey also implemented this separation of their private lives becoming themselves invisible and silenced in the LTE programme. Marion recounted an episode which illustrated how heteronormative and exclusive she felt the programme to be:

Marion: Professor (...) was teaching a Repetitorium [exam preparation course] that I took because I wrote my Zulassungsarbeit [final exam dissertation] ...em...and em...I think somebody got married and em...she said 'oh, is somebody else gonna get married?'...or...and she's...always kind of saying stereotypical things 'oh, the guys are doing this and that' or 'the girls are doing this and that', so I think I wasn't sure whether I could, you know, out myself and say well...maybe I will and also I wouldn't have said it because (.) er...I wasn't sure at that point but...em... (...) I think it's annoying but I think the heterosexual people probably lack the...em...sensitivity? for it, so I think they don't even realise what they're doing. (0:08:19)

All 4 students shared the view that the exclusion was not a question of malicious intent but a complete lack of awareness on the part of both lecturers and students. Marion said, "it's just not a topic and that's the problem" (0:18:30).

The students also felt their identity to be invisible at school. They all gave examples of the heteronormative exclusionary classes they had watched, but also that, in general, sexual diversity was not addressed in any of the lessons, neither by topic nor in language. As teacher trainees, they conformed to this heteronormativity. Marion said "I'm just realistic about it" and Tobey "That's just the way it is." They did say, however, that when they qualified as teachers that they
would not hide this aspect of their identity at school. Tobey reported that he would expect to have his partner accompany him to school activities, such as a play or recital and Mathew considered himself a role model, not only as a male primary school teacher but also in his gay identity. He had visited the class of a not-heterosexual primary school teacher who was not open about his sexual orientation either in class or with colleagues, which Mathew would not accept for himself, as he explained:

Mathew: I've got (...) 2 nieces. They are 6 and 9, and last year I had a partner and I went with them with my sister and her husband to the zoo and presented him as my friend. And I think they didn't really get it. And my sister doesn't want me to talk about that in particular. And I think it's the wrong way because if we are not treating that as a normal thing then no one else will learn how to treat it. And for me it's not special and if I don't talk about it, and if I hide myself, and em...then my nieces will learn, oh that's something special not really common.(...). And I think if you're, well if you don't talk about it then it's always something which is a secret that can be revealed. (0:19:21.6)

Both Marion and Emma also saw themselves as role models, Emma in primary school teaching tolerance for all diversity as a part of her educator's responsibility and Marion at secondary school. She felt very strongly that teaching linguistic competence and using neutral language was the key to opening classroom discussion to the possibility of sexual diversity, something she missed considerably now that she was at the end of her own LTE programme:

Marion: I think I would always try to include...em...things...or I think the main thing is not so much is to put it out in the open, also that's a big part of it I think, but just because it's more visible, I think if you don't...if you have, say a boy or a girl in your class...em...who's kind of discovering that they're not straight or something like that, then I think you have to explicitly make it...or say things, or name the things, like name, say...I don't know, like have a task that includes non-straight characters so...em...in order for them to realise that it's really ok, because like I said with Ms (...) I don't know if she...how she would react because she's not making...she's not talking about it. [cf. above to Professor who talked about marriage] So I think talking about it is a big, you know, issue. But on the other hand, I think also not insisting so much on...on, you know...er...male/female couples is enough if you formulate that in a neutral way, or if you give different possibilities, just like that, not make a big thing out of it, but say for example, I don't know...what would you...em...I mean you have these typical questions. 'what would you suggest to your friend if they're...em...madly in love with a boy or a girl?' (...) Em...but I think, I mean...the only thing I can do is change it by being different myself, or by, you know, telling people that I'm gay and maybe talking to them about what that changes for me. (40'22)
These comments are similar to Mr. Stevens’ and Delesi’s comments about learning by doing; that both pre-service teachers and students can learn from their behaving in an inclusive way and addressing sexual diversity issues directly and critically. The students were also aware that the location of the school they would be working at would also play an important role in how open they felt they could be, which I will address below.

3.3 Change

Emma’s final comment shows how this new generation of students are eager to disrupt heteronormative processes in their future classrooms. As with Marcello, who realised towards the end of the interview that he was complicit in reproducing the status quo of exclusion, so did Emma and Tobey. Tobey spoke of how sexual diversity is a part of society and thus has to be dealt with openly and critically:

Tobey: Well, that’s a thing you have to do as a teacher, sometimes you just have...you force them to talk about something and I think I would (...) yeah...it’s part of today’s society, you can’t hide from these topics, you have to deal with it, it’s there and...yeah, they can’t hide from this topic, they have to deal with it. So I think, I would try to justify this choice trying to tell them that it’s also a lesson about tolerance and diversity (...) the thing I want to teach them tolerance and yeah an open mind. (0:20:40.)

The problem with addressing these issues is that there is so little time for extensive discussion, again a point highlighted by Mr. Stevens, Marcello and Delesi. Emma suggested asking the children themselves what they understood by particular terms such as schwul and then clarify the real meanings, even in primary school. She emphasised the need to incorporate alternative family lifestyles into her classes in the same ways in which they introduce cultural diversity. For Mathew, one important change that he would suggest would be to address sexual diversity through more topics in class, more publicity in the university in general and for students on the LTE programme to be integrated in such a way that they feel it is safe to be out. Visibility of not-heterosexual lecturers, he thinks, would offer role models. Marion recommended a comprehensive initiative by staff to be trained in tolerance and creating an atmosphere of inclusion, which she felt was the key:
Marion: I think especially with teaching it's so hard to tell other people what to do, I mean, you can, kind of tell them I didn't feel welcome or comfortable or I wouldn't have felt comfortable talking about this and that em...(pause 5 sec) but what they do with it is their thing. I think it would have to be part of...or it would have to be a whole programme or training or something. If you, for example, if you wanted to change something here. I think you would have to maybe say, you know, for this semester or for this year even, I think maybe a year would be better, we kind of (...) we want to improve the diversity in our...and we start with sexuality, and we like we all work together and we have regular meetings where we discuss what's happening and how the students are reacting. (...). So I think it would have to be a programme, it would have to be a structure because if you tell one person or if it's just part of an evaluation, I think it'll just get lost. You have to make a bigger effort to actually change something. (0:53:47)

She felt the staff themselves needed to learn how to be tolerant and inclusive, to become conscious of their language use, to include materials, topics and language that disrupted heteronormativity. She contended that teachers/lecturers need to feel comfortable with the issues in order to promote critical awareness of inclusiveness. Individuals can change some areas but for the LTE programme as a whole to change, she thinks, needs a concerted group effort.

4. Section 4 – The Course

RQ 3: What are the classroom realities of addressing inclusiveness in these areas [class construction 15 weeks] with respect to structure, preparation, content, delivery, student responses and evaluation?

This penultimate section will analyse the one semester course which I taught and in what ways the materials chosen addressed the aim of raising awareness of diversity and social justice issues in the classroom. The course was recorded and the most salient discussions transcribed. I have added the detailed course construction as well as key texts to the appendices (cf. Appendix P). The last session of the course comprised a lesson analysis and a reflective essay.

The course took place over a full semester (15 weeks): 2 general introductory classes, 2 assessment classes (cf. Appendix Q) and 1 reading day. It was part of a compulsory language module as one of a number of courses the students could
choose from. I assigned the students pseudonyms: Wendy, Daria, Eleanor and Marta (cf. Appendix E 1, Table 3). These students were all from upper semesters and about to finish their LTE at the university. Marta was an exchange student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>Introduction I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>Introduction II: Training vs. education; what is social justice in education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Society I: What is it and who decides?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>Gender II: Gender and the ESOL classroom; the case of the pseudo-generic he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>November 18</td>
<td>Gender III: Inclusiveness in language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>November 25</td>
<td>Gender IV: Teaching materials; strategies for more equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>Sexual Diversity I: What is it and why bother?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>December 9</td>
<td>Sexual Diversity II: Homophobia – what to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>December 16</td>
<td>Reading Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>December 23</td>
<td>Assessment 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>January 13</td>
<td>Sexual Diversity III: In the classroom; materials analysis; reflection &amp; round up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>January 20</td>
<td>Heteronormativity I: Article presentation &amp; analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>January 27</td>
<td>Heteronormativity II: Analysis of teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>February 3</td>
<td>Heteronormativity III: Article presentation, analysis &amp; critical review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>February 10</td>
<td>Assessment 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.11: Course plan

My premise for the course was to attempt to set in motion a process of consciousness raising of issues of exclusion by exploring and que(e)rying students' knowledge about and attitudes towards social justice issues in general and gender and sexual diversity in particular. My aim was to raise awareness of their role and
position of power as future teachers in educational institutions and examine possible strategies for addressing exclusion and heteronormativity in their English language classrooms critically. Because the construction of identity is very much part of education, I hoped the trajectory of the course, Figure 5.11 above, would create a logical progression of understanding and knowledge of the ways in which gender identity is formed, regulated and may be influenced.

The course proceeded from que(e)rying understandings of gender through language expressions to an examination of how gender is linked to the way sexuality is constructed and understood, and finally to exploring the ways in which the social regulation of gender and sexual identity may result in heteronormative teaching. Throughout the term students were challenged to queer and deconstruct their linguistic status quo, to analyse exclusive practices in language and education materials critically and to explore their own complicity in heteronormative processes. This was done through language activities, discussion, texts and critical reflection (cf. Appendix P).

As the participants were all advanced students in the final phase of their university education, they had background knowledge of theories dealing with gender, race, and cultural issues, as these had been discussed extensively in their university education so far. With the exception of Marta, the students shared a cultural identity as Bavarians, all originating from within 40 miles of the university. The 15-week term produced a large amount of data, all of which dealt with issues of diversity and how to deal with them in ESOL classrooms. In the process of sifting through this data, I chose to examine recurrent comments which fit most closely with the key issues of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity. I also considered the silences which, when discussed, revealed key realisations. These realisations illustrate a crucial shift in students' awareness of exclusion, of social heteronormativity, the new critical insights they gained, the recognition of their own complicit roles as well as the potential for them as future teachers to contribute to ending the invisibility of sexual diversity in their classrooms. I consider these
moments to be “critical events” (Wragg 1994: 64) in this case study in that they illuminate particular behaviours which have important insights to offer.

4.1 Key Moments: Gender

As a seasoned lecturer, I was aware that the initial classes would determine which students stayed and which would drop the course. Of the 9 sign-ups, 6 came to class 1 and only four returned in class 2. I hung up flyers to advertise the course and distributed them to my colleagues endeavouring to persuade other students that this would be an interesting and rewarding course for them. Despite these concerted efforts and, at times, my own doubts whether I would be able to run the course with such a small class, no new students signed up. My dilemma was to approach difficult issues, which involved the students’ own identities, but not scare them off. The group dynamics of the first 3-5 sessions reflected the sensitive nature of the topics and students' initial reticence about speaking freely. Preliminary discussions addressed discrimination in general and began by focussing on students’ own identity formation and individual experiences of bullying or discrimination. It was imperative I create a relaxed atmosphere in which students would feel in a position to queer their own status quo and discuss these highly controversial issues, especially keeping in mind the Bavarian social and cultural context. I incorporated a number of ‘getting to know you’ activities and general discussions about teaching, education and the definition of social justice, but the students offered only relatively superficial responses and comments.

In week 5, I realised I had to incorporate my Self in such a way as to persuade the students they could trust me and the class could be rewarding for their future lives as English teachers. The classroom setting was a rather large room and as is typical of students, they all sat at the very back. In week 5, I told them I wanted us to be able to discuss these issues authentically and suggested we start with an exercise for them to ask me anything they wanted to. I was aware they may ask for information about my (sexual) identity but was willing to give this information to enable the course’s success. I sat down across the desk from them and they started to ask questions and the atmosphere immediately became more personal
and relaxed. This was a turning point for me as the teacher and researcher and for the students, who in later weeks maintained the sense that they could comment on and question what I said as they saw fit, the ice was broken.

The students investigated gender as represented in language leading to the recognition of the exclusive nature of the pseudo-generic *he* and how many nouns are understood as gendered, although grammatically speaking they are not, for example: surgeon, astronaut, doctor, secretary, nurse. With the exception of Daria, they were unable to solve a riddle exemplifying how this gendering inhibits understanding (cf. Appendix P, p. 268) and provoking a discussion and heightened awareness of how language functions to regulate gendered understandings of specific terms such as surgeon = male. The students discussed and considered the social repercussions of bringing up a child without disclosing their gender (cf. Storm article, Appendix P, p. 271-2) and how far-reaching the social effects of such a choice would be. The difficulties they foresaw meant that they said they would not do this with their own child. However, the discussion and questioning of this choice revealed to the students how language functions to regulate social behaviour according to historically developed gender meanings and how their presumed free choices, in turn, are influenced by those meanings. Through the process of discussing and deconstructing common binary constructions, e.g. rational/irrational, beautiful/ugly, stable/unstable, girlfriend/boyfriend, mother/father, masculine/feminine, students queried in how far their own identity as young women was formed by the binary organisation of their social world.

Adopting a queer-theoretical, questioning approach was not successful with all the students. Wendy considered it *natural* that there are more male science and maths teachers than female and generally seemed to condone the binary construction of society as natural, saying it would be too difficult not to do this. When problematising the view of women as carers, often restricting them to the home, she commented that men who are waiters are also carers. Her beliefs and attitudes represent a more superficial view of the complex social regulation that categorising women as *natural* carers involves. She wanted to discuss discrimination and social
injustice as issues related to migrant backgrounds, parental income or physical disability. She considered religion and race more important for the school context than gender or sexuality. She had clear views about how social justice might be improved and criticized the decline in the importance of faith and a lack of values in society as resulting in a loss of a sense of right and wrong, seeing this as the main contributing factor to social problems.

Daria also resisted the questioning of the social status quo, for example commenting that girls were simply not that interested in science or maths as a reason for having so few female teachers in those subjects. She also expressed a lack of conviction that language needed to be unbiased. She considered the use of Mrs for all women unproblematic, as taught in many German ESOL classrooms, and liked the certainty of binary categories, which she explicitly termed "normal". Using default male forms did not strike her as discriminatory at all. Where German has grammatical gender and the term der Student can only correctly be applied to males, Daria was adamant that she found it perfectly acceptable to use male default forms to describe herself. She had taken physics at school as the only girl in a class of boys, but believed the reason for this was that girls were simply not interested in physics. Throughout the course, it was Daria who questioned the validity of a queering stance. She was a constant advocate for the status quo, especially in language. She held the view, for example, that it was fine for same-sex couples to be together, but it should not be called marriage. She did not view discrimination as a serious issue that she would have to contend with in her classroom. She insisted language she would teach was separate from these issues. By contrast, Eleanor and Marta were more readily willing to queer their own understandings of the world and were open to questioning the status quo. Both thought that bringing up a child without the shackles of gender such as Storm would be a desirable goal. Marta said:

Marta: I just had the impression that it would be quite nice to...not to be put into these labels from the early childhood and to be able to taste how it is to be both a boy and a girl and then decide...I'm sure that it would be very difficult both for the parents and for the child maybe at times, due to this bullying thing. But it just came to my mind right now that actually I would like to see how it is
to be free to not be a girl, but just to behave like you want to, not like…what society demands of you. (Class 3, 0:27.18)

The participants' own university explicitly promotes unbiased language. Our discussion of ways in which certain individuals may feel discriminated against if excluded by specific language choice then resulted in unanimity amongst the students that teachers must be careful in their language use in order to be a role model of tolerance for their pupils. At the same time, they realised why this is not done and how difficult it is to uphold the changes. The key insight here was a realisation that differentiation in TLS is crucial to promoting an inclusive classroom.

Further, by critically analysing specific images and texts and revealing underlying exclusive meanings perpetuated through them, the students practiced amending the examples to create inclusive lessons. The discussion of a textbook image of Ellen DeGeneres and her wife (Appendix P, p. 277) in a lesson on marriage created a conundrum for the participants. On the one hand, the textbook explicitly presented an image of same-sex marriage, which suggests it is an acceptable topic for class. On the other, these students will be teaching in a social environment heavily influenced by Catholicism which regards homosexuality as a taboo. Moreover, the task in the book is, "Which image do you like the best?" The students believed that pupils would not choose this image as their favourite because of the unspoken social norm that weddings are heterosexual, and pupils might worry about being accused of being homosexual. This estimation was based on the students' own experience of homophobic reactions. Eleanor described how 2 boys from her senior school year came out in class and through the extensive discussion that ensued, the other pupils rallied round to protect them from any kind of homophobic responses. She described how they all stopped making derogatory comments about homosexuality. However, one of the maths' teachers in her school would no longer look at the boys, wanted them out of his class and gave them lower marks. Daria spoke of a pupil in her school class whose behaviour and demeanour she described as "stereotypically gay" and flicked her wrist limply to emphasise what this meant. He liked musical theatre and dancing, but was in fact not gay. Daria's terminology reflected her own organisation of binary oppositions
and stereotypical understandings of diversity. On the one hand she would describe how she had no issues with sexual diversity by emphasising her indifference to it and at the same time promote social norms as natural occurrences.

When challenged to imagine how to use the DeGeneres image to create a discussion of diversity in marriage and reject compulsory heterosexuality (Rich 1980), Eleanor suggested she, with the authority of teacher, would choose the image as her favourite thus disrupting the heteronormativity of the concept of marriage and simultaneously establishing herself as role model of tolerance to the heterosexual students. Additionally, this approach would explicitly include pupils who potentially identify as not-heterosexual by making their lives visible.

4.2 Key Moments: Sexual Diversity

Having established the connection between language use and understandings of gender, the next phase addressed how gender meanings are related to heterosexuality. Here, again, binary understandings of sexuality as normal/deviant were examined and through discussion, the concept of compulsory heterosexuality was problematised. The students criticized the extensive exploitation of especially naked female bodies in advertising and the media, portrayed as objects of male desire perpetuating and reinforcing heterosexual stereotypes. The issue of visibility of not-heterosexuality was discussed at length resulting in the realisation of how little they had noticed the presumption of heterosexuality everywhere.

Marta talked extensively on the issue of religion (Catholicism) as a regulatory force in her country and how heterosexual relationships are deemed the norm on the basis of the ability to procreate. She recounted an anecdote from her university, which she considered symbolic of how pervasive the influence of the Catholic value system was in upholding heteronormativity.

Marta: During the summer holidays there was a huge scandal in my academic city (…) because the medical university let a room for an American professor who came to give a lecture on how to cure homosexuality. (0:39:14)
In the end the event had to be cancelled, but the fact that this was considered an acceptable topic for a lecture highlights that even a university can be uncritical if the influence of the church is so dominant. Daria contended that this used to be the case in Bavaria but was no longer so. However, this is doubtful as Catholicism is highly visible in Bavaria standing in marked contrast to northern German states. As noted above, crucifixes are visible all over the countryside, in schools, in the corners of people’s homes etc., and the celebration of traditional Catholic holidays is the status quo. Bavaria was one of the last states in Germany to allow same-sex unions (civil partnerships) in registry offices in 2009, instead of exclusively with notaries – possibly a measure to reduce visibility and desirability of such a ceremony – although other states had granted this 8 years earlier in 2001. These conventions illustrate that Bavaria is far from progressive in its willingness to challenge heteronormativity or the hegemony of Catholicism’s influence on its social norms.

Eleanor commented that it would be brave of 2 male students to openly exhibit any physical display of affection in the university, such as kissing or holding hands (Class 6, 1:08:48) and that fear of reprisals, ridicule or homophobic comments is a key element to regulating behaviour and restricting it to what is considered normal (see also Givens & Nixon 2006). This discussion led to the questioning of why resistance to these normative pressures is so difficult. The students agreed that they had realised that these social forces were highly complex and interwoven, and their own inhibitions meant that they were often reluctant to react to normative exclusive texts or language. On the basis of discussions resulting from the readings (cf. Appendix P, pp. 278, 281, 285; Bedford 2002; Simone 2002), the students examined their own complicity in excluding sexual diversity both in language and images. Eleanor stressed how enriching she considered all kinds of diversity in the classroom, but both she and Daria were concerned about getting through materials in the short time they had, echoing comments made by Mr. Stevens and Marcello. Nevertheless, as teachers, they concluded that it is part of their job to integrate images, TLS and discussion topics that might make sexual diversity more visible in language classrooms. It had become clear by this point in
the course that critical discourse and questioning were a means to instigate movement away from a rigid status quo and potentially effectuate change.

4.3 Key Moments: Heteronormativity

The exploration of how language use, gender meanings and a systematic presumption of heterosexuality result in systematic heteronormativity was the focus of this final section of the course. It investigated how this exclusiveness affects the real life of young lesbian teacher, Jessica, in Sparkes' (1994) life history article. The discussion of the strategies of covering and passing (Ibid) that many not-heterosexual individuals employ in order not to be discovered (cf. Marcelllo’s comments) made the students very sad for Jessica. Marta thought that leading a double life, not being able to reveal her true identity must have meant carrying a "secret burden" as well as the stress of worrying about being found out (cf. Ferfolja 1998 & 2005). All of the students felt that this could be addressed by having alliances especially from heterosexual teachers. They maintained the issue of visibility had to be addressed by more than just the teacher herself. Eleanor reported that she had visited a personal, social and health education (PHSE) class in England, in which someone from outside came to teach about different sexualities, which resulted in the class at least being exposed to diversity. Daria contended that in Bavaria, this exposure was rare and reiterated the importance of challenging pupils to address issues they may never have encountered before. Both Daria and Eleanor described how, from their experience of schools in Bavaria, a gay PE teacher would probably be ostracised, and parents would likely be extremely upset. They all felt that despite the number of openly gay politicians, writers, actors, musicians that they knew of in Germany, there was a sense of distance to Bavarian culture. The strength of heteronormativity in schools, the omnipresence of Catholicism, and the social and educational focus on traditional heterosexual families, they felt, obstructed integrating this otherness into Bavarian identity, especially outside the main cities. Knowledge and exposure to diversity and visibility in school, the participants argued, would mean that this unknown otherness would no longer be rejected out of fear of the unknown.
Straut & Sapon-Shevin (2002: 34) advocate 3 goals in teacher education: knowledge, courage and skills. This means knowing the correct language to use to discuss issues and the facts; it means knowing why it is important and that even small courageous moments in class can make a huge difference; it means learning how to respond skillfully and appropriately and knowing that this is also a process which takes time. The participants had expressed an awareness of the necessity for change and I wanted to address this by challenging the class to critically rework lesson texts from actual textbooks used in Bavaria today. The aim was to make them inclusive of diversity, e.g. Pink’s Dear Mr. President (discussion of the lines: "What kind of father would take his own daughter’s rights away? And what kind of father might hate his own daughter if she were gay?") and Obama’s (first) inauguration speech. The students’ suggested using discussion and questioning, for example why Obama had not referred to gay marriage. They said they were aware that the pupils would probably shy away from difficult issues and new ways of doing things, but that eventually they would take it for granted as the norm if the teacher addressed them often enough. Daria highlighted an experience from school and the method of teaching physics via problem solving, which pupils had initially hated. After getting used to it though, they had eagerly awaited the new problem each week. She also thought it was important not to make a "big thing" about diversity because then it would again become something "special" as opposed to the norm. This was an interesting strategy to compel pupils to do something despite their initial resistance in the knowledge that it would benefit them in the long run.

The final key discussion in the course, based on Hawkins & Norton (2009) gathered together the theoretical background, their own understandings of connections between language, gender and heteronormativity and the importance of being critical. Marta summed up the heteronormative social system by recounting, as an analogy, a monkey experiment. A group of monkeys learn not to climb a ladder because the others in the group will get a cold shower if one does, so the one climbing the ladder is beaten by the others. Slowly the original group are all replaced so that none have ever experienced the cold shower but they
nevertheless stop new monkeys from climbing the ladder. They pass on (negative) behaviours to new monkeys even though they have not learned them directly themselves (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0344qRfAOtA This behavioural experiment originated from Stephenson 1967). She argued that it illustrated how we, too, behave in heteronormative ways although we may not have thought about why, and she felt talking about why may disrupt our automatic self-regulation. Eleanor believed that, "as a teacher, you really have to know how the mind works" (Class 14, 0:48:00) in order to combat exclusivity and normativity.

A key realisation about how powerful norms can be was represented in the final discussion about naming. This brought to fore the discussion of how language manipulates and is manipulated by social norms, often in unconscious ways and echoes Althusser's notion of *interpellation* discussed in chapter 3. The students criticised what they considered 'bizarre' naming practices in North America (e.g. *Storm*). All felt very strongly about what names should or should not be allowed. By que(e)rying this, I asked the students to analyse the underlying assumptions that had led them to think in this way. German law dictates that a child's gender must be visible in their name. This is not the case in the UK or the USA. The students questioned why Germany needs to know the gender of a child and what this means in their social context. They realised that they had never in fact questioned this and what impact it might have. They all concluded that critical reflection and discourse on that which we take for granted, such as naming a child, may affect our awareness of heteronormative structures and that this could bring about change. Daria, however, remained unconvinced that giving a child a gendered name would be a disadvantage. This seems to confirm how difficult it is to change understandings which are so firmly embedded in the cultural and social status quo.

The students' final assessment task (cf. Appendix Q) was a critical reflection on the course content and the discussions we had had as well as a pragmatic section to explore strategies for their own classrooms to prevent an exclusively heteronormative lesson. All of the students produced answers which offered a differentiated and insightful perspective on how gender bias is upheld through
language and exclusion, but also in what ways the same language and exclusion functions to promote and perpetuate compulsory heterosexuality. Their chosen strategies for inclusive lessons were: rewriting a song text changing the focus of the discrimination from race to other issues (Daria), having students reflect on their own behaviour and language to see if they are discriminatory (Eleanor), or questioning a whole range of cultural discriminations within Europe itself from their knowledge of different cultures (Marta). In the end, the students had all seemed to internalise a questioning approach, not taking the status quo for granted. They revealed through their answers that they had learned to reveal underlying regulative and exclusive mechanisms, which constitutes a considerable change to the initial perspectives at the beginning of the course. Eleanor commented:

Eleanor: This course has definitely broadened my mind and em (.) I know that it can work so I can do the same with my students and tell them again and again and again that there is so much more than they think there is.(Class 13, 0:07:05)

5. Section 5 - SJE Course Participants

RQ 4: Would students attending such a class gain a greater critical awareness of the issues?

