

Homophobic conceptions of high school students¹

Carina Alexandra Rondini^{a*}
 Fernando Silva Teixeira Filho^b
 Lívia Gonsalves Toledo^c

^a Universidade Estadual Paulista, Faculdade de Ciências e Letras, Departamento de Psicologia Experimental e do Trabalho. Assis, SP, Brasil

^b Gestor e Colaborador do Conselho Regional de Psicologia 6a. Região (SP) – Conselho Regional; de Psicologia (SP). São Paulo, SP, Brasil

^c Faculdade de Ciências e Letras – FCL – UNESP/Assis – Psicologia Clínica. Assis, SP, Brasil

Abstract: This paper presents the results of a study carried on with 2,159 male and female high school students from three cities in the countryside of São Paulo State, Brazil. The data obtained by a Likert scale were analyzed by a multivariate statistical technique. Regarding the factor analysis, the method used for extracting the factors was the major component and oblique rotation method, in which the six factors obtained aid to interpreting the possible correlations among the homophobic views presented in items. The study revealed that moderate tolerance for gay, lesbian and transgender people in this young sample is a reality that needs attention of public policies in education targeting strategies for the deconstruction of gender stereotypes and eradication of homophobia, lesbophobia and transphobia among adolescents.

Keywords: homophobia, school, adolescents, homophobic conceptions, factor analysis.

Introduction

Until the 19th century, people with the same biological sex had sexual and erotic relationships but were not called homosexuals and therefore did not feel like homosexuals. Hence, in spite of the existence of homoerotic practices, homosexuality and heterosexuality did not exist as different ways to experience human sexuality. The word homosexual was first used in Germany in 1869 by Austro-Hungarian writer and translator Karl Maria Kertbeny. It was published in clandestine manuscripts written for the German government to fight the paragraph 143 of the Prussian Penal Code, which criminalized such sexual practice², arguing that

it was not possible to criminalize an “innate” and “natural” condition shared by many good men throughout history.

In 1880, Gustav Jaeger invited Kertbeny to write the preface of his book (*Entdeckung der Seele* – “The Discovery of the Soul”). Richard von Kraft-Ebing decided to use the term in 1887, in the second edition of his famous book *Psychopathia sexualis* (Haboury, 2003, p. 256). Thus, the term comes from the fight against the criminalization of homoerotic practices and became a synonym for disease until the 1970s³. As a result, we can state that homosexuality was invented historically as a category opposed to a norm (heterosexual) that is largely defined by that which it excludes. Hence, studies in the field of sexuality are expected to look into the simultaneous origin of “heterosexuality, homosexuality and bisexuality” and the discourses that built heterosexuality as a normative reality (Katz, 1996), thereby showing how they work for the biopolitics (Foucault, 2008) which is concerned with the management of individuals, populations and the control of “deviations”, which are based on the imposition of the superiority of heterosexuality with respect to the other forms of expression of human sexuality.

Hence, the definition of homosexuality, as well as those of sexuality and heterosexuality, varies according to culture and historical period. Mexican psychologist Marina Castañeda (2007, p. 24) states that:

1 The research project was approved by a public notice issued in 2007 within the Cooperation Agreement PN-DST/AIDS – SVS/Ministry of Health/IBRD/UNODC (project ad/bra/03/h34 – loan agreement IBRD 4713-BR). The project has been developed through a partnership between the following institutions: the NGO NEPS (*Núcleo de Estudos e Pesquisas sobre as Sexualidades* – “Center for Studies and Researches about Sexualities”) and the *Grupo de Estudos e Pesquisas sobre as Sexualidades* – GEPS (“Group of Studies and Research on Sexualities”) linked to the Department of Clinical Psychology of UNESP – Assis.

* Corresponding address: carina@assis.unesp.br

2 According to David Halperin, the efforts of Kertbeny were in vain: “the new Criminal Code of the North German Federation maintained the ancient German law in its article 152, which was incorporated, in 1871, into the new Code of the German Empire in its well-known Paragraph 175, which started criminalizing the ‘obscenities against nature’ among men” (Haboury apud Halperin, 2003, p. 256). From efforts of Magnus Hirschfeld, well-known sexologist who was born in Berlin, this paragraph was suppressed in 1929. But, in 1933, with the rise of Nazism, it was retrieved, causing the death of thousands of gay people on concentration camps. This law changed in 1969, but it was suppressed only in 1994, in the second reunification of the German State, which led to another legal reform.

3 In December 15 1973, the board of the *American Psychiatric Association* (APA) voted to suppress homosexuality from the International Classification of Diseases (ICD). Thirteen of the fifteen members were in favor of it. The decision was contested by many psychiatrists, who demanded its annulation or a referendum.

The question “who is homosexual?” always leads to great debates. In the 1970s and 1980s, the Gay Liberation Movement proposed the liberation not only of a specific population, but of the homosexual in each of us. It stipulated the existence of a natural bisexuality, inherent to all human beings. This bisexuality is circumscribed and repressed by heterosexual socialization. The goal was then to liberate not only the homosexuals, but society as a whole. This program was modified throughout the 1990s. The gay associations from developed countries focused on a much more limited goal, adopting an ethnic model for homosexuality. From this perspective, homosexuals constitute a community, and as every oppressed minority, it should have the same rights as the majority and maintain its own cultural identity at the same time. More recently, the Queer Movement proposed the abolition of all these categories, arguing that any classification based on sexuality or even on gender derives from an essentially repressive social discourse.

Consequently, no sexual identity is given from birth, not even a heterosexual identity. Every sexual identity is socially, historically, politically and culturally built. However, many socially built discourses – such as the religious discourse, the medical discourse from the 19th century (which is still valid for many subjects), the legal discourse and the educational discourse – lead us to believe that heterosexuality is natural, normal, predominant and, in the case of Christian countries, the only identity blessed by God.

With the concept of device, Foucault (2008) allows us to see that the device is strategic, i.e., it is created so that an ideology, a process, a system can prevail, which is organized into a network and establishes relationships between heterogeneous elements, the aim being to solve specific problems. Thus, the device of sexuality creates sex and sexuality, but it presents them as realities which are “natural to the body”. As a result, Butler (2003) states that there is a system of sex/gender/desire/sexual practices that makes us believe in the existence of a linear relationship between these elements, when in reality there is no natural relationship between them. Consequently, when XY (male) is born, it is naturally believed that this individual is masculine and that his desire (and practice) is heterosexual, i.e., aimed at a person with the opposite biological sex (female) and vice-versa. Any option different from that will be categorized as deviation, pathology, perversion, anormality. This system is regulated by the heteronormativity engendered by the sexuality device, transformed into truth. From that status, the discourses are organized, such as the scientific, mediatic, artistic and religious discourses, for the device that is, in short, “a decidedly heterogeneous ensemble that encloses discourses, institutions, architectonic conditions, laws,

administrative measures and actions, scientific statements, philosophic, moral or philanthropic propositions,” in such a way that “the despotic constitutes the net that is tied between these elements” (Foucault, 2008, p. 244).

We understand heteronormativity as:

the reproduction of heterosexual practices and codes, supported by monogamous marriage, romantic love, marital fidelity, constitution of family (father-mother-children). Among the implications of the word, we find compulsory heterosexism, which is an imperative unquestioned and unquestionable by all society members, in order to reinforce or legitimize heterosexual practices. (Foster, 2001, p. 19)

Foucault (1988) helps us understand that, since the 19th century, we have lived under a “heteronormative dictatorship” expressed by the device of sexuality, which uses homophobia as a way to maintain its control.

The purpose of the idea of a heteronormative dictatorship is to show that the hypothesis that homophobia is the result of a same “truth” about sexuality, which was born centuries ago, and is based on the superiority of the male over the female (machismo) and heterocentrism; two naturalist principles that enclose the paradigm of male dominance (Bourdieu, 1996).

