

臺灣教育社會學研究 七卷一期

2007年6月，頁147～189

學校場域中男性氣概的階層化：道德惶恐、酷兒與男性氣概的危機

張盈堃

摘 要

本文的焦點在討論校園次文化中所形成男性氣概的階層化現象，一方面質問為什麼男性氣概成為學校教育中所尊崇的高貴形式，另一方面則據此討論道德惶恐、男性氣概危機與酷兒三者之間的關係。透過相關理論的討論，以及呈現研究者過去田野研究中的部分軼事，本文檢視外在的社會或文化機制如何導致在教育場域中男性氣概認同的型塑。最後，本文提出回應同性戀恐懼症的若干可行策略。

關鍵詞：道德惶恐、男性氣概、同性戀恐懼症

- 本文作者：張盈堃 屏東教育大學幼兒教育系助理教授。
- 投稿日期：95年1月2日，接受刊登日期：96年2月1日。

Masculine Stratification in the School Field: Moral Panic, Queerness, and the Crisis of Masculinity

Yin-Kun Chang

Assistant Professor

Early Childhood Education, National Pingtung University of Education

Abstract

The focus in this paper is masculine stratification in campus subcultures. This paper (1) questions why masculinity has become an ennobled concept in schooling and (2) discusses the relationships among moral panic, the crisis of masculinity, and queerness. By reviewing relevant theoretical debates on the basis of some fieldwork-based anecdotes, this paper examines how external social or cultural mechanisms shape masculine identities in school fields. Finally, this paper portrays certain possible reactions to homophobia.

Keywords: moral panic, masculinity, homophobia

A “real” man is someone who feels the need to rise to the challenge of the opportunities available to him to increase his honor by pursuing glory and distinction in the public sphere. Exaltation of masculine values has its dark negative side in the fears and anxiety aroused by femininity.... Like honor—or shame, its reverse side, which we know, in contrast to guilt, is felt before others—manliness must be validated by other men, in its reality as actual or potential violence, and certified by recognition of membership of the group of “real men”.... Manliness, it can be seen, is an eminently relational notion, constructed in front of and for other men and against femininity, in a kind of fear of the female, firstly in oneself. (Bourdieu, 2001: 51-53)

I. Preface

In the common sense, many people still regard queerness as a social stigma. In particular, the first image of a gay that comes to mind is, in general, the image of a sissy male. In the eyes of most people, gays lack strong masculinity. Most mainstream discourse portrays gays as feminine guys: that is, they embody—and suffer from—a crisis of masculinity. Thus, some people undergo a moral panic in relation to gays, and this panic has a name: homophobia. In this paper, I push myself to rethink the relationships among moral panic, the crisis of masculinity, and queerness in schooling. I am curious about why masculinity has become a supreme value in the school field. In the beginning of this inquiry, we should make a clear distinction between queer issues and other issues germane to multicultural education. Given this task, we should clarify, first, the different

terms that surface in this area and should make distinctions among the meanings behind such catch words as queer, homosexual, gay, and lesbian. Queer culture, in my opinion, is a camouflage culture (unlike race or gender cultures) owing both to its lack of distinctive stylistic characteristics and to its multi-faceted, complex transformations. That is, queer folks can easily conceal or shift their most-despised status and act publicly as though they were not homosexuals. However, in mainstream discourse in multicultural education, most papers discuss sexuality and gender education from a heterosexual perspective and sometimes ignore the existence of homosexuality or queerness. Many people still regard queer teachers, queer students, and queer issues as a negative thing, and I consider this attitude toward queer issues to be the very “moral panic” to which I have referred.

Basically, I agree that the stereotype of masculinity is a social construction. Such a position implies that social construction privileges heterosexuality and that this privileging results in homophobia.¹ Thus, in a culture of domination, masculinity as a social norm is not simply acceptable but required. Put another way, male homosexuality may be viewed as one index of the burdens of masculinity. In this paper, I focus on the following argument: why do gay issues always give rise to moral panic in schooling? What are the characteristics of this moral panic? I attempt to identify and analyze the process underlying the social construction of masculinity in the school field so that we can see the constructedness of the masculine nobility. All in all, I am extremely curious

¹ In my opinion, we should link this to Durkheim’s social fact. Social fact refers to a continuum of phenomena ranging from major institutional structures to types of feeling promoted by collective gatherings. In other words, this symbolic order is built around representations of what is sacred to group life; things set apart and forbidden from the profane, mundane world of everyday life.

about why and how the educational system plays a solid role in the maintaining of masculine heterosexism. Thus, I examine how external social mechanisms shape masculine identities.

This paper consists of four parts. In the following discussion, and besides the introduction and the purpose statements in the preface, I first present an overview of the topic of “masculinity in the school field” with the relevant arguments from Martin Mac an Ghail, R. W Connell, and critical pedagogy. Second, I will focus on the relationships among power, masculinity, and moral panic. In order to do justice to this treacherous topic, I articulate multiple theoretical approaches. I refrain from a focus on only one theoretical standpoint, such as Foucault’s notion of power and discipline, Butler’s notion of performance, and relevant notions of moral panic and resistance. In the end, I will articulate my conclusion about benefits and the drawbacks of masculinity. Beside theoretical debates, I will present some evidence that derives from my past fieldwork and that reveals the process by which heterosexism operates in the school.² I know that this theoretical purpose entails certain limitations that derive from queer culture’s multiple dimensions. For instance, homosexual men of color may be willing to fight racism, heterosexism, and homophobia, but may be unwilling to explore sexual hierarchy within the same race. Thus, queer culture is constructed from difference differently at different periods of time, and differently for different ages, classes, and racial groups.³ However, the theoretical debate is still quite significant and necessary for us to construct the

² The analyzed data come from some parts of varied and fragmented collections in my dissertation, including face-to-face interviews; journalists’ reports in newspapers, magazines, or websites, and reflexive fieldwork notes.

³ For instance, the debonair guy (書生) is a form of masculinity that is not only accepted but also valued, but this kind of masculinity would be considered sissy in the Western context.

whole picture related to this issue.

II. Masculinity in the school field

(1) Schooling as a masculinity agency

There is no denying that school has become an important site for the production and the reproduction of masculinity. Mac an Ghail (1994) argued that schools are sites where sexuality and gender subjectivities evolve: where—in relation to these issues—people conform to, deviate from, challenge, participate in, and engage with ideological state apparatuses. Schools are micro-cultures of management, teachers, and students and are key infrastructure mechanisms through which masculinities and femininities are mediated and lived out. In other words, schools—as deeply gendered and heterosexual regimes—construct relations of domination and subordination within and across these micro-cultures.⁴ Thus, Mac an Ghail identified “schooling as a masculinizing agency.” (1994: 4) In his thinking, schooling is the best masculinity-centered setting. Schooling represents heterosexism and homophobia at both formal and hidden levels. In order to answer the question about how masculinity circumscribes schooling and how modern systems of schooling contribute to the formation of contemporary modes of masculinity,

⁴ Mac an Ghail’s arguments are built on a Foucauldian foundation. Foucault (1977) highlights the idea that society rewards those who conform to norms and punishes those who deviate from norms. Foucault is interested not only in how the social institutions in which individuals find themselves program them, but also in why they accept being programmed. Thus, Foucault (1977: 303) is concerned about the question, “how were people made to accept the power to punish, or quite simply, when punished, tolerate being so?” He mentions that norms exist in all social institutions such as schools, hospitals, factories, and armies and that, consequently, perhaps entire societies threaten to become “carceral” (“prison-like” in its English meaning).

