

1-1-2010

Elementary School Girls and Heteronormativity: The Girl Project.

Kristin Myers

Laura Raymond

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/allfaculty-peerpub>

Original Citation

Myers, Kristin and Laura Raymond "Elementary School Girls and Heteronormativity: The Girl Project."
Gender and Society 24: 167-188.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Research, Artistry, & Scholarship at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Peer-Reviewed Publications by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

**ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GIRLS AND HETERONORMATIVITY:
THE GIRL PROJECT***

This paper examines pre-adolescent girls in a group setting as they co-constructed heteronormativity. We contend that heteronormativity is not the product of a coming-of-age transformation, but instead an everyday part of life, even for very young social actors. It emerges from the gender divide between boys and girls, but is also reproduced by and for girls themselves. In the “Girl Project,” we sought to understand younger girls’ interests, skills, and concerns. We conducted nine focus groups with 43 elementary school girls, most of whom were aged nine or younger. We observed these girls as they defined “girls’ interests” as boy-centered, and as they performed heteronormativity for other girls. This paper contributes to the gap in research on gender and sexuality from children’s own point of view.

Children navigate a world already ordered by a gendered binary (Butler 2004), with masculinity opposing femininity, men opposing women, and boys opposing girls. The binary is a power dynamic reinforced through situated interactions among individuals (Foucault 1990) and only makes sense within a heterosexual framework (Butler 1999; Fausto-Sterling 2000; Ingraham 1994). Women are taught to be opposites of men, socially complementary, because they are expected to partner with these men sexually (Jackson 2009). For women to “do gender”

* We would like to thank Dana Britton and the excellent *Gender & Society* reviewers for their thoughtful and expedient feedback on this paper. We thank Leah Koch and Julie Schroeder for their invaluable help in collecting data. Thanks to Kirk Miller for patiently reading and editing various drafts of this paper. We are more grateful than we can express to Diane Rodgers for her careful, fastidious counsel on this paper as we revised it. Her attention to detail is unmatched. And, of course, we thank the girls, their parents, and the school for making this project possible.

properly (West and Zimmerman 1987), they adhere to heteronormative ideals. They compel each other to follow prescribed heterosexual scripts (Rich 1980), continually realigning gender performances with them. This pressure is managed by all social actors—even children.

We know that children as young as one year old “creatively appropriate” gender from the adult world to fit their own needs, rather than passively accepting adults’ versions of manhood and womanhood (Corsaro 2005, 40; see also Thorne 1993). We also know that children wrestle with sexuality and desire (Angelides 2004; Renold 2006; Thorne and Luria 1986). Most studies of heteronormativity among children focus on *adolescent* girls and boys (aged 12-18), or on those transitioning into adolescence (9-11 year olds). It stands to reason that younger girls struggle with these pressures too. In this paper, we examine girls only, most of whom were aged nine or younger, interacting in a small group setting. We observed these girls co-constructing heterosexual ideals, reinforcing the larger binary in which girls are measured by their relationship to boys. In the “Girl Project,” subjects defined “girls’ interests” as boy-centered, and they performed heteronormativity with and for each other.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In American society, heterosexuality is the only acceptable sexual category, despite the complexity of human desires. Few people recognize the overwhelming pressure to be straight (Butler 1999). As Hyde and Jaffee (2000) write, “Just as the fish does not know that it lives in a wet environment” (291), so too are we unable to recognize the pervasiveness and effects of heteronormative messages. Martin (2009) defines heteronormativity as “the mundane, everyday ways that heterosexuality is privileged and taken for granted as normal and natural” (190). Gender and heterosexuality are also interconnected (Connell 1987; Ingraham 1994). Thorne and Luria (1986, 176) state,

In our culture, gender and sexuality are deeply intertwined, especially for adults; “woman/man,” and especially “femininity/masculinity” are categories loaded with heterosexual meanings.

Traditional gender arrangements—or hetero-gender (Ingraham 1994)—reinforce women’s sexual subordination to men. Jackson (2009) explains: “What confirms masculinity is being (hetero)sexually *active*; what confirms femininity is being sexually *attractive* to men” (152).

Children are hetero-gendered, too, although this process is under-theorized and under-researched (Martin 2009). In her study of preschoolers, Martin (1998) argued that “theories of the body need gendering, and feminist theories of gendered bodies need ‘childrening’ or accounts of development” (495). Here, we argue that theories of sexuality also need “childrening.” Being an appropriately heterosexual *child* is rife with contradiction. What “sexual scripts” (Gagnon and Simon 1973) exist that permit a child to perform desire? In contemporary Western society, sexual scripts are reserved for adulthood.

Yet, from a very young age, children are pressed into a rigid heterosexual mold. Martin (2009) shows how heteronormativity is foisted upon children by their mothers, who are themselves “enmeshed” (190) in a heteronormative culture. Mothers act both unwittingly and intentionally to reproduce the heteronormative order. Because mothers greatly influence children’s development (Corsaro 2005), children easily see heterosexual coupling and, ultimately, marriage as natural and necessary. Similarly, Hyde and Jaffee (2000) show how traditional gender norms and heterosexuality are co-constructed, influenced by four social forces: peer groups, parents, the media, and schools. Peers are “fundamentalists about gender conformity and view heterosexuality as a key component to the female role” (289). Parents assume that their kids are straight, and they reward heteronormativity. Hyde and Jaffee say that

media promote heterosexuality and demonize homosexuality. And schools affect kids through curriculum, teacher-student interaction, and the formal structuring of activities (see also Wilkinson and Pearson 2009). Under these concerted heteronormative pressures, most children conform.

Several scholars have noted the absence of children's own voices in the research on children's sexuality (Angeledes 2004; Casper and Moore 2009; and Renold 2006). Much extant research has relied upon adults' interpretations of children's behavior. This is problematic because adults often distort children's perspectives. For example, Martin (2009) shows how mothers latch onto even the smallest indicator of heterosexuality in their own children. Mothers may overlook any counter-normative behaviors because they view heterosexuality as fixed. Further, Renold (2006, 495) explains,

... there is a tendency to view children as just "playing at," "practicing," "trying on," or "mimicking" older sexualities and thus conceptualizing such heterosexualising practices and cultures as preparatory.

