

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Facilitating Conversations about Sexuality between Minority Sexuality Athletes

by

Don Zeman, D.C., M.Sc.

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DIVISION OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY

CALGARY, ALBERTA

JULY, 2007

© Donald Robert Zeman 2007

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled “Facilitating Conversations about Sexuality between Minority Sexuality Athletes” submitted by Don Zeman in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. T. Strong, Supervisor
Division of Applied Psychology

Dr. N. Arthur
Division of Applied Psychology

Dr. D. Brown
Faculty of Kinesiology

Dr. D. E. Lund
Division of Educational Research

Dr. C. Kitzinger, External Examiner
The University of York

Date: _____

ABSTRACT

Minority sexuality (gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, queer – GLBTQ) persons and, specifically, minority sexuality athletes report challenges in accessing mental health care professionals and report dissatisfaction with their professional counselling experiences. The specific issue addressed in this study was ‘What practices facilitate conversations about sexuality between GLBTQ or minority sexuality athletes and counsellors or psychologists?’

Eight minority sexuality athletes were invited to discuss sexuality and to later identify, from videotapes of their discussion, passages of dialogue they found helpful to them in talking about sexuality. Drawing from conversation analysis and critical discourse analysis as well as feminist and queer perspectives, discourse analysis was then used to identify facilitative practices in participant-chosen passages from the videotaped research conversations. Themes were organized from passages that participants chose as having been helpful to discuss their sexuality. The facilitating topics and practices identified were a) recognizing and talking about heterosexism; b) making sexuality disclosure easier; c) using understandings, clarifications, reflections, and summaries; d) creating space for and gaining perspective and making sense of sexuality; e) synthesizing and processing aspects of sexuality; f) identifying helpful and non-helpful aspects of previous counselling experiences; and, g) feeling comfortable with a conversation partner who was ‘real’ to the participant when talking about sexuality. The results provide information useful in helping counsellors and counsellor trainers improve attitudes, knowledge, and skills for working with minority sexuality persons.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have been instrumental in helping sustain my occasionally wavering passion for lifelong learning during the completion of this research. I would like to thank Tom Strong, my supervisor, for his supportive guidance, endless patience, and his ability to always suggest just the right articles or books to help answer my questions. Thank you to the members of my supervisory committee, Nancy Arthur and Doug Brown, for their careful reading, thoughtful suggestions, and encouragement. I also want to thank Celia Kitzinger and Darren Lund for agreeing to be part of my examining committee and for their inciteful comments and questions.

I would not have been able to do this project without the eight participants who were willing to talk about their experiences so openly. Thank you for sharing and for all that I learned from you. Thank you also to the people who read my chapters and analyses and whose interest in discursive research helped provide further room for exploration of understandings and meanings.

My parents left a legacy of learning and remaining curious about everything. Thank you, Frank and Peggy. Thanks also to my family and friends who understand why I would take on such a challenge. I especially want to acknowledge the constant encouragement and support of my partner, Mike. Thank you for your understanding, love, and your own dedication to learning, all of which helped make this journey easier for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
APPENDICES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF EXEMPLARS	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
My Interest	2
Starting the Conversation	7
My ‘Location’	9
Overview – Chapter Breakdown	13
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	14
Erikson and Identity Development	14
Ethnic Identity Development	18
African-American and Chinese-American Identity	19
White Identity	21
Social Constructionist Perspectives of Identity	24
Defining Terms Related to Sexuality	27
Non-dominant Sexuality? Non-heterosexual? Minority Sexuality?	29
Challenges of Term Definitions	30
Politics Reflected in Term Choices	32
g0y?	36
A Brief Historical View	36
Sexuality Development/ Sexuality Construction	38
Essentialist Perspectives of Sexuality.....	39
Social Constructionist Perspectives of Sexuality	42
Dual and Multiple Non-dominant Statuses	45
Queer Perspectives	46
Queer Resistance and Deconstruciton in Sport.....	52
Non-Euro-American Perspectives.....	53
Summary	56
Postmodern, Queer (Quare? Kuaer?) Counselling Perspectives and my Researcher ‘Positioning’	57
CHAPTER THREE: METHOD	61
Introduction	61
Qualitative Research Method Considerations	63
Discourse Psychology and Discourse Analysis	65
Discourse Analysis	69
Conversation Analysis	72
Gathering Data and Considerations of Researcher and Participant Positions...	74

Conversation Analysis and Counselling	79
Queer Linguistics	81
Recruitment of Participants	83
Participant Characteristics	84
The Research Conversations	85
First Conversations	85
Second Conversations: IPR (Interpersonal Process Recall) Interview	86
Transcription	87
 CHAPTER FOUR:ANALYSES	89
Introduction	89
Transcription Explication	93
Transcription	93
Transcription Notation	95
Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discourse Analysis (DA) ‘Tools’	96
Introduction	96
Conversation Analysis	96
Example 1	98
Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis	98
Example 2	100
Detailed Analyses of Our Research Conversations about Sexuality	101
1.Acknowledging Heterosexism and Homophobia in Sport and Other Life Contexts; Deconstructing and Contesting; Social Action and Social Justice	102
Understanding heterosexist cultural discourse	102
Contesting heterosexist discourse about lesbians	106
Deconstructing and challenging heterosexist discourse about gay males	111
2.What Helped Sexuality Disclosure; ‘Coming Out’	114
Trust	114
Inviting gentle contestation.....	117
3.Understandings were Clarified; Reflections; Summaries	119
Exploring summaries	119
Getting to agreement of shared understandings	122
4.When Nods are Enough: Creating Space for Talking about Sexuality; Making Links, Making Sense	127
5.Synthesizing and Processing	136
First example of synthesizing and processing	136
Second example of synthesizing and processing	139
6.Talking about Previous Counselling Experiences	143
7.Feeling Comfortable with and Supported by the Researcher.....	148
Conversation as dance	148
Pauses: Problematic disfluencies or synchronizations?	152
Participants’ Segment Selections: Second Session/IPR Interview	155
Organizing the Themes from Participant-Selected Passages	156
Themes in the Helpful Passages	159

Contesting and deconstructing heterosexism and homophobia	159
Disclosure/coming out	160
‘Extra’ Questions in the Second Session Interview	160
 CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	164
Facilitating Practices for Mental Health Practitioners and Minority Sexuality Clients	165
1. Recognizing and Talking about Heterosexism and Homophobia	166
2. What made Disclosure or ‘Coming Out’ Easier?	168
3. Understandings, Clarifications, Reflections, and Summaries	169
4. Creating Space, Gaining Perspective, Making Sense	171
5. Synthesizing and Processing	173
6. Previous Counselling Experiences	175
7. Feeling Comfortable with Co-conversant; Being ‘Real’	176
Summary	177
Social Constructionism, Queer Perspectives, Multicultural/Diversity and Postmodern Counselling	179
Limitations	183
Suggestions for Future Research	185
What’s Next?	187
 REFERENCES	188

APPENDICES

APPENDICES	PAGE
A Brief reference list for suicide, risk of suicide, suicidality of minority sexuality persons	258
B Descriptions of sexuality by women with same-sex romantic or physical attraction to other women	262
C Brief reference list of those who promote conversion therapy	264
D Recruitment poster	266
E Participant consent form	268
F Typical questions in the first conversations	271

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Transcription Notation	95
2 Themes from First Conversations	158
3 First 'Extra Question': What have you thought about from the first session?	161
4 Second 'Extra Question': Helpful/necessary requirements of possible future counsellor	162

LIST OF EXEMPLARS

	EXEMPLARS	PAGE
I	102	
II	107	
III	111	
IV	112	
V	114	
VI	118	
VII	119	
VIII	120	
IX	122	
X	127	
XI	136	
XII	140	
XIII	144	
XIV	146	
XV	149	
XVI	153	
XVII	154	

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In my study, I examined what minority sexuality¹ athletes identified that made it easier to talk about sexuality in conversations with me, about sexuality. I am intrigued by what occurs during these specific parts of conversations which may be facilitative to conversations about ‘delicate topics’. Conversations about delicate topics such as sexuality are often difficult for most people and perhaps particularly challenging for minority sexuality or GLBTQ (gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, queer) clients and counsellors. My primary aim is to find out what occurs during these conversational interchanges that these athletes found helpful so that facilitative practices may be identified and shared with other counsellors, therapists, sport psychologists, and sport mental trainers who work with minority sexuality athletes or any minority sexuality clients.

Although experiences vary widely, most people explore concerns of identity and sexuality at various times in their lives, sometimes separately, sometimes together (Bucholtz & K. Hall, 2004). As a counsellor, I envision conversations as means by which these varying processes may be worked out between counsellors and clients. Minority sexuality athletes often have limited access to or confidence in finding appropriate mental health care workers to talk about their challenges and concerns about sexualities, concerns which also often include thoughts of and attempts at suicide (Barber & Krane, 2005; Martens & Mobley, 2005). Focusing more specifically, I believe that there is a lot of work to do before athletes will know that there are safe places to talk about sexualities

¹ In this document, I use minority sexuality or GLBTQ unless a cited author or authors use another term. In these instances, I use the term or terms used by the cited author(s).

and find counsellors, psychologists, and sport psychologists supportively competent to facilitate these conversations.

W. M. L. Lee (1999) and Eubanks-Carter, Burckell, and Goldfried (2005) believed that it is possible to behave in sexist, racist, and homophobic manners without being aware of doing this. Counsellors are often not aware that cultural differences can be important if they are too wrapped up in traditional approaches to practice. They may treat all clients ‘equally’, believing that cultural modifications are not needed. W. M. L. Lee (1999) suggested that counsellors insensitive to the differences between clients and themselves often believe that clients who drop out are resistant or not ready for counselling rather than that there is an unacknowledged and unresolved mismatch between the counsellor and the client.

Pedersen (2001) posited that a shift toward culture-centred theories in counselling is emerging, that we are moving from monocultural to multicultural perspectives. He thought that counsellors needed to acquire skills and practices necessary for working with clients from minority groups, not just minority sexuality clients, but all clients who have experiences of being in minority groups. Much of my life has been involved in athletics, working with, and studying athletes, yet I have not found any empirical work done on ways that would make it easier for minority sexuality athletes to talk about sexuality with mental health care professionals or how these professionals can be helpful to these athletes. Woog (1998, 2002), however, has written two books recounting the stories of gay, male athletes, and pointed to a need for improved counselling services for minority sexuality athletes.

My Interest

A fiction novel I read 30 years ago first highlighted for me the possible tragic consequences of not being a heterosexual athlete. In *The Front Runner* (Warren, 1974), Billy Sive, an openly gay, American long distance runner is killed by a sniper only metres away from winning a second gold medal at the Montreal Olympics. I can trace my interest in pondering the impact of sexuality in sport back to the powerful emotional impact that book had on me. Over several years, I have had conversations with gay and lesbian athletes, from several sports, about their experiences in their sport relating to sexualities. I encountered stories and experiences which did not match my own and those of my friends in high-level figure skating. Many of these athletes from other sports related experiences of verbal and physical attacks because of their sexuality. Heterosexism and homophobia have long been recognized as issues in sport with negative effects not just for gay and lesbian athletes but for coaches, trainers, and sport psychologists and sport mental trainer consultants (see P. Griffin, 1994, 1998, 1999; Rotella & Murray, 1991, for example).

What appeared clear to me is that gay men, in particular, and lesbians are more likely to develop suicidal ideation and attempt suicide than heterosexuals, particularly apparent in adolescent and young adult age groups (for example, see Paul et al., 2002; Appendix A). I found no research that specifically addressed suicide or attempted suicide by minority sexuality athletes. Woog (1998, 2002), however, in his work with gay, male athletes, described that many of these athletes attempted suicide when they felt that they had no one to talk to about their experiences. Suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and suicide itself are not the only negatives for gay and lesbian athletes because of homonegativity, heterosexism, and homophobia (Barber & Krane, 2005). For example,

higher levels of stress (Iwasaki & Ristock, 2004), decreased athletic performance and increased team conflict (Krane, 1997), and, at least for university and college athletes, even greater homophobia from other heterosexual university college athletes than they might experience in non-sporting venues (M. B. Andersen, Butki, & Heyman, 1997).

Given that “homophobia is still the norm in most sporting contexts” (Gridley, 2005, p. 220), not just from athletes but from some sport psychologists as well, unsurprisingly, many minority sexuality athletes hesitate consulting sport psychologists. Rotella and Murray (1991), for example, quoted sport psychologists who worked with gay and lesbian athletes: “... I cannot afford to be understanding and helpful to homosexual athletes. As a sport psychologist, it would destroy my reputation and credibility with too many other athletes” (p. 355); and, from another that, “I will work with homosexual athletes, but I ... believe there was a traumatic experience or family or parent-child problem early in life causing the condition. I feel I must help them straighten out their sexual preferences” (p. 356). Aitchison (2007) considered sport “the last great bastion of homophobia within contemporary western society” (p. 1). These views have not gone unchallenged particularly by those who want to destabilize and challenge such perspectives.

Although minority sexuality athletes still face such challenges, many of these athletes along with sport academics and researchers are actively resisting, contesting, and deconstructing heterosexism, homophobia, and heterosexist discourses in sport and in all areas of their lives. E. Anderson (2002), for example, studied the experiences of openly gay male athletes on predominantly heterosexual teams and found that there is “softening of hegemonic masculinity in the sporting realm” (p. 860). Similarly, Broad (2001)

observed gendered, queer resistance in American women's rugby participation that destabilized the binary of heterosexuality and homosexuality. Further, Broad, Cahn (1994), and Caudwell (2003) found that women competing in sport contested hegemonic notions of gender and sexuality. Fusco (1998) recorded lesbian athletes' stories of resistance to and rejection of "heteronormativity" or what Rich (1980) called "compulsory heterosexuality".

These descriptions of places of resistance, with the culture and subcultures of sport, to heterosexism and homophobia may only slowly translate to improvements in conversations between minority sexuality athletes and counsellors, psychologists, and sport mental trainers. The lesbian women in these studies experienced comments such as "abnormal and unnatural" (Fusco, 1998, p. 98) and "that's not what women do [play rugby]" (Broad, 2001, p. 188). I recognize that there are opportunities to foster the growth of these places of resistance in sport as well as work toward more welcoming and supportive mental health environments.

In my professional work as a chiropractor and also as a sport mental trainer, I encountered at least two challenges when attempting to find appropriate referrals for minority sexuality athletes who disclosed challenges in their sports related to their sexualities. Few mental health care professionals considered themselves competent to work with minority sexuality clients. Almost none of the athletes agreed to talk to any of these counsellors because they felt that the counsellors would not accept or understand that they might be gay or lesbian. They also thought that counselling might actually make things worse. Their concerns are borne out in research: Muller and Hartman (1998) found that school counsellors assumed that all students are heterosexual; Mercier and

Berger (1989) found that 43% of homosexual adolescents thought that counsellors might be unhelpful or even harmful; and, Dorland and Fischer (2001) found clients who experienced heterosexist-free language were more likely to disclose sexuality and more likely to return for further counselling.

While I still worked as a chiropractor and sport mental trainer and prior to returning to university to become a counselling psychologist, the athletes who disclosed their sexualities to me described that they felt safe and supported and that it was easy to talk to me. I was not, however, trained to work with them as their counsellor. At the same time, I also recognized that perhaps I was doing something which contributed to a safe space for them to disclose these very deep and disturbing parts of their lives to me. I became curious about examining what might have happened that was helpful for them to talk about sexualities.

There is a paucity of research on what clients consider helpful in building a strong working alliance with therapists and, specifically, there is no research on what minority sexuality clients believe is helpful to talk about sexualities with therapists. Horvath and Bedi (2002) showed that the strength of a counselling alliance, as perceived by clients, is a stronger predictor of positive counselling outcomes than counsellors' perceptions of the alliance strength. I think that elucidating client and counsellor perspectives in conversations about sexualities may increase our understanding of what, specifically, is facilitative to these conversations. Petitpas, Giges, and Danish (1999) felt that sport psychology educators might "borrow extensively from the research in counselor education" (p. 344), and I hope to provide insights and bridges from my research that will support their view.

Bachelor (1995) found that clients perceived nurturant, insight-oriented, and collaborative counselling relationships contributed to good working alliances. Mohr and Woodhouse (2001) determined that about three-quarters of client-identified therapy priorities were related to personal (warm, self-disclosing, and personable therapist) and professional (collaborative and challenging therapist) alliances. Bedi, M. D. Davis, and Arvay (2005) and Bedi, M. D. Davis, and M. D. Williams (2005) found that psychotherapists' personal characteristics (for example, age, gender, and ethnic background) and the environment of the session affect perceptions of therapeutic alliance. Farber and D. Hall (2002) found that clients (their sexualities were not discussed) were least likely to disclose sexuality and procreation topics with therapists. When I consider this information, I become even more curious about examining what might facilitate conversations about sexuality.

Starting the Conversation

We stand at a major threshold in the extension of consciousness, caught in the remolinos (vortices) of systemic change across all fields of knowledge. The binaries of colored/white, female/male, mind/body are collapsing. Living in nepantla, the overlapping space between different perceptions and belief systems, you are aware of the changeability of racial, gender, sexual, and other categories rendering the conventional labelings obsolete. Though these markings are outworn and inaccurate, those in power continue using them to single out and negate those who are “different” because of color, language, notions of reality, or other diversity. You know that the new paradigm must come from outside as well as within the system. (Anzaldúa, 2002, p. 541)

Sarbin (1997) suggested that we live in a world where our identities are shaped by stories told, enacted, and even read. Antaki, Condor, and Levine (1996) posited that identities are descriptions which do not appear or are discovered but are *used* in interactional structures and are also highly flexible. People may describe themselves as being members of categories or groups. These descriptions may be seen as devices which may facilitate understanding in a conversational interaction in relation to its local reference and people may decide the breadth and latitude they may give any particular category label (Sacks, 1995).

The present categories most people use for sexuality do not adequately account for the vast array of understandings across cultures, currently, and across history. Over a lifetime, people often categorize themselves differently at different points of their lives depending on their circumstances. For example, several researchers have noted that many men who have had sexual activities with other men do not identity as homosexual, gay, or bisexual but as heterosexual (Carballo-Diéguez, 1997; Peterson, 1995; Choi, Yep, & Kumekawa, 1998). M. Cross and Epting (2005) believed that, although the use of sexual categories or labels may not acknowledge the possible fluidity and development of a particular person's sexuality, using labels and categories "can be both a disenfranchising prison or a 'safe place' and somewhere to come home to" (p. 53). Further, Moorhead (1999) felt that while queer theory supported flexibility in labels (when they are used at all), some minority sexuality persons used labels "at least at certain times, to limit ambiguity" (p. 333).

I recognize that clients may have preferred terms for describing their sexualities which may or may not match terms commonly used (such as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transsexual,

or queer). Creating a place where conversations about sexualities can occur safely and openly will be useful to clients. I am also concerned, however, with conversational practices and ways of talking: how words, labels, meanings, and understandings are co-created and negotiated within conversations.

My ‘Location’

I recognize that many factors have influenced my interest in doing this research and my queer, feminist, social constructionist perspectives. Ten years ago, I was trained to teach health care professionals to recognize, in their practices, abuse of and violence against women: to create a safe place for disclosure, to facilitate disclosure and discussion, and to provide affirmative support after disclosure. I recognized, while I still worked as a chiropractor and as I continue to work as a sport mental trainer, a parallel for GLBTQ clients in my own practices as well as other health care professions. I believe that many of the clients with whom I have worked who disclosed their sexuality may have done so because I endorsed and expressed factors which match ‘gay affirmative therapy’ (see Harrison (2000), for a literature review). For example, I clearly supported a non-pathological perspective about minority sexuality, I worked at creating a safe environment or conversational context to disclose the ‘difficult to talk about’, and I contested oppression (abuse and heterosexism, for example). I had been taught a model for working with women who had experienced abuse but I had no information or specific training about how to work with minority sexuality clients. A large contributing factor to my desire to become a counsellor was to become adequately knowledgeable about and trained in working with minority sexuality athletes who had challenges within their sports and lives because of their sexualities.

I have found that my perspectives about challenging oppression, power imbalances, and overt and subtle forms of androcentrism and heterosexism, match well with feminist, queer, and social constructionist perspectives. Goldberger (1996), for example, felt that gender and gendered behaviour are socially constructed or negotiated and rather than ‘having’ a gender we ‘do’ gender. Matching feminist perspectives, in particular, I also like the notion of challenging dominant and tacit metaphors that affect perspectives about sexualities and gendered behaviour. Working with these can make it possible for clients, if they choose to do so, to challenge dominant cultural group perspectives in their lives.

Although it may seem almost axiomatic that these perspectives would fit well with minority sexuality or GLBTQ clients, I also need to learn research participant experiences and understandings, of what happens, for them, in conversations about sexuality. My foremost curiosity and my particular research question has become, ‘What practices facilitate conversations about sexuality between minority sexuality or GLBTQ athletes and counsellors or psychologists?’ I also want to look for ways to create safe and encouraging environments where conversations that give form to clients’ identities and sexualities may occur.

When I initially began the development of this research about seven years ago, I was interested in finding out more about theories which criticized stage, linear models of identity development. As I read and studied Erikson’s (1968) model of identity development, for example, I felt that my life did not match his model. Through conversations with others and in class discussions, I found that Erikson’s model did not adequately represent their experiences either. My initial searches quickly led me to ethnic and sexuality identity development models and, again, I found that the linear, stage

models did not seem to fit for me and many others to whom I spoke. For the next two years, I was primarily interested in how multiple non-dominant group experiences (for example, ethnicity and/or race, sexuality, gender, socioeconomic status, age, and bodiedness) might influence identities. First, as a competitive athlete, next as a professional athlete, and finally, as a health care professional who worked predominantly with athletes, I recognized that experiences in sports and the social cultures of sports also influenced how athletes viewed their identities, sexualities, and selves.

When I considered what I could sustain as research, I recognized that I would need to choose something about which I felt passionately. So much of my life has been involved either actively participating in sport or working with athletes that it was an easy decision to find a topic with potential utility for athletes and especially minority sexuality athletes. I knew that I wanted to work with athlete research participants and I also knew that I would very likely continue to work with athletes professionally in my future as a mental health care practitioner. This led me, with the help of academic advisors, to look for a way to both narrow my research topic and also make it into something which would be practically applicable for mental health care professionals as well as athletes.

Having participants talk about their experiences is consistent with postmodern notions that we may come to our identity or identities through the narratives we create or speak about ourselves. Several writers believed that narratives may shape our identities (Cass, 1990, 1996; Hermans & Hermans-Jansen, 1995; Sarbin, 1986, 1997; Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger, 1996). They have helped us look at how individuals' lives are framed by cultural understandings of things like sexualities. I recognize that I influenced the research conversations in which I have been a co-participant, collector and reporter.

Rather than eliminate, if that is even possible, any influence that I might have had, I made myself, my experiences, and my positions patent at the outset and throughout the conversations. I also acknowledge that my research has been influenced by both personal as well as professional experiences.

I found almost no literature where researchers have examined what, specifically, might be facilitative for minority sexuality clients when talking to counsellors about sexualities. Fogel (2002) developed a questionnaire to predict disclosure, of being gay or lesbian, to healthcare providers as a preliminary step of facilitating minority sexuality disclosure (and also identifying barriers to disclosure) and developing safe health care environments for disclosure. Harrison (2000) reviewed literature he identified as gay affirmative therapy and found that a non-pathological perspective of minority sexualities was at the core of these therapies. C. Kitzinger and Coyle (2002) also reviewed the extant literature and their findings closely matched Harrison's when they identified practices that would be helpful to mental health care workers who worked with minority sexuality clients (for example, being able to empathize with and be knowledgeable about GLBTQ sexualities and associated stresses and experiences; being open about and comfortable with their own sexuality). Further, Milton, Coyle and Legg (2002) described their research, with gay and lesbian clients and their therapists who identified as being gay-affirmative therapists, and identified that therapeutic sessions "should be experienced as a personal (rather than technical) encounter for both participants" (p. 189).

Despite some of the basic guides and perspectives that clients and therapists feel are helpful for minority sexuality clients, discourse analysis on conversations between minority sexuality clients and therapists has not yet been adequately explored. I believe

that through the use of these two methods I can highlight practices which minority sexuality clients have noted in our conversations about sexualities that will be particularly helpful to anyone in mental health care professions who work with minority sexuality clients. Additionally, I feel that my own self-reflections and perspectives as a co-participant in these conversations will also be additive to this field.

Overview – Chapter Breakdown

In the first four chapters of this dissertation I describe how I have come to my question, my approach, and the specific methodology I have utilized. In Chapter Two, I discuss the literature on sexuality and identity as well as provide a rationale for the question I investigate in this study. In Chapter Three, I discuss further how I settled on the use of a qualitative research method, discourse analysis, drawing on conversation analysis and critical discourse analysis theory, research, and findings. Bavelas, Kenwood, and B. Phillips (2002) consider discourse analysis a cluster of methods with shared interests and researchers, in diverse disciplines, may occasionally join various discourse methods within one study. I also include the project methods, how client-participants identified specific facilitating passages in our conversations, as well as transcription. In Chapter Four, I introduce explanation and examples of conversation and discourse analysis as well as the analyses of my data. In my final chapter, I discuss my original contributions to the field through my analyses and discussion and a brief personal reflection of my dissertation experience.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

This is, indeed, the basic problem of language: to describe something as seamless as lived experience, one needs categories. Yet a danger arises when those categories come to be seen as valid descriptions of experience rather than as tools to apprehend that experience.

Valentine (2004, p. 217)

In this chapter, I endeavour to answer questions of how recent perspectives of sexuality and identity have not arisen *de novo* and how earlier work and theories have contributed to and informed these perspectives. I begin with discussion of early identity development theories, particularly Erikson's. I follow this with a brief section on the historically important ethnic identity models and White identity development. Next are social constructionist perspectives on identities. I give an overview of the often confusing terms used in relation to sexuality and then sexual identity models. I follow this with queer perspectives on identity and sexuality, including a short section on queer views in sport, and a brief section on sexuality in non-Euro-American cultures. Finally, I provide concluding remarks.

Erikson and Identity Development

The earliest authors on identity (Erikson, 1950; Freud, 1920/1968), ethnic identity (W. E. Cross, 1971; Vontress, 1971), and sexual identity (Cass, 1979; Coleman, 1982; Troiden, 1979, 1988, 1989), regarded identity or sexuality as linear, stage-invariant processes. These views have been criticized by social constructionist, feminist, multicultural and queer theorists and researchers. To highlight some of the tensions between earlier and later perspectives, I begin with a brief and important historical homage to Erikson (1950). His views of identity followed from identity theory writing by

W. James (1890), Mead (1934), and Freud (1920/1968; 1930/1965). Erikson's (1950, 1968) concepts were broad and included aspects from psychology (intrapsychic forces) and sociology (environmental factors, Schwartz, 2001).

Freud (1920/1968) felt that a person's identity developed in childhood over the first five years of life, in psychosexual stages, and that whatever identity and sexuality a person developed during this period remained relatively unchanged in adolescence or adulthood. Freud's notion that a person's sexuality is fixed in childhood has been widely criticized, particularly by symbolic interactionists (K. Plummer, 1975, 1995, 2003), social constructionists (S. Seidman, 2003), feminists (Sedgwick, 1990), and queer theorists (Jagose, 1996; Turner, 2000; Warner, 1999). Lane (1997), in his interpretation of Freud, emphasized psychoanalysis's potential to reveal the 'unfixity' of sexual categories.

Erikson (1968) believed that humans developed in psychosocial stages over the course of a person's life, and that each stage had a critical or unique crisis task which must occur and be successively managed before the next stage could occur. The fifth stage (Erikson, 1950), occurred during adolescence: *identity versus identity confusion*. Identity development was a dynamic process that existed within an individual's core as well as his or her communal culture. One's sense of identity began at birth when one was given a name which was meant to signify either male or female (Erikson, 1997).

Researchers have found at least some support for Erikson's theory of identity formation: construct validity and internal reliability of the dynamic process of adolescence (Frégeau & Barker, 1986); adolescent peer assessment and emergence of the observer self (Gray, Ispa, & Thornburg, 1986); and, exploration as the core of adolescent identity crisis (Kidwell, Dunham, Bacho, Pastorino, & Portes, 1995). Others, however,

have noted divergence from Erikson: Eaton, Mitchell, and Jolley (1991) found that Erikson's theory may be more relevant to males than females; Kidwell et al. (1995) and Eaton et al. (1991) also found gender differences; and, Lytle, Bakken, and Romig (1997) found that females attempt to resolve both intra- and interpersonal challenges whereas males deal primarily with intrapersonal issues.

Erikson (1980) discussed identity in three levels relating to self and context with ego identity as the most fundamental; personal identity as those goals and values that a person shows to the world; and, social identity as a person's relatedness to a group or groups such as ethnic group. Although there has been extensive work done by neo-Eriksonians (e.g., Berzonsky, 1989, identity style; Grotevant, 1987, identity formation), I briefly discuss one expansion on Erikson's model: developmental social psychology of identity (Adams & Marshall, 1996). Their model was a multidimensional approach with a focus on context. Social context was divided into two arenas: the micro context, where interpersonal interactions such as dialogue affected personal identity, and the macro context, where identity was influenced by larger cultural practices and beliefs.

Like Erikson (1980), Adams and Marshall (1996) described differentiation of the individual as unique (personal identity) and integrated into a larger cultural group (social identity). An individual with high levels of differentiation may be rejected by his or her cultural group while low integration with cultural norms may also result in the marginalization of that person. Entire non-dominant groups may be marginalized from the dominant culture (Côté, 1993) and individuals who identify strongly with their non-dominant cultural group (Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992). Although this may match some non-dominant cultural groups' experiences, stage theories, however, do not match many

non-dominant cultural groups' understandings. For example, the Navajo view development as a cyclical process with no particular beginning or end point (Epple, 1997). Further, Navajo consider humans to be inseparable from everything in the universe's cycle.

There has been wide criticism of Erikson's stage model and, of many possible choices, I will briefly describe one. Harkness, Super, and Keefer (1992) found that in upper, middle-class families in Cambridge, MA, the same behaviour of two children with different parents would be explained quite differently by the parents. That is, behaviour such as resistance to or squirming while being diapered by a child who had previously been acquiescent was seen as a 'stage', the beginning of 'independence', by the child's parent. Another similar-aged child who became quiet during diapering merited no comment. The second child's parent, however, noted that starting to resist being put into a car seat was the beginning of the child's 'independence stage' while the first child, who always easily went into the car seat and promptly fell asleep, gets no comment from the parent. I like Gee's (2005) speculation that behaviours noted by upper, middle-class families would fit 'stage' theories because they are familiar with the theories and may even write such theories. Additionally, he felt that much of psychology matches their discourse of their own experiences.

Most recent identity research includes social aspects such as sexuality, gender, class, and ethnicity and diverges from Erikson's fixed, stage model. Erikson (1968) suggested that identity was stable and consistent over time and, mostly, an unconscious process except when internal and external experiences did not match. When this conflict occurred, a person experienced a painful, or heightened, 'identity consciousness'. I

believe that this provides support for studying the importance of context in relation to identity. This may be particularly appropriate in circumstances where a person from a non-dominant group experiences oppression, marginalization, and lack of support.

Notions of multiple influences, intersections, and multidimensionality challenge and contest Erikson's identity models. Many models of ethnic identity emerged during the political unrest in the United States in the 1960s, preceded and influenced models of sexuality identity and, in the next sections, I briefly describe some of the most important models.

Ethnic Identity Development

Ethnic identity development has been studied in several social disciplines. The first ethnic identity models followed identity models such as Erikson's. The earliest sexual identity models developed from both earlier identity and ethnic identity models. In this section, I provide a brief historical overview of ethnic identity research and models. I believe it is important to have some historical perspective of theories and models of identity, ethnic identity, and sexual identity as they did not initially appear concurrently, but consecutively.

Social psychologists conducted ethnic identity research within the framework of social identity (Phinney, 1990). Over fifty years ago, Lewin (1948) asserted that individuals needed to believe that they had a group identification to be able to keep their sense of well-being. Tajfel and Turner (1979) developed social identity theory and wrote that just being included in a group gives individuals a feeling of belonging that enhances a positive self-concept. Tajfel (1978) described ethnic groups as special cases of group identity and individuals who perceived themselves as being in low-status groups

endeavored to improve their status. Conflicts may arise between groups who have perceptions of unequal status. Cheatham, Ivey, Bradford Ivey, and Simek-Morgan (2002) suggested that ethnic identity development models developed in the 1960s and 1970s as the result of racial tensions between the majority White group and the minority African-American group.

African-American and Chinese-American Identity

Working independently, W. E. Cross (1971), Vontress (1971), and Jackson (1976) created fixed, stage models of identity development of African-Americans (Franklin, J. R. James, & Watson, 1996). W. E. Cross (1971) developed a five-stage model: pre-encounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, internalization, and internalization-commitment. Vontress (1971) proposed three categories for African-Americans: coloured, Negro, or Black. Jackson (1976) also created a five-stage model: naivete, acceptance, resistance and naming, redefinition and reflection, and multi-perspective internalization.

Also during this period, S. Sue and D. W. Sue (1971) studied Chinese-American personality and ethnic development based on the level of rejection or acceptance of traditional values. Their work followed acculturation theory which suggested that ethnic identity development became germane only when two or more cultural groups encountered one another (Phinney, 1990, 1996). S. Sue and D. W. Sue created three categories to describe individuals of Asian descent in America: traditionalist, marginal, and Asian American.

Although proponents of stage and status theories acknowledged that there may be movement from stage to stage in recurring cycles (Jackson, 1976; Marcia, 1980, 1989),

other researchers found these models too unidirectional and deterministic (Yeh & Huang, 1996). Steenbarger (1991) believed that there are at least three major limitations to stage theories: linearity; invariant structural unfolding; and, sequential ideal or normal development. Even W. E. Cross (1995) suggested that the validity of the stages of his earlier Black identity models was uncertain.

Yi and Shorter-Gooden (1999) also criticized traditional stage theories for failing to adequately acknowledge multiple sources of identity which influenced individuals such as age, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation. These criticisms inspired constructionist views of development which emphasized change and relativity to context and relational terms (Steenbarger, 1991). There are several more recent models (Banks, 1994; Franklin, et al., 1996; Helms, 1990; Smith, 1991; Yi & Shorter-Gooden, 1999). Smith (1991), for example, believed that ethnic identity development occurred over a lifetime and is a process of differentiation and integration.

Phinney (1990) pointed out that there have been few studies which provided empirical support for stage models of ethnic identity development. Yi and Shorter-Gooden (1999), working from their constructionist, narrative model, suggested that interviews, although time-consuming, could provide rich narrative material to help better understand ethnic identity development. Additionally, other researchers (Phinney, 1990; Rowe, Bennett, & D. R. Atkinson, 1994; Yeh & Huang, 1996) have pointed out that there has been little research on people from mixed backgrounds and multiple non-dominant groups.

Models of ethnic identity development first appeared in the 1970s except for models of White identity development which began in the 1980s and 1990s. I believe the later appearance was related to perceptions that only non-White persons had an ‘ethnicity’. In

the next section, I describe perceptions of ‘difference’, Helms’s (1984) White identity development model, and considerations of ethnic identity models in counselling.

White Identity

Tiger Woods is predominantly written and spoken about as though he is African-American or Black, something which he has said that he does not like (J. E. White, 1997). He is one-quarter Thai, one-quarter Chinese, one-quarter White, one-eighth American Indian, and one-eighth Black, and, as an adolescent, coined ‘Cablinasian’ to describe himself. When he has been asked who he is, he has replied, “I’m just who I am, whoever you see in front of you” (p. 35).

Even D. W. Sue and D. Sue (2003), important guides to multicultural counselling, are occasionally confused. They described Tiger Woods as both Black (p. 163) and ‘Cablinasian’ (p. 363). J. E. White (1997) stated that people from the dominant White culture view anyone who is not White as ‘different’. C. Kitzinger and Wilkinson (1996), operating from feminist perspectives, wondered how groups to which we do not belong might be represented and whether we should even write about those groups. They pointed out the long history of those in dominant groups writing about ‘other’ groups which are ‘different from’ the dominant groups usurping the voice of that ‘other’ group or culture.

I noted that D. W. Sue and D. Sue have changed the name of their Fourth Edition to ‘*Counseling the culturally diverse*’ (2003) from the Third Edition, ‘*Counseling the culturally different*’ (1999). Although I could not find an explanation for the change, I believe it reflects recognition of the power and status tacit in the use of ‘different’. That is, ‘different’ cultures are all those which are not White (or heterosexual or able-bodied, for example) with the implication that they are not as good as the dominant culture.

Most counsellors, particularly in North America, are White and many of their clients, especially those from non-dominant groups, have experienced racism, heterosexism, or other forms of discrimination (Daniels, 2001; D. W. Sue et al., 1998). D. W. Sue and D. Sue (2003) considered that racial and ethnic identity models are useful approaches in multicultural counselling and various White identity models have been promoted as helpful for White counsellors to learn to facilitate multicultural counselling competencies. The most commonly cited model was developed by Helms (1984) who recognized that most multicultural counselling dyads involved a White counsellor and a non-dominant ethnicity client. She felt that counsellors would benefit from learning about both White and other racial identities.

Helms's (1984) first model was a linear, stage model and she proposed that White counsellors who reached higher stages such as 'autonomy' would display nonracist White identity as well as appreciation for cultural similarities and differences. An earlier linear, stage model was created by Hardiman (1982) when she interviewed people whom she described as having attained high levels of racial consciousness. Three other stage models (Corvin & Wiggins, 1989; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovsky, 1991) are all similar to Hardiman's (1982) and Helms's (1984) models with White individuals going through roughly five stages, from 'naïveté' or 'preexposure', through 'conflict', and, finally, to 'autonomy' or 'integration'.

Rowe et al. (1994) criticized these models as being too focused on attitudes toward non-dominant ethnic groups and not enough on White identity as well as being too linear and based on stages. Rowe and his colleagues developed a model which they felt represented White racial consciousness, proposing three types of unachieved and five

types of achieved White racial consciousness. Further, they suggested that an individual could move, sometimes back and forth, between statuses or types.

Perhaps in response to such criticism, Helms (1990, 1995) revised her model to six multidimensional, hierarchical (not necessarily linear) dimensions or statuses. Helms's White racial identity models have been widely used especially in multicultural counselling (Daniels, 2001), school counselling (Constantine, 2002), and sport psychology consultations (Butrym, 2002). Helms (1997) claimed that her model is multidimensional. Yet, neither her model nor any of the other White identity models are multiperspectival, fluid, and multidimensional in the way that recent social constructionist ethnic identity models (e.g., Yi & Shorter-Gooden, 1999) or sexual identity models are (e.g., Horowitz & Newcomb, 2001).

Kwan (2001a) suggested that counsellors in any type of dyad (White counsellor and non-dominant ethnicity client; non-dominant ethnicity counsellor and White client; non-dominant ethnicity counsellor and non-dominant ethnicity client; and, White counsellor and White client) need to be aware of their own and their clients' racial, ethnic, and cultural values and beliefs. Kwan (2001b) also posited that learning about racial and ethnic identity models could help counsellors understand psychocultural experiences of clients from various racial and ethnic groups; assist counsellors to consider social and multiple influences important to clients beyond visible physical characteristics; and, acknowledge that people with similar visible racial characteristics may identify in varying ways with that racial group or not identify with that group at all.

Familiarity with essentialist models of ethnicity development can be useful for counsellors working with non-dominant ethnicity clients (D. W. Sue & D. Sue, 2003). At

the same time, many multicultural and diversity counsellor educators promote “consideration of how multiple identities, visible and invisible, converge simultaneously and affect development, behaviour, and counseling” (Robinson, 2005, p. vii). Knowledge of social constructionist perspectives in the convergence of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and other cultural influences in people’s lives are also valuable considerations for mental health practitioners.

While I was a professional figure skater, I lived and worked in over 50 countries. I had several experiences when I was thought to be of mixed racial background, particularly in South America and occasionally in Europe. For example, in 1982, I was held for 24 hours in a Buenos Aires jail primarily for being ‘Negro’ (not White) and as recently as seven years ago in a Dublin pub I was asked if I was ‘coloured’. It is, at least in part, from these episodes in my life that I have become interested in examining and exploring identities, ethnicities, and sexualities. I am interested in the intersections and interacting influences of our various cultures and, as I become a counsellor, in what may help make it easier to talk about them, especially sexuality. In the next section, I discuss social constructionism in relation to identity.

Social Constructionist Perspectives of Identity

Over 100 years ago, W. James (1890) suggested that a person had many social selves and as many identities as social roles. The question we might ask ourselves, ‘Who am I?’, or as researchers asking research participants, ‘Who are you?’, may be perceived as more limiting than the question, ‘Who do I/you want to be?’. That is, the former question aligns more closely with an essentialist notion that a person has ‘discovered’ his or her ‘real’ self and thus can attach closed categorical descriptions of who he or she is. The

latter question allows for multiple possibilities while acknowledging the temporal and contextual nature of identity. Sarbin (1997) suggested that, from a social constructionist view, identity is both voiced and unvoiced responses to ‘who am I?’ questions and responses form a composite that a person may construct for this question. The shape of the answers is influenced by and, to a great degree, dictated by the social context. I like discourse analyst Gee’s (2005) notion of *socially situated identity*: “the multiple identities we take on in different practices and contexts” (p. 34).