Mac an Ghaill used Foucault's framework concerning power, discourse, and sexuality to discuss schooling and masculinity. He found that (1) heterosexual males construct masculine subjectivities in schooling and traduce women (femininity) and gays (homosexuality); (2) in masculinity-centered ideology, gayness was constructed as a form of disability such as softness or sissy temper and deemed a non-masculine mode exemplifying the heterosexual superiority-gay inferiority complex; and (3) at the micro-cultural level, student peer-groups, haircuts, sport bags, and so on were key signifiers that marked out gender and sexual status (Mac an Ghaill, 1994). It should be pointed out that the soft or sissy disposition, although a favorite target of discrimination, is not unchangeable. Today, we can discern a new tendency—the so-called “feminization of male youth cultures.”⁵ Hair, skin, and clothes are becoming male focal concerns on a much larger scale. This trend means that a male's sexuality and gender identities are formed against an older generation's surveillance and social regulations. Of course, school masculinities are complex, problematic social phenomena, and we must understand the construction and (re) production of masculine identities in schooling.

(2) Hegemonic masculinity

Much research in this area concentrates on the concept of hegemonic masculinity. Therein, Connell (1987) pointed out that hegemony means a social ascendancy achieved through interplay between private lives and cultural

⁵ The best example is of men who dabble in beauty products and services. This focus by males on male beauty indicates a deconstruction or breakdown in rigid gender categories and images. Beauty transformation suggests that the ideological sphere of masculinity-based references has widened to include a greater diversity of physical styles, with beautification as another component of masculinity.

processes. Hegemonic masculinity is constructed in relation to women and to subordinated masculinities. The most important feature of contemporary hegemonic masculinity is that it is heterosexual; and a key form of subordinate masculinity is homosexual.⁶ For instance, the social side of sports in school is definitely heterosexual. In his fieldwork about little league baseball and preadolescent culture, Fine (1987) pointed out some interesting phenomena related to homosexuality in sports-team culture. Boys attempt to define their sexualized selves by addressing that facet of sexuality defined as opposite to sexual maturity: homosexuality. Despite this, homosexuality is a central theme in preadolescent male talk. In each language, boys use expressions like “You’re a faggot,” “God, he’s gay,” “He is the biggest fag in the world,” “He sucks,” “What a queer,” or “Kiss my ass.” In Fine’s analysis, being gay has little to do with homosexual behavior: when used in informal interactions, the label “gay” stigmatizes the target of the label by suggesting that he is immature. Indeed, some homosexual behavior (i.e., mutual masturbation) occurs among boys who would never be labeled “gay” (Fine, 1987: 114). Fine’s example echoes Beneke’s (1997: 152): we commonly use sexual language to express nonsexual

⁶ Connell (1995) pointed out that masculinity, rather than constitute a single uniform standard of behavior, comprises a range of gender identities clustered around expectations concerning masculinity, which he termed “hegemonic masculinity.” According to Moose (1996), hegemonic masculinity is a stereotype transformed into the norm by the rising European bourgeoisie at the end of the eighteenth century. The attributes of that masculinity are specific (1) physical skills, (2) postures, (3) appearances, (4) moderation, (5) manifestations of control, (6) service and dedication to a superior cause, (7) morality, and (8) aggression. Connell (1995: 76) also stated that hegemonic masculinity “is not a fixed character type, always and everywhere the same. It is rather, the masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable.” Connell (1995: 207) suggested that we need to analyze the hegemonic nature of masculinity, to question the usefulness of making generalizations about “boys as a bloc,” and to focus research on achieving a better knowledge of “how far schools can affect masculinity and its enactment.”

feelings in everyday life. When a man says “Fuck you!” to another man or “I got screwed by my boss!” he is using the sexual to express the nonsexual. It follows then that talk of homosexuality is an important focus on campus. Fine’s ethnography finds boys calling each other faggot or fag, fairy or feather, gay or gay wad. “Cocksucker” is an intimate put-down because it makes explicit what is hidden in the other terms. Some other important common—and not-so-common, as the case may be—phrases are “Bite my ass,” “Bite my head,” “Bite my bag,” “French my hole,” “Go suck a cow,” “Go suck an egg,” “Lick my ass,” and “Suck my summer sausage.” In other words, homosexuality is an important theme for some members of this age group; sexual lore generates prestige in the interpersonal marketplace of communication. However, the term queer on campus sometimes becomes blurred today when, for example, “goody-goody” boys or teachers’ pets are considered “queers.” Thus, through many rhetorical images, the meanings underlying the term homosexuality are sufficiently ambiguous that preadolescents can use it without necessarily agreeing completely on its referent. Fine in advance contended that homosexual rhetoric does not necessarily imply hostility in the relation; friends sometimes call each other “faggot” or “gay,” and through an understanding of their relationship, of specific performance circumstances, and vocal cues, no offense is taken. (Fine, 1987: 115)

In addition, the relationship between honor, masculinity, and sexuality is an interesting focus in relevant studies. For instance, Peteet (2002: 321) discussed the concept of honor as a defining frame for masculinity and applied this concept to the cultural politics of violence. Drawing on Bourdieu’s ideas, she asserted that Bourdieu located the man of honor in the context of challenge and riposte. A challenge confers honor upon a man, because it is a cultural assumption that the “challenge, as such, requires a riposte and therefore is

addressed to a man deemed capable of playing the game of honor.” (Bourdieu, 1977: 11) The challenge provides an opportunity for males to prove that they belong to the world of men. Thus, Peteet discussed Bourdieu’s contention that “A man dishonors himself when he challenges a man considered incapable of taking up the challenge.” (Bourdieu, 1977: 11) Honor represents the concept of “compulsive masculinity” proposed by Timothy Beneke, (1997) which means the compulsion or need to relate to, and at times create, stress or distress as a means of both proving manhood and conferring on boys and men superiority over women and other men.

(3) False stereotype related to masculinity in schooling

In its essence, the school field already implies sexuality and gender education. For example, it produces and reproduces gender stereotypes in both formal curricula and hidden curricula. I agree again with Mac an Ghaill’s statement about stereotypes reproduced at both formal levels and hidden levels and with his assertion that we have to extend a traditional vision from the formal curricula to the hidden curricula. In other words, masculine sexuality—like other concepts such as race and class—is always produced and reproduced by power relations. If we focus uniquely on either the formal or the hidden, we cannot master all the problems associated with this issue. Critical educators combine both of these curricula and call the outcome “curriculum-in-use.” (Apple, 1990: 51) That is, normal or deviant knowledge always goes beyond the given meaning of any formal curriculum, regardless of the teacher’s instructions or interactions in the classroom. Thus, it is too naïve to think of the school curriculum as neutral knowledge. Rather, what counts as legitimate knowledge is the result of complex power relations among identifiable class, race, gender, sexuality, and religious groups. In addition, it is a common fact that sexuality

and gender education is based on a separation of the sexes. The logical presupposition of sexuality-themed analysis is that masculine roles and feminine roles are reciprocal. There is a basic tendency in sex-role theory to understand men's and women's positions as complementary—this is the point made explicit by Parson's theory of instrumental (masculine) and expressive (feminine) orientation (Parsons, 1964). Thus, schooling produces gender stereotypes and an affirmative heterosexual-centered ideology. Needless to say, the heterosexual-centered ideology links males with a particular strong masculinity and inscribes this code into students' minds.

It is worth reiterating that the stereotypical image of a gay man is that of a sissy. Even within gay groups, masculine gays always regard sissiness as a stigma. There is still a clear distinction between the so-called beach boy and the bitch boy. In general, society cannot accept a man who displays feminine qualities or a man who does not take a dominant position in an intimate relationship. Such ideas, based on the supposition that good men should not learn from women, are consequently discriminatory against women. In Taiwan's male culture, if some students lack strong masculinity, they are typically considered sissy boys.⁷ These students always suffer some punishment or oppression for what is perceived as their weakened masculinity. For example, such boys are regularly labeled as gay and are targets of physical abuse.⁸ We

⁷ Richard Green described the "sissy boy syndrome," according to which little boys who develop "feminine" interests—playing with dolls, wanting to dress in girls' clothing—fail to engage in enough rough-and-tumble play. These boys are at high risk for becoming homosexuals (qtd from Fausto-Sterling, 2000: 113). However, Green's definition exhibits not a little of the ideological bias that characterizes medical hegemony.