When we see children as "becomings" rather than "beings and becomings" (Renold 2006, 495), we fail to take them seriously and to some extent negate their personhood (Angeledes 2004; Butler 2004; Foucault 1990).

Researchers more commonly study sexuality in *adolescence*—a period of physical and emotional changes during which "sexual awakenings" are expected and normalized (see, for examples, Cavanagh 2004; Hyde and Jaffee 2000; and Welles 2005). Adolescence is described as a tumultuous transformation from innocent childhood to knowing adulthood. Adolescence has been shown to be particularly challenging for girls. For example, Thorne (1993) found that adolescent girls face "the fall," when they begin to define themselves primarily through the eyes

of boys. They lose confidence, start hating their bodies, and perform poorly in school (see also Evans 2006; Frost 2003; Garrett 2004; Hirschman, et al 2006; and McCabe, *et al* 2006).

Researchers have also tended to focus on the gender divide between boys and girls as generating heterosexual meanings. For example, Thorne and Luria (1986) showed that early adolescent boys and girls (aged 9-11) constructed heteronormativity differently. Girls in their study shared secrets to establish intimacy, making them “mutually vulnerable through self-disclosure” (183). Boys expressed “contagious excitement” (181) when they violated rules together. Contagious excitement was a sign that boys were “learning patterns of masculinity” (182). Similarly, Renold (2006) found that 9-11 year olds “practice heterosexuality” in ways that both subvert and maintain heteronormativity. Kids’ discussions of romance also revealed contradictory forces: romance was feminized and shunned by boys yet embraced by girls.

In this paper, we contend that heteronormativity is not only the product of a coming-of-age transformation. Instead, it is an everyday part of life, even for very young social actors. It does not only emerge from the gender divide, but is also reproduced by and for girls themselves. Researchers have studied sex segregated groups of boys for years, providing great insight into the interconnections of gender and sexuality (Connell 2001, 2005; Kimmel 2006; Kimmel and Mahler 2003; Messner 1990; Messner et al, 2000). For example, Connell (2005, 15) argues, “Heterosexuality is learnt, and the learning, for boys, is an important site of the construction of masculinity.” We argue that the same is true for femininity among girls. Girls are not a monolithic, mono-gendered group. They co-construct heteronormative meanings in a situated context.

We follow Renold (2006) and Casper and Moore (2009), who urge us to study younger children from their own point of view. Here, we observed a group of elementary school-aged

girls, most of whom were 9 or younger, co-constructing heteronormativity. These girls performed heterosexual desire for each other, framing “girls’ interests” as boy-centered.

METHODOLOGY

To collect data, Kristen Myers recruited and trained three students (two undergraduates and one graduate student, Laura Raymond) who were interested in qualitative research and gender. We approached a local elementary school, which was established as a “partnership school” with our university. One purpose of the partnership was to facilitate a relationship between educators and research practitioners. The school was in a rural, primarily white community (65% white, 12% black, and 17% Hispanic). The school was whiter (75%) and less Hispanic (4%) than the larger community. The school was less poor than the community: 26% of the children were categorized as low income (receiving public aid) as compared to 37% percent district-wide. About 250 children attended this school, approximately half of whom were girls.

Kristen’s two daughters attended this school, giving her access to the Principal, faculty, and parents (Adler and Adler1998). With consent from the school, we approached parents of all girls in Kindergarten to 5th grade. With parental consent, and girls’ assent, we collected data in several different ways. First, we conducted age-appropriate focus groups with 43 girls, to discover their interests, how they spent their time, and what they liked in school. Focus groups were intended to be exploratory, to be used in constructing a face-to-face interview schedule (Fern 2001; Morgan 1996). Though Kristen later conducted face-to-face interviews with 15 of the girls, these did not contradict what we observed in focus groups. This paper relies on focus group data only because we are concerned with capturing subjects’ co-construction of reality.

The Girls

We designed our sampling strategy to ensure that younger girls—aged 5-11—were included. Approximately 34% of the total population of girls participated. The table below describes the age and race composition of the sample, which roughly reflected that of the school.

** Insert Table 1 here**

There were 4-10 subjects from each grade, and most of whom were aged nine or younger. Although the site was a “partnership school,” only four of the children’s parents were professors. Mothers’ occupations were largely feminized, including homemakers, teachers, nurses, and office managers. Fathers’ occupations were largely masculinized, including carpenters/construction workers, salesmen, and military officers. The families were primarily lower middle-class.

Our sample was not racially diverse, although it reflected the racial make-up of the school. In the findings below, all of the girls quoted were white, except for Mia, a 4th grader. White girls dominated most of the conversations. This pattern likely signified the larger racial regime of the school. Previous research shows that white girls tend to dominate inter-racial interactions (Goar and Sell 2005).

To recruit subjects, we sent home fliers with every girl in the school. The fliers, decorated with multi-racial graphics of girls doing activities including reading, playing guitar, painting, and dancing, featured the question, “What’s it like to be a young girl in today’s society?” The fliers stated that many researchers have looked at middle-school and high-school girls to see what pressures they deal with, but few have looked at elementary school, pre-adolescent girls. They also stated that we wanted to find out about younger girls: their strengths and skills as well as their struggles and concerns.

Focus Groups

Both Eder and Fingerson (2002) and Morgan, *et al.* (2002) argue that group interviews are the best method for exploring children's own interpretations of their lives. Forty-three girls participated in focus groups. We held three sessions for each group, because we could not get very far into the interview schedule in only one session (Krueger 1993). We also wanted these busy girls to be able to participate in at least one meeting. For each age group, the third day of focus groups was less structured, allowing us to observe the girls play together. We conducted nine focus groups altogether. Each one lasted about 75 minutes. The largest group had 11 girls, and the smallest had 5. The size of each group varied daily, depending on the girls' other commitments.