Since the Middle Ages, scientific, philosophical and religious discourses have constructed the belief that there is a superiority of the man/male over the woman/female, and consequently over all that is related to the latter. This idea is called sexism or machismo.

Heterocentrism is a way to think, act and feel that uses heterosexuality as a reference for desires, ideals, principles and values, which in its turn produces a feeling of superiority with respect to all other manifestations of sexual orientation. Heterosexism comes from this paradigm and defines heterosexual orientation as “normal,” correct, “true,” being therefore superior to all other sexual orientations.

As a result, the heteronormative dictatorship has the function of “normalizing” the relationships between the sexes and genres both through sexism – which oppresses women and the feminine through the viriarchy, forcing men to position themselves in the territory of masculinity and women in the territory of femininity – and heterosexism, which is sexual oppression with respect to other sexual orientations.

Therefore, homophobia⁴ is a result of these two processes. It is a defense/attack/interdiction aimed at

4 We understand that the concept of homophobia has been problematized by many researchers (Welzer-Lang, 2001; Junqueira, 2007) and activists who consider that it homogenizes the other forms of violence suffered by other dissents from the heteronormative standard, such as that suffered by lesbian women (lesbophobia) and by transsexual and transvestite men and women (transphobia). We agree with this, and whenever appropriate we will use these conceptual specificities to the detriment of the homophobia concept, which in this article is more useful to analyze the device

removing any questioning or shaking from the paradigm of male dominance, which is implicit in heteronormativity. It is not actually a “fear”, but a form of oppression. Due to the virile valorization of men and the submission of women as a rule, as well as to the heterosexual norm, it affects everyone who has sexual/affective relationships that differ from the heteronormative model.

Therefore, it is possible to understand that effeminate homosexual men, for instance, are victimized since they are compared to women in the position of receiver of the penis, no longer being a part of the virile universe. In this sense, it is understandable that homophobia also exists with respect to social practices that are valued differently, depending on the socio-cultural context in which they are inserted. Moreover, in Latin cultures and cultures with machismo, there is still the misunderstanding that the “true” homosexual is the passive homosexual (the person who is penetrated during the sexual relationship) (Silva, 2007, pp. 79-80).

Thus, the homosexual who is effeminate, and therefore supposedly passive, is the person who is insulted (queer, lady, fag, fairy, or *veado*⁵ in Portuguese). The insult is based on the “horror” of not fitting into the heteronormative logic (Rubin, 1989) with respect to sexual practices, genres and misogyny, for no one calls a lesbian a “man” or a “macho”. Even if it is said (macho-woman), it is not meant to offend her, but rather to indicate that she should not occupy the place of men. Being referred to as “macho” is never offensive, for it is a synonym of strength, courage and honor.

As for homosexual women, especially when “masculinized”, they are victimized for not fulfilling their role of being available to men, since it is believed that they will not fulfill their role as reproductive beings and that they are not accepted in the virile universe because they do not have a penis. Moreover, by identifying themselves as lesbians, they assume an active position with respect to their sexual desire, a behavior expected only for the standards of a hegemonic masculinity, and thus they are repelled by men and other women for not being silent about the supposed feminine passivity, in addition to affirming, through their sexual practice, that they do not need men (the biological owner of the penis) to obtain sexual pleasure.

Therefore, homophobia is an ensemble of practices, beliefs, dogmas, ideologies and discourses that aim at driving away/excluding/discriminating any manifestation that differs from the heterosexual norms applied to sexual practices or gender. It is part of the social discourse and the constitution of the subjectivity of all of us, regardless of our gender or sexual practices and orientation. Given

of control of sexualities than specific violence.

5 According to Silva (2007, p. 80) based on the studies of Green (2000), the Portuguese term *veado* “is an adaptation of the French word *biche* (doe), the female deer; the popular perception associated it to the animal deer since it considers it to be the most fragile, delicate and effeminate member of the fauna” (Parker, 1991).

its level of exposure (and of imposition), we assimilate it without realizing it and it becomes “naturalized” in us. “It becomes an implicit and unconscious value, generating immediate, automatic and apparently instinctive reactions” (Castañeda, 2007, p. 146).

Lastly, it is worth mentioning that it is not just the issues related to homosexuality that are hard to discuss within the context analyzed in this article – teaching institutions –, but sexuality as a whole. School education, as a part of the device of sexuality and an agent of control and normalization, puts school in a privileged place to teach the models of gender and sex hygiene, and consequently to impose a heteronormative culture. Junqueira (2009) reminds us of studies performed in many state capitals of Brazil during the LGBT Pride Parades⁶ (Carrara, Ramos, Simões, & Facchini, 2006; Prado, Rodrigues & Machado, 2006) where gays and lesbians affirmed that school is one of the worst institutional spaces with respect to homophobia. Nardi (2010, p. 157) complements this by saying that the efforts to fight homophobia in Brazilian schools are isolated experiences, and “there is no dissemination of this discussion in Brazilian schools as a whole”.

With all the school violence that we see through media outlets, Nardi (2010) discusses the double-edged sword that is the device, suggesting that we also consider school a fundamental place of access to equal rights, highlighting the property of rights as a component of the device of sexuality from the school. According to him:

Education, as an institution that became democratized during the 20th century and is singled out as a privileged place for building citizenship and a space to go from the private world of the family to the public space of work, which now faces the challenge of transforming itself. (Nardi, 2010, p. 156)

We conducted our study in this sense, aiming to understand the opinion of high school students with respect to homosexuality so that we could analyze which beliefs and discourses guide them when expressing their homophobic opinions. Our purpose is to define which factors reveal indexes of homophobia, so that they can guide studies and strategies aimed at deconstructing the homophobic discourse and proposing an Inclusive Education, with equity and respect to the multiple forms of sexual expression.

Method

Our study analyzes a research project involving 2159 high school students from three cities located in the West of the state of São Paulo: Presidente Prudente (n=683), Assis (n=745) and Ourinhos (n=731). The survey was conducted in 2009 with the purpose of identifying

6 Acronym for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transvestite and Transgender people.

and interpreting/analyzing the homophobia constructs presented by the students.

Following procedures indicated by Pasquali (1999), the items were constructed based on national and international research projects, such as Abramovay, Castro and Silva (2004), and sent to experts from the field so they could correct the theoretical content.

After a pilot study conducted in 2008 with 108 adolescents, in order to solve possible problems related to translation, interpretation and semantics (Teixeira Filho & Marretto, 2008), the final instrument had 30 items in a 5-point Likert scale, in which the students were asked to agree or disagree with the statements and also inform the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each item.

From the 30 items that compose the research instrument, 27 items have a negative meaning, i.e., the agreement with the statement expresses homophobic attitudes. The other 3 items express non-homophobic attitudes, since they have a positive meaning, and for them the agreement is expected. The positive items are 10, 13 and 27, and for them the score is as follows⁷: CA=5, PA=4, A=3, PD=2, CD=1. The items with negative meaning, in turn, had the reverse score: CA=1, PA=2, A=3, PD=4, CD=5.

It is important to state that, although the research instrument went through a thorough construction process, with peer review and a pilot study, it was not submitted to any standardized validation process.

The sample is predominantly composed of female students, 1238 (57.34%), (Yates Correction=47.52, $p < 0.0001$). There was no significant difference in age with respect to sex (female average 17 years old, standard error=0.03; male average 17 years old and standard error=0.04).

Among all the schools that agreed to be part of the study in each city, there was a random draw (without replacement) of 50.00% of classrooms from the first to the third year. The students from these classrooms received explanations about the goals of the research and were invited to take part. Those that wanted to contribute to the study completed the questionnaire, which was self-applied and anonymous, during one class.