⁸ One gay teacher told me about some of his experiences in middle school: "I remember one time in gym. I chatted with some female classmates around the corner. One male classmate suddenly ran toward me and pulled down my gym pants. That day, I was wearing pink briefs, and many classmates laughed at me

call this subculture on Taiwan's campuses "aluba," wherein bullies punish a sissy boy by separating his legs and forcing his penis to rub against a tree, a building's pillar, or some other phallic structure. In addition, teachers and students often devalue sissy boys with negative language drawn from a spoken code, the overall message being that the victims of this abuse have a moral disease due to their sissy temperament. One queer teacher mentioned this interesting example. In a small group discussion in a counseling and guidance class, one member was gay. One time, this boy coughed during the discussion, and many members in this group felt very anxious and uncomfortable, basically thinking, "My god, all of us feel uncomfortable and might have contracted the disease!" I asked them what was wrong. They answered that they guessed we had all contracted AIDS, because after close-distance interaction, all of us felt dizzy and were coughing. Then, they asked me a question: "Teacher, could you make him straight so that he will no longer infect us with this disease?" (Personal Interview, 2003-10-31)

I believe that sexual oppression targeting sexual variants or minorities functions as does any form of oppression, such as political oppression. It is quite common to use physical violence like, aluba, and to use symbolic

about this feminine color. Their derision embarrassed me terribly. Of course, he wanted to figure out whether I was boy or girl. In addition, I remember that when I was a sophomore in middle school, one guy who was sitting next to me felt disgusted at my sissy temperament. He separated his legs and said, "Bitch, do you want to touch my cock?" (Personal interview, 2003-10-24) This situation is also a reality in the United States. MacGillivray (2004: 35, 37) described the same situation in his fieldwork: "verbal harassment saturates every queer youth's experience—I hear that every day like a gay youth got surrounded by other kids and was doused with water.... I overheard two teachers talking and one referred to a student she was describing as the faggot. In class, while watching a video, a table behind me was gay-bashing a student the entire time. I looked over and the teacher was sitting right behind us reading a book ignoring the entire conversation."

violence, like the effects of name-calling. As Franklin (1998: 12-13) stated, “In group assaults the homosexual victim can be seen as fundamentally a dramatic prop, a vehicle for a ritualized conquest through which assailants demonstrate their commitment to heterosexual masculinity and male gender norms while simultaneously engaging in homosocial bonding with each other.” Similarly, Rofo (2000: 137) asserted that many heterosexual students and faculty members continue to find gay male sex disgusting and view heterosexual intercourse as ideal. In sum, in the representation of this hegemonic control, it is quite common for students to use physical violence and symbolic violence both to punish students who are perceived as gay and to enforce this authoritative anti-gay stance. From my perspective on gay-bashing situations, sexual orientation becomes a matter of aesthetics—the heterosexual-homosexual split represents the complex of superiority-inferiority.

(4) To break the masculine-feminine dichotomy

However, I must point out that the mainstream discourse concerning the masculine-feminine dichotomy gives rise to a significant paradox: A male’s being gay does not necessarily contribute to the crisis of masculinity, and a “sissy boy” is not equivalent to being gay. In other words, this vigorous heterosexuality-masculinity dichotomy and the vigorous homosexuality-femininity dichotomy will lead us into a trap set by heterosexuality and will simplify and dilute the plentiful implications of studies on gay topics. The popular debate on gay topics always focuses on the supposed sissy temperament of gay men. Men become terrified of being seen as gay or feminine—a fag, queer, wimp, sissy, and so on. In other words, a narrow conception of five fields of being—heterosexuality, power, authority, aggression, and technical competence—characterize the dominant masculine form. Therefore, the

masculine function has hegemonic implications: hegemonic masculinity has to be associated with high-status academic curriculum. For example, boys with qualities that are characterized as strong and masculine are excellent in school sports, but girls and sissy boys are not. This kind of stereotype sets up standards for boys' and girls' performance in academic work. Connell also argued that the institutionalized structure of schooling is central to the production of masculine subjectivities: "The strongest effects of schooling on the construction of masculinity are the indirect effects of streaming and failure, authority patterns, the academic curriculum and definitions of knowledge—rather than direct effects of equity programs or courses dealing with gender" (Connell, 1987: 183). Similarly, Beneke (1997: 41) mentioned that to prove manhood requires the ability both to resist the impulse to "go soft" and to emphasize a skill strongly needed to remain cold-blooded when confronting suffering or horror.

To fix masculine and feminine boundaries and to construct gender subjectivities must occur through the process of bodily hexis (the values attributed to a body's physical shape and to the body's deportment).⁹ Undoubtedly, mainstream discourse points out the universality and the naturalization of heterosexuality as the norm, and identifies specific forms of institutional and social regulations and boundaries that operate at the school level. In my past fieldwork, most queer teachers in Taiwan had attempted to make sexuality invisible, frequently subsuming it within a more general discourse of gender. They feared that they might discuss forms of sexuality

⁹ Bourdieu (2001: 64) wrote that bodily hexis, which includes both the strictly physical shape of the body and the way it is carried, is assumed to express the deep being, the true nature of the person, in accordance with the postulate of the correspondence between the physical and the moral, which gives rise to the practical or rationalized knowledge whereby psychological and moral properties are associated with bodily or physiognomic indices.

other than heterosexuality. Within this context, teacher education is an important site for the shaping of knowledge, and therefore we need to reflect on the center-periphery relations that affect the organization of knowledge in teacher education itself. Hsiao (2002) pointed out that, in Taiwan's teacher-education program, there is no positive knowledge about women. No doubt, it is impossible to have queer knowledge in a positive way. For instance, a few years ago at a Taiwanese government hearing entitled "Who Cares about Gay Rights?" a Ministry of Education (MOE) official compared homosexuals to drug addicts and questioned whether they should be granted basic human rights. "Homosexuals should not pollute others with their relationships," the official said, adding that education authorities "do not know how to handle this problem." (Chiang, 1998: 9-10) This comment reflects the fact that LGBT issues still lack legitimacy in the eyes of the educational authority in Taiwan, where queers are still taboo and are therefore excluded from schooling.¹⁰ In this vein, the task of the teacher-education program is to civilize pre-service teachers in the so-called normal way. In other words, the civilizing process involves the inculcation of societal norms with respect to behavior and body management.

¹⁰ On June 23, 2004, Taiwan started to implement the Law of Gender Equity in Education. This law requires schools to implement gender-relevant curricula. For instance, in the elementary-education and secondary-education levels, the law requires at least 4 hours of relevant inclusive curricula or activities per semester. (In fact, this requirement already operated 7 years by commission of gender equity in education.) At the high school level, schools must have inclusive curricula concerning gender equity. At the college level, this law encourages colleges to offer more gender-relevant courses. Queer pedagogy will be one significant element of this law. Ideally, teaching queer issues will not be taboo once this law is fully implemented. Relevant gender-equity curricula in this law cover topics such as emotional education, sex education, queer education, physical education, technology education, media education, and career planning (from udn.com 2004-12-14). However, this ideal comes from the juridical perspective, and it remains to be seen whether the ideal will materialize.

Societal norms that are adjudicated by a heterosexual disciplinary system transmit and enact a moral authority through heterosexual teachers, who inscribe these norms into students' minds and behaviors.