This final section of the data analysis will appraise participants’ (cf. Appendix E 1, Table 3) critical reflections on the course, if it succeeded in raising their awareness of heteronormative processes, exclusion and discrimination of all kinds of diversity. Each exit interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and was transcribed using Transana and thematically coded. The coding process corresponded to that of previous interviews. Interviewees reviewed and commented on the transcripts and some added their comments via email approximately one year after the interview. The interviews were semi-structured (cf. Appendix E 3) and I identified and created an index of key words extrapolating four main themes (cf. Appendix J): awareness of the invisibility of sexual diversity as a social justice issue, awareness of exclusion in images and TLS, strategies for integrating topics to trouble heteronormativity in their classrooms and their own attitudes towards discrimination
of diversity in the classroom. Wendy left the class in session 5 which began to focus on sexual diversity. She declined my request for an interview saying the class did not address the social justice issues she wished to discuss. She sent the following email:

Dear Sam,

unfortunately, I'm very busy and won't be able to meet you in your office. However, I can write you why I decided not to attend your course any more: In my opinion, the title of the course “Social Justice in Education and TESOL” was misleading. I assumed that social justice includes many different issues, such as injustices due to ethnic origin, parental income, height, disabilities, beliefs as well as gender. I think that the subject of gender is important, but I see it equal to the other social injustices students and teachers have to face. Since I was interested in a more general approach to “Social Justice” and your course covers “only” one of those issues, I decided to focus on my other courses.

5.1 Awareness of the invisibility of sexual diversity as a social justice issue

All of the students (with the exception of Wendy, who left) reported that they had benefitted from the course with a heightened awareness of their heteronormative social and educational reality. Marta, who already had a substantial foundation in feminist theory through literature courses, was the most enthusiastic:

I: what kinds of things would you say that you have learned or realised or thought about that you wouldn't have thought about before, before having done the class? (0:14:37.0)
Marta: (2 seconds) OH::, I know the most striking topic for me is when you gave us the article about the parents who bring up the bo..boy or the girl.
I: Storm↑
Marta: Yes, I think that was what actually punched me in the face a bit (0:14:59.9)
I: Uuhh
Marta: Yea..h, Like what consequences does it actually have↑ like the sex , the gender. That it really er.that there is so much hidden knowledge behind that I, I knew that but I didn't realise that there was so much of that.
I: Everything?
Marta: YEAH basically everything, totally everything (0:15:13.4) And also what surprised me was the rest of the people reacted with em.reacted a bit negatively to this experiment.

The students thought this course should be on offer more frequently, or should be integrated into other courses, especially didactics or pedagogy as they felt they
needed more practical training in how to integrate diversity issues with materials. Eleanor commented that it would take time for her to process everything:

Eleanor: I didn't think about lots of these aspects before and em they well the course made me realise that I need to be a lot more careful about with what I say as a teacher and with how I handle things, and problems in my class. (0:02:16.6)

Daria commented on having gained a new perspective which was a huge shift in her thinking. While she saw herself as relatively indifferent to the issues and very tolerant, she agreed that she had realised that her indifference may cause others to feel excluded. She described her shift in perspective:

Daria: [...] I think just taking another perspective on looking at things (0:04:14.9) [...] I think just em thinking about more topics in class like em homosexuality but also other things that, so other things that, especially topics that could be used for bullying, so especially talking about topics like that without any cases of bullying there, so just kind of as you...to get the students aware of those topics and so to prevent the topics from becoming simply negative (0:04:49.2)

This also illustrates how the teacher plays an important role in addressing silences and invisibility, but only if they themselves are aware of the ways heteronormative mechanisms work in language, materials and behavioural assumptions. The participants reported that they had never addressed diversity issues in such breadth, had not even come across the term LGBT, and many topics came up that they had never previously thought about or discussed. Marta mentioned the activities with the riddle, post-it game and virtual identities game (cf. Appendix P, pp. 273, 269, 284) specifically having made her think about gender and sexuality as being key categories which are used to make sense of the world. She said of the issues discussed:

Marta: Aha, usually I have to think hard during that class. I really have to think about things I would maybe not pay close attention to normally, but maybe that's good actually. [...] For example, the one issue: how to be a teacher in a very diversified group of people and how to include everybody in the class and not to make somebody feel out of place, or strange or I don't know alien. [...] And I think that's important. (0:08:48.6)

Daria also commented that issues such as sexual diversity had to be discussed critically in class, as social justice issues, to make students aware of the ways they
may be used in bullying. However, she added that making students think is not always an easy course:

Daria: I think that a lot of...there are always students who are who just want to go by with the least effort and who don't like talking about things which make them think, so I think they probably would not like to talk about it because if you talk about that that also means changing the rest of your life. Because otherwise you don't really participate in class (...) and I think there are a lot of people who don't really want to do that, they don't want to think a lot. But I think that a lot of people would like it and I think that most or many heterosexual students would be made aware of things that you don't think so much about, as I said, especially if you have a very heterosexual surrounding. (0:32:39.8)

The discussion of sexual diversity as a social justice issue throughout the course resulted in all of the participants realising that it had been invisible to them. The detailed accounts from the articles read in class revealed underlying heteronormative processes in classroom textbooks as well as their LTE education in general and the students commented on their new found awareness of this. Daria said, "I think it makes sense to have em yeah, to make future teachers aware that it's useful to raise the topic, especially if you yourself are heterosexual" (0:15:42.4).

5.2 Awareness of exclusion in images and TLS

With respect to visibility of diversity in language and images, the students were all in favour of using non-biased language, which they had not considered before. They realised that only using the language or imagery inclusive of sexual diversity was not enough to change their pupils' use. They all agreed that having students discover their own discriminatory practice by queering text examples or images and using their own empowered position as teachers to be role models were key aspects of this. This echoes comments made by both Mr. Stevens, Delesi and Marcello. Daria, who had persistently resisted using non-biased forms saying, "I don't feel excluded just because it's the male version" but after discussing the ways language can regulate behaviour and exert normative power, she conceded:

Daria: Now I know several things that I did not know before or I notice that they (male default) are, yeah heteronormative. (...) That's fine I'd say so because people who do feel excluded by it now feel included and I don't care if I use either or so I can just use the one that makes everybody feel included. (0:08:10.5)
Eleanor also described a key change in her awareness of noticing casual discrimination in language use. She looks after a young girl whose neighbourhood friend has two mums, which the girl finds "perfectly normal", and yet the same little girl used the word schwul (gay), as a derogatory comment. Eleanor then "explained to the little girl, who is only 6 years old, why she shouldn't say that and I wouldn't have said anything before" (0:04:38.5). Marion had also spoken of this in her use of spacko (cf. section 3.1, p. 132) and how it is important to change your own, sometimes discriminatory, language use.

5.3 Integrating topics to trouble heteronormativity in classrooms

The most problematic area that the students foresaw was the issue of actually integrating sexual diversity issues into their future classrooms. While they were convinced that it should be done, especially with TLS and images, they were sure they would encounter resistance. They realised that there was a presumption of heterosexuality in the classroom and addressing sexual diversity would, they felt, bring up uncomfortable discussions, especially with the predominance of Catholicism. Daria worried that the discomfort with the unknown would lead to avoidance:

Daria: I think a lot of people just don't feel safe with, for example, homosexuality if they don't really know anyone who is homosexual or have really close friends cause if you do then you feel better with the topics. I think there are a lot of people like me who generally don't have any any er yeah better friends who are homosexual and so you don't have a lot of contact and then you just don't. It's not so easy to just kind of include it in class without making it a real topic. (...) They just don't feel, they just don't yeah really like the topic or feel happy about doing it, cause you of course you usually prefer doing topics that you either like a lot or that you just feel very interested in and if it's something where you think 'yeah I should do that but...'. (0:21:38)

Nevertheless, she did feel that English offered critical potential for all kinds of topics, including sexual diversity. Eleanor thought that students may laugh or avoid serious discussion and that prohibiting this would not be effective. She would give students tasks asking them to adopt a different perspective (as Mr. Stevens had done) and emphasised the need to talk to parents with the support of colleagues.
as a comprehensive approach. Marta thought that the LTE programme, but also university in general, should address these topics to prepare teachers:

Marta: I think it is essential to provide that training, teaching, or how to call that, at university. I just cannot imagine being a translator or teacher or anybody who deals with languages and being narrow-minded. (0:02:10)

The students did feel more in a position to queer their textbooks and materials after the practice done in the course, although they were aware of the multilayered problems that would face them in school, the key one being a lack of time for discussion. This was voiced by all the interviewees in the study.

5.4 Attitudes towards discrimination of diversity in the classroom

All of the students felt that there were discriminatory attitudes in schools; Eleanor had spoken about this with respect to sexual diversity and open homophobia (cf. section 4.2, p.145) and Marta had recounted bullying examples from her school time, which were not addressed by her teachers. They all described the extensive discussion of cultural difference as an almost exclusive focus in their LTE, and spoke of how racist comments might still be made and ignored by staff. Eleanor said "I wouldn't say they would tolerate it, but I can think of situations where they would just ignore it" (0:14:03.3), whereas Daria insisted her teachers did not tolerate any bullying. It seems that there is discrimination and it is not always addressed whether cultural, racial, physical or with respect to sexual diversity. As Eleanor pointed out, there is a perception, however, that "when someone is discriminated for his or her weight, it's not accepted as much as discriminating someone for sexuality for example↑ his or her sexuality"(0:01:32). The students agreed that it remains a conundrum how the hierarchy of acceptable discrimination is silently upheld. Although individual teachers and pupils may reject all kinds of discrimination, the power of the educational status quo, they thought, consistently thwart efforts to change.

In general, the students considered any discrimination unacceptable but were aware that they would be in schools with teachers from different age groups and
parents and pupils with a range of cultural, political, social and religious backgrounds. Daria thought tolerance of diversity should be taught early on:

Daria: That's also something that you just need to learn as a child that it's...that...that's also normal, because it's always hard to like change your opinions on things if you are already older. (0:38:46.6)

And Eleanor offered her critical strategy for dealing with exclusive attitudes:

Eleanor: I think the only thing that can be done is em showing the students that you yourself are open, tolerant, by what you're saying, by what topics you include into your lessons. (0:30:31.4)

I considered their views to offer an optimistic perspective on the potential for change that new teachers may bring to their schools in general and their English lessons in particular. This echoes Tobey's enthusiasm that he, too, would demand tolerance and acceptance (cf. p. 136) of his future school, staff and pupils, illustrating that perhaps his generation will bring about changes as a matter of course. The consensus throughout was that it would not be easy.
CHAPTER 6

Discussion

This chapter extrapolates and discusses the analysis from chapter 5 in light of the wider discussion of LTE. Bodies and subjects are the inseparable agents/mediators of heteronormed education discourses and the embodied teacher/educator in those discourses a key focus in this case study. I will discuss the ramifications of the data analysis in 3 sections: the macro level of visibility in discourses of state and educational institutions and the ways in which their (heteronormative) power mechanisms regulate education; visibility in language and image in society and culture and, on the micro level, the ways these macro discourses constitute and monitor the visibility of the embodied individual teacher as subject. The overarching research questions in this project were:

- To what extent are respondents aware of heteronormative processes in Language Teacher Education?
- In what ways do participants see gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity?
- What experiences do not-heterosexual students and staff have?
- How might course content and structure contribute to raising awareness of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity as social justice issues?
- In what ways can such a course raise critical awareness and what limitations might arise?

Beginning with the quantitative findings of the macro group in this case (cf. Appendix D 2), the analysis has shown that in LTE in Bavaria, there is some awareness of discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and of heteronormative processes. The latter, however, is relatively superficial and
uncritical. Chapter 5 has addressed the experiences of staff and students in detail, ranging from experiences of homophobia and exclusion, but also the positive experiences of tolerance, and open attitudes towards change by LGBQTI staff on the LTE programme. The course taught did succeed in heightening participants' awareness of heteronormativity and, in detail, how to trouble it by queering teaching materials. The following discussion will look more closely at ways in which these findings may be seen in the larger project of increasing critical awareness of diversity issues in LTE in TESOL, but also why the troubling process is needed. To return to Foucault's contention about power (cf. chapter 3, p.59): if heteronormative power functions best when masked, then it is visibility through discourse that is key to the process of transgression and resisting that power. I would like to revisit this by reviewing the visibility of diversity in educational institutions, visibility in language and image on the LTE programme in this particular social and cultural context, and the visibility of the individual teacher as embodied subject.

In 1993, Cynthia Nelson queered the voice and face of the TESOL teacher/educator/researcher/academic. Her speech (from the 26th Annual TESOL Convention, 1992) challenged the status quo of 7 common attitudes towards diversity and the systematic exclusion of diversity in the field, but also in education in general. The findings in this research project at times echo the attitudes that Nelson criticised despite 2 decades having passed in between. I would like to borrow these 7 attitudes in order to discuss further my own exploration's findings.

1. I don't get it. How are gay teachers any different from heterosexual teachers? I mean, we're all teachers. What's the big deal?
2. Whether or not a teacher is gay simply doesn't - or shouldn't - come up in a classroom. It has nothing to do with teaching English.
3. Our students are from countries where there aren't many gay people. I honestly don't think they could handle talking about gays. It would be too controversial.
4. There are lots of gay men in ESL. One of them brought his friend to an office party once. There was no problem. Why are you making an issue out of nothing?
5. I don't care whether or not someone is gay. I never say anything against gays. In fact, I never say anything at all about gays.
6. Gay students? I've never had a student come out to me. Besides, is it really our job to help them with their social lives?
7. Only gay people can address gay issues. I'm no expert. I wouldn't know where to begin. (Nelson 1993: 144-149)

These 7 attitudes reflect the complex interrelatedness between 3 dynamics in education: institutional power mechanisms (6 & 7); social, cultural and content knowledge (2, 3 & 5) and gendered subject/subjectivity (1 & 4).

1. Visibility in Educational Institutions

1.1 Educational Body – Institutional Power Mechanisms

This section will consider the macro level of the where (and when) of this research project. One school class I visited in Bavaria while carrying out this research project (cf. chapter 4, p.80) epitomises the complexity of the conversation between macro-institutional and social/heterosexist discourses. There was a crucifix in one corner of the classroom and semi-naked pinup girls/women on the wall facing the female teacher. This was both surprising and inappropriate on several levels. The first, because of the organisation of the room - all the pupils' desks faced the blackboard at the front of the room, and the female teacher stood at her desk in front of the blackboard facing the pin-ups of semi-naked women. The class comprised all male teenage students. Not only were these images disrespectful to the female teacher, but also, arguably, undermined her authority as teacher by making a spectacle of the female body as object. The second issue is the apparent inability of the teacher to demand the posters be removed as the classroom was considered the boys' domain. Thirdly, the heteronormative force being exerted on those subjects in the classroom who may have had queer identities cements their silencing and exclusion. The teacher accepted the posters without question and the crucifix in the corner seemed paradoxically to bear witness to this acceptable expression of masculinity. This example illustrates how certain behaviours, no matter how offensive, are simply taken for granted. The teacher informed me
afterwards that she did not comment on the posters as she worried that the class's class teacher would see this as meddling in their affairs. This understanding meant that she regulated her own behaviour in advance and tolerated this discrimination so as not to create a fuss. It is tantamount to insidious institutional policing to uphold a heterosexist agenda (cf. Ferfolja 2007).

The institutional context of this Bavarian urban university LTE has, as I have shown (Appendix D 2, Fig. 5.5), a high degree of homogeneity. There has been considerable discussion of the issue of silences and exclusion of sexual diversity in educational bodies (Ferfolja 1998, 2005, 2006; Applebaum 2003; Petrovic 2003; Bedford 2002; Atkinson 2002a; Jackson 2009 and others), and both Mr. Stevens as a school teacher and as an LTE supervisor, and Marcello made it quite explicit that institutionalised exclusion was the norm both with respect to the Bavarian school ESOL classroom and university LTE of pre-service teachers. Both agreed that this is regulated by both the Bavarian Ministry of Education and parents, but also to a certain extent by colleagues. Broadly speaking, there is an awareness of issues of discrimination, if not a critical awareness of the pervasiveness of heteronormative processes. The professor Marion described in her LTE course (cf. chapter 5, p.134), who displayed exclusive language in her classes, the (closeted) gay primary teacher Mathew visited, the lectures paying brief lip service to heterogeneity, and the total exclusion of not-heterosexual TLS in language classes all re/create the social and cultural status quo and pander to the hegemonic norm of heterosexuality. The question then remains: where is the LGBQTI body in these educational settings? Why do educational bodies systematically exclude LGBQTI bodies in education and, in this study, in LTE? It is the silencing through this body that constitutes the most devious element of institutionalised heteronormativity.

Phillips and Larson's (2011) revealing study of the silencing of pre-service teachers by external institutional bodies in the real context of Oregon's heteronormative media culture illustrates that the social discourses and structures offer little room for resistance at the institutional level. Their research addresses the issue of pre-service teachers and other teachers bowing to the pressure of media, parents and
then school boards, effectively silencing open discourse on sexual diversity and eventually resulting in teachers being transferred, fired or leaving their jobs. This is reminiscent of the comments that both LGBQTI lecturers Marcello and Delesi made about their own past careers as school teachers in the UK, resulting in their leaving school altogether, again almost 2 decades ago.

Phillips and Larson (2011) argue that not naming homosexuality when reading *And Tango Makes Three* means there is no interpellation, effectively regulating "what will and will not be a recognizable form of being" (Butler cited in Phillips & Larson 2011: 159). By deflecting uncomfortable or controversial questions about LGBQTI issues, teachers are essentially covering and presenting a clear cut world of binary oppositions excluding the messiness of plurality and diversity. A lesbian journalist in the study poignantly commented on this covering: "Maybe it's cowardly. I think it's common sense" (Ibid: 173). Phillips and Larson, however, suggest an alternative to the "common sense" silence. They suggest constructing a subject position of the Teacher Who Cares and Meets the Needs of All Children, even those preservice teachers who believe homosexuality is unacceptable, are momentarily able to focus on the child and are committed to finding ways to create a safe and welcoming classroom where their family structure is respected. Momentary imagining is an opportunity to think differently, to break out of the binary and to challenge discourses of heteronormativity. Although it may appear fleeting, it introduces a difference and can function to disrupt normed and homophobic attitudes. (Ibid: 172)

When Eleanor spoke of her three fellow pupils at school, who came out to their classmates in their final year, we discussed how long these students had had to hide their identity and how they must have felt about this secrecy, what impact it may have had on them to go through almost their whole school career in hiding, but also how she and the other participants, as future teachers, might create that "momentary imagining" a caring, inclusive space through behaviour and language to make sure such students do not experience such long term harm. Petrovic, responding to Appelbaum’s (2003) discussion of whether silencing is ever morally acceptable, contends "[h]eterosexual children who are exposed to positive portrayals of LGB people in the curriculum are done no harm" (2003: 163). Inclusive teaching might arguably subvert the hegemonic power of the dominant
heterosexist ideology and thus prevent harm, however, to not-heterosexual pupils. Phillips and Larson argue that this alternative subject position does not intentionally inflict harm by ignoring children, discouraging them not to speak of their families, or allowing them to be teased and bullied. This teacher subject position moves between public/private spaces to a between-space, that of the classroom, a space controlled by the teacher, a space where all children are nurtured and protected 'despite' the practices of their parents. This teacher subject position plays upon the good intentions of the Teacher Who Cares and Meets the Needs of All Children. (2011: 172-3)

Although this may not be the ideal position to create equity in education, I do see it as a position which LTE could foster in the Bavarian institutional and cultural context as it exhibits a practicable teaching position for all teachers as the notion of caring is also fundamental to the Catholic belief system. To return to Nelson's attitudes above, choosing a positionality which does not harm the not-heterosexual student or teacher would dissolve the basis on which these attitudes rest. The differences between teachers'/students'/parents' orientations would become irrelevant as they would be visible to pupils/students because they would be integrated into classroom and institutional discourse, for example on issues of materials choice, school policies and curriculum. Multicultural learning would include sexual diversity and exclude "words that wound", no matter what religion, culture, sexuality. Not-heterosexual individuals would be part of the visible landscape through colleagues, images in textbooks, fellow students or pupils; classroom interaction would not tolerate the exclusion of sexual diversity in TLS and therefore speaking about gays would be a normal aspect of discourse, and finally, teaching the subject position of Teacher Who Cares and Meets the Needs of All Children means adopting a different perspective, que(e)rying the status quo and seeing differently. Being teachers/educators on a LTE programme or teaching an ESOL class means being just to all the participant subjects and respectful of their diverse and shifting identities.

Institutional power systems interact with social and cultural norms to regulate subjects' knowledge and subjects' bodies (cf. chapter 3, Part 2.4 - 2.6) in Bavarian educational settings through the CSU led Ministry of Education (Kultusministerium), which makes and regulates policies for universities and
schools (cf. Article 7 (1) “The entire schooling system stands under the supervision of the state). The unspoken hidden regulation by Catholic mores has been historically developed, as argued previously (cf. chapter 2) and is very much part of the status quo, a power house masked by its position as norm, unquestioned and yet pervasive. Sexuality diversity is not considered a matter for school except in the context of biology, religion or ethics education (in Bavaria based on the heterosexual family unit (cf. Analysis of sex education policy in Germany, pp 41-50). They are excluded from the LTE programme. This seems to indicate that the presumption of heterosexuality in education goes hand in hand with the presumption of Catholicism in Bavaria. It is such an integral part of the subjects' unconscious knowledge and identity that it is a challenge to unravel the complex interwovenness of so many aspects of daily life which are affected by its normative presumption and it is difficult to find the space, the language and the opportunity in class to queer it. The crucifix in the corner of the room has become as normal a sight as the ever visible blue and white chequered Bavarian flag.

Interviewees reported that deferral to ministry dictates about what is acceptable and unacceptable is also often unquestioned. Teachers are rightly wary of parents' disapproval as they know parents can and will complain about transgression to the ministry, which can then exert pressure on the teachers. The power of the ministry is additionally enhanced by the power and morality of the Catholic Church. This renders the institution immense political, cultural and moral power to regulate educational institutions and their employees. An exemplary exhibition of the taken-for-granted nature of this power, I would argue, was shown in a recent TV news interview with a Bavarian CSU minister. Gerda Hasselfeldt, chair of the Parliamentary Ministers' Group from Bavaria, who commented on public television's nightly news programme, Tagesschau on the 7.6.2013 (06:55) that she saw absolutely no need to practice pre-emptory obedience in the matter of according civil rights of equal taxation law to not-heterosexual couples, as it is their (CSU) basic conviction that it is not absolutely necessary and that they felt they only really needed to react when 'forced' to do so by the constitutional court. Her choice of words leaves no doubt whatsoever that the party would never accord full
civil rights to not-heterosexual couples if they could avoid it in any way. This recalls the resistance that Bavaria showed in 2001 not allowing same sex couples to marry anywhere but in the notary office as opposed to registry offices. These examples underscore how powerful this public, normative, institutional voice is and especially the unwavering disregard for diversity equity, but also understandable in this specific context of a state ruled by the same party since 1946.

Hasselfeldt's display not only exemplifies the confident arrogance that such a politician feels able to express publicly, but also a dearth of respect towards both the many not-heterosexual citizens of Germany who are campaigning for equality in legal matters, and the constitutional court. I would argue she is only in a position to do this because of the close ties this political party has, including its integration of ecclesiastic members, with the Catholic Church. In speaking out, the minister presented an unflinching exclusive attitude that these institutions seem to have accorded her. This is also reminiscent of Whitlock's (2007) description of the Christian Right's widespread prejudice against homosexuality in some southern states of the United States. It is expressed openly without any kind of reticence for example in Alabama, USA. Whitlock offers the example of Alabama Supreme Court Justice Roy who, like Hasselfeldt above, felt that he would in no way jeopardize his career by "asserting the power of the state to execute queers as subversive criminals harmful to children" (2007: 83) when commenting on the case of a lesbian mother. The sense of right and wrong is so fundamental to these religious communities, whereby only heterosexuality is right, that such heteronormative opinions are taken-for-granted as natural, which Whitlock deems the "last acceptable form of oppression" (83).

The dominant heteronormative discourse of political power, exemplified above, is embodied in the Ministry of Education, which is so strong that it functions as a regulatory force creating a fearful teaching body and rendering the female teacher I alluded to above, and, arguably, Marcello, well versed in vorauszeitender Gehorsam (anticipatory obedience or pre-emptory obedience). In educational institutions, this is an extremely effective regulatory tool and the data collected here confirm that it
is operating in the LTE programme in this investigation. *Anticipatory obedience* is a term that echoes Foucault's notion of the dissemination of power and the example of the behaviour of drivers at red lights in the middle of the night (cf. chapter 3, section 2.6 *Power/Knowledge/(Hetero)Normativity*, p.59). It is also typified in the text *Der Untertan* by Heinrich Mann (first published in 1918) to describe the behaviour of subjects who anticipate in what ways they think they should be obedient and then become obedient even before or if they have to be. This behaviour has often been used as a characteristic of German identity. It offers one explanation of why the pupils regulate each other in school, even though outside of the school, they do not necessarily agree with the exclusion of sexual diversity. The LGBQTI students and staff in this research act in the same way in the university when considering whether to be open about their identities, not "thrusting it down their throats" (Marcello p.124 and Ellwood 2006). These behaviours serve to perpetuate the status quo uncritically. This thesis has shown, however, that this can at least be troubled by a critical queer approach. Nevertheless, when faced with the web of mechanisms of control - social, political, cultural and economic - which come into play, transgression is a difficult path to follow. The variety of data in this research have revealed just how complex these interwoven discourses are. If a subject resists at one point of the web, another thread of control takes over.