That we tell stories about our lives suggests that we are self-narrating creatures who develop biographies relevant to our lived experiences (Maines, 1993). Ezzy (1998) described the narrative conception of identity as a subjectivity which is not a philosophical illusion or an impermeable substance. Through discourse and conversations a person may have a subjective sense of self-continuity which comes from the lived experience expressed in episodic plots a person tells about his or her life. Ezzy further suggested that the self is a temporal unity, changeable and even transient, locating both future and past into present accounts. Narrative identities are constructed and performed intersubjectively, in dialogue with others, as well as intrasubjectively in internal dialogue.

For Ricoeur (1992), a person’s self is constructed through narrational acts in which a person reflects on him- or herself whereas identity is the product of the reflective process narratively constructed. The narratives constructed in these stories a person tells about him- or herself contribute to a continuity of his or her ‘character’ in the plot and the story, in effect, becomes that person’s history. Ricoeur described identities as being neither linguistic illusions nor immutable substances. A sense of self-continuity of identity occurs through narratives of self-consistency over the course of life’s changes and yields

a sense of connection and unity over time for a particular person and the people in relation with her or him (Dunne, 1995). Whisman, writing from feminist perspectives, (1996) agreed: “Personal narratives (of all sorts, not only sexual ones) are central to how we construct our most basic sense of self” (p. 119), as would Clausen (1999): “Who I am is not a noun, but a narrative” (p. 248).

B. Davies and Harré (1990) suggested that people be viewed as having a multiplicity of selves and that how they construct their sense of how they take themselves to be involves several processes. They believed that people learn that there are categories (which may be socially constructed) to which they may belong or are excluded and that they participate in the discursive practices connected to these categories. They learn to position themselves in relation to these categories and develop story lines and behave as though they are in some categories and not in others. They recognize that they either have or behave as though they have characteristics that place them in particular groups or subclasses. Further, B. Davies and Harré believed that people develop a particular sense of belonging in their world and see their cultural and worldviews from the perspective of people positioned in these particular ways. Bucholtz and K. Hall (2005) proposed a framework to analyse identity as produced in linguistic interaction and that “[i]dentity is best viewed as the emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic practices and therefore as fundamentally a social and cultural phenomenon” (p. 588).

Most of the language available at this time has typically arisen from categories defined by the belief system of the dominant culture. Gergen (1985) and Sampson (1993) thought that the language people use, with the categories and beliefs explicitly or implicitly stated, create the meanings they perceive as their reality. Discourse, with the particular

constructions which come from familiar cultural understandings, informs our experience rather than reality. C. Kitzinger (1995) added that people construct phenomena as well as meanings through discourse and that naming a thing ‘speaks it into being’.

For Foucault (1978), the act of naming *homosexuality* brought it into being: “the psychological, psychiatric, medical category of homosexuality was constituted from the moment it was characterized” (p. 43) and that discourses are “practices that systematically form the object of which they speak” (Foucault, 1972, p. 49). Butler (1993a) promoted the perspective that “the category of ‘sex’ is the instrument or effect of ‘sexism’...that ‘race’ is the instrument and effect of ‘racism’...that ‘gender’ only exists in the service of heterosexism” (p. 123). Hopkins, Reicher, and Levine (1997) maintained, for example, that without racist ideology there would be no category called race.

Other researchers believed that narratives also shaped our individual identity (Cass, 1990; Hermans & Hermans-Jansen, 1995; Sarbin, 1986; Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger, 1995). Many researchers have done work which help us view how individuals’ lives are framed by their cultural understandings of concepts like sexual orientation and people may or may not self-identify with a particular designation such as lesbian, gay, queer, or heterosexual. Before I describe models of sexuality development, I detail some of the difficulties and challenges of understanding the myriad words and terms used for concepts and designations relating to sexuality.

Defining Terms Related to Sexuality

Until the 1990s, most writing on sexuality was predominantly in relation to heterosexuality and sexuality was rarely the sole focus of analyses (Bucholtz & K. Hall,

2004). Foucault (1978, 1988) was one of the first to challenge heterosexuality as a natural condition, contending that sexuality was a discursive production maintained through mechanisms of power. Butler (1990) also reframed heterosexuality, as well as gender, as “ongoing discursive practice[s] … open to intervention and resignification” (p. 43).

Definitions of terms and the study of sexuality and sexual identity are contentious issues between various writers with queer perspectives. On the one hand, Kulick (1999) suggested stopping the study of sexuality and sexual identity and, instead, promoted focusing on language and desire. On the other hand, Bucholtz and K. Hall (2004) considered that focusing on desire would too closely align with notions of fixed identity categories and “marginalize issues of gender, power, and agency” and “erase decades of nuanced feminist discussions of the hows and whys of social subjectivity” (p. 485). Although there are wide arrays of how words such as majority/minority, dominant/non-dominant culture, sexual behaviour, sexual orientation, sexual identity, sexuality, and queer are utilized, I will give a brief overview of some of the more common perspectives relating to these concepts.

Until recently, most people who wrote about ethnicity and ethnic groups used the term ‘minority’ when referring to any group other than White or Caucasian. With the diversification and increase of non-White populations in many American cities, the term minority is no longer appropriate in places like Washington, D.C. and Los Angeles. By 2000, the non-White populations were approximately 70% (60% Black) in Washington and 51% in Los Angeles (US Census Bureau, 2000). More recently, White culture is often regarded as the dominant culture in most Western countries and non-White cultures are referred to as non-dominant cultures or ethnicities. ‘Minority’ is still commonly used

with reference to non-White groups though ‘non-dominant’ usage is increasing (e.g., Tsou, 2002). I believe that ‘non-dominant’ reflects power and status differences especially when the non-dominant group is either the largest or majority group in a population yet does not have the apparent status of the White group.

In terms of sexuality, ‘dominant culture’ usually refers to heterosexuals. Simoni and Walters (2001) proposed that both heterosexuals and Whites are dominant groups with privileged statuses. They suggested that heterosexuals’ attitudes and perspectives on heterosexual identity are almost taken-for-granted in a way that many Whites think about White identity. Heterosexual is often considered the ‘default’ sexuality in that someone is thought to be heterosexual unless he or she states otherwise (E. Atkinson, 2002; Butler, 1993a; Rich, 1980). Butler (1990) and Lorber (1994) criticized the notion of gender as an essential quality. This raised the contention that sexuality does not have to be dependent upon the gender or biological sex of a person. As Clausen (1996) suggested,

To accept the notion that orientation to same or opposite sex is biologically determined is to do more than decide that homosexuality and heterosexuality are real categories. It is also to bow to the concept that gender is real in some sense that transcends differences between genitals or chromosomes. It is to decide that the meanings we attach to gender (or through which we ‘make’ gender) are somehow not meanings, but fixed attributes. (p. 129)

Non-dominant Sexuality? Non-heterosexual? Minority Sexuality?

R. R. Barrett (2003) described how many lesbians are almost invisible in the dominant heterosexual culture. This matches comments that minority sexuality youth are an invisible or silent population (Muller & Hartman, 1998; O’Connor, 1992). Although

Russell and Bohan (1999a) suggested the use of non-heterosexual, I propose that non-dominant sexuality may be an even better term as it reflects some of the power and privilege differences between dominant and non-dominant sexuality groups. At the same time, I found responses to this particular term in the recruitment poster that I used elicited confusion and some laughter for at least two of the research participants. I was told that they wondered if I was referring to specific *dominant* and *non-dominant* sexual practices and, if so, would they fit the participant criteria.

Therefore, I decided to use *minority*, rather than *non-dominant, sexuality* in this research. I also avoided using *non-dominant sexuality* in the conversations with participants because I felt that it was important to avoid colonizing this meaning on them by imposing its use. Although I thought that this term might fit, as (at least to me) a logical extension of *non-dominant*, I found that participants' everyday or "lifeworld" use did not match my "specialist" notion (Gee, 2005, p. 63).

Challenges of Term Definitions

Additionally, I found equivocal definitions for many terms related to sexuality and I give a brief explication of some prevalent writings. Sexual behaviour has often been thought to define a person's sexuality even though it has been over fifty years since Kinsey pointed out that the simple binary of heterosexual/homosexual was inadequate to represent the range of people's sexual orientations (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948). In some cases, same-sex sexual behaviour has been the legal definition of homosexual (for example, see Turner's (2000) discussion of the United States Supreme Court's 1986 decision to uphold state anti-sodomy laws in the *Bowers vs. Hardwick* opinions).

Although several researchers have shown that for some men (Carballo-Dieguez, 1997; Peterson, 1995; Chng, F. Y. Wong, Park, Edberg, & Lai, 2003) and women (Diamond 1998, 2000; Rothblum, 2000), sexual behaviour does not always match a person's self-definition of his or her sexuality, others have found that sexual behaviour plays a significant role in sexuality identification for 'sexual-minority' (Dubé, 2000) males. Some people identify their sexuality as gay or lesbian without ever having had sex (e.g., Rothblum, 2000), or at least same-sex sexual experience (Bohan, 1996). Bohan added that this would match many who identify as heterosexual either before having had sex or even if they never have sex.

Further, Peplau and Garnets (2000) stated that even when people label their sexual identity it may not indicate past or present behaviour, thoughts, or feelings. Adam (2000) found that the discourse about same-sex sexual behaviour differed for the men in his study with some men identifying as gay, some as bisexual, and some as not gay. Additionally, he found that, for some men, the use of the term 'gay' was in reference to the possibility of relationship and emotional involvement more so than a concept of a sexuality which was essentialized.

Klein and his colleagues (Klein, 1993, 1999; Klein, Sepehoff, & Wolff, 1985) viewed sexual orientation as consisting of seven components including sexual behaviour, emotional preference, sexual fantasies, sexual attraction, social preference, life styles and community, and self-identification. Sexual orientation, sexual identity, and sexuality were sometimes described as though they are the same or nearly the same. Floyd and T. S. Stein (2002) studied the sexual orientation identity (combining sexual orientation and sexual identity) of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth (sexuality).

Garnets (2002) and Rothblum (2000) believed that sexual orientations reflect at least two dimensions of sexual and affectional attractions to peoples of the same sex, other sex, both sexes, or even perhaps toward transgendered individuals. If a person chooses to self-identify his or her place on these dimensions a sexual identity may be named and referred to as a sexuality (Gamson, 2000). At the same time, information on the American Psychological Association website (<http://apa.org/pubinfo.html>) does not include sexual behaviour or sexual identity as part of sexuality but does include biological sex, gender identity, and social sex role in addition to sexual orientation. I concur with Lawler's (2001) suggestion that our conceptualization and categorization of gender and sexuality, sexual practice and sexual identity are "more fluid and unstable than we might allow" (p. 71) and that, given the divergent perspectives, it is temporally difficult to clearly delineate sexuality.

Politics Reflected in Term Choices

I found that, particularly in queer writing, notions or definitions of sexuality are also very political. For some people, describing oneself as queer or lesbian may be political rather than related to sexuality; some queer-identified persons are heterosexual and some political lesbians do not have sex with other women (N. Sullivan, 2003). There is great tension within minority sexuality or GLBTQ communities about how to gain better societal rights. Will these be acquired through assimilationist perspectives ('we're just like everybody else') which more closely align with essentialist perspectives that we are born with a sexuality or through liberationist, social constructionist (Sartelle, 1994) or queer (Gamson & Moon, 2004) views? Both philosophical views may help promote minority sexuality political rights through social change. Ball (2001, 2003) and Richards

(1999), for example, argued that focusing on liberalist universal rights will be most useful; McWhorter (1999) felt that queer theory and action would have greater disruptive potential against heterosexist cultural discourses. Further discussion of this very interesting topic is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Actions such as ‘coming out’ as GLBTQ have potential challenges and advantages and even the notion that one may have an unambiguous minority sexuality or any identity has been challenged by those with postmodern views (Creet, 1995; Sedgwick, 1990; N. Sullivan, 2003). As Quiroga (2000) noted, for those in countries where being known to be a minority sexuality person may result in imprisonment, unemployment, cultural exile or death or, even in places with less restrictive laws, being ‘in the closet’ may be a way to survive and to be able to pass art, music, and culture on to future generations.

I found a striking, perhaps shocking, example of perception of power, politics, and meaning, related to how sexuality terms are used, in a scene in the television mini-series version of *Angels in America* (Nichols, 2003). In this scene, Roy Cohn (portrayed by Al Pacino), who had been an assistant and advisor to anti-Communist, anti-homosexual Joe McCarthy, tells his doctor that he cannot have AIDS. He says this is so because only homosexuals, drug addicts, and hemophiliacs get AIDS and since he is none of those things he cannot have AIDS. For Cohn, homosexuals have no political power – no clout – and do not know anyone important and since Cohn knows people and has clout he cannot be homosexual. He believes this even when he takes his male sexual partner with him to the White House (“I have sex with men. But unlike nearly every other man of whom this is true, I bring the guy I’m screwing to the White House and President Reagan smiles at

us and shakes his hand”, Nichols). So, since Cohn cannot be a homosexual, he cannot have AIDS.

Doctor: You have AIDS.

Cohn: AIDS. You know your problem Henry is that you are hung up on words, on labels that you believe they mean what they seem to be. AIDS, homosexual, gay, lesbian. You think these are names that tell you who someone sleeps with, they don't tell you that.

Doctor: No?

Cohn: No. Like all labels they tell you one thing, and one thing only – where does an individual so identified fit in the food chain, in the pecking order. Not ideology or sexual taste, but something much simpler – clout. Not who I fuck or who fucks me, but who will pick up the phone when I call, who owes me favors. This is what a label refers to. Now to someone who does not understand this, homosexual is what I am because I have sex with men, but really this is wrong. Homosexuals are not men who sleep with other men, homosexuals are men who, in 15 years of trying cannot get a pissant anti-discrimination bill through city council. Homosexuals are men who know nobody and who nobody knows, who have zero clout. Does this sound like me?

(Nichols, 2003)

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, heterosexual, and transgender are commonly thought of as sexualities. Queer is a term which has been utilized pejoratively from those outside the GLBTQ community. Especially since the early 1990s, however, queer has been reclaimed by minority sexuality people and their allies to indicate community, political ideology as well as sexuality (Rimmerman, 2002; Turner, 2000; Warner, 1993). In a dramatic fashion, a character from the British television show *Queer as Folk*, Stuart, in a confrontation with his family, defiantly reclaims anti-queer epithets: “I’m queer, I’m gay, I’m homosexual, I’m a poof, I’m a poofter, I’m a ponce” (Schindler, 2000).

As some people may name a racial or ethnic identity such as African-American, some people may describe their sexuality as gay, straight, or lesbian, bisexual, transsexual, queer, or whatever word or words seem to fit for them (Howard, 2000). I use these words as adjectives rather than nouns. That is, I prefer ‘gay man’, ‘lesbian woman’, and ‘transexual person’, for example, rather than ‘a gay’ or ‘a queer’. ‘Gay’ and ‘queer’ are

often used as ‘all-encompassing’ terms for all minority sexualities. I believe this usage has been rightly criticized as not adequately representing all minority sexuality persons.

Many acronyms for minority sexuality people have been coined. For example, GLBT (gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender) or LGBT have been quite common for several years though GLBTT (add two-spirited for the final ‘T’) and BLGTQQA (add queer, questioning, and allies, respectively for ‘QQA’) are more recent terms. A few other more recent additions for possible letters in the acronym are the following: QS, queer straight; QHET, queer heterosexual; M, metrosexual (Schlicter, 2004); T, transsexual, transidentified; I, intersexed, indeterminately sexed; and, another Q, quare (E. P. Johnson, 2001).

In this section, I have not included words which are used in non-English cultures or even words which are used by English-speakers in other cultures, such as *tonghzi* (more or less GLBTQ in Hong Kong, W. Lee, 2003). I do offer a brief section on non-Western word usage later in Chapter Two. I have also not included intra-community jargon terms such as “hasbian” (a woman who previously identified as lesbian but who is no longer considered a ‘real’ lesbian as she now has sex with men, Clausen, 1999, p. xvi). I have not attempted to define or name every sexuality, identity, or gender but, like Halberstam (1994), allow “that sexuality manifests itself as multiple sexualities” (p. 226).

Any or all of these words and terms have imperfections and I have not endeavoured to record or create a list of absolute completeness or plenitude. For a glimpse into the many possible words for sexuality, please see the list of thirty-one words women, who claimed romantic or physical attractions to other women, used to describe their sexuality (Rust, 2001; Savin-Williams, 2005, Appendix B). Savin-Williams and Diamond (2000) found

that only a minority of the women in their study who had same-sex attractions used the term lesbian. I suggest that although terms such as gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, and transgendered are still common there is also a greater flexibility and breadth of words used to describe sexuality.

g0y?

There has been a very recent and intriguing construction or creation of a new facet of sexuality by a group of men who describe themselves and their sexuality as ‘g0y’ (spelled with a zero) (<http://www.g0ys.org>). Although these men like to be affectionate and sexual with other men they do not classify themselves as gay, bisexual, or homosexual because they are not effeminate and do not have anal sex. They also believe that their behaviour is not specifically prohibited in the Bible, apparently making it acceptable for men with certain religious convictions to name this sexuality as fitting for them. I suggest that although more and more people resist the notion of classifying their sexuality, many people in Western cultures still feel the need to classify themselves into discrete categories and are not comfortable with grey shadings of sexuality.

A Brief Historical View

Although same-sex sexual behaviour has been identified across recorded history and in virtually every society in the world (see Murray, 1992, 1995, 1996, 2000, for extensive explorations), descriptions of, attitudes toward, and even labelling of these behaviours have been extremely variable. The word “homosexual” is believed to have first appeared in German about 1870 (1869, according to Katz (1983), or 1872, Halperin (1990)) and in English in 1892 (Halperin, 1990). At the extremes of attitudes about homosexuality, Halwani (1998), echoing Foucault (1978), suggested that essentialists view

homosexuality as “ahistorical and acultural” (Halwani, 1998, p. 26), while social constructionists view homosexuality as “a property which is both culture-bound and time-bound” (p. 26). Debate about sexuality will likely continue in the foreseeable future and I appreciate that the disparate views maintain discussion about and contestation of perspectives on sexuality.

The Christopher Street riots and Stonewall in 1969 are, particularly in North America, considered influential in making it easier for researchers and political activists to write about gay, lesbian, and bisexual sexualities (Rimmerman, 2002). Bohan (1996) suggested that actions of the emerging gay rights movement, as well as empirical studies by Hooker (1957) and later corroborated by Siegelman (1972) and Thompson, McCandless, and Strickland (1971) encouraged the American Psychiatric Association, in 1973, to remove homosexuality from the DSM. This was also supported by the American Psychological Association, in 1975. The Daughters of Bilitis (D’Emilio, 1983) and the Mattachine Society (Adam, 1995) were important organizations for homosexuals in the 1950s and the 1960s and whose foundations helped lay at least a small pathway prior to the 1969 Stonewall riots.

I have attempted to give a brief historical perspective to the use of words and terms relating to sexuality as well as provide a sense of the tensions over how these words are used. I appreciate the move away from the fixed binary terms of heterosexual and homosexual toward queer theory views that encourage the deconstruction of stigmatizing sexuality labels that marginalize anyone who is not heterosexual (Esterberg, 1997). At the same time, I recognize the pride, affirmation, and safety that labels may provide individuals and that may also foster social change. Until such time that category labels

are unnecessary, I appreciate their utility for many people. In the following section, I describe concepts of sexuality development and sexuality construction from essentialist and social constructionist perspectives, respectively.

Sexuality Development/ Sexuality Construction

Although it has occasionally been stated that GLBTQ persons may be considered like any other minority group, minority sexuality youth rarely receive any early socialization from their parents for being minority sexuality (Floyd, T. S. Stein, Harter, Allison, & Nye, 1999). PFLAG (Parents and Friends of Gays and Lesbians) is an organization, mostly in Canada and the United States, where people can get information about and find solidarity with others with similar experiences (<http://www.pflag.org>). This organization had a very humble beginning when one mother, Jeanne Medford, marched with her son in the 1972 New York Gay Pride Parade. It has grown to over 200,000 members in the US (<http://www.pflag.org>) and over 60 chapters in Canada (<http://www.pflagcanada.ca>) who have learned how to improve their relationships with their GLBTQ children and friends. The biological parents of an ethnic minority child and adolescent can communicate to their child that he or she is African-Canadian, for example, and what that might mean living in Canada. The parents of a minority sexuality adolescent, unless they are also minority sexuality, cannot, in the same way, prepare their child for what it is like to be minority sexuality as he or she grows up.

A coherent identity has been conceptualized as having many identities, including ethnicity and sexuality, integrated into an overarching notion of self (Baumeister, 1998). There is controversy over the notion that minority sexuality requires integration into a minority sexuality culture, referred to as ‘gay culture’ (Irvine, 1994). That is, debate

exists whether lesbians and gay men constitute a culture or whether minority sexuality is just one of many descriptive terms which may be used to describe someone (Warner, 1993). Further, research suggesting that there is a biological etiology of sexual orientation (Breedlove, 1994; Firestein, 1996; Herschberger, 1997) is countered by the argument that sexuality is a socially constructed, culture-bound notion (DeCecco & Elia, 1993; Epstein, 1996; Gamson & Moone, 2004; S. Seidman, 2003; S. Seidman, Meeks, & Traschen, 1999; T. S. Stein, 1992, 1996). Epstein (1996), for example, believed that “sexual meanings, identities, and categories were intersubjectively negotiated social and historical products – that sexuality was, in a word, *constructed*” (p. 145, italics in original).

Essentialist Perspectives of Sexuality

The earliest works on sexual identity are stage models and reflective of essentialist perspectives about sexuality (Cass, 1979; Coleman, 1982; McCarn & Fassinger, 1996; Rotheram-Borus & Fernandez, 1995; Sophie, 1986; Troiden, 1979, 1988, 1993). These are fairly similar and include a period of discovery, awareness, and identification of sexual orientation; a period of confusion, exploration, or search; and, finally, a period of integration or commitment to sexual orientation. This may occur with or without total acceptance and pride in one’s sexual orientation. There were few early, non-stage models of sexual identity development, although Cox and Gallois (1996) developed a model which utilized social identity theory related to the two processes of self-categorization and social comparison.

These early models were developed at a time when essentialist discourse on sexuality was particularly influential and the stages and categories reflected the hegemonic cultural

understandings and beliefs about sexuality (Bohan & Russell, 1999a). Sedgwick (1990) felt it might be difficult to ask about the development of gay identity in a way which was not structured around essentialist notions of sexuality. As early as 1975, however, K. Plummer (1975) challenged essentialist views of sexuality and suggested that sexualities were constructed and that sexual meanings could be contested (K. Plummer, 2003). Although K. Plummer (1975) developed a stage model for sexual identity he posited that social interactions and the meanings that a person constructed from those interactions contributed to the evolution of that individual's sexual identity.

Several studies have provided support for these linear, stage models (for example, Cass, 1984; B. E. Chapman & Brannock, 1987; Floyd & T. S. Stein, 2002) or partial support (Sophie, 1986). Sophie found that, contrary to stage models, some self-reported lesbians reported an identity where attractions to males were incorporated suggesting that sexual identity did not necessarily come to a fixed end point. More recently, however, Floyd and T. S. Stein (2002) used an exploratory procedure of cluster analysis with self-identified gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth and found that just over one-quarter of their sample matched developmental stage models (e.g., Troiden, 1989) whereas there was divergence from the typical sequence in the rest of the sample. Additionally, youth who may not have felt that category labels accurately described them, those confused about their sexuality or not comfortable revealing their sexuality were not part of the participant group (Russell & Bohan, 1999b; Diamond, 1998).

Tiefer (1999) suggested that the main reason that we have such categories is to compare and contrast individuals for gender or race and which often seem to exist in order to perpetuate difference. Richardson (1993) proposed that there was no basis to

support generalized models of “homosexual identity” and that “without the existence of a specific category of persons labelled as homosexual there can be no development of a discrete homosexual identity” (p. 120). Weeks (1995) argued that there is a paradox of identity since familiar categories can offer security even though there is more individuality and chaos than order to human sexuality. He believed that rather than simply attaching a label once people noted their sexual behaviour, people put sexual identity together in their lives. Bohan and Russell (1999b) found that many youth and young adults who would usually be categorized as gay, lesbian, or bisexual do not choose any of those categories to describe their own sexualities. Rather, these youth and young adults frequently described themselves as having “spectrum sexuality” (that is, a broad range of sexualities encompassing a spectrum of possibilities) with none of the usual words adequately indicating how they saw themselves. Bohan and Russell speculated that some may not choose a category as the result of internalized homophobia while, for others, the available categories do not adequately reflect their experiences.

More recently, Savin-Williams (2005) reported that the age when people may attach a sexuality label has decreased by about five years (more for females) from the 1960s and 1970s to about age 16 for both males and females. Additionally, these younger people are becoming more likely to resist or refuse any sexual identity labels. Cass (1999) was hopeful that, “[p]erhaps the concept of sexual orientation is becoming irrelevant to personal experience. Perhaps we really *are* beginning to understand relationships, emotions, and attractions without needing to label them as homosexual or heterosexual” (p.106, italics in original).

Several researchers have criticized linear, stage models. Weinberg (1984) felt that linear models did not adequately allow for multiple paths and identities, varying starting points, or for changes in identity over a lifetime. He found that existing models often reified researchers' constructs rather than reflected participants' perceptions of themselves. Of particular note is that Cass (1990, 1996) criticized her own linear, stage model (1979). Cass (1999) suggested that both the similarity and variability of sexualities are constructed and that researchers may look for ways to explain all behaviours and sexualities. Further, she posited that asking questions about how sexualities are constructed and influenced by social interactions and biology may lead to clearer understanding of the broad range of sexualities. Morris (1997) and Cox and Gallois (1996) criticized stage models for not taking individual differences into account as well as race, age, ethnicity, and factors which influence identity.

Social Constructionist Perspectives of Sexuality

From social constructionist perspectives, identity may be viewed as an interactive and sometimes fragmentary process between a person and his or her social environment, a continual process over a lifetime. The meanings that the individual gives to and derives from these interactions influence the sense of identity that he or she might construct. Within this same contextual framework, Horowitz and Newcomb (2001), argued against essentialist notions that a person forms a homosexual identity when he or she recognizes his or her 'real' sexuality. They proposed that coming to identities or sexualities occurred through the interaction of the individual and the social environment and the meanings given to multiple factors. Further, they suggested that because these processes are continual, a person's sexual identity may be fluid over a lifetime and, from social

constructionist perspectives, sexual identity has no definitive final destination. I believe this matches Broido's (2000) view that there are multiple ways that people interpret cognitive, emotional, and behavioural experiences of sexuality related to and separate from any sexuality labels.

C. Kitzinger (1987) was perhaps one of the first writers to describe lesbian experience as not fitting linear, stage models. Consistent with social constructionist perspectives, C. Kitzinger (1995), describing her earlier 1987 work, stated "that 'the lesbian' as a type of being does not exist, but is rather actively constructed in a society which ...is predicated on male subordination of women through prevailing ideas of 'femininity', including the requirement that the 'feminine' woman be heterosexual" (p. 139). C. Kitzinger and Wilkinson (1995) related some of the stories of women who felt that their sexuality changed from heterosexual to lesbian and that both sexualities fit for them. More recently, C. Kitzinger (1995, 2000) continued work on non-linear, non-stage, multidimensional models.

Earlier models of sexual identity development were considered essentialist in nature and not reflective of the multiple influences of age, socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity, religion, education, and gender (Baumeister, 2000; Cox & Gallois, 1996; Morris, 1997). McCarn and Fassinger (1996) and Morris (1997) developed models of lesbian identity which had stages or dimensions where multiple influences were considered and the ordering of stages was not necessarily so rigid as previous models.

Much of the criticism of sexual identity models has arisen from researchers studying female sexuality (Baumeister, 2000; Diamond, 1998, 2000; C. Kitzinger, 1987; C. Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1995; Peplau & Garnets, 2000). Dubé (2000), however,

suggested that models such as those of Cass (1979) and Trolden (1988) do not fit for all gay males. He found that some gay males come to a gay sexual identity without any sexual behaviour. Other researchers report similar findings (D'Augelli, 1991; Savin-Williams, 1998). Dubé proposed that the samples for the early models were older gay males and that younger gay males, especially in recent times, represent other possible pathways to gay sexual identity; that is, if they identify as gay at all.

More recent researchers have found that, especially for women, sexuality is flexible, complicated, and multidimensional (Garnets, 2002). Notions that sexuality forms at an early age and is then unchangeable are not borne out in recent studies, where sexuality, more so for women, was fluid and changeable over time, (Baumeister, 2000; Diamond, 1998; Peplau & Garnets, 2000). Within a sport setting, Iannotta and Kane (2002) examined sexual stories of female coaches that supported the view that sexuality is “non-linear, fluid and contextualized” (p. 347).

Most early models of lesbian identity development assumed a heterosexual/lesbian binary and bisexuality was viewed as a ‘phase’ on the way to a lesbian or gay identity (Swann & Anastas, 2003) and transgendered persons were virtually ignored in research. Several investigators found that sexuality development was not linear in nature (Diamond, 2000; Rust, 1996; Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000). Diamond (2000), for example, found that a majority of the minority sexuality women interviewed did not have childhood indicators of sexual orientation, stability in same-sex attractions, and changed their sexual identity label more than once before identifying as lesbian or bisexual, or not identifying at all.

Cox and Gallois (1996) believed that social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) could explore sexual identities amongst multiple social identities. For example, someone may have multiple dominant status identities such as White, heterosexual, and male whereas someone else may have multiple non-dominant or minority identities such as female, lesbian, and Asian. They argued that sexual identity is not unidimensional and simply a matter of sexual behaviour but rather a complex interaction of sexual behaviour, sexual attraction, self-identity, gender identity, emotional attachments and other factors. They posited a ‘non-stage’ theory of minority sexual identities where individuals’ social factors have influences on individuals’ psychological processes.

Dual and Multiple Non-dominant Statuses

There are few models that take dual non-dominant statuses into accounts of identities and sexualities. Y. B. Chung and Katayama (1998) suggested that the development of sexual and ethnic identity is interactive; Dubé and Savin-Williams (1999) argued that socialization forces such as family origin, language, culture, and religion are influential in the development of individuals from non-dominant ethnic and sexuality groups. For many Latino men, for example, there may be contexts in which they identify as only Latino and in other contexts as gay but the places where they can be both may not commonly exist (Quiroga, 2000). The tension and opposition between these identities becomes a question of *position*; that is, where do these men employ or celebrate these multiple identities?

For people from multiple minority or non-dominant groups, developing an identity can be extremely challenging. For example, open acknowledgement of homosexuality

may be even more restricted in Asian-American cultures because traditional gender roles and the family system are central to Asian cultures (C. S. Chan, 1989, 1993, 1995; Kim & D. R. Atkinson, 2002). Either minority sexual orientation or minority ethnic status may create huge struggles within an adolescent and facing both challenges may be daunting, leading to a conflict between choosing which of these is more important to his or her sense of identity: Asian-American gay adolescent, gay Asian-American, or both gay and Asian-American (C. S. Chan, 1989, 1995; Kim & D. R. Atkinson, 2002). Broido (2000) suggested that for persons from non-dominant ethnic groups to identify as gay or lesbian, they must consider their identity through Western concepts.

Queer Perspectives

In this section, I describe queer theory and perspectives on sexuality, including queer work in sport, as well as writings about non-Euro-American cultural perspectives on sexuality. For some, queer perspectives, theories, and criticisms have become too associated with gay, White, middle-class males and that ‘queer’ is not endorsed by many people of multiple non-dominant groups such as transgendered people of colour (E. P. Johnson, 2001). E. P. Johnson, echoed concerns of C. S. Chan (1989) and Dubé and Savin-Williams (1999), and stated that race, ethnicity, class, and other factors may not have yet been adequately considered in terms of sexuality. E. P. Johnson suggested “quare” as a more inclusive term for representing multiple non-dominant group statuses experienced by a person in relation to minority sexuality and encouraged researchers to engage in studies from quare perspectives. W. Lee (2003) took E. P. Johnson’s notion of quare theory in a personal way and came up with “*kuaer*” theory in her experiences of

Taiwanese and Chinese cultures to create a perspective which is more transnational as well as include race-consciousness and womanist views.

Words such as ‘gay’ and ‘queer’ are sometimes celebrated for having been reappropriated from dominant discourse usage of them which fits well with Butler’s (1993a) notion that, rather than stopping the use of terms which arose from “oppressive regimes of power”, that “they ought to be repeated in directions that reverse and displace their originating aims” (p. 123). There has, however, been at least some resistance to using these words and I give two of many possible examples. Over 30 years ago, Johnston (1975) felt that the Women’s Movement (with the importance of lesbians within it) should be separated from the mostly male Gay Liberation Movement because “[l]esbians are feminists, not homosexuals” (p. 86). More recently, many older and at least some younger males who identify as gay feel ‘queer’ has been imposed on them by gay leftists and academics (Kirchick, 2006). Johnston, E. P. Johnson, and Kirchick might agree that reappropriating ‘ownership’ of these words is worthwhile but also contest that they are adequate to represent all minority sexuality persons.

Queer theory and queer perspectives are not unified, often contradictory and even attempting to define queer is an “un-queer thing to do” (N. Sullivan, 2003, p. 43). I will not endeavour to present all explications or definitions of queer but will include at least a few common views of queer. Jagose (1996), for example, believed that “queer itself can have neither a fundamental logic, nor a consistent set of characteristics” (p.96); and that, “queer is very much … in the process of formation… not simply that queer has yet to solidify and take on a more consistent profile, but rather that its definitional indeterminacy, its elasticity, is one of its constituent characteristics” (p. 1). Jagose also

felt “part of queer’s semantic clout, part of its political efficacy depends on its resistance to definition, and the way in which it refuses to stake its claim” (p. 1). Further, Jagose stated: “queer is markedly unlike those traditional political movements which ground themselves in a fixed and necessarily exclusionist identity … stretch[es] the boundaries of identity categories” (p. 101).

For Warner (1993), queer was not a specific sexuality but rather “suggest[ed] the difficulty in defining the population whose interests are at stake in queer politics” (xxvi). Gamson (2000) suggested that fifty years ago most people who either had same-sex desires or actually practiced them led ‘double lives’. Gamson also said that, today, burgeoning queer theories reject that there is a core self which can be defined by sexuality or race and these theories support perspectives that challenge the stability of categories such as gay and lesbian. He believed that because of these challenges to stable categories gay and lesbian participants are sometimes difficult to recognize and research. Gamson (1997) also wrote about the challenge of collective identity boundaries between minority sexuality and heterosexual communities. Further, he noted that there is disputation of the range and plasticity of sexualities and political stances so that a person may not feel that he or she belongs within the porous boundaries of the minority sexuality community.

The use of ‘queer’ has varied over time. Chauncey (1994) found that, in the early 1900s in New York City, queer was the preferred self-reference for men whose main self identification was their sexual desire for other men. Although Dynes (1990), in the *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*, predicted the death of the word queer, soon after, de Lauretis (1991), used queer as a way to describe specific discursive conjunctions while

avoiding the assumption of a determined definition. Since then, queer and queer theory have expanded widely though found primarily in GLBTQ-affirmative groups or academic contexts and “limited to certain communities of practice” (McConnell-Ginet, 2002, p. 148). I recognize that although I find queer and queer theory to fit for me - particularly as locations of contestation, challenge, and resistance - that these terms do not necessarily fit for everyone. That is, I do not assume that someone who may identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered will also support or agree with my use of queer. In fact, only one of the research participants in this study used queer in connection with his sexuality.

There is a certain appeal, I think, to consider queer as a broad-based term which fits diverse minority sexualities. Applying queer as a ‘one-size-fits-all’ label, however, does not adequately represent the broad range of minority sexualities and as Anzaldúa (1991) described, “[q]ueer is used as a false unifying umbrella which all ‘queers’ of all races, ethnicities and classes are shoved under....[and] even when we seek shelter under it we must not forget that it homogenizes [and] erases our differences” (p. 250).

S. Seidman (1994) posited that lesbian women and gay men of colour in the 1980s contributed to social contexts to challenge notions of the universality of gay experience (usually from White, male perspectives). Whisman (1996) agreed that most understandings of gay identities did not critique male dominance and “actually reproduce[d] [them] in the way that [they] cast male homosexuality as universal and lesbianism as particular” (p. 116). Those who have experienced the intersectionality and multiple influences of race, ethnicity, sex, gender, class, and sexuality identities are most likely to resist or reject choosing or naming a single identity. I think it makes sense to

consider queer a position (Halperin, 1995), rather than an identity or sexuality, an unfixed place to deconstruct, resist, and contest “the normal, the legitimate, the dominant” (p. 62).

I like the queer notion of challenging fixed boundaries, binaries, and categories but recognize that we also need ways of communicating across perceived borders. Laing (1960) suggested that for someone to develop a sense of identity, one needed to be known by at least one other person, and that to find self-recognition any other way would mean that it is possible to be human without relationships with others. The idea that humans use simple, heuristic, categories in language processing (Chomsky, 1957, 1965) has intuitive appeal but evidence for this is at least equivocal and has been increasingly challenged (Danziger, 2005; Otake & Cutler, 2003). Chomsky believed that there is human-only syntax but it has been produced by at least some birds (Gentner, Fenn, Margoliash, & Nusbaum, 2006). Although full discussion or explication of this topic is beyond the scope of this paper, I would like to suggest that the use of categories is not natural or universal.

What is germane to the present discussion is that as long as boundaries are maintained or promoted, then essentialist binaries of gender (male and female) and sexuality (heterosexual and homosexual) perpetuate ‘them’ and ‘us’ categories. I believe we must consider the effects of the words employed in naming and whom is affected and that for minority sexuality persons and “anyone who has been othered by dominant discourses and institutions, the importance of naming is abundantly clear, and in particular, the necessity to resist categories that are imposed by others and that are detrimental to the self” (N. Sullivan, 2003, p. 114). Further, it is important that minority sexuality persons “provide their own images of themselves to escape from the images that have been so long produced of and on them” to “produce [their] own representations for [themselves]

and thereby produce [themselves] as discursive subject[s] who refuse merely to be the object[s] of the Other's discourse" (Eribon, 2004, p. 75). Eliason and Morgan (1998) found that women who self-identified as lesbian varied widely in how they defined their lesbian identities but felt that their definitions were important for them.

Queering boundaries and blurring sexualities relates well to perspectives on 'ethnicity' or 'race' where there has been resistance to 'multiracial, mixed-raced, multiple ethnicities' because it undermines the basis for racism. When categories for any sexuality other than heterosexual are utilized, heterosexuals may view those categories as 'the other'. Queering categories attacks heteronormativity and the 'preferred' status of heterosexuality. Multiracial or multiply ethnic individuals challenge the precept that race is an irreducible difference between people (Wright, 1994). Bisexuals or persons who describe their sexuality as fluid do not match the heterosexual-homosexual binary. Thus, queer perspectives and theory aim to blur and disrupt "sex and gender identity boundaries and deconstruct identity categories" (Gamson, 1995, p. 390). Additionally, A. Stein and K. Plummer (1996) believed that at least two "hallmarks of queer theory" were that: a) sexual power pervaded social interactions and was "enforced through boundaries and binary divides", and, b) that sexual and gender categories should be 'problematised' as "always on uncertain ground" (p. 134).

In the preceding section, I have described primarily Euro-American, Western queer perspectives. In the following sections, I provide a short section on queer writing in sport and then a brief introduction to non-Western perspectives. Tourist travel, immigration, the media, and, especially, the Internet, all contribute to world cultural groups meeting and having cross-cultural experiences.

Queer Resistance and Deconstruction in Sport

Several authors have utilized feminist and social constructionist perspectives to research gender and sexuality in sport (for example, McKay, Messner, & Sabo, 2000; Messner & Sabo, 1990; Nylund, 2004; Sykes, 1996; Wellard, 2002). Sykes examined the “constriction” and the “construction” of lesbian identities in physical education. Wellard encouraged challenging “exclusive masculinity” in sport. Nylund noted that there are spaces, in some sports talk radio programs, “where men can negotiate and reconfigure masculinity” (p. 136).

Wolf-Wendel, Toma, and Morphew (2001) found that student-athletes, coaches, and athletic administrators at five top athletic universities in the United States accept most forms of diversity they “remain closed and even hostile to issues of difference related to sexual orientation” (p. 465). These authors viewed sexuality as socially constructed and suggested several possibilities to promote civil rights for minority sexuality athletes such as adding non-discrimination clauses to athletics’ charters.

It is, however, these places of marginalization and difference from which several sport authors with queer perspectives want to contest, deconstruct, problematize, and resist hegemonic discourses about gender and sexuality in sport (for example, C. W. Johnson & Kivel, 2007; Krane, 2001; Messner, 1996, 1998; Krane, 2001; Pronger, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2002). Messner (1996) suggested that “queer, destabilizing humor” could be used to in sport research to “interrogate the entire institution of sport by asking, ‘If heterosexuality is so natural, why do we all have to work so damned hard to recruit new heterosexuals among every generation of youth?’” (p. 234).

C. W. Johnson and Kivel (2007) promoted queer perspectives in counselling practice to “transform the oppressive/marginalizing structures of leisure and sport, as a means of both subverting the privilege and entitlement earned through heterosexuality and masculinity and for questioning heteronormative behaviours which function to maintain heterosexuality’s dominance” (p. 94). Krane (2001) integrated queer and feminist theory to challenge socially constructed and reified privilege of heterosexuality over “nonheterosexuality” and masculinity over femininity. Pronger (1999, 2000) believed that sport rules and homophobia in sport disciplines, in a Foucauldian sense, how people move and perform in sport and express (or probably not) desire within sporting contexts. Further, Pronger (2000) felt that the promotion of assimilation and inclusion of the “gay community” in both sport and mainstream culture undermined “the radical and transformative potential of homosexuality” (p. 234); or that, from his radical, lesbian, gay, and queer agenda, “gay sport is part of the gentrification of homosexuality....that undermines the transgressive, transformative potential of homosexuality” (p. 241). I found that Pronger appears to really embrace the deconstructionist and transgressive possibilities of queer perspectives. I believe that these feminist, postmodern, and queer views in sport writing support and inform my interest in studying conversations about sexuality between minority sexuality athletes.