In facilitating focus groups, we used a semi-standardized interview schedule (Lofland *et al* 2005). We asked the girls to sit in a circle on the floor during our conversations. We opened by thanking them for participating, and reminded them that our conversations were "just for us." We said, "We aren't going to talk about anything that might hurt someone's feelings or embarrass them. If anyone says anything today that they want to keep private, we will all agree to keep that person's words to ourselves once we leave the group." We repeated that we would discuss the kinds of things that girls were interested in these days. The interview schedule included questions about favorite television shows, actors, music, books, teachers, extra-curricular activities, and friends. Following Thorne (1993), we asked about interactions between boys and girls in classes, at recess, and on television.

We decided against electronically recording the conversations, because we believed audio/video recorders would have distracted the girls. Instead, we spread out among them and took notes as best as we could. We shared our notes later, filling in gaps. Open note-taking also

allowed the girls to shape interactions. During moments of our preoccupation, girls in every age group took the opportunity to restructure our initial guidelines: they left the circle, danced, wrestled, dragged chairs around the room, and changed the subject. We repeatedly tried to reorganize the groups, but we were largely ineffective. Although we were adults—one of us a known parent—we were not truly “sanctioning adults” (Thorne 1993). As the children reorganized the structure, we were able to observe them co-construct their own order (Hyden and Bulow 2003). We agree with Thorne that research methods for collecting data on children must be flexible given the physical, spontaneous character of kids’ interactions.

We analyze the “group product,” or the meanings produced by the group as a whole (Fern 2001). We refer to “these girls,” in analyzing data so as to acknowledge the situational construction of reality in each session (Hyden and Bulow 2003). We note many similarities across age groups, underscoring our decision to treat the data as group-driven rather than individual-driven. We coded data in three-stages: open, axial and selective coding (Lofland et al 2005). This grounded process led us to claim that these girls co-constructed and performed heteronormativity for each other in the group context.

FINDINGS

We asked these girls about television, books, and music, and they answered through a heteronormative lens. Girls in each age group redirected the conversation to discuss heterosexual crushes, sex, and dating. Girls as young as 1st grade proclaimed themselves “boy crazy.” As we will show, these girls worked together to define “girls’ interests” as boy-centered.

Crushes

The girls came to the “Girl Project” focus groups knowing that we would be talking about girls’ interests. Our flier never mentioned boys in any way. Many girls, however, seemed

to expect girls' interests to include boys, and they were surprised when we did not ask about them. Ariana (3rd grade) introduced the subject within 5 minutes of our first 2nd-3rd grade meeting:

Ariana said, "Are we going to talk about boys, because if we do I'm going to freak out."

A couple of the girls shrieked, jumped up, and ran to the other side of the room. Ariana said, "No talking about crushes!" Kristen said, "No we're not going to talk about crushes." The girls said, "Phew," and came back to the circle.

These girls defined crushes as exclusively boy-girl. For example, when the Kindergarteners and 1st graders mentioned crushes, Laura asked them what it meant to have a crush. Caroline (1st grade) said, "If a boy really likes you they have a crush on you. If they *like-like* you, then they love you." The rest of the girls giggled nervously. The term, "like-like," was introduced and recognized by girls in every age group, indicating that these girls talked about crushes in their everyday lives. "Like-like" was part of their pre-existing vocabulary, informed by peer culture (Adler and Adler 1998).

We initially avoided discussing crushes because we thought it would be too embarrassing for the girls, as this interaction in the 4th-5th grade group implied:

Lila (4th grade) said, "I'm going to hide in a bomb shelter over there while we talk about [crushes]." Kristen asked, "Why?" She said, "Because I don't want to talk about this!" She was laughing and turning red.

However, we learned quickly that many *did* want to talk about boys, despite their initial protestations. For example, 15 minutes after Ariana's (3rd) promise to "freak out," she said:

"I want to talk about crushes. I just want to talk about that now." Kristen said, "We weren't going to talk about that." Ariana said, "But I want to now." The other girls

looked at us with anticipation. Maddie (3rd) said, “We can’t tell the boys though.”

Kristen said, “Ok, we can’t tell the boys.” Kristen put her fist in the center of the circle.

The others put theirs in. We promised to keep our comments to ourselves, and we all cheered, “Girl Project!” in assent.

These girls expected to talk about heterosexual crushes, and they were stymied by our resistance.

They claimed agency and reshaped the conversation. Before proceeding, these girls pledged to keep each others’ secrets, recognizing their vulnerability to teasing. They established intimacy, an important part of femininity (Thorne and Luria 1986).

Contagious Excitement: Affirming Crushes

As the 2nd and 3rd graders shared their crushes, they showed their support for each other through oo’s and ah’s, heightening the drama. Thorne and Luria (1986) say that “witnesses and kibitzers” (186) are necessary for the construction of heteronormativity. Ariana (3rd) took the lead, explaining that girls should go around the circle, saying who they liked, and who they “like-liked.” She wanted to start:

Ariana said, “I like-like Toby!” The girls around her started screaming. She said, “I have a big crush on him.” Alicia (3rd) said she like-liked Lewis. The girls screamed again. Jenna (3rd) said she like-liked Juan (more screaming). Alicia said, “That’s my brother! He is cute!” Morgan (2nd) said she “just likes” Clay.

At this point, the noise level was a roar. The girls pressed in on each other, turning the circle into a knot of screaming, writhing bodies. We researchers stared blankly at each other for a beat, and then began scribbling frantically. The girls played off of each other, feeding on the responses of their peers:

Audrey (2nd) whispered to Kristen that she doesn't like anyone. Molly (2nd) said, "Ooo Audrey likes Noah!" Audrey looked at her in confusion. Kristen said, "No she doesn't have a crush on anyone." Molly said, "Well, I like-like Noah. He's cute and he got his hair dyed blonde." Ariana said, "Toby's cuter." Kaitlyn (3rd) said she likes Brian. Ava (2nd) like-likes Luke, saying, "I think he's annoying actually. But he's so cute."