III. Power, Masculinity, and Moral panic

(1) Masculinity is based on power

Critical issues in masculinity studies concern heterosexuality and whether it is possible to conceive it both as a relationship of power in the larger society and as a legitimate sexual orientation. Often, the ways we conceive of relationships of power, particularly within a framework of a hierarchy of powers, have made it seem as though heterosexuality itself is somehow invalid. What needs to be challenged are (1) how this power undermines women, gay men, and lesbians and (2) how this power—insofar as it is normalized—discounts the validity of other forms of sexual orientation. In other words, it might be that heterosexuality is a structured institution that enforces the conception of normality taken for granted within a culture. A significant amount of research has drawn on a Foucauldian framework and its concern with power's productive capacity. Foucault focused on discourse and the relationship of discourse to power, taken together as a productive system that creates people's very sense of who they are. Discourse comprises systems of knowledge, supported by institutions and practices that create a picture for people of what is true and what is not. If we apply a Foucauldian framework to queer issues in the school field, we can find heterosexual hegemony through the production of normalizing discourse, which labels what is considered normal and abnormal. In Foucault's term, this production is the so-called regime of truth—"truth" is situated in both scientific discourse and the institutions that produce it. Foucault

contended that power is not just repressive but productive, as well. Thus, one's identification of oneself as heterosexual or homosexual would be impossible if categorizing discourses of sexuality did not exist. So we can say that we are produced by discourses and discursive practices. Of course, masculinity and femininity function in the same way.

From a historical perspective, Foucault explored how the homosexual was produced in Western society. Since the nineteenth century, practitioners of medicine and psychology have sought to gain knowledge of same-sex sexual behaviors and to organize this knowledge into a discourse on homosexuality. This discourse has created the very idea of "the homosexual" (Foucault, 1977: 135). Foucault claimed that before this time, homosexual acts occurred but that the social identity of the homosexual did not exist. This creation of knowledge concerning homosexuals was—and continues to be—based on power relations: because schools of medicine and psychology have knowledge of related matters, certain scholars exercise power over this sexual-knowledge category.¹¹ Then, this knowledge will discipline both body and mind. That is, power may produce subjectivities, but the subjectivities it creates are those of marginalized, oppressed, or administered peoples like gays.

In my opinion, Foucault's concepts of normalization and of normalizing judgments are fruitful. Foucault conceptualizes "discipline" broadly as the mechanism for a new mode of domination that constitutes us as individuals who possess a specific perception of both our identity and our potential. The identity and the potential appear natural rather than derivative from power relations. The

¹¹ In *The History of Sexuality Volume I*, Foucault described this deviant sex as sodomy, which had previously been understood as simply a category of forbidden acts. At the end of the nineteenth century, sodomy was transposed onto a certain kind of person or body: the homosexual (Foucault, 1978: 43).

disciplinary techniques of schooling actively produce individual social identities of heterosexuality. Rather than ferret homosexuality and bisexuality out and cast them according to the standards of heterosexual hegemony, heterosexuality naturally exists. The objective of power produces identity, is the production of people who are docile, self-regulating, and self-disciplined workers (Ferguson, 2001: 52). Disciplinary power becomes a particularly relevant technique of regulation and identity-formation in constructing a regime of truth. Foucault's analysis of disciplined bodies is a corollary of his account of the production of truth within discourses; bodies become the objects of new disciplinary sciences, as new technologies of power bring them under control. In other words, body-reflexive practices involve social relations and symbolism. Particular versions of masculinity are constituted as meaningful bodies. Normalization results in the regime of truth through disciplinary technology, and this regime of truth functions in education to inscribe hegemonic ideology. That is, bodies embody pedagogic ideology. Through this process, we can see that a social world is formed. The world formed by the body-reflexive practices of gender is a political domain of struggle that thrives on contexts of inequality. Thus, gender politics is an embodied social politics.

(2) Heterosexual identity as normal form

In light of the condition that masculinity rests on power relations and heterosexuality, we have to recognize the functional process of heterosexual identity as the normal form in the following context. Mac an Ghaill (1994: 47) pointed out that the construction and the mediation of masculine and feminine student typifications are embedded in a multiple set of power relations. He also discussed sexual-boundary maintenance, policing, and legitimization of male heterosexual identities. In his analysis, heterosexual male students are involved

in a double relationship: one is external, and the other is internal. On the one hand, heterosexual male students traduce others, including women and gays, in external relations; on the other hand, they expel feminine and homosexual forms within themselves in internal relations (1994: 90). In other words, masculine function must be situated in masculine identity. However, the insecurity of straight men about heterosexuality and masculinity is enormous and even hysterical. As Jeffrey Weeks (1985) noted, heterosexuality is embroiled in a deep contradiction. Heterosexuality is at once presented as the most natural thing in the world, and yet, so many straight men behave as though it were perpetually fragile and in danger of being undercut by any association with gays.

Hall (1990) has argued that identities are not historically fixed entities; rather, they are subject to the continuous interplay of history, culture, and power.

Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, ..., we should think, instead, of identity as a production, which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. (Hall, 1990: 222)

Sexual identities are not descriptive but performative—not what people are but what they do. That is, identities have no essential meaning outside performance. Thus, the concept of gender performance proposed by Judith Butler becomes a key notion here. Butler (1993) argued that gender is something that we do in a performance and that is both individually and socially

meaningful. We signal our gender identification through an ongoing performance of normative acts that are ritually specific, drawing on well worked-over and easily recognizable socio-historical scripts. Butler's emphasis on the coerced nature and the coercive nature of this performance is especially useful. She pointed out that the enactment of sex difference is neither voluntary nor arbitrary in form; instead, it is a compulsory requirement of social life. Gender acts follow socio-historical scripts that are policed through the exercise of repression and taboo. The enactment of masculinity is also a thoroughly embodied display of physical and social power (Ferguson, 2001: 171). Identification in this sense is a series of public acts of commitment to a subject position. In the same way, sexual and gender relations can be seen as a crucial point of intersection of different forms of power, stratification, desire, and subjective identity formation. Butler (1993) documented that schooling processes can be seen to form gendered identities.

Identity will result in agency. Butler considered agency to be immanent to power and not opposed to it. Butler (1992: 13) expressed it this way:

Agency is always and only a political prerogative. As such, it seems crucial to question the conditions of its possibility, not to take it for granted as an a priori guarantee. We need instead to ask, what possibilities of mobilization are produced on the basis of existing configurations of discourse and power? Where are the possibilities of reworking that very matrix of power by which we are constituted, of reconstituting the legacy of that constitution, and of working against each other those processes of regulation that can destabilize existing power regimes? For if the subject is constituted by power, that power does not cease at the moment

the subject is constituted, for that subject is never fully constituted, but is subjected and produced time and again.

According to Butler, subjects are also produced to a considerable extent in the political field in which they are engaged. She argued that agency can never be understood as exercising a controlling or original authorship over the signifying chain, and that it cannot be the power, once installed and constituted in and by that chain, that sets a sure course for its future (Butler, 1993: 219). In other words, a political signifier is always re-signified in that it derives its meaning from the sedimentation of prior signifiers and from a repetitive citation of prior instances of itself. Agency is located for Butler in the performativity of signifiers when the signifiers are repeated or cited. To be constituted by a discourse is not the same thing as being determined by it.

Paradoxically, identity seeks to foreclose the very contingency on which it depends. Butler noted that “agency is the hiatus in iterability, the compulsion to install an identity through repetition, performance which requires the very contingency, the undetermined interval, that identity insistently seeks to foreclose.” (1993: 220) To understand that the subject is constituted as such is not to claim that agency is determined or that the subject is dead; rather, it is to understand that power structures induce the belief in an autonomous subject, and that scholars in the field should approach the notion of subjectivity as a problematic.