Non-Euro-American Perspectives

Although queer theorists contest the fixity of sexual categories, Euro-American categories of sexualities (and words describing them) travel to almost all countries in the world via tourists, media, and the internet. Groups such as the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission work to promote the rights of minority sexuality

persons worldwide but often find that their predominantly Western notions of sexuality do not match local non-Western cultures (Massad, 2002). Altman (2001a) believed that “the spread of sexual identities as a new step in neocolonialism” (p. 94) was justifiably criticized by Massad (2002) and others (Cantú, 2002; Glick, 2003; Prieur, 1998; and Quiroga, 2000, for example). Kagitçibasi (1997) believed that, for many collectivist, non-Western cultures, identity may mean fitting into that culture or society harmoniously and inextricably. With relation to sexualities, there may have been traditional views about sexual practices which were not labeled to make ‘sexual identity categories’ to avoid marginalizing anyone from the collective cultural experience.

Quiroga (2000) argued against the universality of sexual categories and viewed Western sexualities as being a part of the history of imperialism. Altman (2001b) explored the Western transportation of the notion he called “the global gay” (p. 20) and widespread local cultural resistances to this and asked “whose scripts are being played out as more people in developing countries adopt the idea of forming homosexual couples” (p. 27). Although many North American words are being transported globally (*gey* in Turkey, Bereket & Adam, 2006; *gaié*, Ambrecht, 2005 and *queer*, Gunther, 2005, in France; *kuaer* and *kuer* in China and Taiwan, W. Lee, 2003), they often have wide local meanings.

Bereket and Adam (2006) acknowledged that Western models of sexual identities are being globalized and challenge local longstanding traditions of how sexual behaviours are organized. At the same time, they reported that, in Turkey, inter-male interactions and sexualities and the meaning of *gey* is widely varied. *Gaié* does not fit well in France due to resistance to American globalization and that “American conceptions of queer identity

often are seen as an export as threatening to France as is the Big Mac” (Ambrecht, 2005, p. 20). While queer may be viewed as anti-assimilationist and against forming identities around fixed notions of sexuality in the United States (Gamson, 1998), this does not fit well with the French social model of universalism and social integration (Gunther, 2005). *Gey, gaie, and kuer* (W. Lee, 2003) may be viewed as “boundary objects” (Star & Griesemer, 1989) or terms which, when brought into different social worlds, are flexible enough to be influenced by local understandings and meanings. Moore and Clarke (2001), writing from feminist perspectives, believed that terms for genders, anatomies, and sexualities may be transported but “may also vary widely across local cultural/political/historical/ [and] economic formations” (p. 58) and may be considered “*both* immutable and mutable” (p. 58, italics in original).

Blackwood (2005), while doing archeological research in West Sumatra, Indonesia, developed a relationship with a female described locally as a *tomboi* (a woman acting in the manner of a man). Blackwood felt that they had a *lesbian* relationship or at least they were two women-who-loved women but discovered that for the Indonesian they were in a *cowok-cewak* (man and woman) relationship. This highlights, I believe, Livia and K. Hall’s (1997) idea that, when studying sexualities in any culture, it is necessary to “pay acute attention to the historical moment and specific community involved” (pp. 12-13).

Same-sex sexual behaviour has been recorded across history and across cultures (Murray, 2000). How these behaviours are viewed or described in contemporary cultures varies widely across the world. In many, if not all, Western countries, sexualities are considered an important consideration of people’s identities. In some non-Western cultures, same-sex sexual practices are known but not necessarily described or named

(Sambia tribes in New Guinea (Herdt, 1984, 1997); traditional forms of male-male intimacy in Turkey (Bereket & Adam, 2006) and other Arab cultures (Massad, 2002)).

In Latino cultures (Mexico, for example), public gender performance as well as gendered roles in sexual behaviours define ones sexuality (Cantú, 2002). For males, only the *passivo* is viewed as being homosexual while the *activo* is mostly seen as being heterosexual; for women, a masculine-behaving woman (*marimacha*) is viewed as homosexual (Cantú). Additionally, a gay identity, or at least a gay identity as understood from American perspectives, is not commonly found in Mexico and is viewed as incompatible with Mexican views on sexuality (Cantú). Quiroga (2000), believed that the work of Latino artists, writers, and film makers showed that Latinos “are not interested in defining sexual behavior according to cultural models” (particularly Anglo-American models) when, in their work, they focused “on the sites where taxonomies don’t quite fit...a different way of conducting social dialogue...not within a world defined by categories...[and] interested in the negotiation [of identity] (p. 195).

I have given only a few examples of non-Western cultural and community perspectives about sexuality. Many of these may be unfamiliar and even surprising to Western readers. Western mental health care practitioners are likely to encounter people from non-Western backgrounds and I believe that it is useful to become at least rudimentarily familiar with non-Western notions of sexuality.

Summary

Freud and particularly Erikson provided some of the groundwork for studies on identities. Although both of them lived and worked in primarily White, Western cultures, Erikson (1968) recognized the possibility of multiple influences of the contexts where

people lived. People in European and American cultures have become increasingly aware of the myriad of interacting ethnic groups as well as many other non-dominant groups and issues relating to them such as minority sexuality groups. The relationships between dominant and non-dominant groups include negotiation and occasionally confrontation around issues of power, dominance, and oppression.

Until about the last hundred years most people were more or less born into an identity based on where they lived and their family circumstances and work (Howard, 2000). European American societies have had increasingly rapid cultural and technological changes and this likely has influenced our awareness and study of identities. Most of these have tended to focus on separate identities such as ethnic or sexual identities. I agree with Jones and McEwen (2000) that identity research needs to include the multiple dimensions and interactions of all our socially constructed identities.

Postmodern, Queer (Quare? Kuaer?) Counselling Perspectives

and my Researcher ‘Positioning’

When I consider social constructionist perspectives, I envision that identity formation occurs as an interactive process between a person and his or her social environment, a continual process over a lifetime. The meanings that the individual gives to these interactions influence the sense of identity that he or she might develop. Within this same contextual framework, sexuality identity also develops, though it is fluid over time with no endpoint to sexual identity development (Horowitz & Newcomb, 2001). From this perspective, sexual identity is maintained through social interaction and a person will experience sexuality positively, allowing and tolerating diversity and ambiguity within him- or herself. Haldeman (1999, p. 68) suggested that “we not only tolerate ambiguity

but embrace it” even when that may be not be a comfortable place, and that social constructionism “creates chaos and mess where once there were neat categories” (p. 69).

Counsellors, and their clients, can benefit from becoming familiar with work on identities, ethnicities, and sexualities and the challenges and recognition of issues for anyone in relation to these topics (Ponterotto, 1998). Multicultural counsellors often assume that every counselling setting is a multicultural one (Weinrach & Thomas, 1996). Ethnic identity (e.g., Aldarondo, 2001), sexual identity (e.g., K. A. Barrett & McWhirter, 2002), and the multiple interactions and influences of these and other identities (Abreu, R. H. Chung, & D. R. Atkinson, 2000) are important considerations in every counselling session.

Pope (1995) suggested, over 10 years ago, that minority sexuality “must be part of any definition of multiculturalism” (p. 301). All recent multicultural, diversity, and culture-infused counselling books that I reviewed include chapters primarily on gay men and lesbian women (for example, see Arthur & Collins, 2005; Ponterotto et al., 2001; Robinson, 2005). Bisexual and transgender are occasionally included under ‘sexual minorities’ (D. W. Sue & D. Sue, 2003) but rarely receive separate coverage (see J. A Lippincott & R. B. Lippincott, 2007, for a recent exception). I found no texts with separate chapters on queer perspectives or queer populations. In fact, queer was barely mentioned in most texts or not mentioned at all, something I found surprising.

At the same time, I found that all recent GLBTQ-affirmative counselling texts often included separate sections for transgender and bisexual and also included at least smaller sections for queer (for example, see C. C. Lee, 2006; Bieschke, Perez, & DeBord, 2007). Multicultural and diversity counselling texts mostly featured essentialist sexuality

development models with occasional mention of social constructionist, fluid models for lesbians. Counsellors who recognize that minority sexuality clients' concerns may be central to them, rather than marginal and seen only in heteronormative terms, have been called affirmative counsellors. Affirmative counselling texts provided more balanced presentation of essentialist and social constructionist views about sexuality and also included queer perspectives.

There is a wide range of affirmative counselling practices and there is evidence that mental health care professionals are moving from discriminatory treatment to more affirmative counselling for minority sexuality clients (Dillon & Worthington, 2003). Bieschke, McClanahan, Tozer, Grzegorek, and Park (2000) and Bieschke et al. (2007), for example, proposed that effective affirmative counsellors are aware of sexuality concerns including multiple influences of ethnicity, religion, and other factors; counselling skills related to advocacy and support; awareness of their own as well as other's sexual identities; ability to create a positive working relationships; and, ability to adequately assess challenges and concerns of minority sexuality clients.

Some of the earliest writing on affirmative counselling included only gay and lesbian affirmative counselling (Morrin, 1991). The trend has been for more inclusivity in affirmative counselling: lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients (Croteau, Bieschke, J. C. Phillips, & Lark, 1998; D. Davies & Neal, 1996; Perez & Amadio, 2004); lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender clients (Bieshke et al., 2007); and, queer clients (Tanner & Lyness, 2003).

I recognize that essentialist notions about sexuality fit for many clients as well as counsellors (Russell & Bohan, 1999b). Social constructionist and queer views about

sexuality will match for others (Denborough, 1996). I acknowledge I have feminist, queer, and social constructionist perspectives and believe that they most closely align with postmodern counselling practices (for example, narrative therapy, M. White & Epston, 1990). I believe, however, that all of these perspectives may assist in answering my primary research question, ‘What practices facilitate conversations about sexuality between minority sexuality or GLBTQ athletes and counsellors or psychologists?’

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

Her knowledge of me was so deep, her version so compelling, that it held together my miscellany of identities. To be sane, we choose between the diverse warring descriptions of our selves; I chose hers. I took the name she gave me, and the criticism, and the love, and I called the discourse *me*. (Rushdie, 1999, p. 510, italics in original)

Introduction

My research is vitally important to me as a queer, ex-athlete who works professionally with minority sexuality athletes and minority sexuality clients. Although I am an ‘insider’ in this respect, I am, at the same time, an ‘outsider’ in my role as a research investigator. I agree with Wheeler (2003) that it is important for me to acknowledge my ‘other’ role and to remind myself that “membership in a group does not give [me] *carte blanche* for accessing that group for research purposes, nor does it guarantee the development of a productive working relationship with its members” (p. 67, italics in original). At the same time, minority sexuality persons may more readily volunteer to participate in research done by someone who also is a minority sexuality person (LaSala, 2003). Identities, ethnicities, and sexualities are often concerns which clients bring to counselling settings and I also describe how these concerns may be relevant to mental health care professionals.

In the past, when there was less flux in societies and identities were more or less assigned to people at their birth, identity was of less concern than today (Howard, 2000). Especially in the Western world, we live in contexts which are constantly and quickly changing and many people find that they need to negotiate their sense of selves in these

multiple and evolving milieus. Tensions, challenges, and concerns about identity and sexuality which may develop as the result of being in one or more minority or non-dominant groups may be reasons to visit a counsellor (Bieschke et al., 2000).

Over the last several years, ethnic identity and sexuality have been increasingly studied. The proportion of research on the global construct of identity has decreased, particularly in the last decade. Almost all journal articles and books on identity, or aspects of identity, focus on ethnicity, sexuality, class, age, ablebodiedness, and other identities, either alone or in combination.

Although essentialist theories are still influential, many recent models of and theories about identity, and especially ethnicity and sexuality, are from social constructionist perspectives (DeLamater & Hyde, 1998; Dubé & Savin-Williams, 1999; Horowitz & Newcomb, 2001). Even counsellors who subscribe to social constructionist views find that many of their clients have more essentialist beliefs about discovering their ‘real’ self rather than supporting the concept that selves may be socially influenced and constructed (Russell & Bohan, 1999b). Some clients may even ask counsellors to ‘change’ their sexuality to heterosexual via conversion therapies (see Yarhouse (2005) and others, for example, Appendix C). Ethnic and sexual identities are important to people and there are often concerns and challenges about these identities which bring people to counselling.

In the first part of this chapter, I outline several qualitative methods I considered to study sexuality. I follow this with sections on discursive psychology and discourse methods which relate to my research. Next, I include a section on conversation analysis and, finally, a short section on queer linguistics, an important influence on my research method and analyses. In the next portion of the chapter, I describe the recruitment and

characteristics of the research participants. In the following sections of this chapter, I briefly describe the two research conversations in terms of how they were collected and typical questions and topics we discussed in the conversations.

Qualitative Research Method Considerations

When I considered how to answer my research question, there were several qualitative research methods from which to choose (e.g., Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; M. Q. Patton, 2002). Although I considered several qualitative methods, only discourse analysis focused on the fine details of talk-in-interaction in our conversations to examine the internal and external influences in our conversations. I also considered how interviewing might fit with the aim of my research. Interviewing is often part of qualitative research and, consistent with social constructionist and feminist perspectives, Fontana and Frey (2000) described ‘postmodern interviewing’ as how researchers influenced conversations collected and reported. Of the types of interviews Fontana and Frey described, structured interviews did not appear to have much potential for getting spontaneous stories from participants; and group interviews, although they held the possible benefit of triangulation, were not likely to be intimate enough to create space for identity and sexuality stories.

The three-interview phenomenological format, developed by I. Seidman (1998) allowed greater depth of personal revelation and allowed for inclusion for some degree of context and details of participants’ experiences as well as the meanings that participants may make from their own experiences. This method does not, however, include the researcher telling research participants about his or her own contexts, experiences, and meanings and thus loses the potential for such interchanges between the research and

research participant. Since my intention was to be fully public (H. Anderson, 1997) or transparent in the research conversations, this method also did not fit.

Traditional ethnographies describe what is seen and perceived by the ethnographic researcher, attempting to explain a particular culture in a certain period of time (Janesick, 1991; Tedlock, 2000). For example, the related research approach of ethnomethodology has been used recently to examine sexuality among men who have sex with men (Adam, 2000). One challenge for researchers using this method to explore identity might occur for people who are from multiple non-dominant or minority groups. For example, Y. B. Chung and Katayama (1998) found that many of their participants from Asian cultural backgrounds who also identified as lesbian or gay did not feel as though they fit into their family or any cultural group (because of their sexuality) or into a minority sexuality group (because of racist attitudes).

Certain aspects of feminist ethnography, such as reflexivity, considerations of class, ethnicity, sexuality, and experiences of oppression fit for research on identity (Glesne, 1999). I appreciate what Glesne suggested about reflexivity: that researchers “are inseparable from [their] findings” (p. 177), that researchers were reflected in their interpretations, and that “they have always been [in their research] creating meaning” (p. 176). Feminist perspectives also consider the potential for an asymmetrical power relationship between the researcher and research participants as well as the intersubjectivity between the researcher and the participants. As Prus (1998) suggested, the interaction between people is a process which begins any intention or ‘human agency’ and we cannot understand human behaviour without reference to these interchanges, especially taking context into consideration.

Because of my own experiences of and thoughts about identity, ethnicity, and sexuality, autoethnography (Ellis, 1997) held a strong appeal as an appropriate research method. This method connects personal experiences to cultural experiences (Ellis & Bochner, 2000). Reed-Danahay (1997) believed that by examining one particular life it may be possible to understand a culture and identities from that culture. I did not feel that my own experiences were a fit to answer my research question but certainly contributed to my desire to explore the question.

In terms of narrative inquiry, Connelly and Clandinin (1991) believed that “the principal attraction of narrative as method is its capacity to render life experiences, both personal and social, in relevant and meaningful ways” (p. 141). V.-L. Chapman’s (1997) work, for example, combined her personal experiences as well as those of her participants in her narrative method in looking at the stories and identities of women’s learning experiences.

Phenomenological research is a systematic method which is explicit, self-critical, intersubjective, and not generalizable (van Manen, 1997). Moustakas (1990) suggested that phenomenological research “encourages a kind of detachment from the phenomenon being investigated” (p. 38). Although phenomenological research has been utilized with both athletes’ identity development (Stelter, 2000) and lesbian identity development (Resides, 1998), I did not feel that researcher detachment fit. Further, phenomenology does not focus on the performative nature of conversation.

Discourse Psychology and Discourse Analysis

In this section, I focus on discourse psychology and discourse analysis methods which contributed to my research. From social constructionist perspectives, identity formation

occurs as an interactive process between a person and his or her social environment, a continual process over a lifetime. The meanings that an individual gives to and derives from these interactions influence the senses of identity that he or she might develop.

Within this same contextual framework, sexual identity also develops, though it may be considered to be fluid over time with no endpoint (Horowitz & Newcomb, 2001). From this perspective, sexuality, developed through social interactions, may also be fluid as a person's social interactions change.

Sarbin (1997) suggested that we live in a world where our identities are shaped by stories told, enacted, and even read. Antaki et al. (1996) posited that identities are descriptions which do not appear or are discovered but are used in interactional structures. Identity and, for some, sexuality are flexible. Peoples' descriptions of themselves as being members of categories or groups may facilitate understanding in conversational interactions in relation to local references (Sacks, 1995). Further, people may decide the breadth and latitude they may give any particular category label and whether or not a label fits within the context of a particular conversational interaction.

How we talk about ourselves contributes to our social identities which emerge in our ascriptions and avowals, in the ways that we utilize our contextualized descriptions, including group or category inclusions, in situated and valenced manners (Antaki, et al., 1996). Our storied self-descriptions accumulate into a portfolio of identities which may vary depending on the settings and over time and we may invoke inclusion in and exclusion from a group or groups at different times, sometimes even with the same people. Gubrium and Holstein (1994) similarly described lives as narratively constructed, organized, and informed locally through interaction and dialogue with others.

Goffman (1962) felt that people reinterpreted the past in current situations and that stories' constructions are influenced by society's basic values; the stories told usually have culturally acceptable plots. Somers (1994) agreed with this and suggested that we tell stories about ourselves in social narratives of our situated culture, narratives largely made by others. Our stories are often limited to sanctioned and available narratives which we can use to interpret our experiences. Goffman (1962) also thought that a person's narrative identities develop in a pattern of social control both from those around us as well as within the person in conversation with those with whom we interact and dialogue. Further, Goffman pointed out that the stories we tell are influenced by social organization, power, and the politics of storytelling. When I consider minority sexuality athletes, I believe that many of them have never had the opportunity to describe their thoughts on or experiences of their sexuality. Such descriptions, when they occurred, were likely heavily influenced and sanctioned by the culture of their sport as much or more than the sanctions of their families and their larger culture.

B. Davies and Harré (1990) believed that conversations, rather than entailing complicated decoding of speakers' social intentions, unfold when all participants jointly make, or at least try to make, sense of their own and other's actions and conversations. Further, they suggested that we make choices in relation to these practices and take up particular positions that are our own. People see the world from positions within particular discursive practices and utilize the images, narratives, and metaphors relevant to these discursive practices. Additionally, B. Davies and Harré suggested that people may be viewed as enacting a multiplicity of selves or, as Rushdie (1999) said, "a miscellany of identities" (p. 510) and that how people acquire a sense of themselves

involved several processes. They posited that people learn that there are categories (which are socially constructed) with which they might match or fit or not match and be excluded and that everyone participates in the discursive practices connected to these categories. People learn to position themselves in relation to those categories, and develop story lines and behave as though they are in some categories and not in others.

I concur with S. Seidman's (1993) concept of social constructionism, "speaking of multiple, local, intersecting struggles whose aim is less 'the end of domination' or 'human liberation' than the creation of social spaces that encourage the proliferation of pleasures, desires, voices, interests, modes of individuation and democratization" (p. 106). From social constructionist perspectives, identity construction occurs as an interactive process between a person and his or her social environment, a continual negotiation over a lifetime (Horowitz & Newcomb, 2001). Further, Horowitz and Newcomb believed that the meanings that an individual gives to these interactions influenced the sense of identity that he or she holds; that sexual identity is maintained through social interaction and experienced positively when diversity and ambiguity were allowed for him- or herself. I feel that having a place where alternative social discourses about identity or sexuality may occur is an appropriate aim for both research and counselling settings.

Polkinghorne (1988, 1991, 1995) held that we maintain and communicate our identities in storied forms. Telling stories about oneself may increase personal self-awareness, communicate messages to others, and develop into increased understanding, for self and others, through interpretation with another person. This may often be the listener, but may, as Bakhtin (1984) suggested, also be through interpretation with an

implied audience. Polkinghorne built on Merleau-Ponty (1962) who suggested that new meaning was constructed through spoken language. Polkinghorne believed that narrative discourse analyses may be used to find meanings about human existence from our narratives. He also suggested that we look for meanings in his sense of discourse. That is, a discourse is a unit of meaning which is larger than a sentence, an integration of sentences which produces a meaning larger than anything taken from the sentences individually.

Discourse Analysis

There is a rather confusingly broad range and variety of types of discourse analysis (DA) across many disciplines and theoretical traditions (Gee, 2005; Speer, 2005; Potter & Wetherell, 1994). Wood and Kroger (2000) described discourse analysis as “a related collection of approaches...a set of metatheoretical and theoretical assumptions” (p. x). Although I will not attempt to decipher or explicate all of the possible forms of DA, according to Speer (2005), several have attempted to sort them into two main streams ('camps', Edley & Wetherell, 1997; 'strands', Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995; 'styles', Wetherell, 1998). Speer (2005) also came up with two discursive approaches: a) critical, “informed primarily by (one or more of) critical theory, poststructuralism and psychoanalysis” and b) discursive, “informed primarily by ethnmethodology and CA” (p. 14). N. Phillips and Hardy (2002) outlined four approaches along two dimensions of text and context when examining discourse with considerations of local and global, social and cultural contexts.

Potter and Wetherell (1994) suggested, following from Foucault's (1971) post-structuralist discourse analysis, that “institutions, practices and even the individual human

subject itself can be understood as produced through the workings of a set of discourses” (p. 47). Further, they outlined particular analytical practices concerned with talk and text as social practices; concerned with action, construction, and variability; and, concerned with the rhetorical organization of talk and texts, particularly with how a version of talk or text may compete successfully with an alternative (which may not be stated). This last portion, I believe, is significantly related to how people talk about sexuality, in particular, and identity, generally. I agree with N. Phillips and Hardy (2002) that discourse analysis may be used for identity research and, I propose, for sexuality research. Identity and, for some (especially females), sexuality (Garnets, 2002), are not essential and stable but may be fluid, ambiguous, and changeable.

Gubrium and Holstein (1994, 1998) stated that we may analyze stories for ways in which the context and conditions of the storytelling locale may contribute to and shape what is occasioned in these stories. I believe this particularly relates to questions of what practices may facilitate conversations about sexuality. They encouraged us to consider how we, as researchers and counsellors, may create or co-create a space where research participants or clients can talk about themselves in ways which give coherence to their lives. As Gubrium and Holstein recommended, researchers may want to make visible the ways in which they can help make narrative activities contribute to personal coherence as well as reveal difference(s); or, as Potter and Wetherell (1994) suggested, ‘potential variations’.

Taylor (2001) believed that discourse analysis closely examined language in use, that language was “**constitutive**: it is the site where meanings are created and changed” (p. 6, bold in original). Taylor suggested considering the context and situated places language

is used in interactive processes and to look for patterns within our language to be able to examine meaning and significance. Further, she posited that since there are multiple realities and truths no single truth or reality can be found. Taylor also suggested that there were four rather loose categorical and sometimes overlapping ‘types’ of discourse analysis. One type encouraged researchers to look for patterns in the usage of language and the interaction which occurs between conversation participants; another “involves the study of power and resistance, contests and struggles” (p. 9).

Although discourse analysis has been used to explore gay male marathon runners’ resistance to dominant discourses (Bridel & Rail, 2007) and as an exposé of the *Revue Olympique* (Brown, 2001), it has not yet been used extensively in sport writing. Faulkner and Finlay (2002) encouraged sport researchers to consider using discursive analyses, especially conversation analysis, in future work. I want to take up Faulkner’s and Finlay’s challenge to utilize discourse analysis in research with athlete participants.

Wodak (2001) described the purpose of critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a way to analyse “opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, power, discrimination, and control as manifested in language” (p. 2). Language is viewed as social practice (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) and the context of language is considered critical. Critical discourse analysis combines text analysis with an analysis of discourse processes in studying text production and interpretation while incorporating ethnographic methods such as interviews. Now considered an influential and visible form of discourse analysis, CDA emerged in the 1990s, primarily in Europe, exemplified in the work of Fairclough (2003), Fairclough and Wodak (1997), van Dijk (1983, 1993, 1997a, 1997b), Wodak (1997, 2001), and Wodak and Meyer (2001).

Some CDA researchers advocated that it is insufficient to show the social influences in the ways we use language and the ways social structure impinges on human relations and discourse patterns. Toolan (1997), for example, suggested that CDA should be used to create means for change and corrections to particular discourse. Multimodal and multidisciplinary work as well as advocacy of reduction of social power imbalances via CDA has been encouraged (van Dijk, 1998; Wodak, 2001).

Conversation Analysis

In the next section, I describe conversation analysis and how it relates to identity and sexuality. The development of conversation analysis began in the late 1960s by a group of researchers (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) who were interested in what participants do in conversations and their interactive reciprocity (Wooffitt, 2001). They developed their method from Goffman's writings on social interaction (1955) and Garfinkel's ethnomethodology (1967).

More recently, Antaki and his colleagues (Antaki et al., 1996; Antaki & Horowitz, 2000; Widdicombe, 1998) wrote extensively about exploring identities in conversations. They suggested that identities are descriptions which are *used*; that identities are only understandable in an interactional format; and, that identities are highly flexible. Additionally, they suggested that a person may have different identities at different times depending upon the contexts and interactions which might occur. They believed that it may be possible to carefully examine conversational structure(s) such as stories, formulations, accounts, arguments, and grounds and determine which identity or identities are promoted by the talk in those structures.

Widdicombe (1998) suggested that people have identity or identities available to use, that identities are “something that people do which is embedded in some other social activity, and not something they ‘are’” (p. 191). Further, she posited that conversation analysis may be used to examine how people, in conversations, may make an identity which is a local and *occasioned* occurrence. It is possible to do micro-analyses of conversations to determine how and when a person might have chosen a particular way of talking about him- or herself and when he or she might have said something different from something he or she might have potentially said or even previously said.

For Arminen (1999), conversation and social interaction are enough to consider in CA and that it is not necessary to view conversations as indicators of wider social processes but sufficient for their own analyses. He suggested that significance may be found in any detail(s) of talk rather than assume that some words or utterances are irrelevant; that without careful microanalyses of conversations, it would be difficult to know what might be important. Arminen outlined some of the structures of CA such as ‘next-turn proof procedure’, explaining that there is a reflexive relationship between adjacent turns. I believe that this is an important consideration when examining conversations and to keep in mind how both or all people in a conversation interact with and influence each other in talk. Discourse analysts, Gee (2005), for example, hold a reflexive view of language and context: “an utterance influences what we take the context to be and context influences what we take the utterance to mean” (p. 57). Context, however, includes not just the specific, local setting but the speakers’ “social relationships...their ethnic, gendered, and sexual identities as well as cultural, historical, and institutional factors” (p. 57). I appreciate the details that can be learned through microanalyses of text. I also like to

consider how the potential range of meanings for words and speech have local, specific contextual meanings when speakers negotiate understandings influenced by both local and broader context.

Gathering Data and Considerations of Researcher and Participant Positions

There are many ways of gathering data for discourse analysis such as the audio or video-recording of conversations in research settings or using public domain recordings or transcripts of events (Wooffitt, 2001). Detailed transcription allows for analysis of participants' actions and interactions, and how they observably make sense of and respond to each other. In terms of researching identities using discourse analysis there are many viable options. Ultimately, everything which might be suitable could include conversations between two or more people and the settings in which these conversations could occur, as suggested above, in research or counselling environments or come from public domain conversations. I chose to use video-recording of conversations between myself and research participants.

In some cases, the researcher may be one of the co-participants and this becomes an important consideration. The topic itself has likely been chosen because of its interest or links to the researcher and this position needs to be acknowledged along with the possible influences the researcher's identity (gender, ethnicity, sexuality, for example) may have on the conversations (Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2001). Sunderland (2004) felt that pre-set topics "may yield richer data" (p. 183). The conversations may occur in the form of guided interviews which are at least semi-structured or may be quite informal. At the outset of our conversations, I told research participants the main general topics I hoped to include when we spoke but kept these conversations quite informal.

Edley (2001) and Gough (2002) suggested that the double role of co-coparticipant interviewer and researcher can enrich the interpretation of the text by being open about the connection to the topic and also discussing feelings and reactions during the conversation. This aligns with Billig's (1991) belief that people produce language and are also the products of language. I support the move toward more participatory and inclusive research (Wheeler, 2003) and feel that the present research has been a collaborative process. That is, I was a co-participant in research conversations about sexuality as both researcher and GLBTQ person. I also consider this research as a way to empower participants such as advocated by CDA researchers and theorists (Toolan, 1997).

In addition to what Edley (2001) suggested, there may be additional advantages and benefits in my research in that I am conducting research within my own GLBTQ community. I had knowledge of where to find and how to access groups of people who might be suitable participants. I formulated questions which may not have occurred to outsiders; participants may have been more open to speaking to an insider (Meezan & Martin, 2003). And, I understood constructs and terms and participant responses in our GLBTQ discourse which may not have been readily apparent to an outsider (Leap, 1996; Livia & K. Hall, 1997). At the same time, I worked at remembering that the research participants and I did not necessarily have shared understandings of meanings and terms. I kept in mind, during our conversations and in my analyses, LaSala's (2003) admonition that "inside investigators may mistakenly assume common cultural understandings with [participants] and fail to explore [their] unique perceptions" (p. 15).

Although I have an emic perspective in that I am a GLBTQ insider and may share many views with the research participants, I kept in mind etic or outsider theories that

might be applicable to all groups. I also knew that, as a researcher, I might be viewed as being at least partially an outsider to the research participants. Lett (1990) believed that gay or lesbian researchers can benefit from acknowledging and developing an awareness of the ways they are both insiders and outsiders in order to access both emic and etic perspectives. These insider researchers might also consult with heterosexual researchers to consider places they may have missed places for further analyses of data such as not exploring assumed common understandings (LaSala, 2003). With this in mind, I asked my supervisor to consider these points when he reviewed my analyses. I also believed it important to remember that research participants always have places and perspectives where we match and do not match (Ohnuki-Tierney, 1984). Many minority sexuality research volunteers often feel that insider researchers may be trusted to adequately and fairly represent them (LaSala, 2000, 2001). A potential disadvantage of an emic or insider perspective, however, is that it is possible to miss adequately exploring places where what is familiar to insider co-conversants is also vague or taking up participant leads with further questions or discussion (Kanuha, 2000).

C. Kitzinger (2000), writing from feminist perspectives, raised concerns about unequal power between participants of conversations. The differences of or perceived differences of power can lead to interactional asymmetries (Heritage, 1997). Because of these possible differences between people in conversations or interviews, such as between counsellor and client or researcher and research participant, it may be useful to address this either during or after the conversation. As C. Kitzinger suggested, power differences, gender, male, and heterosexual privilege, sexist, racist, and homophobic language may not be noticed unless they are raised as open for discussion during or after the

conversations. C. Kitzinger (1995, 2001) and others (Butler, 1993a; Sedgwick, 1990) have theorized that sexualities, genders, and identities are constructed through conversation and interaction, talked into being, so it is important to consider and even ask about what is not being said by all members of a conversation. In some instances, more powerful others may privilege certain topics and marginalize others, sexuality, for instance. Further, conversations about the conversations may elicit further discussions and comments about the interactions.

Finlay (2002) outlined how researchers influence all parts of the research process, from the selection of the topic, to collection, and interpretation of data. During the interviews or conversations of the research, the researcher, as co-participant in the conversation, also influences the responses of the research participant and even the direction of the conversations. As C. Kitzinger (2000) pointed out, the gender, ethnicity, and sexuality of the researcher may all affect the course of conversations and another researcher with the same research participant may co-create quite another conversation. While the research and these genders, ethnicities, and sexualities are jointly produced by the research participant, the researcher, and their relationship, the conversations may alter meanings for all involved in the conversations (Finlay). The telling of stories may alter meanings and even change people (Beer, 1997; Wortham, 2000).

There appears to be a very large range for the number of interviews or conversations which may be used for conversation analyses: from one therapy session (Gale & Newfield, 1992); less than ten conversations (Wooffitt, 2001) or newspaper articles (Edley, 1993); to as many as sixty interviews (Wetherell & Edley, 1999). Most journal articles appear to reproduce ten or fewer exemplars, some as short as two or three lines of

transcribed text, which have been analyzed to show how the talk-in-interaction and sequential analyses illustrate the topic of study (Wooffitt, 2001). In most cases, the authors of the articles appear to have selected the passages.

Keeping C. Kitzinger (2001) in mind for research about identity and sexuality, I felt it was productive to invite research participants to highlight portions of the conversations we had which stood out *for them* as moments or times which were facilitative to them for discussion of sexuality. People may delineate their identities as being a member of a social category or categories (Sacks, 1995). For example, a minority sexuality athlete of Asian descent might describe him or herself as a ‘gay, Korean-Canadian, skater’. I believe it is also important to consider that categories and identities can be ‘talked into being’ (C. Kitzinger, 1995, 2001); that sexualities may be fluid or even have no end point (Horowitz & Newcomb, 2001); and, that social categories are contestable, fluid, and even changeable within one conversation (Antaki, et al., 1996).

Gergen (1985) and Sampson (1993) suggested that the language we use, with the categories and beliefs explicitly or implicitly stated, created the meanings we perceived as our realities. Discourse, with the particular constructions that come from familiar cultural understandings, formed our experience rather than ‘reality’ itself. C. Kitzinger (1995) added that we construct phenomena as well as meanings through discourse and that naming a thing ‘speaks it into being’. Analyses of selected passages may focus on the specific utterances which the speakers said to ‘do’ the talk about identity (Wooffitt, 2001). The sequences of the interaction, turn-taking and overlapping talk, management of difficulties and errors, pauses, inflections and emphases, and the relationship of posture and body movement and body language may be examined to see what moments and

portions of conversation were important in co-producing the identity talk. I believe that these are all relevant aspects for mental health care practitioners to consider in counselling conversations. In the next section, I discuss considerations of conversation analysis in counselling.

Conversation Analysis and Counselling

M. J. Patton (1989) suggested, some years ago, that conversation analysis could be useful to counselling interactions by providing detailed observations of the sequential utterances in a counselling session and identifying the structures of these interactions. McLeod (2001) also suggested that conversation analysis might be utilized to discern counselling practices which facilitate asymmetrical interactions in counselling such as those outlined by Edwards (1995). More recently, Gale, Lawless, and Roulston (2004) also suggested that conversation analysis is a discursive approach that may be used in clinical research, to focus on the local interactions between conversation participants and how they make sense and meaning about and from the interaction.

There have been some recent researchers who have taken up their call for conversation analysis in counselling settings (see Buttney, 2004; Gale & Newfield, 1992; Hutchby, 2007; Lawless, 2001; Peräkylä, 2005; Peräkylä & Vehviläinen, 2003; Poskiparta, Kettunen, & Liimatainen, 1998, for example). I found one example where conversation analysis in a counselling setting was used when identity concerns were part of the session (Botschner, 2001). Peräkylä and Vehviläinen used conversation analysis on counselling conversations and what they called “stocks of interactional knowledge” (p. 730) or theories and models learned in professional training. I could not, however, find any references where specific identities such as ethnicities or sexualities were discussed and

analyzed. Edwards (1995) suggested that conversation analysis might help illuminate practices which help or hinder therapeutic conversations.

There have been several studies done in which conversation analysis has been utilized to examine interactions between service providers and health care consumers in various health care settings including health care telephone helplines. Drew, Chatwin, and Collins (2001) reviewed two studies of doctor-patient interactions using conversation analysis. They suggested that conversation analysis has the potential to provide information about what interactional communicative practices “are most likely to be efficacious[and] facilitate patient participation” (p. 67). Maynard (2003) used conversation analysis to make recommendations for health care professionals when delivering bad or good news more effectively.

C. Kitzinger and S. Kitzinger (2007) examined recorded calls to the Birth Crisis help-line using conversation analysis and felt that such analyses could be useful for midwife call-takers to “develop a more sensitive and nuanced understanding of the interactional skills involved across the phases of a counselling-type interaction (p. 264). Peräkylä and Vehviläinen (2003) looked at sections of AIDS counselling sessions, closed questions, educational counselling, and career guidance counselling. They suggested that linking the findings of this type of data analysis could be linked back to “professionals stocks of interactional knowledge” (p. 746). These authors’ work and that of others such as Hutchby (2007), who examined child counselling conversations, provide support for take their research findings to health care professionals who have conversational interactions in their work.

Jones (1997) believed that personal construction of selves may be seen as knowing how to be in a person's particular world, a dynamic process founded in practical knowledge. Wahlström (1990) suggested that therapy may be viewed as conversation and, at the same time, that conversation may be viewed as therapy. I agree with Wahlström's concept and would add that anything which might help facilitate conversations about sexuality could also be considered germane to counselling and counsellors.

As I read and explored discourse analysis theories and findings, I found that several disciplines utilize these research methods: psychology, sociology, women's studies, communication, and gay, lesbian, and queer studies. I learned that many researchers and theorists used queer theories and perspectives in analyzing passages of talk in an area of study called queer linguistics. I felt that I would be informed by discourse analysis findings to help me analyze conversations about sexuality between minority sexuality persons. I also found that queer linguistics matched social constructionist, feminist, and, perhaps obviously, queer theoretical views. In the next section, I give a very brief introduction to queer linguistics.

Queer Linguistics

Foucault (1978, 1985, 1988), Butler (1990, 1991), and Sedgwick (1990) are often considered major contributors to the foundations of queer theory and queer perspectives though none of these authors had yet used the word queer in any of these volumes. Queer theory, queer perspectives, and queer linguistics have flourished in the last fifteen or so years encouraging contestation and resistance in the margins where dominant and non-dominant cultures meet: what Anzaldúa (1987) called the borderlands or *la frontera*

where borderland discourse (Gee, 1996) or queer Gaybonics (Blackburn, 2005) might “explore …access to power, particularly in the margins” (p. 89).

In my analyses, I am informed by the view of queer performativity (Butler, 1993b; Sedgwick, 1993) as ways to disrupt ties to heterosexual sanction and heteronormativity. That is, as Leap (1996) suggested, “[p]erformative effect requires listener, as well as speaker, involvement *coconstruction* and *cooperative discourse*” (p. 160, italics in original). Sedgwick (1993) referred to this notion as “the interpellation of witnesses” (p. 4) or, what Gee (2005) called “co-constructing socioculturally situated identities” (p. 138).

Queer theory has contributed to queer linguistics’ approach to language and sexuality. Queen (2002) considered that using linguistic analyses to consider the linguistic construction of sexuality was a priority for queer linguistics. Bucholtz and K. Hall (2004) added that queer linguistics could be used to study all possible sexual identities, ideologies, and practices. Livia (2002) believed that, for specific contexts, the intentions behind speakers’ choices of performatives could explicate the reasoning behind those choices; that ethnographic approaches to language that foreground the importance of local understandings and contexts informed queer linguistics. Additionally, queer linguistics does not consider identity or sexuality categories as *a priori* givens but “as ideological constructs produced by social discourse” and that the goal of queer linguistics “cannot be the study of the language of a pre-defined set of ‘queers’ (since such a set cannot be defined)” (R. Barrett, 2002, p. 28).

A. Wong, Roberts, and Campbell-Kibler (2002) suggested that “certain linguistic features may become markers of social groups, even if they are not used by all and only

members of the groups which they symbolize” (p.3). Although there is debate about how to approach the study of sexuality in sociolinguistics and queer linguistics, I believe that there are everyday linguistic practices within particular local groups such as GLBTQ persons. I recognize any conclusions I may make from my analyses will have limited generalizability but also consider that my understandings of intersections of language, sexuality, and power in our local conversations have been strengthened by my views. I am not attempting to answer if there are identifiable, particular, or unique gay, lesbian, or queer speeches. I do consider how language may be used by GLBTQ persons to construct their identities and sexualities by drawing on gay (Blackburn, 2005; Leap, 1996), lesbian (Land & C. Kitzinger, 2005; Queen, 1997), or queer (Livia & K. Hall, 1997) speech in varying gay, lesbian, or queer ways of speaking.

Within queer linguistics, questions of how meanings arise, or about power and marginalization, and dominant and non-dominant ideologies are important. That is, how does one meaning gain predominant acceptance over other possible meanings and how do ‘naturalized’ dominant ideologies become literal meanings, reflected in certain labels? In the next section, I outline the method I used for collecting and analyzing the research conversations.