Some girls seemed eager to participate while others appeared reticent to claim a boy by name. As we went through the 2nd -3rd grade group, some girls asked to be skipped while they thought of a boy. Later, they often named someone that a friend had also named. Eventually, almost every girl said that she "liked" a boy, if not "like-liked" one. Most conformed to the situated pressure to attach themselves romantically to boys. Claiming to have a crush on a boy conferred insider status to these girls, even if a crush might not have been genuine and instead, perhaps, an imitation of another girl's crush.

One girl, a 2nd grader named Brooke, said, "I want to go last." She stood up, looking down upon her peers seated on the floor, and she waited until she had their attention. When it was quiet, she said, "I like-like Noah." The group began squealing, and Brooke held out her hands and yelled, "But that's not it!" She stood silently, grinning. The whole group started chanting, "Who else? Who else?" Brooke waited several seconds, and then announced: "Jesse." The girls rolled on the floor, howling. Alicia yelled, "Oh my gosh!" Morgan exclaimed, "I'm on fire!" Like Thorne and Luria's (1986) boys, these girls expressed "contagious excitement" when discussing crushes. Children are typically prohibited from sexualized discourse. These girls' contagious excitement may have signified a rebellion against that prohibition as they performed heteronormativity.

Hotties: Constructing Heteronormative Desire

The girls' language accentuated their performance of heteronormativity, particularly when discussing "their hotties." "Hottie" was their term for celebrity adolescent and teenaged boys, rather than boys they knew in everyday life. For example, Anastasia (1st) screamed that *American Idol* contestant, David Archuleta, was "H.O.T.!", snapping her fingers after each letter, imitating racialized camp. The 4th and 5th graders got excited talking about the Naked Brothers Band, Zac Efron, and the Jonas Brothers.¹ The girls squealed and argued over who was the cutest among these. Megan (5th) asked us, "Do you want me to go get my hotties out of my locker?" Unsure what this meant, we said, "Sure." Megan ran out of the room. Amber (4th) ran out to get "hers" as well. Megan returned with a poster of one of the Jonas Brothers that she kept in her locker. She smiled and held it out for everyone to see. Lila (4th) grabbed Megan's poster and flipped it over to show a picture of Zac Efron on the back. Lila said, "See. He's much cuter." Amber returned with a small scrap from a magazine and showed her picture of the Naked Brothers Band. She said, "Look, aren't they so cute?!"

Their term, "hottie," had great cultural capital (Bourdieu 1999) among all groups of girls, and it was striking for several reasons. First, the girls argued among themselves over who was the hottest—it was contested terrain over which they competed by showing their loyalty to one boy over the others. Second, they used possessive language—*my* hotties—to mark these boys as their own. Third, the girls objectified the boys uncritically and with verve. Fourth, their hotties were celebrities rather than "real" boys—sex symbols created by Disney and Viacom and marketed expressly for their consumption (Martin and Kayzak 2009).² Fifth, hotties were always boys. No one referred to a girl idol, like Mylie Cyrus, as "their hottie," even though they

obviously admired her. Last, “hot” is an implicitly sexualized term, despite its common usage. The girls understood the larger connotation, and they applied it correctly.

Although the girls had no problem objectifying celebrity boys, the older girls mocked real-life boys who “hit on” girls they knew. The 4th and 5th grade girls described awkward moments between boys and girls in their classes:

Marissa (5th) said “Parker and Jason love Kayla (5th).” Megan said that Dustin asked Kayla, “Do you have a map because I get lost in those eyes?” Another boy told Kayla, “I could swim in those eyes.” Tyler told Marissa that she had pretty eyes. The next day he told her she had pretty hair.

The girls cracked up at these memories, recalling others as they shared them:

Evie (4th) said that a 3rd grader told Jackie (4th), “Do I smell fire, because you’re smokin’ hot!” Kristen asked, “What does that mean?” Emma (4th) said, “That you’re hot!” Kayla said, “Boys say I have big lake eyes.” Megan said, “But you have brown eyes!” Kristen said “They’re muddy lakes.” We all laughed.

Here, the girls were amused by 4th and 5th grade boys using cliché pick-up lines. Even though these girls ostensibly desired boys’ attention, they were not quite persuaded that *these boys’* comments were valuable. They indicated that such interactions drew unwanted attention to them. For example, the 5th graders told us about their field trip to the middle school that they would be attending the next year, when the kids were divided into groups of boys and girls. As the girls separated, the boys yelled to Kayla, “We will miss you!” Tom asked if he could wear her hat. He put it on and declared, “I have a hot body!” Kayla was embarrassed by this spectacle, even though it was intended to celebrate her attractiveness:

Kristen asked her how it felt to have boys treat her that way. Megan said, “Every boy is in love with Kayla, and they do it all the time.” Kayla said, “It’s weird.” Megan said, “She makes boys cry.” Kristen said, “You make boys cry?” Kayla shrugged and nodded. Megan said, “Because they love her so much.”

The other girls found boys’ reaction to Kayla odd and a bit fascinating. Megan seemed to envy her. Kayla seemed simultaneously pleased and disconcerted by boys’ attention. Boys’ treatment of Kayla tested the 4th and 5th graders’ valorization of hotness. They discerned between their highly romanticized ideal, where pick-up lines were “sexy” and desirable, and their actual lives, where real boys embarrassed themselves as well as the girls they hit on. In discussing boys’ treatment of Kayla, these girls began to recognize beauty standards.

Inappropriate Intimacies

Although these girls were passionate in their idealization of heterosexual romances, they agreed that some desires were “inappropriate.” The term, “inappropriate” was often used by these girls in their discussions, across all age groups. Although a few girls fantasized openly about kissing boys [like Ariana (3rd) who wished aloud that her crush would French kiss her], most expressed concern about the appropriateness of physical interactions between girls and boys.