In my opinion, performances of identity and agency are also based on material conditions. In a school setting, the hegemonic structure created by the heterosexual-centered ideology dominates docile bodies through the structure’s control of space and other social conditions. For example, the teaching of queer issues in the classroom violates school rules: queer issues are supposed never to

exist in the mainstream discourse of our society. In the material condition of space, which defines the physical boundaries and the physical content of hegemonic structures, the classroom is a window into the disciplinary system of the school. Chang (2000) referred to “the visible and invisible hierarchical supervision in school” to describe this situation in Taiwan. He thinks about the school through its architectural setting, where the superintendent or administrator always observes the teachers’ teaching, and where they have the privilege to invent classroom instruction and control what content can be taught and what cannot. That is, schools have a strong monitoring system. Of course, sexual minorities’ voices always disappear in the classroom. Chang uses Foucault’s interpretation of the panopticon as a metaphor to explain how a school’s superintendent and administrators can monitor classrooms easily. This ease stems from visible hierarchical supervision. Censoring students’ diaries is another monitoring system in the material conditions of schools. Chang (2000) also described one case in his research in which school administrators who were censoring students’ diaries came across one gay teacher’s response to a gay student’s problem about his sexual-orientation. Administrators then informed the student’s parents and sent the student to professional therapy. The gay teacher left the school in order to avoid any trouble.¹²

In contrast to the visible role of a school’s superintendent and administrators, parents play a role in invisible hierarchical supervision. Students report everything that happens in school to parents and some parents also care about what content is taught in the classroom. Thus, queer teachers have to be

¹² A similar example from 2001 concerns a single-sex high school in Taipei, where school administrators, after outing a lesbian student, wondered whether her sexual orientation would have some negative effect on other students. Thus, school administrators suggested that she transfer to a different school (from Liberty Times 2001-6-4).

very careful about what their instruction contains because parents might become angry and protest. In other material conditions in school, the relations of masculinity are played out and validated for other men. For example, consider one of the main functions of men's sex-related banter in school. Male teachers have access to this kind of subculture and can even share their sexual media with each other, such as adult tapes and magazines in private, to validate their masculinity to their male friends (Taiwanese euphemistically refer to adult tapes as "lunch boxes"). I consider this subculture to be a rite of passage¹³ among male schoolteachers. This collective affirmation of peer identity often manifests itself in terms of a highly ritualistic obsessive discourse. Related sexual narratives always carry predictable exaggerations of homosexuality. Needless to say, gay teachers keep silent about these practices in order to maintain a safe position.

However, it is politically and pedagogically important to stress that both gay and straight people experience their class, gender, and ethnicity through sexuality. The sexualization of straight subjectivity frequently remains unacknowledged by straights because heterosexuality signifies normality and dominance. In the ideal situation, sexuality would function as a relational concept in which different non-essentialist sexual identities are defined in relation to each other, with homosexuality always present in heterosexuality. Mac an Ghaill (2000: 172) argued that a major task for educators is to deconstruct the complex social and discursive practices of heterosexual

¹³ A rite of passage is a ritual that marks a change in a person's social status. The term was popularized by the French ethnographer Arnold Van Gennep. Rites of passage are often ceremonies surrounding events such as childbirth or other milestones within puberty, weddings, menopause, and death. In this paper, rite of passage means that male schoolteachers are involved in the same subcultural activities.

hegemony. As Hall stated, identities are not historically fixed entities, and gay/queer teachers can also develop their alternative identities. Through identity politics, those who are historically marginalized along various axes of identity formation have begun to find a voice and to counter their cultural marginalization. Actually, male heterosexual identity can be seen as a highly fragile socially constructed phenomenon. Therefore, it is a call for a politics of difference and empowerment as the basis for developing a critical pedagogy through and for the voices of those who are often silenced.

(3) Moral panic: Homophobia¹⁴

As I mentioned, Butler (1990) suggests that gender needs to be read within the context of a “heterosexual matrix” in which compulsory heterosexuality shapes gender definitions. This term was coined by Lorde (1985: 3), who describes heterosexism as “a belief in the inherent superiority of one pattern of loving over all others, and thereby the right to dominance.” In other words, the dominance of heterosexist ideology and culture leads to homophobia and consequently to an unspeakable situation for queer people. Such a forced silence is both invasive and coercive. Whereas heterosexism relates more to a set of ideologies pervasive throughout a culture, homophobia acts out heterosexist beliefs and attitudes; its purpose is to exclude non-heterosexuality. Thus, it is not difficult to imagine that a perceived lack of masculinity results in a situation

¹⁴ One reviewer gave me a different reading of moral panic: moral panic can form ideological displacement. I quite appreciate this suggestion. In my fieldwork about queer content in the textbook industry, I have had the same feeling: textbook authors select certain content owing to the chilling effect that censors will have on the marginalized content. This would be moral panic or “political unconscious” (Fredrick Jameson’s term), which is the repressed narrative of class struggle, a story concealed within the narrative of history. Thus, the textbook content itself is a site of the textual unconscious or the moral panic.

of moral panic. A moral panic is an extreme social response to the perception that the moral condition of society is deteriorating at a calamitous pace. Such an overreaction by media, police, courts, governments, and members of the public in labeling and drawing attention tends to amplify itself. It does so by constructing role models for others to follow or by identifying an instance of the designated behavior as unruly or unsocial—behavior that might otherwise attract little attention. That is, moral panic is acting on behalf of the dominant social order. McRobbie and Thornton (2002: 69-71) discussed early theoretical explorations of moral panic, such as the pioneering studies of Jock Young's (1971) *The Drugtakers* and Stanley Cohen's (1980) *Folk Devils and Moral Panic*. Their studies not only explore how agents of social control such as the police played a role in amplifying deviance, but also develop a vocabulary for understanding the powerful part played by the media. In particular, Cohen's work is an acknowledgement that social control is uneven and much less mechanistic than the model of deviancy that amplification suggests. In addition, Birmingham schools' *Policing the Crisis* (Hall et al., 1978) used the Gramscian concept of hegemony to analyze the way in which moral panic around mugging and the alleged criminality of young Afro-Caribbean males created the social conditions of consent that were necessary for the construction of a society more focused on law and order and less inclined to embrace the liberalism and the permissiveness of the 1960s. This particular analysis of the moral panic shows it to be not an isolated phenomenon but a connective strategy, part of the practice of hegemony that enlarges the sphere of influence that Gramsci labeled civil society. The moral panic then becomes an envoy for dominant ideology. Hall and colleagues noted that the complexity of historical and social breakdown can be managed only through the escalation of control and coercion. Finally, Simon Watney's (1997) *Policing Desire* looks not at crime but at so-called deviant

sexual practices, taking the debates raised in *Policing the Crisis* further by providing a foundation for a better understanding of how controversial social and sexual issues become inscribed with certain kinds of meaning across a wide variety of media forms.

As Mac an Ghaill stated, schools are absolutely important sites for the production of sexualities and moral panic. In *Schooling Sexuality*, Epstein and Johnson (1998) pose this controversial question: How far is schooling influenced by wider public debates and scandals about sexuality? The authors seek to embed an understanding of the dominant discourses of sexuality and schooling within the wider but specifically located context of the nation, traced through government policy and practice around sexuality and the regulative commentaries of the press (media). Focusing on the borderlands of dominant heterosexuality, it explores its points of breakdown, questioning its “naturalness” and producing it as a socially constructed category, which can be and indeed is often breached. It goes on to explore how these potentially damaging breaches are handled and contained by “splitting off” other sexual categories as natural but different and so barely tolerated, in the case of pluralistic political discourses, or by disorganizing constructive thought around sexuality in the case of the press.