Recruitment of Participants

I created a poster (see Appendix D) to recruit minority sexuality or GLBTQ athletes who might volunteer to have conversations about sexuality with me for research purposes. I met the Board of Apollo Friends in Sport (“a volunteer-operated, non-profit organization serving primarily members of the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgendered communities but open to members of all communities”) (<http://www.apollocalgary.com/>

apollo/other/about.asp). The Board gave me permission to either speak directly to their members at any of their sport events or to send the poster to the directors of each of the Apollo sports. I sent a poster as an attachment in an email to the President of the Alpine Frontrunners Club Calgary (“a club to promote health and fitness in the gay community” (<http://members.shaw.ca/calgaryfrontrunners/about/index.html>). The President passed this on to the various members. I sent the poster or gave the poster to a few minority sexuality athletes and non-athletes who said they had athlete friends. Participants received no monies.

Participant Characteristics

All of the participants were adults at least 18 years of age who had responded to information on the posters and contacted me. I had initially hoped that the participants who volunteered might represent a range of minority sexualities. Over a period of months when I sought volunteers, only two women who described their sexuality as lesbian and six men who described their sexuality as gay came forward. I was not able to find any participants who might have described their minority sexuality in other ways, such as bisexual or transgendered.

Although I did not have this information on the poster, I asked each of the potential participants if he or she had participated in a sport for long enough to have competed at Provincial (or higher) competition levels. The participants have all competed in sports at Provincial or higher levels (Regional, National, and International). The sports in which they competed have all been in either the Summer or Winter Olympics. Participants signed the Consent Form (Appendix E) after having read it and asking me and discussing with me any questions they might have had about it. This occurred before each of the first

conversations began. Participants were given a copy of the Consent Form. All of the participants identified their sexuality as either gay (6) or lesbian (2).

The Research Conversations

First Conversations

Each of the volunteer participants and I had approximately one-hour, video-recorded conversations held at the University of Calgary. At the outset of the conversations, I told participants that I would introduce some topics we might discuss including identity and sexuality, their sport, and possible experiences with counselling. Although I did not use the exact same questions with all participants, I employed similar questions and worked to keep the conversations as open as possible. Early questions in the conversation might match, ‘what have been your experiences in discussing sexuality or your sexuality?’ and ‘what has been helpful or hindering for you, in the past, when considering your sexuality or talking about it?’ Further into the conversations, I might ask, ‘if you would describe your sexuality as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, or queer while you were in your sport, what were attitudes about minority sexuality in your sport?’, ‘what made it easier or harder to consider minority sexuality in your sport?’ I have included a more complete list of questions in Appendix F.

After the conclusion of a first conversation, I gave the participant the video-recording of our conversation. I asked each participant to take the video-recording home, watch it and pick out one to three places in the conversation which he or she felt had been helpful to talk about sexuality. I asked participants to make note of either the time in the conversation of each of these places or to make note of the counter number on their VCR.

I asked participants to notify me once they had done this so that we could set up a time to meet again to look at and discuss the segments they had selected.

Elliott (1985) believed studying participants' perspectives on what was important or helpful to them, in this case indicated by the segments they selected, was useful to process researchers. We participated mutually in conversations and the practices or ways we co-constructed our discussions – the processes and meanings – are what I am most interested in examining (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1992, 2003; McConnell-Ginet, 2003). I also felt that letting the participants know that I was interested in what they thought was helpful to them, not what I thought was helpful, was important to indicate their value and power in the process (Sunderland, 2004; Weatherall, 2002).

Second Conversations: IPR (Interpersonal Process Recall) Interview

Approximately one to three weeks after the first conversations, I met with each of the participants for a second conversation. I reviewed consent with each of them and asked if they consented to proceed with the second conversation. We reviewed the video-taped segments using a form of Kagan's Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR) (Kagan, 1975a; Kagan, 1975b; Kagan & Kagan, 1991; Kagan, Schauble, Resnikoff, Danish, & Krathwohl, 1969). These conversations were audio-recorded. During these sessions, I asked participants to briefly tell me, before we watched each segment, what might have seemed helpful or useful to them, in that segment, to talk about sexuality. Their responses and, occasionally, our discussions about what they were saying were brief, from about 30 seconds to three minutes.

During the IPR conversations, the participants and I continued to construct meanings, clarifications, and understandings within the relationship we had created in our sessions

(Speer, 2005). Although the IPR session might have yielded more data for further analyses (Gale, Odell, & Nagireddy, 1995), I wanted to check if participants were doing fine after the first sessions or if anything had arisen for which they might have sought, or were considering, counselling. Primarily, of course, I wanted to learn if the participants had found any places in the first conversations which had been helpful to them to talk about sexuality.

Transcription

Once I had finished all of the second session interviews, I had the video segments transferred to DVDs. This allowed me to import them into Transana (Version 1.22), a free software program, developed by researchers at the University of Wisconsin (for website information, see Woods, 2003), useful for working with qualitative data. Transana provides a split-screen with four sections on the computer monitor. It is possible to see and hear the recorded conversation in the top right quadrant and also type the transcription in the bottom left quadrant. Pauses can be measured in tenths of seconds. The volume of what is said, in wave form, may be seen in the top left quadrant of the Transana screen.

In Chapter Four, I provide an explanation of the form of transcription notation that I did on the participant-selected passages. I also give simplified examples, informed by conversation analysis (CA) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) theory and practice, prior to my fuller analyses of these passages. I have linked explanations of my analyses methods closely with the actual analyses to make the analyses and any claims I make from the analyses as transparent as possible for the reader. I have done this in Chapter 4 rather than Chapter 3 so that readers have the conceptual aspects that informed my

analyses closer at hand to how I applied the concepts and subsequently reported my findings. My hope is that the initial explications make the subsequent analyses easier to follow.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSES

Introduction

In this chapter, I examine and analyze passages which participants have chosen from video-recordings of our research conversations. Specifically, I use discourse analyses, drawing from the work of several discursive, conversation analysis, and critical discourse analysis researchers, to examine how, in the research conversations, we co-constructed those segments that participants felt were helpful to them to talk about sexuality. That is, I investigated our talk-in-interaction (Schegloff, 1987) to account for what we did in the conversations.

After the introduction section to this chapter, I provide explication of the transcription notation I used that Kogan (1998) adapted from one developed by Jefferson (J. M. Atkinson & Heritage, 1984). I follow this with a brief introduction, via two simplified examples, of how researchers are informed by CA and CDA methods to show what occurs in the back-and-forth of talk-in-interaction. Discourse analysis generally examines speakers' use of language and ways of communicating what gets accomplished in these communicative interactions. I have included these two examples as a simplified introduction to the more detailed analyses which I do in the following sections.

I have utilized discourse analyses on the fifteen exemplars from the participant-chosen segments that I transcribed. In these analyses, I highlight the microdiscursive practices in our talk in these segments which relate to answering my initial research question. That is, *what and how we performed* in the talk in these segments that made it easier for participants to talk about sexuality. My aim, in these analyses, is to highlight communicative practices which are often taken for granted, yet significantly related to

good communication. The detailed analyses will provide deeper and more nuanced understanding about facilitative communicative practices that may occur in important conversations about sexuality. My findings are based on these research-generated conversations and not on conversations from counselling settings.

The research conversations were not the ‘naturally occurring’ talk-in-interaction which analysts such as Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) suggested should be used, but more like ‘guided’ or ‘contrived’ interview/conversations (ten Have, 1999). There is a lively academic discussion about the relative merits of, and what may qualify as, ‘natural’ and ‘contrived’ data (see Speer, 2002b; 2002c; and responses to her article by Lynch, 2002; Potter, 2002; ten Have, 2002). I will not review the debate here but I join others in seeing the merits in having a pre-set topic so that research participants are clear about what topics are likely to occur in the research conversations (e.g., Sunderland, 2004).

I also recognize that researchers, and my place as the researcher in these conversations, have an impact on research participants (Speer, 2002a). I worked at reducing possible power differentials between us, following feminist perspectives of fostering egalitarian research relationships (C. Kitzinger & Wilkinson, 1996). Although I am writing about my co-researchers as the ‘Other’ (relating to sexuality), I also attempted to be fully transparent or public (H. Anderson, 1997) with the research participants, indicating that I am also, in this sense, an ‘Other’ (I am a queer male). I acknowledge that a completely non-hierarchical relationship was never fully possible. Additionally, even if I am an ‘insider’ I cannot presume to know anyone else’s experience.

I took the view that the research participants and I had dynamic, negotiated, and discursive positions or ‘locations’ or positions within our conversations (Edley, 2001). I

considered my being an ‘insider’ as an advantage. That is, although we talk about and co-construct a ‘delicate object’ (sexuality) (Silverman, 2001), the participants may have been less concerned with ‘impression management’ (Goffman, 1967) because of my ‘insider’ status. I felt that they would be more open in what they said about themselves. I share Roulston, Baker, and Liljestrom’s (2001) perspective on research interviews: they “are socially situated occasions in which speakers negotiate identities, display knowledge of cultural worlds, and characterize talk to jointly build a body of research knowledge” (p. 749).

My detailed transcription and analyses which follow show both *what* we spoke about in our conversations as well as *how* we achieved what participants found helpful or facilitative in talking about sexuality. Research participants and I had second sessions in which participants and I would watch each of the videotape segments they had chosen. After we watched each segment, I asked participants if they would talk about what they had found helpful in the segment. I audio-recorded our discussions, transcribed the recordings, and then examined our discussion to identify participants’ themes of what was helpful, in our conversations, for them to talk about sexuality. I explain theme selection more fully after the analyses below.

I am also interested in how we *performed* these passages, especially via a reflexive examination of my place or location in the conversations with a view to translate this reflexivity into practice (Speer, 2002a). That is, I examined both the utterances of the research participants and myself in these passages, as discursive actions (Edwards & Potter, 1992, 1993), to show how we co-created these facilitative spaces to ‘accomplish’ what the research participants felt were eventful for them (Austin, 1962).

When selecting segments or exemplars to analyze, I also considered the complaint that White, middle-class, males have been over-represented in research on minority sexuality populations (Meezan & Martin, 2003). Therefore, I felt that it was important to include analyses of the two lesbian women and the one non-European background gay male who participated. I also considered my analyses as a way to empower the participants and give them voice (Dodd & Meezan, 2003).

I come from a background in a sport, figure skating, where judges had a fairly short, one-time-only, period of time to decide how to score and rank a skating performance. Inspired, at least in part, from the judging ‘scandal’ in the Pairs event at the 2002 Olympics at Salt Lake City, the judging system has been overhauled. Now the task of evaluating and scoring competitive performances includes access to video replay and the division of marking tasks to separate groups of judges for particular aspects of the performances. The system still has some flaws and plenty of critics but what I appreciate is that there is opportunity to examine what happened in the performances on the ice more than once.

I think the judging system change is at least somewhat akin to being able to re-read books, re-view movies, and re-hear musical recordings a second or more times to be able to confirm or change perceptions gleaned the first time. Although we can often make meanings and interpretations from one focused and careful reading, listening, and viewing, I recognize that not only do I discover many things I missed the first time, I also recognize that I sometimes change my first-time perspectives. Even though I have watched and listened to the recorded conversations and have read the transcripts dozens

of times, I often notice something new or change my thoughts about something every time I examine the recordings.

Transcription Explication

I followed transcription conventions Kogan (1998) adapted from Sacks et al. (1974) to transcribe the participant selected passages. Participants took the video-recorded first conversation home to choose one to three passages which they felt had been helpful to them to talk about sexuality. I numbered all of the lines of transcribed date (from 1 to 1800). The line numbers are consecutive beginning with the first participant's chosen passages and proceeding to the last segment of the eighth participant. The numbers of the lines within the exemplars, when they are shorter than the full segment chosen by a participant, correspond to the exemplar's place within the segment. I also assigned Roman Numerals (I – XVII) to the 17 exemplars and indicated, via a pseudonym, which participant's passage was analyzed. To also assure anonymity, I changed particular sports in which participants had competed to more 'generic' summer or winter sports and changed, as necessary, any other specifically identifying words. I use line numbers in my analyses of the exemplars to help readers go to those places in the transcriptions (Psathas & T. Anderson, 1990).

Transcription

There are several systems used when transcribing recorded data with varying degrees of detail styles of notation. I chose one Kogan (1998) adapted from Sacks et al. (1974) that is sufficiently detailed for discourse analysts to be able to examine the transcription of the talk-in-interaction on a turn-by-turn basis. The notation conventions assist in showing how speakers negotiate with and respond and orient to each other. The

transcription is meant to illustrate or display many details omitted or missed in more conventional transcription. Included are breath intakes and exhalations, non-lexical markers such as *mm*, *mm-hmmh*, *um*, and *uh*, rising and falling pitch intonation, overlapping talk, laughter, and even gestures. I chose this particular form of transcription and notation (see Table 1, on the following page) to provide a representational version (O'Connell & Kowal, 1995) of our conversations.

Detailed transcription facilitates the investigation of turn-by-turn speech for discourse analyses. I utilized the above transcription notations to denote as many of the details of the research conversations as possible to help make evident the relevant dynamics in how participants co-constructed and negotiated our conversations. The actual process of transcription is very time consuming.

Each minute of recorded conversation takes well over 1 hour to measure pauses, determine, as closely as possible, where overlapping speech occurs, insert nonverbal gestures, and mark emphases and other notations. There are nearly 1800 lines of transcription for the 85 minutes of participant-selected segments. I analyzed 470 lines from this total. All of the transcriptions remain on file and readers may approach Dr. Tom Strong, my supervisor, or me to receive copies of the full transcript.

Spending this much time with each segment helped increase my understanding of speakers' behaviours (ten Have, 1999) or what Potter (1998) described as profound engagement with the dialogue. Except for eye gaze of speaker and addressee, I attempted to make transcription notations for every possible place a notation fit. I have added eye gaze notation for one short segment section in Analyses Section 3 following gaze direction transcription in J. M. Atkinson and Heritage (1984, p. xiv). I also added more

gesture description for a segment of Analyses Section 7. In these two sections, I provide analyses that are relevant to the added transcription notations.

Transcription Notation

Table 1

Transcription Notation

Symbol	Indicates
(.)	A pause which is noticeable but too short to measure.
(.5)	A pause timed in tenths of a second.
=	There is no discernible pause between the end of a speaker's utterance and the start of the next utterance.
::	One or more colons indicate an extension of the preceding vowel sound. I also used this for consonants which were extended such as for um:::
<u>Underlining</u>	Underlining indicates words uttered with added emphasis.
CAPITAL	Words in capitals are uttered louder than surrounding talk.
(hhh)	Exhalation of breath; number of h's indicate length.
(hhh)	Inhalation of breath; number of h's indicates length.
[]	Overlap of talk. [marks the beginning of the overlap and] marks the end of the overlap.
(())	Double parenthesis indicate clarifying information, e.g. ((laughter)).
?	Indicates rising inflection.
?	Indicates rising inflection.
!	Indicates animated tone.
.	Indicates a fall in tone.
**	Talk between * * is quieter than surrounding talk.
><	Talk between >< is spoken more quickly than surrounding talk.
{ }	Non-verbals; choreographic elements.
↑ ↓	Arrow indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance-part immediately following the arrow.
-	A single dash indicates a halting, abrupt cutoff; multiple dashes hyphenating the syllables of words or sounds suggests a stammering quality
,,, X _____	Gaze of a speaker is marked above an utterance; gaze of an addressee is marked below. Commas indicate the dropping of gaze. Dots mark the transition movement from nongaze to gaze. Point where the gaze reaches the other person. A line indicates the person so marked is gazing toward the other. The absence of a line indicates lack of gaze.

Adapted from Kogan, (1998, p. 232)

Conversation Analysis (CA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) ‘Tools’

Introduction

Conversation analysis (CA) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) are two qualitative discursive methods of studying talk-in-interaction. In my discursive analyses, I draw from both CA and CDA methods. There is incomplete agreement of exact definitions of CDA and CA (see Speer, 2005, for example) and it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to discuss these challenges of definition. I will first briefly introduce a few of the concepts which conversation analysts consider when examining transcribed date. I follow this with a short introduction to critical discourse analysis practices. I have chosen to do so here, and not earlier, so that readers can more closely link the conceptual aspects informing my analyses with how these were applied and subsequently reported as findings.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis developed from Harvey Sacks’s analytic work on the “structurally organized phenomenon in the everyday practice of talking ordinary conversation” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 17). Sacks and one of his colleagues, Schegloff, had been graduate students at the University of California in Berkeley in the early 1960s where they had important sociological influences: Goffman’s (1959) work on interaction order and Garfinkel’s (1967) examination of everyday interactions (ten Have, 1999). Sacks did some of his initial work on recorded phone calls to the Los Angeles Suicide Prevention Center when he became interested in looking at what activities happened when callers avoided or delayed giving their names (Wooffitt, 2005). Sacks

was joined in his studies by colleagues Schegloff and Jefferson whose foundational paper (1974) is frequently cited today by CA researchers and theorists.

Sacks et al. (1974) suggested that the basic, or smallest, unit of talk in conversations was the turn-constructional unit (TCU) which they related to the organization of turn-taking by speakers. Sacks et al. (1974) stated that conversational occurrences such as transitions, overlaps, and variable turn order and size were observable (complete list, pp. 700-701).

There is not, however, complete agreement on what constitutes a TCU. Ford, Fox, and Thompson (1996) suggested moving away from TCUs and considering what practices form turns. Selting (2000) felt that “phrasing unit” (p. 477) might be an alternative especially in longer or more complicated kinds of conversations. I mention the small critiques of TCU to suggest that the definitions here are not meant to be exclusively precise and inflexible, but adequate for performing this level of discursive analysis.

Sacks et al. (1974) also promoted the notion of transition relevance place (TRP). They noted that people take turns speaking in conversations. At the completion, or possible completion, of a speaker’s turn, there are places or spaces where a transition to the next speaker becomes important or relevant. Transitions do not, however, always occur at these places but they are the most likely places for transitions to occur.

Schegloff and Sacks (1973) also described the concept of adjacency pairs as “sequences [of] (1) two utterance length, (2) adjacent positioning of component utterances, [and] (3) different speakers producing each utterance” (p. 295); one speaker produces the first pair part (FPP) followed by a different speaker for the second pair part (SPP). Question and answer and greeting/greeting are two examples of a “pair type” (p.

296). The actual “parts of adjacency pairs do not need to be strictly adjacent” (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998, p. 40) but the utterances are paired by their relevance to each other.

Example 1. (taken from transcribed segment, transcription simplified):

- 373 D: what would be important for you in selecting a counsellor↑
 374 (0.3)
 375 P: well I can tell you right now I see a psychologist (.hhh)
 376 D: OK
 377 P: an' she's a lesbian

The first TCU is line 373 where D asks P a question. The first TRP is at the end of line 373, a possibly complete TCU, after which there is a short gap (0.3 seconds). P takes the opportunity at this TRP to respond and lines 375 and 377 are the second TCU. Together, the two TCUs, constitute an adjacency pair. Why this matters to conversations like those I had with participants, is that TCUs and TRPs show how speakers work out their responses to each other and how they prefer to proceed turn by turn. If a reader stops at the end of line 375, it is not apparent that P has oriented exactly to what D has asked in line 373. Reading lines 3375 and 377 together show that P has told D something that is important when P selects a counsellor and that she has oriented to the question in line 373. At the end of line 375, P breathes in before completing her turn. This is not a TRP and although D says “OK” in line 376, this would not be considered his next turn. Rather, the “OK” indicates that he has heard or received what P has said in line 375.

Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis

Defining discourse analysis is a challenging task. Jaworski and Coupland (1999) listed ten definitions taken from several sources. Gee (2005) suggested that none of the many approaches is exactly “right” and that each of the various approaches may fit a particular issue “better or worse than others” (p.5). Schiffrin, Tannen, and Hamilton (2001)

described three main groups with varying degrees of foci, from examination of more formal linguistic text and grammar (subject, verb, object, for example) to language in use (conversational interactions) to larger social questions of power and cultural discourses. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) fits in this last group and focuses on social problems (racism, genderism, heterosexism), power relations, and challenging those relations of power and dominance (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Wodak & Meyer, 2001; van Dijk, 2001).

Schiffrin (1987) developed a comprehensive analysis of discourse markers, commonly used by discourse analysts, to describe and account for how these markers are used in everyday speech and social interaction (Schiffrin, 2001). She grouped markers into various word classes (for example, *and*, *but*, *or* are conjunctions; *oh*, is an interjection) and felt that discourse markers had important communication functions (Schiffrin, 2001). Further, Schiffrin (1987) believed that communication is context sensitive and that analyzing markers would contribute to understanding “how speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meanings, and actions to make overall sense out of what is said” (p. 49).

Gee (2005) believed that one possible approach to discourse analysis would consider several ways of approaching how to analyze language-in-use data. For example, how do speakers build significance; how do they use language to perform an identity; and, how are political and cultural discourses conveyed? Gee, informed by the work of Foucault (1978, 1984, 1985) and Bourdieu (1990), felt that some descriptions and enactments of ways of being, speaking, and believing have preferred statuses or representations in societies and become ‘big D’ discourses. These ‘D’iscourses “have no discrete boundaries because people are always creating new Discourses, changing old ones and

contesting and pushing the boundaries of Discourses" (Gee, 2005, pp. 29-30). The next example is also from one of the research conversations. I introduce more discursive analyses 'tools' here to illustrate their utility in close and detailed examinations of conversations and developing understandings of what occurs in these conversations. These understandings may then become particularly useful to those who work with clients where such conversations may occur.

Example 2. (taken from transcribed segment, transcription simplified):

- 1046 F: I think he dealt with it really well and hopefully he came away with it with an
 1047 understanding
 1048 D: mm-hmmh
 1049 F: um (0.5) but even then I think y'know i-i- I think it would be beneficial for
 1050 someone like him to understand the effects of oppression on i-i- on identity on
 1051 an individual
 1052 D: mm-hmmh
 1053 F: and um: (0.6) just more specifically like I never really talked about well he
 1054 never asked like how can I make an environment where it's safe or whatever

Just prior to this transcribed section, F has just told D that he talked to his coach about his sexuality after he finished competing in the sport. In line 1046, "it" refers to this discussion F had with his coach. There are several discourse markers in these lines: D's "mm-hmmhs" in lines 1048 and 1052; F's "ums" in lines 1049 and 1053; F's "y'know" in line 1049; and F's "likes" in lines 1053 and 1054 (Schiffrin, 1987). D's "mm-hmmhs" are considered 'continuers' or encouragements for F to keep speaking (Gardner, 2001). F's "ums" are meant to let D know that there will be a delay in speaking (Clark & Fox Tree, 2002). F's "y'know" is meant to draw attention to the importance and saliency of what F is saying and to draw D's attention in a personally inviting way (He & Lindsey, 1998). F's "likes" suggest new information and emphasis to what follows them (Fuller, 2003b; Tagliamonte, 2005).

In this short segment, F mentions “oppression” which he experienced while he was still competing in his sport which contributed to him delaying talking to his coach about his sexuality until he was out of the sport. The ‘big D’ discourse suggested here is the message F got that it was not all right to be gay and be in his sport. When he felt that his coach might have gained some understanding of F’s sport experience in relation to his sexuality, F introduces ideas which might challenge that discourse. That is, understanding that oppression occurs might lead to changes which create safe environments for GLBTQ athletes (F calls this “an anti-homophobic stance” a few lines later). This stance is in keeping with how narrative therapists invite reflection on the discourses which have informed and constrained clients’ understandings of concerns (e.g., Winslade, 2005).

Detailed Analyses of Our Research Conversations about Sexuality

In the next seven sections, I provide discourse analyses of passages from the helpful, participant-chosen segments of our conversations about sexuality. In my analyses, I draw from researchers and theorists in various areas of discourse analysis, including critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis and, occasionally, queer linguistic analysis. I did detailed transcription of the segments to help illustrate the performance dynamics in our talk-in-interaction. Most, if not all, of the seven themes are recognizable to counsellors as important considerations in counselling sessions and particularly when working with minority sexuality clients. These themes aided me in organizing the kinds of facilitative practices used in the videotaped passages chosen by the participants, practices helpful to mental health practitioners who work with minority sexuality clients. I also used these seven themes to organize and integrate recommendations for practice and suggestions for further research in the final chapter.

*1. Acknowledging Heterosexism and Homophobia in Sport and Other Life Contexts;
Deconstructing and Contesting; Social Action and Social Justice*

Athletes experience heterosexism and homophobia both within their sports (M. B. Andersen et al., 1997; Gridley, 2005; P. Griffin, 1994, 1998, 1999; Martens & Mobley, 2005; Rotella & Murray, 1991) and in other areas of their lives as well (Bohan & Russell, 1999b; Butler, 1993a; Daniels, 2001; Rust, 1996). Herek (2000) believed that the oppressive and discriminatory actions against minority sexuality persons are rooted in heterosexism. In this first segment of detailed analysis, I examine how we co-construct and negotiate our conversation about heterosexist cultural discourse experiences of this participant.

Understanding heterosexist cultural discourse.

In this segment, Don and Frank (D and F, respectively, for the rest of the text in this section) have just begun discussing possible barriers or messages F felt within his sport and other areas of his life. That is, barriers or cultural or family messages that prevented him from being open about his sexuality while he was still competing in his winter sport. Frank is an early-20s male of Asian descent who describes his sexuality as gay and queer at various places in our conversation. What appears to be salient for F is that the presence of athletes from the same Asian country as his family remind him of the cultural message and discourse about sexuality he has had from his family (C. S. Chan, 1992; Y. B. Chung & Katayama, 1998; Gee, 2005; Kim & D. R. Atkinson, 2002). That is, being anything but heterosexual is not a fit for his culture.

Exemplar I

928 D: I guess I'm wondering um (1.4) trying to get a sense of (.hhh) uh (hhh) if there

- 929 was something that kind of stopped you from [(0.3)]
 930 F: [right]
 931 D: saying anything while you [were]
 932 F: [yeah]
 933 D: still competing (.hhh) and

And, further along in the conversation:

- 940 F: right (.hhh) uh::: I think some of the barriers that I had (0.4) was (0.7) um again
 941 (.) situationally sort of specific [but]
 942 D: [mmm]
 943 F: (.hhh) um (1.1) I: (2.3) uh (hhh) (1.1) being that I like I (0.4) from (0.7) uh:
 944 (0.6) an immigrant family [and]
 945 D: [mm-hmmh]
 946 F: um: (1.4) and e' (1.3) e' (.) my family's from an Asian country right [and]
 947 D: [mm-hmmh]
 948 F: so (0.3) um that (0.5) part of it (1.0) I think (0.4) because there are other: (1.1)
 949 within that community of winter sport competitors (0.8) there was also people
 950 from the same Asian country

Further along:

- 961 F: and (0.6) um there was no:: (0.8) yeah like in that Asian country there's no::
 962 there's no:t any acceptance of (0.6) um: (0.5)

Further along:

- 977 F: but it's very um (1.3) in terms of somebody being openly gay and just (0.6) um
 978 having a partner and stuff it's very (.hhh) (0.6) uh::: it's almost non-existent [um]
 979 D: [so]
 980 in part then it wasn't just about the sport it was about (.hhh) those athletes of
 981 Asian descent {marking words with hands} being here connected to your
 982 family that also might have [{emphasized this with left hand}]
 983 F: [yeah {nods head strongly}]
 984 D: acted as a barri[er]
 985 F: [yeah]
 986 D: [oh]
 987 F: [that] was a huge barrier too was (0.3) kind of like well if (.hhh) y'know like if
 988 this person told that person an'
 989 D: [yeah]
 990 F: [these] people found out an' then (.hhh) y'know it's just this huge sorit
 991 of [(.)]
 992 D: [mm-hmmh]
 993 F: circle a::nd uh (.hhh) an': (1.2) I think that (1.2) being (0.7) um: (0.7) a person

- 994 of colour [too (.hhh)]
 995 D: [{nods head} mm-hmm]
 996 F: y'know like (.) um (0.3) made an i' (1.0) made an impact

In lines 928-933, D is trying to find out if there was anything within F's sport which kept him from revealing his sexuality. F acknowledges, in lines 940-941, that "some of the barriers" were "situationally...specific". The word "but" at the end of line 941 acts as a connector and also signifies that there will be a contrast between the ideas before the "but" and what is to follow. The "but" also indicates that the subsequent statement is more important (Schiffrin, 1987) and 'reformulatory' or more accurate (Fraser, 1996) to F. This also allows F to change the focus of the topic slightly to what he wants to highlight (Umbach, 2005).

D's "mm" in line 942 is a weak, minimal response token and is delivered in a very neutral tone with no rise or fall and "can be seen as a non-intrusive, reserved response to a delicate topic" (Gardner, 2001, p. 31). D also says this "mm" at a transitionally important place right after F says "but" which marks a contrast shift. F gives further explanation of his personal and cultural circumstances with his family and within his sport, from 943-962, and D, in lines 945 and 947, uses "mm-hmmhs" as moderately strong continuuer responses to what F is saying which also let F know that D recognizes that F's turn is in progress and not over (Schegloff, 1993).

F, in lines 960-961 and 977-978, explains what the discourse about minority sexuality is in his family's country of origin: no acceptance and almost non-existent for someone to be openly gay. There are several pauses in these lines and F is using them to think about what he is going to say and how he is going to say it and, at the same time, not pause so long that he stops his turn at speaking (Fox Tree, 2002). In lines, 979-982 and 984, D

gives a summary of what he thinks he has heard F say. D introduces the summary with “in part” which suggests that the summary is not meant to be taken as exact and is open to contestation. F signifies agreement, in line 983, with a large head nod and “yeah”.

F’s “yeahs” in lines 983 and 985 may indicate that he is acknowledging and agreeing with what D is saying and also indicate that F has more to say and wants to move out of a hearing or recipient place (Drummond & Hopper, 1993) and act as “preshift tokens” (Jefferson, 1993). In this case, F does not shift the topic when he starts his next turn, at line 986, but concurs with D’s choice of “barrier” and gives further explanation of what he means. The barrier is the cultural discourse against minority sexuality which, if breached, would quickly be known within F’s cultural and family ‘circle’.

D’s “oh”, in line 986, acts as a “newsmark” or “change-of-state” token (Heritage, 1984) or transition of information knowledge (Schiffrin, 1987) and indicates that D now recognizes that he knows something new: that his summary, a slight reformulation of what F has said, fits for F. D’s “yeah”, in line 988, acts as a continuer for F, not that D wants a turn at speaking or, if D did want a turn, he changes his mind in lines 992 and 995 where his “mm-hmmhs” are more clearly acknowledgements and continuers.

F’s use of “huge barrier”, in line 987, builds on and amplifies D’s “acted as a barrier” in line 984. This amplification is what Pomerantz (1984) called an “upgraded agreement” (p. 65), where F has added “huge” to D’s use of “barrier”. D shows that he has understood F and F, by utilizing an upgraded agreement, indicates that he agrees with and endorses what D has said. F’s use of “y’know” in lines 987, 990 and 996 are meant to draw D’s attention to what he is saying and to receive the information as acceptable (Jucker & Smith, 1998). These “y’knows” are in the middle of F’s speaking turn (lines

987-996) and He and Lindsay (1998) suggested that F's use of them is to help orient D to what he is saying before and after them ("bi-directional", p. 137). Fuller (2003) felt that an interviewee would utilize discourse markers to make what he or she is saying "more acceptable and accessible for the hearer [the interviewer]" especially if the interviewee was "being asked questions about [his or her] background and attitudes by a relative stranger" (p. 36).

In the preceding section of analysis, I have highlighted some words and utterances in our conversation which may be commonly overlooked or taken for granted in communication. For example, I noted words like 'but' and how this word was used by F in a way which let D know that what he said after 'but' was likely more important to him. Additionally, how D and F used "yeah", "mm-hmm" and head nods also contributed to their shared understandings. This detailed analysis provides evidence of why F specifically chose this passage from our conversation as having been helpful to him to talk about sexuality. I believe it is possible to link what we did in this passage and how we co-constructed our understandings to facilitative counselling practices.

Contesting heterosexist discourse about lesbians.

This exemplar comes from the second segment which Pat chose as having been helpful to her. Pat is a woman in her early 20s who says she is lesbian. She competed at a Provincial level in a women's team summer sport. She now participates, at a recreational level, in both the same sport and a women's team winter sport. She said that what was helpful for her was that she had not thought about the "dynamics...on our team...and those [lesbians] who are better [players] seem to fit a lot easier than those who aren't as good". Just prior to the beginning of this segment, P has explained that although her

winter sport team has become less homophobic and she had a good experience when she talked to her captain about her sexuality, she still faces heterosexism.

Exemplar II

- 238 P: yeah so:: (.4) I I think the climate [within]
 239 D: [((clears throat))]
- 240 P: our team is changing
 241 D: mm
 242 P: um because a lot of people >like< (.7) a lot of the lesbians on the team are
 243 actually: (.8) good players (.) like they're stars
 244 D: mm
 245 P: an' so:: (1.1) I think that makes a difference too: (.3) because people look at
 246 them and (.3) um well like >they're gay and they're good< (.) hmm it can't be
 247 that bad >y'know [what I mean] like< (.) so
 248 D: [((small laugh))] I I wonder if we could tweak that [a] little bit↑
 249 P: [yeah ((smiling))]
 250 D: um (.9) while I'm happy to hear that your athletic prowess is being celebrated
 251 (hhh) um the little sad part that's going off in my head is that you have to be a
 252 good athlete before you start being (.7) either >acceptable at all< or more
 253 accepta[ble?] [mm]-hmmh
 254 P: am I hearing that?
 255 D: [OK]
 256 P: yeah I think that sometimes um I feel (hhh) um from my perspective that (.) I
 257 need to be a better player to kind of make up for [((2 quick exhalation laugh))]
 258 D: [hmm]
 259 P: y'know the points the negative points (.)
 260 D: [OK]
 261 P: [um] that I'm scoring with my sexuality=
 262 D: =all right [so]
 263 P: [so]
 264 D: they have plus and minus column or negative {right and left hands go up and
 265 down in the air} and positive [an'] [mm-hmh]
 266 D: being a really good {right hand goes up to top of head height} team player:
 267 (1.2) either (.5) {left hand pushes from mid-line of body to left} it doesn't make
 268 it disappear? or it just (.5)
 269 P: yeah it doesn't make it disappear
 270 D: [on a scale] {hands go up and down once}
 271 P: [but it] it if you're good {left hand goes up to top of head height} then it I
 272 don't know seems like
 273 D: OK
 274 P: that kinda gets pushed down {right hand moves from head height toward lap} a

275 little bit

In lines 242-243 and 245-247, P suggests that she thinks that one of the reasons that her team is slowly becoming more receptive to the lesbians on her team is that most of the lesbians are “stars”. That is, because these women are good players and also lesbians, that being lesbian cannot be all bad. The non-lesbian players have to examine a previous discourse or text of equating lesbians with bad, contesting and pushing the boundaries of that discourse and, perhaps, even writing a new discourse for themselves. This fits well with Fairclough’s (1992) idea that examining ‘intertextuality’ (which he developed from Bakhtin’s and Kristeva’s writings) is worthwhile in critical discourse analysis. Here, P and D are working up a present-time (for them) spoken text or discourse about the lesbians on P’s team and P ‘borrows’ from the text (from the past) on her team. D, in lines 250-253, ‘borrows’ from and adds to P’s intertextual presentation of the discourse. Gee (2005) and Mills (1997) also felt that because discourses do not have impermeable boundaries, they can be challenged in local contexts when people find that new interpretations do not match their previous discourse.

P’s use of “like” and “y’know” in lines 246-247 and D’s small laugh in 248 and P’s smile in 249 suggest informal language that is used more between friends than in formal settings and that there is a perception of equitability between them (Fuller, 2003a; Fuller, 2003b; Gee, 2005). Jucker and Smith (1998) found that ‘like’ is the most frequent discourse marker used in conversations between friends whereas ‘yeah’ is the most frequent between strangers. I also think this informality reflects familiarity that P is presuming shared knowledge of ‘insider status’ between herself and D. Although D is much older than P (more than 30 years older), she uses informal language which might be

more commonly expected between conversation participants who are closer in age or between friends (Fuller, 2003a). The discourse marker ‘like’ has been shown to have several functions in varying contexts (G. Andersen, 2001). ‘Like’ is not placed randomly, occurring most frequently before noun phrases (Tagliamonte, 2005); P’s three “likes”, in 242, 243, and 246, all are placed before noun phrases. The first 2 “likes”, in 242 and 243, act as focusers and bring attention to what follows and, in 246, “like” functions as quotative where P is ‘quoting’ what her teammates think (Dailey-O’Cain, 2000). P is highlighting the ‘new’ discourse about lesbians by non-lesbians on her team or at least new discourse for lesbians on the team who are good players. I think that when D does not contest K’s “likes” suggests that K and D are sharing ‘insider’ perspectives about these discourses and, possibly, common or at least similar experiences.

P’s smile along with her “yeah” response (lines 246-247), to D’s question about “I wonder if we could tweak that a little bit↑” in line 245, shows that P is readily agreeable to move into more discussion of P’s personal experience. D’s question is an invitation for P to join him in contesting the discourse and also leaves space for P to contest him as well. P could have chosen to say ‘no’ at this point rather than “yeah”. When P agreed to ‘tweak’ what might be a dominant heterosexist discourse P and D may jointly explore new discursive possibilities in the deconstruction or contestation.

D is open with P about his personal reactions to what she has said (“happy” and “sad”, lines 250, 251) which matches the more informal, ‘between-friends’, language that P has been using. He is still tentative (“am I hearing that”, line 255) after he summarizes, in lines 251-253, what he has understood P to be saying: that the contestation of lesbian equaling bad only occurs when lesbians are good athletes. P explains further that

although the ‘new discourse’ may fit for better players, that she is still being viewed from an ‘old discourse’ where her being a less skillful player may not balance out her lesbian sexuality. Her experience matches discourses in professional sport. Larry Bowa was asked, while he was still manager of the Philadelphia Phillies National Baseball team, what he thought it would be like if a baseball player revealed that he was gay. Bowa replied that if the player had a batting average of .340, often high enough to win a batting title, it would be a lot easier than if his average was .220, which is well below team averages (Outsports, 2007).

D and P, in 263-272, supplement their words with body language which mirrors each other and matches their language: left and right hands going up and down alternately like a balancing scale. P’s left hand going up and down (line 271) mirrors D’s right hand going up and down (line 263) like the movement of a scale: up with a hand matches ‘good’ and down matches ‘bad’ and, for P (line 274), the downward movement also means that the ‘good’ is not just falling downward like a scale but is being actively pushed down by the discourse of ‘bad lesbian’ and ‘poor player’ (Heath & Luff, 2000; Bryan, McIntosh, & Brown, 1998). D and P show, with nearly matching gestures, a synchronicity and common ground (Gerwing & Bavelas, 2004) that suggests they understand each other and share the metaphor they are using (Pelose, 1987).

In this section, I have noted, for example, what language may indicate D and P are speaking as ‘between friends’ and where their gestures may indicate they have reached common ground and understanding. Paying attention to such small details can help direct us to the kinds of facilitative practices which may otherwise go unnoticed. In this case, I

believe that such details provide evidence of why P may have chosen this segment as having been helpful to her to talk about sexuality.

Deconstructing and challenging heterosexist discourse about gay males

In this section, I analyze two pieces from one of the segments which Victor chose as helpful to him. Victor is an early-40s male who describes his sexuality as gay. He competed in two summer, individual sports, one to a Provincial level and one to a National level. He is still involved in the second sport at the International level as an official.

Exemplar III

- 549 V: and then her response (.) was (1.1) was very matter-of-fact there was no
 550 judgement in it there was no (.hhh) and I was looking for it (0.4) and at
 551 [some]
 552 D: [mm-hmmh]
 553 V: level I realize now I wanted her to tell me how horrible that was and (.hhh)
 554 'cause that's what I was expecting
 555 D: OK
 556 V: full anticipatory set was (.hhh) if I tell anyone you are going to (1.0) throw
 557 stones at me and cast me into Hell and all that other stuff um (0.9) and (0.6) to
 558 go back to something I said earlier that was for me the (.) the impetus for me to
 559 be athletic in the first place was (.hhh) I have to develop enough of a (1.0) of a
 560 constructed (1.9) person here that if anyone finds out
 561 D: mm:
 562 V: they cannot discard me completely they have to at least acknowledge (.hhh) that
 563 well (0.7) OK he can do a sport or (.hhh) or y'know he can pass a course or
 564 D: [mm-hmmh]
 565 V: [or] whatever (hhh) I had to build this (0.7) this (0.4) persona (1.0) to
 566 be so strong that it would be (1.3) there would be some recovery if someone
 567 found out (.hhh) how I [feel]
 568 D: [be]cause being athletic matched
 569 V: [my social sense]
 570 D: [some of the] celebration of what a young man should [be]
 571 V: [exactly]
 572 D: yeah

Just prior to the beginning of this segment, V has been telling D about the first person

to whom he revealed his minority sexuality and what it was about that person that had made it easier for him to do so. V relates that (lines 549-560) although he was looking for and expecting her reaction to be negative and judgemental this did not occur. In lines 555-560, V explains his prior understanding about minority sexuality set him up to expect any person hearing about his sexuality to “throw stones” and “cast [him] into Hell”. In order to counter his sexuality, V had actively chosen to become an athlete; that is, if someone found out his sexuality they would already know him to be a successful athlete and student. Not everyone uses language such as “constructed person” (line 560) which certainly fits for social constructionist perspectives. Although this might appear to be more “specialized” than “everyday language” (Gee, 2005), V, like all of the other participants, has post-high school education (a Master’s degree) so this way of speaking may be ‘everyday’ for him. This segment occurs about 27 minutes into our 50-minute conversation and matches the style of language and words we had been using. V, like Pat in the last section, is constructing a metaphor of balancing and countering the discourse of the negative of being a minority sexuality person by actively ‘building’ an athletic, educated person.