Kissing had a taboo quality to it, especially among the younger girls. When we asked the girls about favorite tv shows, we learned that many of the Kindergarten-1st grade girls were not allowed to watch shows on which the characters kissed, but they all seemed to know about them. When asked about kissing on tv, the 2nd and 3rd graders squealed, “Ew! It’s gross!” Molly (2nd) said, “Kissing is gross!” Most said they were allowed to watch them, though. Ariana (3rd) said,

“My dad makes me cover the tv when they’re kissing.” Some of these “kissing shows” were actually adult programming, as Brooke (2nd) explained:

Brooke said, “I watch a show with my parents and sometimes by myself, but I can’t tell you what it’s called because you’ll be shocked.” Kristen said, “Just tell us.” Brooke said no, and put her hands over her mouth. Several girls yelled, “Tell us!” Brooke said that she watches *Sex in the City*. Alicia (3rd) shrugged and said, “It seems bad because of the ‘x’ word, but it’s not about that. It’s about women talking about their problems and stuff.” Girls nodded.

Brooke thought that she would shock the group, but, based on many girls’ reactions, *Sex and the City* was common viewing. These girls defended it as *not* inappropriately sexual—the “x-word”—but as gender appropriate—“women talking about their problems.” Thus, despite the programming being for adults, it was not “inappropriate” for them.

Most of the tv programs discussed were designed for young girls in particular. Martin and Kazyak (2009) have shown that G-rated media, although aimed specifically at young children, is actually riddled with heterosexual imagery. Even the Kindergarten-1st graders recognized that imagery in kids’ tv shows, and some found it inappropriate:

Mimi (1st) said she likes *Hannah Montana*³ because [characters] Jake and Mylie kiss.

Chloe (1st) said, “That’s disgusting.” She kept muttering this to herself. Kristen asked, “What’s an ok age to be kissing?” Girls called out: 13! 15! 11!

The most popular romantic programming discussed by these girls included Disney’s *Hannah Montana*, *Suite Life with Zack and Cody*, and the *High School Musical* franchise, plus Nickelodeon’s *Drake & Josh* and *Life With Derrick*.⁴ In describing these shows, these girls dissected not just the characters’ romances on the shows, but the actors’ real-life sexual and

romantic activities. They often confused the actors' and characters' names in doing so, showing how the two worlds melded in their perceptions. The 2nd and 3rd graders in particular critiqued the actors' sexual engagements:

Maddie (3rd) said that Troy (Zac Efron) took naked pictures of Gabriella (Vanessa Hudgens) and put them on the Internet. Ariana (3rd) said, "They are still on the Internet and I saw them. I saw her naked breasts and her privates." Girls said, "Ew!" Ariana said "Troy cheats on Vanessa with Ashley Tisdale, and he kisses her." Jordan (3rd) said that Vanessa cheats on Troy with Drake Bell.

Some of this is true: teenaged actress, Vanessa Hudgens, did take photos of herself in the nude; these ended up on the Internet after she sent them to would-be boyfriend, Drake Bell. But a lot of this was a free-form construction where fact blended with fiction, just as fictional characters blended with real actors' biographies.⁵ Despite their inaccuracy, they served as cautionary tales: too much kissing can have polluting effects.

We asked the 2nd and 3rd graders where they learned these stories. Most of them read about them on the Internet. A couple of them learned these and other stories from youth-focused magazines, like *Teen Beat* and *Nickelodeon Magazine*. Several others found their information in tabloid magazines:

Alicia (3rd) said that she reads magazines in her mom's bathroom that say that Vanessa is with Drake or Zac and that they're always kissing. Brooke (2nd) said that she was in the doctor's office and was reading a magazine and read the same thing.

Tabloids offer detailed information about the sexual goings on between celebrities, which these girls then shared with each other:

Brooke said that there was a picture of Zac and Vanessa with “a caption” that said that they were coming home “from lunch” (she used finger quotes). Kristen asked, “Why did you use finger quotes when you said they were coming home ‘from lunch?’” She said, “Because they were probably coming home from kissing naked in bed.” Alicia said, “Vanessa was walking home wearing only a bra and panties.”

This revelation triggered an eruption in the group. Girls began talking all at once. We could not capture everything said in this period, but we heard them say “French kissing,” “making out,” and “sex.” Audrey (2nd) said that French kissing is when you put your tongues in each other’s mouth. Molly (2nd) agreed. This content of this conversation was rather graphic, titillating and yet discomfiting to some. Trinity (2nd) turned to Laura and said, “I don’t think we should talk about making out.” Laura asked why? Trinity said, “Because it is about the three letter word” [sex].

In co-constructing heteronormativity, the 2nd and 3rd graders defined sex as illicit. Sex—“kissing naked in bed”—was gross yet provocative. Despite its allure, these girls implied that sex was inappropriate for them. They also declared it inappropriate for the teenaged celebrities who were actually having sex. Most Kindergarten to 3rd graders argued that moderate kissing was for adolescents, 11 and older. The 2nd-3rd graders insinuated that sex was for adults only. They seemed to have internalized adult taboos about children’s sexuality (Angeledes 2004), reinscribing these rules for themselves. Together, they regulated their sexual imaginings.

Dating

Girls reported that a handful of kids began dating as early as 2nd grade. They called their relationship “dating,” and some even went on “dates,” with their parents as chaperones. Each class had at least one recognized couple in it, and the 5th graders reported 3-4 couples. The 4th

and 5th graders were the most vocal about dating. What did appropriate dating relationships for kids look like if sexualized interactions were problematized?

As with romance, dating ideals did not match dating realities. Ideally, these girls favored traditional dating arrangements. Mia (4th) said, “I would never ask a boy on a date. I would wait for the boy to ask me. I would expect to go to a restaurant and to a movie.” Girls around her nodded. These ideal arrangements applied to older boys and girls, who could drive and had their own money to spend. “Real” dating for elementary school kids did not match these traditional ideals. As Mia said, “In ‘kid world’ dating is just an idea.”

