

Rhodes University – Department of Psychology

Research project cover sheet

To accompany a research project submitted for examination in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Honours Degree in Psychology / Organisational Psychology

1. Information

Student's name	MICHELLE GROTH
Type of thesis	SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
Supervisor's name	MS SARAH-ANN MOORE

2. Declaration by supervisor

Either:

This project has been prepared under my supervision. I have read it carefully and believe that it meets the standards set out in the appropriate guidelines booklet in terms of academic content, clarity of research question, description of methodology, quality of analysis and ethical standards, as well as in terms of format, length, structure and referencing.

Signature and date:  28 January 2021

Or:

This project has been prepared under my supervision using the guidelines set out in the appropriate guidelines booklet in terms of format, structure and referencing. However, I am not convinced that it meets the required academic standards with regards to academic content, clarity of research question, details of the methodology, quality of analysis, or ethical aspects.

Signature and date:

Student's signature and student number: G17G1396



**The Influence of Life Orientation Sexuality Education on Attitudes to Sex and Sexuality
in South Africa: A Systematic Review**

Submitted by: Michelle Groth

Supervised by: Ms Sarah-Ann Moore

**Research Project submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Psychology**

Rhodes University

January 2021

Abstract

Youth in South Africa experience significant sexual and reproductive health problems, including high rates of STIs, HIV, unwanted pregnancy and sexual violence. Life Orientation (LO) sexuality education has been identified as crucial in promoting young people's well-being and equipping them to manage their sexual and reproductive lives in healthy ways. In this systematic review, a thematic analysis was conducted on 17 articles to identify and explore what themes were present in relation to the attitudes of educators in delivering sexuality education through LO and the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality. Of the 17 articles reviewed, six themes were identified and discussed. The findings highlight various shortcomings of LO in providing effective sexuality education and barriers that should be addressed to improve sexuality education in South Africa. To conclude, research that focuses on the attitudes of LO educators is important in order to identify areas in which they require increased support. In addition, research needs to continue to focus on the attitudes and experiences of youth through their own voices and perspectives in order to understand how sexuality education can meet their needs.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my parents and siblings for supporting me throughout this project, and thank you to my supervisor for her guidance and feedback.

Table of Contents

Introduction	6
1. Setting the Context and Review of the Literature	7
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 Research Context	7
1.2.1 Importance of sexuality education in South Africa.	7
1.2.2 Background of LO.	9
1.3 Review of the Literature	9
1.3.1 Implementation of LO sexuality education.	10
1.3.2 Youth attitudes and experiences.	13
1.4 Conclusion	15
2. Methodology	17
2.1 Introduction	17
2.2 The Criteria and Procedures for a Systematic Review	17
2.3 Units of Analysis	18
2.4 Procedures for Data Collection	18
2.5 Search Strategy Procedure	20
2.6 Procedures for Data Analysis	23
2.6.1 Phase 1: Familiarising yourself with the data.	23
2.6.2 Phase 2: Generating initial codes.	23
2.6.3 Phase 3: Searching for themes.	24
2.6.4 Phase 4: Reviewing themes.	24
2.6.5 Phase 5: Defining and naming themes.	25
2.6.6 Phase 6: Providing the report.	25
2.7 Ethical Considerations	25
3. Results and Discussion	27
3.1 Introduction	27

3.2 Attitudes around Abstinence	27
3.3 Gendered Attitudes	30
3.4 Attitudes around Sexuality Diversity	35
3.5 The Influence of Personal Beliefs on Sexuality Education	39
3.6 Barriers to Delivering Sexuality Education	41
3.7 The Perceived Value of Sexuality Education	45
3.8 Conclusion	48
4. Conclusions	50
References	54
Appendix A: Systematic Review Protocol	60
Appendix B: First Screening of Articles	61
Appendix C: Second Screening of Articles	62
Appendix D: Summary of Reviewed Articles	63
Appendix E: Map of Themes and Codes	64

Introduction

This systematic review explores the findings of recent literature on the influence of Life Orientation (LO) sexuality education on attitudes to sex and sexuality through two research questions: (1) what themes are present in relation to the attitudes of LO educators in delivering sexuality education, and (2) what themes are present in relation to the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality. Guided by these questions, a thematic analysis was conducted on 17 articles published between 2015 and 2020 and six themes were found. The process of this research is detailed in the following chapters. The first chapter provides the context for the research questions posed above, followed by an overview of the literature on sexuality education and youth attitudes to sex and sexuality in South Africa. In the second chapter, the research methodology is described. The second chapter outlines the criteria and procedures of a systematic review and describes the steps that were followed in the collection and analysis of data in this research. In the third chapter, the findings of this review are provided and discussed in reference to similar findings in the existing literature. Finally, the concluding chapter discusses the extent to which the research questions have been answered, the limitations of this review, and suggestions for future research that could build on this review.

1. Setting the Context and Review of the Literature

1.1 Introduction

This research aimed to explore the influence of LO sexuality education programmes on attitudes to sex and sexuality through two main research questions: (1) what themes are present in relation to the attitudes of LO educators in delivering sexuality education, and (2) what themes are present in relation to the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality. The following section will provide the context for the questions posed above, highlighting the importance of sexuality education in South Africa and outlining the background of LO. Subsequently, the implementation of sexuality education in South Africa will be discussed. Lastly, an overview of youth attitudes and experiences with regards to sex and sexuality will be provided.

1.2 Research Context

1.2.1 Importance of sexuality education in South Africa.

This research focuses on the influence of LO sexuality education on attitudes to sex and sexuality. The term ‘attitudes’ is used in this study to refer to the views, ideas, beliefs and feelings people have about sex and sexuality, including the ways in which people construct and understand their sexuality. Educators’ attitudes are examined in relation to the messages they deliver in sexuality education, and youth attitudes are examined in relation to how they receive these messages. While various definitions of youth exist, in this review youth are defined as secondary school learners in grades seven through twelve, for whom LO is compulsory. The learners who constitute these grades are typically between twelve and eighteen years old (Adams Tucker, George, Reardon, & Panday, 2017).

School-based sexuality education is an important area of research in South Africa, as young people in the country face considerable risk in terms of their sexual and reproductive health outcomes (Francis, 2011). Major sexual and reproductive health issues experienced by young people in South Africa include HIV and unwanted pregnancies (Macleod, 2009). It has been reported that “9.2% of young persons aged 15 to 19 years living in the country are infected with HIV” (Thurston et al., 2014, p. 1266) and that “youth between the ages of 15-24 are most vulnerable to contract HIV” (Beyers, 2013, p. 560). In addition, it has been shown that “over

half of the approximately 11 million South Africans infected with STIs each year are 15-20 years old” (DePalma & Francis, 2014b, p. 625).

Moreover, there are differences in terms of gender and sexual orientation regarding the risks that youth face. It has been shown that women face greater risk than men. For example, a study on the national prevalence of HIV showed that between 2002 and 2005, while the overall prevalence of HIV decreased, the overall prevalence “had increased for females by 0.5%” (Mkhwanazi, 2014, p. 335). In addition, “In 2008, HIV prevalence among 15– 19-year-olds in South Africa was 6.7% among females and 2.5% among males, with females disproportionately affected” (Dietrich et al., 2011, p. 245). Scholars have suggested that one of the reasons women are at an increased risk for HIV infection is the prevalence of intimate partner violence and gendered power relations in South Africa (Jewkes, Dunkle, Nduna, & Shai, 2010). Furthermore, it has been suggested that that sexual minority youth are more at risk than heterosexual youth. In a study conducted by Thurston et al. (2014) in Johannesburg, South Africa, between 2008 and 2009, it was found that sexual minority youth engage “in riskier sexual behaviours” (p. 1267) than heterosexual youth. One of the reasons suggested for this increased risk is the stigma that exists around same-sex sexual interactions (Thurston et al., 2014).

Education has been identified as a key tool for addressing sexual and reproductive health issues in the country, including challenging gender inequality and promoting inclusivity (Aggleton, Yankah, & Crewe, 2011; Kruger, Shefer, & Oakes, 2015; Macleod, 2009; Mkhwanazi, 2014; Swanepoel, Beyers, & De Wet, 2017). Education is seen as crucial in terms of providing people with knowledge on safe sex practices, such as how to prevent HIV infection, as well as influencing a change in “attitudes toward risk reduction and risk behavior change” (Aggleton et al., 2011, p. 497). It has also been suggested that “negative gender attitudes can be modified” (Aggleton et al., 2011, p. 498) through education. Thus, it is crucial that South African youth are provided with effective, quality sexuality education. A prerequisite for delivering effective sexuality education programmes is understanding young people’s perspectives and how they experience and give meaning to sex and sexuality (Pattman & Chege, 2003; Stern & Cooper, 2014).

It is also important for the implementation of sexuality education programmes to be evaluated, as studies have suggested that merely providing youth with knowledge about safe sex practices does not guarantee that they will engage in safe sex (Dietrich et al., 2011; Sayles et al., 2006).

For example, in 2008 the Youth Risk Behaviour Survey reported that “71% of the sexually active male learners did not use condoms” and of the sexually active female learners, “67% did not use condoms” (Beksinska, Pillay, Milford, & Smit, 2014, p. 676). In addition, the use of condoms by youth between the ages of 15-24 “dropped from 85.2% to 67.5% for males and from 66.5% to 49.8% for females, according to two nationally representative surveys conducted in 2008 and 2012” (Beksinska, Pillay, Milford, & Smit, 2014, p. 676).

1.2.2 Background of LO.

In South Africa, school-based sexuality education is compulsory and forms part of the LO curriculum (Francis, 2010). LO was introduced into South African schools in 1994. Before this, there was no formal sexuality education in schools (Macleod, 2009). LO has four primary learning outcomes: personal well-being, citizenship education, recreation and physical well-being and career choices. These outcomes were established in line with the aim of equipping learners with knowledge, values and skills that can be practically applied in their lives (Francis, 2019b). In addition, LO focuses on “empowering learners to be aware of themselves, their roles in their communities, and their responsibilities as citizens” (Ngabaza, Shefer, & Macleod, 2016, p. 71). Sexuality education is usually taught as part of the personal well-being learning outcome (Francis, 2011, 2019b). Within LO sexuality education, there are six sections that are expected to be covered in lessons: gender differences and inequalities, physical development during puberty, sexual health and sexually transmitted diseases, relationships and sexual activities, gender and sexual violence, and traditional and cultural sexual practices (Francis, 2019b). The learning outcomes of LO and the topics included in the sexuality education curriculum suggest that LO sexuality education programmes are intended to be comprehensive and relevant to learners’ experiences.

1.3 Review of the Literature

The following review of the literature will begin with a discussion on the implementation of LO sexuality education, where the shortcomings of LO sexuality education programmes will be highlighted. Subsequently, the attitudes and experiences of youth in South Africa will be discussed with a focus on how they relate to gender and sexual orientation.

1.3.1 Implementation of LO sexuality education.

Despite the design and intentions behind LO, studies have shown that the implementation of LO sexuality education often falls short of meeting learners' needs (Mayeza & Vincent, 2018). The need for effective sexuality education programmes in the country is widely recognised (Francis, 2011). However, some scholars have suggested that the sexuality education provided through LO programmes is not helpful, meaningful or relevant to young people in the country, and as a result fails to address the social problems that youth face (Francis, 2010; Macleod, 2009; Mthatyana & Vincent, 2015; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015).

Related to the shortcomings of LO programmes is that South Africa's policies around sexuality education were developed to address the country's HIV epidemic (Francis, 2011). Sexuality education policies were designed in line with a focus on danger and disease prevention (Francis, 2011; Macleod, 2009). Consequently, teaching young people about sex is often understood as equivalent to teaching them about HIV prevention (Francis, 2011). South African scholars have linked the ineffectiveness of LO sexuality education to the emphasis placed on risk, danger and disease by LO teachers (Francis, 2011; Macleod, 2009; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015; Shefer et al., 2015). Although HIV prevention is a crucial aspect of sexuality education, focusing exclusively on risks and prevention does not adequately prepare or equip learners to manage their sexual and reproductive health or facilitate the development of positive sexualities (Macleod, 2009). South African scholars have argued that sexuality education should expand beyond disease prevention and engage with youth as knowledgeable and sexual beings rather than as naive and sexually innocent (Francis, 2010; Khoza, 2004). International scholars Tolman & McClelland (2011) argue that understanding youth sexuality as normative allows us to provide young people with the information they need to manage risks, without disregarding their sexuality or shaming them for it. According to Francis (2010), an effective sexuality education programme should include a discourse on desire and engage with positive aspects of sex as well as the risks.

As mentioned above, the need for effective youth sexuality education programmes is widely acknowledged due to the prevalence of sexual and reproductive health issues in South Africa. However, there is no clear consensus amongst scholars, teachers and parents about what sexuality education should include and how it should be delivered to young people (Francis, 2011). Furthermore, although it is a requirement for sexuality education to be taught in South

African schools, there are no standard and structured guidelines stipulating the content and delivery of lessons (Francis, 2011). The lack of guidance surrounding the teaching of sexuality education often means that the personal values, beliefs and comfort levels of teachers play a significant role in determining what messages and information get delivered to learners (Francis, 2011; Francis, 2013; Swanepoel et al., 2017).

Several scholars have conducted studies on the implementation of LO sexuality education by teachers. A repeated finding is that teachers deliver moralistic messages in LO lessons and often choose to promote abstinence (Ahmed, Flishe, Mathews, Mukoma, & Janse, 2009; Beyers, 2013; Francis, 2011; Francis, 2013; Francis & DePalma, 2014). Abstinence-only sexuality education discourages sex outside of marriage and presents abstinence as the only acceptable option for young people. An abstinence-only approach portrays sex outside of marriage as inherently wrong and dangerous, focuses on the risks of engaging in pre-marital sex and provides limited information on sexual and reproductive health issues (Beyers, 2013; Francis, 2013; Francis & DePalma, 2014). On the other hand, comprehensive sexuality education takes a non-judgmental approach and prioritises providing learners with in-depth, relevant and accurate information and skills (Beyers, 2013; Hanass-Hancock, Nene, Johns, & Chappell, 2018). While there is not a consensus on whether abstinence programmes are more effective at reducing risky sexual practices than comprehensive programmes, it has been argued that abstinence-only programmes are not extensive enough to be effective (Mokwena & Morabe, 2016). In promoting abstinence, important aspects of sexuality education, such as information on contraceptives and condom use, are often omitted (Francis, 2013; Francis & DePalma, 2014).