What is problematic in these considerations is twofold: in the first instance, the LGBQTI students, staff and pupils are required to be tolerant and accepting of a heterosexual lifestyle but when the tolerance is reversed, this exploration has shown that there is little structural tolerance and both at the institutional and the subjective level there is little space, voice or tolerance of plurality and sexual diversity's very existence. Chang calls this "cultural aphasia", whereby

> the notion of queerness is designated a silent issue by all kinds of techniques, such as inclusion and exclusion, in order to meet with heterosexual rules. In sum, cultural aphasia is not only the avoidance of speaking but also the forbidding of naming. [...] Thus, finding ways to dig out the queer voices or narratives in schooling becomes the core mission for critical educators.

(2007: 123)
The second aspect is the actual protection of diversity laws. Institutions purport to protect as dictated by the constitution. This thesis also makes clear that in the interests of inclusive pedagogy, heterosexual students and staff also need to learn to be critical educators and allies to constitute supporting bodies to those silenced (cf. Rodriguez & Pinar 2007). These issues affect them and their colleagues, pupils, friends and family, regardless of their sexuality. Nelson's attitudes 6 and 7 above imply that the not-heterosexual students are the experts, but as has become clear, speaking out is not so easy when institutional structures are so alienating. Additionally, if only experts were given a voice as attitude 7 stipulates, Caucasian teachers could not address racism or discuss literature by or about non-Caucasian individuals (Houser 2008; Straut & Sapon-Shevin 2007).

This case study has clarified that while topics may be included or allusions made to not-heterosexual identities, the systematicity with which these identities are excluded in teaching materials (not one single sentence in the English textbooks Green Line for Gymnasium, Ashford et.al. (2001) or Thomson & Maglioni (2005), LifeLike: Multicultural experiences in the English-speaking world give voice to non-heterosexual identity), curricular structures (with the exception of this course, no course addresses sexual diversity explicitly as part of the LTE programme), and university English grammar TLS, serves to uphold normalising processes of exclusion and silencing. School teaching staff usually derive from schools and then universities in Bavaria itself as it is more difficult for individuals qualifying outside of Bavaria to be accredited to teach in Bavarian schools (although it has formally been made easier, first choice is still generally from the home pool. cf. Kultusministerkonferenz decision 2001). As with this study, the high number of Bavarian students on the LTE programme confirms this. In the cultural context of Bavaria, the homogeneity of educational bodies and bodies in education means that norms and conformity to those norms seem to be part of the very social and cultural identity:

Socialization processes guarantee not only a future adult with the cultural norms of body behaviour, but one that learns compliance at an early age, the better to fit into the adult demands of a hierarchical social system.

(Henley 1977: 195)
2. Visibility in Language/Image on LTE and in School Curricula

2.1 Body of Knowledge - Social, Cultural and Content Knowledge

From a linguistic and pedagogical perspective, TESOL must decide what body of knowledge with respect to language (cultural and social relations) and teaching (strategies, methods and content) is given to the pre-service teachers. I again call upon Nelson’s list of attitudes. Attitudes 2, 3 and 5 reflect the ideas of cultural knowledge, knowledge of social interaction and language competence. These areas address the what of teaching on a LTE programme.

2.2 Cultural Knowledge and Social Interaction

Subjects know the culture they are working in and teachers know about the social and cultural limitations and the taboos on discussing not-heterosexuality openly. Teachers also know that there are consequences if controversial topics are integrated into the classroom both on an institutional level from school heads, and on a social level from parents, or resistance from pupils in the classroom (Pascoe 2007; Lehr 2007; Loutzenheiser, 1996; Mellor & Epstein 2006; Nixon & Givens 2004). Nevertheless, language teaching involves speaking words used by other cultures and, in order to understand how and when to use specific language, the social and cultural relations also need to be taught. Meanings of words sometimes overlap with those of the learners’ culture, but are, at the same time, distinct in that they refer to social and cultural existences which, while they may be similar, are not the same. One need only consider the understanding of the term marriage in its many social and cultural realisations. The use of specific sound units in incorrect contexts can instantly reveal the speaker as unversed in the respective rules of appropriacy. Students are often not aware of how different words are coded in different contexts, especially with respect to gender (Spender 1980; Sperber & Wilson 1986; Mills 1995) and the often obscure ways language relates to reality (Cameron 2006). To my mind, teaching language with its context is key to linguistic competence, which, in LTE, acquires additional importance in that it will be passed on to countless generations of pupils in school. Our course discussion on the use
of Mrs. is a case in point. Daria’s point-blank refusal to see any problem in its use derived from the fact that, for many years now, this has been taught as a default address for all women in English classes all over Germany, as a mistranslation of the German form of address Frau, which used to apply only to married women. The question then is who determines what social contexts are taught and which are not. If TLS are antiquated such as the persistent use to this day of the phrase it’s raining cats and dogs, then contemporary usage is being left behind, including language items such as civil partnership, LGBT issues, or same-sex relationships. Nelson (2009: 206) maintains that in the global village, it is as much part of linguistic as of cultural fluency to be

able to communicate about sexual diversity matters, and with sexually diverse interlocutors. Because sexual identities tend to be construed, interpreted, and valued differently in different cultural settings, language learners need to become familiar with the practices and norms of the new language and cultural milieu vis-à-vis sexual identity. (Ibid: 206)

In German there is still a bias in use towards male default terms such as student = der Student, teacher = der Lehrer, professor = der Professor. As discussed previously, German’s grammatical gender system is not the same as English gender. If a student uses the term student in English, the pronoun cannot be only he. In German, there are two distinct forms marked for grammatical gender, including a different article, i.e. der Student (masculine gender) and die Studentin (feminine gender) respectively. Nevertheless, the masculine form is widely used to refer to females and males. This causes transference errors into English such as author (antecedent) = he (pronoun), doctor = he, teacher = he etc. However, speakers do seem to be aware that the pronoun he is not used for terms stereotypically understood as referring to females, such as nurse, secretary or hairdresser, which would seem to suggest there is an awareness of gender, but not differentiated teaching or correction. This is an added area that needs attention in LTE in this context.

Robinson and Ferfolja (2008) investigated the integration of anti-homophobia and anti-heterosexist issues into the curriculum as social justice issues and found that it was often included not because of curricular or pedagogic requirements, but
because of a sympathetic teacher. They argue that it is crucial that it be systematic as it "is the responsibility of all educators" (856). This systemic inclusion in curriculum and pedagogy, I would argue, is also overdue in Bavaria and this case study contributes to elucidating ways in which LTE can be improved. Current Bavarian LTE has a key focus on intercultural communication, which espouses tolerance, and yet systematically excludes sexual diversity thus obfuscating the heteronormativity of the curriculum. The teacher population in this LTE programme were almost all from this geographic area, as such it follows that they have unconscious knowledge of social and cultural appropriacy; however it also means that they may be inhibited by this knowledge. They need to be explicitly taught how to introduce diversity issues, normally silenced in their culture, into their classroom discourse in the same way they are taught about racism, migration issues, language or religious diversity.

Attitude 3 above highlights talking to pupils, fellow students or staff from different cultural backgrounds. The term countries could be replaced with culture for the Bavarian context. Here, it appears to be primarily the religious culture that impedes equity processes promoting a solely heterosexual lifestyle for families in sex education. However, in a secular society in which the federal constitution guarantees equality, religious views which dictate this heteronormative perspective have no place in the classroom of LTE university programmes or state schools. And yet, as argued in previous chapters, the special status that Bavarian culture and identity has kept for itself, separate from the rest of the Länder (states), means that the dominance of Catholicism in education is still palpable (cf. crucifix debate p.31; sex education exclusions p.33). The LGBQTi interviewees on this programme all spoke explicitly of the restrictive and stifling culture that they had experienced in their own school years and while they felt the university, by contrast, was much more relaxed, they still did not reveal their identities in their LTE seminars. Systematically filtering out diversity on the basis of religious beliefs, to my mind, constitutes a privileging of religious restriction and intolerance rather than promoting tolerance. In a state in which not-heterosexuality can be viewed as a different culture to the dominant heterosexual culture, in which diversity is kept
secret and pressure to conform to the status quo is pervasive, it seems self evident that individuals will not come into contact with other individuals who identify in ways which may be perceived as unknown and foreign. Also, the knowledge that Catholic beliefs categorise not-heterosexuality as a sin, a clearly disparaging term, generates reticence among subjects to deal openly with diversity so as not to tread on anyone's toes. Self-regulation is so efficacious that LGBQTI students and staff reported that they do not broach these subjects and demand visibility and a voice despite constitutional equality.

The homogeneity of the responses of the students in this study seems to confirm that they are performing their subjectivity according to the institutional, social and cultural discourses which constituted them. This notwithstanding, Butler argues that "what is constituted in discourse is not fixed in or by discourse, but becomes the condition and occasion for a further action"(1993: 187), which I would suggest leaves room for resistance. This can be implemented at the language level and individual intervention, which will be discussed below.

2.3 Language Competence

The apparent unity and naturalness of the heteronormative language classroom may be symbolized by the impossible triangle in Figure 6.12 below, which when turned and viewed from a different perspective reveals the lacuna, the omission, the silenced empty space which sabotages the perception of unity and introduces the queerness of what was thought to be natural as fiction. The traditional perspective conceals the fiction – the space where something is wrong. It is only when a subject moves away from a particular position that they have taken for granted that they can realise that there are many different positions revealing different perspectives. This is especially pertinent in such a homogeneous context as in this study.

In this project, I wanted to find out if the staff teaching and students studying on the LTE programme were aware of exclusion of diversity, if they thought it should be changed and if they knew how it could be changed. None of the interviewees
connected general English lessons to heteronormative processes. I find the notion that there is such a thing as *general* English, neutral and ungendered intriguing when reported by LGBQTI teachers. Their own existence is systematically silenced and excluded by materials, discourse and language examples and they often do not see the omissions. This group became more critically aware of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormative issues following the interviews and the course. The interview process itself set a spark of awareness of the comprehensive silencing which had gone unnoticed and the course contributed to all of the participants being more aware, despite resistances.

This was a key success as not-heterosexual teachers who do not demand that they are visible in language or image in the ESL classroom, while understandable, are unintentionally complicit in their own discrimination, which does serve to perpetuate institutional and social silencing and exclusionary discourses. This process is termed *internalised homophobia* and refers to negative stereotypes, beliefs, stigma and prejudices about homosexuality and LGBQTI people that a person with same-sex attraction turns inward on themselves, whether or not they identify as LGBQTI (e.g. Martino 2000). If attitude 1 above were true and all teachers were the same, there would be equality in representation of LGBQTI subjects in textbooks, in TLS and in images. Heterosexual teachers would explain to heterosexual parents that inclusion of sexual diversity is an issue of tolerance and equity, as Tobey pointed out, and not-heterosexual teachers would speak about partners, social lives and weddings without a second thought or inner censorship. If one agrees with Yep (2003: 12) that "sexuality connects the individual to the social", then filtering out a subject's sexuality is limiting their access to social discourse effectively making them perform as *heteronormed*
subjects (cf. also Epstein & Mellor 2006). And finally, students, pre-service teachers and their LTE lecturers would not have to weigh up the consequences of speaking openly about their identity and lives, as Marion did in her seminar, but could talk about their own dreams about getting married, having children or whatever they chose to and would be simply visible (DePalma & Atkinson 2009b). It seems that the "big deal" that has to be at the same time made and not made is similar to the big deal about racism. One need only ponder what decisions, if any, heterosexual subjects have to make on a daily basis when they wish to talk about their lives. I agree, "we are all teachers" but as Atkinson points out, when we try and create a disembodied neutrality of subjects in the classroom

we have sanctioned and institutionalised the normalisation of nothingness, the assumption that those who teach are not actually people at all, and that those who learn can only resume their full identities once they leave the classroom.

(2004: 65)

Staff/student use of specific language reflected the heteronormative processes which are the status quo in their community, for example the use of the pseudo-generic he and Daria's insistence on the inclusive meaning of male default pronoun and noun use. If one agrees that language helps to form subject identity and social discourse norms, the use of exclusive language is exclusive and perpetuates exclusionary discourse. The absolute lack of TLS incorporating sexual diversity and teachers' comments about lack of time to change materials or field discussions on difficult topics critically, as well as the view that they have no place in English language classrooms serves to uphold and constantly reinforce the notion that dominant heterosexuality is normal. For this reason, I believe Bavarian, and other, LTE programmes would benefit from the course taught here as a compulsory course.

As LTE educators, it seems to me that the knowledge and teaching of cultural diversity could help the LTE students to introduce more social justice into their classrooms by critically reviewing choice of cultural materials, visibility issues and most poignantly knowledge of the body. As one teacher/educator and researcher, I wanted to find out if I could use my experience and knowledge of diversity to
construct a course that would trouble the exclusion of diversity and actively encourage students to queer their attitudes about whose body is known and how. Is the LGBQTI body given a voice or an image as part of the knowledge pre-service teachers should be given? According to the LGBQTI staff and students interviewed here, the answer is a resounding ‘no’. I believe this indicates a need for change. This brings my discussion from the institutional and social macro level to the micro level of the individual subjects and bodies in the classroom.

3. Visibility of the Individual Teacher

3.1 Staff/Student Body – Subject/Subjectivity

This section looks at the individual who(s) of this LTE programme and how pre-service teachers have been socialized and subjected to the Bavarian social, cultural and educational context. Even the non-German lecturers have lived in Bavaria for some time and have also adapted to living in this context, have learned the taboos and heteronormative rules of social appropriacy, and have assimilated that status quo. Despite living in their own communities outside of the university, in some cases in very pro-gay urban areas, within the university, they conform to the heterosexual status quo (cf. the structure of decision making processes and bodies in the University System in Bavaria) which has been established under the influence of decades of CSU government. But what about the bodies of the students and staff as subjects? In this exploration, I also wanted to find out how they felt about their invisibility, whether they saw understandings of gender as part of perpetuating heteronormative processes in LTE and in school, and whether promoting more visibility of diverse bodies would help facilitate more equity. Where is the recognition of LGBQTI existence, their bodies as subjects of discourse, and visibility in the LTE content? The LGBQTI students and staff made it quite clear that their identities were not visible in their classrooms, the materials, on the LTE programme or at school. The attitudes 1 and 4 above would seem to imply that there is no silencing as everyone is the same, that there is no "big deal" and that there is no need to "make an issue out of nothing", which I understand literally, that
there is a perception of comprehensive tolerance and acceptance. Again, if this were the case, the interviewees would have openly spoken about their personal real lives as is the status quo for heterosexual students/staff, and would not have filtered discussions about diversity out of the LTE classroom or their own interactions with their peers. They would not have separated their private lives from their public teaching personas. This study makes quite explicit that non-heterosexual bodies as a topic for classroom discourse is still a "big deal" and thus adds to the wider discussion on teacher training/education. Kissen (1996) posits that it is crucial to be who you are to be able to build relationships with students, a key factor in learning success, and this is not the case if a teacher is in hiding.

It is also still a "big deal" for not-heterosexual pupils at schools. The youth group lambda Bavaria goes into schools and attempts to demonstrate diversity and support pupils. Their own questionnaire results showed 95% of pupils thought the subject of sexual diversity was insufficiently addressed in school, and 78% of pupils identifying as not-heterosexual reported being afraid of discrimination, 68% of whom were not out at school (cf. lambda Bavaria website, no date given). There is clearly a need on the part of the bodies of not-heterosexual individuals in Bavaria's schools to have themselves, their identities, their bodies be seen. This constitutes an open challenge to teachers and teacher educators to queer the positionality that silences these subjects and makes them invisible. Intercultural learning is not only about different heritages, it is also about different subject positions. The aspect of these subject positions being part of Bavarian school culture is a fact which, it seems to me, both students and staff have to learn to deal with (cf. Nelson 2009). The students in this study reported being cautioned about upsetting parents in school when on practica if they addressed LGBQTI issues in class. Drawing from Atkinson and DePalma's use of Bakhtin's notion of "carnevalistic inversion" (2008: 32) can offer a means to queer this cautioning by adopting a different perspective, namely the vision of large groups of not-heterosexual parents protesting outside schools demanding that more gay topics be taught. Adopting this reversal of perspective may function as a tool for teachers and researchers to see transgressively by creating "homonormativities" (Ibid: 30).
Atkinson and DePalma (see also Butler 1997; Youdell 2004) call on the Althusserian sense of being hailed:

The act of hailing other not-heterosexuals as legitimate constitutes the not-heterosexual both as intelligible and as having discursive agency, thus creating the possibility for new citations to reconstitute new legitimate subjects. (Ibid: 30)

In addition, there is the element of what DePalma & Atkinson (2007) term strategic embodiment, which described individuals who created an embodied virtual self on anonymous website postings to add the “authority of lived experience to their postings” (504). I would argue that in the classroom the self that is othered and silenced through dominant heterosexist discourses can also be given strategic embodiment through the process of que(e)rying materials and TLS. This initiates “shifting the gaze from the Other to the othering process operating within society, it becomes society, not the marginalized victim, that needs help” (Ibid: 510).

What is problematic in the Bavarian context is that the predominantly Catholic voice hailing not-heterosexuals as sinners is part of the dominant discourse of Catholicism, which, as I have shown, is ubiquitous in Bavarian cultural norms (cf. chapter 2). Appelbaum (2003) discusses whether it is acceptable to silence this voice in the classroom as I inadvertently did with the participant Wendy. Applebaum contends that there are two aspects to this issue: oppression and discourse. The first is that a religious student is silencing a not-heterosexual student by voicing rejection of their identity as abject (Kristeva 1982) on the basis of beliefs, and the second is that s/he enjoys the privilege of the dominant Christian heteronormative discourse. Simultaneously, through these words s/he causes harm. Applebaum also utilises Althusser’s notion of interpellation. By the very process of naming the not-heterosexual subject as sinner, the subject is made into a sinner. She argues that the harm comes from "words that wound", which are illocutionary speech acts "in which the speech act and the deed are one” (Austin cited in Applebaum 2003: 156). This also exemplifies the power of language and the caution and reflection that is imperative when teaching language.
One of the final discussions in the course on SJE was a heated discussion on naming. Throughout this project, the focus on language as a potentially regulatory, exclusive and heteronormative system was perceived by the students relatively uncritically as an abstract, intellectual, academic challenge. It was not until the discussion of how to name one's children that the participants individually and very personally realised how their attitudes were socially and culturally entrenched in the norms of this particular part of Germany. The vehemence of their rejections of other naming practices, such as in the UK or the USA, in which gender was invisible and thus heteronormative assumptions briefly silenced, revealed to them (and me) how difficult it is to change that which is so rigidly fixed in the social and cultural psyche. Their responses also revealed to them (and me) that their subjectivity, attitudes, beliefs and very names were products of the array of discourses in which they lived. It seemed that the full force of the complexity that the issues we had discussed throughout the term, including the discursive constitution of gendered subjectivity and sexual diversity settled on them in that moment. In the subsequent exit interviews, they all spoke of this realisation and how they would need time and effort to process what had transpired in class with a critical eye/I. I concluded from these realisations and discussions that it would need a concerted effort on the part of the participants to explicitly name, include and protect the non-normative body in their respective classrooms. The course, and this thesis as a whole, contributes to inciting critical reflection in these individual subjects, but also offers them real strategies they can use in their own lessons.

The second aspect of disallowing subjects to voice rejection or name non-heterosexual identities as unacceptable contains within it the issue of practicing oppression from the position of subjectivity within a dominant group (Atkinson & DePalma 2008; DePalma & Atkinson 2009b; Barnard 1993; Britzman 1995). This thesis has argued that the effects on those rejected or demeaned are no different from the voicing of racist or sexist comments. Deriding women, LGBQTI individuals, or any subjects as inferior or abject in a binary heterosexist construct is an expression of intolerance of diversity. Similarly, commenting on the inferiority of an individual depending on their racial heritage or skin colour is an equally
unacceptable act and, as such, should be silenced in the classroom. I hold with Petrovic who contends that if teachers cannot exhibit inclusive practices, what he calls "positive systematic inclusion" (2003: 165) because of religious or any other belief system, then teacher educators should "actively counsel such students out of becoming teachers" (Ibid).

The data gathered from both quantitative and qualitative methods in this case study have revealed that there are many reasons underlying the systematic exclusion and silencing of diversity in the LTE programme of this university, not least because, socially, culturally and politically in this specific conservative context, heterosexual relations are seen, as Warner points out, as "the elemental form of human associations, as the very model of inter-gender relations, as the indivisible basis (my emphasis) of all community" (1993: xxi). This community has been in/formed historically by Catholicism and its concomitant taboos. A disruption of this indivisible basis could mean the creation of a void, an uncertainty and insecurity that would shake the very foundation on which "peaceful" coexistence rests. Britzman contends that it is difficult to conceive of a society "unhinged from the dominant conceptual order" (1995: 165). By shaking the foundations of this order, as this critical feminist poststructuralist and queer theoretical study has done, there is instability and unknowing. This describes my experience as a researcher and teacher of these issues in this context. On the one hand, the data have shown the potential to create a space for growth and innovation as with Marta, Eleanor, Daria, Tobey, Marion, Emma, Mathew and Marcello, on the other however, also a void and insecurity that may cause a backlash and return to the safety of the known, as I experienced with Wendy. Mr Stevens showed me how these choppy waters can be navigated in school through literature and Delesi how to challenge the students by being a role model. I found all of the participants brave in the face of such institutional rigidity and I can only hope that the young teachers will remember our discussions when they are standing in front of their own classes and queer their future teaching both for themselves and the future generations of pupils they will teach.
CHAPTER 7

Contribution and Implications

It seems paradoxical that humans are delighted and intrigued by diversity in flora and fauna, in nutrition and in the planet's geographical wonders. And yet humans' curiosity and desire for diversity within their own species seems to have been sacrificed in the pursuit of certainty. Creating normalcy and its concordant abnormalcy has served to quash wonder at the diversity that humanity offers. Within education and in particular teacher education, it seems to me that it is a challenge worthwhile pursuing to try and incorporate diversity as a norm, and paradoxically, as a certainty in flux, as part of humanity that we do not know but that invites our curiosity and passion. Over my years of teaching, I have met and taught a hugely diverse body of students, each unique, and I have found this uniqueness intriguing and rewarding. I have been changed by them and they by me, and I continue to change. I see this as my goal as an educator. I see this inclusion of diversity as a taken-for-granted approach to learning, teaching and curiosity.

This chapter provides a brief exposé of the contribution and originality of this case study as well as its implications for future projects. I believe it has become clear throughout my discussion that this thesis contributes to knowledge about heteronormative discourses in pre-service language teacher education in Germany, specifically in Bavaria, and adds to critical discourses in TESOL in its use of a course distinctively designed to queer the status quo of teacher knowledge in Bavarian LTE and promote critical awareness.

The subject of this exploration has also been the exploration of subjects: the students who filled out the questionnaire - all future teachers, the LTE teaching
The detail of this case study has rendered a rich and complex view of LTE in Bavaria especially through the application of the theoretical foundations of feminist poststructuralism and QT to explain the complex factors at play impacting on subjects, subjectivity, identity constitution and the overarching interplay of social and cultural power relations. The implications of this study comprise 3 areas: implications for my own practice, implications for texts, materials and the language they use, and implications for curriculum design.

1. Implications for my own practice: Positioned Researcher

My own education from primary, secondary, undergraduate and graduate has been a lesson in exclusion and invisibility. Sexuality, or rather not-heterosexuality has been blinding in its invisibility. I have learned 4 foreign languages, studied my own language and never once was reference made to not-heterosexual individuals or their lives. I have been working in TESOL for over 30 years, starting as a tutor for a small Chinese girl while at school and moving through all levels and types of teaching institutions. Most of my teaching over the past two decades has been in LTE in German universities. As a feminist, I was always very clear about making sure my students learn and use gender neutral and inclusive language, however, like Marcello and Delesi, I too did not realise that I was censoring my own language and excluding sexually diverse TLS to such an extent. Over the years
and my own development as a teacher and teacher educator, I became more aware of the exclusive nature of materials, not only with respect to gender, ability, race or class, but also with respect to sexual diversity. At the end of one semester a student came to my colleague’s office hours to inform her that as of the following semester ‘he’ would be ‘she’ with a new name. This incident sparked off a discussion of our own materials and what we ought to do in order not to exclude students like this. Most of us were flummoxed and completely unprepared to deal with the situation. A decade later, and working in a new part of Germany, I realised that not much had changed in the materials used on the whole and that these issues are still given little if any attention in our TESOL programmes. Visibility was minimal and inclusive language still treated with the negativity often accorded political correctness. The perception persists that teaching English is more training in linguistic competence, which is perceived to be separate from the culture that is being taught through specific linguistic items or text choices.

In retrospect, I realised that one of the main premises of my thesis was that my interviewees would be prepared to be critical. When I encountered significant resistance and profound reticence about addressing controversial and sensitive issues, I was initially uncertain as to how to deal with it. It was clear to me that I wanted to be a supporting body not only as an experienced LTE teacher/educator and now researcher, but also as a not-heterosexual woman. However, this was not always unproblematical. Wendy decided to leave the class, for example, and I was unable to persuade her to stay. She stayed for 4 weeks and over this period, it perhaps became clear that I was extremely critical of religious dogma and did not agree with her belief system. My failing as a teacher was not to be able to remain neutral and unthreatening, or persuade her that the queering approach was valuable as a tool for all kinds of critical reflection. She, in turn, was unable to articulate any detailed reasons for leaving but maintained she wanted to look at diversity "in general". I believe this reflected a lack of linguistic competence to differentiate, but also an unwillingness to question her own status quo.
As discussed in chapter 4, I did not reveal my own sexual orientation in the course as I wanted the students to wonder (Conrad & Crawford 1998) and by doing so open my identity to being queered. Marta, in turn, made me wonder. She never referred to any relationships in gendered terms unlike the other heterosexual participants in the course, her language use was exceptional in its neutrality of pronoun use and she made various comments which were highly ambiguous. She spoke of her love of writers Jeanette Winterson and Sarah Waters, and was an ardent feminist and Angela Carter fan. She also commented on how time had been lost in a friendship with a fellow student because the latter had only revealed her (not-heterosexual) sexual orientation late in their friendship. All of these conversations were inconclusive and so, in my eyes, she remained queer, which in retrospect was symbolic of the aims of the course.