The project was analyzed by the Research Ethics Committee of UNESP (#547/2007), Campus of Assis, in accordance with the norms of resolution 196/96 from CONEP/MS.

To identify and interpret the factorial structure of the homophobia indicators, the data were submitted to factorial analysis. According to many authors (Hair Junior, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2009; Pestana & Gageiro, 2005; Artes, 1998; Figueiredo Filho & Silva Júnior, 2010), factorial analysis is the study of the inter-relations between the variables that are directly measurable (observed variables or items), with the purpose of finding a reduced set of factors (latent variables or constructs) (Field, 2009), which shows what the original variables have in common, i.e., it shows

what is more important or significant from a set of variables. Thus, the identified homophobic constructs (factors) will be able to help the pedagogical activities of the teachers. For Field (2009, p. 593), “the use of the analysis of the factors is exploratory; it should be used only to guide future hypotheses or to inform researchers about patterns within the datasets”, which is exactly what we looked for here.

According to indications from Pestana and Gageiro (2005, p. 490), we performed the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test (KMO⁸), 0.81, and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity, chi-square=14325.44; $p = 0.000$, to identify if the data were adjusted to the factorial model. To verify the degree of internal consistency of the items, we calculated Cronbach’s Alpha⁹, 0.82. The test for multicollinearity (highly correlated variables) or singularity (variables which are perfectly correlated) of the data was performed by calculating the determinant of the correlation matrix. According to Field (2009, p. 573), the determinant needs to be higher than 0.00001, otherwise eliminating the problem’s strongly correlated variables ($r > 0.80$) should be considered. For the data being analyzed, the determinant is equal to 0.001. The analysis of these measures indicates that the data adjusted to the factorial model and multicollinearity will not be a problem for these data.

The principal components analysis was the factor extraction method, its advantage being that there is no assumption of normality of the variables involved (Artes, 1998), which is appropriate for the Likert scale used in our study (Field, 2009). The oblique rotation was applied, since it was more appropriate than the orthogonal rotation. When the latter was applied, the transformation matrix did not provide a “symmetrical matrix”, as stated by Field (2009, p. 589).

Here, according to Hair Junior et al. (2009, p. 114), since the number of variables is between 20 and 50, the Kaiser criterion was used to find the minimum number of factors. In addition, the cutoff point of the factorial loadings – “how much a variable contributes to form a factor” (Field, 2009, p. 558) – was established for values equal to or higher than 0.50 (Hair Junior et al., 2009, p. 119). We chose to remove the items with communality lower than 0.45, i.e., values below the acceptable minimum (Figueiredo Filho & Silva Júnior, 2010, p. 176). As a result, items 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 28 were excluded from the analysis.

According to these criteria, the principal component analysis extracted six factors, which accounted for 63.03% of the total variance explained (Table 1). The amount of “non-redundant residuals with absolute value > 0.05 ” was below the 50.00% level indicated by Field (2009, p. 587). Here, this quantity was calculated in 52 (27.00%).

It is worth noticing that, although the general reliability of our data is considered good (Cronbach’s alpha=0.82), the reliability of the subscales (Table 1) or

7 CA=completely agree; PA=partially agree; A=agree; PD=partially disagree and CD=completely disagree.

8 For the author only values above 0.7 are acceptable.

9 Statistics that vary between 0 and 1, where we have reasonable internal consistency from 0.7.

factors was generally between acceptable and good, and in two cases (Factor 3 and 5) it was unacceptable. However, it is necessary to consider that the alpha values for each subscale is influenced both by the value of the correlations of the items and the number of evaluated items. Thus,

factors with fewer items tend to present lower alphas (Factor 5), while high correlations tend to present a high alpha. Consequently, Factor 3 presents a small alpha. Nonetheless, this fact does not disqualify the obtained factorial structure.

Table 1

Results after oblique rotation of the 6 factors extracted from the sample (Assis, Presidente Prudente and Ourinhos, 2009)

	<i>Item</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Loading</i>	<i>Com.*</i>
Factor 1: Repulsion to social life ($\alpha = 0.848$) Variance = 25.76	23	I would not like having a lesbian classmate.	0.789	0.584
	24	I would not like having a transvestite classmate.	0.778	0.715
	25	I would not like having a transsexual classmate.	0.770	0.701
	14	I would not like having a lesbian teacher.	0.701	0.500
	15	I would not like having a gay teacher.	0.679	0.589
	12	I would not like having a gay classmate.	0.510	0.471
Factor 2: Internalized homophobia ($\alpha = 0.866$) Variance = 9.19	21	I am afraid my parents think I am homosexual.	0.947	0.881
	20	I am afraid my friends think I am homosexual.	0.935	0.875
Factor 3: Repulsion to sexual intimacy ($\alpha = 0.245$) Variance = 8.91	8	I would never have sex with someone whose biological sex is the same as mine.	-0.844	0.748
	22	I would never have kiss/hook up with someone who has the same biological sex as me.	0.726	0.603
	9	I would never have sex with someone whose biological sex is different than mine.	0.712	0.531
Factor 4: Cordial homophobia ($\alpha = 0.687$) Variance = 6.98	18	I accept having a gay friend as long as he does not have a feminine behavior.	0.870	0.745
	19	I accept having a lesbian friend as long as he does not have a masculine behavior.	0.865	0.766
Factor 5: Heterosexism ($\alpha = 0.408$) Variance = 6.21	26	Girls like serious relationships and boys like casual relationships.	0.795	0.660
	29	Women need to be married and men need a good job.	0.699	0.585
Factor 6: Homosexuality and stigma ($\alpha = 0.752$) Variance = 5.98	6	Homosexuality is a deviation and needs to be healed	0.758	0.607
	7	Transvestites are mentally-ill and need psychiatric and psychological help	0.720	0.560
	1	Homosexuals are a threat to society	0.639	0.517
	27	I'm in favor of gays and lesbians adopting children	0.637	0.459
	30	I'm against the idea of gays and lesbians living together	0.525	0.509

* Communalities: "proportion of common variance present in a variable" (Field, 2009, p. 562).

Source: elaborated by the author

Table 2

Difference of averages per item, according to genre (Assis, Presidente Prudente and Ourinhos, 2009)

	Item	Global		Feminine		Masculine		t*	P-value	Size of the effect
		Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd			
Factor 1	23	4.05	1.32	4.12	1.27	3.94	1.37	-3.20	0.001	0.07
	24	3.62	1.52	4.06	1.26	3.03	1.63	-16.04	0.000	0.33
	25	3.66	1.48	4.06	1.26	3.12	1.58	-14.82	0.000	0.30
	14	4.03	1.36	4.02	1.39	4.04	1.33	0.33	0.743	0.01
	15	3.80	1.51	4.21	1.25	3.25	1.65	-14.66	0.000	0.30
	12	4.04	1.37	4.52	1.03	3.41	1.50	-19.22	0.000	0.38
Factor 2	21	4.11	1.43	4.28	1.34	3.88	1.51	-6.33	0.000	0.14
	20	4.01	1.43	4.15	1.37	3.82	1.50	-5.17	0.000	0.11
Factor 3	8	1.74	1.32	1.80	1.35	1.65	1.25	-2.71	0.007	0.06
	22	1.91	1.44	2.04	1.49	1.73	1.34	-5.11	0.000	0.11
	9	4.78	0.75	4.80	0.72	4.77	0.77	-0.93	0.353	0.02
Factor 4	18	3.59	1.37	3.65	1.34	3.51	1.40	-2.22	0.026	0.05
	19	3.47	1.41	3.76	1.34	3.08	1.42	-11.31	0.000	0.24
Factor 5	26	2.75	1.42	2.47	1.33	3.13	1.46	10.84	0.000	0.23
	29	3.06	1.48	3.11	1.51	2.99	1.44	-1.93	0.054	0.04
Factor 6	6	3.70	1.39	3.93	1.31	3.39	1.43	-9.15	0.000	0.19
	7	3.89	1.38	4.18	1.21	3.50	1.50	-11.44	0.000	0.24
	1	4.06	1.23	4.27	1.07	3.77	1.38	-9.11	0.000	0.19
	27	2.79	1.54	3.02	1.53	2.49	1.51	-7.91	0.000	0.17
	30	3.84	1.42	4.08	1.28	3.50	1.52	-9.37	0.000	0.20

* T-test for equal means

Source: elaborated by the author

To identify possible differences between boys and girls, we conducted a *t*-test for the equality of means for each item that composed the 6 identified factors, considering a significance level of 0.05. The results of this comparison are shown in Table 2. To verify the importance of the effect of the possible statistical significances, we

calculated the size of the effect, r^2 , “measure of the standardized magnitude of the observed effect” (Field, 2009, p. 56).