Nevertheless, many teachers believe that the best way to keep young people safe from risk is through promoting abstinence (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Francis, 2013). It has been suggested that abstinence is the preferred approach to sexuality education because parents and teachers are more comfortable assuming that learners are not sexually active than they are engaging with youth as sexual beings (Francis, 2011). Furthermore, many educators believe that teaching sexuality education comes into conflict with their personal beliefs and values, making it particularly challenging to deliver comprehensive sexuality education (Ahmed et al., 2009). Teachers view it as uncomfortable and inappropriate for adults to talk to young people about sex because of their cultural and religious beliefs (Beyers, 2011; Beyers, 2013; Mkhwanazi, 2014). Due to the focus on discouraging pre-marital sex, it has been argued that

the LO curriculum, and teachers' choices on how to deliver it, do not prioritise the lived experiences and needs of learners (Kruger et al., 2015; Mthatyana & Vincent, 2015).

Despite parents and teachers' beliefs and assumptions, many young people are sexually active (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Eaton, Flisher, & Aaro, 2003). Moreover, the high prevalence of unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections amongst youth in South Africa suggests that they are having unsafe sex (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Stern & Cooper, 2014). Relatedly, it has been found that even when young people are informed on safe sex practices, they do not always feel comfortable initiating condom use, and few are having enjoyable sexual experiences (Stern & Cooper, 2014). These findings reiterate that abstinence-only sexuality education does not adequately address the sexual and reproductive health issues that young people in South Africa experience.

Another characteristic of LO programmes noted by several scholars is that despite intentions of promoting inclusivity and challenging gender inequality, LO programmes often reproduce heteronormative beliefs and stereotypical gender norms (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Kruger et al., 2015; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015; Shefer & Macleod, 2015; Shefer, Kruger, Macleod, Baxen, & Vincent, 2015; Swanepoel et al., 2017). Heteronormative standards are reinforced in lessons because of the influence of teachers' personal beliefs on lessons as well as the implicit assumptions contained in LO manuals, textbooks and curricula (DePalma & Francis, 2014a; Francis, 2017; Francis, 2019b; Macleod, Moodley, & Young, 2015; Swanepoel et al., 2017). The reproduction of heteronormative beliefs in LO programmes includes teachers implying that sexual and romantic relationships only occur between men and women and assuming that all learners are heterosexual (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015). Furthermore, teachers often exclude discussions around sexuality diversity from LO lessons completely (DePalms & Francis, 2014b; Francis, 2017). It has been suggested that the messages communicated in LO sexuality education reinforce patriarchal gender roles by suggesting that women should play a passive and submissive role in relationships. Women are often portrayed as passive victims, whereas men are often portrayed as powerful and predatory (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015). In addition, sex is often presented as a male-centred activity, and female desires and feelings are often silenced and denied. Additionally, the way young people are taught about the risks of having sex is gendered with messages about the potential dangers associated with sex being directed at young women in particular (Kruger et al., 2015; Shefer & Foster, 2001; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015).

The reproduction of heteronormative beliefs and patriarchal gender roles in sexuality education is a problem as it perpetuates patterns of gender inequality, male dominance and coercive and unsafe sexual practices between young men and women (Shefer & Foster, 2001; Shefer & Macleod, 2015). Furthermore, the exclusion of sexuality diversity from LO sexuality education does not align with the ideals of and protections provided by South Africa's progressive constitution (DePalma & Francis, 2014a; Francis, 2017; Francis & Kuhl, 2020; Msibi, 2012). It is important that teachers actively and consciously challenge heterosexism and make lessons inclusive of sexuality diversity as they play a crucial role in making schools safe and inclusive environments for queer youth (Msibi, 2012).

As suggested previously, LO teachers have a great amount of freedom and flexibility in delivering sexuality education because of the lack of structure and guidance provided on how to approach sexuality education (Beyers, 2013; Francis, 2010). To a great extent, teachers can choose what to include in lessons and what not to. Moreover, the discussion above suggests that the messages teachers choose to communicate are often not in the best interests of learners, or aligned with the aims of LO sexuality education. However, it is important to note that in addition to having freedom and flexibility, teachers face significant barriers to teaching sexuality education that inhibits their ability to provide comprehensive sexuality education. The barriers that educators face include "insufficient time, lack of resources, large classes...often from diverse backgrounds, age groups, and religious affiliations" (Ahmed et al., 2009, p. 51). In addition, teachers lack content knowledge about topics such as sexuality diversity (Francis, 2021; Msibi, 2012). Scholars have highlighted that teachers do not receive sufficient training and support, impacting the quality of sexuality education they can deliver (Ahmed et al., 2009; Francis, 2010; Francis, 2011).

1.3.2 Youth attitudes and experiences.

Several South African scholars have focused their studies in the area of sexuality and on the perspectives and experiences of young people. Scholars have shown how various influences and factors shape young people's experiences and attitudes to sex and sexuality (Beyers, 2013; Macleod et al., 2015; Mthatyana & Vincent, 2015). Contextual factors such as gender, race, sexual orientation and socioeconomic status shape people's beliefs, views and experiences (Mthatyana & Vincent, 2015; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015). In addition, the messages young people receive both inside and outside of the classroom are shaped by the values and norms of different cultures, ethnicities and religions (Beyers, 2013). Young people's sexualities are also

shaped by popular culture, such as the music they listen to (Macleod et al., 2015), as well as through social interactions with their peers (Mthatyana & Vincent, 2015).

As mentioned previously, patterns in sexual health outcomes are gendered, with women being disproportionately at risk (Stern & Cooper, 2014). The significant and disproportionate risk that women face has been linked to cultural and religious values taught to learners and upheld in schools and communities. Youth are frequently told they should not be having sex and as a result, secrecy often surrounds young people's relationships. Youth believe that sexual relationships should be hidden, especially from their parents (Mkhwanazi, 2014). Consequently, when sexual relationships are kept secret, women's risk for "HIV, unwanted pregnancy, rape and coercion" is increased (Mkhwanazi, 2014, p. 336).

Although many young people understand sex to be a part of their lives that should be kept secret from adults, studies have suggested that amongst peers, sex is seen as a normal aspect of their lives and can be discussed openly (Kruger et al., 2015). Learners' views about why young people engage in sex include the notion that sex is a natural expression of intimacy that strengthens romantic relationships, as well as the view that sex brings pleasure and is "not always about love" (Dietrich et al., 2011, p. 249). In addition, youths' attitudes, decisions and behaviours are influenced by the experiences and opinions of their peers (Dietrich et al., 2011). Studies have shown that youth sometimes feel left out for not being sexually active (Kruger et al., 2015) and decide to have sex in order to fit in or gain status (Dietrich et al., 2011; Mokwena & Morabe, 2016). It has also been suggested that young people view unprotected sex as normal amongst their peers and engage in unprotected sex because of beliefs that it is "not cool" (Dietrich et al., 2011, p. 248) to use condoms, or that condom use indicates a lack of trust between partners. However, studies have shown that some learners choose to abstain, feel that this choice protects them from physical and emotional harm, and believe that abstinence should be promoted to all youth (Mokwena & Morabe, 2016).

Studies have suggested that young people's attitudes toward sex are gendered. Stereotypical gender norms and expectations conveyed in and out of school play a role in shaping these attitudes (Stern & Cooper, 2014). Young women are repeatedly told that they need to be responsible and self-police. In addition, their behaviour is regulated by the notion that the risks of pregnancy and sexual violence will disproportionately affect them (Shefer et al., 2015; Shefer & Macleod, 2015; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015). Relatedly, it has been found that some

young women associate sex with rape and violence (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015) and understand sex as dangerous and damaging (Kruger et al., 2015). Furthermore, it has been shown that women find it challenging to negotiate safe sex and exercise their agency in sexual relationships with men (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015). Beyers (2011) has suggested that reinforcing the association of women with passivity and silencing their desires makes it challenging for them to navigate sexual relationships safely. Young women may be hesitant to take responsibility for their sexual health as, in taking precautions, they may be perceived as having sexual desires, which they have been taught not to express (Beyers, 2011).

Scholars have also highlighted youth views and experiences regarding counter-normative sexualities. In schools, the imposition of heteronormative ideals on learners puts limitations on how they are able to develop and understand their own sexual identities (Swanepoel et al., 2017). Furthermore, learners who do not meet the expectations and assumptions placed on them are marginalised (Francis, 2019a). Queer learners experience discrimination by being isolated, as well as through verbal abuse and physical violence. Furthermore, queer youth experience homophobia at schools from their teachers as well as their peers (Francis, 2017; Msibi, 2012). Many young people have homophobic attitudes and view homosexuality as wrong (Dietrich et al., 2011; Francis, 2017). In addition, it has been shown that many young people conflate sexuality and gender, and hold the idea that a defining feature of being a man is having sexual relationships with women (Francis, 2017). Some learners hold the idea that homosexuality is contagious, an idea disseminated by their teachers (Msibi, 2012). On the other hand, some youth believe that same-sex relationships should be more widely accepted in society (Dietrich et al., 2011).

1.4 Conclusion

The discussion above has provided context for this research and an overview of the literature on educators' delivery of sexuality education and youth attitudes to sex and sexuality. It has been shown that young people in South Africa continue to face a significant risk of poor sexual and reproductive health outcomes. The ways in which these outcomes are shaped by factors such as gender and sexual orientation have been described. LO sexuality education can play an important role in promoting healthy attitudes and better outcomes for learners but has several shortcomings, some of which are related to the messages communicated by educators. This study will explore what recent literature reveals about the attitudes of educators in delivering sexuality education and how LO sexuality education influences the attitudes of youth. The

research questions and methodology are discussed in detail in the following chapter.

2. Methodology

2.1 Introduction

Through a systematic review of literature, this research aimed to address the following research questions: (1) what themes are present in relation to the attitudes of LO educators in delivering sexuality education, and (2) what themes are present in relation to the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality. In the following sections, the various methodological processes that were undertaken in order to address these research questions will be outlined. To begin with, the criteria and procedures for a systematic review will be described. Next, a summary of the preliminary and final data sets of this review will be provided. Subsequently, the procedures that were carried out for data collection and data analysis will be outlined. The chapter will end with a brief discussion on the ethical considerations of this review.

2.2 The Criteria and Procedures for a Systematic Review

Systematic reviews are carried out to reveal the themes, trends, and inconsistencies in the existing literature on a topic. Carrying out a systematic review involves finding and examining studies that are relevant to a specific topic and evaluating selected studies critically and systematically. The process of conducting a systematic review consists of the researcher organising and synthesising data from a collection of similar studies, with the aim of producing a coherent, well informed and reliable answer to a specific research question. The features that make a review systematic are that it is carried out in a manner that is formal, transparent, rigorous and replicable. To fulfil these criteria, the steps and procedures that are followed from the start to the finish of a review should be clearly outlined and consistently followed. The research questions, as well as the methods undertaken to address them, are outlined at the start of the research process. In addition, systematic reviews require that the data collected for review constitutes the best available evidence on the research topic. In order to source the best available evidence, extensive data searches of multiple sources are carried out according to specific criteria. Furthermore, the limitations of the research, as well as challenges that may occur during the research process, should be acknowledged (Bambra, 2011; Gough, Oliver, & Thomas, 2012).

The features described above make systematic reviews a useful methodology for evaluating and analysing literature. In addition, systematic reviews are valuable in that they include more viewpoints and evidence than would be possible in a single primary research study, making an

extensive amount of information on a topic accessible. Systematic review methodology is appropriate for this study as a vast body of research exists on sexuality education and LO in South Africa. This body of research has been carried out by several different scholars utilising a variety of different research strategies and perspectives. This systematic review located and synthesised existing research that related the attitudes of LO educators in delivering sexuality education and the influence of LO sexuality education in shaping youth attitudes. This was done with the aim of producing a thorough and accessible account that has practical value and contributes to a growing pool of knowledge on the topic of sexuality education in South Africa (Bambra, 2011; Gough et al., 2012).

2.3 Units of Analysis

The data included in this review were identified from six databases. From the six databases searched a total of 346 journal articles were found and screened. Of the 346 articles screened, 17 journal articles were selected to be reviewed. After initial screening, 73 articles were selected as potential articles to be included in the review. The set of potential articles to be included consisted of 34 articles from Google Scholar, 15 articles from Academic Search Premier, 10 articles from PsycInfo, no articles from PsycArticles, 12 articles from SA ePublications and two articles from ScienceDirect. Thirty-four duplicates were removed from this data set, leaving 39 articles as potential articles to be included. Subsequently, a second screening was carried out with two additional screening criteria. From this screening, 22 articles were excluded, and 17 remained as the final data set. A more comprehensive explanation of the searching and screening procedures conducted is provided in the following section.

2.4 Procedures for Data Collection

The data collected in this study were journal articles concerned with LO sexuality education programmes and attitudes to sex and sexuality. Relevant data were identified through searches conducted on the search engine Google Scholar as well as the following databases: Academic Search Premier via EBSCOhost, APA PsycArticles via EBSCOhost, APA PsycInfo via EBSCOhost, SA ePublications via Sabinet, and ScienceDirect. Google Scholar, Academic Search Premier and ScienceDirect were chosen as they are major and extensive databases. APA PsycArticles and APA PsycInfo were searched because they cover psychological literature, and Sabinet was searched because it specifically covers South African journals.

The databases listed above were searched using the following keywords: sexuality education, sex education, sexuality, sex, South Africa, South African, life orientation, school, and attitudes. On all databases, only the titles of articles and not the full articles were screened for keywords in order for searches to produce the most relevant articles. All searches were conducted in August 2020, and all searches conducted and exclusions made were recorded in a Google Sheets spreadsheet. The screening of sources was undertaken according to specific inclusion and exclusion criteria. The abstracts of all articles were screened. In cases where the abstract did not provide enough information to answer all criteria, the full texts were searched. The criteria that were applied to each article identified in searches, the order in which they were applied, and the justification for each criterion are provided in the following paragraph.