In my thinking, teaching is like a performance, in Butler’s purist sense. If one understands teaching as embodied and relational, this means bodies are the interface of knowing and exchange (Ahmed 2004), which is as true for the classroom as for other social/cultural interactive spaces and times. And it is the knowledge lived by the LGBQTI bodies that is key to revealing the impact of silencing on the individual teacher subject:

[Knowledge cannot be separated from the bodily world of feeling and sensation; knowledge is bound up with what makes us sweat, shudder, tremble, all those feelings that are crucially felt on the bodily surface, the skin surface where we touch and are touched by the world. (Ibid: 171)]

In this study the LGBQTI students and teachers performed as heteronormed subjects, forcibly separating the knowledge of parts of their identity to conform to the dominant heterosexist discourse in the LTE programme. As a former dancer, I feel the same sense of performing a role in front of a class as when standing on a stage. The relationships between characters in a ballet have been performed repeatedly over centuries and the new dancer is both a new swan and a new interpretation of the old swan, bringing nuances of differences but through her/his/their uniqueness, adding innovation and change. I consider teacher education to fulfil a similar function. Teaching basics, subject knowledge,
administration and classroom management are like the steps, which remain the same. The key change comes through the performer. I see my role as a teacher/educator as being responsible for providing the tools to the LTE students that they will need to create their own unique performance as holistic bodies and embodied teachers. This also means giving them the language to do so. By language, I mean the means to deal with diversity in all its forms, how to field and ask questions which may be controversial in their context, to discuss how to deal with resistance from colleagues, parents or institutions, to at least prepare them to be ready for these issues. What they then do on the stage that is their classroom is their own choice.

2. Implications for texts, materials and language use

I believe this thesis has shown that it is possible to raise critical awareness of diversity issues, especially sexual diversity even in a homogeneous and conservative environment and that through reflection and que(e)rying, create inclusive materials and TLS. It offers insight into the ways that this can be done in real LTE courses. However, this study has also shown that this needs to be practiced on actual teaching materials to give the teachers the confidence that they can deal with tricky situations sensitively but without tolerating silencing and exclusion. Simply knowing about the ways power systems regulate individual subjects through silencing and exclusion and knowing the theories underlying subject and identity formation is insufficient to effect change. As a language teacher, this is similar to being able to read and understand a language or speak it. The crucial element is the practice of these knowledges in the classroom situation and this requires the incorporation of strategies for being inclusive of all kinds of diversity with texts, TLS and other materials. This study stands as a model project for further exploration in the broader class of Bavarian LTE courses or other conservative social contexts and how one might reflect critically on including the language of diversity into classroom discourse in general by questioning what students take for granted as norms in images, stereotypical behaviours, derogatory language or the meanings of words. Textbooks often incorporate practice activities
that seem to accord stability to meanings, which are in fact dependent on who, where, when and how utterances are made (Pavlenko 2004). I would argue it is time for future textbooks to address (sexual) diversity issues and assist teachers and learners by creating texts, contexts, images and practice activities which help integrate these topics with the respective language practice activities and vocabulary into standard chapters such as dealing with family, relationships, dreams for the future etc. Technology and media resources are also available in the form of EU websites, online interviews, lectures, documentaries and films, soap operas and literature all helpful in creating a more inclusive representation of how English is used in (sexual) diversity contexts.

3. Implications for curriculum design and limitations

In the Bavarian context, there is resistance to change and this too could be a topic of discussion for LTE academics to address in their curriculum and syllabus discussions, to encourage publishers and schools to be inclusive, to suggest lessons, materials and approaches to their pre-service teachers and mentor them in carrying out such work at schools. Utilising the authority of the university as a high seat of learning and research might precipitate change, especially since there is already a substantial body of supportive work in the field. Further research projects similar to this one would also be useful to gain a broader view of all LTE in Bavaria.

The suggestions made above represent the practical possibilities for change, but it is the volition, the awareness of necessity, and the time given to these issues that lay the foundations for change. There has to be a safe place to practice, reflect and learn as well as the practical opportunity and time to do it. Some ways academics on the Bavarian and other LTE programmes could acknowledge LGBTQI bodies of students to support the student body would be to encourage critical presentations on diversity issues, encourage que(e)rying the materials they have, encourage integration of LGBTQI voices in their lectures and seminars, and themselves use explicitly inclusive language and imagery. Ferfolja (2008) points out how religious
institutions are often exempt from anti-discrimination legislation resulting in the exclusion of specifically inclusive language. Including a phrase such as “the university does not tolerate discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation” would also mean resistance to the (religious) status quo in Bavaria. This would represent leadership, as can be expected of academic institutions, and would also mean effecting change at a high level, which is key in conservative contexts where power is often held at institutional levels (cf. chapter 3 part 1, chapter 6 part 1). State approved and sponsored studies in all Bavarian LTE programmes which integrate diversity in LTE, a clear commitment to diversity, especially sexual diversity in professional development courses at the ISB and the introduction of curricular change to target raising awareness of ways of dealing with these sensitive issues as compulsory courses - these many possibilities could further the work on diversity in LTE in Bavaria and education in general, which would benefit not only those who are at present systematically silenced, as this study has revealed, but also those who are complicit in the silencing by doing nothing.

This has been a small scale case study in a large urban university. It can reflect only on what is happening in this specific group at this specific time. I am aware that in order to be able to generalise for the whole programme a much larger group of participants and perhaps also more courses teaching the same content on diversity would be necessary. Making the course compulsory would address this. Time constraints also meant that the course and participants were only available for 1 semester. Running a course over 2 semesters with critical reflection on students’ teaching practica as they are completed would enhance this study, but was not doable in this university. Further, the questionnaire, while covering a large number of the early semester students, would benefit from comparison to other university programmes and the same beginner student group. This was, however, outwith the scope of this project.
4. Finale

As a critical feminist poststructuralist and queer theoretical researcher, I cannot end this study but merely offer a culmination report that may conclude this investigation into LTE in Bavaria, but by no means end the need for further study. I return to my starting point for this thesis and Nelson’s strategies for the troubling process I have engaged in:

1. Recognizing that Sexual Literacy is Part of Linguistic/Cultural Fluency
2. Facilitating Queer Inquiry about the Workings of Language/Culture
3. Unpacking Heteronormative Discourses for Learning Purposes
4. Valuing Multisexual Student and Teacher Cohorts
5. Asking Queer Questions of Language-Teaching Resources and Research

(Nelson 2009: 205-18)

Having addressed these strategies throughout, I would now modify them to four que(e)rying considerations to guide future projects and contribute to teaching critically with heightened LGBQTI awareness in this and other programmes especially in TESOL:

1. LTE (TESOL) educators should not presume all of their students are heterosexual and choose their own language use and materials inclusively.
2. LTE (TESOL) educators should view their TLS critically presuming sexual diversity in their classrooms and, by acting as role models, teach how to be inclusive.
3. Institutions should not presume heterosexuality in their discussions on curriculum and textbook choice, and remember they harm many students, colleagues and children by excluding their realities.
4. LTE (TESOL) educators conducting research should not presume heterosexuality in their interviews, questionnaires, lectures, papers, teaching modules and classes.

In her work on self and identity in which she also investigates LGBQTI pre-teachers, Evans reports on an incident at school in which a pupil asked her
partner: "Are you a lesbian?" (2002: 175) to which she responded, "Is this a safe place to answer 'yes' to that question?" Following this, my question would be "Is this Bavarian LTE programme or school a safe place to answer 'yes' to that question?" In my thinking and through the analysis of this data, the LGBQTI staff and students in this study answered 'no' to this for themselves in this LTE context in which they work and study. This is not because they fear for their lives, but because the consequences in university, school, professional or social contexts can be far reaching. For the sakes of Marcello, Delesi, Marion, Tobey, Emma, Mathew but also Eleanor, Marta and Daria, this project has offered a small step in the process of at least questioning why this is the case and by investigating gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity critically, I hope it has introduced a troubling crack in the wall of certainty that is this hegemonic heteronormative discourse. I would end this thesis with a que(e)ry: Is it not our responsibility as academics, teachers, educators, curriculum advisors and simply human beings, to ensure that the body of our work in education includes all the bodies in the classroom?
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EXPLORATORY QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions and where necessary enter as much detail as possible and use the reverse side of the paper if required.

The answers are absolutely confidential.

Please do NOT enter any names or personal information.

The questionnaire is completely anonymous.

Please put the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided. Thank you.
Exploratory Questionnaire (please tick √ the appropriate answer):

1 Male _______ Female _______ Other _______
2 Semester ____________
3 Are you from this German state? ______________________
4 Where did you grow up? ______________________
5 Religion? ______________________
6 Give 2 reasons why you would like to become a teacher:
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
7 Which of the following would you reject in class (Please tick √):
   Negative/Derogatory comments on
   Religion ____________ Age ____________ Height ____________ Skin Pigmentation ____________ Cultural Background ____________ Sexual Orientation ____________
8 Do you have friends, family, or acquaintances who have experienced discrimination in one or more of these areas? ____________ Please give details____________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
9 Have you ever experienced discrimination in the above topics? Please give details
   ______________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
10 Do you have friends, family, acquaintances who identify as non-heterosexual? (Please tick √)
   YES_________ NO____________
11 Do you think the above issues should be integrated into classroom discussions in English classes? (Please tick √)
   YES_________ NO____________
   Please give reasons for your answer________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________
12 Would you integrate these issues? (Please tick √) YES_________ NO____________
13 Are there any topics from the list above you would not address in class?
   (Please tick √) YES_________ NO____________
   Which?____________________________________________________________
14 Do you think your program should address social justice issues such as sexual diversity?
   (Please tick √) YES_________ NO____________
15 Would you like to participate in a class teaching you how to deal with these issues? (Please tick √)
   YES_________ NO____________
**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX D (2)**

1. Analysis questions 1-6: Background

1. Male __ Female __ Other __
2. Semester
3. Are you from this German state?
4. Where did you grow up?
5. Religion?
6. Give 2 reasons why you would like to become a teacher.

![Figure 5.5: Participants' background information (cf. chapter 2.3) Totals: Male n=29, Female n=92 non-identified n=1](image)

**Figure 5.5** illustrates the numbers of respondents in total, their semester in the LTE programme, their religious affiliation and their cultural heritage. The numbers are colour-coded for gender and reflect a higher number of women, which is not uncommon in education. On this programme women constitute 75% overall (In 2013, 74% of all students doing an LTE programme in Bavaria were female: [https://www.statistik.bayern.de/statistik/hochschulen](https://www.statistik.bayern.de/statistik/hochschulen); Retrieved 17.5.2013). The majority of the students were in their first 3 semesters as the questionnaire was carried out in an introductory lecture as one of few courses aimed at precisely this
group. The average number of students in the first 3 semesters of the university LTE programme was 182, which means these 122 respondents constitute 67% of the average.

The findings in this section suggest that the majority of students on this programme share a Bavarian cultural heritage 108/122 (88.5%) and Catholicism 77/122 (63.1%), which reflects the previous discussion (cf. chapter 2.3) of this particular context. Of the 14 students who did not come from Bavaria, 6 came from the neighbouring state of Baden Württemberg, which as the other largest state in the south of Germany also has a large (36.6%) Catholic population (Sekretariat der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz 2009). Catholicism is the majority religion in this region of Germany, with Bavaria having over 55% of the population Catholic, only surpassed by Saarland, which has 63% (Ibid). The other answers were: protestant=15/122 (12.3%), none=24/122 (19.7%), Islam=2/122 (1.6%), Christian=2(1.6%), Greek Orthodox=1 (0.8%) and no answer=1/122 (DNA) (0.8%).

Question 6 explored in detail students' reasons for becoming teachers. I considered this an important aspect of the students' motivation and hoped to acquire insight into their potential willingness to contribute to changing discriminatory practices in education. I coded their responses into the four categories as illustrated in Figure 5.6 below. The reasons the respondents gave are grouped as follows:

i. Academic Reasons: included reasons highlighting the professional aspects of teaching such as improving schools and teaching in general, transferring skills and knowledge, interest and passion for the subjects they would be teaching and following the progress of the pupils (male n=23 female n=68).

ii. Economic Reasons: comments on how well-paid the job of teaching is as well as the aspect of job security; teachers are civil servants with significant financial benefits (male n=2 female n=0).
iii. **Social Reasons**: such as wishing to improve society by teaching or helping children and doing a job they considered worthwhile and useful (male n=23 female n=86).

iv. **Personal Choice**: such as personal interests or talents, personality, aptitude, passion for English language and culture (male n=9 female n=25).

**Figure 5.6**: Overview Q6: Give 2 reasons why you would like to become a teacher.

Both male and female respondents offered similar reasons for wanting a teaching career. 2 male students gave reasons not given by females:

i. lots of free time
ii. well-paid, safe job
iii. job not to do with the economy
iv. I'm good at it.

Only 2 (male) respondents mentioned job security although teachers can become civil servants, which means they enjoy longer holidays, better healthcare provision and cannot be fired unless they commit a criminal offence. The most common reasons given for becoming a teacher belonged to the category social i.e. to "work with children" (35 F; 9 M); the next most common was "interested in young people" (16 F; 7 M), followed by "to help children improve their skills" (16 F; 3 M). **Figure**
5.6 above shows the two areas which motivated students most were both social and academic, which seems to indicate that these respondents have a broad awareness that the teaching profession melds both academic skills and passions with a clear social remit. One respondent stated that "children are the future and teachers form the future."

2. Analysis questions 7-10: Discrimination

The next 4 questions in the questionnaire targeted respondents' attitudes toward discriminatory comments in their classrooms as well as their experiences of discrimination. They were asked to comment on discrimination they had experienced personally or that they had experienced with friends, family or acquaintances.

Q7 Which of the following would you reject in class (Please tick √):
Negative/Derogatory comments on: Age__Height__Religion__Skin Pigmentation__Cultural Background__Sexual Orientation__

Figure 5.7 below shows that gender only marginally affected which kinds of discrimination students (n=122) felt most unacceptable, with women choosing cultural heritage (88%), men sexual orientation (90%).

![Figure 5.7](attachment:Figure_5_7.png)
One could speculate that the transgression of traditional understandings of masculinity is seen more predominantly from the male perspective and thus gay males may be more visible than gay females. In this case, the transgression may be felt more keenly as a threat to traditional masculinity and thus is viewed as in need of close supervision. The percentages overall varied less amongst male respondents than female. There were 13 non-responses.

Questions 8 and 9 focussed on respondents' experience of discrimination as individuals or within their community and is shown in Figure 5.8 below. The questions were open-ended and students were asked to provide details or examples.

Q8  Do you have friends, family, or acquaintances who have experienced discrimination in one or more of these areas? Please give details:

Q9  Have you ever experienced discrimination in the above topics? Please give details:

After having been sensitized through question 7 to possible types of discrimination, I found that 48% of male and 50% of female respondents stated that they had not
experienced any kind of discrimination; the homogeneity of these participants might explain this phenomenon. The fact that 52% of males and 50% of females did experience discrimination was interesting in that the respondents did not elaborate on their experiences. Perhaps civility, politeness discourses or conformity inhibited them from disclosure. Alternatively, they might be under pressure to perform in ways that identify them as belonging to the group 'Bavarian Identity'. The fact that as a group they are predominantly from this area, homogeneous culturally, and share a mutual identity, means they are perhaps rarely in the position of Other. It could be argued that there is little reason to experience discrimination, or at least little awareness of difference. This lack of awareness of discrimination, however, is not unique to Bavaria. It has also been widely reported internationally including: Vandrick (2001) and Meyer (2007 & 2011) on issues of silencing and exclusion of sexual diversity in schools through genderism, bullying and school policies; Lehr (2007) on exclusion and discrimination in the science teaching; Whitlock (2007) on exclusion and homophobia in conservative social norms; Nelson (2009) on silencing of sexual identities in teacher education; Page & Liston (2002) on explicit and implicit homophobia in schools; Bedford (2002) on homophobia and the silencing of lesbian identities and Kluth & Colleary (2002) on how inclusion applies to sexual diversity as well as disability. The many writings addressing the issues of the lack of awareness about discrimination and silencing of sexual diversity indicates that teacher education in general, and LTE in TESOL in particular, is often normative and conservative.

Of all respondents, 51% reported having experienced no personal discrimination and 49% having experienced no discrimination with family, friends or acquaintances. Only 34% in total reported having experienced any discrimination. Relatively few reasons were given: 15/122 cited sexual orientation, 11/122 racism or skin colour, 11/122 cultural background, 5/122 height/weight and 3/122 religious or political backgrounds. 45/122 did not offer any reasons.
Looking more closely at the figures for female responses in Q9, a number of females 38/92 (41%) did not respond (cf. 8/29 males=28%). This reticence might reflect an internalised, more passive stance contributing to them not seeing discrimination against women. The predominance of Catholic mores and conservative roles for women as mothers and wives means that this may constitute a blind spot for them.

Question 10 (Do you have friends, family, acquaintances who identify as not-heterosexual? YES/NO) explored respondents' own contact with not-heterosexual individuals as the literature often comments that those who have no exposure also have less awareness of sexual diversity (Straut & Sapon-Shevin 2002). I was interested to see if knowing not-heterosexual individuals impacted on their experiences of discrimination. These findings did not confirm this. 66% responded to having friends, family or acquaintances that identify as not-heterosexual. Just under half reported having experienced discrimination with friends, family or acquaintances.

3. Question 11-15: LTE

This next section, questions 11-14, addresses the students' attitudes towards heteronormativity in their LTE programme and in their future school classrooms and Figure 5.9 below lists some of the most common reasons given. It shows that at school: 87% of respondents (n=118) thought these issues should be integrated into class and 13% rejected this notion; 4 did not respond. The reasons given were very clear and very explicitly worded.

Q11 Do you think the above issues should be integrated into classroom discussions in English classes? (Please tick √) YES/NO. Please give reasons for your answer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES 87% (n=103)</th>
<th>NO 13% (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. create tolerance and understanding of difference</td>
<td>1. there are enough topics to deal with, unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. part of society so it needs to be discussed to learn to integrate difference</td>
<td>2. certain points of person’s life should not be discussed in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. raise awareness</td>
<td>3. class is not suitable place to discuss such problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. children need this knowledge</td>
<td>4. too personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. it is normal that people are different</td>
<td>5. not a subject for English, other topics better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. problems that concern everybody</td>
<td>6. only (sic) if there is a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. make students aware that people are the same no matter what differences</td>
<td>7. not a subject for English but for Ethics or Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. tolerance is one of the most important things to teach at school</td>
<td>8. don’t over-discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. it is important for society to deal with these topics</td>
<td>9. age dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. erase prejudice</td>
<td>10. depends on class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. teenagers should be confronted with controversial issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. discrimination affects self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. discrimination sometimes happens unconsciously so it should be discussed openly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.9:** Should these issues be integrated into the classroom discussion in English classes?

The 13% who rejected these issues for the English classroom responded in ways which have been documented from other studies including Meyer (2007, 2011) on why it is necessary to address issues of sexual diversity even if one is heterosexual, and the many ways in which school policies and materials assume heterosexuality as norm and silence otherness; Nelson (2009) on how sexual identities of teachers can be addressed in language classroom and why this is necessary for social justice and the Kissen & Phillips (2002) anthology addressing
a wide range of issues which arise when addressing LGBTQI issues in classrooms, including homophobia, transgressive teaching and promoting democratic learning and teaching. These international works suggest that the social forces of institutional, political, cultural and religious regulation that impact on attitudes towards LGBTQI issues in the field of education are similar cross-culturally. The high number of respondents suggested to me that the students filled in the questionnaire thoughtfully.

The final questions aimed at investigating respondents' attitudes towards their own potential taboos by reflecting critically on their future role:

Q12 Would you integrate these issues? (Please tick \(\checkmark\)) YES/NO

Q13 Are there any topics from the list above you would not address in class? (Please tick \(\checkmark\)) YES/NO Which?

Q14 Do you think your program should address social justice issues such as sexual diversity? YES/NO

While question 12 produced an overall response of YES, questions 13 and 14 were more differentiated: 6% of all respondents would not want to address sexual orientation, but 66% overall would not remove any of the issues alluded to in Q7. In addition, 81% overall stated that they think that social justice issues, including sexual diversity, should be dealt with on their programme.

One interesting anomaly between the answers to questions 14 and 15 merits mentioning. I correlated the answers to see if those who said they should have this on their programme would also then take a course. Of the 20 male YESes, 1 said NO to the course; of the 67 female YESes, 5 would not want to do a course. Of the 6 male NOs, 4 said YES to a course and of the 14 female NOs, 9 said YES to a course. Of the NOs then, a total of 13/20 said YES to a course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Would you integrate these issues?</td>
<td>91% (n=102)</td>
<td>7% (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Are there any topics which you would not discuss?</td>
<td>25% (n=27)</td>
<td>74% (n=78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. Should these issues be discussed in your programme?</td>
<td>81% (n=87)</td>
<td>19% (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. Would you attend a course addressing these issues?</td>
<td>89% (n=104)</td>
<td>14% (n=17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.10:** Summary of findings from questions 12-15

The final question on the questionnaire, Q15, aimed at revealing whether there might be interest amongst this student body to participate in a course on social justice issues. The findings demonstrated a high degree of interest with 89% of respondents stating their willingness to attend such a course.
## Pseudonyms & Brief Biographical Information

### Table 1 Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>Other Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcello</td>
<td>Delesi</td>
<td>Mr. Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>Other Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 10 years</td>
<td>c. 28 years</td>
<td>c. 25 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys’ secondary</td>
<td>Comprehensive 6 years</td>
<td>Secondary School Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school in England,</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games/French/German</td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years university</td>
<td>university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>Other Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Identification</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>LGBQTI Staff</th>
<th>Other Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not-Heterosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>LGBQTI STUDENTS</th>
<th>LGBQTI STUDENTS</th>
<th>LGBQTI STUDENTS</th>
<th>LGBQTI STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>Secondary School Gymnasium</td>
<td>Secondary School Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Bavarian Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobey</td>
<td>3 Semester</td>
<td>2 Semester</td>
<td>4 Semester</td>
<td>10 Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>Not-Heterosexual</td>
<td>Not-Heterosexual</td>
<td>Not-Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 Pre-Service Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>COURSE PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>COURSE PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>COURSE PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>COURSE PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daria</td>
<td>School Gymnasium</td>
<td>School Gymnasium</td>
<td>School Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Bavarian/Protestant</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Non-German/Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>10 Semester</td>
<td>9 Semester</td>
<td>5 Semester</td>
<td>10 Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>Erasmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>School Gymnasium</td>
<td>School Gymnasium</td>
<td>School Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavarian/ Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian/Protestant</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Non-German/Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Semester</td>
<td>9 Semester</td>
<td>5 Semester</td>
<td>10 Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage/ Religion</td>
<td>Bavarian/Protestant</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Non-German/Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavarian/ Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian/Protestant</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Bavarian/Catholic</td>
<td>Non-German/Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Semester</td>
<td>9 Semester</td>
<td>5 Semester</td>
<td>10 Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E (2)

Interviews Guidelines (LGBQTI) Staff

What do I want to get out of the interview?

Aims: Investigation of two areas: teachers’ evaluation of the LTE programme, their sense of its inclusion of sexual diversity in materials and of them as individuals, and how they deal with their own identity in the teaching context.

LTE programme at UNI

- Does the teacher see themselves as a trainer or educator?
- I want to know if the teacher is out in class
- Are they aware of heteronormative process, does the teacher comment on them?
- How do they feel in class? Are they at ease, do they feel they have to cover/hide their sexuality?

Teacher’s perspective on their visibility

- Do they feel that they are visible in their gay identity? Has the issue ever come up?
- Are the students aware of their sexuality? Did any ever ask questions about personal life in conversation?
- How did that feel? How did the teacher respond?
- Do they think that students would welcome discussions around discrimination against sexual diversity?
- What would they most like to change about the programme and the way it is taught?

Semi-structured Interview Guideline Questions LGBQTI Teachers

Brief introduction of the project highlighting the importance of hearing LGBQT voices in order to show that real people are affected by heteronormative lessons in LTE.

Introduce myself and the project, thank student for taking the time.

A. General Questions

1. What brought you into the teaching of English world and how long have you been doing it?
2. Do you see yourself as a trainer or educator
3. Do you enjoy teaching future teachers? What do you like most/least?
4. How long have you taught here?
5. Have you ever encountered homophobia from other staff/students? What kind?
6. Do you feel visible as a gay wo/man and lecturer at the uni? Why, why not?
7. Do you know any students who do not identify as heterosexual, have you ever talked about issues they may have?
8. Do you feel that the LTE programme is heteronormative or exclusive of sexual diversity, i.e. materials, issues discussed, etc. How exactly?
9. Why do you think that is the case e.g. culture, religion, geographical area?
10. Do you think it is important to integrate issues of sexual diversity into your teaching?
11. Have you encountered resistance? What exactly is said?
12. Have you experienced any homophobia in this city? What, when?
13. In lessons teachers often introduce topics with personal anecdotes: at the weekend we went to…..Do you do this and talk about your partner?
14. How would you describe your coping strategies? Passing(trying to be perceived at hetero), covering(hide gay identity), implicitly coming out (telling about partner’s gender)
15. Do you feel you can point out shortcomings in teaching or address heteronormative content with your colleagues? Why/why not?