¹⁰ $r=0.10$ (small effect); $r=0.30$ (medium effect); $r=0.50$ (large effect). (Field, 2009, p. 57)

Boys and girls differed in practically all items that compose the 6 factors, except for items 14 (“I would not like having a lesbian teacher”), 9 (“I would never have sex with someone whose biological sex was different than mine”) and 29 (“Women need to be married and men need a good job”). However, for items with statistical significance, none of them presented a large effect. Medium effects were observed in only four items that compose Factor 1. These variations will be more detailed in the discussion of the results.

Results and discussion

Firstly, we want to mention once again that the goal of the research is to map the homophobic factors present in the opinions of the participants, without having to interview them. In this sense, we are aware of the methodological limits of the research with respect to the differences from heteronormativity that the participants could single out if they had the opportunity to “discuss their opinions” through an interview or focus group. However, they were given the opportunity to choose between totally or partially agreeing and disagreeing with statements that were often filled with explicitly homophobic values and opinions. Hence, considering that there was no total disagreement with any homophobic statement in this sample, neither a total agreement with the non-homophobic item, we can state that homophobia, lesbophobia and transphobia are actually observed at some level in the opinions of the respondents regarding the differences from heteronormativity, thereby providing a foundation to the factors that group these items. Therefore, we will base our discussions in ways to understand the possible reasons on which the answers are based. For that purpose, we will use the means of the items, and, in some cases its loadings, to compare it with other research projects on the topic.

As we can see in Table 2, with the exception of items 8 and 22 (Factor 3), item 26 (Factor 5) and 27 (Factor 6), all the other global averages are equal to or higher than 3, beginning their variations with item 29 – 3.06 (Factor 5) and reaching the highest average with item 9 – 4.78 (Factor 3). With the exception of item 27, which has a positive meaning, since it is a non-homophobic statement, among the other 19 items that compose the 6 factors, 3 items (8, 22 and 26) show strongly homophobic opinions, i.e., or CA or PA, while the other 16 items vary between moderate (A=3) and partial acceptance (PA=5) of not fitting into heterosexuality. Thus, although it is not possible to state that each participant is strongly or slightly homophobic based on this study, as each person can

totally agree or disagree with each item individually, we can still state that generally the respondents moderately or partially agreed with the homophobic, lesbophobic and transphobic statements presented. Next, we will discuss these impressions for each of the factors.

Based on the statistics used, the 6 items that compose Factor 1 ($\alpha=.848$) inspired us to refer to it as “Repulsion to social life” (Table 1), considering that all items are about the social life and social exclusion of people that do not follow the heteronormative standard in the school environment. When analyzing Factor 1 from the averages obtained for the items (Table 2), we find that the participants have a general tendency of considering the presence of a lesbian, gay, transvestite or transsexual a nuisance, even if only partially, as the general averages varied between 3.62 and 4.05. However, we highlight that among the female participants the tolerance of spending time with people who do not fit into heteronormativity seems to be higher compared with the male participants, since, for the females, we do not find any average below 4 for any item. Nonetheless, we highlight that for item 14 (“I would not like having a lesbian teacher”) the average was practically the same for both sexes, indicating that they would not be very concerned if they had a lesbian teacher. We believe the highest tolerance of the female participants to spending time with people who stray from heteronormativity may be related to the fact that, in societies with machismo (such as the Brazilian society), women are educated to be submissive to the male heteronormative gender, thus from an early age they need to learn how to deal with oppression and gender inequality perpetrated by discourses filled with machismo. Maybe this is the reason behind their higher tolerance of those that suffer sexual and gender oppression, such as gays, lesbians, transvestites and transsexuals.

Mexican psychologist Marina Castañeda (2003, p. 13) starts her book about machismo with the following sentence: “Just like so many women, I can say: machismo is not only something I know, but it is something I experience”. Machismo, as proposed by Castañeda (2003, p. 16), is a power relationship that can be learned from an early age and that is manifested through a “set of beliefs, attitudes and conducts” based on an excluding binary (masculine versus feminine) and on the “superiority of the masculine in areas considered important by men”, such as driving the family car, earning more money than the wife, etc. Learning theories show that for a boy to “learn to become a man”, he needs to learn, for instance, to stop relying on his mother and distance himself from the link and the identification he has with her (Castañeda, 2006, p. 59). The idea that relationships between teachers and

students are repetitions of family models in the classroom is well known. Maybe this is the why the boys were not very concerned with the possibility of a lesbian teacher, for lesbian women face the stereotype of a “macho women”, which would prevent them from projecting motherly relationships and reactivating the same dependent relationships that they want to avoid.

In Factor 1, the fact that item 23 – spending time with a lesbian classmate – had the highest loading (.789) and item 12 the lowest (.510) caught our attention. As a result, we can state that lesbophobia seems to have a slightly greater weight with respect to repulsion to social life. We believe that this happens due to the dispute of power in the universe of sexuality. In other words, while male homosexuals “lose power” when facing the heteronormative society, as their difference is still socially considered an “inversion”, i.e., being gay is a synonym for being “effeminate” – because the association positions them within a feminine territory – the opposite happens with lesbianism. Homosexual women whom are seen as “butch” end up positioning themselves in a territory of power (“in the position of the man”), and this is much more aversive to the biopolitical order of maintaining people who stray from heteronormativity than the opposite. In other terms, homophobia aimed at lesbian women, which we can call lesbophobia, adds repulsion to difference, misogyny, machismo and sexism, thus it is possible to infer that, in this context, lesbian women suffer two types of discrimination: for being women (which makes them vulnerable to misogyny and sexism) and for being lesbians (which makes them vulnerable for being different and threatening machismo).

Another explanation for us to better understand the lesbophobia suggested in the choices of this sample, and that composes Factor 1, is the fact that the sample had a higher number of girls than boys. In this sense, lesbianism may seem more threatening to the sexual “normalcy” of the respondents, showing a type of homophobia which is “internalized” by heterosexuals in their “unconscious bisexuality”. Freud’s proposition of a bisexuality which was inherent to the human sexuality affirmed that, according to Castañeda (2006, p. 53), “all human individuals, due to their bisexual disposition . . . have in themselves both feminine and masculine characteristics, in a way that pure masculinity and femininity are just theoretical constructions of an uncertain content”. Hence, the contact with a homosexual person and the possibility of being desired by a same-sex person activates the fear of awakening the homosexual desire in the person that claims to be heterosexual. In our sample, even though in a moderate or partial way, lesbophobia was present. In comparison with boys,

the rejection of girls to having a female classmate was lower, and similarly to boys, they would not be very concerned by having a lesbian teacher. We believe that the rejection of lesbian classmates is related to the fear of getting close to them. Since the relationships between classmates is horizontal, the contact with the classmate is greater than with the teacher, and the latter is more distanced due to her position as an educator and the ethical commitment of not having any erotic intimacy with students. In the case of girls, the possibility of being sweet-talked by a same-sex person implies the terrorizing question “what if I like it?”. As for boys, the discomfort may arise due to disputes of power, as the classmates would argue over the right to occupy the same spaces, play the same games, etc.