The studies identified for inclusion in the review needed to have been: published between 2015 and 2020; available in English; carried out in South Africa; primary research studies; qualitative studies; published in peer review journals; based on LO sexuality education; and carried out with only learners or educators as participants. The criterion that studies be published between 2015 and 2020 and the criterion specifying that participants of studies should be educators or learners were only applied after all the initial searches and first screenings had been conducted and were only applied to the preliminary data set in the second screening of articles. In the first screening, studies published between 2010 and 2020 were included, and there was no criterion regarding the participants of studies. The criterion for the year of publication was applied and amended to ensure that the studies included in the review were recent enough to reveal themes and patterns relevant to the current South African context. It was a requirement that studies be available in English, as most journals are published in English and it was not possible to have articles not in English translated. Only studies that were carried out in South Africa were considered as the focus of this research is on sexuality education in South Africa and it was important that findings were relevant and could be applied to the current South African context in a meaningful way. It was a requirement that studies be primary research studies, as systematic reviews are intended to synthesise the findings from a collection of similar primary studies. Only qualitative studies were included as this review aimed to explore in-depth research with findings focused on the accounts of educators and learners and their views, ideas, beliefs, and feelings. As a measure for ensuring the quality and credibility of articles included in the study, only articles published in peer-reviewed journals were considered. In addition, only articles published in journals, and not books, were included as the more regular publication of journals ensured that the focus of articles was as current and

relevant as possible. In addition, in order to include only articles relevant to the research questions posed, included studies needed to have been focused on LO sexuality education and needed to have been carried out with learners or educators. All the criteria mentioned above, as well as the databases that were chosen to be searched, were selected to ensure that the data corpus represented the best available data and the data most relevant to the research questions. A protocol summarising the search strategy and exclusion criteria for this review is provided in Appendix A.

2.5 Search Strategy Procedure

Google Scholar was searched first. Eleven separate searches were carried out in Google Scholar using the keywords noted previously. The searches specified that the words searched appear in the title of the article and that citations and patents not be included in the search results. The searches made were as follows: sexuality education South Africa; sexuality education South African; sex education South Africa; sex education South African; life orientation sexuality; life orientation attitudes; sexuality South Africa school; sexuality South African school; sex South Africa school; sex South African school. A total of 164 academic sources were identified. One hundred and twenty-one sources were excluded after screening abstracts and, in some cases, full texts for inclusion and exclusion criteria. A further nine duplicated articles were excluded, leaving a total of 34 articles identified as potential articles to be reviewed.

The second search was conducted on Academic Search Premier via EBSCOhost. One search was conducted on this database using the following Boolean operators: TI= (sexuality education South Africa OR sexuality education South African OR sex education South Africa OR sex education South African OR life orientation sexuality OR life orientation attitudes OR sexuality attitudes South Africa OR sexuality South Africa school OR Sexuality South African school OR sex South Africa school OR sex South African school). The search was expanded to apply related words and apply equivalent subjects. Fifty-three articles were identified, and 38 excluded. No duplicated articles were found. Of the 38 articles excluded, 13 were not from the last decade, one was not available in English, three were carried out in regions other than South Africa, eight were not primary research studies, five were not qualitative studies, six were not about school-based sexuality education and two were focused on school-based sexuality education but not on LO programmes. After all exclusions, a total of 15 articles were identified as potential articles to be reviewed.

The next search was conducted on APA PsycInfo via EBSCOhost. One search was conducted on this database using the following Boolean operators: TI= (sexuality education South Africa OR sexuality education South African OR sex education South Africa OR sex education South African OR life orientation sexuality OR life orientation attitudes OR sexuality attitudes South Africa OR sexuality South Africa school OR Sexuality South African school OR sex South Africa school OR sex South African school). The search was expanded to apply related words and apply equivalent subjects. Forty articles were identified, and 30 articles were excluded. No duplicated articles were found. Of the excluded sources, 14 were published before 2010, three were based on studies carried out outside of the region of South Africa, two were excluded for not being primary research studies, three were excluded for not being qualitative studies, five were not based on sexuality education, and two were not based on LO programmes. After screening, a total of 10 articles were identified as potential articles to be reviewed. APA PsycArticles was also searched, and no sources were identified through this search.

Two separate searches were conducted on SA ePublications via Sabinet. The first search used the following Boolean search operators: (Title contains 'sexuality education South Africa') OR (Title contains 'sexuality education South African') OR (Title contains 'sex education South African') OR (Title contains 'sex education South Africa') OR (Title contains 'sexuality South Africa school') OR (Title contains 'life orientation attitudes') OR (Title contains 'life orientation sexuality') OR (Title contains 'sexuality attitudes South Africa'). Forty-seven articles were identified from this search before any exclusions were made. From this search, 36 articles were excluded, leaving 11 potential articles to be reviewed. Out of the 36 excluded articles, eight were not published between 2010 and 2020, five were not primary research studies, 13 were not qualitative studies, four were not on the topic of school-based sexuality education, and six were not focused on LO programmes. The second search on SA ePublications was conducted using the following Boolean search operators: (Title contains 'sexuality South Africa school') OR (Title contains 'Sexuality South African school') OR (Title contains 'sex South Africa school') OR (Title contains 'sex South African school'). Thirty-four articles were identified from this search before screening took place. Twenty-eight articles were excluded, and six identified to potentially be included. Of the excluded sources, seven articles were published before 2010, five articles were not primary research studies, nine articles were not qualitative studies, five were not on school-based sexuality education, and two were not about LO. The articles that met all of the inclusion criteria from both searches were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet. Five duplicated articles were removed, and 12 articles

remained as potential articles to be reviewed.

Three separate searches were conducted on ScienceDirect. The first search was conducted as follows: Title: sexuality education South Africa OR sexuality education South African OR sex education South Africa OR sex education South African. Two articles were identified in this search, and both met all of the inclusion criteria. The second search on ScienceDirect was conducted as follows: Title: life orientation sexuality OR life orientation attitudes OR sexuality South Africa attitudes OR sexuality South Africa school. Three articles were identified in this search, and two were excluded. Of the two excluded articles, one was published before 2010, and one was not relevant to school-based sexuality education. The third search that was done on ScienceDirect was as follows: Title: sexuality South African school OR sex South Africa school OR sex South African school. In this search, three articles came up, and two were excluded as they were both published before 2010. The articles that met the inclusion criteria from all three sources were listed in a spreadsheet, and the two duplicates were removed, leaving a total of two articles as potential articles for review.

After the keyword searches had been conducted on the databases mentioned above, and the initial screening processes completed, the articles identified from each search were listed in a spreadsheet as potential articles to be included in the review. A total of 73 articles were recorded, and 39 articles remained after duplicates were removed. A second screening was carried out with the criteria for data of publication amended from 2010-2020 to 2015-2020 and the criteria for the sample of studies added. Through this second screening process, 22 articles were excluded. Nine articles were published before 2015, six articles had a sample that did not include educators or learners, an additional six articles were excluded for not being primary research studies, and a further four were excluded for not being focused on LO sexuality education. A table illustrating the first screening of articles is provided in appendix B, and a table illustrating the second screening process is provided in appendix C.

After the second screening of articles, 17 articles remained in the final data set and were reviewed. The studies reviewed were conducted in a diverse range of schools sampled from various settings. Study settings included all provinces in the country apart from Northern Cape and Limpopo. The samples of the studies also varied. Out of the 17 studies included, nine were conducted with educators, five were conducted with learners, and three had a sample of both educators and learners. Studies also varied in terms of the research methods and theoretical orientations used. A summary of the articles reviewed is provided in Appendix D. Following

the collection of data, studies were analysed, and the findings of this analysis were reported.

2.6 Procedures for Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using thematic analysis and following the step-by-step guide provided by Braun and Clarke (2006). Thematic analysis was the chosen data analysis method as it allows for the exploration, identification, and integration of themes across a collection of data. This method enables the researcher to organise data in a meaningful way and draw connections between trends that emerge in a set of data in order to address a research question, making it well suited for this study (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In the following paragraphs, each phase of the analysis that was carried out will be outlined. At every phase, the analysis process was carried out with the research questions in mind. While the process will be described according to the progression of phases outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), as the paragraphs below will demonstrate, the process was “not a linear process of simply moving from one phase to the next” (p. 86) but rather involved continuous movement between these phases throughout the process.

2.6.1 Phase 1: Familiarising yourself with the data.

The first phase of thematic analysis is to become familiar with the data, and this requires that data be read through multiple times (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The articles under review were read through a first time without any notes being taken, or initial themes for coding marked. Subsequently, a table was created in Google Sheets in which the sample, setting, aims, theoretical orientation, methodology and key findings of the studies were summarised during a second reading of the articles. In addition, during this process, initial notes were taken about patterns that were noticed, and initial ideas for coding were listed. This initial list of ideas for possible codes was recorded in a spreadsheet and included 47 items.

2.6.2 Phase 2: Generating initial codes.

In the second phase of analysis, initial codes are to be generated (Braun & Clarke, 2006). At this phase, every article was read through again with notable features of the data being highlighted and labelled. During this process, similar labels were highlighted with the same or similar colours. Many of these initial codes generated were the same as or similar to the possible ideas for coding that were recorded in the first phase of the process. Coding of extracts was done on pdfs of the articles in Adobe Acrobat Reader using the “comment”, “highlight

text”, and “add sticky note” tools. After every article had been coded, the codes generated were recorded in a spreadsheet and highlighted to match the colours used in coding the extracts. According to the codes under which they fell, data extracts were collated by copying and pasting extracts from the pdfs into a spreadsheet. Initially, 62 codes were generated through this process. However, during the process of organising codes into themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report of findings, the list of codes changed often as codes were continuously renamed, redefined, split up and merged. The final codes can be found in Appendix E.

2.6.3 Phase 3: Searching for themes.

Following the listing and collating of initial codes, codes were organised into potential themes. The organising of codes into themes was done in spreadsheets, where different groupings of codes were combined in different ways to explore potential themes. At first, codes were clustered together according to their colours, with colours being linked to similarities that were noted during the coding of extracts. Eight colour groups existed but did not combine to form coherent or clearly defined themes. The colour groups were then given labels to signify what the majority of codes that fell under them were related to. Some codes were relocated into colour groups within which they were better matched. Codes that did not fit into any of the existing labelled groups were placed into new groups. Relationships between these groups were then drawn, creating overarching themes. Several different combinations of codes and labels for groups were considered. An initial set of potential themes were formed with three overarching themes, two sub-themes under the first, five sub-themes under the second, and a group with a miscellaneous code. These initial themes were discarded during the process of initial analysis and write-up, after which the final themes were generated.

2.6.4 Phase 4: Reviewing themes.

After the potential themes were identified, the coded extracts of data falling under each theme were reviewed. Some extracts were re-coded and moved into different themes. In addition, names of codes and themes were changed to more accurately reflect the extracts of data that fell under them and more coherently fit together. During this phase, the miscellaneous code was discarded from the analysis. This process was repeated with the final set of themes, where a further three codes were discarded. A summarised representation of the map of these final codes and themes is provided in Appendix E.

2.6.5 Phase 5: Defining and naming themes.

After each theme had been reviewed, it was given a brief definition. Each definition elaborated on the name of the theme and summarised the main message communicated by the extracts that fell under the theme. In addition, each theme was named and defined with the research questions in mind. The initial themes were named according to whether they related to youth or educators. In comparison, the names and definitions of the final themes were more focused on specific attitudes.

2.6.6 Phase 6: Providing the report.

In writing up the report and carrying out the final analysis, it was decided that the initial three overarching themes and their sub-themes did not concisely, coherently or clearly reflect the patterns that existed in the data, and under a different set of themes data could be organised and analysed more logically. In addition, the definitions of the initial set of themes were not sufficiently clear and produced overlap and repetition. Following the identification of the final set of five themes, themes were mapped, reviewed and refined. Subsequently, themes were integrated and contextualised using existing literature. The report and discussion of these findings are provided in the following chapter.

2.7 Ethical Considerations

The data for this research was accessed from published material and did not directly involve human participants. However, there are ethical considerations relevant to this research. Namely, it was important that the researcher remain reflexive and maintain transparency throughout this research process, as the influence of subjectivity is inevitable in systematic reviews. The researcher's subjectivity has shaped the choice of research questions and influenced decisions made in collecting and analysing data, thus affecting the findings (Rees & Olivers, 2012). For example, in the process of data analysis, the researcher played an active role in identifying themes, and the process was thus influenced to an extent by the researcher's subjective viewpoint.

Furthermore, it was essential that the published material selected in this study uphold ethical principles and standards, such as getting necessary permissions, informed consent, confidentiality, and respect to participants (Willig, 2013). The value, relevance and reliability of a systematic review are partly determined by the quality of the studies reviewed. Ethical

considerations are an important aspect of the quality and credibility of studies (Harden & Gough, 2012). As a measure to ensure the reliability and ethical standards of the research reviewed, only articles published in peer-reviewed journals were reviewed.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Introduction

This research explored the influence of LO on attitudes to sex and sexuality through a systematic review of 17 articles. A thematic analysis was conducted to identify the themes present in relation to the attitudes of educators in delivering LO sexuality education and the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality. The following six themes were identified through analysis: attitudes around abstinence; gendered attitudes; attitudes around sexuality diversity; the influence of personal beliefs on sexuality education; barriers to delivering sexuality education; and the perceived value of sexuality education. In the following sections, these themes will be discussed in relation to what was found about the attitudes of educators and youth as well as how these findings relate to other literature. It is suggested that aspects of educators' are reflected in some youth's views, and challenged in the views of others. In addition, the findings highlight the shortcomings of LO sexuality education and emphasise the need for increased support to be provided to LO educators.

3.2 Attitudes around Abstinence

A prevailing theme across studies was that LO educators often took an abstinence-only approach to sexuality education and centred their lessons on the risks and potential negative consequences of sex. For example, in the study by de Reus, Hanass-Hancock, Henken and van Brakel (2015), educators referred to the 'ABC method (Abstinence, Being faithful, Condomise)' as a guide for their lessons, and noted that abstinence was emphasised as the best option for learners. While many educators shared the preference for promoting abstinence, various reasons were provided for the choice of approach. For example, an educator in the study by Swanepoel and Beyers (2019) stated that they preferred to advocate abstinence over condom usage due to their "Christian beliefs" (p. 5). Furthermore, some educators preferred to promote abstinence because they found in-depth conversations about sexuality difficult to navigate with learners. It was noted that learners sometimes "make it personal" by asking teachers sensitive and personal questions or "digress" (George, Tucker, Panday, & Khumalo, 2018, p. 53) and go beyond planned lesson content. In comparison, teachers felt that the message to abstain was easy to convey and easily understood.