B. Lessons and Perspectives

1. Do you feel that you are visible in your gay identity? Has the issue ever come up in class? Can you describe what happened?
2. How did that feel? How did you respond?
3. Were you able to be ‘out’ at school or as a student? If not, what kind of strategies did you use to function?
4. Why do you think students are not openly non-heterosexual here?
5. Do the other teachers talk about their personal lives in the staffroom/copyroom? Do they ask you questions? Do students? How do you deal with that?
6. Do you think sexual diversity should be part of your ESL classroom? Why/why not?
7. Do they think that students would welcome discussions around discrimination against sexual diversity?
8. Can you think of ways that staff could change the programme to make it less heteronormative? What exactly?
9. Are there any questions you have for me or other comments you’d like to make before we finish?

Thank you very much for your time, I’ll send you the transcript and you can say if it’s okay. Would you like a particular pseudonym?
Interview Guidelines LGBQTI Students

What do I want to get out of the interview?

**Aims:** Investigation of two areas: students’ evaluation of the LTE programme, their sense of its inclusion of sexual diversity in materials and of them as individuals, and how they deal with their teacher training slots at school in an environment which is often alienating to individuals who do not conform to heteronormative practices.

**Problems:** Having carried out a couple of interviews, I noticed that the interviewees often had monosyllabic answers and it was only when I questioned their understandings of their own practices that they began to speak about the discrimination they had noticed. I gave examples from my own practice and felt that only then was an atmosphere created which was intimate enough to render the data and answers I was looking for I think this is because the questions and answers demanded a certain criticality about their own practices and they didn’t know whether they could trust me with this information since they didn’t really know me. I thought it was important to give them a feeling of safety and in the end they told me about their own discrimination in the education system and about the sometime extremely homophobic responses they experienced as teachers.

**LTE AT UNI**
1. I want to know if the student is out in class
2. Does the student comment on heteronormative process, are they aware of them?
3. How do they feel in class? Are they at ease with fellow student or do they feel they have to hide their sexuality?
4. What would they most like to change about the programme and the way it is taught?

**LTE AT SCHOOL**
1. How was their school practice?
2. Were the teachers/mentors aware of their sexuality? Did any ever ask questions about personal life in conversation, or volunteer that information about themselves?
3. How did that feel? How did the student respond?
4. What would they like teachers to do to make them feel they can be who they are at school?
Semi-structured Interview Guideline Questions LGBQTI Students

Brief introduction of the project highlighting the importance of hearing LGBTQ voices in order to show that real people are affected by heteronormative lessons in LTE. Introduce myself and the project, thank student for taking the time.

A. General questions
1. What semester and how did you decide to become a teacher, what subjects?
2. Are you enjoying the programme? What do you like most/least?
3. Do you identify as non-heterosexual?
4. Do you feel accepted in the programme?
5. Do you know any other students who do not identify as heterosexual, do you talk about the programme?
6. Do you feel that you are visible in the LTE programme? Materials, issue discussed etc.
7. Do you think it is important to integrate issue of sexual diversity into your LTE?
8. Have you encountered resistance? What exactly is said?
9. Have you experienced any homophobia? What, when?
10. How would you describe your coping strategies? Passing(trying to be perceived at hetero), covering(hide gay identity), implicitly coming out (telling about partner’s gender)
11. Do you feel you can point out shortcomings in teaching or address heteronormative content? Why/why not?

B. Training in school
1. Have you done any practical training? How was it?
2. Were you able to be ‘out’? If not, what kind of strategies did you use to function at the school?
3. Could you describe how you felt at school.
4. Did the other teachers talk about their personal lives in the staffroom? Did they ask you questions? How did you deal with that?
5. Do you think sexual diversity should be part of your ESL classroom? Why/why not?
6. Is there anything you would change? How exactly?
7. Are there any other comments you’d like to make before we finish?

Thank you very much for you time, I’ll send you the transcript and you can say if there is anything you’d like omitted or changed.
APPENDIX E (4)

Interview Guidelines Participants

What do I want to get out of the interview?

Aims: To have the student report on their experience of the course, whether it was helpful, and if so, how. Changes in their attitudes, ideas about inclusion in their future lessons and if the course should be part of LTE and if they would recommend it to others. Do they think the course is necessary, why? What changes would they want to be implemented?

Problems: Students may be reluctant to speak honestly, even though their credits for the course are safe. The rigid hierarchy was always a problem and to some extent I managed to make them feel comfortable but in this one on one situation, there may still be reticence.

Questions

1. Were there things we did on the course and what you found helpful, that you didn't find helpful?
2. Have you've got any suggestions for improvements?
3. Do they see sexual diversity more than before?
4. Are you aware of specific exclusion?
5. What do you think about these issues now? Has your opinion changed through the course discussions or materials?
6. What changes could you integrate into your own language lessons?
7. How can language lessons be made more inclusive?
8. Do you think you will be able to be more inclusive? How exactly?
9. Do you think you would speak out if colleagues or pupils were discriminatory of sexual diversity? Why/Why not?
10. What improvements could I implement into such a course for the future?

Thank you very much for your time, and for participating in the course. I’ll send you the transcript and you can say if it’s okay or if there is anything you’d like omitted.
As an integrated skills course for language practise, this class aims at promoting discussion of a variety of issues to do with social justice in the classroom. We will look at textbooks used in school, at what is included and excluded from the curriculum, how equity issues can be dealt with in class and problems that new teachers may face. While there is some theoretical reading, the concept of the class is to critically address a variety of issues through discussion and, through self-reflection, find strategies that might be helpful in students’ own future teaching.

### Course plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>October 21</td>
<td><strong>Introduction I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>October 28</td>
<td><strong>Introduction II</strong>: Training vs. education; what is social justice in education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>November 4</td>
<td><strong>Gender &amp; Society I</strong>: What is it and who decides?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>November 11</td>
<td><strong>Gender II</strong>: Gender and the ESOL classroom; the case of the pseudo-generic <em>he</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>November 18</td>
<td><strong>Gender III</strong>: Inclusiveness in language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>November 25</td>
<td><strong>Gender IV</strong>: Teaching materials; strategies for more equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>December 2</td>
<td><strong>Sexual Diversity I</strong>: What is it and why bother?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>December 9</td>
<td><strong>Sexual Diversity II</strong>: Homophobia – what to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>December 16</td>
<td><strong>Reading Day</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>December 23</td>
<td><strong>Assessment 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>January 13</td>
<td><strong>Sexual Diversity III</strong>: In the classroom; materials analysis; reflection &amp; round up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>January 20</td>
<td><strong>Heteronormativity I</strong>: Article presentation &amp; analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>January 27</td>
<td><strong>Heteronormativity II</strong>: Analysis of teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>February 3</td>
<td><strong>Heteronormativity III</strong>: Article presentation, analysis &amp; critical review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>February 10</td>
<td><strong>Assessment 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TRANSCRIPT NOTATIONS**

**Jeffersonian Transcription Notation** includes the following symbols:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ text ]</td>
<td>Brackets</td>
<td>Indicates the start and end points of overlapping speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equal Sign</td>
<td>Indicates the break and subsequent continuation of a single utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(# of seconds)</td>
<td>Timed Pause</td>
<td>A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Micropause</td>
<td>A brief pause, usually less than 0.2 seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. or ↓</td>
<td>Period or Down Arrow</td>
<td>Indicates falling pitch or intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? or ↑</td>
<td>Question Mark or Up Arrow</td>
<td>Indicates rising pitch or intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Comma</td>
<td>Indicates a temporary rise or fall in intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hyphen</td>
<td>Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⊇</td>
<td>Degree symbol</td>
<td>Indicates whisper, reduced volume, or quiet speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL CAPS</td>
<td>Capitalized text</td>
<td>Indicates shouted or increased volume speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>underline</strong></td>
<td>Underlined text</td>
<td>Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or text stressing the speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:::</td>
<td>Colon(s)</td>
<td>Indicates prolongation of a sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hhh)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audible exhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• or (.hhh)</td>
<td>High Dot</td>
<td>Audible inhalation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( text )</td>
<td>Parentheses</td>
<td>Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcript.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transcription Notation continued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My additional notation</th>
<th>Italic text</th>
<th>Italics in Parentheses</th>
<th>Researcher’s comments or explanations of what is being referred to, which was implicit in the context.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>Three dots</td>
<td>Three dots</td>
<td>Slightly longer pause 2-3 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bold</strong></td>
<td>Bold type</td>
<td>Bold type</td>
<td>Indicates the speaker emphasised word/phrase far louder than the rest of their speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er. /em..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pause to think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhuh/Mhmm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging sounds to show I wanted the speaker to continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>Exclamation</td>
<td>Exclamation</td>
<td>Indicates exclamation, astonishments, surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Indicates either a real question or very high rising intonation meaning a rhetorical question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(...)</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>Indicates omitted passage for reasons of anonymity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(course)</td>
<td>Parentheses</td>
<td>Parentheses</td>
<td>Indicates translation of German terms used by the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question mark in parentheses</td>
<td>Indicates speech which was indecipherable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX H

KEY WORD SUMMARY REPORT
FOR
LGBQTI STAFF/STUDENTS’ TRANSCRIPTS

COLOUR CODING

KEY GROUP: Awareness

**Awareness of Gender** AG

Topics discussed which reveal the binary system of masculine/feminine, the different behaviours assigned to each and how they are socially regulated in the cultural context of Bavaria.

**Awareness of discrimination of gender** ADG

This covers issues of sexist behaviours, sexist language, disadvantages based on gender, unconscious understandings of masculine/feminine nature, and systematic discrimination on the basis of these assumed norms.

**Awareness of discrimination on the grounds of sexual diversity** ADSD

Queer bashing, language of discrimination, *schwul, poof, gay, lesbo, dyke*, and the origins of this discrimination.

**Awareness of the Exclusion of Sexual Diversity** AESD

Are respondents aware of their own attitudes towards sexual diversity, their own heteronormative schooling, how sexual diversity is excluded in LTE, and what regulative practices schools employ to ensure heteronormative structures.

**Awareness of Heteronormativity** AH

This covers all issues of regulation of sexual identity and using heterosexuality as a norm. It relates to the way we understand gender and how it is linked to identity and sexual diversity. How heterosexuality is normalised and normative.

**Awareness of Sexual Diversity** ASD

This relates to LGBQTI issues, are they visible in the interviewees’ environment, are they talked about, how, are they present in the LTE programme.

**Awareness of Discrimination** AD

What kinds of discrimination are the respondents aware of in general, their own experience of discrimination, what do they think about it.
**KEYWORD GROUP: Experiences**

**LGBTQTI student experience ES**

what experiences have LGBTQTI students had in school, at university on the LTE programme, are they visible, can they be 'out', is there a perception of tolerance and acceptance in their school and university environment.

**Responses to Sexual Diversity Inclusion RST RS RSU**

Responses of students to whether sexual diversity is included, responses of staff to this and responses of both groups to actual usage they've seen or used.

**Staff Experiences EST**

what experiences have they had as staff, what experiences have they had in LTE as students and now as teachers, is there tolerance and acceptance in the university LTE programme, do they feel their lives are visible in the university

**KEYWORD GROUP: Changes**

**Changes CST and CS**

What changes do they think need to be integrated into LTE or at school in English classrooms to be more inclusive.

**Necessity NST and NS**

should the issue of sexual diversity be integrated into English lessons and into the students' LTE seminars.
SAMPLE TRANSCRIPT: STAFF

I = Interviewer
M = Marcello (pseudonym)

Interview with Marcello

Marcello is English and an experienced English Language teacher in a university in Germany. He used to teach games at boys’ school in England. He has been in Bavaria for some time. He identifies as non-heterosexual and is in a long-term relationship. The LGBQTI students interviewed did not know that he was a gay man as it was not apparent in the university, although Marcello reported that he did not hide it.

I: So it is something that is there everyday in every class...the question is whether we are aware of it or not (0:23:15)

M: Yes, yes, I mean when you out it like that, I must be honest I've never really been aware of it. It's never been something I've thought about (...)

I: If you have..you said in some of your classes you have the odd topic where homosexuality comes up, you say the students are quite open. Does that mean that they're PC↑ or that they are truly interested or relaxed or have you noticed that this may actually be a topic that might be uncomfortable for students↑?

(explanation of PC)

M: We've talked about gay marriage for example and thinking back through discussions, em..they're very open, not politically correct, for example, I had a student, a male student, when we were talking about gay marriage, who was very much against it. But at the same time showed understanding for the need, the want to have equality. I found that interesting and he certainly wasn't ashamed or afraid to give his opinion and he also said 'I have a lot of homosexual friends' or 'I have a number of homosexual friends, but I still think that marriage should be..': that was a very interesting discussion we had, yeah.[This is also interesting in that Marcello did not feel affected himself by the fact that a student finds it perfectly acceptable to deny Marcello himself the right to get married. It seems to me this indicates the extent of conformity to the status quo of exclusion]

I: As far as the gay marriage issue, when that comes up, does everyone participate? Because I know that obviously where we are there is also an issue of religion? which is quite prominent here in this part of Germany.

M: Yes! That also played a very big role in this discussion as well.
I: And did people comment on that, that for religious reasons it shouldn't be allowed?

M: Em..difficult to remember now.eh.. I know that religion was mentioned, whether religion was actually mentioned in that context, that you shouldn't have marriage because of religion I can't remember.(brief aside about participation)

I: Em..Do you notice that (...) there are shortcomings with respect to the visibility or the open acceptance of non-heterosexual students here in the university. Is it visible to you when you walk around and can spot them? Or, I mean you can definitely spot the heterosexual students cuddling in the corner or snogging at the door?

M: Really, I don't see many, I must go around with my eyes closed No, I'm not really aware of it, and I don't. It's something I really think so much about. I don't, I certainly don't go around..(...)I don't notice students when I'm in the university..(0:27:42.8) I mean I've never seen two male students holding hands or talking in such a way that I think aha, they could be a couple.

(...edited for anonymity)

I: Has as student, have you ever had a student approach you, a non-heterosexual student and say anything or have you ever noticed someone in class who wanted to be visible as a non-heterosexual student?

M: No.

I: Why do you think that is? Because they're bound to be there, somewhere.

M: They're bound to be there. I really don't know. Perhaps it has to do with my own attitude, that to me it's not important (comment about my dog who yawned) partly because of my attitude, that could be one reason. Perhaps homosexual students see, perhaps they know, I mean word does get around obviously, and because they see that for me it's no big deal, perhaps they see me as a role model, that could be one reason.{This part of the talk Marcello was reluctant to say he was out in the university. It seemed to me that this was his identity. He was known to be gay by colleagues but not by students. This reticence about using the term 'gay' to me too as we did not know each other that well felt like his unwillingness in general to address the issue publicly. This was a sense I had with all the gay staff I spoke to. They did not openly talk about this but said if it came up they would not avoid it but rarely spoke about personal issues in class.}

I: Do you think that's important for students as well, to see that, to see that there are gay lecturers?

M: Yes, definitely, definitely, but again not thrusting it down their throats.

I: no, no, but just to know that people are there and who live in this environment..

M: ..are happy in this environment, are accepted in this environment, em..but deal with it in a normal way, that don't make a fuss, that's the way I feel.

I: Em..do you think that in our classrooms that we should actually em..talk about the use of language, because we're all language teachers, the use of language as, as a means to communicate all kinds of diversity in..em.my point is simply when you go into a classroom and you have a non-white students, nobody in that
classroom dare to say something derogatory or racist, if it's visible and yet in our classrooms sometimes students say things where they take it for granted that everyone has access to all kinds of institutions - marriage or whatever - and they don't even think that the individuals who are not heterosexual might not have access to the privilege that they do, because you're always in the privileged position as a heterosexual student, that that is actually something that we should discuss, because it is part of the English speaking world, it is part of the language that we're teaching and how to be inclusive in language. Is that something you think about or have ever looked at? Like the use of 'partner' for example?

M: Yeah, yeah. I must be honest that I'm always so focussed on the specific things that I have to get through to get to get them through the exam at the end that I don't really look to the left or the right about particular aspects of language, em..

I: Do you notice in your...when you give examples, do you teach grammar as well or...

M: Mmmm

I: in the examples that the examples are inclusive examples↑ or is it always 'John did this..'?

M: It's funny actually when you were talking before, because I said I don't really use em many books and actually with grammar, yes, And I remember now a very specific incident, I had to prepare some questions for (name edited) for the exam, the grammar exam, and I was reading through the examples in the book and I got really annoyed because they were all John and Mary. There were a number of heterosexual couple questions, 'When John came home in the evening, Mary had already cooked the meal' and em it did actually occur to me, yeah, why is that and it annoyed me as well (0:32:58.8).

I: I read an article recently, do you know the Azar book (...)and it had one example of a non-heterosexual couple (..)

M: I haven't found any in our books.

I: which means that we are systematically excluding anyone who is not heterosexual and we're perpetuating stereotypes and I do think you need an awareness of that. You need that view when you look at it and say - wait a minute, we can't be doing this - that you have to actually do something else and to teach the next generation of teachers also not to do.(...)Can we do anything about that?

M: Well, definitely! I think, as I said, it was something I hadn't really been aware of before because it's just one of those things, you do just sort of accept it because we grew up in a heterosexual world anyway and em so we are taught to a certain extent that that's the way it is and will always be so, you know, why fight against it↑ But now you mention it Yes publishers should be well..or the people who write these exercises should perhaps be made aware of this issue, this problematic if you like and include other examples. One thing that I can imagine happening which again, I think it would be a good thing, (0:35:09.4)but at the same time it's the problem of the system if you like, what are we actually preparing our students to do, are we training them to pass an exam or are we educating them at the same time? And if that example, let's say I had a list of 10 grammar sentences and half
were heterosexual, some of them wouldn't include any couple problems at all, but if there were 2 or 3 sentences that were visibly gay, of course. I'm sure it would actually provoke some sort of discussion, which I would see as very positive, a very, very positive thing, but at the same time, would I then start worrying actually I've got to get through the grammar point, because it's a grammar lesson. Do you see what I mean? (0:35:56.4)

I: I do, I do..

M: there is a slight dichotomy there of what's more important.

I: The questions though is if we did it as a matter of course, and our students then did it at school, then that discussion wouldn't necessarily have to come up, because it would be just like well why not.

M: It shouldn't. Exactly!

I: And as you say, if they're all so tolerant, as they appear to be in your discussion of gay marriage, then why would they want to have a discussion anyway, they would just accept it and move on.

M: I think because it's what I've noticed in a lot my courses there are those who are feel it important to if they have an opinion to actually express it and put it forward and it's something that I do actually try and encourage in my class as well, which is I think why we do often have very open discussions. But I agree with the entire and one thing that I have noticed that education from a very very early age, much earlier than university level my partner's brother, him and his wife, they have 2 daughters who (name) and myself have known right since they were born, the time they were born, and these 2 girls, they're now 10 and 7, it's perfectly normal that we're the 2 uncles and I remember when (name) went to visit them once, I think the younger one (name), I think she must have been, she was 4 at the time and she said 'oh, where's the other man?' To her it was natural that the 2 men came together so to speak, and to them it's perfectly acceptable and again, to them it's nothing that they need to discuss either, because they see they have 2 uncles (0:37:13.4) there, and they have an aunt who is single, who doesn't have a partner and I think that's where we should actually start is at that level, that primary level.

I: Absolutely, a lot of work is done, but there is a lot of resistance from parents who then panic and then think, h they're teaching them... if you think about Section 28 in Britain, in England, you know this promotion of homosexuality, oh we can't have that, we can't corrupt our children as though... and yet nowadays I have a friend in England (..) and she and her partner have a son and that son is going to go Kindergarten soon and yet his reality is invisible, doesn't exist in the kindergarten texts, in the kindergarten materials. You know, this is a little boy who's got 2 mummies and

M: and all the textbooks talk about mummy and daddy. (0:38:31.8)

I: (. so it's going to come up, you know, where is daddy. so I think, I agree it has to start early. But it doesn't only have to start early because we're teaching the people who are going to be teaching these kids, so I think it up to us as well.

M: Of course, yeah, yeah.
I: Anyway, if you could change something, you know, in order to...like for the grammar, here within the university context, is there anything that you could imagine that you know, that we could do as a group of lecturers, that we could change something? for our, to make to help the non-heterosexual students who don't feel visible, to be more visible in the classroom, in our classes?

M: Very much so. I mean just within this last 3/4 of an hour it's started me thinking, because to be quite honest, perhaps I should be a little bit ashamed as well, but as a homosexual teacher, it's something that has never really occurred to me before. I always..I haven't ignored it, it just hasn't been present to me and now I've started thinking and for example, em.having talked to you this last 3/4 of an hour and thinking back to this situation where I got really annoyed with these examples, I'm sure I took them over as they were, but I think in future, I will probably change them and prepare my own examples, where there perhaps is a homosexual couple

I: That'd be good, I think as a start

M: In fact I definitely will, you know, because to me it was just an example and it annoyed me but I didn't think to the next step - well shouldn't we actually be preparing them and so yes! Definitely! and I think something like what you're doing and I'm sure my other colleagues, if I, as a homosexual teacher, aren't really, not aware of this, I'm sure my heterosexual colleagues aren't either and we all need educating

I: I think actually that heterosexual teachers should be more willing to promote diversity because they're the ones who are in the...because they're in the safe position, they're the ones who can say, because a lot of resistance comes in - ah, you're gay anyway, so they don't have to take seriously what you say

M: yes, yes, mmhm, yeah

(...) 

M: I've got a question there as well, because when you do start introducing the context of homosexuality, for example, you have to then also be fair and talk about transgender and talk about bisexuality, because they also exist, and...

I: Last week was the first time I put LGBQT on the..lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, transgender/transsexual and I said does anyone know what this means, and they were like, no, never seen it before. So it's not visible, I think but it is an issue. So I don't want to take up too much more of your time, is there any..are there any questions or comments you'd like to make before we finish, questions that you'd like to ask me?
APPENDIX J

KEY WORD SUMMARY REPORT FOR PARTICIPANT EXIT INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

COLOUR CODING

KEY GROUP: Awareness

AWARENESS OF EXCLUSIVE LANGUAGE [SAL]
Are students aware of using male mechanics, heterosexual married couples, female hairdressers as target language samples (TLS)? Do they use diversity of cultural backgrounds in images and TLS? Are participants aware of pronoun use, neutrality, heteronormative image examples and descriptions?

AWARENESS OF TOPICS AND STRATEGIES [SIT]
Can students integrate sexual diversity topics or gender issues into their sample lessons? Can students employ queering strategies to disrupt heteronormative, sexist and general exclusive cultural and social assumptions in sample texts and textbook examples?

KEY GROUP: Visibility and Attitudes

VISIBILITY [SAV] CONTENTS
Do the students have a heightened awareness of the social injustice that is caused by systematically excluding sexual diversity in their English lessons? Are student aware of exactly how exclusion and discrimination works in their classes?

ATTITUDES [SATT]
Do participants think they should integrate diversity issues into their lessons, why/why not? Why should sexual diversity be discussed in class?
SAMPLE TRANSCRIPT: COURSE PARTICIPANTS

I = Interviewer
E = Eleanor (pseudonym)

Interview with Eleanor

This student was called Eleanor and was almost at the end of her LTE programme. She was about to do her finals and hoped to start the second phase of the LTE at school in early the next year. She was a relatively quiet and shy student but very willing to participate and cooperate in all of the discussions nevertheless. She had been to England on several occasions for periods of study abroad and was participating in the class purely out of interest as she needed no more credits. As a favour to me, she also completed the written tasks I had deemed necessary for those who did need credit for the course.

I: So this whole project has been to look at...my aim is to raise awareness of these issues. And...em, I’d quite like for you to just give me some feedback on what we did on the course and what you found helpful, what you didn’t find helpful, you know, if you’ve got any suggestions for improvements, by all means. So I’m going to ask you a couple of questions, I’ve got some questions...you as a teacher and the course.
E: Yes!
I: So, I’ll just start with the course, em do you think there’s a difference between discrimination on the grounds of weight, height, race, gender or sexual orientation? Is there a difference between discriminating these issues? Do you think?
E: I don’t really think there is a difference because it’s cruel and mean anyway to discriminate someone because of whatever and em I think that there might be a difference, because when someone is discriminated for his or her weight, it’s not accepted as much as discriminating someone for sexuality for example his or her sexuality, em because sometimes pupils might make fun of someone, em and it’s really hard to explain. em because it’s not you can’t really grab it (she means grasp, I think, put your finger on it. This was often the case and supports the argument that there is insufficient linguistic competence taught to deal with these issues properly. We tried to address this but only scratched the surface)
I: Yeah, so there’s some bullying or discrimination that’s still, yeah, we don’t particularly like it but it happens
E: YEAH, exactly!
I: and there’s some that we would say is absolutely unacceptable.
E: exactly!
I: Mmm. Did you benefit from the course, do you think?
E: YES, I'd say so because I didn't think about lots of these aspects before and em, they well the course made me realise that I need to be a lot more careful about with what I say as a teacher and with how I handle things, and problems in my class.

I: and em, is there anything that we did, you know all the texts and everything that we looked at, is there anything that you remember best? or it stuck out in your mind? or worst?

E: Emm, mhm no, not really, maybe em.. I believe like all the aspects about language, how we say something and don't really realise it, Yeah, I'd say that's what I liked best.

I: And have you got an example?

E: Maybe the...er... what was it..yeah, you gave us one example but I can't remember, in the hospital(I think she was a little nervous and perhaps felt slightly put on the spot, she later relaxed) where they had this em...

I: Oh, where the surgeon..yeah{this refers to a riddle we did in class which revealed how we use male as a default when specific professions or vocabulary is used}

E: the surgeon, yes

I: like the surgeon, that we just assume, like dentist, astronaut, all those prestigious jobs, lawyer, doctor, where you just don't realize it, that you autom..me too, I mean even though I do this all the time, I still catch myself when I'm reading and I think, mm, I just thought that was a man, but it could be a woman.