Research by Peres (2005) show that transvestites and transsexuals are those suffer most in school life, followed by lesbians and then gays. In Factor 1, the loadings show that transphobia is also present, coming right after lesbophobia. Items 23, 24 and 25 present the loadings that intensify the most the consistency of Factor 1. This reaffirms what was already discussed regarding machismo being behind the homophobic statements that lead people to have a “fear” of diversity and to gender confusion (Louro, 2004). We believe it is still very difficult for society to accept gender dissent exemplified by transvestites and transsexuals, as they do not fit into the intelligible system of binary comprehension (masculine/male and feminine/female) of sexuality. In this case, their sexualities are considered unnameable, despicable¹¹. Unfortunately, Brazil is the world leader of violence against LGBT people, and transvestites and transsexuals are those who suffer the most (Brasil, 2013)¹².

With respect to Factor 2 ($\alpha=.866$), we called it “Internalized homophobia”, as its items discuss the issue of an adolescent being mistaken for a homosexual person. The concept internalized homophobia (Castañeda, 2007) is most commonly used for people who experience not fitting into the device of sexuality and who avoid it for fear of social rejection. However, only 4.80% of our sample defined themselves as dissenting (Teixeira Filho & Rondini, 2012). Hence, why is it that so many young people, even though they are not LGBT, are afraid of being recognized as gays or lesbians? Spending time with people that stray

11 For Butler (2000, p. 155), “despicable here means those ‘inhospitable’ and ‘inhabitable’ zones of social life that are, however, densely populated by those who do not enjoy the status of subject, but whose designation of “inhabitable” is necessary so that the domain of the subject is circumscribed”.

12 Although governmental data collected from phone calls show the small number of transvestites reporting crimes, the data collected by NGOs show that transvestites and transsexuals account for more than 55% of the data regarding homophobic violence, and it is not uncommon for this type of violence to be expressed through murder.

from the normative standards of gender and sexuality may awaken homosexual desires in people that claim to be heterosexual, making their “internalized” homophobia start to fear the possibility of feeling homosexual desires or of being seen as a homosexual, which would mean the loss of their “normalcy” status (Castañeda, 2007). In addition, we believe that due to the binary and heteronormative logic imposed by the device of sexuality, it is common for these feelings to appear. In other words, heterosexuality is not sustained only by attraction of a sex to and by its opposite, but also by the rejection to a gender and a pleasure which differ from what one accepted for oneself. Thus, it seems natural that there is the division between “games for boys and games for girls”, “different physical activities for boys and for girls” etc. Construction of gender, therefore, means a great dose of rejection from the other gender, for instance: crying seems to be a feminine prerogative, as is taking care of one’s appearance, being “sensitive”, welcoming, not showing aggressiveness, etc. Any manifestation of characteristics considered specific to a certain gender, if manifested in the other gender, may be interpreted as a “tendency towards homosexuality”, and this must be rejected. From the interpretation of the loads in Factor 2, we see that the slightly greater concern is the fear that the parents might think they are homosexuals, which reveals that sexuality is indeed mainly constructed in primary socialization. In other words, the parents are the first to show the social rules and norms with respect to the behavior of men and women in same-sex and different-sex interactions as well as to the expression of their sexuality. Moreover, since the respondents are mostly adolescents, they depend on their parents financially and emotionally, which implies the need to satisfy their desires so as to prevent being rejected or expelled from home. However, if the same factor is interpreted based on the averages, it reveals that the respondents, especially the female respondents, seem to trust the fact that their sexualities are in accordance with the heterosexual norms of expression of their genre and desires, so they believe their parents and friends do not consider them to be different. Hence, they have no reason to fear that someone else may think they are homosexuals and therefore are not significantly afraid of social rejection.

Factor 3 ($\alpha=.245$) was called “Repulsion to sexual intimacy” and is based on the items that discuss the sexual initiation of the students. In this factor, the global averages indicate that the respondents had already defined heterosexuality for themselves. Although we are talking about adolescents that are still in the first stages of their sexual life, they certainly have already been submitted through the device of sexuality, thus there is already strong social pressure for their feelings and desires to be aimed

at heterosexuality. As a result, which is something that can also be inferred from Factor 2, even if some of the respondents are attracted to people of their same sex, many of them will deny it in order to be socially accepted. As Marina Castañeda (2007, p. 19) says:

We begin with a paradox: a homosexual is not always a homosexual. A heterosexual is. . . the homosexual does not move in the world with a constant identity. Their attitudes, their gestures, the way they start their relationships with others change according to the circumstances. He may seem to be heterosexual at the office, asexual in his family and express his sexual orientation only in the presence of a few friends. Or, during long periods of his life, he may completely deny his homosexuality and seem precisely the opposite: a Don Juan or a femme fatale, always on the lookout for new conquests. . . . Moreover, the heterosexual was taught to be heterosexual; since his early childhood, he was shaped for a role, a place in the heterosexual world. This is not the case for homosexuals, who frequently only realize their own orientation when adolescents or adults. Therefore, he did not grow into his role; he was not taught to be homosexual.

This quote expresses how difficult life can be for people who stray from the heteronormative standard. The feeling is almost that “there is no affirmative, no success” in society. In this sense, we need possibilities that expand the debate, explanations, and access to information for young people is required in order to deconstruct this supposed absence of affirmative places for people who do not “fit” in the heterosexual category. It is certainly not about inciting or promoting a certain direction for desire, but rather about not fitting it into arbitrarily constructed norms that control bodies and pleasures to discipline them according to universal interests instead of individual interests.

Factor 4 ($\alpha=.687$) analyzes the fact that the respondents accept the dissents as long as they are “camouflaged or in the closet”. The highest rejection was for female characteristics, highlighting that, based on the averages, girls seem to be slightly more tolerant of these behaviors than boys. The “Cordial Homophobia” discusses the fact that being close to a dissenting person awakens questions about our own sexuality, about our own conformity to the device. There is an unconscious fear that a certain curiosity may arise, a desire for the other who is “different” from me. This may threaten the “normalcy” status and consequently the superiority, the privileges and the social acceptance that heterosexuality has within society. However, in our sample, the averages of the items 18

and 19 that compose Factor 4 are intermediate. In other words, a moderate agreement was observed for the way in which gay and lesbian classmates behave, respectively, indicating an average (in)tolerance to dissent. This means that the participants would accept having dissenting friends, and the fact that this dissent is or is not evident in their social relationships within the school context is moderately significant. This acceptance needs to be better researched because based on it we can find interesting strategies to create programs and actions that minimize homophobia, transphobia and lesbophobia in schools, helping us overcome the presence of cordial homophobia. Christian humanism is commonly found behind it, stating that the homosexual person is loved by God as long as they do not practice homosexuality, which is understood as an abominable sin (Trevisan, 2002).

It is important to notice that the main aspect to strengthen homophobic cordiality, according to Sedgwick (2007), is the closet; in other words, when homosexuality is clearly seen by the public eye. Being a homosexual does not mean being openly homosexual, for it is possible to be a homosexual “behind closed doors”, without anyone knowing it, hence the acceptance of non-stereotypical gays and lesbians. However, the dissent of genre excludes the possibility of maintaining homosexuality “in the closet”, since male aesthetics and actions adopted by a female person and vice-versa indicate a supposed homosexuality. In this sense, it is understandable this binary logic makes transvestites and transsexuals more vulnerable to violence.