Marissa and Megan explained that a 5th grade date means that you stand in line together, eat lunch together, and partner together in gym. Marissa said, “And you move your chairs closer together in class.” Kristen asked, “How do you know people are boyfriend/girlfriend?” Kayla (5th) said, “Winter and Travis are in love because they are always with each other.” Simply spending time together could mark kids as dating. But they also had to confirm it themselves: “We are dating.”

This was clearly new territory for most of the girls. Lila (4th) asked the 5th graders, “Do you really go on dates?” Marissa said, “No. You ask the teacher to move your chairs closer to each other. You play on the playground.” Marissa agreed: “You just sit by each other.”

These girls mocked dating relationships as not even being real relationships. Mia said that kids don’t even talk to each other when they are “dating.” Megan said that she knows a guy whose friends had to force him to talk to his girlfriend. Mia said, “That’s retarded. Dude, go say hi to your girlfriend.”

Megan said, “I think dating is stupid.” Marissa said, “When I am asked on a date, I say I’m too busy.” Lila said, “When I was in the 3rd grade, someone asked me out, and I said no.”

Kayla said, “The teachers know all about it, and they get involved.” Kristen asked how they get involved. Marissa said, “They ask us who’s together and broken up.” Evie said, “They say it’s inappropriate because they think dating is about kissing.” Mia said, “Exactly!” Marissa said, “But it’s not. The closest it comes to that is, ‘Uh, hi.’” Mia said, “That’s why I like Courtney and Nick [as a couple], because they at least talk to each other.”

Dating was paradoxical for the 4th-5th graders. On the one hand, attracting a boyfriend conferred status. Fifth graders made fun of girls (who were not part of the Girl Project) like Angelina (4th), who “could never get a boyfriend.” Evie concurred: “She has hair on her arms *this long!*” They mocked Emma (4th), who they claimed went to every boy in the class and asked, “Will you be my boyfriend? No. Will you be my boyfriend? No. It was ridiculous!” They measured each other by *the potential* to get a boyfriend. Girls who were pretty, funny, nice, and smart—traits that the girls thought would attract boys—had status, even though few of them actually had or even wanted boyfriends (see also Hyde and Jaffee 2000). On the other hand, “kid-world dating” engendered awkward interactions with boys. It exposed girls to the scrutiny of the class and the teachers. Most of these girls did not relish that position.

One night, Kristen drove Autumn and Evie home after a 4th-5th grade group meeting. She said, “I still don’t understand this dating thing.” Evie said,

I think I know what it is about. When boys and girls play together, they get teased.

Everyone says, “Ooooo, you’re boyfriend and girlfriend!” So you don’t want to play together because you’re embarrassed, because you’re *not* boyfriend and girlfriend.

You’re just friends. But if boys and girls decide to be boyfriend/girlfriend, then no one teases you anymore.

Evie, although only 9 years old, recognized the ways that heteronormativity constrained cross-sex friendships; being a girl meant playing with girls. Kristen probed, “So you have to decide whether you should be dating so that you can be friends? Or else you can’t be friends?” Evie said “Yes.” Kristen said, “That’s sad.” Autumn said, “I know. I don’t want a boyfriend unless I really like him. So I can’t be friends with Jason because I don’t like him that way.”

Some 4th and 5th graders managed these contradictory pressures by forming heterosexualized, boyfriend/girlfriend relationships. Once these relationships were established, these girls could feel comfortable talking to and playing with boys, or “scooting their chairs closer to one another” just to share space legitimately. They used heterosexualized terminology—dating—to validate their non-sexualized interactions: standing in line with one another, playing on the playground, and sitting together at lunch. Girls did not have to construct parallel scenarios to justify their relationships with other girls. Therefore, even though these boy-girl friendships may not have been entirely romantically motivated, they *were* shaped overtly by heteronormative pressures.

Gay Desire

We have shown how the free-form nature of the focus group allowed these girls to express themselves spontaneously. So too their views on gay desire emerged, organically. Take this excerpt from a 2nd and 3rd grade conversation:

Audrey (2nd) said, “Kissing is gross.” Jordan (3rd) said, “Joe from the Jonas Brothers is cute.” Maddie (3rd) said, “Troy (Zac Efron) from *High School Musical* is cute.” Most girls agreed. Brooke (2nd) said, “He’s gross and he eats boogers.” Jenna (3rd) said, “He’s gay.” Kristen asked, “What is gay?” Ariana stood up, snapped her fingers, and said, “It’s when a boy wants to marry another boy.” Kristen asked, “How do you know he’s

gay?” Kaitlyn (3rd) said, “My mom told me.” Maddie said, “It’s on websites.” Kristen said, “Are the websites true?” The girls all yelled, “Yes!”

Girls sneered, squinching their faces as they discussed homosexuality. They used “gay” pejoratively—like eating boogers—and they also seemed to know that it involved same-sex desire. Interestingly, these same girls discussed Zac Efron’s heterosexual exploits at length. Yet here, they seemed agree that he was gay.

Their discussion of Zac Efron’s sexuality could imply a queer conceptualization of sexuality. That is, rather than reifying dominant sexual categories—gay and straight—as mutually exclusive, the girls seemed to treat sexuality as fluid, evolving with each sexual encounter. We rather doubt that the girls were queering sexuality, though. Instead, the 2nd and 3rd graders seemed to be saying that no matter how many girlfriends a boy has, he is gay if he kisses even one boy:

Brooke said, “Zac’s gay.” Jordan said, “No he isn’t.” Brooke said there’s a picture of Zac kissing a boy online. All the girls responded with “Eww!” Alicia said that gay people who were kissing were breaking the law.

These girls seemed repulsed by the thought of boys kissing, even though this was only a rumor. This rumor was discussed in the Kindergarten-1st grade group too. Anastasia (1st) said that her brother (4th) refused to watch *High School Musical III* because Zac Efron was gay. Other girls nodded. Anastasia’s brother seemed to fear that merely watching Zac on screen could impeach his own sexuality, and Anastasia’s peers seemed to concur.