E: Can I just say something else, to the question before? Em, it's not about the course but in real life, for example, when I em, I babysit and em, the kids are 6 and 8 years old. And sometimes they say something without realising it, for example, can I say that in German?

I: Yeah

E: For example, they're playing a game where 'irgend was ist mhmm und das andere ist schwul' {this means: one thing is mhmm and the other thing is queer, or gay or poofy} and I realised that ( I think she meant I 'noticed' that) and explained to the little girl who is only 6 years old why she shouldn't say that and I wouldn't have said anything before. {Ja (It's totally bizarre that I didn't realise the importance of what she was saying and responded without much recognition of it although this is precisely what the aim of the course was.)}

I: And what did she say?

E: She found it interesting, she didn't know at all.

I: It's funny I just talked to someone who told me a similar story that em his friend's kids have grown up with him and his partner as uncles, the two uncles, and when they arrive, then the kids often say 'oh, where's the other uncle?' and for them at 5 or 6 that's normal, that's the world they see, but if they don't know that, they are never exposed to that, how can they possibly know. And that's very interesting I think. There's a lot of work done on primary school and that's where we need to start.
E: Yes, yes exactly. And this little girl that I'm looking after, they have neighbours and I know the little boy and he told me he has two mums and (0:05:36.0) that was perfectly normal for her.(SAV)

I: Yeah, because they have no sense of, you know like what people do, a friend of mine who's a farmer, a gay farmer, and he said, you know my..the other farmers round about, they just see me..am I a good farmer or not a good farmer, they don't care what I do in my bedroom, but you know, are my cows healthy or are they not. And I think that's sort of like a perspective that kids then have, that's a mummy and that's a mummy, ok. I've got a mummy and a daddy, you've got two mummies ok.

E: Yeah, yeah.

I: I've got a dog, cat, they have no judgement yet. We teach them that.

E: Yes.

I: Do you think you're more aware then of heteronormative processes in general?(SAV)

E: MMM↑ Yes! But I think it would take more time to really influence me completely(0:06:31.4) Sometimes I'm more aware but..(SAV)

I: Is there anything else that's struck you then? You know just normal things in day-to-day here at the university?

E: Yeah, I think just normal things, because I'm not actively teaching at the moment. I think that will make a difference for me.

I: And when will you be, you said next year already↑

E: Next year. I have my exams by the end of this year and then I start.

I: Gosh, how exciting, money, pay!

E: Yes, yeah, well..

I: Do you think you're more aware in general of discrimination issues because of the course? Other discriminatory issues?

E: Yes.(SAV)

I: Yeah? Have you noticed anything in particular?

E: No, again I didn't have the time or the opportunity to notice and think..

I: But not even on a bus, or in a cafe or..

E: YES, yes. I wouldn't necessarily do anything at the moment, but I'm more aware of it, yeah.(SAV)

I: And em, do you know any students in your classes or in the time that you've been here at the university who identify as non-heterosexual?

E: At the university? NO, no. {this was important because I had talked to LGBQT students who had said they were not very integrated and usually hung out with like students and that they did feel invisible in the university, which is why these students didn't notice them I assume.}(0:07:58.5)

I: And does that strike you as being odd?

E: Em, mmhm.

I: because they're there, I promise, I know them.

E: Mhm, ok,... well now that you're asking, yes. But I haven't really thought about it before.(SAV)

I: Why do you think that is? That you don't see them, here at the university? Open seat of learning?
E: Yeah..
I: We're all so tolerant.
E: Maybe because..it's such a big university that I have my group of friends, I know
like 20 people, really well, and the other ones are just sitting in my class and I don't
really talk to them. (0:08:42.0)
I: Mhm. How do you think they feel about being invisible? (SATT)
E: Em..mhmm↓•(pause 3 secs) {she clearly had not considered this perspective
and was flummoxed}
I: So they they can't know that you're, em you know, that you're open and very
tolerant and accepting of sexual diversity
E: no no
I: otherwise they would feel at home being open in class, so it must be something,
there must be something going on in the classes that these people are not visible.
E: Yeah, I'm just wondering how they would come out°(SAV) {she said this in such
a way as though she were saying a swear word, I think it was her insecurity about
reflecting on her own participation in this dynamics} in in the class or at university,
because I I wouldn't say that there is an atmosphere that we all talk and ..(SAV)
I: Do you talk about boyfriends girlfriends?
E: Only with my close friends
I: And when people you know talk about what they did at the weekend? Sort of
small talk?
E: Honestly I don't really do that here.
I: Yeah?
E: I wouldn't say so, no.
I: Ok I mean it's just, I think it's quite striking
E: IT IS, it is absolutely, yeah
I: Because, you know anything up to 10%, and if you've got 400 students in one
year, that's 40 students, so
E: That's lot
I: They must be somewhere, even if it's only 10 students, they're still there, but we
don't see them.
E: But do we need to see them? (SATT)
I: Well, they see you. Maybe I think, e. maybe I think em the..I think they want to
see, maybe.. they would like to have an atmosphere where they felt that being
different is as equal as not as being heterosexual, and clearly that's not the case
otherwise we would all know who they are
E: Yeah, yeah.
I: So there must be something going on. I don't know what it is because I can't sit in
on your classes, but there must be something going on. One student whom I talked
to, a gay student, they {I used the they pronoun on purpose to mask the gender o
the student to ensure their anonymity. I think giving that as an example made the
issue real in the context of this specific university which mean sit's difficult then to
say this doesn't happen here, it must be some other university as an avoidance
strategy, similar to the assumption that none of the students or teachers are gay cf.
Pinar 2007.}said that for example that even in small group tutorials or seminars,
that sometimes the small talk, "oh, such and such isn't here today because she got
married. So are any of you thinking of getting married?" and this student said well
she (they) was on the verge of saying something and thought no, I don't know how
they will react. (SAL) I don't know, you know, I don't know if I want to be that personal. Because it's very much different for a non-heterosexual person to say 'yes I'm going to get married' because they're making themselves vulnerable.

E: Yeah
I: which a non-heterosexual person isn't {slip of the tongue here} Because you're the norm, it's like a black person in a class full of white people.
E: Yeah, yeah
I: Except that we can see them
E: Yes, exactly.
I: Em, do you, would recommend the course to other students? (SAV)
E: YES! {this answer came emphatically and quickly}
I: Yeah? And why specifically?
E: Because it wasn't so much about language and about getting the credits, but more about an open mind and about talking I think it was really interesting. (SAV)
I: And em, do you think perhaps this kind of course might be useful if it were compulsory?
E: MMM, hm, no, I don't think so because then there would be people who are not: might not be really interested and I really liked the fact that we were just 3 girls (0:12:48.1) (SATT) or just 3 people.
I: Yes that was really nice.
E: And em, yeah that we were able to talk openly, at least I had the feeling that I could say what I think we really
I: If it were em if there were no compulsion to learn about these issues, then perhaps nothing would change↑ If only the people who go there who are interested anyway, so what do we do about the ones who need to be who need to have interest..for example if I give you the example about racism. Ok now we're white, I would ask you would you ever tolerate a racist remark in your class?
E: I'd say no.
I: NO. And why, you're not black, it's nothing to do with you?
E: No, but we would discriminate(against) someone openly. (SAV)
I: Now do you think that that is the case for all of us who are white here, teachers?
E: Probably not, no
I: Do you not think so?
E: No. no
I: Can you imagine teachers here that would tolerate racist remarks? {I was astonished by this as I hadn't thought about it. But in retrospect, the close-knit community is highly discriminatory of all other in their space}
E: I wouldn't say they would tolerate it but I can think of situations where they would just ignore it. (0:14:03.3) (SATT)
I: Uuhh. So. But what about remarks about non-heterosexual individuals?
E: As well. (SATT)
I: They would just ignore it?
E: Yeah. (SATT)
I: Do you think as many people would em would be averse to accepting as would be averse to accepting em remarks against non-heterosexual individuals?
E: Mhm.
I: Do you think they are equal?
E: No
I: And why not?
E: Because the heterosexual..the homosexual question em didn't come up such a long time ago so that needs more time. (SATT) [What she means is that there has been little discussion of homosexuality as and equity issue until relatively recently]
I: You think? and do you think it just needs time?
E: and action probably as well. (SATT)
I: Well how did we manage to get rid of racism then?
E: Em by raising awareness. We need to do the same about homosexuality (SATT)
I: So how can we do that with people who are not interested in..
E: Well, I wouldn't say they need to em visit a whole course about it, maybe in the context of didactics (0:15:18.6) one or two lessons and then yeah, letting them write about it (SIT) or I don't know
I: Would you feel comfortable let's say giving a class on a text by an African American writer about an African American issue ↓ so let's say women in abusive relationships in African American culture.
E: Yeah
I: You would feel quite happy doing that although you're white?
E: I think so (SATT)
I: And what about other people, do you think that's also something that we can expect that people can do now?
E: Yeah
I: And what about doing the same with non-heterosexual texts?
E: I think that's a really hard question because I'd say I do because I like to look at things from very different points of view and I like to do that in my classroom as well, but I don't know if everyone is like that. I really find it hard to answer that question. (SIT)
I: I think it's go to be the aim, for me anyway, that heterosexual teachers feel at home with dealing with these issues in the same way as they will talk about other issues. The Catcher in the Rye, or Kill a Mockingbird, or all these texts,
E: yeah, absolutely, absolutely (SATT)
I: Salinger, what is it that they always do, it is Catcher in the Rye that they always do isn't it
E: it is yeah
I: I mean these are issues which we don't relate to everyday necessarily so it is something completely different that we have to learn in order to teach it. so it shouldn't be any different than..
E: Yeah, yeah.
I: Em• Can you think of any situations in which you've noticed that you assumed a heterosexual norm..here recently?
E: hah, can you give me an example?
I: Well you walk into a cafe, you see a man and woman sitting there, you assume they're a couple↓
E: Yes.
I: So have you had situations like that, anything else that you can think of? {I think she would have had to think about this a bit more, it is a bit of an on-the-spot question, not easy to answer}
E: em...mmmm
I: two men sitting in a cafe that you don't assume that there a couple.
E: Yes, clearly and the same with the other way around.
I: Yeah. And em has any of that changed, like you said that you've noticed with the little girl? Has anything changed in general, you know, that if you see people that you think well, who knows maybe they are a couple.
E: Well it might have changed since I've moved into a different area in X, I'm living in the X quarter, now and there are no sort of .. it is famous for all the gay bars and all the gay people, well that has changed obviously, but apart from that..(SAL)
I: Yeah, I'm still amazed at myself when I walk in..I see in cafes and restaurants.how indoctrinated we are, constantly reindoctrinated that when you see people that you don't think, well, maybe they're a couple, but we always find a lot of other explanations first and then when they are we think, oh, that's nice, but it takes a while.
E: Yeah, yeah, it does really.
I: Have you changed any of your behaviour (SIT) because of the course apart from speaking up to the little girl?
E: Em, mm yes, I'm more aware myself, when I read something(0:19:01.2)and I think about different things, but not actively I'd say apart from that incident.(SIT)
I: Em.
E: AND. sorry. I've talked to some of my friends about the course(0:19:16.3) and they are all going to be teachers and they find it really interesting. So I tried to explain to them what has changed for me.(SATT)
I: So do you think it actually is worthwhile then to actually try and raise that awareness.
E: Yes, yes, clearly.
I: Well that's good, that's good feedback for me anyway. Em Could you imagine standing up for a non-heterosexual student in the university by pointing out discrimination?
E: Yes(SATT)
I: And have you ever done that before?
E: Em in England with my friends.
I: Uuhh And what happened then or ..?
E: Well we went to a church group and I was just with one of them and we went there on a weekly basis and before Christmas we had a meeting in a pub. And then there was a couple, the woman was from America and the man from England and they were sitting at our table and she mentioned her girlfriend and they .yeah.they basically stopped talking to us (0:20:32.1) and turned to someone else. I don't know if I did the right thing but I I was trying to talk to her and find someone else to talk..I didn't really stand up, but I was trying to protect her.(SAV)
I: What could one do in that kind of situation? Can you think of any other ways of dealing with.
E: Yeah, ask them directly why they didn't want to talk to her.(SAV)
I: Maybe they just don't know what to d.say, maybe it's so foreign for them..I mean. I think a lot of times people are just they're so inhibited because they are so unexposed, which I think is not unlike if you meet someone who is an African American or from another culture and E: that's true, they're so different(SAV)
I: they're so different and you think
E: and you can see it
I: and the you're so. you're like mmmmm I don't know what to say, maybe they're.
and who knows instead of just seeing another person.
E: Yeah, yeah, that's true.
I: So it might be just exposure
E: And it was in this em church group, you know, we didn't really knew what to say
because she didn't come out before, she was just talking about herself and her
family but never about her girlfriend before so...it might have been a situation.
I: Yeah, I think it's em I think it's difficult, but I think just like you would stand up,
you know, if someone were being called nigger, or something, I think we wouldn't
even stop to think
E: No
I: about whether to say something or not
E: Yeah that's true.
I: So how do we get non heterosexual identity to have that same, you know, taken
for granted that it's unacceptable, how do we get there?
E: We need to have the awareness that it's as bad as calling someone 'nigger',
because with the example of the little girl, I heard that before(SAV) (she means the
use of schwul as a derogatory term) and I didn't even think about it (0:22:41.5) that
'schwul' is something very insulting in this context. And em.yeah. now that I'm
aware of it, it kind of hit me↑ can you say that↑(SAV)
I: It's like an 'ahah', a moment
E: Yeah!
I: Ok, em. Can you think of some of the reasons why that make teachers especially
gay teachers inhibited about addressing these issues openly, in classrooms and
schools?
E: Homosexual teachers?
I: Mhmm, well queer, transgender, those who don't know. Remember that.
remember the em..I still have that so in my mind, the woman standing up saying,
you know, where someone says are you a man or a woman and she say 'I don't
know, somewhere in there,
but I don't know yet', the French film that I saw that I
 got from the internet, on ARTE.
E: Em, yes they might face problems with the parents, the students as well and
other teachers. I'd be careful probably because I wouldn't want. I'm just thinking of
this one incident where in England we had this very young male teacher, that he
was advised to not touch the girls. And not come close to them at all because he
might get problems when one of the girls is mad at him..(SATT)
I: harassment?
E: and then says that he touched her° or anything. and it might be the same, let's
say, for a lesbian sports teacher(SATT)
I: or gay..homosexual..gay male sports teacher yeah
E: Exactly!
I:Yeah, it's also been written about that it's..it's especially if you imagine a gay male
in a boys school teaching P.E., sports and how how frightening that is. Because of
the stereotype also of gay men being so promiscuous, I think that's also
something. Em...what exactly could a young teacher do if she or he hears
homophobic comments or ridiculing remarks about non-heterosexual individuals?
Especially young teachers like yourself, you know, starting out at school.
E: Asking the students what is so funny about it, just asking them again and again, cause I think prohibiting something like that doesn't really work.(SIT)
I: makes it exciting?
E: Yes!..but asking why they think about that and asking them to take another view↑ and think about how they would feel.(SIT)
I: Mm, that's true. em,what can teachers do if students resist the attempt to deal openly with non-heterosexuality?
E: Mmm, they could talk to the parents and I think it's very important that they are not doing it on their own, that there are at least 2 or 3 teachers em standing behind them(0:26:07.3)(SIT)
I: And from the schools that you've worked at, did you feel that any of them had a staff where you could say, you know, I could have these people as my allies?
E: YES, all the young ones(SAV)
I: OK. So they're much more open you think
E: Yes clearly
I: or up for change?
E: not all of them, but there were some, yeah.
I: Em, do you think that sexual diversity should be a part of your ESL classroom?
E: Yes. (SATT)
I: And how exactly and why?
E: Just the same like all the other topics like Afro-Americans (SATT){this is a case in point that German students are not taught the correct termini for African Americans or indigenous peoples etc and proves a lack of linguistic competence which they will hand on if it remains unchecked.} or I don't know..
I: disability
E: disabilities, exactly, yeah
I: weight, height
E: everything, yeah
I: class, income, I remember we talked about that, yeah. Do you think students would welcome discussions around sexual diversity?
E: MMmm, it depends I think. I mean, like, for example you told us about this film where em..
I: Boys Don’t Cry? or em..
E: No, no, no. One that hasn’t come out yet? Em about a world that with just homosexuals {this is the film “Almost Normal”, in which homosexuality is the norm and heteros are discriminated against using the same arguments as are now used against homosexuality}(0:27:30.4)
I: No, no it has come out. It's a French film I think. Or is it? Is it French, no I think it's American, where he gets hit on the head or something and wakes up and everybody is homosexual. Yeah.
E: And I think that would be SO interesting and the students would really enjoy it.(SIT)
I: And it's supposed to be funny too
E: Yeah!
I: It’s like the heterosexual questionnaire, you know, it asks all the questions that we sort of ..we don't realise that we're thinking like 'When did you come out', 'Oh, I came out as a heterosexual when I was..' and did you tell your parents and things
like that. So it asks all kinds of questions...so it makes it slightly light-hearted then. I can't remember what it's called but I'll look it up and send you it.

E: Ok, that would be really good because I think that's such a good opportunity when you have a film like that and they'd really enjoy it. (SIT)

I: Yeah. Do you think students would welcome discussions also on class and racism?

E: Yes (SIT)

I: Have you experienced that at all at school as a teacher or a student?

E: Umm, I can't really remember as a student, but as a teacher yes, yeah. We did with the A-level courses, we did all kinds of topics like that. So they had to talk about it.

I: And they were interested.

E: Um, not really. (laughs) but it was also, I don't know, they had this sheet with this one picture and the questions and then we moved onto the next topic it was all the same, you know? (SATT)

I: It's a bit boring

E: Yeah I think it really depends on your ideas and how you present it. (SATT)

I: Yeah, yeah absolutely. I agree I think you know even doing a bit from a these rap songs or something, you know, that are so sexist sometimes or racist, yeah very interesting. Yeah I think it depends on what you do with it. mm Can you think of ways that we, the staff here at the university, could change the programme to make it less heteronormative?

E: That's a good question (0:29:42.8)

I: Is there anything that we can do? If you have a friend, one of your 20 close friends who you knew was gay, em and they wanted to feel supported and seen with all the issues, I mean it's always a question, you know, do you come out at school, do you not, do you look for allies first, do you not, do you wait? If you wait, when is the right point, do you come out to the kids?

E: I think the only thing that can be done is em showing the students that you yourself are open, tolerant, by what you're saying, by what topics you include into your lessons. I think it's really hard at university because it's about literature or about language, so.. (0:30:31.4) (SIT) {again here there is the sense that these issues are somehow apart from language or literature, separate from everything else and have to be dealt with separately.}

I: They're not separate, literature and language are not separate from the context.

E: NO, of course that's true.

I: But your choice of books, for example, already which books do you choose by men, by women, by gay men, gay women, by transgendered people, by African Americans, by...So every time you choose a text you're making a choice {we were talking about choosing to include or exclude through text choice}

E: Yeah, I think you could do something by choosing something that says I'm tolerant and open and I accept you whoever you are. (0:30:15) (SIT)

I: And yet, even though we're trying the students don't feel it, obviously. I don't have an answer to that, I'm quite perplexed about it. Em..what do think should change here in the language teacher education programme, you're at the end of it pretty much now, so is there anything that you can say, well I wish we had been taught such and such, or I wish we had had classes on this or that. Is there anything that you could say in general?
E: Yeah. Em. I'd wanted more thing in didactics and pedagogy (SATT)
I: So real like, you know, don't give the handout before you've given the instructions kind of things or what?
E: Yes, but as well, things like which films can you watch, what kind of books would you recommend to read and courses like this, for instance, clearly where you open your mind(0:32:23.9)(SATT) get new input and I would really like to have more lessons where you get to know people and where you do something together, like going on trips or...I don't know and there are many, there are so many opportunities that you could do but it's not really present here.(SATT)
I: Maybe because of the size? or.
E: The size definitely.
I: Mmm. Are there any questions that you have for me? Or any comments you'd like to make before we finish? We've run out of time.
E: Emm, no not really. I'd be really interesting interested in how someone who is not heterosexual at our university feels and what they would want to change (0:33:21.7) I would want to know because....(SATT)
I: I told the student about lecturers I knew welcomed any kind of discourse on this issue at the university. She was extremely surprised although the lecturers themselves had told me they thought all of their students knew about them. Clearly this was not the case. Eleanor's comments about the friendliness she thought was missing, the collegiality of students and more personal contact that she had seen in the UK.
E: I'd say this was exactly the same as at the school I taught. But there were these older teachers and the younger ones. We had stuff like, I don't know, we went out for dinners and there were always the same people and out of them everyone knew that my friend was gay and the other ones didn't because she was so afraid that, I don't know, of what they would say (0:36:44.5)(SAV)
I: Is she a P.E. teacher?
E: No, French.
I: mm. It's frightening yeah. And I think but it's really important in school situations, you know, that the younger students get together and build a front and say 'we want change' 'we want tolerance' we need to deal with this'. Because it's not only us, it's the kids, it's the kids who are em who are...have to learn to deal with it and it's your "Erziehungsauftrag"{their professional education remit, ethical responsibility} it's part of your job to teach them to be tolerant individuals, and if you don't do it, who's going to do it?
E: Exactly! No one.
I: It has been great having you in class.
E: Thank you I’ve enjoyed it.
I: It has been. I've enjoyed teaching the class even though it's a Friday afternoon. Thank you very much for all your input, all your and sitting down and writing the thing, which I have not finished correcting although I do have it somewhere.(...) Thank you very much.
APPENDIX L

KEY WORD SUMMARY REPORT
CLASS TRANSCRIPT

COLOUR CODING

KEY WORD GROUP: Gender, Sexual Diversity, Heteronormativity from course transcripts

Key Moments Gender:

- Binaries, language exclusion/male default, derogatory terms used for men and women, denigration of men by using terms for women and non-heterosexuals
- LTE - teachers use of non-discriminatory language, pronoun use, pseudo generic he
- Power – how prediscursive meanings affect how we make sense of our selves and others in the world
- Key discussion – Storm problems perceived if gender category withheld, why students reject/accept this approach, pressure to conform, desire to be able to do this.
- Bedford article – becoming a heretic, problems
- Blind spots revealed – investigation of hidden assumptions in language and text
- Use of Mrs, Ms, Mr
- Realisation that we often use biased language not to stick out, make a fuss, too much trouble
Key Moments Sexual Diversity:

- Binary constructions of meanings of sexuality, use of normal/abnormal, heterosexual/homosexual, female/male in language use
- Realisation of the link between disruption of gender norms and disruption of sexuality norms, seeing and speaking diversity
- Realisation that choice of language and use are important but also in constant flux, constantly changing, discussion of marriage
- Realisation of own complicity in silencing diversity
- Realisation of own assumptions in understanding the world e.g. white, male privilege, compulsory heterosexuality
- Textbook images and language presume heterosexuality
- Key discussion - why do we not resist? Realisation of the complexity of social, cultural, economic power relations and how they are regulated by discourse

Key Moments Heteronormativity:

- Realisation of passing/covering strategies, necessities (Sparkes’ article 1994)
- Reality of leading a double life – LGBQTI staff and students
- Realisation of the connections and relations between understanding of gender (language) and heteronormativity.
- Analysis of materials – language choices perpetuate heteronormativity
- How to queer TLS, gentlemanly/ladylike, feminine/masculine, stud/wHore
- Discussion of what it means to be critical
- Discussion of strategies for queering materials and own attitudes
SAMPLE CLASS TRANSCRIPTION

This sample transcript is from the Class 13 in which the students reviewed the text discussion which had been started the week before.

I = Teacher

Participants: Marta, Eleanor, Daria

Marta gave a brief overview of her presentation from the week before on how critical awareness strategies in teaching can lead through discussion to knowledge from Hawkins & Norton (2009).

Marta: (0:03:14.9) And the student, by acting out the play became aware of the problems that may arise in this cultural background and then they had to discuss it, so it was from awareness to knowledge approach. (...) the guy described 3 critical moments in the classroom when disruption by a.. as far as I remember, male black teenager.. However, it was also from awareness to discussion and to knowledge and er.. the last part was em getting the list of some characteristics↑ and every student got this and had to act it out and there was basically discussion and students had to guess who is who.

I: And do you feel.. do you see any parallels to this class?

Marta: Yes↑ We actually used like mmm the last for example when we had descriptions of a person {this referred to an activity in class in which the students had virtual identities without knowing if the name of the character they were playing referred to a male or a female} and only I knew who I am and we just had to exchange information with the rest of the students and decide whether it was a male or female for example. Or when we had name of the famous person here {this activity saw students have the name of a famous person stuck to their forehead} and we had to guess without asking a question about the sex of the person and that was a.. stirr the awareness that gender and sex is not the same but it's actually very important. (0:04:19.9)

I: And critical self reflection?

Eleanor: That was my part.

I: And what do you remember from that?

Eleanor: Emm.. Not so much I have to say. ... but I read it!

I: In a few years time, I promise you, in a few years time, you'll go, oh gosh I remember reading about that, we did that in that course... aww what was that again?

(students laughed)

Eleanor: em well there were examples where..