Cohen (1980: 9) articulated a succinct view of moral panic: “[It is] a condition, episode, person or group of persons [that] emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests; its nature is presented in a stylized and stereotypical fashion by the mass media; the moral barricades are manned by editors, bishops, politicians and other right-thinking people.... Sometimes the panic passes over and is forgotten, except in folk-lore and collective memory; at other times, it has more serious and long-lasting repercussions and might produce such changes as those in legal and social policy or even in the way that

society perceives itself.” This moral panic in the queer context is the best evidence of homophobia. Lee (2003: 68-69) summarizes divergent definitions of homophobia. For instance, hostility toward homosexual persons that takes the form of a phobia implies that those attitudes are based on an irrational fear, similar to the fear that some people experience when confronted with snakes, spiders, or open spaces. In addition, Lee also offers the definition from the juridical perspective: “homosexual panic is the idea that a latent homosexual—and manifest homophobe—can be so upset by a homosexual’s advances to him that he becomes temporarily insane, in which state he may kill the homosexual.” In sum, mainstream research discusses sexuality in a way that treats gays as either social problems or victims. As Connell observed, “Homophobia is not just an attitude. Straight men’s hostility to gay men involves real social practice such as job discrimination from macro and micro level through media vilification to imprisonment—the spectrum of what Gay Liberation called oppression.” (Connell, 1995: 40)

David Jackson (1990: 123) mentions that homophobia is an integral component of heterosexual masculinity, to the extent that it serves the psychological function of expressing who one is not (i.e., homosexual) and thereby affirming who one is (heterosexual). That is, homophobia is not a marginal matter but an integral part of the way in which heterosexual masculinity is constructed. At the heart of heterosexual masculinity is the precarious formation of the masculinity in the midst of confusion; therefore, this masculinity defines itself in opposition to the other (women, homosexuals, and so on). In other words, a male-on-male sexual advance threatens a heterosexual man’s sense of identity as a man. For instance, men in Taiwanese society are—with regard to sexual desire—supposed to be interested in women, not men; and men are supposed to be the sexual aggressors, not the ones aggressed upon.

These two rules strengthen heterosexual masculinity's internally cracked condition because they encourage people to jeer at what they most fear and to take refuge in the group-defined solidarity and support of other heterosexual men. In short, homophobia is about fear and hatred of gays and lesbians. It is also about the narrowing of relations between men and the distancing of men from other men, regardless of sexual orientation. Straight men fear close contact with each other and try to avoid doing anything that others might interpret as effeminate or unmanly.

In addition, homophobia is socially reinforced and solidifies current social arrangements, including the male themes of top dog and fallen subordinate. Homophobia marks a line of demarcation and helps maintain a narrow, traditional definition of masculinity. Beneke (1997: 143) wrote that homophobia is entirely about extinguishing the feminine and extinguishing the child. Because what are the two enemies of the masculine myth? The woman and the child. In this vein, homophobic experiences for gay teachers and students take the form of frequent physical and psychological abuse, like being smuted, sent to a doctor or a psychiatrist, and so on. We can get a clear picture that heterosexism and homophobia are to be incorporated into each other; therefore, the development of such understandings may serve to illustrate the range of femininities and masculinities and how these take up the different forms of sexuality that are constructed within schools. Consequently, schools and colleges are of central cultural significance, both in terms of the reproduction and possible transformations of hegemonic sex and gender regimes and in terms of the power positions that are contained within these regimes. When we can better understand homophobia, we can develop more effective strategies of resistance.

Homophobia is especially intense in the educational field, as the case of

Jeff, the gay teacher, indicates. In his story, homosexuality was constructed as a form of disability. The principal and the parents feared that gay teachers would teach children to become gays in the future, and their own fantasies of men sleeping together made them feel sick.¹⁵ They even worried that being gay or homosexual is like an infectious disease. These phenomena are always mediated and reproduced through both formal curricula and hidden curricula, which are pedagogical and evaluative systems that serve to regulate all subordinated sex minorities. Characteristic of such curricula is a dichotomy between heterosexual superiority and gay inferiority. In any homophobic ideology, the boundary between straight and gay is in accordance with the boundary between masculine and feminine. Gay men are imagined to be feminized men and lesbians to be masculinized women (Connell, 1995: 40), but I would like to emphasize again that this dichotomy leads us into an analytic trap and blocks the fruitful implications of related studies. Patriarchal culture has a simple interpretation of gay men: they lack masculinity.

This interpretation is obviously linked to the assumption that culture generally makes about the mystery of sexuality, that opposites attract. If someone is attracted to a masculine type, then that person must be feminine. However, “gay” implies that such people are more than their sexuality; that they are people with a unique and historical culture that has been silenced and made invisible. Representation implies for gay people a deliberate effort to challenge stereotypical and oppressive representations of gayness in popular culture

¹⁵ Mac an Ghaill recounted one of his interviewees’ interesting observations: “Teachers, especially male teachers, assume your being gay is a problem but there are a lot of plusses. In fact, I think that one of the main reasons that male straights hate us is because they really know that emotionally we are more worked out than them. We can talk about and express our feelings, our emotions in a positive way. They can only express negative feelings like hatred, anger and dominance. Who would like to be like them?” (Mac an Ghaill, 1994: 167).

through the promotion of an official ideology and positive media images. Only homosexuality as an indispensable category can make the articulation of heterosexuality possible. Heterosexuality becomes intelligible only through the difference to its other—homosexuality. So, Foucault (1977: 216) said, “The target ... is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are.”

Most important of all, we need to recognize that internal fear, intense ambivalence, and collapse produce external disintegration, and this may be a vivid description of most queer teachers in their everyday lives. In particular, we need to focus on the internalized homophobia in queer teachers. Besides the story from this paper, the stories of queer teachers include Karen Hardbeck's (1997) *Gay and Lesbian Educators: Personal Freedoms, Public Constraints*, which applies an historical analysis of the United States context to the juridical rights of LGBT educators. This story illustrates precisely the powerful challenges faced by gay male teachers who simply seek to survive in primary, secondary, and post-secondary education. With stories of verbal harassment, physical assault, and threats of punitive action or employment termination threaded throughout the volume, simply because some teachers acknowledge themselves as gay, it seems impossible to imagine gay men as having any breathing room in which they can assert transgressive aspects of gay male cultures. Rofe (2000: 450) mentioned how he is hyper-aware of how he represents himself as a gay man to students. He wonders how his queer students would like to see him perform sexual identity and what his heterosexually identified students take away from their time with him. He noted several of his concerns: Should I look and act like a stereotypical fag or should I provide an alternative vision of gay manhood? Is it okay to use camp, wit, and biting irony, or should I eschew the affectations of fagdom and provide an alternative vision? Is it okay to cross my legs, move my hands, raise my eyebrows? These concerns

echo the concerns raised in a powerful essay entitled “Classroom Management and the Erasure of Teacher Desire,” in which Ann Phelan (1997: 89) examined ways in which “preoccupation with orderly conduct in schools masks a disciplining of student and teacher desires, bodies and pleasures.” Phelan attributed the obsessive preoccupation with order to “a fear of the erotic” and showed how teachers and children pay a price for our cultural eroto-phobia: “Teachers are in fear that their touch may be framed as molestation, their emotional expression as professionally inappropriate. The downside is that teachers are in danger of forgetting their capacity for feeling.” This is not just a flippant remark. We need to seriously focus on how schools implement a curriculum of the de-desirable body through social, textual, and material practices and disciplining mechanisms that disavow any possibility of queerness. In sum, both queer oppression and the oppression of teachers result from the imposition of subordination.

(4) Reacting to homophobia

In spite of the fact that queer oppressions exist in many situations, it is important for us to notice “elements of good sense as well as bad sense.” (Gramsci, 1971) That is, on the one hand, schools are important agents for the production and the transmission of sexual beliefs and values that are organized by particular discursive systems and that involve relations of control, discipline, and moral regulation. However, on the other hand, education also allows for a critical understanding of everyday oppressions as well as of the dynamics involved in the constructing of alternative political cultures. For instance, Mac an Ghaill (1994) proposed that people produce gender and sexual counter-discourses as a way to counter masculine-centered hegemony. In this paper’s context, this proposal means that people should counter homophobia. Female,

male, straight, and gay students, teachers, and staff have the capability to adopt resistance and contestation strategies around the issue of sexuality and gender essentialism and its regimes. Foucault used a similar term: he argued that in opposition to the domination of regimes of power, “counter discourses” must be developed.¹⁶ Foucault’s injunction, in this context, means resistance to heterosexual hegemony.