Although many educators promoted abstinence, most did not completely exclude topics around sex and sexuality from the curriculum. Only one study, focused on LO educators in special

schools, suggested that some educators only addressed “non-sexual topics” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 343) in sexuality education lessons. More commonly, educators addressed topics through the lens of risk, danger and negative consequences. Educators repeatedly portrayed sex as something to be feared, focusing on the “painful and bad things” (Shefer et al., 2015, p. 77). They usually convey the potential risks of sex as inevitable outcomes that could only be avoided by abstaining. For example, an extract from the study by George, Tucker, Panday, & Khumalo (2020) demonstrates common messages around risk, danger and consequence that were communicated to learners:

It’s good for you if you don’t know because sex is very dangerous, because you are going to fall pregnant, you’re going to get HIV, you’re going to have babies with no fathers. (p. 108)

In focusing on risk and dangers, educators often failed to provide accurate information about how risks could be managed through methods of contraception and protection. Furthermore, when lessons were centred on negative consequences, discussions around the complex and positive aspects of sex and sexual relationships were usually omitted (Shefer et al., 2015). Thus learners were often presented with the limited options of delaying sex until marriage or sacrificing their health and futures.

Furthermore, several studies suggested that educators expressed judgmental attitudes towards sexually active learners. Consequently, some learners were hesitant to ask questions in sexuality education lessons for fear that they would be judged:

And there is always that fear that if you ask questions about sex in class you’ll be judged by the teacher and the other learners will think you’re already having sex and that’s why you have a lot to say about it. (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 480)

As suggested above, educators’ attitudes around abstinence hindered learners’ freedom to engage in sexuality education lessons as learners did not want to be perceived as sexually active. Rather than conveying sex as a normative aspect of young people’s lives, educators suggested that all learners need to know is that sex is risky and should be avoided.

The analysis indicated that the emphasis on abstinence and risk in LO sexuality education was also reflected in the views of learners. Learners often focused on the negative consequences of

sex, describing sex as “scary” (Shefer et al., 2015, p. 77) and as a risk that “is just not worth it” (Shefer et al., 2015, p. 75) because of dangers such as disease and pregnancy that “can lead to a lot of damage to you” (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 34) and jeopardise one’s future. Learners also held the understanding that they should not have sex because “sex before marriage is a sin” (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 35). In addition, some learners perceived the risks associated with sex as inevitable consequences. For example, learners held the belief that if you have sex “you are gonna get pregnant” (Shefer et al., 2015, p. 75) and your “future will be gone” (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 34), suggesting that methods of contraception and protection were either not trusted as effective options or not seen as available options to youth.

Furthermore, young people’s views around abstinence and risk were informed by what they saw and heard outside of LO lessons. Studies showed that young women associated sex and relationships with rape and sexual violence based on what they had observed within their communities, as well as in media. For some young women, violence and rape were understood as possible outcomes of wishing to abstain from sex and were intertwined with the decisions they made about sex:

Tessa: Like in our community I see the boys hit their girlfriends if they don’t want to do it. Or they rape their girlfriends, without the girlfriends saying yes If the boy wants to have sex, then he will nag the girl and if she really does not want to, he will rape her ... (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 39)

The extract above shows how complex decisions around abstinence can be. The promotion of abstinence assumes that youth have the ability to make active and conscious decisions to abstain. However, women are frequently denied the ability to make choices about their sexual and reproductive lives. Many women’s capacity to make decisions such as when to have sex and whether protection is used are constrained by the coercive and violent practices of men (Jewkes, Dunkle, Nduna, & Shai, 2010; Wood, Maforah, & Jewkes, 1998). Thus, the simplistic and regulatory messages delivered in LO can be seen as having limited relevance and value, considering the context of gendered power relations and sexual violence and the experiences described by youth.

Importantly, however, in several studies, learners challenged the centrality of messages around abstinence and negative consequences in sexuality education. Some learners suggested that punitive messages had the adverse effect of evoking learners’ curiosity, as “Forbidden fruit

always tastes the best” (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 71). Thus, when sexuality education is limited to prescriptive warnings, they are subsequently drawn to “find out the truth” (Shefer et al. 2015, p. 77) about sex for themselves. Furthermore, learners suggested that the messages they received about abstinence and the dangers of sex were futile as they “don’t listen” (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 69) to regulatory warnings and “young people have sex anyway, whether you tell them to abstain or not” (Francis, 2019a, p. 779).

The emphasis on abstinence and risk in LO sexuality education programmes have been highlighted by many scholars (Ahmed et al., 2009; Beyers, 2013; DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Francis, 2011; Francis, 2013; Macleod, 2009) and is reiterated in this review. Several scholars have identified the narrow focus of LO sexuality education as a shortcoming of the programme. In focusing on deterring learners from having sex, LO sexuality education fails to adequately equip learners to have safe, healthy and enjoyable sexual experiences (Francis, 2013; Francis & DePalma, 2014; Ngabaza et al., 2016).

LO aims to provide learners with the knowledge and skills to make informed decisions and take responsibility for their lives (Francis & DePalma, 2015). In order to make informed decisions, learners need to be provided with accurate, relevant and in-depth information (George et al., 2020). In addition, it is necessary for youth to be recognised as sexual beings and treated as capable of discussing sensitive and complex issues and managing risks if they are to take responsibility for their lives. Equipping learners to manage their sexual and reproductive health requires that LO sexuality education programmes foster agency and positive sexualities (Shefer et al., 2015). In contrast, the discussion above suggests that youth are led to understand their sexuality as rebellious and disobedient, the result of them being drawn to the forbidden or not listening to authority. The abstinence centred approach of many educators does not fulfil the aims of LO.

3.3 Gendered Attitudes

The studies under review repeatedly showed that educators delivered gendered messages in sexuality education. Several studies highlighted the difference between the messages communicated to young men and young women. As discussed above, LO educators often promoted abstinence and centred sexuality education lessons on the risks and dangers of sex. However, while educators were found to encourage all learners to abstain, the studies suggested that the importance of abstaining was usually emphasised for young women. Young women

suggested that the only acceptable option available to them was abstinence. Abstaining was presented to them as part of correctly behaving like a woman, as teachers portrayed “a ‘good and healthy girl’ as one who delays first sexual intercourse until marriage” (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 477). Furthermore, the gendering of abstinence was reflected in the difference between young women’s descriptions of LO lessons compared to those of young men.

Young women’s descriptions of LO sexuality education usually entailed being taught to abstain and practice “self-control always”, (Shefer et al., 2015, p. 81) whereas young men usually reported being taught “about the importance of using a condom when having sex” (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 482). Similarly, in the study by Ngabaza et al. (2016), young women suggested that the emphasis on abstinence in sexuality education lessons was primarily directed at girls because “boys won’t get pregnant” and as a woman “you will be the one with the baby” (p.75), left to face the consequences of sex alone. The notion that women are disproportionately affected by the risks of sex was common in studies, and learners and educators often used the possibility of falling pregnant to justify the extra caution directed at young women:

So we’re basically, they’re really trying to make us aware of those kind of things because girls they have to take on more responsibilities once they fall pregnant than boys... Because boys you know they just go to school every day you know those kind of things, so we sort of we’re more at risk than they are. (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 71)

Furthermore, Kruger et al. (2015) found that young women received contradictory messages from LO sexuality education. Young women were told to take responsibility for their sexual lives, suggesting they “should exercise agency over their sexuality” (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 34), while also receiving the message that men have the power and control in sexual relationships. Similarly, Mayeza & Vincent (2019) highlighted the contradiction of young women being expected to avoid disease and pregnancy, while only being educated about male-oriented methods of safety and protection. Mayeza and Vincent (2019) reported that the female learners in their study had “never heard of a female condom”, and suggested that the knowledge learners receive is “insufficient to empower girls to protect themselves from STIs and unwanted pregnancies” (p. 478).

Another aspect of the gendered nature of LO sexuality education lessons was educators reinforcing normative gender roles in their lessons. Studies showed that LO educators upheld

the association of women with passivity and submissiveness and men with power and dominance. For example, Ngabaza et al. (2016) reported that LO teachers expected “stereotypic feminine behaviour” from female learners inside the classroom, and used phrases such as “act like a lady” (p. 74). Furthermore, studies showed that male teachers preferred to separate their classes for sexuality education lessons and have the “boys together and the girls together” (Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019, p. 7) with female learners addressed by a female teacher. The reluctance of male teachers to address female learners was expressed by educators as well as female learners.

Relatedly, studies suggested that young women were silenced in LO sexuality education lessons. Kruger et al. (2015) reported that the young women in their study “explicitly stated that, in their experience, sex was either not spoken about, or when it was spoken about, their voices were not listened to or taken seriously” (p. 36), especially with male LO teachers. Similarly, Shefer et al. (2015) pointed out that “young women certainly got the message that they were not allowed to openly discuss their sexuality or their sexual behaviour in Life Orientation classes” (p. 82). As discussed previously, educators’ judgmental attitudes silenced learners by making it difficult for them to ask questions. However, female learners were further silenced through the gendered messages that teachers put forward. In portraying men as dominant and powerful, LO educators implied that women’s views and feelings were not as important as men’s (Kruger et al., 2015). In addition, young women in particular faced judgement, from educators as well as their male peers, for participating in discussions around sex and sexuality as this put “their socially approved of identities as virgins at risk” (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 478).

Despite the prevalence of educators reinscribing patriarchal gender norms, the study by Francis and DePalma (2015) showed examples of educators who viewed sexuality education as a tool for challenging gender inequality and generating social change:

Cyril talks about the LO teacher challenging oppression, sexism specifically:
 “There are still those, and I can believe that they are like that because they are brought up in a home with a patriarchal pattern. The father is in charge. A boy is a boy. A girl is a girl. These things are wrong and it must change”. (p. 36)

In similar studies, it was suggested that some teachers wanted to challenge the ideas about gender and power that youth learn in their homes and elsewhere. Some educators expressed

that social change “starts from the classroom” (Ngabaza et al., 2016, p. 73). Thus, in order to address problems in wider society, such as gender inequality, educators should encourage learners to question and, in turn, transform the status quo. Nevertheless, the examples mentioned above were anomalies, and it was more common for educators to uphold patriarchal ideas.

Several studies suggested that the gendered attitudes that are reproduced in LO lessons are reflected in learners’ views and understandings of gender and relationships. For example, Kruger et al. (2015) found that young women’s discussions about sex included “concepts such as force, power, control and their own lack of control and disempowerment” (p. 38), reflecting their awareness of the imbalance of power that exists between men and women. In addition, the young women in their study viewed men as forceful and manipulative:

Erin: Or the boy manipulates the girl. Tells her “I love you” and then “You will have sex with me”.

Annelise: ... for boys it’s almost like “If you love me, prove it to me”, then the girl will always ask “how?”, and then the boy will say “With sex”.

Susan: The guy will maybe force her to do it [have sex], and if she doesn’t want to, he will maybe leave her just because she doesn’t want to have sex with him. That is what happens in relationships. (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 38)

Additionally, the study by Ngabaza et al. (2016) revealed that some young men had a similar understanding of sex and relationships typically involving manipulation and unequal power dynamics:

On the other side it [LO] teaches me about guys and girls that girls have a low self-esteem to guys. We always intimidate them, because we always pressure girls into doing things that they do not want to do and we always do stuff in general without fear, we add things up to make it more attractive and they fall for that. (p. 74)

The extract above illustrates a male learner’s idea of how interactions between men and women typically play out. The above-cited learner suggested that LO has taught him that women lack confidence and are thus easily manipulated and vulnerable to men’s persuasion. From his understanding, it is normal and acceptable for men to coerce women. These accounts from

learners emphasised the previously stated point that youth decisions and experiences take place in the context of gendered power relations, and this needs to be considered in LO sexuality education.

Furthermore, learners believed that there were different standards of behaviour placed on men and women. Women's behaviour was seen as governed by a restrictive "girl-code" that required them to practice "self-control always" (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 73). In contrast, boys were viewed as having "more freedom" (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 73) to behave as they pleased without being policed or faced with disapproval. In addition, studies suggested that young women perceived themselves as having more to lose from sex than men, as sex "spoils you as the girl and at the end you are the one that is being finished, not him" (Ngabaza et al., 2016, p. 76). Learners reiterated the notion that pregnancy is a consequence that women endure alone, while "the boy goes on with his life" (Shefer et al., 2015, p. 80), making sex more of a risk for women than men. Furthermore, studies suggested that the gendering of responsibility in LO sexuality education was internalised by learners. For example, a learner in the study by Mturi & Bechuke (2019) suggested that one of the ways sexuality education could be improved was by "laying more emphasis on girls when teaching sexuality education to prevent teenage pregnancy" (p. 145) highlighting the notion that women alone are responsible when it comes to pregnancy.

In addition, learners' accounts showed how the silencing of women that was perpetuated by LO educators played out in their experiences outside of the classroom as well. Kruger et al. (2015) found that, when speaking about their sexual experiences, "participants did not mention that they made a conscious decision to have sex" (p. 40). This finding suggests that young women, in particular, do not always play an active role in making decisions regarding their sexual and reproductive health, and are not always able to voice their thoughts, desires and feelings. Furthermore, learners' accounts revealed that young women "are aware of the fact that raped women 'usually' remain silent and that those who do tell are typically not believed" (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 39), suggesting that young women had an understanding of the ways in which they were disempowered.

The discussion above has illustrated the gendered messages that were delivered by educators in LO, as well as the ways in which the experiences and views of youth were gendered. Other research focused on gender and sexuality education has found similar patterns in the gendered messages delivered by educators, and suggested that educators' unexamined assumptions

around gender compromise the effectiveness of sexuality education (DePalma & Francis, 2014b). The acceptance of patriarchal gender norms by LO educators is concerning, as LO sexuality education has been identified as a key tool for challenging gender inequality in South Africa (Ngabaza et al., 2016). Patriarchal ideas and practices are dominant in society, and although the youth attitudes around gender described above are likely a reflection of a variety of influences, it is clear that LO does not often provide a space in which these ideas and practices are questioned or challenged. In silencing and disproportionately policing young women, LO educators play a role in maintaining a patriarchal status quo. In addition, separating mixed-gender classes reinforces a binary understanding of gender and is unhelpful in terms of destabilising patriarchal gender norms (Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019). Educators' gendered attitudes undermine the ability of LO to promote gender equality and reinforces the gendered attitudes of learners.