Daria: that's what usually happens, I think, when you go looking for whatever it is you're thinking about.
Marta: Yes!•
Eleanor: Yeah.↓
I: These..em critical awareness, em language teacher education, what is language, what is education per se? What is training?
Marta Training?
I: Is there a difference? Em, critical awareness and then raising awareness and critical reflection, these are like the corner stones of education, which you will come to understand perhaps once you've been teaching a little bit. So what is critical reflection then?
Eleanor: Em well, the students em should reflect on themselves and see themselves in a broader environment in relation to others or em..I can't really express myself..
I: Have you been drinking as well? {Daria had explained that she had attended a birthday lunch before class and had had a cocktail}
Eleanor: No, no, no, just working, working really hard. {Eleanor had been preparing for her finals and had attended the course purely out of interest} Yes, they should come to understand who they are.
I: (...) Where could you actually then bring that into your em being a student in the classroom, critical reflection, or being a teacher then later when you're at school? But here at the university, can you actually use anything of what we have done in your everyday life here as students here at the university?
Eleanor: In general or from this course?
I: From this course. Is there anything here in this..because critical reflection..if you reflect on something, you just think about it↓
Eleanor: I would say so, because em this course definitely has broadened my mind¤ (0:06:49.5)
I: Mhmm.
Eleanor: I know that it can work so I can do the same with my students, I can em tell them again and again and again that there is so much more than they think there is.
I: And as students here in a classroom at university?
Eleanor: I would try and integrate others more¤ (0:07:23.9). For example, I realised that often I'm sitting in the classroom with my friends and we're talking in a group and we don't ever talk to other people.
(brief discussion of how to make individuals from other cultures feel welcome)
I:(...)Since our class has been specifically focussing on gender and heteronormative practice, then heteronormative is that which is obvious, would you agree?
(they nodded)
I: Ok, so how can we, then in that awareness of heteronormative structures, how can we invite the people who are not part of that culture to feel included?
Marta: If I were a teacher, English teacher, and there was a topic about relationships and marriages and we had a handbook that focussed only on heterosexual couples, I would just basically skip that handbook and do the lesson my way, presenting pictures or materials that show various kinds of relationships, not only between men and women and the marriage kind of relationship,
so that the kids or the students would notice that it's not the only possible way and those who actually might feel different would not feel excluded.\footnote{(0:11:58.2)}\footnote{(0:11:50.5)}

I: mhmm
Marta: I think that might help.

(...),
I: What about you as students? (...)What do you do those in the powerful position to include others, what could you do theoretically, you don't have to, nobody's forcing you, but what potential is there?

Marta: I think it usually happens that when I hang out with some of my female friends, most of them after a while switch to the topic 'and our boyfriends did this and that'. And I think it would be actually nice to make allowance for the fact that there might, there probably are some homosexual people, because it's like statistically proven that out of every 10 there is at least one..

I: Ahah
Marta: and I don't know, like moderate the discussion in a slightly different way, not to say always 'my boyfriend' but maybe my partner, and just to switch this that, I don't know, the person that might be homosexual, does not feel excluded or does not know what to say because she does not have a boyfriend or he does not have a girlfriend.\footnote{(0:13:16.9)}

Daria: Yeah, and I think especially if you're talking in general then not use then the 'boyfriend' or 'girlfriend' term but just kind of broaden that. Because when I talk about my boyfriend there I think that it's fine to say my boyfriend because I am heterosexual and I do have a boyfriend, but if I'm talking in general about relationships then concentrating on this kind of picture then leaves others out.

\{Daria did not seem to have taken on board what Marta had said. Marta's point was as a heterosexual, it was important to use neutral language so as not to force non-heterosexuals to 'out' themselves but to leave the language neutral, perhaps with implicit pronouns. Daria, however, insisted on her right to have everyone know she had a 'boyfriend'. Daria's resistance to neutral language occurred in different lessons.\}

I: Yeah, I think general comments, I think that's definitely something I would agree that you could say make general comments, if you make comments about relationships in general that it's not strictly made to be a heterosexual understanding..I think it's very difficult though.

Marta: It is very tricky and actually difficult when people have not come out yet. Because, like I, for example, got to know, maybe not recently, but not at the beginning of my friendship with one girl and then I felt that if she had told me earlier, then some conversation would go a different way\footnote{(0:14:23.1)} and then like it's a small lost chance of making other people feel a bit better.\{This was a slightly ambiguous, queer? comment by Marta. On the one hand, she had intimated to me that she was a huge fan of Sarah Walters and Jeanette Winterson,which made me think she was not heterosexual, but her language use was so carefully neutral that she never clarified her sexual orientation. In this comment, perhaps she regrets that the friend may have become closer on the basis of a shared non-heterosexual identity, or that Marta simply wanted to show her solidarity more. In either case, Marta remained uncategorised in terms of her sexuality, which in a classroom using queer theory was an excellent unfixed identity to have.\}
(... topic shift to what teachers need to be cautious or sensitive about when addressing sexual diversity in class.

I: What do you have to be cautious about? (0:33:19.2)
Marta: Everything
Eleanor: Your answers
(laughs)
Marta: More or less
I: Well, for school?
Eleanor: That every student is different
I: Uhuh. But why do you have to be cautious there?
Eleanor: Because every student needs room and time. (0:33:39.3)
I: Ok, so let's say you have a non-heterosexual student in your class, or even, more unusual but still existent, a transgender student, so a student who presents in your class as male, but was born in a female body. What would you do with that student?
Eleanor: well, include him or her.
I: Mhmm. And how?
Eleanor: By what you're saying or by treating him or her the same way that you treat all the others.
I: Mhmm. And what would you have to be cautious about?
Eleanor: About what you say.
I: In what way?
Marta: Or maybe not to make any remarks that might indicate that me as a teacher have got something against or are prejudiced. (0:34:20.7).
Daria: Yeah but I think also not to overdo it in including the person, because if you do that too much then you emphasise the point that the person is different and needs to be included. (0:34:32.5)
I: And I think that is an issue, to..if you make..it's different if you question something than if you make an issue of it. So, if you remember, we were talking about this briefly, if I had called this class, for example, 'A Study in Gender and Heteronormativity'. Would you have signed up for it in the same way?
SAMPLE EMAIL FROM COURSE PARTICIPANT

January 4, 2013 5:46:49 PM EST

Dear Sam,
how are you? I hope you had a great Christmas in sunny Charlottesville. Happy new year to you!
I had a look at the transcript. I didn't remember it being so long. Generally I do not have anything to add or veto. The course has made me more aware of certain issues and I guess I tried to be more open and talk to different people in my courses (apart from my friends). But as this last year was my final year and I spent most of my time in the library, I didn't manage to change too much.
Although it doesn't have a lot to do with the content of our course or the transcript, I still would like to add that afterwards I thought that the topics we discussed should be part of my teaching. I decided to take a 3rd subject and am currently revising for my final exam in philosophy. So in February I will start my teacher training and I'll have the exams in April/May. It is a lot of work, but I really like being busy!
Say hi to the other girls. Best of luck to you, Sam! Let us know how you are getting on!
Viele Grüße,

2012/12/10 sjh232@exeter.ac.uk

Dear Eleanor,
remember me? greetings from sunny Charlottesville in Virginia, USA!
I wanted to send you the transcription of our talk together way back at the beginning of the year. Could you have a read and see if there is anything you would like to veto, or add for that matter. Or anything new that has struck you since doing the course.
Since I saw you last I have taught in Magdeburg for a semester and am now living in the US for the next 3-6 years. We moved here in August and are just now really settling in. I was thinking of (...) the other day when we watched the German news and saw how much snow you have! I certainly don't miss that. It's pretty to look at but driving in the icy weather was always really stressful. It's drizzly today but around 16 degrees, so mild.
I'm in the writing up phase of my thesis now and before I do the final analyses of the course and the interviews, I wanted to check the transcript with you. It was funny as I was typing it up I felt as though we were back in my office.
I know you will be very busy coming up to the final phase of your exams I should think by now and I wish you the best of luck.
I hope you have avoided the flu or the cold and have a great break when it comes. Our term finished on Friday as it starts at the beginning of September. I'm looking forward to turkey and movies!
Take your time looking at the transcript and just let me know if there is anything that you'd like left out or would like to comment on further.
very best wishes,
Sam (Hume)
**Looking for Interviewees!!**

As part of a doctoral research project on Heteronormativity, I am looking for around 10 LGBQTI interviewees to talk to about their experiences in the Language Teacher Education program (Lehramt Englisch) here at the university.

All information will be held in the strictest of confidence and absolute anonymity is guaranteed by extensive university ethical procedures.

You will receive an interview transcript and may veto any comments at any time.

I am flexible timewise and am happy to arrange times that suit you best.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX P

Integrated Language Skills       Class Content       Social Justice in Education

The content of each individual class is outlined here although depending on the numbers of students and whether other issues arise in the course of the term, the content may be amended. This content is aimed at collecting data to answer the following research questions:

- How can an awareness of gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity as social justice issues be promoted in Language Teacher Education?
- How can a course promote criticality and reflective practice?
- How can a course disrupt normative, categorical and taken-for-granted assumptions?
- How can inquiry and questioning be encouraged?

Class 1 Introduction: Formalities for credits, assessment (reflective commentary and analysis of sample target language teaching sample), description of class, introduction of issues to be discussed, request for consent to participate. After the formalities, I will explain that the course aims to question the status quo and our own assumptions and to inquire into what possibilities there may be to queer exclusive teaching materials.

The first phase of the class will be to find out how the students chose this path of study. The students will be asked to carry out a reflective activity and to take coloured pencils and draw their development towards being students on the TESOL LTE programme using an image of a road or a river. They should mark significant points perhaps with bridges or trees which they believe influenced them to take their chosen path. Additionally, students should reflect on any experiences of discrimination they might have had and insert them into their drawing. I will give them the following questions as guidance:

- Do you remember anything in your childhood or your own educational experiences that may have influenced your current choice of study? What happened?
- Were there any individuals who influenced you? Who were they?
- Were there any events you found significant? What happened and why was it important?
- Were there places you may have visited that influenced you? Where was this?
- Have you ever felt left out, discriminated against, bullied? When, where, why?
[The aim of this activity is for the students to situate themselves as having motivation from their own lives to become teachers, to see themselves as multi-dimensional dimensional individuals in the classroom. It is a key element of reflective practice for them to see their roles as powerful and influential in the social community of the classroom]

Plenary discussion of any similarities/differences between the influences they wish to share. The materials they have produced will be collected as materials to be reviewed at the end of term.

Class 2

Before the class begins properly, students will be asked to fill in the exploratory questionnaire (cf. Appendix D), which I will collect immediately afterwards.

Plenary discussion and querying of the difference between education and training. How do the students see their future as teachers? What is their role? Why is this? Students will receive a handout of two tables in which they will organise a list of given statements about teaching and teaching activities into training or education statements and be asked in groups or pairs to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of being a trainer or educator.

The title of the course is Social Justice in Education and I will next initiate a discussion of what this means to them. In groups the students will write their ideas on an OHT transparency and we will have a plenary discussion of what the groups have come up with (e.g. race, age, religion, cultural background) highlight similarities, hopefully elicit the issues of gender and sexual diversity, perhaps also prompted by the questionnaire. We will briefly discuss in what ways the issues they have targeted are social justice issues and I shall attempt to queer the definition to ask about gender and sexual diversity as social justice issues.

I will then introduce the three areas (among many) which we will be focusing on over the course of the term: gender, sexual diversity and heteronormativity and have the students explain what they understand by these terms. At the end of the class, I aim to have a definition/explanation of each term to be returned to in the second last week of term.

Class 3

Gender and Society: Class begins with a warm up game of Who Am I?. The students will be given a post-it on their backs with the name of a famous individual. They have to mingle and find out who they are. The one restriction is that they may not use gendered pronouns or say whether the individual is male or female.
After the game, students then discuss briefly in groups what their impressions were and how they coped with the restrictions. Plenary feedback of findings. Elicit the way power mechanisms regulate our understanding of gender and perpetuate inequalities.

The students are then asked to read the following text and answer the questions. They may confer with a partner when finished.

**Questions for discussion:**

1. How would you feel if Storm was your sister or brother?
2. What do Storm’s parents mean by the "tyranny of pronouns"?
3. Do you agree with the parents giving their children freedom to express themselves or with the critics speaking of crude social engineering?
4. What do you think about the statement: to raise a child not as a boy or a girl is creating a freak?
5. Name at least 3 restrictions you have experienced because of your gender.
6. Is gender fixed? Could it change? Where does the determination of gender come from and why do you think it is necessary/not necessary?
The baby who is neither boy nor girl: As gender experiment provokes outrage, what about the poor child's future?

By Tom Leonard Daily Mail (Retrieved 28th May 2011) Amended

Chubby-cheeked and fair-haired, Storm Stocker has the expression of permanent puzzlement familiar to parents of four-month-old babies. But then this child has a lot to think about: such as whether he or she is a boy or a girl.

It won't be much help turning for guidance to Storm's brothers: Jazz, five, with long pigtails, a pink ear stud and sparkly pink dresses, and two-year-old Kio, with collar-length hair and a penchant for leggings.

Still, even if they do sound as if they were named after family hatchbacks, Jazz and Kio got off lightly. Their parents David Stocker and Kathy Witterick have something more extreme for their third child. In a move that has earned the Toronto couple the dubious title of the world's most politically correct family, they are raising Storm as 'genderless'.

The midwives who delivered the child had no uncertainty about Storm's sex — the baby isn't a hermaphrodite. It's just that the parents will be keeping it a secret until the child is old enough to 'choose' which gender he or she is most comfortable living with. Apart from the two siblings, a family friend and the two midwives, no one knows if Storm is biologically a girl or a boy.

The rest of the couple's friends and family — even the grandparents — were sent an email that announced: "We've decided not to share Storm's sex for now — a tribute to freedom and choice in place of limitation." The couple admitted their missive was initially met with silence. One can only imagine the emails and phone calls that passed between their loved ones as they digested this bizarre plan.

The couple say no one they told had a kind word to say about their decision. The grandparents were annoyed that they had to explain to friends that their grandchild was more of an 'it' than a 'he' or a 'she'. Some friends accused the couple of imposing their ideology on the child; others chided that they had condemned Storm to a life of bullying.

But, naturally, the parents weren't dismayed. Repulsed by a world of what they see as pushy parents, they believe very young children can — and should —
choose who they want to be, free from social norms about being male or female. "I am saying to the world: 'Please can you just let Storm discover for him/herself what s(he) wants to be?'" says Witterick. Or, as her husband puts it: 'What we noticed is that parents make so many choices for their children. It's obnoxious.'

Stocker, a progressive teacher, wrote a textbook, Math That Matters, which urges teachers to stop using everyday objects in maths questions and instead work with issues such as homophobia, poverty, child abuse and racial profiling to spark discussion and increase students' interest in social justice advocacy.

Witterick says she was put out when, after the birth, the first question from even the people you love the most was to ask if she'd had a girl or a boy. Well, yes, people do tend to ask that, but as Stocker adds, charmingly: "That the whole world must know what is between the baby's legs is unhealthy, unsafe and voyeuristic. We know — and we're keeping it clean, safe, healthy and private (not secret!)." But Storm's parents are offering no clues. The child is dressed in gender-neutral red and the couple are so determined to fight the 'tyranny of pronouns' that, after considering 'Z' (pronounced 'zee'), mum refers to Storm as 'she' — but imagining the 's' in brackets.

There are already signs of trouble ahead. At the local playground, two little girls refused to play with the 'girl boy', and a shopping trip ended in humiliating retreat when an assistant balked at the idea of selling a feather boa to a little boy.

Revealing not a jot of self-doubt, Jazz's parents insist their decision to go the whole gender-neutral hog with Storm came after Stocker found a book in his school library called X: A Fabulous Child's Story. It's about a child with 'no gender' who plays football and weaves baskets. The child ignores bullying and ends up stunning experts with how well-adjusted s/he is.

The parents insist they are giving their children freedom to express themselves. Critics tend to see a pair of crackpot liberals indulging in crude social engineering. When they went public with their decision, Stocker and Witterick may have assumed readers of the liberal Canadian newspaper the Toronto Star, would applaud, but instead hundreds emailed to express their horror. "This is a perfect example of why you should have a licence to have children," erupted one reader. And the shockwaves have moved across Canada and beyond. 'To raise a child not as a boy or a girl is creating, in some sense, a freak. It sets them up for not knowing who they are,' says Dr Eugene Beresin, a child psychiatrist at Massachusetts General Hospital.

Dr Harold Koplewicz, a leading U.S. child psychiatrist, said he was 'disturbed' that well-meaning parents could be so misguided. 'When children are born, they're not a blank slate. We do have male brains and female brains,' he says. 'There's a reason why boys do more rough and tumble play; there's a reason why girls have better language development skills.' For him, 'the worst part of the story' is that the two older boys have to keep Storm's gender a secret — an act that other experts say will make them ashamed.

As for the Toronto experiment, experts doubt the parents can keep up the charade, particularly as studies show we cannot help but treat boys and girls differently. Storm's mother says that if people want to take a peek when she changes a nappy, 'that's their journey'. The question of whether her youngest child will use the gents or the ladies is still some way off.
Class 4  **Gender in the ESOL classroom** – Class begins with a riddle:

> A father and his son were driving along the highway when the father suddenly lost control of the car and crashed into a telephone pole. The father was killed instantly and his son badly injured. The boy was rushed to the local hospital where it was found that he was suffering from serious internal injuries. A prominent surgeon was immediately summoned. When the surgeon arrived and went to the operating room to examine the boy, a loud gasp was heard. "I can't operate on this boy", the surgeon said, "he is my son".

**WHAT HAD HAPPENED?**

The riddle will be resolved with a close reading of the text and a discussion of the assumptions that underlie language use in order to see why it works. This will lead into the querying of how gendered language may be considered exclusive. Since the German constitution guarantees equality and as teachers, students are civil servants and bound to this constitution, they need to have an awareness of inclusiveness. Following on from the discussion of pronouns in class 3, the first activity addresses the common notion that there is a *generic ‘he’*. Students receive the following handout and are asked to discuss the use of the pronoun ‘*he*’:

**Sample sentences containing the pronoun *he***

**Male referents:**
While he is working, an engineer must make many calculations.  
A mechanic knows how to take good care of his car.  
A doctor must attend to his patients.  
Before he can do research, a scientist must go to school for many years.

**Neutral referents:**
When a gardener is in the field, he is usually working.  
A bicyclist can bet that he is not safe from dogs.  
A student must pay attention to his professor.  
While he is performing, a musician must concentrate intently.

**Female referents:**
A secretary must sit at his desk for many hours a day.  
Before a model is photographed, he must style his hair.  
When a receptionist answers the phone, he must be polite.  
A nurse must frequently help his patients get out of bed.
**Question:** Can the pronouns in any of the sample sentences refer to female persons?

After their group discussion, there will be a plenary discussion of their use of such terms in English and German. On the board, I will collect the many reasons why they think discrimination of this type is still so difficult to change. The aim is to query what is taken for granted and perpetuated in the classroom.

Because students will most likely be native speakers of German or at least be teaching in the German school system, the next activity addresses comparisons between German and English use of gendered language in order to highlight that the issues are not simply linguistic but also part of social regulation.

**Activity 2** – Questionnaire on the significance of gender.

**Exercises:**

1. Find five examples of non-parallel coordinate constructions (e.g. *man and wife*) from English and five examples from German. Compare your findings. How might you explain the apparent exception to the more general pattern of placing the male first in the public address salutation *Ladies and Gentlemen!*? Can you think of any other exceptions to the male-first pattern in coordinates?

2. A critical notion in debates over reforming sexist language use is the determination of what constitutes "realistic" reform. Suggestions for reform have ranged from fairly radical proposals, such as changing words like *history* to *herstory*, to more modest proposals such as changing address forms (e.g. using *Ms* for women regardless of marital status) and altering generic noun and pronoun reference (e.g. using *people* instead of *man* and *she/he* instead of *he*). What general guidelines might we follow in determining what constitutes a "realistic" reform in this area?

*(Suggested reading: University internal flyer for non-biased language; Cameron 1992: ch. 6, Talbot 1998: ch. 11.)*

The class will end with a review of the suggestions the students have come up with and return to the problems of using exclusive language with respect to gender as well as an introduction to the search for strategies for the classroom, which is scheduled for next week. Students will receive the university handout on a guide to inclusive language as well as the following exercise for homework:
Gender distinctions:

1. Can you explain the difference between sex and gender, i.e. grammatical and cultural?
2. How is grammatical gender marked in English? Is it the same in German? Does English have a semantic or a formal assignment system?
3. How do English speakers refer to biological sex? Is it the same in German?
4. Do you think that there is a generic 3rd person singular pronoun?
5. With respect to terms referring to people, e.g. to women and men, how are metaphors used to reflect power structures? Can you give a brief definition of the term metaphor?

Why do you think there are so many derogatory terms for women, in fact vastly more than for men? What kind of remedy is sensible—changing language or changing peoples attitudes?

Class 5 Strategies to address gender inequity in classroom materials. The class will begin with a critical reflection and review of the homework activity focussing on investigating the inequities present in language use and highlighting suggestions for more non-discriminatory language. Students will then be asked to brainstorm the possible problems that may arise from social regulation of gender in schools.

The following handout is a summary of ways to create bias-free language.

Handout Class 5: Non-Discriminatory and Bias-Free Language

Biased Language includes the all of the following:

- Leaving out individuals and groups
- Making unwarranted assumptions
- Using derogatory/unwanted names
- Stereotyping
- Unnecessarily mentions membership in a particular group

DEFINITION OF TERMS:

1. Inclusive/Exclusive
   i. Inclusive language includes everyone.
   ii. Exclusive language excludes some people.

2. Sexist/Nonsexist
   i. Sexist language assumes that the male is the significant gender and stereotypes men and women under the same category of male.
ii. Nonsexist language treats all people equally and refers to men and women in symmetrical ways.

3. Gender-Free/Gender-Fair/Gender-Specific
   i. Gender-free terms do not indicate sex and can be used for both male and females. For example, teacher, employee, child, student, patient.
   ii. Gender-specific words specify the sex of a person and, when used, should be applied equally between male and female terms.

4. Gender Role Words
   i. Gender role words are those that describe males and females by stereotypical behaviour and characteristics, such as feminine/masculine, manly/womanly, fatherly/motherly.

NAMING:

5. "Insider/Outsider" Rule
   i. This rule states that insiders may describe themselves as something, which outsiders may not.

6. "People First" Rule
   i. One should always name the person as a person first, following with the relevant qualifier. For example: "disabled person" should become "person with a disability."

GENERAL RULES:

7. Parallel Treatment
   i. When discussing different groups, every group should be included and referred in the same manner.
   ii. Symmetry of words is most often ignored when discussing gender.

8. Hidden Bias/Context
   i. Although bias-free terms are used, there are some instances where the message is still biased. This is often found when one makes assumptions or stereotypes a group of people.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS:

9. Letter Salutations
   i. When writing a letter to an unknown person, one should use inclusive terms to include both men and women. "Dear Sir" or "Gentlemen" is discriminatory against women; therefore "Dear Friends" or "To Whom This May Concern" is more appropriate.

HANDOUT 1B

Ellen DeGeneres and her wife. Centre picture top row.

**Different ways to get married**

a) Look at these wedding pictures. Which is your favourite one? Why?

b) Where and when do you think were the pictures taken?

**Why get married?**

Throughout the centuries people have got married for one reason or another.

a) Here is a list of possible reasons. Can you think of more reasons?

- You want to share your lives with each other.
- You believe in romantic, everlasting love.
- You've always wanted a fancy wedding.
- Your culture or religion tells you to do so.
- You want to have someone around when you're old.
- You want to help someone get work in your country.

b) Which reasons do YOU think are the 'right' reasons to get married? Work in small groups and talk quietly about your ideas. One of you takes notes. Then choose a member of your group to present your results in class.

FROM: CAMDEN MARKET 6
Homework Reading:  Handout II Class 5: Quotes on Gender

The influence of cultural images and ideologies about passive females and active males are transferred into the interpretations of the functions of bodies and this in turn influences how individuals are then taught to view those bodies and their abilities. In Toril Moi's What Is a Woman? (Moi, 1999), there is an extensive discussion on the difficulties of separating sex and gender, the biology from the socially constructed. She sets out two parallel lists collected from the work of Judith Butler, Elizabeth Grosz and Donna Haraway that help elucidate much of that which is usually silenced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biological</td>
<td>political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td>cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essence</td>
<td>construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>essentialist</td>
<td>constructionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td>superstructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being</td>
<td>doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substance</td>
<td>performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixed</td>
<td>[mobile; variable]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable</td>
<td>unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coherent</td>
<td>non-coherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prediscursive</td>
<td>discursive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prelinguistic</td>
<td>linguistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presocial</td>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahistorical</td>
<td>historical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Moi, 1999: 33)

The following 5 points illustrate some of the ongoing discussions surrounding social regulation of gender and how understandings and knowledge has developed:

1. The Second Sex (first published in 1949), Simone de Beauvoir was among the first to reveal and criticise the use of male to mean human as a typical characteristic of male-dominated cultures:

[Man represents both the positive and the neutral, as is indicated by the common use of man to designate human beings in general; whereas woman represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, [...]. It amounts to this: [...] there is an absolute human type, the masculine. Woman has ovaries, a uterus; these peculiarities imprison her in her subjectivity, circumscribe her within the limits of her own nature. It is often said that she thinks with her glands. Man superbly ignores the fact that his anatomy also includes glands, such as the testicles, and that they secrete hormones. He thinks of his body as a direct and normal connection with the world, which he believes he apprehends objectively, whereas he regards the body of woman as hindrance,

---

1 Moi herself points out the problematic form of the binaries presented in such a list but calls it a checklist which it seems may have been taken as an aid to understanding.
a prison, weighed down by everything peculiar to it. [...] Thus humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being. [...] She is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute – she is the Other. (1997: 15-16)

2. Even before de Beauvoir, Charlotte Perkins Gilman in her book *The Man-Made World or our Androcentric Culture* (published in 1911) elaborated on the universal nature of the male subject and a "sub-species" thereof (i.e. the female) by introducing the concept of androcentrism:

Real written history only goes back a few thousand years, [...]. During this period we have had almost universally what is here called an Androcentric Culture. The history, such as it was, was made and written by men. [...]. We have, so far, lived and suffered and died in a man-made world. So general, so unbroken, has been this condition, that to mention it arouses no more remark than the statement of a natural law. We have taken it for granted, since the dawn of civilization, that 'mankind' meant men-kind, and the world was theirs.

Women we have sharply delimited. Women were a sex; 'the sex', according to chivalrous toasts; [...] and the woman – a strange, diverse creature, quite disharmonious in the accepted scheme of things – was excused and explained only as a female.