Exemplar IV

- 596 V: therefore (.hhh) celebrated therefore (1.1) all of the positive things that go
 597 with that
- 598 D: so part of part of (0.6) your motivation then to participate in both of those
 599 summer sports A and B (0.6) was connected a bit to that (0.9) so-called (0.5)
 600 masculine (0.6) standard↑
- 601 V: (.hhh) yes
- 602 D: ((clears throat))
- 603 V: the need the need to be perceived as (1.0) worthy
- 604 D: OK
- 605 V: I would say and
- 606 D: so not just about heterosexuality it was like (.hhh) other aspects of that
- 607 V: it was tied to it (0.5) but heterosexuality was the (1.5) was probably the (0.6)

Line 596, the start of Exemplar IV, begins about 6 minutes after the end of line 571, the end of Exemplar III. V and D continue to contest and deconstruct the heterosexist discourse of “masculine standard” (line 600) and “worthy” (line 603). V and D continue actively constructing a space for V to build on his metaphor of overcoming being gay by being athletic and educated. V has co-constructed a safe space with D where he can get to a place where he can describe his “moral outrage” (line 621) that no matter how successful in sport and science a gay male might be he would never be perceived to “quite as good as” (line 619) a non-athletic, intellectually-challenged, heterosexual man.

In this segment, V contrasts the pictures of acceptable, heterosexual male, no-matter-what, with unacceptable, gay male, no-matter-what. V appears to increase the emotional intensity of “the need to be perceived as worthy” (line 603) to what might be categorized

as anger, in line 621 (“my sense of moral outrage”). Edwards (1999) suggested that “[e]motion categories provide a flexible resource for situated discourse, including the potential for rhetorical opposites and contrasts” (p. 278). D appears to join V in both the content and the intensity of what V is saying and employs encouragers and agreement tokens throughout. This is perhaps most noticeable in line 618 when D starts to say “yeah because” while lifting his arms off the chair. In our second session, V felt that this passage was helpful for him: “what it did for me was allow me to synthesize my life and to see the progress...and see the construct I had of ‘I’ll never be good enough’ was flawed at some level”. I suggest that the use of encouragers and agreement tokens are examples of what may have facilitated our discussion and that noting such small actions and words may be useful for counselling practices.

2. What Helped Sexuality Disclosure; ‘Coming Out’

Trust.

The next section is from a segment which Terry, a mid-40s woman who identifies as lesbian, chose as being helpful to her. In particular, she said the question about how she picked someone to talk to about her sexuality “led [her] to realize it was only a woman I could trust and be able to talk to” about coming out. Terry had competed, for several years, at an inter-provincial regional level on a summer, team sport. She continues to participate, at a recreational level, in the same sport.

Exemplar V

658 D: (hhh) um I'm wondering (hhh) um: (0.4) if there was somebody that you first
 659 thought about talking to: (0.3) about sexuality (hhh) um: (1.0) y'know how did
 660 you pick that person?
 661 T: (1.9) um: (1.6) it was somebody that I was very comfortable with and built a

- 662 trust with
 663 D: [mm-hmmh]
 664 T: [] (0.5) I knew that I could say anything to and (0.7) they wouldn't
 665 walk away
 666 D: mm-hmmh
 667 T: y'know um:: (3.3)
 668 D: how did you know how did you know (hhh) from this person that it was OK: .
 669 T: (2.4) believe it or not it was uh: (0.4) a friend that I met a- at school (0.6)
 670 D: mm-hmmh
 671 T: we ended up (0.5) y'know both being from (0.5) y'know I I never thought I was
 672 ever going to move out of City X I thought I was destined to have (0.9)
 673 y'know a family of four with a white picket fence y'know 'cause that was
 674 ingrained into [your]
 675 D: [right]
 676 T: head y'know (.hhh) oh don't worry you're going to married and have kids an'
 677 y'know (0.5) you'll settle down↓ (0.7) no I didn't wa- (.hhh) that was my
 678 biggest fear no I don't wanta white picket fence y'know like (.hhh) I think I
 679 kinda knew then
 680 D: mm-hmmh
 681 T: y'know that (0.4) I didn't want anything I [wanted to (inaudible)]
 682 D: [] and it [] didn't match
 683 T: yeah
 684 D: yeah [yeah]
 685 T: [that] there we- and I think that's (0.3) that was an internal struggle for me
 686 D: mm-hmmh was this person you said um (hhh) was in school↑ (0.8) um:: (1.1)
 687 and not in your outdoor sport or in your outdoor sport as well
 688 T: no not in the outdoor sport
 689 D: all right
 690 T: um we ended up playing an indoor sport together
 691 D: OK
 692 T: so it was still sport-related
 693 D: [right]
 694 T: [but] we built up a (.) a good relationship of um (1.4) i- again (0.3) team (0.5)
 695 when you're part of a tea:m (0.8) you can you usually find one person that you
 696 can confide in because [you]
 697 D: [mm-hmmh]
 698 T: you're (hhh) your (0.7) life's rules are the same y'know you just (0.6) I don't
 699 know I guess it's an attraction
 700 D: right
 701 T: to to one person (hhh) and you end up (0.3) just y'know (.) it's the beer drinking
 702 at night y'know or after an' you [just]
 703 D: [mm-hmmh]
 704 T: get a comfort level right (hhh)
 705 D: so you did establish a comfort level [(hhh)]
 706 T: [mm-hmmh]
 707 D: and (0.6) again I'm just (0.5) I'm wondering if there were some other (0.6)

708 messages that you [(got)]
 709 T: [oh I] was attracted to her
 710 D: oh you were attracted to her?
 711 T: she brought me out
 712 D: O:K (hhh) so
 713 T: that's that's what happened
 714 D: an::d
 715 T: and she was the one I started confiding in

For approximately five minutes prior to line 658 T and D had been talking about when T was about 21 years old and in the early part of her competitive years. She had been dating a male athlete and began wondering about her own sexuality because of how the dating was going. She was also curious about the sexuality of some of her female teammates. During this period of her life, T competed at an elite level on one female, team sport as well recreationally in other team sports which sometimes had both men and women on them. T, from line 651 until the end of line 709 uses gender-neutral terms for the person in whom she confided: "it was somebody" (line 661); "they wouldn't walk away" (lines 664-665); and, "to one person" (line 701), for example. D also uses gender-neutral words ("this person", line 668) until after T says "I was attracted to her" in line 709. T's use of an anonymous other may have been a way to be discrete about the woman who helped her during this time, a way to keep her invisible (Piper, 2002), and T may also have felt reticent about disclosing this information to D.

Between lines 667 and 668, there is a fairly long pause (3.3 seconds). T's use of "y'know" in line 667 suggests that she thinks D understands what she is saying. The long pause indicates that D is taking time to frame his question in line 668 and let T know that she may be able to give more information to explain how T knew she could say anything to this person. In lines 669-693, D uses encouragers (mm-hmmh, right, yeah) in the back-and-forth of our conversation to keep T's description of her confidant flowing. That is,

the encouragers let T know that D is attending closely to what she is disclosing about T's confidant and that he is interested in knowing more.

Beginning in line 694, T starts explaining part of how she picked a particular person to talk to about her sexuality. D encourages T with moderately strong continuers, "mm-hmmhs" in lines 697 and 703 and his use of "right" in line 700 acts as a connector between T's "I guess it's an attraction", in line 699, and "to one person", in line 701 (Gardner, 2001). In 705, D uses T's word from her preceding turn, "comfort level", and starts this line with "so" that suggests that he has been waiting to say something (Bolden, 2005): he understands the "comfort level" and he is still unclear about something ("I'm wondering if....", lines 707-708).

Although I have listened to and watched this particular segment (lines 705-709) over 50 times I am still uncertain how T decided what I was wondering about or what "some other messages" might be. Clark (1996) called this a "truncation" where someone understands and responds to a question without it actually having been completed. T's "oh" at the start of line 709 indicates that she is giving a new piece of information or making a clarification (K. Lee, 2001) and she 'packages' or designs this information so that D, the recipient, will easily be able to understand the clarification ("recipient design", Sacks et al., 1974). D's "oh", at the start of 710, indicates he is receiving this as new information or that he did not know this and uses T's exact words, "attracted to her", as a question, to confirm this. From line 709 and for a few minutes afterward, while we are still discussing the woman in whom T confided, T begins to and continues to use gendered terms (*she* and *her*) which D takes up as well.

Inviting gentle contestation.

In this segment, Victor, the same participant as in Analysis section 1c, is describing what it was about a woman he knew that made it easier to talk to her about his sexuality when he was 19 years old. In our second session, V said that what had been helpful to him about this section was “what I didn’t realize at that time was what was it about her that allowed me to tell her ultimately as being the first person that I told”.

Exemplar VI

- 510 D: so [something about your cousin's girlfriend at that time (hhh) um I'm maybe
 511 making a leap here] but
 512 V: [{nods head several times}] mm:
 513 D: her her [connecting feelings to] ac-
 514 V: [{nods head four times and a fifth time when he says}] mm-hmmh
 515 D: to (1.0) you and other people in your family and behaviours so connecting
 516 feelings to people and behaviours
 517 V: mm-hmmh
 518 D: um:: was kind of the invitation for you to
 519 V: yes (.) {nodding head} that's exactly right
 520 D: OK
 521 V: it (0.8) first of all set a stage (0.7) that (0.9) someone cared enough to ask
 522 D: right
 523 V: and then: (0.8) also led me to trust her (0.7) and (0.7) there was more about her
 524 as well she was quite a dynamic (0.9) um articulate

D, in lines 510-511, 513, 515-516 and 518, gives V a tentative summary of what V has been saying about his cousin's girlfriend. D introduces the summary in a manner that what he says is open for contestation: “I'm maybe making a leap here but”. D's use of “but” indicates that what he is about to say is open for contestation. D turns a ‘spotlight’ on what he has understood from certain parts of V's account of this woman and their interactions: she connected A (feelings) with B (behaviours) which led to C (an invitation to talk). D's language appears to be inviting V to contest D (Tomm, 1988). Although D says he may be making a leap, V is nodding his head throughout the time D is speaking, evidence that he taking up what D is saying, so it is not surprising that V responds to D

with “yes that’s exactly right” (line 519).

Even though V has agreed with D, V, in lines 521 and 523-524, adds to D’s formulation or ‘repairs’ what D has said in a way that reflects what fits more accurately for V (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). That is, rather than immediately take up the ‘invitation’ (D, line 518), V reformulates this as “set a stage” (line 521). In this section, it is as though D has offered V a ‘model’ which D has made from what he has been hearing in V’s account. V initially agrees that this is an accurate model, in line 519, and then immediately begins to slightly reshape the model (“set a stage”) and add two important pieces to the model to better suit what he wants to convey: [she] “cared enough to ask” and V could “trust her”.

EXEMPLAR VII

545 V: the way you phrased it I would say is accurate that (.) it was (0.6) an invitation
 546 to explore emotions combined with a sense of trust that allowed to us to get
 547 there

In lines 525-544 (not included here), V continues to shape his model. He sums up this section, in lines 545-547, with a model which combines parts from D’s model and parts from his own work. This joint model reflects how he was able to reveal his sexuality to someone or, using V’s words from earlier in our conversation, to come out. In this segment, I believe that the analysis contributes to understanding how to make room for contestation. Contestation, in a supportive environment such as a counselling setting, may be significantly useful to clients. This may be especially so when the discussion is on topics which may not have felt previously safe for a client to discuss.

3. Understandings were Clarified; Reflections; Summaries

Exploring summaries.

Although most minority sexuality persons have experienced oppression and homophobia in their lives, many have also had positive experiences and support. Ken is a mid-30s male who describes his sexuality as gay. Ken competed at a National level in an individual, winter sport. He was forced to stop competing because of injury and shifted his focus in this sport and is now an International official. In our second session, Ken noted what was helpful for him in this small section (which follows below) near the end of our first conversation. Specifically, he said that

I think it was basically I had spent the previous 50 minutes talking about my history and you essentially summed my history up in one sentence saying that it seems like you've had a very positive experience with coming out. It's something I'd never really thought about because it's my life but when you said that I went, I have been awfully lucky that way.

Just before this segment, D asked K if he had spoken to any counsellors about sexuality and K said that he had only spoken with friends about sexuality.

Exemplar VIII

- 146 D: OK (hhh) (0.6) and (0.4) from your description you have a (.) a lot of um not
 147 just accepting you had a lot of very supportive (0.7) uh friends
 148 K: yeah
 149 D: an' those kinds of things made it a lot easier to [happen]
 150 K: [yeah↑] >I guess that looking
 151 back on it now I never really thought about that but< (0.4) um I did have it (0.5)
 152 I did have a pretty good go at it (0.7) like I've always been around (0.4) I've
 153 always had (1.1) at least one close friend that was (0.5) very supportive of that
 154 D: mm-hmmh
 155 K: side of my sexuality (1.0) even though I wasn't expressing it at the time they
 156 they knew (0.8) an' they were
 157 D: OK
 158 K: very supportive

In lines 146-147, D offers a summary of K's narrative and uses pauses to give him time to frame what he is offering and to invite K to attend to this summary (Clark, 2002). K's *yeah*, in line 148, acknowledges receipt of D's summary and that, although new to him, it is consistent with their conversation (Jucker & Smith, 1998). K's "yeah" here also illustrates Clark's (1996) grounding principle. That is, D needs his statement in 146-147 to be acknowledged by K before D would consider the statement to be complete.

D speaks with fewer or reduced hesitations in line 149. K anticipates D finishing his turn and K's "yeah", in line 150, signifies agreement or affirmation (Fuller, 2003a) and also the start of his responsive turn which he delivers at a more rapid rate than he has used previously. K, in 151-153 and 154-155, also uses several pauses which give him time to verbalize some of those things he had not thought about from his past experiences which fit with D's summary. D uses a moderately strong acknowledgement continuer (Gardner, 2001), "mm-hmmh", in line 154 which shows he recognizes that K is not done his turn in what he has to say about those things about his sexuality and his friends. In line, 156, D's use of "OK" occurs at a possible transition place where D now signifies he understands K's speech as being what, for K, fits with D's earlier summary and that K is nearing the end of what he has to say about this (Beach, 1995). Something which stands out is that K, in lines 153 and 158, uses "very supportive" which matches D, earlier, in line 147. Not only have K and D reached mutual understanding and common ground (Clark & Brennan, 1991) but this is such an important realization for K that he says it twice. Stivers (2005) suggested that when the second speaker repeats the first speaker's words (K repeats "very supportive" twice), that the second speaker is agreeing with the first speaker but also has "primary rights to make the claim" (p. 153). Although D has

apparently evaluated K's friends as being "very supportive", these are K's friends and he may be expressing that he is the first person who gets to describe his friends this way.

Getting to agreement of shared understandings.

In the next exemplar, D and John have been talking about the levels of understanding and acceptance of his sexuality which J felt on various teams on which he played. J describes himself as gay and is a late-20s male who played at a Provincial level on a team, indoor sport. J has played, more recently, on various recreational teams. In our second session, J said that what was helpful for him in this section was that "your clarification of your understanding of my ramblings clarified what I was thinking and led to a deeper understanding of what I was saying about the comparison of the different teams and the level of heterosexism on them". Just prior to this segment, J has been explaining that gay players who were better players seemed to have an easier time on the team as well as how levels of friendship and depth of knowing each other were important. Although we also are deconstructing varying levels of heterosexism in his various team experiences, I will primarily focus on how we developed clarification about those levels of heterosexism. At this point in our conversation, J is talking about his Provincial team on which most of the players were together for about 3 years and then moves on to describe teams where players do not get to know each other.

Exemplar IX

I have included 'gaze' transcription notations for lines 1465-1472. These notations are cumbersome and I have included them only here to illustrate some of my analysis which follows below. The speaker's gaze is marked above the line and the addressee's gaze below the line. The absence of a line indicates no direct gaze, dots indicate the gaze is

moving toward the other person, commas indicate the dropping of gaze, and X marks when the gaze starts on the other person (J. M. Atkinson & Heritage, 1984).

.....X
1465 J: other spheres of life right (hhh) so:: (1.9) the relationship is deeper [an' more]
1466 D: _____ [{nods}]

.....X
1467 J: ___, understanding and more accepting [(.)]
1468 D: _____ [mm-hmmh]

.....X
1469 J: ___, perhaps than (hhh) y'know you get a group of guys [(1.0)] together [(0.7)]
1470 D: _____ [{nods}] _____ [{small nod}]

1471 J: the first time together who don't really know each [other]
1472 D: _____ [OK]
1473 J: very well (hhh) (0.8) and (0.7) uh: (0.8) maybe heterosexism is just higher in
1474 those [(1.1)]
1475 D: _____ [OK]
1476 J: groupings
1477 D: (hhh) {moves left hand off chair arm and to lower chin} so (0.8) it sounds like
1478 there's a combination of things happening that (0.4) uh (1.9) level skill level
1479 might be one [thing]
1480 J: _____ [mm-hmmh]
1481 D: and (0.4) the amount of uh:: (0.6) friendship (.)
1482 J: mm-hmmh
1483 D: that has been developed (.hhh) uh so uh:: (0.6) being (0.3) closer friends (0.4)
1484 would that (0.5) be: uh: more of a catalyst (0.7) for comfort level of (0.7)
1485 differing sexualities
1486 J: I think so
1487 D: is that what I'm hearing?
1488 J: oh yes {small nods of head}
1489 D: ye[ah?]
1490 J: [yep]

D's head nods, in lines 1466 and 1470, let J know that he is listening and function as embodied receipt tokens (Taleghani-Nikazm & Vlatten, 1997) and encouragers (McClave, 2000). When I started watching and listening to the segments of the first sessions using the Transana program, after I had the segments put on DVDs from VHS, I recognized that I could not see all of our eye and facial movements. Subsequently, I

would go back and find the segments on the VHS tapes and watch them on a larger television screen to see some of what I missed on the smaller computer screen. Even when I enlarged the video portion of the Transana screen it was difficult to see eye glances and focus. I understand that every time the format is changed, in this case from VHS to DVD and then to a computer screen, there is a loss in viewing quality (A. Wilson, University of Calgary, Media Technician, personal communication, May 5, 2006).

By watching the segments on a television screen I was better able to see where we were looking during the conversations and often was able to note when our eye focus or gaze moved and when we might be looking more directly at each other. Bavelas, Coates, and T. Johnson (2002) suggested that listeners usually look at speakers for fairly long spaces and speakers frequent but shorter spaces. When there is a turn exchange of speaking the roles reverse but for a brief time there is mutual gaze, called ‘the gaze window’, in which listener responses, such as head nods or mm-hmmhs, occur. This also fits with Wittgenstein’s (1969) notion that for knowledge be considered shared knowledge, there needs to be acknowledgement: “Knowledge is in the end based on acknowledgement” (Aphorism #378, p. 43e).

In line 1465, J moved his eye focus toward D at the end of 1465 just after D starts nodding his head (line 1466) while J is still speaking (“an’ more”). In 1467, however, near the end of this line, while he is still speaking J turns his head very slightly toward D and looks directly at him just before D says ‘mm-hmmh’ (1468). Just after the start of line 1469, J looks at his hands, which are in front of his chest. J then looks back toward D and his gaze is on D before D first nods his head in line 1470. D has been looking directly

at J throughout all of these lines. When D nods his head in line 1466 it is while J is still speaking whereas the “mm-hmmh” (line 1468) and head nods (line 1470) occur in pauses in J’s speech. While J’s eye movement toward D in 1465 may be simply a response to the movement, J’s eye gaze movement toward D in 1467 and 1469 occur before D’s ‘generic listener responses’ (Bavelas, Coates, & T. Johnson, 2000). These last two mutual gaze points are possible turn exchanges or transition relevance, especially during the 1.0 and 0.7 second pauses in line 1469, but D does not take up a turn as he appears to be waiting until J is finished. Although J has been doing most of the speaking and, in effect, narrating a story, D and J have been working together, where D’s listening has worked as co-narration, and that without D’s active listening and his mostly ‘generic’ responses, J would not have continued his story.

When D does initiate his turn, in line 1477, he begins with “so” indicating he may have been keeping what he has to say in abeyance; where *so*, in this sequence-initial position acts as an emergence marker for what D has been formulating to say (Bolden, 2005) or cooperative turn entry (Schiffrin, 1987). D switches from nonverbal (nods) or small (mm-hmhh) listener responses to more vocalized ones (“OKs” in 1472 and 1475) which suggest he is leading up to saying something and taking his turn to speak at the next appropriate turn exchange (Beach, 1995).

In 1477-1486, D now does most of the speaking and J is listening and J also uses ‘generic’ listening responses until, in line 1486, he voices a response to D’s question. D, in lines 1477-1479, 1481, and 1483-1485, puts together a tentative summary of what he has understood J to have been saying about J’s varying experiences of heterosexism while participating on his sport teams. The pauses suggest that D is having some

challenge or difficulty finding a way of capturing J's narrative and moves to a direct question ("is this what I'm hearing", line 1489) after J's fairly weak-sounding agreement ("I think so", line 1486). J's "oh yes" response, with the "yes" emphasized, is also augmented with head nods. The "oh" also gives added weight or intensification to the yes (Schiffrin, 1987). Even so, D's rising, questioning tone in "yeah" in line 1489 suggests D is still not certain if J's tentative agreement of understandings ("I think so") is enough. J quickly and definitely responds with a very short "yep" that starts just after the questioning tone in D's "yeah" in line 1489 and indicates that they both have reached a shared understanding of J's narrative and experience.

Counsellor summaries and reflections are common counselling practices (Ivey & Bradford Ivey, 1999). In the preceding sections, I noted how D's pauses, for example, were helpful in framing a summary and inviting K to attend to this summary. Additionally, paying close attention to how and when we focus our eye gaze in conversations can also contribute to speakers' shared understandings. In this exemplar, D's summary (lines 1477-1479, 1481, 1483-1485) is offered to J with the question, "is that what I'm hearing?" (line 1487). J actively agrees with the summary, in line 1488, with small head nods as well as an emphasized, "oh yes" (line 1488). Counsellors may benefit from attending to their client's and their own eye focus to indicate places where these shared understandings have occurred. K. Davis (1986), for example, examined portions of a therapy session with a client and demonstrated the interactional activity between the client and the psychotherapist that helped transform or reformulate the client's initial challenge. Additionally, reformulatory summaries and places where the client indicates that he or she has been understood may also be particularly useful for

counsellors to notice. Davis also pointed out that health care professionals need to attend to the potential abuse of power in imposing *their* reformulations.

4. When Nods are Enough: Creating Space for Talking about Sexuality; Making Links, Making Sense

This segment, in which Ken (the same participant in 3a) does most of the speaking (90%), matches a discourse unit (DU) style of interview (Mazeland & ten Have, 1996; ten Have, 2004) in which the participant is the “primary speaker” and the interviewer is a supportive and active listener. ten Have (2004) suggested that this ‘implies’ that the speaker is the ‘expert’ and I purposefully took the notion of client or, in this case, participant as expert into these conversations from my narrative (Besley, 2001, 2002; Freedman & Combs, 1996; Gergen & Kaye, 1992; Monk & Gehart, 2003; Speedy, 2000), collaborative language systems (H. Anderson, 1995, 1997; H. Anderson & Goolishian, 1992), and multicultural (Arthur & S. Collins, 2005; Ponterotto, Casas, Suzuki, & Alexander, 2001; D. W. Sue & D. Sue, 2003) counselling perspectives.

In my analyses, I show how I was an active, co-participant while I was an interested listener. K and I coconstructed and facilitated a space for him to talk about his sexuality and his experiences of his sexuality while he was still competing in his sport. In the second session, K said that what was helpful for him about this segment was “that was the first time I really had thought about growing up in [my sport] as a budding homosexual...I'd always treated [my sport] as [my sport] and being gay as being gay and I didn't link them”.

Exemplar X

- 1 K: y'know certainly kind of screwed me up (1.0) y'know 'cause you're (0.5) (hhh)
 2 like >oh I'm so attracted to him and at the same time it was like oh!< (.) well

- 3 that's (.)
4 D: {nods head} mm-hmmh
5 K: >that's horrible I shouldn't be<
6 D: so you [you]
7 K: [y'know]
8 D: were (hhhh) having some sense of (0.7) of um (1.2) sex- sexuality:::
9 understandings about yourself at that time?
10 K: oh (.) >God ever since I was fo:ur or five<
11 D: {nods head} oh OK
12 K: yeah I mean that's that was the (hhh) sport for me an' the whole gay issue (0.4)
13 was (1.1) I wou- I don't say a no:n-issue . (.) but (0.5) the fact that I was gay:::
14 (0.3) or knowing I was attracted to (0.3) to guys
15 D: [{nods head}]
16 K: [(hhh)] um when I was competing (.) it wasn't (0.5) it wasn't a huge
17 de:al (0.5) except for when you get into a situation where [(1.0)]
18 D: [{nods head}] mm-hmmh
19 K: people acted like they weren't (0.9) right?
20 D: and possibly even: (.) guys that you: knew were also gay?
21 K: >yeah yeah<
22 D: OK yeah (.)
23 K: an' also i- i- it was all of a sudden it was like (1.8) all all that unspoken
24 understanding went [out the window=]
25 D: [{nods head} right] [{nods head}]
26 K: [=and as] something all of a
27 sudden (0.7) to be belittled (0.7) but at the same time (0.4) well it's like (0.5)
28 [oh] (.)
29 D: [{nods head}]
30 K: y'know I know {right hand index finger moves and points three times with each
31 'he is' following} [he is and I know he is and I know he is ((laughs))]
32 D: [{nods head several times}] mm-hmmh
33 K: an' an' our one coach was {lifts both arms off chair upward quickly} (0.4)
34 [totally flamboyant an']
35 D: [{nods head three times}] mm-hmmh
36 K: y'know but everybody really respected him but (.) behind closed doors when the
37 guys got together it was all like >oh did you check him out man he was checking
38 you out an' stuff< (hhh) so you were made
39 [to feel]
40 D: [{nods head, moves forward in chair, sits back down}] interesting
41 K: ashamed (0.5) (hhh) which is (0.4) kind of weird (0.7) I I get so mad when I see
42 that [no:w↑ (0.3) and an' now in my]
43 D: [{nods head twice}] mm-hmmh
44 K: (hhh) capacity as a as an official when I work with athletes and
45 [monitoring and (hhh) y'know an']
46 D: [{nods head twice}]
47 K: (0.4) y'know getting to know them travelling with them and stuff (1.0) as an
48 official (hhh) um whenever I see: [(hhh)]

- 49 D: [{nods head}]
 50 K: derogatory [stuff]
 51 D: [yeah]
 52 K: like that happening I just [(1.0)]
 53 D: [{nods head twice}]
 54 K: y'know [I]
 55 D: [yeah]
 56 K: cut it off(.) >especially if I kno::w< (0.7) that that (0.8) athlete is (0.8) gay or or
 57 potentially gay (hhh) y'know

Approximately 2 minutes prior to this segment which K chose, I asked him the question, “How was it for you (.) >if you were in your sport long enough< to have (.) any experience of y’know thinking about your sexuality (.) what was it like in your sport↑”. For the next two minutes, Ken spoke about the experiences he thought that all, or at least most, mid- to late teen, gay, males that he knew in the sport had experienced. Line 2 is the first place that Ken shifts from using second person plural, “you” (which he had used in the prior 2 minutes), to first person singular, “I”, and I think that is why Ken noted this point in this portion of the conversation/interview as having been specifically helpful to him. This pronoun shift indicates that K has started to personalize what he is hearing in his own narrative.

In this segment, K uses discourse markers (DMs), ‘y’know’, ‘like’, and ‘oh well’ (Schiffrin, 1987) several times, particularly y’know and like. These markers indicate relations in the discourse, cannot usually be interpreted without context, and guide conversation participants to integrate components of the conversation (Schiffrin) or to denote relationships between discourse units or assumptions underlying what is said (Schourup, 1999). Although I have not included the preceding 2 minutes of dialogue after I asked the initial question which started K’s answer or the 10 minutes before the question, K was not using these DMs nearly as frequently as in this section. K is

reflecting on himself and getting to a level of personal significance and making sense of his previous experiences (Gerhardt & Stinson, 1995).

Although research findings on the differential rates of DM use for various ages, classes, and gender are equivocal, Cheshire, Kerswill, and A. Williams (2005) felt that speakers in informal conversations used DMs more frequently than in formal conversations. Jucker and Smith (1998) found that friends in conversations used these presentation markers to negotiate common meaning more frequently than strangers. Croucher (2004, unpublished manuscript) found that rates varied: females significantly more than males and adults less than teenagers.

Another consideration, germane to an analysis of talk about minority sexuality is how we, in these conversations, may have been employing ‘gayspeak’ (for example, see R. Barrett, 1997; Leap, 1996) or ‘queerspeak’ (Bucholtz & K. Hall, 2004; Campbell-Kibler, Podesva, Roberts, & A. Wong, 2002; Livia & K. Hall, 1997). Although certain patterns or types of speech may be called gay, lesbian, or queer these are usually ‘worked up’ in complicated cultural and contextual manners in which co-conversants understand that what is said will be interpreted by ‘insiders’ in a particular manner (Livia & K. Hall, 1997). That is, Ken and I have utilized membership categories (Sacks, 1995), in this case gay males in sport, to understand each other and negotiate our conversation. I will not elaborate further on the research findings but have noted the change in frequency in Ken’s usage of “you know” and “like” and speculate it may be related to him talking about a time when he was a teenager, or as a gay male, and also because he was becoming more comfortable in our conversation.

When I listened to, watched, and read this segment initially, I was somewhat surprised that K had chosen this segment because it helped him have space to talk about his experience of his sexuality in his sport and make links. Those links were that he was both an athlete and gay and that these had not been totally separate experiences for him. What had stood out for me in this segment was that K had recognized messages of heterosexism and hypocrisy of young, gay men making “derogatory” (line 51) remarks about a coach and that is still with him. Now, as an official in this sport, he actively takes an anti-homophobic stance toward that “derogatory stuff”. So, when I started my analysis on this segment, I put what K had felt was important for him first and suspended, as much as possible, what I thought had occurred. I looked for what we had done together.

In lines 1-3, K’s use of “y’know” and “like” act as focus or presentation markers (Fuller, 2003b) which emphasize the importance and saliency of his specific narrative pieces and structure how D responds to this new information (He & Lindsey, 1998). K uses “oh” twice in line 2, the first as a presentation marker for “I’m so attracted to him” and the second as an interjection which can indicate emotion (“well that’s that’s horrible”, lines 2-3 and 5) (Fuller, 2003, K. Lee, 2001). At line 4, D nods his head as well as voices “mm-hmmh”. The “mm-hmmh” acts as a moderately strong “backchannel”² utterance (Gardner, 2001) that gives acknowledgement, support, and encouragement to K. The head nod indicates attention and further backchannel support (McClave, 2000). Further, D’s direct gaze, or visual focus, on K at this point, and throughout this segment,

² Sacks et al. (1974) referred to the work of Yngve (1970) and Duncan (1972), who developed the earliest work on backchanneling, as one is “a range of interesting features and details of that sort of organization [such as taking turns in talk].....operative in conversations” (Sacks et al., p. 696). Several discursive researchers incorporate backchannel evaluation in their work (for example, Drummond & Hopper, 1993; Gardner, 2001; McClave, 2000; McCarthy, 2003).

indicates interest and concentrated tracking (Bavelas et al., 2002; Heath & Luff, 2000).

K's "y'know" in line 7 gives an emphasis to his faster-than-usual speech in line 5 of the message he felt at that time that he should not be attracted to other males his age.

D, in lines 6 and 8-9 offered a tentative or 'not-knowing' question (indicated by the two pauses of 0.7 and 1.2 seconds as well as the "um" and two starts to "sex- sexuality"), relating to K's experience at that time. Even though K and D are the same gender, have been involved in winter sports, and fairly close in age, D's tentative or not-knowing attitude shows that he is not making assumptions because of his 'insider' status (S. L. Morrow, 2000). As Pedersen (1995) suggested, it is beneficial to consider all interactions with others as cross-cultural even when there appears to be a high degree of matches between conversation participants, both visible and non-visible. Additionally, this fits Strong's (2002) view that "the dialogues of therapy are context[s] in which client and therapist practice culture [and] take place in an imaginary dialogic meeting place – a 'borderzone'" (p. 245).

Bucholtz and K. Hall (2004) suggested that "at the micro level of interaction, it is important to ensure that sameness and difference are equally available as interpretive possibilities"; that "highlighting often functions ... to establish interactionally sufficient alignments"; and, that "what is sufficient is merely partial identification or similarity between social subjects" (p.495). In line 2, K says "I'm so attracted to him" and in line 5, "that's horrible". Although K and D have used "gay" earlier in the conversation, D's "sex- sexuality understandings" is offered as a possible interpretation of what "attracted" might mean for K. D's pauses also suggest that he has taken time to consider (Fox Tree, 2002) both what and how to offer this to K.

K's "oh" at the start of line 10 is a recognition marker (Fuller, 2003a) and the short pause suggests that K is slightly surprised (K. Lee, 2001) whereas D's "oh" in line 11 suggests he realizes and understands what K has just said in line 10. In lines 12-14, K uses "gay" twice and also, in line 14, gives another description: "or knowing I was attracted to guys", perhaps in response to the tentativeness of D's "sex- sexuality understandings" in lines 8-9. D and K are creating, between them, what Leap (1996) called 'gay space' or 'queer space' (where the boundaries are somewhat flexible). K, in line 19, does not complete "acted like they weren't" with any particular word for sexuality and his "right" with a rising questioning tone suggests that he is soliciting confirmation (Bangerter & Clark, 2003). D, in line 20, responds in a more obvious joint action to get to a shared understanding yet still offers his understanding tentatively, "possibly even". K, in line 21, responds with quick "yeahs" to signify that D's use of "gay" at the end of line 20 did fit as a confirmation of understanding.

There are several places in this segment where the language that K and D use suggests they are linguistically 'performing' sexuality (McIlvenny, 2002) and "homosociality" (Davidson, 1995) and their rhetorical practices play a role in K's construction of his 'selves' and his sexuality (Bacon, 1998). K recalls that his attraction to other guys ran counter to the cultural message that he "shouldn't be" (line 5) and D asks about what understandings K made of this. K uses language, "the whole gay issue...the fact that I was gay or knowing I was attracted to guys" (lines 12-14), which D takes up "that you knew were also gay" (line 20). I think that D's tentative question in line 20 provides an opening where K and D deconstruct (K through his words and D by his timely, encouraging, and supportive head nods) the hypocritical, homophobic attitudes in K's

sport – from other gay males within the sport. He describes how the “unspoken understanding” (lines 23-24) between males he believed were gay (“I know he is and he is and I know he is”, line 31), “went out the window” (line 24) when they spoke about a coach who was “checking you out”. K says that while he was “made to feel ashamed” (lines 38-39 and 41) when his being gay met the hegemonic discourse that his sexuality was “horrible” he now gets “mad” when he encounters “derogatory stuff”. Perhaps this realization is also one of the things that K felt was helpful for him in this segment.

D’s many head nods (lines 4, 11, 15, 18, 25, 29, 32, 35, 40, 43, 46, 49, and 53) provide K acknowledgement, encouragement, support and indicate understanding (McClave, 2000; Taleghani-Nikazm & Vlatten, 1997). Although D speaks very little in this segment, his head nods and few verbalizations let K know that he is an active listener. During this segment it looks as though that is all D is doing: 13 places where he nods his head and 6 verbalizations (“mm-hmmh”, lines 32, 35, and 43; “right”, line 25; “interesting”, line 40; and, “yeah”, line 51). In line 32, D nods his head almost in concert with each of K’s right index finger punctuations in the air of “he is and I know he and I know he is”. In line 40 D also moves forward and sits more upright along with adding a verbalized “interesting” to K’s description of the conflict he felt with the situation he describes in lines 30 to 42.

In lines 51 and 55, D gives stronger acknowledgement tokens, “yeah” (Gardner, 2001), as K describes his current actions in relation to past and present hypocrisies in his sport. These acknowledgements provide support for K’s social justice or social action narrative (lines 42 to 57). This matches feminist (L. H. Collins, Dunlap, & Chrisler, 2002), feminist, multicultural (Goodman, Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004; Sinacore & Enns, 2005), and multicultural (Constantine & D. W. Sue, 2005;

Constantine, Melincoff, Barakett, Torino, & Warren, 2004; Romero & A. Chan, 2005; Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2005) counselling perspectives. These views call for creating space, encouragement, and support for social justice. In this segment, K has worked up, with D, a place where he was able to reflect on himself in a multilayered story, and recognize the level of personal significance for him. Ken and D co-constructed or reconstructed, rather than reproduced, a narrative about his sexuality at a time when he was still in his sport that helped him make sense of who he was and who he is now (Leap, 1996).

In this segment, Ken was able to observe and reflect on himself; there was more to his story than ‘met the eye’; and, he was able to recognize the level of personal significance for him (Gerhardt & Stinson, 1995). Although there was no context-driven agenda, in terms of a ‘therapeutic’ agenda, I had, at the outset of our conversation, discussed with him that I was interested in talking about sexuality and, perhaps, his experience of or understanding of sexuality in relation to himself, particularly while he was still in his sport. In this sense there was a ‘context-specific agenda’ that we had discussed as potential topics or areas of interest: before the conversation, in the consent form, in the initial poster, and, again, during the conversation.

In the above section (section four), I found it very interesting that K, the participant, had shifted his pronoun usage from ‘you’ to ‘I’ and to consider that he was beginning to personalize what he heard in his narration. Such shifts may be important places for counsellors to notice and, perhaps, explore the shift. Counsellors may also be able to consider increased frequency of discourse markers by a client as an indication that the client is becoming more comfortable in a session. Without closer examination of

conversations such shifts may be overlooked. Counsellors may, however, learn to attend for these shifts in their counselling practices.

5. Synthesizing and Processing

First example of synthesizing and of processing.

In the next section, I analyze two sections of the conversation with Pat (same participant in 1b). Just prior to the first segment which Pat chose as having been helpful to her to talk about sexuality (Exemplar XI) we had been talking about whether she experienced anything which was either helpful or not helpful in her sports for revealing her sexuality. She initially spoke of one coach in particular with whom she worked for over 6 years. In our second session, Pat noted that she had several coaches over many years and she had not previously thought about why and when she chose to reveal her sexuality to some coaches and not others. P, in our second session, said this segment “was helpful for me in the fact that I’d never really thought about if before....and it was good for me to process it”.

Exemplar XI

- 165 D: so (.) um some of the words we have talked about are kind of like catalysts to be
 166 helpful t- to talk about
- 167 P: [mm-hmh]
- 168 D: [sex]uality (.hhh) and some of the things might be seen as either barriers
 169 or hindrances (.hhh) um if I can use those
- 170 P: [mm-hmmh]
- 171 D: [wor]ds (.) so:: (.7) I'm wondering if there was something that (.3) was
 172 either uh a real or perceived barrier that (1.2) made it 6 years before you
 173 [told that male coach]
- 174 P: [{nods head four times}] um:: I don't remember him specifically saying
 175 anything negative towards (.)
- 176 D: mm-hmmh
- 177 P: lesbians or gays but maybe it was just a general feeling I got from him
- 178 D: mm-hmmh
- 179 P: that I just didn't feel comfortable enough (.6) to talk to him an' also I don't think
 180 (.5) for me it didn't seem like it was that important [(hhh)]

- 181 D: [OK]
 182 P: it doesn't um:: (.9) it's not me like it's
 183 D: [yeah]
 184 P: [(hhh)] >a part of me but it's not< (1.0)
 185 D: [yeah]
 186 P: [it] doesn't make me a summer team player
 187 D: [yeah]
 188 P: [be]cause I'm a lesbian obviously [uh] so
 189 D: [((short laugh))] so if you go to a new team for example oh by the way the first
 190 thing you [need to know ((laughs))]
 191 P: [hee-hee ((laughs)) yeah]
 192 D: because how does that affect your sporting abi[lity]
 193 P: [exactly] so:: I guess I was just
 194 choosing my time an'=
 195 D: =of course we laugh at that but
 196 P: mm-hmmh:::
 197 D: see I made an assumption that (.) we would laugh at that but (.hhh)
 198 unfortunately there's coaches that if you did say that that it wouldn't be [funny]
 199 P: [that's]
 200 true, mm-hmmh:::
 201 D: an' it it would be something that interfered with their perception of=
- 202 P: =an' it's really sad I think
 203 D: yeah

In lines 165-166 and 168-169, D introduces the words 'catalysts' and 'barriers' or 'hindrances' and at the end of 169 and into 171, he asks P if those words and P's mm-hmmh in 170 and 4 head nods in 174 suggest that, at least for now they are all right for her. P goes on to explain, in lines 174-175, 177, and 179-180 that even if her male coach had not said anything specific that there may not have been an atmosphere or attitude from him which supported her disclosure. Her experience with him matches the heterosexist or homophobic discourse that many minority sexuality athletes experience that prevents disclosure (for example, see R. B. Morrow & Gill, 2003). At the same time, in line 179, P explains that she may also have been choosing when to disclose her sexuality as being lesbian does not mean that her sexuality makes her an athlete. She was weighing when it felt appropriate or safe to disclose (Quiroga, 2000). P has decided, by

us having a conversation about this, that she is in a safe place, and thus we are creating GLBTQ ‘space’ (Leap, 1996). P, in line 184, when she says that being a lesbian is “part of me” matches Dorenkamp and Henke (1995) when they wrote “it is never possible to be only a lesbian” (p. 2). In this section, P and D are working out how the words may fit or not fit for P with D giving agreements and encouragers with “mm-hmmhs” (lines 176 and 178) and “yeahs” (lines 183 and 185).