3.4 Attitudes around Sexuality Diversity

Issues around gender are closely connected to issues around sexuality, and the dominance of patriarchal understandings of gender described above was similarly present in educators and learners attitudes around sexuality diversity. The studies reviewed suggested that the sexuality education delivered by many educators was heterosexist as it privileged heterosexuality and presented it as the normal, default sexual orientation while excluding counter-normative sexualities. In the reviewed studies, it was common for sexuality diversity to either not be addressed by educators or to be addressed in problematic ways that marginalised queer learners.

Several studies indicated that LO educators delivered heteronormative messages in sexuality education lessons. Teachers usually did not have specific lessons planned for addressing sexuality diversity. Furthermore, the assumption that all learners were heterosexual seemed to underpin the information learners received from LO educators. For example, when being taught about the dangers of sex, the terms learners described being used implied that educators conflated sex with heterosexual penetrative sex: "that penis going into that vagina" (Francis, 2019a, p. 779), "vaginal fluid comes into contact with semen" (Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015, p. 69), and "what causes infection is that vaginal fluids mix with semen" (Shefer et al., 2015, p. 76). Furthermore, learners in the study by Francis (2019a) suggested that they were "programmed as such a girl with a guy, a guy with a girl and never a guy with a guy, or a girl with a girl" (p. 780) and their teachers only discussed heterosexual relationships, thus silencing

and excluding queer learners. Hence, LO educators privileged heterosexuality by excluding topics around sexuality diversity from their lessons.

Furthermore, the privileging of heterosexuality by educators was explicitly shown through the negative views they expressed towards counter-normative sexualities. Learners in the study by Mayeza and Vincent (2019) recalled teachers describing same-sex relationships as "not natural", "not normal" and as "a sin" (p. 479). Similarly, learners in the study by Francis (2019a) recounted teachers referring to homosexuality as "a bad thing", whereas heterosexuality was portrayed as "normal" and "natural" (p. 780).

On the other hand, in some instances, educators showed intentions of being inclusive while inadvertently expressing views that were othering. For example, educators expressed the notion that queer learners should be accepted and guided "to know the way" (Francis, 2019b, p. 413). Rather than being inclusive, this idea upholds heterosexuality as the standard and positions queer people as "the sinful and immoral Other who must be accepted and tolerated" (Francis, 2019b, p. 413). While educators may have believed that they were inclusive, in putting forward such views, they suggested that queer youth are abnormal, and heterosexuality is the preferred sexual orientation. Furthermore, educators saw queer youth as "innocent" and felt sorry for them, or "hypersexual" (Francis, 2019b, p. 417) and judged them. From either perspective, queer youth were stereotyped and perceived as different from other learners who were presumed to be heterosexual.

Nonetheless, some studies identified teachers who prioritised delivering inclusive sexuality education. For example, in the study by Francis (2019a), a learner described a teacher who made them feel supported and "comfortable" (p. 783) asking questions about sexuality diversity. In addition, in the study by Francis (2019b) a teacher expressed the importance of including topics that prioritise what learners want and need to know, which includes information about counter-normative sexualities:

I always let the learners suggest what we need to include as topics so that they feel that the sexuality education section is for them and about them. Not about me (laughs). . . .They want to know more about gay and lesbian sex. I have learned that I need to be more serious about the topic, and so when they laugh and giggle, I keep a serious tone because for me teaching about gay and lesbian is no joke. Including gay and lesbian sex in the curriculum is [as] serious and

important as when I discuss heterosexual sex. (p. 417)

The educator cited above emphasised the importance of sexuality education being shaped by what learners themselves identified as important topics. In allowing lessons to be guided by learners, she ensured that their wants and needs were met. In addition, in contrast to other educators who constructed same-sex relationships as abnormal, it is suggested that she made a conscious effort to be inclusive, approaching the topic of gay and lesbian sex as a serious and important one that was relevant to her learners. Although many educators did not share this approach, the account above suggests that educators need to learn how to address such topics, as learners want these topics included in sexuality education lessons.

Similarly, the attitudes of youth revealed in studies included a variety of beliefs and understandings around sexuality diversity. In several studies, it was suggested that many young people took it for granted that sex and intimate relationships take place “between a man and a woman” (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 34). In addition, educators and queer learners in studies were asked questions by learners such as whether gay people “are promiscuous” (Francis, 2019a, p. 780), how “gays know who’s the male and female in the relationship” and whether bisexuality was “normal or is it just about being sexually confused” (Francis, 2019b, p. 418). Such questions reflected the misconceptions and limited knowledge and understanding many youths had about issues relating to sexuality diversity. Francis (2019b) found that many of the questions learners raised about same-sex relationships were “framed heterocentrically” (p. 418), based on the assumption that heterosexuality is the normal sexual orientation. Francis (2019b) also noted that learners associated counter-normative sexualities with “a hedonistic lifestyle” involving “drugs, porn, clubbing and having sex with multiple partners” (p. 415). While learners may not have consciously been marginalising queer individuals, their ideas often reflected the notion that counter-normative sexualities are abnormal.

On the other hand, studies showed that in some cases learners explicitly expressed homophobic views through the use of derogatory terms such as “koeksister” (Francis, 2019a, p. 781), a word used to refer to a lesbian, and descriptions of homosexuality as wrong and “unnatural” (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 479). In addition, learners reiterated the notion expressed by teachers that homosexuality was wrong, but needed to be tolerated:

Participant: I hate them. I hate the fact that they turn God's nature. Because if God wanted lesbians, he would have created Adam and Adam and also Eve and

Eve, you see? He created Adam and Eve because he wanted a guy and a girl.
Not so a girl can fall in love with another girl and a boy with another boy

Interviewer: Is it not supposed to be like that?

...

Participant: We all agree that it is not supposed to be that way, a girl is not supposed to date another girl, but we do speak with them when we have to.
(Ngabaza et al., 2016, p. 75)

In the extract above, the learner implied that there was a consensus around the belief that same-sex relationships are wrong and drew on religious ideas to rationalise her feelings towards same-sex relationships. Furthermore, she expressed that her tolerance for counter-normative sexualities was not because she accepted or viewed them as equal. Rather, she engaged with them only when she had no other choice.

In contrast, some learners challenged the absence of sexuality diversity in lessons. The study by Francis (2019a) suggested that learners viewed the heterocentric approach of educators as "narrow" (p. 780) and insufficient. Learners expressed that educators taught "Just hetero stuff which is actually unfair" (Francis, 2019a, p. 782) to the queer learners at school. Furthermore, in response to educators' silence around sexuality diversity, learners brought topics around sexuality diversity into lessons themselves through their projects as well as in "classroom activities, role plays, and discussion" (Francis, 2019b, p. 416).

In common with the findings of other studies, this review has highlighted the exclusion of topics around sexuality diversity from LO as an important aspect of the programme's failure to provide comprehensive and inclusive sexuality education to learners (DePalma & Francis, 2014a; Francis, 2012; Francis, 2017; Francis & Kuhl, 2020). The silences around sexuality diversity in LO undermine the legitimacy of counter-normative sexualities and suggests that the rights guaranteed to queer people in South Africa's constitution are not being carried out in the arena of education (DePalma & Francis, 2014a). Furthermore, findings regarding learners' attitudes have emphasised the need for topics around sexuality diversity to be included in LO sexuality education. Studies showed that many learners were interested and curious about counter-normative sexualities and held several misconceptions regarding same-sex relationships. While learners directed many of their questions to their queer peers, the onus

should not be on queer youth to educate their classmates on topics that have been omitted from sexuality education lessons (Francis 2019a).

LO lessons should be a space in which all learners can ask questions and access relevant and accurate information, including information around sexuality diversity. The negative attitudes of some learners were clearly shaped by influences outside of LO, such as religion. However, if LO is to encourage learners to take responsibility for their lives, including their beliefs and actions toward others, it should provide learners with the opportunity to question the beliefs they hold. LO educators should provide sexuality education that is inclusive of queer learners, and facilitate learners understanding of perspectives and experiences that may be different from their own. It has been suggested that teachers have insufficient content and pedagogical knowledge to teach sexuality diversity (Francis, 2012; Francis, 2017). In addition, teachers have no clear policy to draw on for guidance in addressing sexuality diversity (Francis, 2012; DePalma & Francis, 2014a). Thus, in order for sexuality education to be more inclusive and meet the needs of learners, teachers need to be provided with ongoing training (DePalma & Francis, 2014a; Francis, 2012; Francis, 2017).

3.5 The Influence of Personal Beliefs on Sexuality Education

In this section, the influence of LO educators' personal beliefs on what and how they teach is discussed. Studies revealed that educators' personal views played a significant role in informing the content and delivery of sexuality education lessons. As mentioned previously, educators sometimes linked the promotion of abstinence to their religious views such as their “Christian beliefs” (Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019, p. 5). In addition, studies showed that for many educators, talking about sex with young people did not align with their “conservative” (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 34) backgrounds and “personal value system” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b, p. 371). Educators believed “they were too old to speak to children” (Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019, p. 5) about sex or considered it “taboo within their culture or according to their religious beliefs” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 339). Teachers expressed that this conflict made it “difficult and uncomfortable” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 338) to deliver sexuality education lessons. Furthermore, for some teachers, topics around counter-normative sexualities were a source of discomfort.

Studies showed that youth felt that educators' conservative beliefs made them “unapproachable” (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 480) and unrelatable. Learners felt that

educators were out of touch with their experiences and needed to “come to terms with the fact that teenagers all over are having sex, there are gays, there are lesbians, there are straight people all thinking about or even having sex” (Francis, 2019a, p. 779). In the study by Adams Tucker et al. (2017), it was suggested that one of the strengths of external facilitators compared to LO educators was their relatability and willingness to discuss their experiences openly and assure learners that “there’s no gap between us and them” (p. 84).

Relatedly, studies identified several qualities that were seen as necessary for LO teachers to deliver sexuality education effectively. Studies highlighted the importance of educators creating a sense of privacy and confidentiality between themselves and learners and being “trustworthy, approachable and genuinely concerned about learner well-being” (George et al., 2018, p. 48). In addition, it was seen as important for educators to build a “warm, friendly and open relationship with learners” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz 2019b, p. 372) that was supportive and judgement-free. In some instances, the influence of educators' cultural and religious beliefs concerning youth sexuality may have hindered their ability to make learners feel comfortable, open and accepted in LO lessons. As suggested previously, many teachers created a learning and teaching environment in which some learners felt judged and excluded.

However, several LO educators suggested that the cultural and religious beliefs of learners, as well as their parents and communities, influenced educators' ability to teach sexuality education. Learners reiterated the notion that it is “awkward” and inappropriate for sex to be discussed between learners and educators and expressed that “it’s a taboo in our culture to have adults talking with children about sex” (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 480). Furthermore, educators suggested that their efforts to challenge gender inequality through LO lessons were undermined by gendered cultural practices and patriarchal norms that were upheld in learners' homes and communities. Educators reported that “some of the girls come from cultures where they are expected to take a submissive role” and boys are often encouraged to “demand respect and insist on being recognized as men” (Ngabaza et al., 2016, p. 73).

The influence of educators' personal beliefs on sexuality education has been documented in several studies. Similar to the findings of this review, other studies have highlighted the discomfort of educators in addressing topics that contradict their personal beliefs and the ways in which these beliefs shape lessons. Many teachers view themselves as responsible for teaching morals and values to learners in sexuality education in order to promote healthy attitudes and behaviours (Ahmed et al., 2009; Francis, 2011; Francis, 2013). As values and

morals are subjective, it is not surprising that educators' personal beliefs largely determine the messages they deliver in LO sexuality education. In addition, in the absence of adequate training or guidelines to form a foundation for their lessons, educators use their personal values for direction (Francis, 2011). However, educators' personal beliefs are often in conflict with a comprehensive approach to sexuality education, and thus undermine the aims of LO when used to guide lessons (Francis, 2013). For example, the necessary qualities of an LO educator described above, such as being open and non-judgmental, contradict the widely held belief that adults should not discuss sex with young people. Educators need to be better supported through detailed policy and curriculum documents, as well as training that enables them to engage with their personal socialisation, beliefs and values and how these influence the sexuality education they deliver (Ahmed et al., 2009; Francis, 2013).

Moreover, this review has highlighted the importance of parents and communities being involved in sexuality education as their attitudes have an influence on the beliefs of learners, and how learners receive the messages that are delivered in LO lessons. Educators and schools need to find ways of involving parents and community members so that the aims and value of comprehensive sexuality education are collectively understood (Francis, 2013). Many topics that educators address such as gender and power are social issues, and the attitudes communicated by parents and community members may undermine the efforts of educators. The cooperation and support from parents and communities can make sexuality education more effective and support teachers by creating a shared sense of responsibility for providing youth with comprehensive sexuality education (Ahmed et al., 2009).

3.6 Barriers to Delivering Sexuality Education

Studies repeatedly highlighted the challenges educators face in delivering sexuality education. The sexuality education component of the LO curriculum was described as particularly challenging to teach because of the sensitive and personal nature of some of the topics it includes. Furthermore, LO educators described their position as being different to other teachers, requiring them to take on several complex and challenging roles, including that of a “caregiver, counsellor and friend” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019a, p. 1122), a “role model” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b, p. 371), “a guide or mentor”, “a social worker” (George et al., 2018, p. 47), “a change agent” (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 36), and wearing “the hat of a parent” (George et al., 2018, p. 48).

Furthermore, the challenges inherent in the roles and responsibilities of LO teachers are compounded by several barriers they face in delivering sexuality education. A common barrier highlighted in studies was the lack of training LO educators receive. Studies suggested that educators' lack of training impacts their “classroom management and attitudes towards sexuality education” (George et al., 2020, p. 107), their “knowledge and confidence” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 342) and their ability to “deliver Sexuality and HIV/ AIDS Education confidently and effectively” (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 36). In addition, de Reus et al. (2015) identified that the training educators had received was designed for mainstream schools, whereas they required training in delivering sexuality education to learners with disabilities. Additional barriers related to delivering sexuality education to learners with disabilities were that learners struggled “to grasp the information and lessons taught to them” (Louw, 2017, p. 429) and usually learners in the same class had different types of impairments, multiple intellectual levels, and were different ages, making it “hard to teach the whole class about the things that are naughty” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 339) and deliver sexuality education appropriate for every learner in their class.