The mere rumor of homoerotic behavior threatened to contaminate the purity of heterosexuality. Just as “one drop” of “black blood” could contaminate racial purity in the eyes of a racist (Kristen), one homosexual kiss could spoil a sex symbol (Nielson, et al 2000). The 2nd

and 3rd graders searched for ways to make sense of Zac's (rumored) behavior. Alicia (3rd) mused, "Maybe he's kissing his dad. I kiss my mom [and I'm not gay]." They seemed to agree, nodding and mumbling assent. No one said, "Who cares if he is gay?" Instead, as a group, they reconstructed the rumor to deny any possibility of gayness, justifying their adoration of him.

Most of this discussion addressed male homosexuality. The girls *implied* that you could not kiss girls unless they were family members, but they did not seem as repelled by the notion. Take, for example, this conversation in the K-1st grade group:

Fiona (1st) said, "Chloe (1st) keeps kissing me in school! She kissed me on the back of the neck in line today." Chloe said, "I did, like this," and she crawled over to Fiona and kissed her between the back of her neck. Fiona said, "See!"

Fiona was exasperated by these kisses, but she was also amused. Chloe was her best friend. And the kissing clearly entertained the whole group. Everyone laughed out loud, and Chloe basked in their amusement. This girl-on-girl kissing was problematized, but it did not have the contaminating effect of boy-on-boy kissing, at least within this younger group of girls. We thought that, perhaps, these girls were more tolerant of intimacy between girls.

An incident several months later revealed that, while intimacy between girls might be acceptable, the concept of lesbianism was not. A group of 5th grade girls were engaged in a battle of loyalties during recess. Casie was mad that Lila was playing with Paige and Evie, instead of with her and Joanna. Casie told Joanna, "Lila is a lesbian." Joanna told several girls, and by the middle of the afternoon, Lila heard about it. She dissolved into tears. Both of the 5th grade classes were disrupted. The Principal called Lila's mother to come to school to pick her up. Casie received a week of detention.

This incident may have triggered such outrage because the girls were older—closer to adolescence and sexual awakening. Had they been younger, the use of “lesbian” may have been more quickly dismissed. We cannot know. What is clear is that Casie used “lesbian” in an injurious manner, underscoring her anger at Lila by harnessing its discursive power to cause harm. The adults’ reactions to this incident were complex and contradictory. On the one hand, they sent a strong message to the children that teasing someone about their sexuality would not be tolerated. They attempted to decrease the likelihood that others would use “lesbian” in this way. Given how many children are tormented at school because of their sexuality (Poteat 2007), zero tolerance of taunting is a good thing. On the other hand, these adults treated lesbianism as something so awful that teachers, the Principal, and parents altered their daily routines to make sure that Lila was protected from the heinous label. Chances are that as least some of these 5th grade girls may be/come lesbians. What did all of these girls learn about the value of lesbianism in society? They all were reminded of what they already knew: that the mere rumor of homosexuality could taint an otherwise “appropriate” girl identity.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Casper and Moore (2009) and Renold (2006) have called for more research on children and sexuality, from the perspective of children themselves. Although we did not set out to do either of these things, the flexible format of the focus group allowed these girls to take charge of both the content and form of the conversations. We were fortunate that they did so. They turned the tables on the interviews, reframing “girls’ interests” as heteronormatively boy-centered. These girls performed heterosexual desire being long before adolescence: it was an everyday issue for them. Girls as young as first grade brought their pre-existing boy-centered language to focus groups: hotties, crushes, and dating. These girls measured themselves and each other

according to their perceptions of boys' interests, even when no boys were present. All three groups of girls did this, with the 2nd-3rd graders—7 and 8 year olds—the most expressive.

Girls are not a monolithic group with a single, unified approach to heteronormativity. Some girls called themselves “boy crazy” and openly fantasized about French kissing. Other girls muttered objections to sexualized discourse. Still others sat silently, sometimes nodding, sometimes scowling. Discourse on sexuality includes multiple viewpoints, including dissent. Here, through lively and often loud discourse, these girls negotiated what was appropriate for them, integrating perspectives that were both more and less sexual. In effect, these girls engaged in their own “girl project,” co-constructing knowledge about sexuality.

These girls co-produced a fantasy world of romance and sex, but decided that world was closed to them. Romance and sex were fun to talk about, but inappropriate for actual kids their age. As they performed desire, these girls regulated their sexual imaginings in tune with adults' expectations for them, indicating their internalization of adult taboos.

Observing girl-guided group processes reveals how gender and heterosexuality are interconnected. It is unlikely that these girls had ever had any intimate contact with boys. Some of these girls might actually be/come lesbians. Yet, through their group interactions, they learned that to be an “appropriate” girl, they should perform heteronormativity for other girls (Connell 2005; Ingraham 1994). In so doing, they reinforced the gender binary in which girls are measured—and measure themselves—by their relationship to boys.

Although these girls grappled with heteronormativity before adolescence, they had not yet begun the adolescent “fall” (Thorne 1993). Clearly, these girls co-constructed fantasies in which hypothetical romances played out to their advantage. Perhaps adolescent girls fall when their fantasies confront reality, and the consequences are disempowering. Future research might

examine the process—not just the consequences—through which girls begin to fall. Perhaps then we could help re-empower them, fostering girl-centered-girls and minimizing heteronormative boy-centeredness.