In the above segment, D and P are giving significance to a possible or perceived barrier for P with respect to her sexuality (Gee, 2005). What was significant for P was that, in terms of her sexuality, she did not feel comfortable enough with her coach. Additionally, she said that her sexuality was not the most relevant part of her with respect to her being a summer sport athlete. D and P build the activity about her past experiences into the present conversation.

In lines 189-190, D introduces an irony he notices with respect to P’s comment about being lesbian does not make her an athlete, suggesting that she might introduce herself as a lesbian to a new team as the most important information they need. That is, how does her sexuality make her an athlete? In lines 189-191 D and P share the humour in such a possible scenario when they both laugh. Their shared laughter suggests that P was comfortable with D in what she had shared with him, something quite different from the strain P described in talking to her coach about her sexuality. Norrick (1993) felt that shared humour expressed alignment and rapport between speakers in their co-constructed discourse. In line 193, P concurs with what appears, to her, to be the conclusion to that interlude of her narrative, with “exactly” overlapping the end of D’s “ability” at the end

of line 192. P uses “so” at a transition point from D to her that marks that she is going back to her explanation about when she would disclose her sexuality (Schiffrin, 1987).

D, in 195, does not, however, respond to P’s continuation of her narrative, and introduces the start of a new direction of discussion in regard to other possible views about what, at first, was only a humorous notion. Although P agrees with the shared ‘insider’ perspective, the “we” in line 195, with her “mm-hmmh:::” in line 196, this would also have been a place that D could have taken up P’s continued narrative. I think this illustrates a place where D ‘talked over’ P and pushed his own conversational agenda. Even if P does take up this new discussion, I view this as a missed opportunity for D to have gone with P’s story or at least have checked with her to see if she was done.

In lines 197-198, D does check in with P about his assumption of possible shared ‘insider’ perspectives to see if his assumption is unwarranted (S. L. Morrow, 2000) but I think he also misses the chance to check if he has disturbed the conversational flow by continuing with this new topic. P does not show discomfort or concern that D has apparently missed out her narrative continuation and switches smoothly to the new topic and does not initiate any repair to what he has said (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). She shows strong agreement with D’s comment that, for some coaches, the fictitious scenario would not be funny to some coaches (line 198), by her overlapping agreement “that’s true, mm-hmmh:::” in lines 199-200. P also adds her own personal comment that not only would it not be funny but that it would be sad (line 202) with which D agrees.

Second example of synthesizing and processing.

Another segment which P picked as being helpful for her includes a section where she tells me about how she was a ‘catalyst’ for another player and some of the differences she

has noted within her two sports teams. In our second session, P said that what was helpful for her was that “this was another area I hadn’t thought about and I think that this just brought it to the forefront” – the dynamics on her team in terms of sexuality.

Exemplar XII

- 204 D: um you've talked abou::t (.3) a few teammates an' coaches I'm wondering (hhh)
 205 if there's uh if there are any other experiences with other athletes that either
 206 were helpful or hindering to? (.7)
- 207 P: um: (.5) other athletes . um (2.5) (.hhh) I had a actually it helped I think one of
 208 my teammates that I was out on my summer sport team
- 209 D: mm-hmmh
- 210 P: 'cause she came out to me t[he next]
- 211 D: [o::h] [OK]
 212 P: [summer](hhh)
- 213 D: so you sharing your experience was helpful to somebody else
- 214 P: mm-hmmh
- 215 D: OK
- 216 P: so (.3) I guess i- it sorta just (.) it was a safe place for her
- 217 D: mm-hmmh
- 218 P: she felt she could do that and um (.6) (.hhh) I don't know about hindering I think
 219 (.7) maybe more so on my winter sport team (1.0) 'cause actually there's a lot
 220 more um: (.8) homophobia on my winter sport team (.hhh)
- 221 D: even though there's (.7) several you said there's at least
- 222 P: there's thr[ee:]
- 223 D: [four?]
- 224 P: or four yeah=
- 225 D: =OK=
- 226 P: =other lesbians on my winter sport team but there has been a lot of homophobia
 227 on my team (hhh) and um up until I had been playing on that team for three
 228 years up until last season
- 229 D: mm-hmmh
- 230 P: I finally came out to:: my ca:ptain
- 231 D: mm-hmmh
- 232 P: an' >it was fantastic< like she (1.0) y'know asked questions
- 233 D: right
- 234 P: an' >wanted to know y'know all the things how did you know when did you
 235 know but [she]<
- 236 D: [yeah]
- 237 P: >was so accepting an' I was completely blown out of the water (hhh) because I
 238 had no idea that she would have been that way

In lines 207-208, P describes how her sexuality being known to the players on her summer sport team contributed, at least in part, to another player being able to disclose to her. P may have influenced the atmosphere on that team or at least made it safe for the other player to talk to P about her sexuality. D offers a synopsis, in line 213, of his understanding of P's actions with respect to her teammate and P and D agree on this in lines 214-215 although P's verbalization of "safe place" in line 216 is initially tentative (pauses, "i- it was") and then more assured (line 218) after D's line 217 encourager. P then pauses briefly to consider her winter sport team where the atmosphere does not match her summer sport team.

P appears to be thinking about and formulating what she is going to say, whether "hindering" fits or if she prefers something else. P chooses "homophobia" (line 220). P is designing or packaging what she says in a way that she references what D has said earlier and also knowing that he is hearing what she is now saying (Pomerantz, 2000; Pomerantz & Fehr, 1997). Her pauses (0.6, 0.7, 1.0, and 0.8 seconds) and tentativeness also suggest that she is packaging her talk so that it is easily understood by D as well as offering contestability to a potentially delicate topic.

After the first pause, she starts moving away from experiences in her summer sport team where "hindering" did not match and, after the second pause, moves her talk to her winter sport team. After the longest of the pauses, 1.0 seconds, P moves her talk firmly to her winter sport team and, after the final pause, connects her choice of word, "homophobia", to match with or, perhaps, replace "hindrance". The word "hindering" was not offered as the only possible word which could fit here and D left space for P to work out, in her pauses, what word fit better for her. There is some slight contestation,

from D, in line 221, when he wonders that there is homophobia on that team “even though there’s several” [lesbians on the team].

In lines 221-225, D and P appear to know that D’s “several”, “three”, “four” and “four other” refers to lesbians even though ‘lesbian’ is not mentioned until line 226. D and P each offer different numbers for which D has understood P to mention earlier in the conversation. D is apparently surprised that three or four lesbians on the team was not sufficient to somehow influence P’s team to be welcoming for lesbians or at least that this information was unexpected when he starts with “even though...” (K. Lee, 2001). P goes from three to four (five, if she includes herself) for the number on the team and explains that, in spite of numbers, there had been “a lot of homophobia” even with her on the team for at least three years.

In these same lines, P and D show how they are actively listening to each other as they co-ordinate a “common ground”, that D has not just been a passive listener to P’s previous information about the number of lesbians on P’s winter sport team; P and D actively participate as both speaker and listener as “co-narrators” (Bavelas et al., 2000). While P and D work out the possible numbers of lesbians (several, three, four, and the (implied) five – four others plus P) the number is not crucial for them to go forward and, in fact, an exact number is never settled upon. Both speakers understand that the numbers refer to lesbians in lines 221-225 and that even without P saying “lesbian” in line 226 they have a co-developed sense of ‘adequacy’ for them to keep moving forward (Strong & Paré, 2004) in the conversation.

D finds the information from P that there is a lot more homophobia on P’s winter sport team than her summer sport team as unexpected information. P and D quickly work

through what is less important to P when she uses “but” in line 226 to shift D’s attention to her strong (“has been”) support for her initial statement about homophobia in line 220 and contrasts D’s mild contestation, in line 221, to what she said about homophobia in line 220 (K. Lee, 2001; Shiffrin, 1987). P uses “but” as a focusing device to shift attention to what she feels is the more important part of her speech turn (Schourup, 1999).

From social constructionist perspectives, people have and show a multiplicity of selves (B. Davies & Harré, 1990). In Exemplar XII, P and D find humour in the notion that P’s lesbian self would have precedence over her athlete self and, for P, being a lesbian “didn’t seem like it was that important” (line 181) and “it doesn’t make me a summer sport player” (line 187). I think this illustrates the notion that, in certain contexts, people’s specific ‘selves’, relevant to the context, are performed; they are ‘selving’ (Strong & Zeman, 2005). Our context here is an interview conversation and, as Pomerantz (2000) suggested, “interviews are sites of struggle where individuals strive to construct representations of themselves...as multiple, complex, dynamic, locally situated, and open to negotiation” (p. 25). I believe that examining places of contestation, active listening, and humour may contribute to understandings of how common ground is negotiated and reached in counselling conversations.

6. Talking about Previous Counselling Experiences

In the next piece of analysis, D and Pat (same participant as in Analysis 1b and 5), a mid-20s, self-identified lesbian woman who competed at a Provincial level in a women’s team summer sport, discuss P’s experiences with counsellors. P now participates at a recreational level in both the same sport and a women’s team winter sport. In our second

session, P said she selected this segment because, “I think that it was helpful for me to realize where my biases are....and for [me] to get the most out of a session and a counsellor, [I] need to get what [I] want”. In this first segment, P is talking about some negative experiences she had with a male counsellor.

Exemplar XIII

- 276 D: an' you had mentioned that the next experience wasn't as positive for you?
 277 P: no:: it was (1.0) interesting 'cause my issues were surrounding: my sexuality but
 278 I was (.3) trying to date and I was having real big issues with dating:
 279 D: mm-hmmh
 280 P: and in a rel[↑]ationship and (1.0) um yeah they threw my file into y'know a pile
 281 D: [right]
 282 P: [an'] they go and have this meeting and then they divvy them out (.hhh) an' I
 283 got (.3) the guy who's like in charge and he's doing his study on: relationships .
 284 (hhh) and because my issues were surrounding relationships he wanted to talk to
 285 me
 286 D: OK
 287 P: and [I felt like I was an experiment] (.) and I went in there [and]
 288 D: [{nods head}] [mm-hmm]
 289 P: I: (.7) I saw him once and that was it (.4) 'cause I just one of the first time's I saw
 290 him (.) >he was just all about my relationship and [it that wasn't what I wanted to
 291 talk about< (.8) >like I didn't want to talk about things that were happening in
 292 the past I wanted to talk about what was going on right now< {small slaps of
 293 left hand on left thigh}]
 294 D: [{nods head several times}] [OK]
 295 P: [and] he: (.9) an' being gay: was part of that and he
 296 he didn't acknowledge that (.hhh) an' I didn't feel like I was being listened to.
 297 D: OK
 298 P: an' I just yeah I never went back

P states that in this context, a counselling setting, her sexuality was relevant: “my issues were surrounding my sexuality” (line 277). P and D work together to create a safe place for P to tell the story of her negative experiences with this particular counsellor. In line 276, D comments that P has said that a particular counselling experience was not as positive as an earlier one and his rising, questioning tone at the end of the line invites P to speak about this. The extended or elongated vowel on “no” and the long pause (1.0

seconds) at the beginning of line 277 show that P is thinking about whether or not to take up this invitation and, if so, what to say next (Clark, 1996). The pause also suggests that this topic may be potentially challenging (Clark & Fox Tree, 2002).

P saw the counsellor for issues related to her sexuality and she notes that the counsellor did not acknowledge that her sexuality was part of her concerns (line 295) or even acknowledge her sexuality (line 318) which she describes as “a huge part of me especially at that time” (line 319). D encourages P to continue with her story with several ‘OKs’ (lines 286, 294, and 297) such that P knows that he is attending to what she has said in her prior and subsequent turns of speech (Beach, 1995). D’s use “mm-hmmhs” (279 and 288) that act as encouragers indicating that P has been understood and agreed with and should continue speaking (Filipi & Wales, 2003). D also uses “right”, in line 281, which acts a connector within P’s narrative discourse (Hansen, 1998). By overlapping P’s narrative with “right” (281) and “mm-hmmh” (288), D also helps to develop a co-operative narrative alliance (Clark, 2002).

D’s use of these response and encouragement tokens (Schiffrin, 1987; Schiffrin, 2001) let P know that D is following and understanding her which encourages her to elaborate. D’s use of “OK” (lines 286, 294, 297, and 311) *shows* understanding (Schegloff, 1982) and acts as confirmation, for both P and D, that they mutually understand what she is saying (Beach, 1993). Although D and P do not stop to specify exactly what it is that they understand they behave as though they have similar ideas or shared understanding of what is going on between them. There are no places where P and D stop to repair any possible misunderstandings or ‘problems’ in their discussion (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). The ‘OKs’ serve as ‘default verifiers’ (Condon, 2002) and are an example of “how

speakers make evident to each other that their shared talk is adequate for ‘moving forward’” (Strong, 2005, p. 513).

During lines 289-293, P speaks more quickly and also makes several quick, small slaps of her left hand on her left thigh. Quickly stated phrases such as this have been described by Silverman (1997) as “turbulent speech pattern”, and Cesario (2006) felt that such an increased speech rate gave emphasis to what was being said and invites closer attention of the hearing recipient. Her small hand slaps also suggest she is punctuating these statements. D nods his head throughout this section and keeps his focus directly on P showing that he is attending closely to what she is saying.

Exemplar XIV

- 306 D: if I'm hearing correctly it sounds like (hhh) nothing (.) positive enough
307 happened for you to want to continue that=

308 P: =definitely not (0.6) no and (0.5)

309 D: so he didn't (0.7) ever get what you wanted to talk abo[ut]

310 P: [no] (.) he never did=

311 D: =OK=

312 P: =he wanted to talk about what he wanted to talk about

In lines 306-307, D offers P a tentative summary (“if I’m hearing you correctly”) of what she has been saying. P quickly agrees, in 308, with “definitely not” which follows the end of D’s words in line 307 with no discernable break. The ‘=’ signs used in this segment represent that there is no break, as though the subsequent next speaker’s words ‘latch’ onto the preceding speaker’s words (ten Have, 1999). Although “definitely not”, taken out of context, sounds like non-agreement with a preceding statement. In this case, “definitely not” is agreement with “nothing positive enough happened for you” (D, lines 306-307). It as though P has answered a question without D having asked a question (ten Have, 1999). The “so” at the start of line 309 which occurs after a brief pause at the end

of line 308 suggests that D has been putting this thought together while P has been speaking and keeping it back until his turn or a place where this will fit in their discussion (Bolden, 2005). In line 309, D emphasizes “get” and “you” and, in line 312, P emphasizes “he”; the length of these lines is about the same length and about the counsellor P has been describing. The overlapping speech (end of line 309 and beginning of 310) and P’s emphasis on “he” suggest that she is readily taking up D’s emphasis. Also, the emphases and nearly matching patterns show how P and D have become synchronized in their understanding about what P has said about this counsellor (Clark, 2002).

From the start of line 309 to the end of 312 there is only one very brief pause. These lines flow so smoothly together that, when listening to them, it almost sounds as though one person is speaking. D’s words and meaning in line 309 are echoed by what P says in line 312 and it almost as though D has completed what P might have said after “and” in line 308. P repairs slightly, in line 312, what D says in line 310 (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998). Completing a conversational partner’s utterances and overlapping speech suggest that D and P are collaborating in a co-constructed joint effort (Coates, 1997). P’s “no” at the start of line 310 suggests that she recognizes what D is saying and the rest of line 310 (“he never did”) completes D’s thought in 309 (Hutchby & Wooffitt, 1998).

Discussing a client’s previous counselling experiences may be helpful to understand client preferences. Counsellors may also gain insight into places where matches and non-matches between themselves and clients may be important to clients. Noting places of overlapping speech and completing conversational partner’s utterances may facilitate

understanding of the collaborative and co-constructed processes in counselling conversations.

7. Feeling Comfortable with and Supported by the Researcher

Conversation as dance.

Conversation participants orient to each other via speech as well as through their body language and gestures as they co-ordinate to the talk in each turn and adjacency pairs. Participants dynamically negotiate what is relevant to them through their discursive positions or ‘locations’ (Edley, 2001). Gender (Butler, 1990, 1993b; Sedgwick, 1990), sexuality (Hanson, 1995), virtual (online) gender and sexuality (Sundén, 2002) were considered “dynamic, performative engagement[s] which [are] never complete” (McIlvenny, 2002, p. 2). This view matches social constructionist perspectives that conversation is a performance (Billig, 1996; Holzman, 1999), constructed and constituted through interaction (Speer, 2005). Taking the view of conversation as performance, Strong (2002) suggested that conversations may play out “like dance partners...[who] use words and ways of talking from [their] discourses to lead and follow, to try to get in sync with each other, and, ideally, to create a shared experience” (p. 252). During these dance-like performances, conversation participants can be seen and heard to take up, make sense of and respond to each other’s talk in a co-ordinated and jointly negotiated process. In Exemplar XV, D and Neil occasionally co-produced what appear to be smooth and intricate pieces of choreography.

The next exemplar is from the conversation with Neil, mid-40s, who self-identifies as gay. He competed in a winter sport at an international level and is still now involved in the sport as a coach. In the second session, N said that he selected this segment because

"I felt comfortable with you...you were supportive and you were there for me". In this segment, I focus my analyses on nonverbal interactions. Although most discourse analyses focus on what is said or written, much may be learned by looking closely at the entire interaction. Scheurich (1995), for example, felt that, in interviews, "[s]ome of what occurs is verbal. Some is nonverbal. Some occurs only within the mind of each participant (interviewer or interviewee), but it may affect the entire interview. Sometimes participants...cannot find the right words to express [themselves]" (Scheurich, 1995, p. 244).

In the transcription of the following exemplar I have included description of as much of D's and N's body movements and gestures as possible as they are the focus of much of my analyses here. The transcription will likely be even more challenging to follow than the transcriptions of the other exemplars. Due to the manner of transcription here, the segment appears to be rather long, although it was only about 40 seconds. D and N have just been talking about the idea that some of the topics they had been discussing have not been common ones for N and, earlier in the conversation, N says that this is the first time he has spoken about his sexuality other than to his male partner.

Exemplar XV

- 1298 N & D: {right legs crossed over left so that right lateral lower legs just above the
 1299 lateral ankles are resting on left knees, right leg rotated laterally so that legs
 1300 form a figure '4'; left hands at left medial ankles and right hands at right knees}
 1301 N: um (0.6) y'know (0.4) say when I did come out {right hand moves toward body
 1302 and then away from and to the right from body and goes back toward right knee
 1303 and both hands clasp just inferior to right knee}
 1304 D: sure
 1305 N: um (0.7) so there's no: (0.7) um (0.6) hidden secrets
 1306 D: right {several small head nods}
 1307 N: y'know that kind of thing {several small head nods}
 1308 D: [(hhh) um (1.5) {left hand moves to just behind left ear and scratches head}]

- 1309 N: [{clasped hands move down right lower leg to left ankle}]
- 1310 D: I guess {left hand moves forward from head and makes one small circle in the
 1311 air toward body and then goes back to left ankle} I'm I'm wondering at this
 1312 point {both hands come off right lower leg and make small back and forth
 1313 movement and go back to leg clasped just below right knee} um it felt
 1314 comfortable(.) um I- I'm wondering if there's anything {hands unclasp and turn
 1315 with palms upward then moves forearms into the air and moves hands back and
 1316 forth and go back to rest on lower leg right hand on right knee and left hand on
 1317 right ankle} that (hhh) we (.) that might have happened that you'd went oh (.)
 1318 yeah that made it a bit easy to talk about so (0.6) {hands come off leg turn
 1319 palms up and go back to mid-lower leg clasped together} if off kind of off the
 1320 top of your head (0.3)
- 1321 N: I- I think um: (1.1) y'know if the questions weren't clear (.) clear in my head
 1322 (0.4) even though your your delivery was (.) really well (0.7) delivered (hhh)
 1323 um (0.4) in my own head {right hand moves off lower leg toward head and
 1324 makes circular and back and forth gestures in the air} I- I maybe needed to
 1325 (1.3) clarify
- 1326 D: mm-hmmh
- 1327 N: exactly what it was that (0.4) y'know which you which you {both hands come
 1328 off lower leg and with palms up move slightly toward D} did (.) really well
- 1329 D: so we {hands come off lower leg and move back in forth in the air and go back
 1330 to lower leg right hand on right knee left hand on right ankle} [spent some
 1331 [spent some time=]
- 1332 N: [{small head nods}]
- 1333 D: =clarifyi[ng for you]
- 1334 N: [clar iying
- 1335 D & N: {both nod heads}
- 1336 D: wh[at we were talking]
- 1337 N: [what we were] talking about
- 1338 [um {right hand twisting right pant leg hem}]
- 1339 D: [OK {left hand twisting right pant leg hem}]

D and N, in lines 1298-1300, are seated in virtually the same position and throughout this segment both D and N gesture with their hands when they speak in ways which appear to complement what they are saying and then after the gestures move their hands back to matching positions. N, for example, in lines 1301-1303, moves his right hand toward and then away from his body when he says "when I did come out"; in lines 1323-1324, moves his right hand toward his head and circles in the air with "in my own head"; and, in lines 1327-1328, moves both his hands palms upward toward D with "which you

did". D, in lines 1314-1317, unclasps his hands and moves them back and forth in the air between himself and N with "if there's anything that we that might have happened" and, in lines 1329-1331, again takes his hands off his lower leg and moves them back and forth in the air with "we spent some time". N and D only gesture when they are speaking, within their 'turn' (Fox, 1999) and their bodies are relatively unmoving when the other person is speaking unless, as in lines 1307, 1332, when N nods his head and line 1335 when both N and D nod their heads at the same time. These head nods act as interactive information that let N and D know, while they are speaking, that they are being heard and encouraged; that is, even while either N or D is speaking, he is also noting and 'listening' to the nonverbal cues of the other person and interpreting those cues even while he speaks, co-ordinating understanding between them (McClave, 2000). We displayed or signaled to each other that we understood each other as our conversation progressed (Clark & Krych, 2004).

One of the first times that I was watching and listening (with headphones) to this segment I had to take off the headphones to answer the phone. While I was on the phone I could still see the movements but could no longer hear what N and D were saying. I noticed that our movements were like an improvised yet beautifully choreographed form of communicative dance with each of us occasionally taking turns and sometimes moving together; sometimes the gestures and movements were large (hand and arm movements) and sometimes small (head movements and subtle, almost imperceptible pant leg hem twisting, lines 1337 and 1339). Our gestures, both large and small, ensured and contributed to our effective communication. I am not surprised that N picked this as a

segment which showed that he felt comfortable with me and from analyzing myself in this segment I believe that we appear comfortable with and supported by each other.

One of the many challenges of transcription is to include enough gestural and nonverbal description without interfering with the ‘readability’ of what is spoken. Although there is a clear back-and-forth and turn-taking in lines 1299-1329, lines 1329-1339 occurred almost simultaneously. I have transcribed this in an alternate format here:

D: so we spent some time clarifyi[ng for you] wh[at we were talking]
 N: [clarify]ing [what we were] talking about

This short section of our talk takes just over 2 seconds of time and, from ‘clarifying’ to ‘talking about’, it sounds as though it is the same line of dialogue which has been given to 2 actors who have been told to say the line with one starting just marginally before the other. We co-ordinated this section in a ‘first take’ and I think that if N and D were actually given lines, as actors, to co-ordinate in this manner that there would be significant practice to manage this as seamlessly as they did. This matches what Shotter (1995) described as joint action and shared intentionality. N appears to have ‘latched’ (ten Have, 1999) onto what D is saying so tightly that the words are virtually simultaneous. The complementary and synchronized gestures gave pragmatic information to both D and N that culminated in the clear agreement between them in these lines (Gerwing & Bavelas, 2004; Pelose, 1987). The overlapping and matching speech indicate D and N have reached common ground and shared understanding (Coates, 1997). D and N match or mimic each other in what they say, in gesture and in body movement and this synchronization provide each of them with feedback on how they can move forward with the conversation.

Pauses: Problematic disfluencies or synchronizations?

Rendle-Short (2004) described pauses, uhs, and ums as conventional fillers in speech. Although they are sometimes viewed as problems (Clark, 1994), they are also considered to be solutions to problems (Clark, 2002; Clark & Fox Tree, 2002) and places which show understanding between speakers (Clark & Krych, 2004). Occasionally, speakers need time to think or figure out what they want to say next. These fillers act to hold pieces of a speaker's dialogue together and may be places where a speaker is challenged to express meaningful information about a difficult or delicate topic (Fox Tree, 2002; Louwerse & Mitchell, 2003). A speaker's pauses may indicate difficulties in describing experiences which have not been articulated before (Levitt, 2001).

Exemplar XVI

1227 N: um (0.4) to get me to talk and (.) to s- to say things an' (0.7) that kind of thing
 1228 and um (0.5) he: (0.6) was the one who said well you you are gay (0.7)
 1229 D: um so through those (0.3) conversations with him (hhh) um (0.5) you were
 1230 able to (1.3) I I guess I'm wondering what (hhh) what um: (2.0) what made it
 1231 easier to talk to him (0.8) for you is is one thing (0.7)
 1232 N: um: (1.1) I think (0.6) um (1.6) in a way I wasn't really (0.7) looking for (0.8) a
 1233 change in my life from (0.5) from marriage or [whate]ver
 1234 D: [sure {nodding head twice}]
 1235 N: but (hhh) um: (0.9) when you need something you have a sense of (0.7)
 1236 y'know (0.5) this is (1.1) this is right an' (0.6) there was (0.5) a feeling of (0.8)
 1237 trust an' (0.8) um compassion in a person who (1.3) who really (0.5) cared for
 1238 you even though (.) my wife (0.5) was like that too but

Further along:

1260 D: yeah but sometimes those a- those some of the (0.5) hard part to (0.5) define or
 1261 (0.4) pinpoint or (0.8) uh describe (0.8) what is it about this person but it
 1262 sounds like it's almost k' (0.6) an emotional (0.8) thing that
 1263 N: [very]
 1264 D: [made] it easier
 1265 N: very emotional (0.4) um (0.7) like (0.4) there was a time where (0.8) y'know
 1266 we we took a two weeks (0.8) leave from (.) each other

In these two brief segments, it is apparent that both N and D have many pauses and small sections of speech. Some of the pauses are quite long (up to 2.0 seconds) and the

speech may appear to be quite stilted. At the same time, N and D speak in almost matching cadences and patterns of breaks and even similar length of pauses. Ums generally signal major delays and uhs minor delays (Clark & Fox Tree, 2002). D, in line 1230, has a 2.0 second pause after “um” and N, in line 1232, has pauses of 1.1 and 1.6 seconds after “um”. The first pause in line 1230 is where D stops the line of thought at “you were able to” with no object for the prepositional phrase and, during the pause, moves the direction of what he is saying and tentatively (“I I”) starts to ask N a question rather than complete a statement. D is not moving quickly to the question (“what (.hhh) what um: (2.0) made it easier) and breaks his dialogue into pieces or chunks which almost match N’s prior turn and takes care to be sensitive to how they are proceeding about a delicate topic.

There are other places in their conversation where N and D have several pauses and these, like here, occur where they are discussing potentially difficult or emotional topics (see lines 1262-1265, for example). N and D work out how they may move forward in these conversations in ways that are viable and acceptable for both of them. Each of them take up where they go together with these delicate topics and this is the first time N has spoken to anyone about some of them. Counsellors may find that they may be the first person that a minority sexuality client has had the opportunity to talk about a delicate topic such as sexuality. N, for example, confirms immediately below that this is the case for him.

Exemplar XVII

1157 D: this is the first conversation?

1158 N: yeah (hhh) this might be the first conversation

The importance of non-verbal communication is not a novel idea and has been emphasized for counsellors, especially for diversity and multicultural counsellors (see Welch, 2003, for example). Watching the interaction between D and N, described above, supports the notion that there was important nonverbal communication indicating clear agreement in their complementary and synchronized gestures. I believe it makes sense to connect Pedersen's (1995) suggestion that all communication is cross-cultural and attending to nonverbal communication in all counselling sessions and especially with minority and non-dominant group clients.

Participants' Segment Selections: Second Session/IPR Interview

In the preceding seven sections, I have provided detailed discursive analyses of segments selected by participants as helpful for them to talk about sexuality. I have noted links of what was helpful to them to facilitative counselling practices. In this section, I describe how I developed the theme categories and how I organized the seven sections of analyses from them. These themes came directly from the specific reasons or explanations of what participants said was helpful to them to talk about sexuality in the segments they had selected. After we watched a particular segment, we had an audio-taped conversation, and I asked them, 'I wonder if you could tell me about what you found helpful in this segment for you to talk about sexuality or identity'. I provide support, from their choices, for the particular exemplars I analyzed in relation to my research question, 'What practices facilitate conversations about sexualities and identities between GLBTQ or minority sexuality athletes and counsellors or psychologists?'

As I described in Chapter 3, participants were given the video-recorded first session to take home and choose one to three passages they felt were helpful to them to talk about

sexuality and then meet with me again to briefly discuss the selected passages. These discussions ranged from as short as 30 seconds to about 3 minutes per segment. Once I had finished all of the second session interviews, I used the Transana (Version 1.22) software program to facilitate transcription of the 21 passages participants had chosen.

When I started looking at the amount of transcribed lines of conversations from the participant-selected passages (1800 lines), I realized that if I analyzed everything, the analysis chapter was probably going to be over 400 pages long. During the detailed transcription, I had become familiar with the content of the selected passages. I recognized that there was likely going to be a fair bit of redundancy of the kinds of things which participants had found helpful. For example, I had noticed that several participants had chosen passages in which we had spoken about heterosexist discourses and heterosexism they had experienced.

I also did simple transcriptions, in Microsoft Word, of the audio-recorded second sessions. Once I had finished transcribing all of the discussions of the chosen segments, I began to look at the transcribed passages to organize the themes or specific things that the participants had found helpful. Initially, I started inserting colour-coded notes for each new theme in a discussion segment. Because I had done the detailed transcription from the video-recorded sessions first, I was not surprised to find that some themes were noted in more than one participant's discussions of what was helpful.

Organizing the Themes from Participant-Selected Passages

In order to organize the themes I found into a manageable number of cohesive topics or themes, I recognized that I had to improve my system of thematic analysis. Several researchers (Gough, 2002, in press; Henwood, 1993; Lugton, 1997; Willott & C. Griffin,

1997) have adapted and drawn from Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to help organize data so that they were able to use discourse analyses. Willott and Griffin, for example, felt that it was possible to combine grounded theory and poststructuralist discourse analysis “in a way that maintains the potential benefits of each without becoming enmeshed in epistemological conflict” (p. 111). They employed some of the organizational features of grounded theory to help them select pieces of talk, by unemployed men in England, about masculinities on which to do discursive analysis.

Gough (2002) combined features of grounded theory and discourse analysis, often previously “seen as incompatible but becoming more acceptable to combine in productive ways” (p. 223). He identified themes from group discussions, by male second year university Psychology students in northern England, about gender and sexuality. He further compared and contrasted the themes and then did discursive analysis on them. In a more recent study (Gough, in press), he utilized a “systematic thematic analysis akin to grounded theory [to generate] a set of relevant categories” to analyze. He used discourse analysis to examine these categories from online web postings by gay athletes.

I felt that I might draw from grounded theory to guide to systematically organize the various themes (Charmaz, 2000, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1994, 1998). I started over with the first participant’s transcribed audio-recorded discussion, and began a line-by-line examination. I continued to insert colour-coded notes and labeled each with short names (also numbered for the particular participant and sequentially for each ‘new’ theme) to categorize the various themes. I also started another file, in table format, into which I inserted the numbered and labeled categories. Although

the manner in which I organized my research data was somewhat akin to grounded theory organizing practices, I have not done grounded theory.

I was not interested in doing discourse analysis on these audio-recorded sessions, although I was certainly keen on organizing the themes to help me make my final selections of which portions of the participant-selected segments I would analyze (Holstein & Gubrium, 1997). Occasionally, I was surprised by what a participant had felt was helpful when I thought about the passage selected. If what I thought we had been talking about did not match the participant's perspective, I kept in mind that I was primarily interested in the participants' points of view about what was helpful (Charmaz, 2006). I also used their language in the themes (for example, 'homophobia' rather than 'heterosexism'). At this point, I had 28 statements organized into 10 themes. After carefully examining the initial themes, I determined that some of the themes were similar enough to merge and there were 7 remaining themes (see Table 2, below). Following the Table 2, I briefly describe how participants' words helped me develop the first two themes.

Table 2

Themes from First Conversations

	Theme	# of participants with theme
1	Recognizing and being able to talk about experiences of homophobia and heterosexism in their sports and lives	7
2	Characteristics of or things about person or persons to whom participant first spoke to about his or her sexuality; disclosure and 'coming out'	5
3	Understandings and 'ramblings' were clarified; ideas were reflected and summarized	4
4	Having space to talk about sexuality or identity and being able to get perspective about it and make sense of it	4

5	Having the chance to synthesize or process	3
6	Being able to talk about what was helpful and, particularly, not helpful in counselling experiences in the past	2
7	Feeling comfortable with and supported by Don; feeling that Don was being 'real'	2

Themes in the Helpful Passages

From these themes, I think it makes sense to analyze the first interview sessions as interactional activities where we made sense *of* each other as well as *with* each other (Baker & G. Johnson, 1998). Although analyses of research interviews have often focused solely on the words of the interviewees, Roulston (2006) believed that what interviewers do in co-constructing the conversations in interviews should also be highlighted. Our joint and active participation in these conversations contributed to what the participants chose as meaningful and helpful to them. Identifying the themes helped direct me, for my analyses, to the kinds of activities and co-construction we negotiated in the passages. Additionally, they also helped me consider what facilitative spaces we had co-created which relate to counselling practices (Ponterotto, 1998). I have only chosen two of the seven themes to discuss below. In Chapter 5, I integrate the themes with the discursive practices noted in the analyses of the seven themes.

Contesting and deconstructing heterosexism and homophobia.

Participants employed various words to describe these experiences: homophobia, barriers, problems, and heterosexism depending on which seemed to fit for them. Again, although I was curious about how these words were used and would have enjoyed taking time to talk about what these words may have meant for us, my focus was on how we might open up space for participants to talk about their experiences and, perhaps, make meaning for themselves about those experiences. One participant felt the discussion

helped her “realize that we never did talk about [sexuality]…we tippy-toed around it” and “two top players that came onto our team…quit” when they learned there were lesbian players on the team and that “it was never welcoming [to lesbians] back then”.

Disclosure/coming out.

Although I was curious about what participants had noticed about those persons they had first spoken to about their sexuality, I was also mindful that the term ‘coming out’ was, at least for me, more essentialist than postmodern (Clausen, 1999). I introduced my curiosities by saying something like, ‘I wonder if you could tell me, if there was a first person you told about your sexuality, what it was about that person that made it easier to tell him or her or how you chose that person’. All of the participants, even those who used words like ‘queer’ or ‘minority sexuality’ to describe their sexuality, used ‘coming out’ in their narratives. I recognize that, for most people, ‘coming out’ is most readily utilized and understood even if they consider themselves to have multiple identities or various contextual identities. Rather than spend time deconstructing or contesting this term, perhaps something for my future research, I felt that finding out participant experiences and their perspectives about them were salient to the present research and, thus, would follow their lead with this term after the first time they used it. What one participant felt was helpful: “that’s why I picked her because I knew that she understood emotions I knew that she had…empathy and compassion and that allowed me to make sense of…that situation”.

‘Extra’ Questions in the Second Session Interview

After we discussed the selected passages, I asked participants if I could ask them two more questions: a) What, if anything, might you have thought about, from the first

session, after you left? and, b) What would be helpful for you or what would you look for in a counsellor if you chose to see one in the future? I told participants that these questions were not related to the research project but to my curiosities which had arisen after our first sessions and that they could feel free to decline answering these two questions. All participants agreed to answer the questions. I used the same methods described above to develop Tables 3 and 4 relating to the two questions, respectively.

Although our initial conversations were not counselling sessions, the idea that people make sense of or make use of what is done in a conversation and this occurs after the conversation fits with postmodern counselling practices (for example, Solution Focused Therapy, de Shazer, 1999). I was curious if our initial first interviews had been starting points for any of the participants to build from or expand upon any of the things which we had discussed and which fit for them after the first sessions. Table 3 is a summary of the themes of the responses that participants had to the question, ‘What, if anything, might you have thought about, from the first session, after you left?’

Table 3

First ‘Extra Question’: What have you thought about from the first session?

	Responses	# of participants
1	Wanted to show the video recording to partner, parents, family, and friends – liked what had been discussed; act as explanation	2
2	Wanted to have a copy of the video recording; to be able to look at it again; to have as a kind of narrative recording of their life	2
3	Wrote down pieces about homophobia and wanting to do more anti-homophobia work; work to increase and enhance present anti-homophobia work	2
4	Thought about connecting thinking and feeling	1
5	Thought about feeling good having had the chance to speak freely about own sexuality and feeling good in that comfort zone	1
6	Liked thinking about life history and how being gay fit into his life as part but not all of him	1

In the course of the first research conversations, participants and I had discussed some of their previous counselling experiences at least for those participants who had previous counselling. I felt that all of the participants might be able to describe at least some of the things that they thought would be important considerations if they sought a counsellor in the future. Table 4 is a summary of the themes in their responses to the question, ‘What would be helpful for you or what would you look for in a counsellor if you chose to see one in the future?’

Table 4

Second ‘Extra Question’: Helpful/necessary requirements of possible future counsellor

	Requirements/characteristics	# of participants
1	Body language, facial expressions, posture show counsellor is GLBTQ embracing; non-judgemental	4
2	Counsellor has ‘run the same path’; is GLBTQ; has similar background of experiences	3
3	Counsellor shows vulnerability; reveals self; being ‘real’ and fully engaged	3
4	Must be able to feel completely comfortable with counsellor	1
5	Client agenda is most important and counsellor supports this	1
6	Counsellor checks with clients whether they feel understood and whether counsellor and clients have common understandings	1
7	Counsellor has a group of clients with similar backgrounds and helps discussions among the group	1

In this chapter, I drew from grounded theory to assist me in the development of the common themes of what participants found helpful to talk about sexuality. I was then able to do detailed discourse analyses on portions of the participant-selected passages to highlight the facilitative practices in our talk-in-interaction. That is, I discussed what we *did* together in the back-and-forth of our co-constructed conversations that participants felt was helpful to them to talk about sexuality. In the following chapter, I summarize

how these facilitative practices may help counsellors who work with minority sexuality clients.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

One task of the intellectual is the effort to break down the stereotypes and reductive categories that are so limiting to human thought and communication. (Said, 1994, p. xi)

In this study, I examined passages of conversations about sexuality between myself and gay and lesbian athletes. The passages were specific sections of the conversations that the participants chose as having been helpful to them to talk about sexuality. After reviewing literature on sexuality, specifically minority sexuality, and counselling, I recognized that virtually no studies focused on what persons of minority sexuality felt was helpful to them to talk to counsellors, or anyone else, about sexuality. I was informed by and drew from micro-analytical (conversation analysis) and macro-analytical (critical discourse analysis) perspectives, theories, and practices in my discourse analyses of the specific, facilitating passages in our conversations. I was informed by grounded theory methods to derive seven themes in the participant-identified passages to organize my approach to the analyses. Although I have been guided by grounded theory research methods, I have not, however, done grounded theory analyses in the comprehensive manner suggested by Strauss and Corbin (1994) or Charmaz (2006).

I analyzed approximately 30 minutes from the 80 minutes of passages chosen by participants to illustrate what participants and I did in our talk-in-interaction in these sections that they perceived as helpful or facilitative to talk about sexuality. I recognize that I provide one particular understanding of what occurred in these passages and that I have been particularly influenced in my analyses - by social constructionist, feminist, and queer perspectives. In this chapter, I first describe how my analyses of the specific

passages offer considerations for counsellors, psychologists, and sport mental trainers who work with minority sexuality clients. I follow this with a short section on how particular discursive practices may be helpful to both mental health practitioners and researchers. In the next section, I make connections between social constructionist, queer, and multicultural and diversity counselling perspectives. In the final section of this chapter, I make suggestions and recommendations for future research possibilities as well as point out the limitations of this study.

Facilitating Practices for Mental Health Practitioners and Minority Sexuality Clients

Most, if not all, mental health therapists work with, or have worked with, minority sexuality clients. Pope-Davis and his colleagues (Pope-Davis et al., 2002) also encouraged client perspectives to be considered in counselling settings. Counsellors who work with non-dominant and minority clients need to be aware of the sociopolitical and historical contexts of their clients, ‘extraclient’ variables that may be related to clients’ counselling concerns (Pope-Davis, Liu, Toporek, & Brittan-Powell, 2001). Minority sexuality persons’ experiences may, at least in part, be shaped by being from a marginalized or stigmatized group (Martel, Sarfen, & Prince, 2004). I have shown, in my analyses, some of the fine details in our talk-in-interaction in our conversations about sexuality. The findings that I propose are based on conversations that were research conversations and not counselling conversations. I suggest, however, that analogies for mental health practitioners and minority sexuality clients are appropriate. Additionally, I have also noted places where larger ‘Discourses’ have influenced both what we discussed as well as how we discussed those topics.

Working from social constructionist, feminist, and queer perspectives, I recognize how the analyzed passages in our research conversations highlight practices which particularly fit with postmodern (narrative, solution-focused, and collaborative language systems) and multicultural counselling practices. In the next section, I discuss what the participants identified as helpful in the passages I analyzed and the contributions to practitioners who work with minority sexuality clients. I have used the seven themes as a way of organizing discursive practices illustrated in the participant-selected passages from our conversations. In some instances, a particular conversation or critical discourse analysis links with the particular theme (for example, deconstruction and heterosexist discourse). In most cases, however, I have noted how discursive practices may be helpful to counselling practices without suggesting that they are formulaic.