In addition to not receiving adequate training, studies highlighted the lack of support LO teachers receive from their colleagues, including their supervisors and school management. Some LO teachers reported that their supervisors and principals were not aware of the content expected to be taught or aware of the challenges educators experienced in delivering it, and believed that “anybody can teach life orientation” (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 35) On the other hand, there were also examples of educators who felt supported by their colleagues and were encouraged by their schools to attend training, conferences, and meetings to develop their skills. For example, one study described:

HoDs who provided good direction and support (i.e., curriculum-based support and social and emotional support) to LO educators, who taught LO themselves and were thus aware of the challenges and classroom experiences of their fellow LO educators, played a significant role in the delivery of LO in the school. (George et al., 2018, p. 53)

Another barrier highlighted in several studies was the lack of cooperation LO educators received from parents. Some teachers suggested that parents were not involved enough in sexuality education as they showed a “lack of interest” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 341) and “do not discuss information related to sexuality at home” (Louw, 2017, p. 430). Parents'

involvement was also seen as a challenge as they had “different opinions about the content of sexuality education” (de Reus et al. 2015, p. 341) that did not always align with the sexuality education curriculum. Educators and learners suggested that some parents view their children as too innocent to know about sex, and would “complain if they found out that their children had been exposed to sexual matters” (Mturi & Bechuke, 2019, p. 145). As a result, educators approached sexuality education lessons with caution and were concerned about upsetting parents.

Furthermore, the cooperation of authority figures in the community such as “the head man” or “the chief” lends credibility to educators and allows them to deliver sexuality education without the fear of parents objecting, as “if you have permission from that you can go ahead with everything” (Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019, p. 7). In addition, educators suggested that some community leaders are “flexible” and open to understanding how cultural beliefs and practices, such as “the initiation culture” (Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019, p. 6), might interfere with messages from LO, and helping educators navigate this challenge.

In order to increase their confidence and professional competence, educators require more resources to utilise in the planning and facilitation of lessons. A major challenge experienced by educators was the inadequacy of the LO curriculum as a resource for guidance and direction. Some educators felt restricted by the curriculum and unable to address sensitive or controversial issues in class as “if items were missing in the curriculum, some educators felt they could not talk about them” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 339). Furthermore, it was suggested that the LO curriculum lacks clarity which brings about “uncertain teaching contexts” (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 34) where educators were unsure about what to include in lessons and how comprehensive to be. Moreover, several educators felt that the quality of the sexuality education they provided was compromised because not enough time was allocated for LO lessons and as a result “there is not really time” (Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019, p. 4) to be in-depth or address all important topics.

Additional resources that educators required but often did not have access to included tools and materials such as “Pictures, posters, DVDs and charts which show different aspects of sexuality” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 339), “Complete lesson plans” and “a very good textbook” (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 34), “designated LO classrooms and private rooms for counselling” (George et al., 2018, p. 58) “resources for video streaming/presentation and internet access” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019a, p. 1120). Inaccessibility to these resources

restricted LO educators' ability to deliver effective sexuality education to youth. This is illustrated by the finding that schools that had "greater access to LO resources" were able to facilitate participatory lessons, whereas in schools with "fewer resources, less training, overcrowded classrooms", educators tended to limit their lessons to "simplistic and prescriptive warnings about HIV and sexual behaviour" (George et al., 2020, p. 110).

In the absence of sufficient training and adequate resources, LO educators draw on their life experiences for the knowledge and skills necessary to deliver sexuality education to young people. For example, Francis and DePalma (2015) found that educators felt equipped to deliver sexuality education because of the knowledge and skills they gained from "their previous teaching subjects" (p. 35) and background training in "Psychology or Nursing" (George et al., 2020, p. 108). Educators also gained confidence from their experiences as parents and older siblings as well as "personal experiences, such as marriage, divorce and gay friends" (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 36). Furthermore, some educators believed that being older than their fellow LO teachers made them more competent sexuality education teachers because younger teachers "can't discourage it because they are of that age" (George et al., 2018, p. 49). Other educators suggested that being younger than other teachers made them more "modern" (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz 2019b, p. 372) and relatable, and thus better suited for the role than older teachers.

The barriers to delivering sexuality education discussed above have been outlined in other research. In particular, scholars have repeatedly found that educators lack sufficient training and as a result do not have the skills or content knowledge to successfully deliver sexuality education (Ahmed et al., 2009; DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Francis, 2010; Francis, 2013; Francis, 2021). As suggested in previous sections, the lack of training for teachers leaves them ill-equipped to address topics such as sexuality diversity (Francis, 2012; Francis, 2021; Msibi, 2012) or facilitate open and in-depth discussions about sex which may contradict their personal beliefs (Ahmed et al., 2009; Francis, 2013). Furthermore, the importance of support and cooperation from parents and communities has been reiterated in this section, as without a shared understanding of the aims and content of sexuality education, parents and community members cannot support educators sufficiently, and sometimes obstruct the delivery of comprehensive lessons. In order to clearly communicate the intentions of LO sexuality education, educators themselves need clear and detailed curriculum documents that provide them with guidance on what and how to teach (Francis, 2013). Sexuality education can be

challenging to deliver, and LO educators need to be supported by the government, schools, parents and communities if they are to successfully fulfil their roles (George et al., 2018).

3.7 The Perceived Value of Sexuality Education

As discussed above, many LO educators find the sexuality education component of LO particularly challenging to deliver. However, it is largely agreed that sexuality education is a valuable and important component of LO. Several studies showed that educators viewed sexuality education as valuable because of “the empowerment that can accompany” (de Reus et al., 2015, p. 342) learners' acquisition of knowledge and because “all the children have the right to know about their sexuality” (Louw, 2017, p. 429) and how to live safe and healthy lives. Furthermore, studies suggested that teachers value the input of learners “because they have a lot of information” (Francis & DePalma, 2015, p. 35) and encouraged them to participate in and guide lessons to ensure that “topics were adjusted to be relevant to learners” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b, p. 369) and meet their needs. Only one study suggested that some teachers are concerned that sexuality education has the adverse effect of making learners “more aware in a negative way” (Louw, 2017, p. 429) of their sexuality, and encourages them to influence each other to become sexually active.

However, the value of LO sexuality education is not always acknowledged by other teachers in schools and LO teachers expressed that their colleagues undermined LO:

There's that stigma that life orientation is just a subject where we talk about everything, so it's an 'easy subject.' So, 'Can we have your period now? We can use them for something more important.' Sometimes they don't understand the importance of it. (George et al., 2018, p. 53)

Thus, the attitudes of other educators interfered with LO educators' ability to adequately deliver LO. A common explanation for LO being undervalued was that the subject “was not a requirement for further studies in higher education” (Mturi & Bechuke, 2019, p. 145). The disregard for LO by other teachers and supervisors in the school sometimes resulted in teachers being assigned to LO without being qualified to teach it or “as a form of penalty for underperforming” (George et al., 2020, p. 109). Additionally, LO teachers often taught other subjects alongside LO and had to prioritise their “other more academic subjects over LO and sexuality education” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019a, p. 1123).

Furthermore, LO teachers believed that learners did not take LO seriously and treated it as a “general knowledge subject” (George et al., 2018, p. 52) as they were “disruptive” (Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b, p. 370) in lessons, “do not listen” (Mturi & Bechuke, 2019, p. 145) and “failed to complete tasks” (George et al., 2020, p. 109). Similarly, learners' disengagement was understood to be a response to LO not being a requirement for university admission. Educators also suggested that learners found sexuality education content boring and repetitive, as they had been receiving “HIV prevention messaging since primary school” (George et al., 2018, p. 52).

Although sexuality education was thought to be perceived by some learners as boring and repetitive, LO educators believed that learners lack adequate knowledge and understanding to engage in safe sexual relationships, making sexuality education crucial. An educator in the study by George et al. (2020) identified the paradox between learners simultaneously being bored with sexuality education content, and not having sufficient understanding of it:

Regarding the HIV specifically, I have a feeling that, that it's, old news, it's "flogging a dead horse". The learners have had this on primary school, in every grade, and in different subjects also, they do it in the languages, in essays, or in comprehension tests, or whatever. They are bored with the subject, on the one side. The other side, we must keep on doing it because there are still a lot of myths and lack of information out there and personally I don't know how to bridge that gap. "It will not happen to me", sort of, "It happens to Black people or to poor people. It won't happen to me. So I don't listen in class to what the teacher says". I don't know how to bridge that gap. If somebody can discover that tool. (p. 109)

The reported disengagement of learners despite their perceived lack of knowledge and understanding of lesson content suggests that the content and delivery of sexuality education lessons need to be improved to be effective and meet young people's needs and wants. Youth expressed a desire for more detailed and in-depth discussions about sex and sexuality, including discussions on “sexual and intimate relationships” and “feelings and desire” (Kruger et al., 2015, p. 38). In addition, youth expressed the need for sexuality education to “be more about safe sex” (Francis, 2019a, p. 779), rather than promoting abstinence. Learners also communicated a need for topics around sexuality diversity to be addressed in LO lessons, for example, they “want to learn more about what it means to be gay or lesbian” (Mayeza &

Vincent, 2019, p. 479).

On the other hand, studies indicated that youth value LO sexuality education and felt as though it had empowered them to make informed decisions about their sexual and reproductive health, most commonly with regards to condom use. Youth descriptions of LO sexuality education as important and valuable contrasted educators' sentiments that learners disregarded the subject. The following extract illustrates the value that some learners attached to LO sexuality education.

Many learners in my school have boyfriends and girlfriends and for me LO sexuality education classes have been very useful because I know I must use a condom when I'm having sex. I know many of my peers who are already HIV positive and I think if I was not taught about safe sex I would probably also be HIV positive by now. Because I was taught how to use a condom to protect myself from STIs long before I started dating and having sex, by the time I started dating and having sex I already knew about the risks of unprotected sex. (Mayeza & Vincent, 2019, p. 482)

For youth such as the learner quoted above, LO sexuality education has been crucial in informing them about risks and has shaped their attitudes and behaviours with regards to safe sex. Contrary to the perceptions of some non-LO educators, accounts of youth such as the learner above suggest that LO is an important subject for learners and should be prioritised.

The perceptions of LO educators and learners regarding the value of sexuality education suggest that LO educators want to, and to an extent do provide learners with the knowledge and tools they need to have safe sexual relationships. While sexuality education should entail much more than just messages about risk, safety is a crucial aspect of sexuality education as education is crucial in addressing the prevalence of HIV, which remains a significant health issue (Aggleton et al., 2011). In addition, the discussion above supports Francis and DePalma's (2014) argument that in South Africa, abstinence-only and comprehensive sexuality education are not conflicting approaches. Rather, they are merged by educators to balance their advocacy of abstinence with the importance of acknowledging youth as sexual beings. As previously discussed, educators usually prefer to deter learners from having sex and limit the scope of discussions. However, educators are not naive to the reality that youth are sexually active and see it as important to provide learners with the knowledge they need to manage their sexual

health.

Nevertheless, the extent to which educators meet youth needs and provide learners with valuable skills information is limited. Learners' perceptions of LO sexuality education emphasised areas in which sexuality education needs to be improved. That is, it needs to be more comprehensive and more inclusive. These findings are supported by other scholars' research highlighting the gaps between what learners want from sexuality education and what they receive (Beyers, 2013; Francis, 2011).

3.8 Conclusion

Based on a systematic review of literature on LO sexuality education, discussion in the preceding sections has suggested that similar themes are present in relation to the attitudes of educators in delivering sexuality education and the attitudes of youth to sex and sexuality. Studies revealed that educators predominantly focus their lessons around abstinence, and deter learners from having sex by emphasising negative consequences. Furthermore, it is suggested that educators' messages around abstinence are internalised by learners, who often conceptualised their sexuality primarily through the framework of sex being wrong and dangerous. Furthermore, studies suggested that the attitudes of educators, as well as learners, largely uphold hetero-patriarchal ideas about gender roles, sex and relationships. Based on this review, it is suggested that LO sexuality education does little to challenge gender inequality and is not inclusive of counter-normative sexualities.

Many learners reiterated problematic aspects of LO educators' attitudes. However, some learners rejected the attitudes of LO educators. Learners in the studies reviewed highlighted the need for LO sexuality education to expand its focus beyond abstinence and risk as well as address topics around sexuality diversity. Furthermore, although several areas shape learners' attitudes, it is suggested that LO sexuality education is not an area in which positive sexualities are fostered, or sexual and reproductive health issues are adequately addressed. Where youth perceived LO sexuality education as empowering, the value of LO was typically linked to being taught about condom use and prevention. Furthermore, due to the narrow focus of LO sexuality education, it is likely that a limited group of learners benefit from the information imparted in lessons as, although messages around safety are important, studies suggest that they are usually centred on heterosexual cis-gender males.

The weaknesses in the implementation of LO sexuality education described above should be

understood in relation to the barriers educators face in delivering sexuality education. In particular, the lack of training of LO educators is an obstacle in delivering effective sexuality education. Teachers need to be supported in interrogating their own beliefs and assumptions about gender and sexuality and understanding how this impacts the messages they deliver in LO. Moreover, without training, educators do not have adequate content knowledge or skills to provide comprehensive sexuality education that meets the needs of all learners (DePalma & Francis, 2014b; Francis, 2012).

4. Conclusions

The following sections draw conclusions about the value and limitations of this systematic review. To begin with, this chapter discusses the extent to which the research questions have been answered. Next, the strengths and weaknesses of this research are considered. Finally, suggestions are put forward for how this research can be built on in the future.

Two research questions were posed in this review: (1) what themes are present in relation to the attitudes of LO educators in delivering sexuality education, and (2) what themes are present in relation to the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality. Six themes were identified in the 17 articles reviewed: attitudes around abstinence; gendered attitudes; attitudes around sexuality diversity; the influence of personal beliefs on sexuality education; barriers to delivering sexuality education; and the perceived value of sexuality education. Similar patterns were found with regards to educators and youth attitudes, specifically around abstinence, gender, sexuality diversity, and the value of LO sexuality education. To a certain extent, the themes identified and discussed addressed both research questions.

In terms of the first research question, the themes present in relation to the attitudes of educators pointed to educators' attitudes around abstinence, gender, sexuality diversity, the value of sexuality education and their views about barriers to delivering sexuality education. Educators' attitudes were primarily revealed through the messages that were reported to have been communicated to learners in LO sexuality education lessons. Studies showed that views were not uniform across all LO educators. For the most part, studies showed that LO educators believe that young people should abstain from sex, accept and possibly reproduce patriarchal and heteronormative ideas about gender roles and sexuality diversity, and believe sexuality education is valuable and important. However, educators also find it challenging to deliver comprehensive sexuality education due to several notable barriers, such as lack of training and personal religious beliefs.