SOURCES:

- Adler, Patricia and Peter Adler. 1998. Peer power. New Brunswick: Rutgers.
- Angelides, Steven. 2004. Feminism, child sexual abuse, and the erasure of child sexuality. GLQ 10:141-177.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. Language and symbolic power. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Butler, Judith. 2004. Undoing gender. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 1999. Gender trouble. New York: Routledge.
- Casper, Monica and Lisa Jean Moore. 2009. Missing bodies. New York: New York University Press.
- Cavanagh, Shannon. 2004. The sexual debut of girls in early adolescence. Journal of Research on Adolescence 14:285-312.
- Connell, RW. 1987. Gender and power. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- _____. 2001. The men and the boys. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 2005. Growing up masculine. Irish Journal of Sociology 14:11-28.
- Corsaro, William. 2005. The sociology of childhood. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge.
- Eder, Donna and Laura Fingerson. 2002. Interviewing children and adolescents. In Handbook of interview research, Jaber Gubrium and James Holstein, eds. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Evans, Bethany. 2006. "I'd feel ashamed." Girls' bodies and sports participation. Gender, Place & Culture 13:547-561.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000. Sexing the body. New York: Basic Books.
- Fern Edward. 2001. Advanced focus group research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foucault, Michel. 1990. The history of sexuality. New York: Vintage.
- Frost, Liz. 2003. Doing bodies differently? Journal of Youth Studies 6:53-70.

- Gagnon, John and William Simon. 1973. Sexual conduct. Chicago: Aldine.
- Garrett, Robyne. 2004. Negotiating a physical identity. Sport, Education and Society 9:223-237.
- Goar, Carla and Jane Sell. 2005. Using task definition to modify racial inequality within task groups. Sociological Quarterly 46:522-543.
- Hirschman, Celeste; Emily Impett; and Deborah Schooler. 2006. Dis/embodyed voices. Sexuality Research and Social Policy: Journal of NSRC 4:8-20.
- Hyde, Janet Shilbey and Sara Jaffee. 2000. Becoming a heterosexual adult. Journal of Social Issues 56:283-296.
- Hyden, L.C. and P.H. Bulow. 2003. Who's talking: Drawing conclusions from focus groups. International Journal of Social Research Methodology 6:305-321.
- Ingraham, Chrys. 1994. The heterosexual imaginary. Sociological Theory. 12:203-219.
- Jackson, Stevi. 2009. Sexuality, heterosexuality, and gender hierarchy. In Sex, gender & sexuality, edited by Abby Ferber, Kimberly Holcomb, and Tre Wentling. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, Michael. 2006. A war against boys? Dissent 53:65-70.
- Kimmel, Michael and Matthew Mahler. 2003. Adolescent masculinity, homophobia and violence. American Behavioral Scientist 46:1439-1458.
- Krueger, Richard. 1993. Quality control in focus group research. In Successful focus groups, edited by David Morgan. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lofland, John; David Snow; Leon Anderson; and Lyn Lofland. 2005. Analyzing social settings. New York: Wadsworth.
- Martin, Karin. 1998. Becoming a gendered body. American Sociological Review 63:494-511.

- _____. 2009. Normalizing heterosexuality. American Sociological Review 74:190-207.
- Martin, Karin and Emily Kazyak. 2009. Hetero-romantic love and heterosexiness in children's G-rated films. Gender & Society 23:315-336.
- McCabe, Marita; Lina Riciardelli; and Damien Ridge. 2006. "Who thinks I need a perfect body?" Perceptions and internal dialogue among adolescents about their bodies. Sex Roles 55:409-419.
- Messner, Michael. 1990. Boyhood, organized sports, and the construction of masculinities. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 18:416-444.
- Messner, Michael; Michele Dunbar; and Darnell Hunt. 2000. The televised sports manhood formula. Journal of Sport and Social Issues 24:380-394.
- Morgan, David. 1996. Focus groups. Annual Review of Sociology 22:129-152.
- Morgan, Myfanwy; Sara Gibbs; Krista Maxwell; and Nicky Britten. 2002. Hearing children's voices: methodological issues in conducting focus groups with children aged 7-11 years. Qualitative Research 2:5-12.
- Myers, Kristen. 2005. Racetalk. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Nielson, Joyce McCarl; Glenda Walden; and Charlotte Kunkel. 2000. Gendered Heteronormativity. The Sociological Quarterly 41:283-296.
- Poteat, V. Paul. 2007. Peer group socialization of homophobic attitudes and behavior during adolescence. Child Development 78:1830-1842.
- Renold, Emma. 2006. "They won't let us play...unless you're going out with one of them": Girls, boys and Butler's "heterosexual matrix" in the primary years. British Journal of Sociology of Education 27:489-509.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1980. Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. Signs 5:631-60.

Thorne, Barrie. 1993. Gender play. Rutgers University Press.

Thorne, Barrie and Zella Luria. 1986. Sexuality and gender in children's daily worlds. Social Problems 33:176-190.

Welles, Caitlin. 2005. Breaking the silence surrounding female adolescent sexual desire. Women & Therapy 28:31-45.

West, Candace and Don Zimmerman. 1987. Doing gender. Gender & Society 1:125-151.

Wilkinson, Lindsey and Jennifer Pearson. 2009. School culture and the well-being of same-sex attracted youth. Gender & Society 23:542-568.

Table 1: Demographics of Public School Focus Group Sample

Grade	White girls	Black girls	Latinas	Total per grade
Kindergarten	2	2	1	5 (12%)
1 st	7	0	0	7 (16%)
2 nd	9	0	0	9 (21%)
3 rd	6	1	1	8 (19%)
4 th	8	1	1	10 (23%)
5 th	4	0	0	4 (9%)
Totals	36 (84%)	4 (9%)	3 (7%)	43 (100%)

¹ The Naked Brothers Band are two adolescent brothers who have a tv show on Nickelodeon. Zac Efron, a teenager, starred in the *High School Musical* movies, *Hairspray* and *17 Again*. The Jonas Brothers are three adolescent brothers. They are a band and have their own Disney channel tv show.

² Cable television media is more influential and pervasive than ever before, with 24-hour programming on several networks created just for children. Its importance is discussed in depth in another paper.

³ A very popular show with Mylie and Billy Ray Cyrus, Mylie plays a pop star masquerading as a “normal” girl.

⁴ Except for the *High School Musical* movies, these are all sit-coms with adolescents and teenagers in various romantic situations.

⁵ Other such conversations addressed Jamie Lynn Spears’s pregnancy, Britany Spears’s parenting, and Mylie Cyrus’s photo spread in *Vanity Fair*.