Resistance is a blurred term used in divergent contexts. For instance, this concept in the psychoanalytic sense accounts for compliance with the status quo; in the popularized Foucauldian sense, resistance signifies a way of refusing the normalizing power of the status quo. In critical pedagogy, Giroux’s definition of resistance is as follows: “... the nature and meaning of an act of resistance has to be defined next to the degree to which it contains the possibilities to develop what Marcuse termed a commitment to an emancipation of sensibility, imagination, and reason in all spheres of subjectivity and objectivity.” (Giroux, 1983: 108) In this vein, resistance plays the role of adversary to heterosexual ideology in these power relations. Resistance emerges from a contradictory positioning that is both powerful and powerless, like heterosexual positions and homosexual positions in this paper. Not only does such a condensed location provide the wherewithal to resist, it also generates the motivation. Laclau and Mouffe (1985: 153) argued that such motivation is crucial in turning relations of

¹⁶ Although a Foucauldian approach opens important avenues, it also sets certain limitations at the same time. Under over-abstracted rhetoric, counter discourse sometimes seems like a set of systematically deployed clichés. In educational studies, this situation is the same. McLaren (1992: ix) writes, in the foreword to James Sears’ *Sexuality and the Curriculum: The Politics and Practices of Sexuality Education*, “Lexical distinctions surrounding the term ‘sex’ and ‘sexuality’ give people a general means to discuss and evaluate the consequences of sexual activity and sexual knowledge, but through this process ontologies of moral absolutism often develop that divide people into perverts/queers and straights/innocents.”

subordination, which are accepted, into relations of oppression, which are not. Oppressed people can also exercise power; power cannot be conceived simply as a one-way relation of domination. Instead, it provides us with a way of conceptualizing the practices and the mechanisms that we are forced to use in the deep hope of producing desired effects. Power cannot simply be equated with the control exercised by a particular group such as heterosexuals. What is more, in a society where our identity is a complex amalgam of advantage, marginalization, and repression, identifying a dominant class becomes less clear-cut. Conceptualizing oppositional struggle and resistance is difficult when only one class is perceived to have access to power. I gained particular insight into the issue from Foucault's idea that "where there is power, there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently, this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power." (Foucault, 1978: 95)

In their ideal, resistant acts are by definition transgressions against dominant norms and acceptable definitions of sexuality. The concept of resistance has the value of attributing agency to queer folks, but sometimes it is a negative agency, a reaction to an oppressive condition rather than a power to create and negotiate a new meaning. For instance, we should consider the possibility that resistance is not anti-domination but conformism, ritualism, or euphemism, even sitting on the fence. As Woods (1979: 71-72) notes in his work *The Divided School*, there are many modes of pupil adaptation to be found in schools—conformity, ritualism, retreatism, colonization, intransigence, and rebellion being the major ones. To focus on resistance as the only form opposite to cultural reproduction is to ignore much of what happens in reality.

Critical educational works like those of Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, Paul Willis, and Angela McRobbie feature rigorous analyses of issues related to resistance. Apple (1995) maintains that it is important not to underestimate the

resistance of teachers and students and the agency they exercise. In other words, resistance theory focuses on education as a relatively autonomous field. Educational systems not only reproduce domination but facilitate resistance to domination, as well. One of the most important works on domination and resistance is *Learning to Labor* by Paul Willis. Willis (1977) argues that a school's role in social reproduction resides not merely in certain dominant and invincible institutional determinants but also in the cultural forms produced by the "lads" in their resistance to the authority of the school system. The pupils' resistance is experienced paradoxically as true learning, affirmation, appropriation, and a form of resistance. Willis's fieldwork exhibits not the formal curriculum of a school's structure (which is most important in determining the reproduction of class relations in schools) but the hidden curriculum of pupils' resistances (which must be understood if the dynamic of social and cultural reproduction is to be explained). That is to say, an understanding of the difference between a school's formal culture and working-class pupils' informal culture helps to explain these pupils' opposition to school and their reproduction of their own class positions (1977: 22-23).

Although heterosexual hegemony is strong, counter discourse will gradually take effect and more people will watch out for queer teachers and reflect on queer issues in the school field. As Giroux (2001: 61) mentioned, white, heterosexual men in America not only have come under attack from feminists, gays, lesbians, and various subaltern groups for a variety of ideological and material offenses, but also have had to endure a rewriting of the very meaning of masculinity. He uses Homi Bhabha's statement—the manifest destiny of masculinity—in which "its hardboiled, tough image of manliness has been disturbed, and its blocked reflexivity has been harshly unsettled." (2001: 61) This shock to the system refers to the transformation of a cultural

configuration, and this transformation becomes a core mission for critical educators in the future.

Domination and resistance occur at the same time, and sexual identities can be limiting as well as liberating. Among the related possible strategies, affirmation of subordinate sexual identities has the effect of reinforcing a hierarchical system, one that solidifies sexuality into sexual identities, which can then be divided into those that are considered socially acceptable and those that are not. Rather than affirm sexual-identity categories, queer theory¹⁷ questions the need for them. Rather than legitimize minority sexual identities, queer theory problematizes all sexual identities, even though almost all queer studies in education adopt a discursive approach and propose some ideal principles. Rather than focus on the creation of a society that guarantees freedom and expression for all, queer theory focuses on the individual as the site of change. I confess that to make a choice is a real dilemma for many scholars. In my opinion, current queer theory's concentration on the deconstruction of identity is the result of a certain reaction to power, along with a reductionistic view of the possibility for change. Thus, queer theory needs to be refocused so that it can account for the realities of everyday life. Maybe Mohanty's argument related to resistance becomes more workable. In the essay "*On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberation Education in the 1990s*," Chandra Mohanty (1990: 185) writes,

Resistance lies in self-conscious engagement with dominant,

¹⁷ Queer theory challenges the identity-politics approach to sexuality and argues that categories of sexuality should establish a highly mobile desire that challenges our conventional ways of relating to our bodies, our subjectivities, and each other.

normative discourses and representations and in the active creation of oppositional analytic and cultural spaces. Resistance that is random and isolated is clearly not as effective as that which is mobilized through systematic politicized practices of teaching and learning. Uncovering and reclaiming subjugated knowledge is one way to lay claims to alternative histories. But these knowledges need to be understood and defined pedagogically, as questions of strategy and practice as well as of scholarship, in order to transform educational institutions radically.

IV. Conclusion

In this paper, what has preceded is a discussion and an explanation of the relationship among moral panic, the crisis of masculinity, and schooling. I acknowledge that the force of heterosexuality is huge; actually, gay teachers or other sexual minorities always seem to occupy a repressive situation when they suffer oppression from heterosexuality. Although I criticize masculine nobility in this paper, masculinity is not always negative.¹⁸ Willis (2004: 265) recently noted that gender meanings and resources are important elements within the articulations of cultural forces and practices that are resistant to the school. Symbolic structures of masculinity in male students' cultural references embody

¹⁸ Here, I employ Willis's idea of penetration: "social agents are not passive bearers of ideology, but active appropriators who reproduce existing structures only through struggle, contestation and a partial penetration of these structures" (Willis, 1977: 175). However, we should not forget the idea of limitation at the same time. Michael Apple (1995) uses the idea of contradiction to describe both penetration and limitation, and suggests that we should be wary employing a concept of penetration, which carries with it a sexist metaphor.

and give an extra force to school resistance. It is true that masculinity gives males an axis of power over females, but it also gives them a realistic basis for feeling at least some ambiguous superiority over other less successful males, such as teachers and ear'oles.¹⁹ This response has a definite logic, is effective against schools' attempted domination of students and staff, and establishes both alternative non-mental grounds for valuing the self and a solid, sometimes even formidable, presence for resisting discrimination. Masculinity and its reflexes henceforth help to organize the same repertoire of the defensive and the offensive.