Factor 5 ($\alpha=.408$) correlates items with constructs that indicate heterosexual norms, i.e., generalizations linked to the way men and women behave, think and feel. Curiously, the correlated items show the way women should behave by indicating an unequal relationship between men and women, where the latter want commitment (serious relationship or marriage) and men want freedom (casual relationship) and financial independence (a good job), reaffirming the beliefs that they are “womanizers”, “independent” and “providers”. As we highlighted at the beginning of the article, machismo and misogyny strengthen the principles behind the device of sexuality, and they are the root of gender violence and homophobic attack on people who stray from heteronormativity. The belief in the idea that women are born with “maternal instincts”, and that it makes them more inclined to marry, to have lasting relationships, to take care of their children and their home reinforce their submission to the supposed freedom and to the absence of a family commitment that includes the masculine, which only gives the latter more power and social autonomy. After all, women have the role of taking care of their homes, men, and of being the householder based on their professional success. In the case of our sample, based on the averages, we see that both sexes agreed with the presented statements.

Lastly, Factor 6 ($\alpha=.752$), called “Homosexuality and Stigma”, gathers items that discuss the issue of the pathologization of the dissent from heteronormativity. Therefore, it examines how young people notice, “assess”, “judge” the homosexual person and homosexuality (negatively and/or positively). In item 6, the respondents had averages that indicate a moderate agreement with the statement that homosexuality is a pathology. We believe this agreement may have been caused by a lack of knowledge on the subject and by the internalization of the conception that heterosexuality is a normal expression of human sexuality, thereby reaffirming the superiority of heterosexuality with respect to the other forms of expressing pleasure. The lack of knowledge about homosexuality as a non-pathological expression of human sexuality reveals the influence of the hygienist discourses developed in the 19th century, through what Foucault (1988) called *Scientia Sexualis*. Until very recently, these discourses were fully behind the device of sexuality that uses the subjectification of all these young people (and all of us), making them believe that the dissent is a disabling disease, for instance, for parenthood. Although these beliefs were already deconstructed by current academic researches, we observe that they still affect religious fundamentalism and common sense. This is especially true in Psychology when we see a bill that tries to take down Resolution 1/99 of the Federal Board of Psychology that prohibits psychologists from treating homosexuality as a disease, and therefore it would be unethical to perform therapies that convert homosexual desire into heterosexual desire, as it was believed in the 1950s, although many research projects that followed this period proved the opposite. However, item 1 of Factor 6 has a global average of 4.06, which is not far from total disagreement. Although it is encouraging to see that most people do not consider homosexuality a threat to society, it is still worrisome, but not surprising, to find that boys believe less in this affirmation. The greatest part of homophobic violence and all the cases in which physical violence is involved are caused by men. In our sample, the difference between the average for boys and girls in item 1 was 0.5 higher for girls, which shows that there is still work to be done with boys in order to show them that homosexuality is not a threat to social life. Likewise, the homophobic relationship that is established with sexuality and gender can harm any form of sexual orientation and gender expression. Lastly, in Factor 6, the data showed that the participants tend to accept same-sex marriage (item 30), but they do not easily accept the idea of these people constituting a family through parenthood (item 27). In our opinion, this logic is reinforced by the belief in stigmas linked to homosexuality, such as the idea that gay people are promiscuous, the wrong association between pederasty and pedophilia, the belief that the sexuality of gay fathers or lesbian mothers will influence the sexuality of their children, and the belief that homosexual

couples represent a threat to the traditional family since biologically they do not constitute a reproductive couple, insinuating they are sick, deviant and unable to constitute a family or a relationship as a couple.

However, many studies show (Goffman, 1975 and Parker & Aggleton, 2001) that the stigma is not true for those that carry it (for instance, a person does not need to be heterosexual or homosexual to be promiscuous or a pedophile), but it confirms the normalcy of a few people aiming to protect privileges and “plays a central role in the production and reproduction of power and control relations in all social systems” (Parker & Aggleton, 2001, p. 11).

In the general context of the research results, even though we did not find significant differences between homophobic attitudes for both sexes, as shown in Table 2, that would justify the search for factorial structures specific to biological sex, it is possible to see that boys agreed more with opinions that confirm a rejection of spending time with people whose sexual and gender identities are different from those imposed by the heterosexual norm.

However, we would like to highlight four significant effects with respect to the differences between boys and girls in items 12, 15, 24 and 25. For these items, boys were more transphobic than girls. We believe this is mostly due to the difficulty in dealing with not fitting into the genre established for a specific biological sex, in addition to dealing with homosexuality. This could possibly be explained by the fact that the image of a transvestite or transsexual are images of the feminine, and for boys it may symbolize a place of submission, since “the man puts himself in the place of the woman”, i.e., in a position which is “inferior” to the masculine, one that favors misogynistic behaviors and attitudes. Even though the statement does not specify if it is about male or female transsexuals, it is usually presumed that transsexuals are female¹³ due to the social invisibility of male transsexuals. Obviously there are male transsexuals, but according to the social imaginary “only the man” can become a transsexual woman and not the opposite, as women lack the “organ that defines manhood”, which is supposedly the penis.

Girls, in their turn, may see female transvestites and transsexuals as a “threat to other women”, who despite being anomalous in their imaginaries, compete over men in an androcentric context such as in our society, which values the image of the man as a position of privilege, power and status. One of the strategies to maintain the heterosexual order is to preserve male dominance by encouraging women disunity, competition and rivalry

13 To respect the fight of the social movements of transsexual people, we did not adopt the medical classification that considers biological and/or genital sex more important than gender identity. Thus, when we say “female transsexual”, we are referring to people who are born with male genitalia but who identify themselves with the female gender, and vice-versa for male transsexuals.

(envy) to the benefit of men (Toledo & Teixeira Filho, 2010).

Final considerations

The data presented are a warning and cause for reflection, as although the sample showed a moderate tolerance to homosexuality within the listed factors, we still hoped that homosexuality could be considered a manifestation of desire that is as common as heterosexuality, thus being unconditionally accepted by society. Apparently, although homosexuality is frequently discussed on media outlets, the city of São Paulo hosts the largest LGBTTT Parade of the world and same-sex marriage is a right, there is still prejudice in the school contexts. This prejudice can be explained by the insignificant amount (and lack of quality) of public policies aimed at minimizing homophobia, transphobia and lesbophobia in schools. Research by Lionço & Diniz (2009) reveal more frightening data: sexualities that differ from the heteronormative model are treated with disdain or considered invisible (although they are part of the socio-historical and economic scenarios of the country) in textbooks and dictionaries distributed by the Ministry of Education to public schools in Brazil.

In the countryside of the state of São Paulo, where the research was carried out, the municipalities and the state do not have planned actions to fight homophobia in schools. The few schools that implemented them depend on the isolated actions from teachers and/or partnerships with NGOs and extension projects from universities. In all cases, the execution depends on the “good will” of the school’s headmaster. In this sense, if a specific and planned action based on public policies is not implemented, it will take a long time before the results of this research change¹⁴.

In spite the fact that homosexuality was removed from the International Classification of Diseases in 1973, that in 1990 the World Health Organization (WHO) declared homosexuality to be a vicissitude of human sexuality – just as heterosexuality and bisexuality –, and that Brazil’s Board of Psychology prohibited psychologists from “healing” the homosexual from their homosexuality

14 Unfortunately, while the authors of this article reviewed it for its publication, almost all municipalities in Brazil voted to remove the concepts of sexual gender and sexual orientation from their Municipal Education Plans. As was widely discussed by the media, catholic clerics and protestant groups accused the Plans of being filled with a “gender ideology” that aimed at “destroying family” and the biblical beliefs that associate gender with the naturalness of the biological sex. Similarly, these concepts were also removed from the National Education Plan. Thus, in spite of the scientific advances and countless researches, such as ours, which show how urgently gender binary needs to be deconstructed (the root of homophobia in the device of homosexuality) in order to obtain a more equalitarian and fair society, it will take at least 10 more years to legitimate these proposals and avoid suffering and stigmatization. For more information, see Foreque (2014).