Regarding the second question, the extent to which the review addressed the influence of LO on youth attitudes is limited, as the attitudes of youth discussed were not always influenced by LO. From the studies reviewed, aspects of youth attitudes to sex and sexuality were identified. Namely, studies suggested that learners often view sex as risky, something that cannot openly be discussed with adults such as teachers, and something that many young people engage in, regardless of the abstinence focused messages they receive in LO. In addition, studies

suggested youth attitudes are gendered, with ideas about male power and female submission and responsibility shaping their ideas about sex and relationships. Studies also showed that many learners have several misconceptions about same-sex relationships and a lack of knowledge on topics around sexuality such as same-sex relationships, which, for the most part, they would like to be addressed in LO. While the themes present in relation to learners' attitudes highlighted aspects in which LO sexuality education falls short, it was also shown that LO sexuality education is valuable to many learners, and has had a significant influence on their attitudes around and practices regarding safe sex.

However, it was also shown in studies that learners attitudes towards sex and sexuality cannot be sufficiently understood in the context of LO sexuality education alone. In addition, the implementation of LO sexuality education cannot be sufficiently understood separately from other influences, most notable in this review was that of parents and communities. Studies highlighted the influence of parents and communities in obstructing and supporting the delivering of sexuality education, as well as how parents and communities influence youth views about sex, gender and power. Furthermore, in some instances, the messages delivered by LO educators reflected commonly held ideas in society. For example, the gendered nature of learners' attitudes reflects the sexism and gendered powered relations and practices that exist and play out in several spheres of learners' lives. Although it was shown that LO does little to promote gender equality, the gendered attitudes of learners are not an indication of the influence of LO specifically. Similarly, the homophobic ideas or misconceptions around sexuality diversity that were identified, as well as the reported desire of learners to know more about topics around sexuality diversity, are likely influenced by several factors. Thus, despite the presence of corresponding themes in relation to the attitudes of LO educators and the attitudes of youth, the extent to which the review addressed the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality is limited.

Despite the limitation discussed above, the findings of this review are valuable as they provide an organised, accessible and reliable summary of findings from 17 articles on LO sexuality education. This research has been carried out systematically; every part of this research process has been described, and a series of recorded and replicable steps and procedures have been followed (Bambra, 2011; Gough et al., 2012). While the process of data analysis was subjective, with the researcher playing an active role in the identification and mapping of codes and themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006), the review has been carried out transparently. The formal

and transparent nature of the research process through which this review's findings were reached can be considered a strength. However, this review has several limitations.

One of the limitations of this review is that it is based exclusively on qualitative studies. The studies reviewed were carried out with small sample sizes, and primarily utilised semi-structured interviews, in-depth interviews and focus groups to collect data. None of the samples in the studies were randomly selected, and the focus of studies was often context-specific. Thus, this review's findings cannot be used to make generalisations or determine causal relationships between LO sexuality education and learners' attitudes. As previously highlighted, youth attitudes towards sex and sexuality are not shaped by formal school-based programmes alone, but by an interaction of factors, including culture, religion, and interactions with peers (Beyers, 2013; Macleod et al., 2015; Mthatyana & Vincent, 2015). Furthermore, the categories of youth and educators are not homogenous groups, and within these groups, a variety of experiences and perspectives exist. For example, the specific age, race, sexual orientation and socioeconomic status of a person will play a role in shaping their views and experiences. Thus, the patterns that were found in the reviewed studies do not necessarily reflect the general attitudes that exist among educators or young people. In addition, in summarising the findings of a variety of studies, carried out in a variety of contexts, the ways in which specific contextual factors may have informed the attitudes and experiences of educators and youth have not been represented in this review as substantially as they were in the primary studies that were reviewed. Furthermore, the content and delivery of sexuality education in LO programmes is not uniform across all schools in South Africa. Although all schools are required to include sexuality education in the LO curriculum, different schools and teachers may choose to approach sexuality education differently (Francis, 2011; Francis & DePalma, 2014). In addition, as noted in the findings of this review, factors such as access to resources and the support of communities shape the quality of sexuality education that learners receive. Thus, the patterns found in relation to the delivery of LO sexuality education may not reflect most LO programmes in South Africa.

Considering the limitations described above, it may be valuable for future research to explore the influence of LO through more context-specific and concise research questions than the ones that guided this review. Furthermore, the themes identified in this review more clearly addressed the attitudes of LO educators than youth. In addition, only five out of the 17 studies reviewed were centred on learners' perspectives and experiences alone. In order to gain a better

understanding of learners' attitudes to sex and sexuality, as well as how they might be shaped by LO, future research centred on the voices and perspectives of learners is important. For sexuality education programmes to be effective, they need to understand and prioritise young people's perceptions.

In conclusion, this review has strengths and limitations. The limitations of this review include the extent to which it has addressed the influence of LO on youth attitudes to sex and sexuality, the lack of specificity regarding the research questions and the lack of generalisability regarding the findings. This review's strengths relate to the methodology that has been utilised and includes the reliability of the findings and the access they have provided to the findings from a variety of studies in a coherent and synthesised form. It has been suggested that this review can be built on by informing more directed and specifically focused studies, particularly on the perspectives of youth.

Word Count: 18237

References

- Adams Tucker, L., George, G., Reardon, C., & Panday, S. (2017). Sexuality education in South African schools: The challenge for civil society organisations. *Health Education Journal*, 76(1), 77-88. doi:10.1177/0017896916652166
- Aggleton, P., Yankah, E., & Crewe, M. (2011). Education and HIV/AIDS—30 years on. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 23(6), 495-507. doi:10.1521/aeap.2011.23.6.495
- Ahmed, N., Flisher, A. J., Mathews, C., Mukoma, W., & Jansen, S. (2009). HIV education in South African schools: The dilemma and conflicts of educators. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 37(2_suppl), 48-54. doi:10.1177/1403494808097190
- Allen, L. (2007). Doing 'it' differently: Relinquishing the disease and pregnancy prevention focus in sexuality education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28(5), 575-588. doi:10.1080/01425690701505367
- Bambra, C. (2011). Real world reviews: A beginner's guide to undertaking systematic reviews of public health policy interventions. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 65(1), 14-19. doi:10.1136/jech.2009.088740 17
- Beksinska, M. E., Pillay, L., Milford, C., & Smit, J. A. (2014). The sexual and reproductive health needs of youth in South Africa—history in context. *South African Medical Journal*, 104(10), 676-678. doi:10.7196/SAMJ.8809
- Beyers, C. (2011). Sexuality education in South Africa: A sociocultural perspective. *Acta Academica*, 43(3), 192-209.
- Beyers, C. (2013). In search of healthy sexuality: The gap between what youth want and what teachers think they need. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 9(3), 550-560. doi:10.4102/td.v9i3.197
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- de Reus, L., Hanass-Hancock, J., Henken, S., & van Brakel, W. (2015). Challenges in providing HIV and sexuality education to learners with disabilities in South Africa: The voice of educators. *Sex Education*, 15(4), 333-347. doi:10.1080/14681811.2015.1023283
- DePalma, R., & Francis, D. (2014a). South African life orientation teachers: (Not)

- teaching about sexuality diversity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 61(12), 1687-1711. doi:10.1080/00918369.2014.951256
- DePalma, R., & Francis, D. A. (2014b). The gendered nature of South African teachers' discourse on sex education. *Health Education Research*, 29(4), 624-632. doi:10.1093/her/cyt117
- Dietrich, J., Khunwane, M., Laher, F., de Bruyn, G., Sikkema, K. J., & Gray, G. (2011). "Group sex" parties and other risk patterns: A qualitative study about the perceptions of sexual behaviours and attitudes of adolescents in Soweto, South Africa. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, 6(3), 244-254. doi:10.1080/17450128.2011.597796
- Eaton, L., Flisher, A. J., & Aarø, L. E. (2003). Unsafe sexual behaviour in South African youth. *Social Science & Medicine*, 56(1), 149-165. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00017-5
- Francis, D. A. (2010). Sexuality education in South Africa: Three essential questions. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 30(3), 314-319. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2009.12.003
- Francis, D. A. (2011). Sexuality education in South Africa: Wedged within a triad of contradictory values. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 21(2), 317-22. doi:10.1080/14330237.2011.10820463
- Francis, D. A. (2012). Teacher positioning on the teaching of sexual diversity in South African schools. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 14(6), 597-611. doi:10.1080/13691058.2012.674558
- Francis, D. A. (2013). Sexuality education in South Africa: Whose values are we teaching? *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 22(2), 69-76. doi:10.3138/cjhs.2013.2199
- Francis, D. A. (2017). Homophobia and sexuality diversity in South African schools: A review. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 14(4), 359-379. doi:10.1080/19361653.2017.1326868
- Francis, D. A. (2019a). 'Keeping it straight' what do South African queer youth say they need from sexuality education? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 22(6), 772-790. doi:10.1080/13676261.2018.1539223
- Francis, D. A. (2019b). What does the teaching and learning of sexuality education in

South African schools reveal about counter-normative sexualities? *Sex Education*, 19(4), 406-421. doi:10.1080/14681811.2018.1563535

Francis, D. A. (2021). 'Oh my word; for us African gays it's another story.' revealing the intersections between race, same sex-sexuality and schooling in South Africa. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 24(1), 1-17. doi:10.1080/13613324.2019.1679752

Francis, D. A., & DePalma, R. (2014). Teacher perspectives on abstinence and safe sex education in South Africa. *Sex Education*, 14(1), 81-94. doi:10.1080/14681811.2013.833091

Francis, D. A., & DePalma, R. (2015). 'You need to have some guts to teach': Teacher preparation and characteristics for the teaching of sexuality and HIV/AIDS education in South African schools. *SAHARA-J: Journal of Social Aspects of HIV/AIDS Research Alliance*, 12(1), 30-38. doi:10.1080/17290376.2015.1085892

Francis, D. A., & Kuhl, K. (2020). Imagining a curriculum beyond compulsory heterosexuality in South African education. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 1-20. doi:10.1080/19361653.2020.1844606

George, G., Tucker, L. A., Panday, S., & Khumalo, F. (2018). Challenges facing life orientation educators in the delivery of sexuality education in South African schools. *Southern African Review of Education with Education with Production*, 24(1), 43-57.

George, G., Tucker, L. A., Panday, S., & Khumalo, F. (2020). Delivering sexuality education: A review of teaching pedagogies within South African schools. *Perspectives in Education*, 37(1), 101-114. doi:10.18820/2519593X/pie.v37i1.8

Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (2012). Introducing systematic reviews. In D. Gough, S. Oliver, & J. Thomas (Eds.), *An introduction to systematic reviews* (pp. 1-17). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Hanass-Hancock, J., Nene, S., Johns, R., & Chappell, P. (2018). The impact of contextual factors on comprehensive sexuality education for learners with intellectual disabilities in South Africa. *Sexuality and Disability*, 36(2), 123-140. doi:10.1007/s11195-018-9526-z

Harden, A., & Gough, D. (2012). Quality and relevance appraisal. In D. Gough, S. Oliver, & J. Thomas (Eds.), *An introduction to systematic reviews* (pp. 154-178). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Jewkes, R. K., Dunkle, K., Nduna, M., & Shai, N. (2010). Intimate partner violence,

relationship power inequity, and incidence of HIV infection in young women in South Africa: A cohort study. *The Lancet*, 376(9734), 41-48. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60548-X

Jimmyns, C. A., & Meyer-Weitz, A. (2019a). The Influence of School Contextual Factors on Educators' Efforts in Teaching Sexuality Education in Secondary Schools in Durban, South Africa. *Sexuality & Culture*, 23(4), 1110-1130. doi:10.1007/s12119-019-09616-4

Jimmyns, C. A., & Meyer-Weitz, A. (2019b). Factors That Have an Impact on Educator Pedagogues in Teaching Sexuality Education to Secondary School Learners in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 17(3), 364-377. doi:10.1007/s13178-019-00400-5

Khoza, L. B. (2004). Adolescents' knowledge, beliefs and experiences regarding sexual practices. *Health SA Gesondheid*, 9(3), 34-41. doi:10.4102/hsag.v9i3.170

Kruger, L., Shefer, T., & Oakes, A. (2015). 'I could have done everything and why not?': Young women's complex constructions of sexual agency in the context of sexualities education in life orientation in South African schools. *Perspectives in Education*, 33(2), 30-48.

Louw, J. S. (2017). A qualitative exploration of teacher and school staff experiences when teaching sexuality education programmes at special needs schools in South Africa. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 14(4), 425-433. doi:10.1007/s13178-016-0271-8

Macleod, C. (2009). Danger and Disease in Sex Education: The Saturation of 'Adolescence' with Colonialist Assumptions. *Journal of Health Management*, 11(2), 375-389. doi:10.1177/097206340901100207

Macleod, C., Moodley, D., & Young, L. S. (2015). Sexual socialisation in Life Orientation manuals versus popular music: Responsibilisation versus pleasure, tension and complexity. *Perspectives in Education*, 33(2), 90-107.

Mayeza, E., & Vincent, L. (2019). Learners' perspectives on Life Orientation sexuality education in South Africa. *Sex Education*, 19(4), 472-485. doi:10.1080/14681811.2018.1560253

Mkhwanazi, N. (2014). Twenty years of democracy and the politics of reproduction in South Africa. *African Identities*, 12(3-4), 326-341. doi:10.1080/14725843.2015.1009618

- Mokwena, K., & Morabe, M. (2016). Sexual abstinence: What is the understanding and views of secondary school learners in a semi-rural area of North West Province, South Africa? *SAHARA-J: Journal of Social Aspects of HIV/AIDS*, 13(1), 81-87.
- Msibi, T. (2012). 'I'm used to it now': Experiences of homophobia among queer youth in South African township schools. *Gender and Education*, 24(5), 515-533. doi:10.1080/09540253.2011.645021
- Mthatyana, A., & Vincent, L. (2015). Multiple femininities in a 'single sex' school: Re-orienting Life Orientation to learner lifeworlds. *Perspectives in Education*, 33(2), 49-62.
- Mturi, A. J., & Bechuke, A. L. (2019). Challenges of including sex education in the life orientation programme offered by schools: The case of Mahikeng, North West Province, South Africa. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 23(3), 134-148.
- Ngabaza, S., Shefer, T., & Macleod, C. I. (2016). "Girls need to behave like girls you know": The complexities of applying a gender justice goal within sexuality education in South African schools. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 24(48), 71-78. doi:10.1016/j.rhm.2016.11.007
- Pattman, R., & Chege, F. (2003). 'Dear diary I saw an angel, she looked like heaven on earth': Sex talk and sex education. *African Journal of AIDS Research*, 2(2), 103-112. doi:10.2989/16085906.2003.9626565
- Rees, R., & Olivers, S. (2012). Stakeholder perspectives and participation in reviews. In D. Gough, S. Oliver, & J. Thomas (Eds.), *An introduction to systematic reviews* (pp. 17-35). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Sayles, J. N., Pettifor, A., Wong, M. D., MacPhail, C., Lee, S. J., Hendriksen, E. ... & Coates, T. (2006). Factors associated with self-efficacy for condom use and sexual negotiation among South African youth. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 43(2), 226. doi:10.1097/01.qai.0000230527.17459.5c
- Shefer, T., & Foster, D. (2001). Discourses on women's (hetero) sexuality and desire in a South African local context. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 3(4), 375-390. doi:10.1080/136910501753184123
- Shefer, T., & Macleod, C. (2015). Life Orientation sexuality education in South Africa: Gendered norms, justice and transformation. *Perspectives in Education*, 33(2), 1-10.