Epilog

Readers may wonder why I have used Western discourses throughout the paper.²⁰ One important reason is that queer culture in Taiwan is represented as a translocal or transcultural phenomenon bridging multiple cultures' backgrounds; that is, queerness does not have a clearly domestic and independent cultural or symbolic system in Taiwan (Chao, 2000, Chu, 1998). Instead, queer individuals and groups in Taiwan improvise local performances from collected pasts,

¹⁹ Ear'ole' is slang for the exterior bit of the human ear; male students used this term to refer to a student whom they saw as always listening and never doing. As Willis (1977: 14) said, "the term ear'ole itself connotes the passivity and absurdity of the school conformists for the lads. It seems that they are always listening, never doing: never animated with their own internal life, but formless in rigid reception. The ear is one of the least expressive organs of the human body: it responds to the expressivity of others. It is pasty and easy to render obscene."

²⁰ I notice the idea of cultural appropriation: the appropriation of cultural meanings and practices can occur in different interpretations under different locations. My thinking comes from French cultural historian Roger Chartier. Chartier (1993) proposes a notion of appropriation that "accentuates plural uses and diverse understanding." Thus, using Western discourses to characterize Taiwan as a cultural appropriation presents some possibilities to transform, reformulate, and exceed what we understand currently. In fact, queer folks all over the world share feelings and experience similar predicaments.

drawing on foreign media, symbols, and languages, and queer culture in Taiwan is thus a hybrid of certain local or indigenous characteristics. In other words, queer cultural domains are not only intersectionally constituted within a single culture but also constituted at the articulation between different cultures. In fact, the everyday experiences of being queer have been caught up in the transnational interchange of material and intellectual commodities associated with the logic of globalization. Thus, whether on the Internet, or through the political discourses of human rights in emerging democracies, images of queer sexualities and cultures now circulate around the globe. I know that the tendency of globalization will also reduce the social and political signification of queer sexualities and cultures in different contexts. Thus, for future study, I suggest that we should place diverse queer cultures and geographies in dialogical relation in terms of the tensions and overlapping that takes place “within” and “between” cultures, ethnicities, classes, and so on.

Note: I would like to thank Professor Michael Apple, Amy Stambach and three anonymous reviewers for their powerful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and Curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and Power* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Beneke, T. (1997). *Proving Manhood: Reflections on Men and Sexism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of Postmodernism. In J. Bulter & J. W. Scott (eds.), *Feminists Theorize the Political* (pp. 3-21). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Chang, Y. K (張盈堃) (2000). *Gender Myth—A Discussion of the Ideological Reproduction on Textbook from the Resistance Perspective of Critical Pedagogy* (性別迷思：從批判教育學的抗拒觀點論教科書意識形態再生產的問題). Unpublished Master Thesis. Taiwan National Tsing-Hua University.
- Chao, A. (趙彥寧) (2000). A Reflection upon Taiwan's Queer Studies: From a Viewpoint of Cultural Production and Reproduction (臺灣同志研究的回顧與展望：一個關於文化生產的分析). *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in*

- Social Studies*, 38, 207-244.
- Chartier, R. 1993. Popular Culture: A Concept Revisited. *Intellectual History Newsletter*, 15, 3-13.
- Chiang, S. M. (強淑敏) (1998). *We Are Homosexual Teachers* (我們是同性戀教師). Unpublished Master Thesis. National Tai-tung Teacher College.
- Chu, W. C. R. (朱偉誠) (1998). Coming Out or Not: Postcolonial Autonomy and /Gay/ Activism in Taiwan (台灣同志運動的後殖民思考：論現身問題). *Taiwan: A Radical Quarterly in Social Studies*, 30, 35-62.
- Cohen, S. (1980). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Political*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Epstein, D. & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling Sexualities*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000). How to Build a Man. In A. Tripp (ed.), *Gender: Readers in Cultural Criticism* (pp. 109-114). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Ferguson, A. A. (2001). *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Fine, G. A. (1987). *With the Boys: Little League Baseball and Preadolescent Culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Franklin, K. (1998). Unassuming Motivations: Contextualizing the Narratives of

- Antigay Assailants. In G. M. Herek (ed.), *Stigma and Sexual Orientation: Understanding Prejudice Against Lesbians, Gay Men, and Bisexuals* (pp. 1-23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Giroux, H. A. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvery.
- Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Public Spaces, Private Lives: Beyond the Culture of Cynicism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International.
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T. & Clarke, J. (1978). *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: MacMillan.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural Identity and Diaspora Identity: Community, Culture, Difference. In J. Rutherford (ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, and Difference* (pp. 222-237). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hardbeck, K. M. (1997). *Gay and Lesbian Educators: Personal Freedoms, Public Constraints*. Malden, MA: Amethyst.
- Hsiao, J. J. (蕭昭君) (2002). Whose Knowledge Gets Taught? Gender Bias in Introductory Teacher Education Texts (國小師資培育教導的是誰的知識？初等教育教科書性別內容的初步檢視) . *Educational Research and Information*, 10(6), 19-43.
- Jackson, D. (1990). *Unmasking Masculinity: A Critical Autography*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Lee, C. (2003). *Murder and the Reasonable Man: Passion and Fear in the Criminal Courtroom*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Lorde, A. (1985). *I am Your Sister: Black Women Organizing Across Sexualities*.

- Latham, NY: Women of Color Press.
- Mac an Ghail, M. (1994). *The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and the Public School*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Mac an Ghail, M. (2000). "New times" in an Old Country: Emerging Black Gay Identities and (Hetero) Sexual Discontents. In N. Lesko (ed.), *Masculinities at School* (pp. 163-185). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- MacGillivray, I. K. (2004). *Sexual Orientation & School Policy: A Practical Guide for Teachers, Administrators, and Community Activists*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. (1992). Border Anxiety and Sexuality Politics. In J. Sears (ed.), *Sexuality and the Curriculum: The Politics and Practices of Sexuality Education* (pp. ix-xiv). New York: Teachers College Press.
- McRobbie, A. & Thornton, S. (2002). Rethinking Moral Panic for Multi-Mediated Social Worlds. In J. Muncie, G. Hughes & E. McLaughlin (eds.), *Youth Justice: Critical Readings* (pp. 68-79). London: Sage.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1990). On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s. *Cultural Critique*, 14, 179-208.
- Moose, G. L. (1996). *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Parsons, T. (1964). *Social Structure and Personality*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Peteet, J. (2002). Male Gender and Rituals of Resistance in the Palestinian Intifada: A Cultural Politics of Violence. In R. Adams & D. Savran (eds.), *The Masculinity Studies Reader* (pp. 318-335). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Phelan, A. M. (1997). Classroom Management and the Erasure of Teacher Desire. In J. Tobin (ed.), *Making a Place for Pleasure in Early Childhood Education* (pp. 76-100). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Rofe, E. (2000). Bound and Gagged: Sexual Silences, Gender Conformity and the Gay Male Teacher. *Sexualities*, 3(4), 439-462.
- Watney, S. (1997). *Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS, and the Media*, 3rd edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Weeks, J. (1985). *Sexuality and Its Discontents: Meanings, Myths and Modern Sexuality*. London: RKP.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Willis, P. (2004). Foot Soldier of Modernity: The Dialectics of Cultural Consumption and the 21st-century School. In R. A. Castañeda-Fernandez, H.A. Harding & T. Sorde-Martí (eds.), *Cultural Studies and Education: Perspectives on Theory, Methodology and Practice* (pp. 261-282). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Review Reprint Series No. 38.
- Woods, P. (1979). *The Divided School*. London: RKP.
- Young, J. (1971). *The Drugtakers: The Social Meaning of Drug Use*. London: MacGibbon & Kee.