(for it is not a deviant and pathological sexual orientation), young people are not informed about this. Similar to the rest of us, young people are also under subjectification by the device of sexuality (Foucault, 1988), and therefore their genders and desires are constructed based on religious and biological discourses that are founded on machismo and misogyny. It is inconceivable that this type of information is not disseminated in schools, which should be a place to transmit knowledge, learn to think and criticize. It is not unusual to find teachers from many areas who do not know that homosexuality has not been considered a disease by Brazilian psychiatry since 1983. Similarly, although our opinion is that the experience of transvestites is still considered fetishism by the common sense, it does not imply that transvestites have more or less psychiatric problems than non-transvestite people due to the fact that they are transvestites (Peres, 2005). On the contrary, although they face hostility on a daily basis and live in a country that has the highest number of murders of LGBTT people in the world, especially transvestites and transsexuals, transvestites are sufficiently resilient to constantly deal with transphobia, and nowadays some of them occupy administrative positions, go to university and obtain a post-graduate degrees. However, prejudice and ignorance still seem to prevail in schools, which prevents access to information and critical and inventive discussions.

Based on what was analyzed in this article, the factors of homophobia may be used as reference to guide actions aimed at fighting it in the school context. In addition to variations of averages observed for a few items, we also found variations for the size of the effect for some of them. Similarly to a research project carried out by Venturi & Bokany (2011), which showed that homophobia is stronger between male students, we tried to understand these variations by comparing both sexes and realized that, in our sample, girls seem to be slightly less homophobic than boys for some factors. Thus, we saw that it would be important to encourage the deconstruction of values related to hegemonic masculinity¹⁵ with boys. As for girls, this work should be done with the values that justify their submission to the discourses of machismo, which puts them in an inferior position with respect to men. For both cases, it would be interesting to work with their “fear” and the lack of knowledge

regarding the non-correspondence of gender norms that justify their negative opinion regarding transvestites, transsexuals and people who present behavior that is expected for a different gender from what is supposed to correspond to their biological sex.

Thus, a Sexual Education Program in schools needs to consider the criticism and the deconstruction of heteronormative values that isolate dissenting people and reinforce the binary justifications to the cowardly violence perpetrated toward them. Unfortunately, based on what was discussed, we can conclude from this sample that, even though the school space is not democratic and inclusive with respect to free expression of genders and sexualities, there is still a long way to go so that schools can contribute to gender equality and equality of rights for those who do not fit into the heteronormative device of sexuality. If school is for everyone, it should be open to reconsider its heteronormative values, otherwise it excludes and reinforces the exclusion of millions of young people who do not fit into the gender and sexual orientation rules, in addition to producing citizens who are acritical with respect to sexualities.

Lastly, the more these subjects are not discussed in schools in a way that deconstructs the arbitrary and imaginarily constructed linearity from the device of sexuality among sex/gender/desire/sexual practices, the more we will see the growth of fear and rejection to diversity in the school environment. Similarly to machismo, homophobia, lesbophobia and transphobia are not innate personal attributes; they are effects of the power relationships that create “roles and characters that seem natural” (Castañeda, 2006, p. 19). Thus, we notice that accepting the existence of other sexualities that differ from heterosexuality threatens the privileges of the latter. Therefore, it is a game of accepting differences that also depends on the acceptance of equality, since accepting the different as equal is necessary for the end of the hierarchies between the many forms of expressing sexuality and genders. Apparently, the implementation of studies related to Sexual Education in schools, as proposed by Roberto DaMatta (1997), would also lead to the difficult exercise of accepting the differences which were constructed over privileges that need to be deconstructed. After this, equality of rights would be implemented in our society as a fundamental human condition.

Concepções homofóbicas de estudantes do ensino médio

Resumo: Este trabalho apresenta os resultados de um estudo realizado com 2.159 alunos e alunas do ensino médio de três cidades do interior paulista. Os dados, obtidos pelo uso de uma escala Likert, foram analisados por uma técnica estatística multivariada. Análise fatorial foi realizada, e seis fatores (extraídos pelo método das componentes principais e o método de

¹⁵ For more information about the concept, see Connell e Messerschmidt (2013).

rotação oblíqua) favoreceram a interpretação das possíveis correlações entre as concepções homofóbicas apresentadas nos itens. O estudo mostrou que a tolerância moderada em relação à homossexualidade dos jovens da amostra é uma realidade que necessita de atenção das políticas públicas em educação, visando estratégias para a desconstrução de estereótipos de gênero e erradicação da homofobia, lesbofobia e transfobia entre adolescentes.

Palavras-chave: homofobia, escola, adolescentes, concepções homofóbicas, análise fatorial.

Conceptions homophobes des élèves du secondaire

Résumé: Cet article présente les résultats d'une étude menée avec 2,159 lycéens et lycéennes provenant de trois villes à la campagne de l'État de São Paulo, au Brésil. Les données obtenues par une échelle de Likert ont été analysées par une technique statistique multivariée. En ce qui concerne l'analyse factorielle, la méthode utilisée pour extraire les facteurs était le principal composant et la méthode de rotation oblique, dans lequel les six facteurs obtenus ont aidé à l'interprétation des corrélations possibles entre les points de vue présentés dans les articles homophobes. L'étude a révélé que la tolérance modérée pour les homosexuels, les lesbiennes et les personnes transgenres dans ce jeune échantillon est une réalité qui a besoin d'attention des politiques publiques en matière d'éducation ciblant les stratégies pour la déconstruction des stéréotypes de genre et l'éradication de l'homophobie, lesbophobie et la transphobie parmi les adolescents.

Mots-clés: homophobie, école, adolescents, conceptions homophobes, analyse factorielle.

Concepciones homofóbicas de los estudiantes de secundaria

Resumen: Este trabajo presenta los resultados de un estudio realizado con 2,159 estudiantes de secundaria de ambos los sexos a partir de tres ciudades en el interior del Estado de São Paulo, Brasil. Los datos obtenidos mediante la escala Likert fueron analizados por la técnica estadística multivariante. Sobre el análisis de los factores, el método utilizado para la extracción de los factores fue el componente principal y el método de rotación oblicua, en el que los seis factores obtenidos ayudan a la interpretación de las posibles correlaciones entre las opiniones homofóbicas presentados en artículos. El estudio reveló que la tolerancia moderada para gays, lesbianas y transexuales en los jóvenes de la muestra es una realidad que necesita la atención de las políticas públicas en materia de educación dirigidas a las estrategias para la deconstrucción de los estereotipos de género y la erradicación de la homofobia, lesbofobia y transfobia entre los adolescentes.

Palabras clave: homofobia, escuela, adolescentes, concepciones homofóbicas, análisis factorial.

References

- Abramovay, M., Castro, M. G., & Silva, L. B. da (2004). *Juventude e sexualidade*. Brasília, DF: Unesco.
- Artes, R. (1998). Aspectos estatísticos da análise fatorial de escalas de avaliação. *Revista Psiquiatria Clínica*, 25(5), 223-228.
- Badinter, E. (1986). *Um amor conquistado: o mito do amor materno*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Nova Fronteira.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). Novas reflexões sobre a dominação masculina. In M. J. M. Lopes, D. E. Meyer & V. R. Waldow (Orgs.), *Gênero e saúde* (pp. 28-40). Porto Alegre, RS: Artes Médicas.
- Brasil. *Relatório sobre violência homofóbica no Brasil: ano de 2012*. Brasília, DF: Secretaria dos Direitos Humanos, 2013.
- Butler, J. (2000). Corpos que pesam: sobre os limites discursivos do "sexo". In G. L. Louro (Org.), *O corpo educado: pedagogias da sexualidade* (pp. 151-172). Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
- Butler, J. (2003). *Problemas de gênero: feminismo e subversão da identidade*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Civilização Brasileira.
- Carrara, S., Ramos, S., Simões J. A., & Facchini, R. (2006). *Política, direitos, violência e homossexualidade: Pesquisa 9ª Parada do Orgulho GLBT – São Paulo 2005*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Cepesc.
- Castañeda, M. (2006). *O machismo invisível*. São Paulo, SP: Girafa.
- Castañeda, M. (2007). *A experiência homossexual: explicações e conselhos para os homossexuais, suas famílias e seus terapeutas*. São Paulo, SP: Girafa.
- Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2013) Masculinidade hegemônica: repensando o conceito. *Estudos Feministas*, 21(1), 241-282. Recuperado de <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/ref/article/view/S0104-026X2013000100014>
- DaMatta, R. (1997). *O que faz o Brasil, Brasil?* Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Rocco.