She has needed volumes of such excuse and explanation; also, apparently, volumes of abuse and condemnation.

The task here undertaken is of this sort. It seeks to show that what we have all this time called 'human nature' and deprecated, was in great part only male nature, [...]; that what we have called 'masculine' and admired as such, was in large part human, and should be applied to both sexes; that what we have called 'feminine' and condemned, was also largely human and applicable to both. Our androcentric culture is so shown to have been, and still to be, a masculine culture in excess, and therefore undesirable. (1970: 17-22)

3. Knowledge about the ways in which femininity has been historically defined and constructed remains subjugated knowledge and, as such, repressed. Revealing how the mechanisms of the construction of femininity function and shedding light on the arbitrary nature of what constitutes definitions of femininity, explodes antiquated myths and destroys the misuse of biology to perpetuate social injustice. Bem (1993) outlines a possible alternative reality:

Imagine how different the whole social world would be organized if there were no men around (reproduction would be handled somehow), and hence most of the workers in the workforce – including those at the highest levels of government and industry – were either pregnant or responsible for childcare during at least a certain portion of their adult lives. In this context, working would so obviously need to coordinate with birthing and parenting that institutions facilitating that coordination would be taken for granted. [...]. The lesson of this alternative reality should be clear. Women's biological and historical role as mothers does not limit their access to economic and political resources. What limits access is an androcentric social world that provides but one institutionalised mechanism for coordinating work in the paid labor force
with the responsibilities of being a parent: having a wife at home to take care of
the children. \textsuperscript{(1993: 184-5)}\textsuperscript{2}

4. Gayle Rubin's well-known article "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political
Economy' of Sex" (first published in 1975) reveals how it is the notion of gift-
giving that is one of the basic premises of patriarchal power.\textsuperscript{3} The male sees the
females of the family group as potential gifts in marriage which will enhance his
status. Historically, in kinship systems\textsuperscript{4}, this is an important and fundamental
aspect of exchange practices which elucidates the unequal distribution of power:

Kinship systems do not merely exchange women. They exchange sexual
access, genealogical statuses, lineage names and ancestors, rights and
people – men, women and children – in concrete systems of social
relationships. These relationships always include certain rights for men, others
for women. 'Exchange of women' is a shorthand for expressing that the social
relations of a kinship system specify that men have certain rights in their
female kin, and that women do not have the same rights either to themselves
or to their male kin. In this sense, the exchange of women is a profound
perception of a system in which women do not have full rights to themselves.
\textsuperscript{(1997: 38-9)}

5. Germaine Greer's extensive study of the treatment of the female body as a site
to be operated on, moulded, altered and generally viewed as in need of
intervention summarizes its significance in modern society:

A woman's body is the battlefield where she fights for liberation. It is through
her body that oppression works, reifying her, sexualizing her, victimizing her,
disabling her. Her physicality is a medium for others to work on; her job is to
act as their viceroy, presenting her body for their ministrations, and applying to
her body the treatments that have been ordained. If she fails to present herself,
if she refuses to accept the treatments, she is behaving badly.
\textsuperscript{(Greer 1999: 106)}

Food for thought

To overlook the forms of subjection that engender the feminine body is to
perpetuate the silence and powerlessness of those upon whom these
disciplines have been imposed. \textsuperscript{(Bartky 1990: 65)}

Can you connect each of the points above to experiences you or people you
know have had?

\textsuperscript{2} In the genre of science fiction, there are various Utopian societies created by feminist
writers as for example Joanna Russ's (1975) \textit{The Female Man} or Charlotte Perkins Gilman's (1911)
\textit{Herland} which more or less closely resemble Bem's imagined society.

\textsuperscript{3} The notion of the exchange of women must be credited to Lévi-Strauss in his 1969 text \textit{The
Elementary Structures of Kinship}.

\textsuperscript{4} For a new discussion of kinship see Butler 2004, chapter 5.
Class 6  This class will use sample lessons from a variety of textbooks used to teach English in German secondary schools. Students will rework one excerpt and describe how they could change/expand the material to make it more just with respect to gender, using the bias free guidelines and incorporating reflection of our discussions from the previous weeks. They will then present their suggestions to the class. They will be asked to consider school type, age of their pupils and what types of problems they might encounter from colleagues or pupils themselves if they implemented such changes.
Textbook lessons from: *Greenline*, *Camden Market*, *Go Ahead*, *Advanced Grammar in Use*, *CAE Grammar*.

Following the presentations, the class will end with a look at the next stage in the course which will address issues of sexual diversity as a social justice issue. Students will be asked to read Chapter 5 (Nelson, C. [2009] *Sexual Identities in English Language Education*, pp100-119), which will open next week’s class.

Class 7  Sexual Diversity. To begin the class, students will be asked to fill in the *Heterosexual Questionnaire* (below) and report on their impressions in light of Nelson’s discussion of the problem of regulatory heterosexuality in the classroom. Students will be asked in groups to go through the text and list the difficulties that may arise when addressing sexual diversity in their classroom. The aim is to question the regulatory function heterosexuality has on all individuals and how to foster an inclusive classroom (cf. non-discriminatory language from classes 4-6).

The class discussion will explore the underlying social regulation which is implicit in the questions from the questionnaire, what power mechanisms are at play as well as questioning the language used. They will try to reveal the underlying meanings and how they reflect assumptions about norms in society. Students will be asked to interrogate where these norms have come from, questioning their own status quo assumptions about interpersonal relations and how they are regulated implicitly by the social and cultural status quo, through behaviours and language.

Students will be asked to read two chapters form Kissen, R. M. (2002). *Getting Ready for Benjamin*. One half of the class will read chapter 10 ‘Queer Developments in Teacher Education: Isn’t it Queer?’ by Tim Bedford and one half chapter 11 ‘Getting to the Heart of Teaching for Diversity’ by Genét Simone and be prepared to present the most important points to the class for discussion next week.
HETEROSEXUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

(©1972, Martin Rochlin, Ph.D. Reprinted with permission from the author.)

This questionnaire is for self-avowed heterosexuals only. If you are not openly heterosexual, pass it on to a friend who is. Please try to answer the questions as candidly as possible. Your responses will be held in strict confidence and your anonymity fully protected.

1. What do you think caused your heterosexuality?

2. When and how did you first decide you were a heterosexual?

3. Is it possible your heterosexuality is just a phase you may grow out of?

4. Could it be that your heterosexuality stems from a neurotic fear of others of the same sex?

5. If you’ve never slept with a person of the same sex, how can you be sure you wouldn’t prefer that?

6. To whom have you disclosed your heterosexual tendencies? How did they react?

7. Why do heterosexuals feel compelled to seduce others into their lifestyle?

8. Why do you insist on flaunting your heterosexuality? Can’t you just be what you are and keep it quiet?

9. Would you want your children to be heterosexual, knowing the problems they’d face?

10. A disproportionate majority of child molesters are heterosexual men. Do you consider it safe to expose children to heterosexual male teachers, pediatricians, priests, or scoutmasters?

11. With all the societal support for marriage, the divorce rate is spiraling. Why are there so few stable relationships among heterosexuals?

12. Why do heterosexuals place so much emphasis on sex?

13. Considering the menace of overpopulation, how could the human race survive if everyone were heterosexual?

14. Could you trust a heterosexual therapist to be objective? Don’t you fear s/he might be inclined to influence you in the direction of her/his own leanings?

15. Heterosexuals are notorious for assigning themselves and one another rigid, stereotyped sex roles. Why must you cling to such unhealthy role-playing?

16. With the sexually segregated living conditions of military life, isn’t heterosexuality incompatible with
Class 8 **Sexual Diversity** The aim of this class is to change focus away from discussions about ‘normal’ and ‘natural’ sexuality to why homophobia exits and whether or not it has a place in LTE.

Students present a summary of the content of the respective chapter they have prepared and I will offer a series of questions linking these reports to the real situation students may be facing in their LTE programme.

The students will be asked to query their own classes and consider whether they are inclusive of sexual diversity, whether in language examples, texts or discussion.

Class 9 **Sexual Diversity in the classroom** Students will be asked to analyse a lesson from a school textbook and point out the ways in which it is discriminatory of sexual diversity. In groups/pairs, they should brainstorm possible strategies for combating such discrimination including addressing discrimination, choice of Target Language Samples and topics and present their findings to the class.

Class 10 **Reflection and Inquiry** Students will write a reflective commentary on the material we have covered so far (This constitutes part 1 of the assessment criteria for the course). These commentaries serve to review the main points of our discussion and to raise any further questions arising from such a reflection that have not yet been addressed or that are still difficult to answer. The aim is not to have all the answers but by asking questions to become aware of the issues and the need for them to be taken into account in their future lives as teachers of English.

**ASSESSMENT PART 1**

Class 11 **Heteronormativity** This class aims to clarify the term ‘heteronormativity’. Students will be given a virtual identity and a list of ‘get to know you’ questions. They will be asked to mingle as though at a party and find out as much as they can about the others:

- What is you name, where do you live?
- What do you like to do in your spare time?
- What was your most memorable holiday?
- Where do you see yourself in 10 years time?
- If you could choose any job and anywhere to live, where would it be?
## Virtual Identities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Sex</th>
<th>Jan (M)</th>
<th>Jo (M)</th>
<th>Deepak (M)</th>
<th>Sandy (M)</th>
<th>Charlie (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hobbies</strong></td>
<td>Cooking, painting watercolours, Kiteboarding</td>
<td>Riding Dressage Sewing special horse blankets</td>
<td>Reading Detective fiction. Travelling and Cooking spicy food</td>
<td>Reading trashy novels and playing Tomb Raider. Going to the cinema Art house films.</td>
<td>Cooking, Playing Board Games, Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holidays</strong></td>
<td>France, Italy, Cooking Course in Paris.</td>
<td>Show Jumping Course in England</td>
<td>Hiking in Rockies, Volcanoes, been on Stromboli, Etna, Iceland</td>
<td>Digging a water well in Ethiopian village, so Girls could go to school.</td>
<td>Norway, Finland, Cross-country skiing every Xmas and new year. Northern lights at the polar circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future plans</strong></td>
<td>Would love to have a big family and all live in the same house.</td>
<td>Hope to have offspring at some point but not for a while</td>
<td>Travel the world and hike, maybe with a partner. Work where I can</td>
<td>Find someone who shares my passion for helping people help themselves. Live somewhere hot.</td>
<td>Have a partner, maybe child, live in the countryside with animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job preferences</strong></td>
<td>Ideally would like to go and live and cook in Italy or France with partner, perhaps a restaurant.</td>
<td>Ideally would like to breed Horses or work with partner in Riding school</td>
<td>Manage a Travel Company for Adventure Holidays</td>
<td>Development Agency Improve the world with schooling or building</td>
<td>Teach English Language and literature at university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Favourite Places</strong></td>
<td>France, Italy, Greece</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>India, China</td>
<td>Kenya, Nigeria, Ethiopia</td>
<td>United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each virtual identity has a name which is not recognisably gendered, but included details of relationships, family and aims for the future. The students do not know if they are male or female, transgender etc. nor the gender of their opposites.

After the activity, students will discuss whom they spoke to and what they know about them. Here the aim is to explore how students felt about not knowing their gender, what impact this had on relations or conversations with others whose gender they also did not know. The participants explore what they think the motivation for this exercise is in the discussion, how gender is linked on a very elementary level of dialogue and how it forms our conceptions of the lives of the people we
Questions about how our conceptions of gender and sexuality inform the way we interact will be examined and what this means for these future educators of young people. Additionally, we will look into the teaching of English language and culture in the light of these discussions. What culture is being taught? Is it representative of real English speaking cultures? Is the language taught inclusive? What Target Language Samples should be used?

Students will then be asked in groups/pairs to think of practices in school/university which they consider heteronormative, why this is the case and to try and suggest alternatives which might be more inclusive. A plenary discussion and investigation of the issues that come up will end the class.


**Class 12 Heteronormativity in classroom materials.** This class aims at picking up from discussions in classes 9 & 11 and using them to review teaching materials and analyse them with respect to heteronormativity. The class will begin with a discussion of the Life History of Jessica, the lesbian PE teacher from the homework reading.

Students will then be asked to look at a lesson from a textbook that they perhaps used at their own school and review a unit critically, keeping in mind Jessica’s experiences. They will explicitly address imagery, language choice, and topic choice to explore what underlying assumptions about society and culture are being made, how they might be queried to be made more inclusive and what problems they would expect to encounter in a classroom full of teenagers within the homogeneity of Bavarian culture. They will present their findings to the class. Plenary discussion on possible strategies to expand these and other materials to be more inclusive.

**Handout Class 12: Preparation of a non-heteronormative class:**

1. Look at the 3 handouts and decide on one to prepare a class on. You need to analyse the language from the perspective of equality in terms of sexual diversity. Is there content which is exclusive, how and what can you do to make it inclusive?

2. Decide on an activity that would integrate speaking skills to make students discuss the vocabulary or text in a critical way.

3. What age group do you think the material is suitable for?
4. How could you change the material to use it for younger/older age groups?

5. Is there exclusive or stereotypical language with respect to gender/femininities/masculinities?

6. Can you imagine teaching this class? What problems do you foresee?

7. What could you do to address these problems?


**Class 13 Heteronormativity** This class reviews once again the key points from the readings by Bedford, Simone and Sparkes and discusses the homework reading by Hawkins, M & Norton, B. (2009). Students will each present a section of this reading clarifying how it connects to the class discussions over the course of the semester. The aim is to explore the connections between language, understandings of gender and sexual diversity and reflect on social and cultural process of regulation which are often mirrored in textbooks, materials and classroom discourse but which are exclusive and heteronormative.

**Class 14 Review/Reflection** This final class is an opportunity to discuss the issues we have covered one more time, especially on queering, criticality and critical reflection, and for students to voice their opinions on the class, issues and problems. Students will be asked to consider how they might integrate some of the findings from class discussions themselves at the same time reviewing the problems they may face on an institutional level, social level and if appropriate religious level. If the class is a small class, I may use this time to conduct exit interviews with the students individually.

**Class 15 Assessment Paper.** The final assessment has 2 parts: students will be asked to reflect critically on a series of questions on the topics dealt with in class; students will be given a sample lesson and asked to expand, amend or rework the lesson to make it more social just incorporating the issues discussed throughout the term.

Please answer the following questions in detail (1.5 spacing minimum of c. 700 words)

1. Define how you understand the issue of bullying? What suggestions would you make for strategies to address bullying in your classroom? Does bullying on the grounds of sexual/gender identification differ from other bullying; why/why not?
2. What is homophobia and how best might you deal with homophobia in your English classroom?
4. How do power structures in school or your university Language Teacher Education programme maintain heteronormativity?
5. How do you understand the concept of social justice in education?

Week 15 Social Justice in Education Assessment Part 2

1. In *The Second Sex* (first published in 1949), Simone de Beauvoir was among the first to reveal and criticise the use of male to mean human as a typical characteristic of male-dominated cultures:

   [M]an represents both the positive and the neutral, as is indicated by the common use of *man* to designate human beings in general; whereas woman represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, […] It amounts to this: […] there is an absolute human type, the masculine. Woman has ovaries, a uterus; these peculiarities imprison her in her subjectivity, circumscribe her within the limits of her own nature. It is often said that she thinks with her glands. Man superbly ignores the fact that his anatomy also includes glands, such as the testicles, and that they secrete hormones. He thinks of his body as a direct and normal connection with the world, which he believes he apprehends objectively, whereas he regards the body of woman as hindrance, a prison, weighed down by everything peculiar to it. […] Thus humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being. […] She is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute – she is the Other.

   (1997: 15-16)
In teaching texts/exercises you have used, how is this ideology of male=human default constantly reinforced? Why do you think the understanding of female as Other remains to this day?

2. Foucault says of power:

It seems to me that power must be understood in the first instance as the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization

(Ibid: 92)

How is heterosexuality maintained and constantly reaffirmed as the norm at school and university? Name at least 3 force relations which serve to uphold this norm.

3. Michel Foucault says:

[P]ower is tolerable only on condition that it mask a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms.

(Foucault 1990: 86)

In the field of education in general and Language Teacher Education in particular, power mechanisms are used to systematically regulate knowledge of difference in lifestyles. How is the mechanism of heteronormativity masked at school and in LTE at university?

4. Analyse the following unit from Camden Market 6 and answer the following questions:

i. In M6, what instructions might you offer to open the class up to non-heteronormative discussions?

ii. What strategies might a teacher employ when preparing materials from a textbook in order to be less exclusive of potential difference in their classroom? Give at least 3.

iii. In what way can you integrate the song in a discussion on discrimination in general?
Sample Assessments: Daria Assessments 1 & 2

Social Justice in Education

Assessment Part 1

Due 19.1.2012

Please answer the following questions in detail (1.5 spacing minimum of c. 700 words)

1. Define how you understand the issue of bullying? What suggestions would you make for strategies to address bullying in your classroom? Does bullying on the grounds of sexual/gender identification differ from other bullying: why/why not?

Bullying happens when one person basically makes "fun" of a certain facet of another person in a way that is no fun for the latter but actually hurtful (physically or emotionally). The grounds on which the person is bullied can concern any part of that person be it physical appearances like weight or clothing, be it behavior, problems like stuttering or simply with a subject, or be it likes and dislikes regarding anything from hobbies to sexual preferences. It can even actually concern other people close to that person like their parents or siblings.

It does not really matter on what grounds somebody is bullied. According to the type of person, strategies to cope will be found. That is mostly trying to avoid situations, where bullying is possible. One can for example try to not be alone (with the bullies) or to adapt to the bullies' way in order to not be bullied any more or in many other ways.

All cases of bullying are different as they all regard different people and not two people in the exact same situation will feel the same about it. Therefore it is hard to generalize about bullying and I do believe that the results of the bullying have little to do with the grounds on it is performed. A girl, who is constantly bullied because of being overweight, might in the end have very little self esteem and/or she might become anorexic and not eat any more. But just as well she might eat the more and gain even more weight or become obsessed with sports. There are many different possibilities but one fact usually stays the same: She will probably be touchy concerning her weight for a very long time, even after the bullying stops. Just the same, a girl, who is constantly bullied for being homosexual, will probably have problems with her sexuality and admitting to being homosexual.

So one will likely have problems with her weight, the other with her sexuality and both probably with low self-esteem. Thus, I do not think that bullying differs much according to its grounds.

2. What is homophobia and how best might you deal with homophobia in your English classroom?

Homophobia is the fear of homosexuals. Mostly people fear things that they either have very little contact with or that somebody else has told them to fear. Therefore it is important to get students into contact with homosexuality and show them that it is neither abnormal nor to be feared. Sexual preferences are more like being right handed. One person prefers the right hand, another the left, still another uses either one. In the end, it does not matter which hand one uses. And in former times it was believed to be bad, to use the left instead of the right. Luckily
nowadays that belief is outdated and the same should happen to any negative beliefs regarding homosexuality.

English classes provide lots of room for reading books, texts or excerpts as well as watching videos or movies. Audio-input like audio-text and music can also be used. So there is a vast amount of material that can be chosen from to get the students into contact with homosexuality and to thinking about it. This is always a good step as most students will not necessarily admit openly to their fears, especially when they know that the teacher does not concur. But if a student does openly show his or her homophobia, it is still a good way. Other possibilities are role-plays or discussions, where students are forced to talk about their beliefs about homosexuals and to maybe rethink those beliefs in the course of it.


I think I do not understand this question. Heterosexuality is basically the sexuality concerning two people of the different sexes. Gender concerns not the natural given but a construct formed by society. Gender contains all those clichés and beliefs how things should be because of society, traditions and such.

4. How do power structures in school or your university Language Teacher Education programme maintain heteronormativity?

I am really not all that sure. There are a lot more men in positions of power than women and I guess that there are very few people who are openly homosexual, although I know no numbers on the latter.

5. How do you understand the concept of social justice in education?

Social justice in education is about offering the same opportunities and possibilities to everybody without discriminations for any reason. This includes race, color, sex, gender, age and anything else that might be reason for discrimination.
I think that religion is a part of it. Adam is the first and Eve doesn’t only follow him but is made from his rib. That picture is still transmitted a lot and I think that children reflect upon it critically and later on that is already implemented into your kind of thinking. Of course, that does not concern everybody as not all people belong to the same religion but I do think that it is a starting point.

Another point is that a lot of stereotypical attitudes/trait for men are seen as positive whereas the ones for women are rather negative (strong vs. weak, high ‘shreddy’ voice vs. dach voice, overly emotional vs. rational, etc.).

The male as default is reinforced by why the male form is used all the time, like ‘man’ in the sense of a human being or using male pronouns when talking about male and female students/people... The awareness for that and the so-called politically correct language usage has increased a lot in the last years.

One stereotype thing that is often mentioned is that women’s goal in life is to marry and have children (and maybe a good job), whereas for men the job’s the first part and marriage as well as children kind of accompany along the way. I do think that this is an outdated stereotype but that it’s still very much present in books, etc. especially in technical/other work as well.
Appendices

They have the choice of sports, for example football, ... and of a girl likes for example soccer, and a man to each. That's the only exception to the rule.

2. Most people in a position of power are male. There are vast amounts of female teachers but the majority of headmasters is male. Also, with the very high 'level' of education, the numbers of women decrease, while the numbers of men increase (from about all female 'Grundschule' teachers to about half-and-half in 'Gymnasium' and almost solely male professors at university).
3. Most teachers are given a book with which to teach and so the book already determines quite strongly what is to be taught. Most books are created and then used for several years, so the newest ideas are usually not included or just kind of go on as an aside, the exception and only sometimes. Most homosexuality is a part of life is not included in some books but not in others. If it is included, it is usually rather explicitly as a whole topic or part of the family the book evolves around. But implicitly the picture of a heterosexual couple that's going to marry and have children at some point is presented in the exercises, small sentences, etc.

Language is used is of course a large part of heteronormativity and most people don't reflect critically on it, so it helps mask a lot.

4. Talking about apartheid could include a discussion on other topics that 'need' hope, should be seen hope. A music class could even change the lyrics to a different topic of discrimination.
Sample Assessments: Eleanor Assessment 2

Assessment 2

ELEANOR,

1. The ideology of male human is constantly reinforced through language in every text, exercise, especially in German. When only the male form pronoun is used to talk about women and men at the same time, it is subconsciously implanted into our minds.

2. The understanding of females as "Other" is something that is not done obviously and this is where the problem comes from. We need to become aware of the fact that we often take it for granted. The man is "positive and neutral," as Beauvoir puts it, in order to then change something. It has been silenced and accepted for a long time and people need to become aware of it.

3. Another example are all the famous writers, musicians etc. that are presented in the textbook, leaving out all the famous women who have achieved and created important works as well. Men are presented as "the hero" and students subsequently start believing it.
2) At university and at schools there is a long tradition of maintaining heterosexuality as the norm. First of all, most 'headteacher' higher positions in education (headteachers etc) are filled with men whereas there are a lot more women in the classrooms, doing their everyday teaching job.

Secondly, in textbooks and other teacher material heterosexuality is presented as the norm and teachers really need to be aware and critical in order to realise and integrate other options in their classrooms.

Apart from the reasons mentionned above, it is the educators themselves who have the power to maintain heterosexuality as the norm. As soon as they would start to question it in their own classroom, the whole system could start to change.

3) In my opinion, the mechanism of heteronormativity is masked at school and in LTE by silencing it, being kept silent. The whole topic is not considered to be relevant and left out. This way, knowledge of difference in lifestyle is regulated or not even presented as an option. It is not considered as a problem or something that has to be talked about.
Sample Assessments: Marta Assessment 2

1. Many teaching texts are written by men and are addressed to men. Therefore, they enhance this male = human default. Very often reading materials and exercises are all about men and the only pronoun that is used is "he". It is very common in articles [at least in Poland]. For example students are to work on an article and answer some questions and the article says "What are you going to do in 20 years time once you've got a wife and kids. A new car maybe? Long journey?". Seriously, many articles are like that, as if women did not read newspapers or didn't go to university. When it comes to vocabulary exercises, or grammar sentences, they usually depict this male = human, woman = object, addition default. Stories for kids are about male - animals, heroes, not
It remains like that to this day because too few people are aware about the problem. They take for granted things as they are without making any effort to rethink it. And handbooks continue to be written by men, women are usually co-authors - at least in my country.

2. Heterosexuality is maintained and reaffirmed as the norm by not being a topic to discuss. I mean, it is everywhere and nobody questions it, and homosexuals don't want to risk being bullied by coming out. Usually friends gossip about couples at school, or brag about their relationships which are heterosexual contribute to making heterosexuality seem be the norm.

Next, teachers seldom bother to break this heteronormativity for fear of trouble with the headmaster or parents, at least
Third, the majority of handbooks and teaching materials don’t make any room for homosexual people. As far as I remember, in my English classes (before university), homosexuality was literally non-existent. Or it was made to be like that by teachers, books, and students. So, to sum up, these main forces that keep heteronormativity going are students themselves, not only heterosexual, but homosexuals as well. Second, lazy or conservative and short-sighted teachers, headmasters, and books. As a fourth force I would add religion, or to be more precise—church institution and priests.

3. It is masked in the way that heteronormativity is present everywhere, homosexuality is seemingly acceptable but up to a point somebody comes out. Then suddenly unpleasant consequences crop up. Not only for when homosexuals show
Mentioned, whereas heterosexuals do it all the time and it somehow stays invisible. Also singling out the topic of homosexuality helps to control it and mask the power. Apparently, school/university is open-minded and tolerant because it opens a discussion about that, but in fact it just allocates some little room for that in the white ocean of heteronormativity. Apparently, homosexuality is ok, but only as long as it is discussed within the allowed frame.

4. I would play the song and give the lyrics to the students and make a short discussion about apartheid—what is that about, what kind of discrimination it enhances and then if I would ask them if they see any parallels with contemporary European reality. If they didn't see any, I would ask if sexual minorities are not separated and outcast.