Shefer, T., & Ngabaza, S. (2015). 'And I have been told that there is nothing fun about having sex while you are still in high school': Dominant discourses on women's sexual practices and desires in Life Orientation programmes at school. *Perspectives in Education*, 33(2), 63-76.

Shefer, T., Kruger, L., Macleod, C., Baxen, J., & Vincent, L. (2015). '...A huge monster that should be feared and not done': Lessons learned in sexuality education classes in South Africa. *African Safety Promotion*, 13(1), 71-87.

Stern, E., & Cooper, D. (2014). Experiences and conceptualisations of sexual debut from the narratives of South African men and women in the context of HIV/AIDS. *African Journal of AIDS Research: Contextualising Structural Factors in HIV Prevention*, 13(2), 121-131. doi:10.2989/16085906.2014.943252

Swanepoel, E. H., Beyers, C., & De Wet, L. (2017). Exploring judgement and internal bias of Life Orientation teachers in sexuality teaching. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 13(1), e1-e12. doi:10.4102/td.v13i1.405

Swanepoel, E., & Beyers, C. (2019). Investigating sexuality education in South African schools: A matter of space, place and culture. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 15(1), 1-9. doi:10.4102/td.v15i1.612

Thurston, I. B., Dietrich, J., Bogart, L. M., Otjombe, K. N., Sikkema, K. J., Nkala, B., & Gray, G. E. (2014). Correlates of sexual risk among sexual minority and heterosexual South African youths. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(7), 1265-1269.

Tolman, D. L., & McClelland, S. I. (2011). Normative sexuality development in adolescence: A decade in review, 2000–2009. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 242-255. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00726.x

Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.

Wood, K., Maforah, F., & Jewkes, R. (1998). "He forced me to love him": Putting violence on adolescent sexual health agendas. *Social Science & Medicine*, 47(2), 233-242. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(98)00057-

Appendix A: Systematic Review Protocol

Title of the Review	The Influence of Life Orientation Sexuality Education on Attitudes to Sex and Sexuality in South Africa: A Systematic Review
----------------------------	--

1. Sources to be Consulted

Articles published in peer-reviewed journals.

2. Search Strategy

Database searches	Searches will be conducted on the search engine Google Scholar as well as the following databases: Academic Search Premier via EBSCOhost, APA PsycArticles via EBSCOhost, APA PsycInfo via EBSCOhost, SA ePublications via Sabinet, and ScienceDirect.
-------------------	--

3. Criteria for Exclusion from the Review

Region	Only studies conducted in the region of South will be included. Studies conducted in all regions of South Africa will be considered for inclusion.
Period of publication	Only articles published between 2015 and 2020 will be included.
Language	Only articles available in English will be included.
Features of study	Only primary qualitative studies will be included. Studies utilising all types of qualitative research methods and theoretical orientations will be considered for inclusion. Studies must be focused on sexuality education through Life Orientation programmes. Study sample should only include educators or learners. Studies conducted with all types of schools will be considered for inclusion.
Keywords	The following keywords will be used in searchers: sexuality education, sex education, sexuality, sex, South Africa, South African, life orientation, school, and attitudes.

Appendix B: First Screening of Articles

First Screening

DataBase	Google Scholar	Academic Search Premier via EBSCO host	PsycInfo via EBSCO host	PsycArticles via EBSCO host	SA ePublications via Sabinet	Science Direct	Totals	
Number of articles found	164	53	40	0	81	8	346	
Reason for Exclusion	Published before 2010-2020	42	13	14	0	15	3	87
	Not in English	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Not set in South Africa	4	3	3	0	0	0	10
	Not a primary study	9	8	2	0	10	0	29
	Not qualitative	15	5	3	0	22	0	45
	Not from a peer reviewed journal	18	0	1	0	0	0	19
	Not based on LO sexuality education	25	8	7	0	17	1	58
	Books	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
	Duplicates removed	9	0	0	0	5	2	16
	Articles excluded	130	38	30	0	69	6	273
Potential includes	34	15	10	0	12	2	73	
Duplicates removed from total potential includes							34	
Preliminary data set							39	

Appendix C: Second Screening of Articles

Second Screening

	Preliminary data set	39
Reason for Exclusion	Published before 2015-2020	9
	Sample does not include teachers or learners	3
	Not a primary study	6
	Not focused on LO sexuality education	4
	Articles excluded	22
	Final data set	17

Appendix D: Summary of Reviewed Articles

	Author(s)	Title	Year	Sample
1	Adams Tucker, George, Reardon, & Panday	Sexuality education in South African schools: The challenge for civil society organisations.	2017	both
2	de Reus, Hanass-Hancock, Henken, & van Brakel	Challenges in providing HIV and sexuality education to learners with disabilities in South Africa: The voice of educators.	2015	educators
3	Francis	'Keeping it straight' what do South African queer youth say they need from sexuality education?	2019	learners
4	Francis	What does the teaching and learning of sexuality education in South African schools reveal about counter-normative sexualities?	2019	educators
5	Francis & DePalma	'You need to have some guts to teach': Teacher preparation and characteristics for the teaching of sexuality and HIV/AIDS education in South African schools.	2015	educators
6	George, Tucker, Panday, & Khumalo	Challenges facing life orientation educators in the delivery of sexuality education in South African schools.	2018	educators
7	George, Tucker, Panday, & Khumalo	Delivering sexuality education: A review of teaching pedagogies within South African schools.	2020	educators
8	Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz	Factors That Have an Impact on Educator Pedagogues in Teaching Sexuality Education to Secondary School Learners in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.	2019	educators
9	Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz	The Influence of School Contextual Factors on Educators' Efforts in Teaching Sexuality Education in Secondary Schools in Durban, South Africa.	2019	educators
10	Kruger, Shefer, & Oakes	'I could have done everything and why not?': Young women's complex constructions of sexual agency in the context of sexualities education in Life Orientation in South African schools.	2015	learners
11	Louw	A qualitative exploration of teacher and school staff experiences when teaching sexuality education programmes at special needs schools in South Africa.	2017	educators
12	Mayeza & Vincent	Learners' perspectives on Life Orientation sexuality education in South Africa.	2019	learners
13	Mturi & Bechuke	Challenges of including sex education in the life orientation programme offered by schools: The case of Mahikeng, North West Province, South Africa.	2019	both
14	Ngabaza, Shefer, & Macleod	"Girls need to behave like girls you know": The complexities of applying a gender justice goal within sexuality education in South African schools.	2016	both
15	Shefer & Ngabaza	'And I have been told that there is nothing fun about having sex while you are still in high school': Dominant discourses on women's sexual practices and desires in Life Orientation programmes at school.	2015	learners
16	Shefer, Kruger, Macleod, Baxen, & Vincent	'... a huge monster that should be feared and not done': Lessons learned in sexuality education classes in South Africa.	2015	learners
17	Swanepoel & Beyers	Investigating sexuality education in South African schools: A matter of space, place and culture.	2019	educators

Appendix E: Map of Themes and Codes

1. ABSTINENCE		2. GENDERED ATTITUDES		3. ATTITUDES AROUND SEXUALITY DIVERSITY	
EDUCATORS	YOUTH	EDUCATORS	YOUTH	EDUCATORS	YOUTH
Educators advocate abstinence de Reus et al., 2015; Francis, 2019a; George et al., 2018; Louw, 2017; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Mturi & Beckuke, 2019; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019	Youth view punitive warnings as futile Francis, 2019a; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015; Shefer et al., 2015	Gendering of abstinence by educators Kruger et al., 2015; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Ngabaza et al., 2016	Young women perceive themselves as more at risk Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer & Ngabaza., 2015; Shefer et al., 2015	Educators unintentionally marginalise queer learners Francis, 2019b; Ngabaza et al., 2016	Privileging of heterosexuality is challenged by youth Francis, 2019a; Francis, 2019b
Educators emphasise risks, dangers & negative consequences de Reus et al., 2015; Francis, 2019a; George et al., 2020; Kruger et al., 2015; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015; Shefer, et al., 2015; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019	Youth view themselves as knowledgeable Francis, 2019a	Silencing of young women by educators Kruger et al., 2015; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Shefer et al., 2015	Gender roles and norms are internalised by learners Kruger et al., 2015; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015; Shefer et al., 2015	Sexuality education is heteronormative Francis, 2019a; Francis, 2019b; Kruger et al., 2015; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Shefer & Ngabaza 2015, Shefer et al., 2015	Youth lack knowledge on topics around sexuality diversity Francis, 2019a; Francis, 2019b; Kruger et al., 2015; Shefer & Ngabaza., 2015; Shefer et al., 2015
Educators focus on non-sexual topics de Reus et al., 2015	Youth link sex to morality Kruger et al., 2015	Responsibility is emphasised for young women by educators Kruger et al., 2015; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015; Shefer et al., 2015	Gendering of responsibility is internalised by learners Kruger et al., 2015; Mturi & Bechuke 2019; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer & Ngabaza., 2015	Educators engage with issues around counter-normative sexualities Francis, 2019a; Francis, 2019b	Youth want sexuality diversity to be addressed in LO Francis, 2019a; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019
Educators judge learners who are sexually active Adams Tucker et al., 2017; Francis, 2019a; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Ngabaza, Shefer et al., 2016	Youth believe sex leads to negative consequences Francis, 2019a; Kruger et al., 2015; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015; Shefer et al., 2015	Educators challenge gender inequality in class Francis & DePalma, 2015; Ngabaza et al., 2016	Young women are silenced (outside the classroom) and perceive themselves as disempowered Kruger et al., 2015; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019	LO educators express negative attitudes towards counter-normative sexualities Francis, 2019a; Francis, 2019b; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019	
	Young women associate sex with rape & sexual violence Kruger et al., 2015; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015	Dominant gender norms are reinforced by educators Kruger et al., 2015; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer et al., 2015		Educators have misconceptions regarding queer youth Francis, 2019b	
	Learners want sexuality education beyond abstinence Francis, 2019a; Kruger et al., 2015; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer et al., 2015	Risk is emphasised for young women George et al., 2020; Kruger et al., 2015; Shefer et al., 2015; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015			
		Information about safety is for men not women Mayeza & Vincent, 2019			

4. INFLUENCE OF PERSONAL BELIEFS		5. BARRIERS TO DELIVERING SEXUALITY EDUCATION		6. PERCEIVED VALUE OF SE	
EDUCATORS	YOUTH			EDUCATORS	YOUTH
Educators personal beliefs & values shape lessons de Reus et al., 2015; Francis & DePalma, 2015; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019	Youth views that are influenced outside the classroom George et al., 2018; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019	LO educators are not supported within schools Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019).	Importance of cooperation from parents & community de Reus et al., 2015; George et al., 2018; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b; Louw, 2017; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019	Teachers feel that learners do not value LO George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Swanepoel & Beyers 2019	Learners experience LO sexuality education as valuable & relevant Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015
Discomfort of educators de Reus et al., 2015; Francis, 2019a; Francis & DePalma, 2015; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019		Educators lack the skills & training to deliver effective & relevant SE Adams Tucker et al., 2017; de Reus et al., 2015; Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Louw, 2017	Educators are restricted because of a lack of resources de Reus et al., 2015; Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019a; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b; Louw, 2017	LO educators view sexuality education as a valuable & important subject de Reus et al., 2015; Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; Louw, 2017; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019	Learners feel empowered with regard to their sexual health & lives Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Shefer & Ngabaza, 2015
Qualities & characteristics an LO teacher should have Adams Tucker et al., 2017; Francis, 2019a; Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b		Challenges related to teaching learners with disabilities de Reus et al., 2015; Louw, 2017	Resources that educators have and use Adams Tucker et al., 2017; Francis 2019a; George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019	Educators do not believe learners should be taught about sex Louw, 2017	What learners want vs what they receive Francis, 2019a; Kruger et al., 2015; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019; Ngabaza et al., 2016; Shefer et al., 2015
LO teachers are not relatable or in touch with learners experiences Adams Tucker et al., 2019; Francis, 2019a; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019		Cultural & religious norms and values are sometimes in conflict with LO content de Reus et al., 2015; Francis & DePalma, 2015; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b; Mayeza & Vincent, 2019; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019;	Educators feel competent & confident Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019	Educators believe learners lack adequate knowledge about Reus et al., 2015, George et al., 2020; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b	
An LO teacher is more than just a teacher Reus et al., 2015 Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz 2019a; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz 2019b		Educators are restricted by policy & curriculum Adams Tucker et al., 2017; de Reus et al., 2015; Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Swanepoel and Beyers, 2019	Uncertainty of educators about what is appropriate de Reus et al., 2015; Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018, Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019	Educators value & use the input of learners to guide lessons Francis, 2019b; Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2020; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b	
		The impact of the geographic location of schools Adams Tucker et al., 2017; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019a, Mturi and Bechuke	LO educators are supported by their schools and colleagues George et al., 2018; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019a	Learners' behaviour during lessons de Reus et al., 2015; George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019b; Louw, 2017; Mturi & Bechuke, 2019	
				LO is undermined in schools Francis & DePalma, 2015; George et al., 2018; George et al., 2020; Jimmyns & Meyer-Weitz, 2019a; Swanepoel & Beyers, 2019	