- Field, A. (2009). *Descobrendo a estatística usando SPSS*. Porto Alegre, RS: Artmed.
- Figueiredo Filho, D. B., & Silva Júnior, J. A. da. (2010). Visão além do alcance: uma introdução à análise fatorial. *Opinião Pública*, 16(1), 160-185.
- Foreque, F. (2014, 19 de março). Polêmica sobre questão de gênero predomina em reunião sobre PNE. *Folha de São Paulo*. Recuperado de <http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/educacao/2014/03/1427935-polemica-sobre-questao-de-genero-predomina-em-reuniao-sobre-pne.shtml>
- Foster, D. W. (2001). Consideraciones sobre el estudio de la heteronormatividad en la literatura latinoamericana. *Letras: literatura e autoritarismo*, (22), 49-53. Recuperado de <https://periodicos.ufsm.br/letras/article/view/11823/7251>
- Foucault, M. (1988). *História da sexualidade I: A vontade de saber*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Graal.
- Foucault, M.. (2008). *Nascimento da biopolítica: curso dado no Collège de France (1978-1979)* (Coleção Tópicos). São Paulo, SP: Martins Fontes.
- Goffman, E. (1975). *Estigma: notas sobre a manipulação da identidade deteriorada*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Zahar.
- Green, J. N. (2000). *Além do carnaval: a homossexualidade no Brasil do século XX*. São Paulo, SP: Unesp.
- Haboury, F. (2003). *Dictionnaire des cultures gays et lesbiennes*. Paris: Larousse.
- Hair Junior, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2009). *Análise multivariada de dados*. Porto Alegre, RS: Bookman.
- Halperin, D. (2003). Homossexualité. In D. Eribon (Ed.), *Dictionnaire des cultures gays et lesbiennes* (pp. 256-259). Paris: Larousse.
- Junqueira, R. D. (2007). Homofobia: limites e possibilidades de um conceito em meio a disputas. *Bagoas: estudos gays*, 1(1), 145-166.
- Junqueira, R. D. (2009). “Aqui não temos gays nem lésbicas”: estratégias discursivas de agentes públicos ante medidas de promoção do reconhecimento da diversidade sexual nas escolas. *Bagoas: estudos gays*, 3(4), 172-190.
- Katz, J. N. (1996). *A invenção da heterossexualidade*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Ediouro.
- Lionço, T., & Diniz, D. (2009). Qual a diversidade sexual dos livros brasileiros? In *Homofobia & Educação: um desafio ao silêncio*. Brasília, DF: LetrasLivres, EdUnB, 2009.
- Louro, G. L. (2004) *Um corpo estranho*. Belo Horizonte, MG: Autêntica.
- Nardi, H. C. (2010). Educação, heterossexismo e homofobia. In F. Pocahy (Org.), *Políticas de enfrentamento ao heterossexismo: corpo e poder* (pp. 151-167). Porto Alegre, RS: Nuances.
- Parker, R. G. (1991). *Corpos, prazeres e paixões: a cultura sexual no Brasil contemporâneo*. [M. T. M. Cavallari, trad.]. São Paulo: Nova Cultural.
- Parker, R., & Aggleton, P. (2001). *Estigma, discriminação e AIDS* (Coleção ABIA – Cidadania e Direitos, nº 1). Rio de Janeiro, RJ: ABIA.
- Pasquali, L. (1999). *Instrumentos psicológicos: manual prático de elaboração*. Laboratório de Pesquisa em Avaliação e Medida (LabPAM) – Instituto de Psicologia. Brasília, DF: UnB.
- Peres, W. S. (2005). *Subjetividade das travestis brasileiras: da vulnerabilidade da estigmatização à construção da cidadania* (Tese de doutorado). Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro.
- Pestana, M. H., & Gageiro, J. N. (2005). *Análise de dados para ciências sociais – A complementaridade do SPSS*. Lisboa, Portugal: Sílabo.
- Prado, M. A. M., Rodrigues, C. S., & Machado, F. V. (2006). *Participação, política e homossexualidade: 8ª Parada LGBT de Belo Horizonte*. Belo Horizonte, MG: Prefeitura Municipal de Belo Horizonte.
- Rubin, G. S. (1989). Reflexionando sobre el sexo: notas para una teoría radical de la sexualidad. In C. S. Vence (Comp.), *Placer y peligro: explorando la sexualidad femenina* (pp. 113-190). Madrid, España: Talasa.
- Sedgwick, E. K. (2007). A epistemologia do armário. *Cadernos Pagu*, (28), 19-54.
- Silva, V. G. da. (2007). A visibilidade do suposto passivo: uma atitude revolucionária do homossexual masculino. *Revista Mal-Estar e Subjetividade*, 7(1), 71-88.
- Teixeira Filho, F. S., & Marretto, C. A. R. (2008). Apontamentos sobre o atentar contra a própria vida, homofobia e adolescências. *Revista de Psicologia da UNESP*, 7(1), 133-151.
- Teixeira Filho, F. S., & Rondini, C. A. (2012). Ideações e tentativas de suicídio em adolescentes com práticas sexuais hetero e homoeróticas. *Saúde e Sociedade*, 21(3), 651-667.
- Toledo, L. G. & Teixeira Filho, F. S. (2010). Lesbianidades e as referências legitimadoras da sexualidade. *Estudos e Pesquisas em Psicologia*, 10(3), 729-749. Recuperado de <http://www.revispsi.uerj.br/v10n3/artigos/pdf/v10n3a06.pdf>.
- Trevisan, J. S. (2002). *Devassos no paraíso: a homossexualidade no Brasil, da colônia à atualidade*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Record.
- Venturi, G., & Bokany, V. (2011). *Diversidade sexual e homofobia no Brasil*. São Paulo, SP: Fundação Perseu Abramo.
- Welzer-Lang, D. (2001). A construção do masculino: dominação das mulheres e homofobia. *Cadernos Pagu*, 9(2), 460-82.

Received: February 11, 2014

Reviewed: June 04, 2015

January 17, 2016

Approved: February 16, 2016

Acknowledgements

The project received reading suggestions from the following researchers and support in its execution from the following students: Prof. Dr. Pedro Henrique Godinho and Prof. Dr. Maria Laura Nogueira Pires (UNESP, Assis, Department of Experimental and Occupational Psychology), Prof. Dr. Arilda Inês Miranda Ribeiro (UNESP – Presidente Prudente, NUDISE [Center for Diversity in Education]), Prof. Dr. Fernando Seffner (UFRGS), Prof. Dr. Stella Regina Taquette (UERJ), Prof. Dr. Regina Fachinni (UNICAMP) and Elcio Nogueira dos Santos, MS (PUC/SP), Luis Ramires Neto, MS (C.O.R.S.A), Moisés Alessandro de Souza Lopes (PhD candidate in Anthropology at UnB), Maytê Gouvea Coletto (M.Sc candidate in Education at UNESP – Presidente Prudente).