1. Recognizing and Talking about Heterosexism and Homophobia

During our first conversations, all 8 participants talked about experiences of homophobia (their word choice) and heterosexism in their sports, with counsellors, or in other areas of their lives. It should not be a surprise that minority sexuality persons are vulnerable to loneliness, depression, isolation, and suicide related, at least in part, to their experiences of oppression and marginalization (Dubé & Savin-Williams, 1999). There is a large challenge to create relationships of recognition, acceptance, and support to increase the efficacy of psychosocial interventions specifically suitable for them.

Seven participants chose passages in which we acknowledged their experiences of homophobia and heterosexism as having been helpful to them to talk about sexuality. We worked collaboratively to deconstruct their experiences within the constraints of their particular sport and other cultural discourses. Noticing, asking about and discussing their

'othering' experiences (Strong & Zeman, 2005) provided fertile space for both deconstructing and re-constructing these experiences. Additionally, our discussions translated to possible social justice and social action anti-homophobic stances and activities. Deconstruction has been imported from discursive, feminist, and queer theory and used as a practice in narrative therapy (Boston, 2005). Further, Platzer (2006) believed that encouraging minority sexuality clients to connect to their active community groups and find support could help these clients resist heterosexist and other dominant discourses they might have experienced in mental health care settings.

Participants had the opportunity to talk about their experiences of oppression and heterosexism in a way which made sense for them. My analyses of Exemplars I-IV (pages 102-114) with Frank, Pat, and Victor examined both the macro-sociocultural influences and the micro-details in these passages. This matches Harrison's (2000) suggestion that counsellors work at both the micro and macro level with minority sexuality clients. That is, working with clients in the local back-and-forth conversation of counselling as well as addressing larger cultural influences and discourses affecting clients beyond the counselling setting.

I believe that while it is important to encourage embracing and supportive social attitudes in sport the political context in which minority sexualities are constructed and enacted may still be inhospitable for minority sexuality athletes. Consider the death threats which John Amaechi has received since recently (February, 2007) coming out as a gay, ex-National Basketball Association player (<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,20867,21224200-23769,00.html>). Amaechi said that he wants to send a message to GLBTQ athletes in all sports and was quoted as saying:

I'm doing this for the high school quarterback who is thinking about sticking his head in a noose because he can't come to grips with the fact he's gay. What I'm trying to do is create a discourse, open people's minds.

I believe this exemplifies the importance of counsellors' attending to or even introducing larger cultural discourses in counselling conversations, to talk about sexuality in "sport in ways that challenge normative discursive ideologies and arouse political activism in an effort to eliminate injustice and create social change" (C. W. Johnson & Kivel, 2007, p. 103). My analyses illustrate how both macro and micro discursive analyses may be translated to and helpful for counselling minority sexuality clients.

2. What made Disclosure or 'Coming Out' Easier?

Although disclosing one's minority sexuality or coming out to another person or persons is relatively safe for most people in Europe and North America, this is not the case in many parts of the world (Quiroga, 2000). Being 'out' has been associated with better mental health when compared with those who are not 'out' (Greene, 1994; Kahn, 1991; Morris, Waldo & Rothblum, 2001) though more recent findings have been equivocal (Bosker, 2003). There is, however, increased risk of violence and other negative experiences for those who come out, even in North America (Dunbar, 2006).

Five participants chose segments in which they talked about the first people to whom they disclosed their sexuality as having been helpful for them to talk about sexuality. Not surprisingly, participants felt most confident disclosing their sexuality to someone they could trust. The confidants, as described by participants, appeared to be supportive of the participants and had non-pathological perspectives of minority sexuality (Kilgore, Sideman, Amin, Baca, & Bohanske, 2005). Participants felt that disclosure to their

confidants had been helpful to them when they felt emotional support, complete acceptance, and reassurance (Lebolt, 1999). Talking about those experiences, in our research conversations, had also been helpful to them to integrate and understand their experiences.

Being able to talk to confidants, people who appear to have taken affirmative stances toward minority sexuality, may have helped the participants to overcome earlier experiences of heterosexism and homophobia (Isay, 1996). One participant, Victor, said that by having the chance, in our research conversation, to talk about his earlier disclosure experiences, “allow[ed] me to synthesize my life and to see the progress...and see the construct I had of ‘I’ll never be good enough’ was flawed at some level”. I think this fits with Lyotard’s (1984) view on paralogy that conversationalists have a place to evaluate the legitimacy of their beliefs and ideas without pre-set criteria to judge that legitimacy.

In Exemplar VI (pages 118-119), gentle contestation was displayed. D introduced a tentative response to what the participant, V, had been saying previously. What is interesting in this passage is how the co-participants negotiate with and respond to each other. What may be helpful to counsellors is to attend to what occurs in such passages of talk where participants negotiate collaboratively in a gentle contestation.

3. Understandings, Clarifications, Reflections, and Summaries

Post-modern, constructionist, and discursive perspectives view conversations and language as a matrix for meaning-making and understanding (Neimeyer, 1998). Half of the participants chose passages where they felt they gained understandings, clarifications, reflections, or summaries which were helpful to them. In these passages, we

interactionally accomplished shared understandings and came to a conversational “common ground” (Clark & Brennan, 1991).

In my analyses, I showed how we negotiated getting to such shared understandings by closely examining places in the selected passages where we considered whether words we offered fit for either conversation participant. For example, in my analysis of Exemplar IX (pages 122-127) with J, I found that J and I moved from initially tentative agreement to stronger agreement until our joint acknowledgements meant that we had come to mutual understandings. These negotiations came through questions and summaries (for example, lines 1481-1487 on page 123), what Shawver (2004) called “generous listening”, that helped to clarify and make sense of what was initially unclear. I believe that places where counsellor summaries are reformulations that fit for clients and where clients indicate that they have been understood may be particularly helpful in counselling. It is important clients feel that they have been heard and understood. Grote (2006), for example, found that clients’ feeling understood is a strong predictor of positive outcomes in psychotherapy.

These acknowledgements came through words as well as through eye focus. Attending to eye focus, contact, and gaze can illustrate how conversation participants track and work collaboratively with each other and draw attention to what they are hearing as well as what they are saying (Bavelas, et al., 2002). This may seem like an obvious facilitating practice for counsellors yet specifically looking for and attending to these particular micro-conversation activities can be helpful for counsellors (Gale et al., 1995). This may be particularly useful where the counsellor is unsure if there is sufficient agreement between the counsellor and client(s) to move forward in the conversation.

4. Creating Space, Gaining Perspective, Making Sense

People from non-dominant ethnicities generally have family who share the same ethnic background. Conversely, GLBTQ persons usually do not grow up in households where their parents also have minority sexualities and experiences of marginalization related to sexuality. Those from non-dominant ethnic backgrounds experience are very likely discuss their non-dominant ethnicity with family and others while growing up. This is not the case for most people with minority sexualities. Talking about sexuality can be a delicate topic for anyone and may be even more challenging for GLBTQ persons especially if they do not know whether it is safe to discuss their sexuality (Israel & Selvidge, 2003).

Minority sexuality persons may be very cautious about introducing conversation about sexuality until they have some idea of the perspectives and opinions of their conversational partners. As C. Kitzinger and Perkins (1992) suggested, “Language does much more than simply provide a convenient label or tag for the world. The labels we choose reflect and constitute our politics” (p. 35) I would add that language and words may also reflect views on morality. Discussion of sexuality is unlikely to be a neutral subject. Silverman (2001) felt that interactional solutions to any problems or turbulent places in conversations about ‘delicate’ matters “arise in the sequential organization of talk” (p. 131). Although discussion of sexuality is not always salient for GLBTQ clients, being prepared for those discussions, when they do occur, is relevant for mental health care practitioners. I believe that counsellors and counsellor educators can gain insight into these interactional solutions by closely examining their own and others’

conversations about sexuality. These conversations may occur with colleagues and friends as well as with clients.

Half of the participants chose passages in which having space to talk about sexuality and make sense for themselves was helpful to them. Our conversations permitted discussions of a ‘delicate’ topic and, within the conversations, participants had a context in which to make sense of the discussions. Many minority sexuality persons seek counsellors to “create a safe place to explore, understand, and eventually shed the impact of [experiences of] disempowerment and alienation” (O’Dell, 2000, p. 174). Participants viewed our conversational space as a safe place to talk about and reflect on delicate subjects. That is, there was an implied space where we were engaged as dialogical partners and where we worked out our “joint actions” (Shotter, 1993a, 1993b). Further, participants could discuss what was reflected upon in a supportive, rather than marginalizing, environment.

Mair and Izzard (2001) suggested that such a space may help clients explore and work through experiences of homophobia and heterosexism. Barry (2000) felt that it may be even more important for minority sexuality youth to have safe spaces to develop resistances to heterosexist and ageist cultural views. In our research conversations, all of the participants discussed experiences of heterosexism while they were youth or young adults.

Using discursive analytic methods on conversations about a delicate subject like sexuality can make how the conversation participants co-managed this discussion observable. In Exemplar X (pages 127-136), K, the participant, does most of the speaking and yet, upon closer examination, D is a very active listener. Presentation markers (*oh*,

y'know, and like, Fuller, 2003b) indicated the importance and saliency for K of what he was saying. D's many head nods and few verbalizations are sufficient for K to recognize encouragement, support, and understanding (McClave, 2000). Listening skills are often considered vital for counsellors and micro-examination of interactions about delicate subjects are useful for learning how speakers manage, co-ordinate, and negotiate their speech with each other, dialogically. Counsellors and researchers may benefit from closely examining their own conversations about delicate topics to learn what may be helpful.

5. Synthesizing and Processing

Three participants chose segments in which they thought what was helpful to them was to be able to process something for themselves or, for one participant, that the conversation “allowed [him] to synthesize my life and see the progress”. For another participant, talking about barriers and catalysts for minority sexuality persons was “good for [her] to process”. This might be particularly apt for people from multiple, non-dominant groups with multiple social identities. In such conversations they might take up the chance to talk about how cultural categories such as sexuality, ethnicity, gender, and class might fit or be interrelated (C. B. Williams, 2005).

Minority sexuality persons face barriers which may affect their mental health and, as a group, they are also generally underserved by mental health care professionals (Pearson, 2003). Some of these barriers are political and cultural, and bridging gaps and deficiencies in knowledge about GLBTQ persons may help overcome what Healy (2004) described as “heterocentric” models of mental health care. They may also increase awareness that this group has unique mental health care requirements (Uldall & Palmer,

2004). Ritter and Terndrup (2002) felt that mental health care professionals' negative attitudes toward, insufficient education about, and lack of awareness of specific health concerns of GLBTQ persons were barriers to seeking mental health care services.

Identifying what is helpful or facilitating in overcoming barriers can be useful. Developing a GLBTQ social network, community, and friends (Kocet, 2002) and identifying personal, family, workplace, and other resources and strengths (Palma & Stanley, 2002) are just two examples. For mental health professionals, improving affirmative and ethical strategies and practices for working with GLBTQ clients (Beckstead & Israel, 2007) may all be helpful.

In the analyses of Exemplars XI (pages 136-140) and XII (pages 140-144), there are several places that highlight what the participant may have found helpful to her. For example, examining how the conversation participants work out whether certain words fit (for example, barriers, hindering, catalysts, and number of lesbians). Close inspection reveals how they do this with gentle confrontation (D confronts P, the participant), negotiation, and repair (D and P both repair word choice) and then move forward together in the conversation. Taking note of these observable interactions, or negotiations, in this conversation can have instructive value for counsellors.

Confrontation is just one of several discrete counselling skills taught in counsellor training programs to contribute to effective therapeutic change (Ivey & Bradford Ivey, 1999; Packard, 2006). Occasionally, these skills seem to be presented as a 'recipe' for counselling success or what I view as the 'Black Box effect'. That is, the counsellor is encouraged 'to do' a particular skill with a client, something happens in the Black Box, and out comes positive change for the client. I feel that CA can be used to carefully

examine how speakers interact and negotiate conversational developments in ‘the Black Box’. Counsellor educators, students, and counsellors can benefit from attending to collaborative negotiations that occur dialogically in such passages of talk (Strong & Zeman, in press).

6. Previous Counselling Experiences

Many counsellors, whether they are aware of it or not, may be heterosexist or homophobic (Bowers, D. Plummer, & Minichiello, 2005; W. M. L. Lee, 1999). Cochran, J. G. Sullivan, and Mays (2003) found that minority sexuality persons seek out mental health care practitioners at a higher rate than heterosexuals. This may be related, at least in part, to greater social stress from experiences of heterosexism and homophobia (Dohrenwend, 2000). It is a reasonable expectation that a minority sexuality person seeking counselling should receive competent help. The Canadian Counselling Association (1999), the American Counseling Association (1995), and the American Psychological Association (<http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/guidelines.html>) all have codes of ethics and guidelines which encourage counsellors to respect differences and acknowledge diversity, to be sensitive to issues relevant to non-dominant groups, and to acquire and utilize skills appropriate for these clients, including minority sexuality clients.

Two of the participants had never sought counselling. Two of the six participants who had counselling experiences selected passages in which we talked about their previous counselling experiences as being helpful to them. One participant felt that the counsellor (which she left after one session) neither acknowledged her sexuality or that sexuality was at least part of the reason she had sought out a counsellor. This matches Benjamin’s

(1999) notion that a client's wish to be recognized can be negated or destroyed by a therapist and may explain some minority sexuality clients' negative experiences in counselling (O'Dell, 2000). Liddle (1997) found that about one-half of minority sexuality clients felt dissatisfied with their counsellors. Negative perceptions about counsellor practices and attitudes about minority sexuality contributed to clients leaving after one session.

7. Feeling Comfortable with Co-conversant; Being 'Real'

Many minority sexuality clients do not feel as though they make good connections with counsellors (O'Neill, 2002). Two of the participants chose segments in which they said that they felt comfortable with their co-conversant (Don) and that his 'being real' was helpful for them to be able to talk about sexuality. I think this matches H. Anderson's (1997) notion of being 'public' or what some might term 'transparent'. The comfort that both conversation participants felt was displayed as performance (Holzman, 1999) constituted in our interaction (Speer, 2005). This was noted both in what we were saying as well as through what occasionally appeared to be intricately choreographed pieces of body movements. Our work together displays an alliance between us and matches a key component of counselling (Bordin, 1979). Establishing a working alliance has been found to increase client willingness to discuss sexuality (Asay, 2006).

Rapport and therapeutic alliance are considered important for counsellors to learn and establish with clients (for example, Ivey & Bradford Ivey, 1999). Although nonverbal communication has been found to support verbal communications in health counselling settings (Poskiparta et al., 1998) there has been virtually no research utilizing CA in examining nonverbal communication, with respect to rapport and therapeutic alliance, in

counselling sessions. Bedi (2006) found that clients reported nonverbal gestures and body language as 2 of 11 categories which were helpful in establishing counselling alliance formation. I believe that this could be fertile ground for research which uses CA to examine the nonverbal interactions which occur between counsellors and clients.

In Exemplar XVI (pages 153-154), the nonverbal movements appeared to be an important and integral part of the communication. Although our conversation was not a counselling session, I believe that the kind of co-ordinated ‘dance’ we performed was evident in our nonverbal movements and gestures. Moving discursive analyses from this kind of research conversation to counselling interactions can provide important information to counsellors about what nonverbal communication and gestures may mean in relation to rapport and therapeutic alliances. Discourse analysis can help give ‘discursive legs’ (S. Couture, November 15, 2005, personal communication) to the generalizations of the themes in the analyses.

Summary

In my study, research participants and I had conversations about sexuality. These were not counselling conversations with counselling agendas, goals, or identified challenges. I believe, however, that the discursive practices in the passages chosen by the participants as helpful to them to talk about sexuality may also be heuristically instructive for mental health practitioners who work with minority sexuality clients. By examining these passages using both micro- and macro-discursive methods, I was able to highlight *how* we accomplished meanings and understandings between us. This fits a critical postmodern view that “takes into account both the macro-political level of structural

organization and the micro-political level of different and contradictory manifestations of oppression" (McLaren, 1995, p. 209).

By describing these examples of how we negotiated and co-constructed helpful passages, my research can orient mental health workers to discursive practices that may be helpful to them in their clinical practices and research. I recognize how my participation in these conversations and in the analyses provides me with means to become a fully reflexive practitioner and researcher (Etherington, 2004). Additionally, I have had the opportunity to acknowledge the perspectives and values I brought to my research and to recognize that the research process also shaped my experience as a researcher and a counsellor (Bartlett, 2003).

Taking a non-pathological stance on minority sexuality may facilitate co-constructing a safe environment to discuss sexuality and other sensitive issues and to challenge heterosexist and homoprejudicial views in society (Vareldzis & Andronico, 2000). Tierney (1997) suggested that while understanding is valuable and useful, creating a supportive space for empowering marginalized persons is also necessary. It may then be possible to move beyond the safe space and extend it by moving forward with social justice and social issue practices (Barry, 2000; Sinacore & Enns, 2005).

Our conversations were about what might be considered a 'delicate topic' – sexuality. Discussions about sensitive subjects can be challenging at any time but talking about sexuality may be extremely important and even critical for minority sexuality clients. Participants identified passages which they viewed as helpful to them to talk about sexuality and I utilized discursive research methods to examine how we negotiated these sensitive and delicate passages in the performance of our talk.

There are several places in these passages where I noted how the analytic sensitivities of a DA researcher might be useful for counsellors who work with minority sexuality clients. I oriented to micro-aspects of our talk such as discourse markers (mm, uh-huh, y'know, like, OK, yeah), pauses, contestations and repairs, eye gaze and focus, “gayspeak” (Leap, 1996) or “queerspeak” (Bucholtz & K. Hall, 2004), head nods, and gestures and other nonverbal communications. I also found places where we deconstructed larger cultural discourses – in sport, family, and other areas of society – from macro-perspectives. I believe that these micro- and macro-analytic sensitivities helped me better understand how we worked out and negotiated understandings about sexuality in these conversations.

The themes I developed from the participant-selected passages suggest the kinds of topics counsellors may encounter when working with minority sexuality clients. It is not correct, however, to assume that these or any other topics related to sexuality will be the reason that minority sexuality persons seek counselling. Counsellors, counsellor educators, and counsellor trainees may become better informed about negotiating the delicate aspects of sexuality talk by considering such analytic sensitivities. Practitioners might review audio and videotaped recordings of sessions with clients where delicate subjects and passages of talk were negotiated and worked out in conversation.

Social Constructionism, Queer Perspectives, Multicultural/Diversity

and Postmodern Counselling

My primary aim with my research has been to answer the question of what might make it easier for minority sexuality persons to talk to counsellors. At the same time, I found that I made connections between what made sense for me from my analyses,

readings, and interview sessions with the participants. In particular, I have come to a place where I feel it is logical to work toward integrating social constructionism, queer perspectives, multicultural and diversity counselling and postmodern counselling practices (narrative therapy, for example). In the following section, I explain what I see as some of these connections and how they may be useful for future counselling training and counselling.

Social constructionist perspectives and theories influenced and informed the development of queer theory. Selves and sexualities, for example, are considered to be “constructed in and through [their] relations with others, and with systems of power/knowledge” (N. Sullivan, 2003, p. 41). Cameron and Kulick (2003) brought together social constructionist, feminist, and queer theory with discourse analysis to highlight the social construction of sexuality. They felt that the language that one utilizes in talking about sex *“produces the categories through which we organize our sexual desires, identities and practices”* (p. 19, italics in original). Kellett (2004) argued that mental health therapists could utilize social constructionist and queer perspectives of sexuality to challenge social values and views that pathologize minority sexuality. Denborough (2002) proposed combining queer views with narrative counselling practices.

Several recent multicultural, diversity, and culture-infused counselling texts recognize and promote the convergence and compatibility of social constructionist theory and multiculturalism (Arthur & S. Collins, 2005; Enns & Sinacore, 2005; Jencius & West, 2003). Most, if not all, multicultural and diversity counselling texts include sections on working with gay and lesbian clients. Many newer texts now include bisexual and

transgendered clients, yet very few mention queer clients. Although some very recent texts highlight essentialist stage models of minority sexuality development (Hutchins, 2006) others also encourage counsellors to consider the social construction of sexuality (Fassinger & Arseneau, 2007). Logan (2006) also pointed out that most sexuality development models were based on retrospective accounts of White, middle-aged males and did not adequately represent more fluid accounts of lesbian sexuality development. Harper and McFadden (2003) suggested that accepting social constructionist perspectives about fluid lives and identities, and incorporating collaborative, discursive relationships with clients have been challenges for many counsellors.

Pedersen (2001) believed that we are moving from monocultural to multicultural perspectives. Yet, mental health workers may find themselves “caught in the tension between the ambiguity and fluidity of multisexual, multiracial, multicultural experience and the unambiguous representation of monocultural, monosexual rhetoric” (Offord & Cantrell, 1999, p. 215). I believe that we must become comfortable with ambiguity and, as the poet Keats (1970) suggested, learn to be “capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason” (p. 43). Queer theory is strategically useful to help destabilize fixed identities and sexualities and draw attention to their fluidity.

I believe that social constructionist, multicultural, and queer perspectives and theories are compatible and convergent. Israel and Selvidge (2003) suggested that multicultural counselling and minority sexuality counselling have grown independently from each other and occasionally compete for space within counselling education programs. They believed, however, that these counselling areas could “learn from each other, strengthen

each field and build a more comprehensive vision of counselor competence with diverse clients” (p. 84). Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, and Croteau (1998) felt that counsellor education programs need to help students and faculty become aware of and reduce or eliminate prejudices and biases about minority sexuality clients in order to create an affirmative training space. Several counsellors and counsellor educators suggested that education about and training for providing service for minority sexuality clients is recommended to be included in counselling programs (for example, see Y. B. Chung, 2003; Dillon & Worthington, 2003; Dillon et al., 2004; Halpert & Pfaller, 2001). Alderson (2004) developed a flexible curriculum that counsellor training programs may utilize to adequately train counsellors to competently and affirmatively work with minority sexuality clients. Winslade, Monk, and Drewery (1997), narrative therapists, promoted the integration of social constructionist perspectives into counsellor education programs.

Taking up queer theory and perspectives within counsellor education programs could help bridge gaps and deconstruct barriers in order to prevent further fragmentation of working with minority and marginalized groups (Carlson, 1998; Pinar, 1998). Carroll and Gilroy (2001) suggested that queer theory can help counsellor educators to challenge traditional perspectives of identity and sexuality. Tierney (1997), a queer theorist, suggested that in addition to studying the world, we also need to work to change it and promote “new practices, languages, and ways of seeing and hence acting in the world so that individuals and groups will not of necessity need to subsume their identities into a homogeneous mass” (p. 24). I believe that including queer theory in counsellor education programs can help promote social justice perspectives and focus attention on the multiple

influences of factors such as sexuality, ethnicity, gender, age, and class on people from minority sexuality or other non-dominant groups.

Limitations

In my research project, I was primarily interested in examining what minority sexuality athletes might feel was helpful to them to talk about sexuality. Although there were two lesbian women and one non-dominant ethnicity, gay male there were no participants who described their sexuality as bisexual, transgendered, or queer let alone any other minority sexuality. I recognize that this group of eight participants cannot be considered fully representative of all minority sexuality athletes and certainly not representative of all minority sexuality persons. I believe that having had the opportunity to include participants who are bisexual, transgendered, queer, or any other minority sexuality could have created a broader range of conversations on which to draw my research findings.

Additionally, all eight participants stated that they had post-secondary education, were presently able-bodied, and were either employed or still in educational programs. This group, then, is also not reflective of the experiences of minority sexuality athletes who may be unemployed, underemployed, not able-bodied, and who have less than post-secondary education. The results from this group of research participants cannot be generalized to my research target group. In part, this is due to the lack of fuller representation of minority sexuality athletes and also, in part, because my research method does not lend itself to such generalizations.

I was interested in what participants thought was helpful for them to talk about sexuality in our conversations yet I asked them to do this after our conversations.

Participants watched the video-recorded conversations at their homes to choose one to three segments. This lost the immediacy of what they might have chosen as helpful either during the conversations or immediately after them. At the same time, this also helped participants make their choices independent of my engagement with them in our conversations. One participant reported, in the second IPR interview, that he felt as though he were watching someone else's conversation and had difficulty connecting what he was watching to himself. This matches ten Have's (1999) suggestion that "participants may not 'know' afterwards what they have been doing" (p. 33). If, however, I had asked participants to make comments, during our first conversations, about what we were discussing would have invited them into a new discourse and, perhaps, even stopped the conversation that was underway.

There were nearly 500 minutes of video-recorded conversations from which participants chose 80 minutes of helpful segments. Most participants told me, in the second sessions, that they had difficulty picking only three passages. Two participants asked for copies of the entire first session to keep for themselves to view later and to show to family and friends. Based on selections made by the participants, I chose 30 of the 80 minutes of these selections on which to do in-depth analyses. While my study design omitted passages that I thought were helpful, future research could beneficially include passages chosen by participants and researcher for analysis.

I recognize that in holding social constructionist, feminist, and queer perspectives about sexuality and counselling meant that I likely gave preferred voice to those perspectives and dispreferred status to non-matching views. I prefer non-linear, non-stage, multidimensional and fluid notions of sexual identity (for example, see Horowitz &

Newcomb, 2001). Although some mental health care professionals have social constructionist perspectives about sexuality (Russell & Bohan, 1999b), T. S. Stein (1996) suggested that essentialist notions of sexuality appear to be more common. I agree with Stein's suggestion that this may have occurred because of "[t]he virtual exclusion of much of the social constructionist argument from the biomedical sciences and the mental health field reinforces an intellectual position of unreflective adherence to essentialist assumptions" (p. 96). At the same time, counsellor holding social constructionist views also need to respect clients' views that do not match their own and avoid imposing their own views on their clients.

Cass (1999) found that counsellors, particularly those who hold social constructionist perspectives, often have to work within the essentialist thinking of clients' notions of their sexuality while recognizing the constructed nature of the issues on which the counsellor and client might be working. Future research might take non-matching views of sexuality development into account in the analyses. I may even be able to obtain permission from these participants to do further analyses on the existing video-recordings from this study.

The first conversations were recorded using video equipment in the Division of Applied Psychology at the University of Calgary. I found that once I had the segments transferred to DVDs that some of the quality of the video recordings was lost. This became a limitation in that I was unable to capture some of the more micro-aspects of our paralinguistic communication. I am curious about what relevant details of communication I might have noted if better recordings had been possible.

Suggestions for Future Research

As a result of my present study, I hope to continue along the lines of this research. Specifically, I have three projects in mind which flow logically from this study:

1. I will use discursive research methods to analyze conversations between counsellors (who have GLBTQ-affirmative perspectives) and minority sexuality clients. I hope to illustrate how social constructionist and queer perspectives in GLBTQ-affirmative counselling may be integrated with current multicultural counselling perspectives and linked to both counsellor training and practice. I want to closely examine the inclusive and generative nature of such conversations (the specific conversational practices) for how they relate to the aims of multicultural and diversity counselling.

2. In a second study, I plan to examine perceived and actual barriers minority populations may have which may hinder them from accessing counselling. Initially, I will invite minority sexuality persons into this research and then expand to other minority groups (for example, non-dominant ethnic groups, First Nations peoples, and immigrants and refugees). In particular, I hope to explore tensions between essentialist and social constructionist perspectives relating to minority populations. For example, I am intrigued by how one's concepts of identity or identities might influence their interactions and conversations with others. I will promote postmodern research methods as supportable approaches to counselling research and counsellor education.

3. I plan to create research where I may collaborate with counsellors and sport mental trainers who work with minority sexuality athletes. Seven of the eight participants selected passages in which they spoke about their experiences of heterosexism and homophobia within their sports. In particular, I am interested in promoting GLBTQ-

supportive stances in sport and counselling practices. An initial study will be to identify awareness of and beliefs about minority sexuality that coaches, trainers, and mental health practitioners, who work with athletes, hold.

What's Next?

Now that I am nearing the end of my current research project I have the opportunity to not only look back and reflect upon what I have experienced, I may also look forward and imagine how this has influenced what I hope to do next. I had the chance to visit and learn about a variety of theoretical perspectives. I find that I have made many connections between what often appear to be fairly separate literatures and perspectives: feminism, social constructionism, multicultural and diversity counselling, postmodern counselling, and queer theory.

I had initially anticipated a shorter journey in terms of time. Occasionally, however, I found that my project was hard to rein in when I found new views with which I wanted to run and explore. When this occurred, I found that I wanted even more time to learn everything related to my research. Ultimately, although I am slightly surprised, I am very grateful to feel inspired to look forward to doing future research. In particular, I hope to continue to do research which combines discursive analyses with minority sexuality persons with a view to enhancing counselling practices and social justice. I believe that my research will contribute to counsellors, sport mental trainers, counsellor educators and those who work with minority sexuality persons. My experience has provided me with an excellent basis from which I will launch new and exciting explorations. I hope that counsellors and counsellor educators may make use of this research to benefit them and their minority sexuality clients.

REFERENCES

- Abreu, J. M., Chung, R. H., & Atkinson, D. R. (2000). Multicultural counseling training: Past, present, and future. *The Counseling Psychologist, 28*, 641-656.
- Adam, B. D. (1995). *The rise of a gay and lesbian movement*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Adam, B. D. (2000). Love and sex in constructing identity among men who have sex with men. *International Journal of Sexuality & Gender Studies, 5*, 325-349.
- Adams, G. R., & Marshall, S. K. (1996). A developmental social psychology of identity: Understanding the person-in-context. *Journal of Adolescence, 19*, 429-442.
- Aitchison, C. C. (2007). Gender, sport and identity: Introducing discourses of masculinities, femininities and sexualities. In C. C. Aitchison (Ed.), *Sport and gender identities: Masculinities, femininities and sexualities* (pp. 1-4). New York: Routledge.
- Aldarondo, F. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity models and their application: Counseling biracial individuals. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23*, 238-255.
- Alderson, K. (2004). A different kind of *outing*: Training counsellors to work with sexual minority clients. *Canadian Journal of Counselling, 38*, 193-210.
- Altman, D. (2001a). *Global sex*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Altman, D. (2001b). Rupture of continuity? The internationalization of gay identities. In J. C. Hawley (Ed.), *Postcolonial queer: Theoretical intersections* (pp. 19-41). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Amaechi 'receives death threats'. (2007, February 14). Retrieved February 15, 2007, from <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,20867,21224200-23769,00.html>

American Counseling Association. (1995). *Proposed revision: American Counseling Association code of ethics and standards of practice*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American Psychological Association. (2007). *Guidelines for Psychotherapy with Lesbian, Gay, & Bisexual Clients*. Retrieved April 14, 2007 from <http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbc/guidelines.html>

Ambrecht, T. J .D. (2005). Can one be ‘gay’ and French? *The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*, 12(3), 20-22.

Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation: A relevance-theoretic approach to the language of adolescents*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
<http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/Doc?id=5004967>

Andersen, M. B., Butki, B. D., & Heyman, S. R. (1997). Homophobia and sport experience: A survey of college students. *Academic Athletic Journal*, 12, 27-38.

Anderson, E. (2002). Openly gay athletes: Contesting hegemonic masculinity in a homophobic environment. *Gender & Society*, 16, 860-877.

Anderson, H. (1995). Collaborative language systems: Toward a postmodern therapy. In R. H. Mikesell, D.-D. Lusterman, & S. H. McDaniel (Eds.), *Integrating family therapy: Handbook of family psychology and systems theory* (pp. 27-44). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Anderson, H. (1997). *Conversation, language, and possibilities: A postmodern approach to therapy*. New York: Basic Books.

Anderson, H., & Goolishian, H. (1992). The client is the expert: A not-knowing approach to therapy. In S. McNamee & K. J. Gergen (Eds), *Therapy as social construction* (pp. 25-39). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage

- Antaki, C., & Horowitz, A. (2000). Using identity ascription to disqualify a rival version of events as ‘interested’. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 33, 155-177.
- Antaki, C., Condor, S., & Levine, M. (1996). Social identities in talk: Speakers’ own orientations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 473-492.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Anzaldúa, G. E. (1991). To(o) queer the write: loca, escrita y chicana. In B. Warland (Ed.), *InVersions: Writing by dykes, queers, and lesbians* (pp. 249-263). Vancouver, BC: Press Gang.
- Anzaldúa, G. E. (2002). Now let us shift...the path of conocimiento...inner world, public acts. In G. E. Anzaldúa & A. Keating (Eds.), *This bridge we call home: Radical visions for transformation* (pp. 540-578). New York: Routledge.
- Arminen, I. (1999). Conversation analysis: A quest for order in social interaction and language use. *ACTA Sociologica*, 42, 251-257.
- Arthur, N., & Collins, S. (Eds.) (2005). *Culture-infused counselling: Celebrating the Canadian mosaic*. Calgary, AB: Counselling Concepts.
- Asay, P. A. (2006). Counseling strategies with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients: An online analogue study. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 67(6-B). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 3222472)
- Atkinson, E. (2002). Education for diversity in a multisexual society: Negotiating the contradictions of contemporary discourse. *Sex Education*, 2(2), 119-132.
- Atkinson, J. M., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. (J. O. Urmson, Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bacon, J. (1998). Getting the story straight: Coming out narratives and the possibility of a cultural rhetoric. *World Englishes*, 17, 249-258.
- Bachelor, A. (1995). Clients' perception of the therapeutic alliance: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42, 323-337.
- Baker, C. D., & Johnson, G. (1998). Interview talk as professional practice. *Language & Education*, 12, 229-242.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ball, C. A. (2001). Essentialism and universalism in gay rights philosophy: Liberalism meets queer theory. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 26, 271-293.
- Ball, C. A. (2003). *The morality of gay rights: an exploration in political philosophy*. New York: Routledge.
- Bangerter, A., & Clark, H. H. (2003). Navigating joint projects with dialogue. *Cognitive Science*, 27, 195-225.
- Banks, J. A. (1994). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Barber, H., & Krane, V. (2005). The elephant in the locker room: Opening the dialogue about sexual orientation on women's sport teams. In M. B. Andersen (Ed), *Sport psychology in practice* (pp. 265-285). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Barrett, R. (1997). The "homo-genius" speech community. In A. Livia & K. Hall, *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality* (pp. 181-201). New York: Oxford

University Press.

Barrett, R. (2002). Is queer theory important for sociolinguistic theory? In K. Campbell-

Kibler, R. J. Podesva, S. J. Roberts, & A. Wong (Eds.), *Language and sexuality:*

Contesting meaning in theory and practice (pp. 25-43). Stanford, CA: CSLI

Publications.

Barrett, R. R. (2003). Lesbian rituals and Dianic tradition. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*,

7(2), 15-28.

Barrett, K. A., & McWhirter, B. T. (2002). Counselor trainees' perceptions of clients

based on client sexual orientation. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 41, 219-232.

Barry, R. (2000). The self-creation of a safe space by gay, lesbian, and bisexual students.

In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.). *Construction sites: Excavating race, class, and gender among urban youth* (pp. 84-99). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bartlett, S. (2003). Beyond the looking glass: The qualitative research process as a

development of self. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 18(2), 26-29.

Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.),

Handbook of social psychology (4th ed.) (pp. 680-740). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Gender differences in erotic plasticity: The female sex drive as

socially flexible and responsive. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 347-374.

Bavelas, J. B., Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2000). Listeners as co-narrators. *Journal of*

Personality & Social Psychology, 79, 941-952.

Bavelas, J. B., Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2002). Listener responses as a collaborative

process: The role of gaze. *Journal of Communication*, 52, 566-580.

Bavelas, J. B., Kenwood, C., & Phillips, B. (2002). Discourse analysis. In M. L. Knapp

- & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal communication* (3rd ed., pp. 102-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beach, W. A. (1993). Transitional regularities for ‘casual’ “Okay” usages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 325-352.
- Beach, W. A. (1995). Conversation analysis: ‘Okay’ as a clue for understanding consequentiality. In J. Sigman (Ed.), *The consequentiality of communication* (pp. 121-161). Hillsdale, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Beckstead, L., & Israel, T. (2007). Affirmative counseling and psychotherapy focused on issues related to sexual orientation conflicts. In K. J. Bieschke, R. M. Perez, & K. A. DeBord (Eds), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender clients* (2nd ed.) (pp. 221-244). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Bedi, R. P. (2006). Concept mapping the client’s perspective on counseling alliance formation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53, 26-35.
- Bedi, R. P., Davis, M. D., & Arvay, M. J. (2005). The client’s perspective on forming a counselling alliance and implications for research on counsellor training. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*, 39, 71-85.
- Bedi, R. P., Davis, M. D., & Williams, M. (2005). Critical incidents in the formation of the therapeutic alliance from the client's perspective. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 42, 311-323.
- Beer, D. W. (1997). “There’s a certain slant of light”: The experience of discovery in qualitative interviewing. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research*, 17, 110-129.
- Benjamin, J. (1999). Recognition and destruction: An outline of intersubjectivity. In S.

- Mitchell & L. Aron (Eds.), *Relational psychoanalysis: The emergence of a tradition* (pp. 181-210). Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- Bereket, T., & Adam, B. D. (2006). The emergence of gay identities in contemporary Turkey. *Sexualities, 9*, 131-151.
- Berzonsky, M. D. (1989). Identity style: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 4*, 267-281.
- Besley, A.C. (Tina). (2001). Foucauldian influences in narrative therapy: An approach for schools. *Journal of Educational Enquiry, 2*, 72-93.
- Besley, A. C. (Tina). (2002). Foucault and the turn to narrative therapy. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 30*, 125-143.
- Bieschke, K. J., Perez, R. M., & DeBord, K. A. (2007). *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender clients* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bieschke, K. J., Eberz, A. B., Bard, C. C., & Croteau, J. M. (1998). Using social cognitive career theory to create affirmative lesbian, gay and bisexual research training environments. *Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 735-753.
- Bieschke, K. J., McClanahan, M., Tozer, E., Grzegorek, J. L., & Park, J. (2000). Programmatic research of the treatment of lesbian, gay, and bisexual, client: The past, the present, and the course for the future. In R. M. Perez, K. A. DeBord, & K. J. Bieschke (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients* (pp. 309-336). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions: Studies in rhetorical psychology*. London:

Sage.

- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blackburn, M. V. (2005). Agency in borderland discourses: Examining language use in a community center with Black queer youth. *Teachers College Record*, 107, 89-113.
- Blackwood, E. (2005). Tomboys in West Sumatra: Constructing masculinity and erotic desire. In J. Robertson (Ed.), *Same-sex cultures and sexualities: An anthropological reader* (pp. 232-260). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bohan, J. S. (1996). *Psychology and sexual orientation: Coming to terms*. New York: Routledge.
- Bohan, J. S., & Russell, G. M. (1999a). Conceptual frameworks. In J. S. Bohan & G. M. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 11-30). New York: New York University Press.
- Bohan, J. S. & Russell, G. M. (1999b). Support networks for lesbian, gay, and bisexual students. In S. Davis, M. Crawford, & J. Sebrechts (Eds.), *Coming into her own: Educational success for girls and women* (pp. 279-294). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolden, G.B. (2005). Delayed and incipient actions: The discourse markers 'to' and 'so' in Russian and English conversation. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: The Humanities & Social Sciences*, 66(3). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 3169177)
- Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, 16, 252-260.
- Bosker, M. J. (2003). Assessing level of outness among gay, lesbian, and bisexual

- individuals and its relation to depression, anxiety, and self-esteem. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 64(3-B). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 3083228)
- Boston, P. (2005). Doing deconstruction. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 27, 272-275.
- Botschner, J. V. (2001). Doing not providing: A discourse-analytic investigation of social support as a responsive process. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 61(12-B). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI NQ55617)
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bowers, R., Plummer, D., & Minichiello, V. (2002). Homophobia in counselling practice. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 27, 471-489.
- Breedlove, S. M. (1994). Sexual differentiation of the human nervous system. Annual *Review of Psychology*, 45, 389-418.
- Bridel, W., & Rail, G. (2007). Sport, sexuality, and the production of (resistant) bodies: De-/re-constructing the meanings of gay male marathon corporeality. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 24, 127-144.
- Broad, K. L. (2001). The gendered unapologetic: Queer resistance in women's sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 18, 181-204.
- Broido, E. M. (2000). Constructing identity: The nature and meaning of lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities. In R. M. Perez, K. A. DeBord, & K. J. Bieschke (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients* (pp. 13-33). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Brown, D. (2001). Modern sport, modernism and the cultural manifesto: De Coubertin's *Revue Olympique. International Journal of the History of Sport*, 18, 78-109.
- Bryan, K., McIntosh, J., & Brown, D. (1998). Extending conversation analysis to non-verbal communication. *Aphasiology*, 12, 179-188.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2004). Theorizing identity in language and sexuality research. *Language in Society*, 33, 469-515.
- Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7, 585-614.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Butler, J. (1991). Imitation and gender insubordination. In D. Fuss (Ed.), *Inside/out: Lesbian theories, gay theories* (pp. 12-31). New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993a). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993b). Critically queer. *GLQ: A Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies*, 1, 17-32.
- Buttny, R. (2004). Putting prior talk into context: Reported speech and the reporting context. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 31, 45-58.
- Butrym, T. M. (2002). Critically examining White racial identity and privilege in sport psychology consulting. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16, 316-33.
- Cahn, S. K. (1994). *Coming on strong: Gender and sexuality in Twentieth-century women's sport*. New York: The Free Press.
- Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). *Language and sexuality*. New York: Cambridge

- University Press.
- Campbell-Kibler, K., Podesva, R. J., Roberts, S. J., & Wong, A. (Eds.). (2002). *Language and sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Canadian Counselling Association. (1999). *Code of ethics*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Cantú, L. (2002). De ambiente: Queer tourism and the shifting boundaries of Mexican male sexualities. *GLQ: A Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies*, 8, 138-166.
- Carballo-Díéguez, A. (1997). Sexual research with Latino men who have sex with men. In J. Bancroft (Ed.), *Researching sexual behavior: Methodological issues* (pp. 134-144). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Carlson, D. (1998). Who am I? Gay identity and a democratic politics of the self. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Queer theory in education* (pp. 107-119). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carroll, L., & Gilroy, P. J. (2001). Teaching "outside the box": Incorporating queer theory in counsellor education. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, & Development*, 40, 49-58.
- Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 4, 219-235.
- Cass, V. C. (1984). Homosexual identity formation: Testing a theoretical model. *Journal of Sex Research*, 20, 143-167.
- Cass, V. C. (1990). The implications of homosexual identity formation for the Kinsey model and scale of sexual preference. In D. P. McWirther, S. A. Sanders, & J. M. Reinisch (Eds.), *Homosexuality/heterosexuality: Concepts of sexual orientation*

- (pp. 239-266). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cass, V. C. (1996). Sexual identity formation: A Western phenomenon. In R. P. Cabaj & T. S. Stein (Eds.), *Textbook of homosexuality and mental health* (pp. 227-251). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Cass, V. C. (1999). Bringing psychology in from the cold: Framing psychological theory and research within a social constructionist psychology approach. In J. S. Bohan & G. M. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 106-128). New York: New York University Press.
- Caudwell, J. (2003). Sporting gender: Women's footballing bodies as sites/sights for the (re)articulation of sex, gender, and desire. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 20, 371-386.
- Cesario, J. F. (2006). Regulatory fit from nonverbal behaviors: How source delivery style influences message effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 67(4-B). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 3213484)
- Chan, C. S. (1989). Issues of identity development among Asian-American lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 68, 16-20.
- Chan, C. S. (1992). Cultural considerations in counseling Asian American lesbians and gay men. In S. H. Dworkin & F. J. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Counseling gay men and lesbians: Journey to the end of the rainbow* (pp. 115-124). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.
- Chan, C. S. (1995). Issues of sexual identity in an ethnic minority: The case of Chinese American lesbians, gay men, and bisexual people. In A. R. D'Augelli & C. J. Patterson (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay and bisexual identities over the lifespan: Psychological*

- perspectives* (pp. 87-101). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chapman, B. E., & Brannock, J. C. (1987). Proposed model of lesbian identity development: An empirical examination. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 14(3/4), 69-80.
- Chapman, V-L. (1997). Nuns, poets, and flying breasts. Stories of women learning. Proceedings of the 10th Qualitative Research in Education Conference. Atlanta, GA.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Constructivist and objectivist grounded theory. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 509-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide though qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chauncey, G. (1994). *Gay New York: Gender, urban culture, and the makings of the gay male world 1890-1940*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cheatham, H. E., Ivey, A. E., Ivey, M. B., & Simek-Morgan, L. (2002). Multicultural counseling and therapy: Changing the foundations of the field. In A. E. Ivey, M. B. Ivey, & L. Simek-Morgan (Eds.), *Counseling and psychotherapy: A multicultural perspective* (5th ed.) (pp. 93-128). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cheshire, J., Kerswill, P., & Williams, A. (2005). Phonology, grammar, and discourse in dialect convergence. In P. Auer, F. Hinskens & P. Kerswill (Eds.), *Dialect change: Convergence and divergence in European languages* (pp.135-167). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chng, C. W., Wong, F. Y., Park, R. J., Edberg, M. C., & Lai, D. S. (1998). A model for

understanding sexual health among Asian American/Pacific Islander men who have sex with men (MSM) in the United States. *AIDS Education & Prevention*, 15(S1), 21-38.

Choi, K.-H., Yep, G. A., & Kumekawa, E. (1998). HIV prevention among Asian and Pacific Islander men who have sex with men: A critical review of theoretical models and directions for future research. *AIDS Education & Prevention*, 10(Suppl. A), 19-30.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chung, Y. B. (2003). Ethical and professional issues in career assessment with lesbian, gay, and bisexual persons. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 11, 96-112.

Chung, Y. B., & Katayama, M. (1998). Ethnic and sexual identity development of Asian-American lesbian and gay adolescents. *Professional School Counseling*, 1(3), 21-25.

Clark, H. H. (1994). Managing problems in speaking. *Speech Communication*, 15, 243-250.

Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H. H. (2002). Speaking in time. *Speech Communication*, 36, 5-13.

Clark, H. H., & Brennan, S. E. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 127-149). Washington: APA Books.

Clark, H. H., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2002). Using *uh* and *um* in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, 84, 73-111.

- Clark, H. H., & Krych, M. A. (2004). Speaking while monitoring addressees for understanding. *Journal of Memory & Language*, 50, 62-81.
- Clausen, J. (1996). *Beyond gay or straight: Understanding sexual orientation*. Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publications.
- Clausen, J. (1999). *Apples and oranges: My journey through sexual identity*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Clunis, D. M., & Green, G. (2000). *Lesbian couples: A guide to creating healthy relationships*. Seattle, WA: Seal Press.
- Coates, J. (1997). The construction of a collaborative floor in women's friendly talk. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Conversation: Cognitive, communicative and social perspectives* (pp. 55-89). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cochran, S. D., Sullivan, J. G., & Mays, V. M. (2003). Prevalence of mental disorders, psychological distress, and mental health services use among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 71, 53-61.
- Coleman, E. (1982). Developmental stages of the coming out process. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 7, 31-43.
- Collins, L. H., Dunlap, M. R., & Chrisler, J. C. (Eds.). (2002). *Charting a new course for feminist psychology*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
<http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/Doc?id=10021438>
- Colman, W. (2004). Review of sexuality: A biopsychosocial approach. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 49, 583-584.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1991). Narrative inquiry: Storied experience. In

- E. D. Short (Ed.), *Form of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 121-153). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Constantine, M. G. (2002). Racism attitudes, White racial identity attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence in school counselor trainees. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*, 162-174.
- Constantine, M. G., & Sue, D. W. (2005). *Strategies for building multicultural competence in mental health and educational settings* (pp. 3-18). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Constantine, M. G., Melincoff, D. S., Barakett, M. D., Torino, G. C., & Warren, A. K. (2004). Experiences and perceptions of multicultural counselling scholars: A qualitative examination. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 17*, 375-393.
- Corvin, S. A., & Wiggins, F. (1989). An antiracism training model for White professionals. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 17*, 105-114.
- Côté, J. E. (1993). Foundations of a psychoanalytic social psychology: Neo-Eriksonian propositions regarding the relationship between psychic structure and cultural institutions. *Developmental Review, 13*, 31-53.
- Cox, S., & Gallois, C. (1996). Gay and lesbian identity development: A social identity perspective. *Journal of Homosexuality, 30*(4), 1-30.
- Creet, J. (1995). Anxieties of identity: Coming out and coming undone. In M. Dorenkamp & R. Henke (Eds.), *Negotiating lesbian and gay subjects* (pp. 179-199). New York: Routledge.
- Cross, W. E. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World, 20*, 13-27.

- Cross, W. E. (1995). The psychology of nigrescence: Revisiting the Cross model. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & D. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp.93-122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cross, M., & Epting, F. (2005). Self-obliteration, self-definition, self-integration: Claiming a homosexual identity. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 18, 53-63.
- Croteau, J. M., Bieschke, K. J., Phillips, J. C., & Lark, J. S. (1998). Moving beyond pioneering: Empirical and theoretical perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual affirmative training. *Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 707-711.
- Croucher, S. M. (2004, unpublished manuscript). Like, you know what I'm saying: A study of discourse marker frequency in extemporaneous and impromptu speech. Retrieved December 8, 2006 from <http://cas.bethel.edu/dept/comm/nfa/journal/vol22no2-3.pdf>
- Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2000). The sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes toward focuser *like* and quotative *like*. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4, 60-80.
- Daniels, J. (2001). Conceptualizing a case of indirect racism using the White racial identity development model. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 23, 256-268.
- Danziger, E. (2005). The eye of the beholder: How linguistic categorization affects "natural" experience. In S. McKinnon & S. Silverman, (Eds), *Complexities: Beyond nature & nurture* (pp. 64-80). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- D'Augelli, A. R. (1991). Gay males in college: Identity processes and adaptations. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 140-146.
- Davidson, M. (1995). *Compulsory homosociality*: Charles Olsen, Jack Spicer, and the gender of poetics. In S-E. Case, P. Brett, & S. L. Foster (Eds.), *Cruising the*

- performative: Interventions into the representation of ethnicity, nationality, and sexuality* (pp. 197-216). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*, 43-63.
- Davies, D., & Neal, C. (1996). *Pink therapy: A guide for counsellors and therapists working with lesbian, gay and bisexual clients*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Davis, K. (1986). The process of problem (re)formulation in psychotherapy. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 8*, 44-74.
- DeCecco, J. P., & Elia, J. P. (Eds.) (1993). *If you seduce a straight person, can you make them gay? Issues in biological essentials versus social constructionism in gay and lesbian identities*. Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- DeLamater, J. D., & Hyde, J. S. (1998). Essentialism vs. social constructionsim in the study of human sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research, 35*, 10-18.
- de Lauretis, T. (1991). Queer theory: Lesbian and gay sexualities. *Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 3*, 75-100.
- D'Emilio, J. (1983). *Sexual politics, sexual communities: The making of a homosexual minority in the United States, 1940-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Denborough, D. (2002). *Queer counselling and narrative practice*. Adelaide, AUS: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Denzin, N. L., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- de Shazer, S. (1994). *Words were originally magic*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Diamond, L. M. (1998). Development of sexual orientation among adolescent and young women. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 1085-1095.
- Diamond, L. M. (2000). Sexual identities, attractions, and behaviour among young sexual-minority women over a two-year period. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 241-250.
- Dillon, F. R., & Worthington, R. L. (2003). The lesbian, gay, and bisexual affirmative counseling self-efficacy inventory (LGB-CSI): Development, validation, and training implications. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 235-251.
- Dillon, F. R., Worthington, R. L., Savoy, H. B., Rooney, S. C., Becker-Schutte, A., & Guerra, R. M. (2004). On becoming allies: A qualitative study of lesbian-, gay-, and bisexual-affirmative counsellor training. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*, 162-178.
- Dodd, S-J., & Meezan, W. (2003). Matching AIDS service organizations' philosophy of service provision with a compatible style of program evaluation. In W. Meezan & J. I. Martin (Eds.), *Research methods with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations* (pp. 163-180). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Dohrenwend, B. P. (2000). The role of adversity and stress in psychopathology: Some evidence and its implications for theory and research. *Health & Social Behavior, 41*, 1-19.
- Dorenkamp, M., & Henke, R. (1995). Introduction. In M. Dorenkamp & R. Henke (Eds.) *Negotiating lesbian and gay subjects* (pp. 1-6). New York: Routledge.
- Dorland, J. M., & Fischer, A. R. (2001). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals'

- perceptions: An analogue study. *Counseling Psychologist, 29*, 532-547.
- Drew, P., Chatwin, J., & Collins, S. (2001). Conversation analysis: A method for research into interactions between patients and health-care professionals. *Health Expectations, 4*, 58-70.
- Drummond, K., & Hopper, R. (1993). Back channels revisited: Acknowledgement tokens and speakership incipency. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 26*, 157-177.
- Dubé, E. M. (2000). The role of sexual behaviour in the identification process of gay and bisexual males. *Journal of Sex Research, 37*, 123-132.
- Dubé, E. M., & Savin-Williams, R. C. (1999). Sexual identity development among ethnic sexual-minority youths. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 1389-1398.
- Dunbar, E. (2006). Race, gender, and sexual orientation in hate crime victimization: Identity politics or identity risk? *Violence & Victims, 21*, 323-337.
- Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 23*, 283-292.
- Dunne, J. (1995). Beyond sovereignty and deconstruction: The storied self. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 21*, 137-157.
- Dynes, W. R. (Ed.). (1990). *Encyclopedia of homosexuality*. New York: Garland.
- Eaton, Y. M., Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (1991). Gender differences in the development of relationships during late adolescence. *Adolescence, 26*, 565-568.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 21*, 461-490.

- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Edley, N. (1993). Prince Charles - our flexible friend: Accounting for variations in constructions of identity. *Text, 13*, 397-422.
- Edley, N. (2001). Analysing masculinity: Interpretive repertoires, ideological dilemmas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 189-228). London: Sage.
- Edley, N., & Wetherell, M. (1997). Jockeying for position: The construction of masculine identities. *Discourse & Society, 11*, 203-217.
- Edwards, D. (1995). Two to tango: Script formulations, dispositions, and rhetorical symmetry in relationship troubles talk. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 28*, 319-350.
- Edwards, D. (1999). Emotion discourse. *Culture & Psychology, 5*, 271-291.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1993). Language and causation: A discursive action model of description and attribution. *Psychological Review, 100*, 23-41.
- Eliason, M. J., & Morgan, K. S. (1998). Lesbians define themselves: Diversity in lesbian identification. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, & Bisexual Identity, 3*, 47-63.
- Elliott, R. (1985). Helpful and nonhelpful events in brief counseling interviews: An empirical taxonomy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*, 307-322.
- Ellis, C. (1997). Evocative autoethnography: Writing emotionally about our lives. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice* (115-139). New York: State University of New York Press.

- Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 733-768). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Enns, C. Z., & Sinacore, A. L. (Eds.). (2005). *Teaching and social justice: Integrating multicultural and feminist theories in the classroom*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Epple, C. (1997). A Navajo worldview and Nádleehí: Implications for Western categories. In S-E. Jacobs, W. Thomas, & S. Lang (Eds.), *Two-spirited people: Native American gender identity, sexuality, and spirituality* (pp. 174-191). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Epstein, S. (1996). A queer encounter: Sociology and the study of sexuality. In S. Seidman (Ed.), *Queer theory/sociology* (pp. 145-167). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Eribon, D. (2004). *Insult and the making of the gay self* (M. Lucey, Trans.). Durham, NC: Duke University Press. (Original work published 1999).
- Erikson, E. D. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Erikson, E. D. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. Toronto, ON: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Erikson, E. D. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Erikson, E. D. (1997). *The life cycle completed*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Esterberg, K. G. (1997). *Lesbian and bisexual identities: Constructing communities, constructing selves*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Etherington, K. (2004). Heuristic research as a vehicle for personal and professional development. *Counselling & Psychotherapy Research*, 4, 48-63.

- Eubanks-Carter, C., Burckell, L. A., & Goldfried, M. R. (2005). Enhancing therapeutic effectiveness with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Clinical Psychology: Science & Practice*, 12, 1-18.
- Ezzy, D. (1998). Theorizing narrative identity: Symbolic interactionism and hermeneutics. *Sociological Quarterly*, 39, 239-252.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. *Linguistics & Education*, 4, 269-293.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). 'Political correctness': The politics of culture and language. *Discourse & Society*, 14, 17-28.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, Vol. 2 (pp. 258-284). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Farber, B. A., & Hall, D. (2002). Disclosure to therapists: What is and is not discussed in psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58, 359-370.
- Fassinger, R. E., & Arseneau, J. R. (2007). "I'd rather get wet than be under that umbrella": Differentiating the experiences and identities of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. In K. J. Bieschke, R. M. Perez, & K. A. DeBord (Eds), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender clients* (2nd ed.) (pp. 19-49). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Faulkner, G., & Finlay, S-J. (2002). It's not what you say, it's the way you say it! Conversation analysis: A discursive methodology for sport, exercise, and physical education. *Quest*, 54, 49-66.
- Filipi, A., & Wales, R. (2003). Differential uses of okay, right, and alright, and their

- function in signaling perspective shift or maintenance in a map task. *Semiotica*, 147, 429-455.
- Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the researcher: The provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12, 531-545.
- Firestein, B. A. (1996). Bisexuality as a paradigm shift: Transforming our disciplines. In B. A. Firestein (Ed.), *Bisexuality: The psychology and politics of an invisible minority* (pp. 263-291). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Floyd, F. F., & Stein, T. S. (2002). Sexual orientation identity formation among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youths: Multiple patterns of milestone experiences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12, 167-191.
- Floyd, F. J., Stein, T. S., Harter, H. S. M., Allison, A., & Nye, C. L. (1999). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual youths: Separation-individuation, parental attitudes, identity consolidation, and well-being. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 28, 719-739.
- Fogel, S. C. (2002). Predictors of disclosure of sexual identity to healthcare providers. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences*, 63(1-B). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 3038802)
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ford, C. E., Fox, B. A., & Thompson, S. A. (1996). Practices in the construction of turns: The 'TCU' revisited. *Pragmatics*, 6, 427-454.
- Foucault, M. (1971). Orders of discourse. *Social Science Information*, 10, 7-30.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.).

- London: Tavistock Publications. (Original work published in 1969).
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, vol. I: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1976).
- Foucault, M. (1984). In P. Rainbow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1985). *The history of sexuality, vol. II: The use of pleasure* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in 1984).
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, philosophy, culture: interviews and other writings, 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge.
- Fox, B. (1999). Directions in research: Language and the body. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 32, 51-59.
- Fox Tree, J. E. (2002). Interpreting pauses and ums at turn exchanges. *Discourse Processes*, 34, 37-55.
- Franklin, M. E., James, J. R., & Watson, A. L. (1996). Using a cultural identity development to plan culturally responsive reading and writing instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 12, 41-58.
- Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics*, 6, 167-190.
- Freedman, J., & Combs, G. (1996). *Narrative therapy: The social construction of preferred realities*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Frégeau, D. L., & Barker, M. (1986). A measurement of the process of adolescence: Standardization and interpretation. *Adolescence*, 84, 913-919.
- Freud, S. (1965). (J. Strachey, Ed. and Trans.). *New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. (Original work published 1930).
- Freud, S. (1968). (J. Riviere, Trans.). *A general introduction to psychoanalysis*. New

- York: Liveright Publishing Corporation. (Original work published 1920).
- Fuller, J. M. (2003a). The influence of speaker roles on discourse marker use. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 23-45.
- Fuller, J. M. (2003b). Use of discourse marker *like* in interviews. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 365-377.
- Fusco, C. (1998). Lesbians and locker rooms: The subjective experiences of lesbians in sport. In G. Rail (Ed.), *Sport and postmodern times* (pp. 87-116). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Gale, J., & Newfield, N. (1992). A conversation analysis of a solution-focused marital therapy session. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 18, 153-165.
- Gale, J., Lawless, J., & Roulston, K. (2004). Discursive approaches to clinical research. In T. Strong & D. Paré (Eds.), *Furthering talk: Advances in the discursive therapies* (pp. 125-144). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Gale, J. E., Odell, M., & Nagireddy, C. S. (1995). Marital therapy and self-reflexive research: Research and/as intervention. In G. H. Morris & R. J. Chenail (Eds.), *The talk of the clinic: Explorations in the analysis of medical and therapeutic discourse* (pp. 105-129). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gamson, J. (1995). Must identity movements self-destruct? A queer dilemma. *Social Problems*, 42, 390-407.
- Gamson, J. (1997). Messages of exclusion: Gender, movements, and symbolic boundaries. *Gender & Society*, 11, 178-199.
- Gamson, J. (1998). Publicity traps: Television talk shows and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender visibility. *Sexualities*, 1, 11-41.

Gamson, J. (2000). Sexualities, queer theory, and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 347-365). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gamson, J., & Moon, D. (2004). The sociologies of sexualities: queer and beyond. *Annual Review of Sociology, 30*, 47-64.

Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Retrieved December 28, 2006 from
<http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/Doc?id=10022318>

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garnets, L. D. (2002). Sexual orientations in perspective. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8*, 115-129.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gentner, T. Q., Fenn, K. M., Margoliash, D., & Nusbaum, H. C. (2006). Recursive syntactic pattern learning by songbirds. *Nature, 440*, 1204-1207.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*, 266-275.

Gergen, K. J., & Kaye, J. (1992). Beyond narrative in the negotiation of therapeutic meaning. In S. McNamee & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *Therapy as social construction* (pp. 166-185). London: Sage.

- Gerhardt, J., & Stinson, C. (1995). "I don't know": Resistance or groping for words? The construction of analytic subjectivity. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 5, 619-672.
- Gerwing, J., & Bavelas, J. B. (2004). Linguistic influences on gesture's form. *Gesture*, 4, 157-195.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine Atherton.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. New York: Longman.
- Glick, E. (2003). New directions in multiethnic, racial, and global queer studies. *GLQ: A Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies*, 10(1), 123-137.
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face work. *Psychiatry*, 18, 213-231.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1962). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behaviour*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goldberger, N. R. (1996). Women's construction of truth, self, authority, and power. In H. Rosen & K. T. Kuehlwein (Eds.), *Constructing realities: Meaning-making perspectives for psychotherapists* (pp. 167-193). San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Goodman, L. A., Liang, B., Helms, J. E., Latta, R. E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S. R. (2004). Training counseling psychologists as social justice agents: Feminist and multicultural principles in action. *Counseling Psychologist*, 32, 793-837.
- Gough, B. (2002). 'I've always tolerated it but...': Heterosexual masculinity and the

- discursive reproduction of homophobia. In A. Coyle & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: New perspectives* (pp. 219-238). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Gough, B. (in press). Coming out in the heterosexist world of sport: A qualitative analysis of web postings by gay athletes. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*.
- Gray, M. M., Ispa, J. M., & Thornburg, K. R. (1986). Erikson psychosocial stage inventory: A factor analysis. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 46, 979-983.
- Greene, B. (1994). Ethnic-minority lesbians and gay men: Mental health and treatment issues. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 62, 243-251.
- Gridley, H. (2005). Commentary on Chapter 11. In M. B. Andersen (Ed.), *Sport psychology in practice* (pp. 217-222). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Griffin, P. (1994). Homophobia in sport: Addressing the needs of lesbian and gay high school athletes. *The High School Journal*, 77, 80-87.
- Griffin, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets: Lesbians and homophobia in sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Griffin, P. (1999). Lesbians and bisexual women in sport. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 70, 53-55, 62.
- Grote, B. (2006). The experience of feeling really understood in psychotherapy: A phenomenological study. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: Science & Engineering*, 67(6-B). US: University Microfilms International.
- Grotewalt, H. D. (1987). Toward a process model of identity formation. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 175-182.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1994). Grounding the postmodern self. *Sociological*

- Quarterly*, 35, 685-703.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1998). Narrative practice and the coherence of personal stories. *Sociological Quarterly*, 39, 163-187.
- Gunther, S. (2005). Alors, are we ‘queer’ yet? *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide*, 12, 23-25.
- Halberstam, J. (1994). F2M: The making of female masculinity. In L. Doan (Ed.), *The lesbian postmodern* (pp. 210-228). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Haldeman, D.C. (1999). The best of both worlds. In J. S. Bohan & G. M. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 57-70). New York: New York University Press.
- Halperin, D. (1990). *One hundred years of homosexuality*. New York: Routledge.
- Halperin, D. (1995). *Saint Foucault: Towards a gay hagiography*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halpert, S. C., & Pfaller, J. (2001). Sexual orientation and supervision: Theory and practice. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 13, 23-40.
- Halwani, R. (1998). Essentialism, social constructionism, and the history of homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 35(1), 25-51.
- Hansen, M-B. M. (1998). The semantic status of discourse markers. *Lingua*, 104, 235-260.
- Hanson, E. (1995). The telephone and its queerness. In S-E. Case, P. Brett, & S. L. Foster (Eds.), *Cruising the performative: Interventions into the representation of ethnicity, nationality, and sexuality* (pp. 34-58). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hardiman, R. (1982). White identity development: A process model for describing the

- racial consciousness of White Americans. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43(104-A). US: University Microfilms International.
- Harkness, S., Super, C. M., & Keefer, C. H. (1992). Learning to be an American parent: How cultural models gain directive force. In R. G. D'Andrade & C. Strauss (Eds.), *Human motives and cultural models* (pp. 163-178). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Harper, F. D., & McFadden, J. (2003). Conclusions, trends, issues, and recommendations. In F. D. Harper & J. McFadden (Eds.), *Culture and counseling: New approaches* (pp. 379-393). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Harrison, N. (2000). Gay affirmative therapy: A critical analysis of the literature. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 38, 37-53.
- He, A. W., & Lindsey, B. (1998). 'You know' as an information status enhancing device: Arguments from grammar and interaction. *Functions of Language*, 5, 133-155.
- Healy, S. A. (2004). Advocating for health and human services: The New York experience. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 8, 43-66.
- Heath, C. C., & Luff, P. (Eds.) (2000). *Technology in action*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved December 11, 2006 from <http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/Doc?id=10014977>
- Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *Counseling Psychologist*, 12, 153-165.
- Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity attitudes: Theory, research and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity

- models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E. (1997). Implications for the validity of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 13-16.
- Henwood, K. L. (1993). Women and later life: The discursive construction of identities within family relationships. *Journal of Aging Studies, 7*, 303-319.
- Herdt, G. (1984). *Ritualized homosexuality in Melanesia*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Herdt, G. (1997). *Same sex, different culture: Gays and lesbians across culture*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Herek, G.M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9*, 19-22.
- Heritage, J. (1984). A change-of-state token and aspects of its consequential placement. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 299-345). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1997). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analysing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 161-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Hermans-Jansen, E. (1995). *Self-narratives: The construction of meaning in psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Herschberger, S. L. (1997). A twin registry study of male and female sexual orientation. *Journal of Sex Research, 34*, 212-222.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1997). Active Interviewing. In D. Silverman (Ed.),

- Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 113-129). London: Sage.
- Holzman, L. (Ed.) (1999). *Performing psychology: A postmodern culture of the mind*. New York: Routledge.
- Hooker, E. A. (1957). The adjustment of the male overt homosexual. *Journal of Projective Techniques*, 21, 17-31.
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S. & Levine, R. M (1997). On parallels between social cognition and the 'new racism'. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 305-329.
- Horowitz, J. L., & Newcomb, M. D. (2001). A multidimensional approach to homosexual identity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42(2), 1-19.
- Horvath, A. O., & Bedi, R. P. (2002). The alliance. In J. C. Norcross (Ed), *Psychotherapy relationships that work: Therapist contributions and responsiveness to patients* (pp. 37-69). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Howard, J. A. (2000). Social psychologies of identity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 367-393.
- Hutchby, I. (2007). *The discourse of child counselling*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hutchins, A. M. (2006). Counseling gay men. In C. C. Lee (Ed.), *Multicultural issues in counseling: New approaches to diversity* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 269-289). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Iannotta, J. G., & Kane, M. J. (2002). Sexual stories as resistance narratives in women's sports: Reconceptualizing identity performance. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 19, 347-369.

- Irvine, J. M. (1994). A place in the rainbow: Theorizing lesbian and gay culture. *Sociological Theory*, 12, 232-248.
- Isay, R. (1996). *Becoming gay: The journey to self-acceptance*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Israel, T., & Selvidge, M. M. D. (2003). Contributions of multicultural counseling to counselor competence with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 31, 84-98.
- Ivey, A. E., & Bradford Ivey, M. (1999). *Intentional interviewing and counseling: Facilitating client development in a multicultural society* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Iwasaki, Y., & Ristock, J. (2004). Coping with stress among gays and lesbians: Implications for human development over the lifespan. *World Leisure Journal*, 46, 26-37.
- Jackson, B. (1976). Black identity development. In L. H. Golubchick & B. Persky (Eds.), *Urban social and educational issues* (pp. 158-164). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. Melbourne, AUS: Melbourne University Press.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of psychology (Vols. I & II)*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Janesick, V. J. (1991). Ethnographic inquiry: Understanding culture and experience. In E.D. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (1999). Introduction: Perspectives on discourse

- analysis. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 1-44). New York: Routledge.
- Jefferson, G. (1993). Caveat speaker: Preliminary notes on recipient topic-shift implicature. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 26, 1-30.
- Jencius, M., & West, J. (2003). Traditional counseling theories and cross-cultural implications. In F. D. Harper & J. McFadden (Eds.), *Culture and counseling: New approaches* (pp. 339-349). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, C. W., & Kivel, B. (2007). Gender, sexuality and queer theory in sport. In C. C. Aitchison (Ed.), *Sport and gender identities: Masculinities, femininities and sexualities* (pp. 93-105). New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, E. P. (2001). “Quare” studies, or (almost) everything I know about queer studies I learned from my grandmother. *Text & Performance Quarterly*, 21, 1-25.
- Johnston, J. (1975). Are lesbians ‘gay’? *Ms.*, 3(12), 85-86.
- Jones, S. R. (1997). Voices of identity and difference: A qualitative exploration of the multiple dimensions of identity development in women college students. *Journal of Student College Development*, 38, 376-386.
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41, 405-414.
- Jordan, K. M., & Deluty, R. H. (1995). Clinical interventions by psychologists with lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 51, 448-456.
- Jucker, A. H., & Smith, A. W. (1998). *And people just you know like ‘wow’*: Discourse markers as negotiating strategies. In A. H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (Eds.), *Discourse markers: Descriptions and theories* (pp. 171-201). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Kagan, N. (1975a). Influencing human interaction: Eleven years with IPR. *Canadian Counsellor, 9*, 74-97.
- Kagan, N. (1975b). Interpersonal process recall: A method for influencing human interaction. Unpublished manuscript.
- Kagan, N., & Kagan, H. (1991). Interpersonal process recall. In P. W. Dowrick (Ed.), *Practical guide to using video in the behavioral sciences* (pp. 221-230). Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kagan, N., Schauble, P., Resnikoff, A., Danish, S. J., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1969). Interpersonal process recall. *Journal of Nervous & Mental Disease, 148*(4), 365-374.
- Kagitçibasi, C. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitçibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of Cross-cultural Psychology, Vol. 3* (pp. 1-49). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kahn, M.J. (1991). Factors affecting the coming out process for lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality, 21*, 47-70.
- Kanuha, V. K. (2000). 'Being native' versus 'going native': Conducting social work research as an insider. *Social Work, 45*, 439-447.
- Katz, J. N. (1983). *Gay/lesbian almanac*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Keats, J. (1970). *The letters of John Keats: A Selection*. R. Gittings (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kellett, P. (2004). Queer constructions: The making of gay men and the role of the homoerotic in therapy. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 34*, 180-190.
- Kidwell, J. S., Dunham, R. M., Bacho, R. A., Pastorino, E., & Portes, P. R. (1995). Adolescent identity exploration: A test of Erikson's theory of transitional crisis.

- Adolescence, 30*, 785-793.
- Kilgore, H., Sideman, L., Amin, K., Baca, L., & Bohanske, B. (2005). Psychologists' attitudes and therapeutic approaches toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual issues continue to improve: An update. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 42*, 395-400.
- Kim, B. S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (2002). Asian American client adherence to Asian cultural values, counsellor expression of cultural values, counselor ethnicity, and career counseling process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 3-13.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behaviour in the human male*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.
- Kirchick, J. (2006). Young, out, and gay - not queer. Retrieved December 28, 2006, from <http://www.indegayforum.org/news/show/27334.html>
- Kitzinger, C. (1987). *The social construction of lesbianism*. London: Sage.
- Kitzinger, C. (1995). Social constructionism: Implications for gay and lesbian psychology. In A. R. D'Augelli & C. J. Patterson (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities over the lifespan* (pp. 136-161). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kitzinger, C. (2000). Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism & Psychology, 10*, 163-193.
- Kitzinger, C. (2001). Sexualities. In R. K. Unger (Ed.), *Handbook of the psychology of women and gender* (pp. 272-285). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Kitzinger, C., & Coyle, A. (2002). Introducing lesbian and gay psychology. In A. Coyle & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: New perspective* (pp. 1-29). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

- Kitzinger, C., & Kitzinger, S. (2007). Birth trauma: Talking with women and the value of conversation analysis. *British Journal of Midwifery*, 15, 256-264.
- Kitzinger, C., & Perkins, R. (1992). Watching our language. In C. Kitzinger & R. Perkins (Eds.), *Changing our minds: Lesbian feminism and psychology* (pp. 32-72). New York: New York University Press.
- Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (1995). Transitions from heterosexuality to lesbianism. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 95-104.
- Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (1996). Theorizing representing the other. In S. Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Representing the other: A feminism & psychology reader* (pp. 1-32). London: Sage.
- Klein, F. (1993). *The bisexual option*. New York: Harrington Park.
- Klein , F. (1999). Psychology of sexual orientation. In J. S. Bohan & G. M. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 129-138). New York: New York University Press.
- Klein, F., Sepehoff, B., & Wolf, T. J. (1985). Sexual orientation: A multi-variable dynamic process. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 11(1/2), 35-49.
- Kocet, M. M. (2002). An examination of friendship between gay men and its impact on psychological well-being and identity disclosure: A case study. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 63(1-A). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 3039853)
- Kogan, S. M. (1998). The politics of making meaning: Discourse analysis of a 'postmodern' interview. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 20, 229-251.
- Krane, V. (1997). Homonegativism experienced by lesbian collegiate athletes. *Women in*

- Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 6*, 125-133.
- Krane, V. (2001). One lesbian feminist epistemology: Integrating feminist standpoing, queer theory, and feminist cultural studies. *Sport Psychologist, 15*, 401-411.
- Kulick, D. (1999). Transgender and language: A review of the literature and suggestions for the future. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian & Gay Studies, 5*, 605-622.
- Kwan, K-L. K. (2001a). Counseling applications of racial and ethnic identity models: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23*, 185-191.
- Kwan, K-L. K. (2001b). Models of racial and ethnic identity development: Delineation of practice implications. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23*, 269-277.
- Laing, R. D. (1960). *The divided self: An existential study in sanity and madness*. New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Land, V., & Kitzinger, C. (2005). Speaking as a lesbian: Correcting the heterosexist presumption. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 38*, 371-416.
- Lane, C. (1997). Psychoanalysis and sexual identity. In A. Medhurst & S. Munt (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay studies: A critical introduction* (pp. 160-175). London: Cassell.
- LaSala, M. C. (2000). Gay male couples: The importance of coming out and being out to parents. *Journal of Homosexuality, 39*(2), 47-71.
- LaSala, M. C. (2001). The importance of partners to lesbians' intergenerational relationships. *Social Work Research, 25*, 27-35.
- LaSala, M. C. (2003). When interviewing 'family': Maximizing the insider advantage in the qualitative study of lesbians and gay men. In W. Meezan & J. I. Martin (Eds.), *Research methods with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations* (pp. 15-

- 30). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Lawler, S. (2001). Introduction: The futures of gender and sexuality. *Social Epistemology*, 15, 71-76.
- Lawless, J. J. (2001). Exploring the discourse of race, ethnicity, and culture in clinical supervision of marriage and family therapy utilizing conversation analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 61(8-A). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 9984166)
- Leap, W. L. (1996). *Word's out: Gay men's English*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lebolt, J. (1999). Gay affirmative psychotherapy: A phenomenological study. *Clinical Social Work*, 27, 355-370.
- Lee, C. C. (Ed.) (2006). *Multicultural issues in counseling: New approaches to diversity*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Lee, K. (2001). Teaching, like, discourse markers. Retrieved December 28, from www.klee7.com/quaero/dm/dm_tesol01.pdf
- Lee, W. (2003). Kuaring queer theory: My autocritography and a race-conscious, womanist, transnational turn. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 45(2/3/4), 147-170.
- Lee, W. M. L. (1999). *An introduction to multicultural counseling*. Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers.
- Lett, J. (1990). Emic and etic: Notes on the epistemology of anthropology. In T. N. Headland, K. L. Pike, & M. Harris (Eds.), *Emics and etics: The insider outsider debate* (pp. 127-142). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Levitt, H. M. (2001). Sounds of silence in psychotherapy: The categorization of clients'

- pauses. *Psychotherapy Research*, 11, 295-309.
- Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflicts*. New York: Harper.
- Liddle, B.J. (1997). Gay and lesbian clients' selection of therapists and utilization of therapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 34(1), 11-18.
- Lippincott, J. A., & Lippincott, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Special populations in college counseling: A handbook for mental health professionals*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Livia, A. (2002). The future of queer linguistics. In K. Campbell-Kibler, R. J. Podesva, S. J. Roberts, & A. Wong (Eds.), *Language and sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice* (pp. 87-97). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Livia, A., & Hall, K. (1997). "It's a girl!": Bringing performativity back to linguistics. In A. Livia & K. Hall (Eds.), *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality* (pp. 3-18). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Logan, C. R. (2006). Counseling lesbian clients. In C. C. Lee (Ed.), *Multicultural issues in counseling: New approaches to diversity* (pp. 291-301). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- Louwerse, M. M., & Mitchell, H. H. (2003). Toward a taxonomy of a set of discourse markers in dialog: A theoretical and computational linguistic account. *Discourse Processes*, 35, 199-139.
- Lugton, J. (1997). The nature of social support as experienced by women treated for breast cancer. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25, 1184-1191.
- Lynch, M. (2002). From naturally occurring data to naturally organized ordinary

- activities: Comment on Speer. *Discourse Studies*, 4, 531-537.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lytle, L. J., Bakken, L., & Romig, C. (1997). Adolescent female identity development. *Sex Roles*, 37, 175-185.
- Maines, D. (1993). Narrative's moment and sociology's phenomena. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 17-38.
- Mair, D., & Izzard, S. (2001). Grasping the nettle: Gay men's experiences in therapy. *Psychodynamic Counselling*, 7, 475-490.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence: In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.
- Marcia, J. E. (1989). Identity and intervention. *Journal of Adolescence*, 12, 401-410.
- Martell, C. R., Safren, S. A., & Prince, S. E. (2004). *Cognitive-behavioral therapies with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Martens, M. P., & Mobley, M. (2005). Straight guys working with gay guys: Homophobia and sport psychology service delivery. In M. B. Andersen (Ed.), *Sport psychology in practice* (pp. 249-263). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Massad, J. (2002). Re-orienting desire: The gay international and the Arab world. *Public Culture*, 14, 361-385.
- Mazeland, H., & ten Have, P. (1996). Essential tensions in (semi)open research interviews. In I. Maso & F. Wester (Eds.), *The deliberate dialogue: Qualitative perspectives on the interview* (pp. 87-113). Brussels: VUB University Press. Retrieved November 15, 2005 from <http://www.paultenhave.nl/ET.htm>

- McCarn, S. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Revisioning sexual minority identity formation: A new model of lesbian identity and its implications for counselling and research. *Counseling Psychologist, 24*, 508-534.
- McCarthy, M. (2003). Talking back: ‘Small’ interactional response tokens in everyday conversation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 36*, 33-63.
- McClave, E. Z. (2000). Linguistic functions of head movements in the context of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics, 32*, 855-878.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. (2002). Queering semantics: Definitional struggles. In K. Campbell-Kibler, R. J. Podesva, S. J., Roberts, & A. Wong (Eds.), *Language and Sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice* (pp. 137-160), Stanford, CA: CLSI Publications.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). What’s in a name? Social labeling and gender practices. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 69-97). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- McIlvenny, P. (2002). Introduction. In P. McIlvenny (Ed.), *Talking gender and sexuality* (pp. 1-49). Retrieved January 18, 2007 from <http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/Doc?id=10022278>
- McKay, J., Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. (2000). Studying sport, men, and masculinities from feminist standpoints. In J. McKay, M. A. Messner, & D. Sabo (Eds.), *Maculinities, gender relations, and sport* (pp. 1-11). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Age*. New York: Routledge.
- McLeod, J. (2001). *Qualitative research in counselling and psychotherapy*. London:

Sage.

- McWhorter, L. (1999). *Bodies and pleasures: Foucault and the politics of sexual normalization*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meezan, W., & Martin, J. I. (2003). Exploring current themes in research on gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender populations. In W. Meezan & J. I. Martin (Eds.), *Research methods with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations* (pp. 65-78). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Mercier, L., & Berger, R. (1989). Social service needs of lesbian and gay adolescents: Telling it their way. *Journal of Social Work & Human Sexuality*, 8, 75-95.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *The phenomenology of perception*. London: Routledge.
- Messner, M. A. (1996). Studying up on sex. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 13, 221-237.
- Messner, M. A. (1998). Our queer dilemma: Response to Davidson and Shogan. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 15, 367-371.
- Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. F. (1990). Introduction: Toward a critical feminist reappraisal of sport, men, and the gender order. In M. A. Messner & D. F. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Milton, M., Coyle, A., & Legg, C. (2002). Lesbian and gay affirmative psychotherapy: Defining the domain. In A. Coyle & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: New perspective* (pp. 175-197). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

- Mohr, J. J., & Woodhouse, S. S. (2001). Looking inside the therapeutic alliance: Assessing clients' visions of helpful and harmful psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy Bulletin, 36*, 15-16.
- Monk, G., & Gehart, D. R. (2003). Sociopolitical activist or conversational partner? Distinguishing the position of the therapist in narrative and collaborative therapies. *Family Process, 42*, 19-30.
- Moore, L. J., & Clarke, A. E. (2001). The traffic in cyberanatomies: Sex/gender/sexualities in local and global formations. *Body & Society, 7*, 57-96.
- Moorhead, C. (1999). Queering identities: The roles of integrity and belonging in becoming ourselves. *Journal of Gay, Lesbian, & Bisexual Identity, 4*, 327-343.
- Morrin, S. F. (1991). Removing the stigma: Lesbian and gay affirmative counselling. *Counseling psychologist, 19*, 245-247.
- Morris, J. F. (1997). Lesbian coming out as a multidimensional process. *Journal of Homosexuality, 33*(2), 1-22.
- Morris, J. F., Waldo, C. R., & Rothblum, E. D. (2001). A model of predictors and outcomes of outness among lesbian and bisexual women. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 71*, 61-71.
- Morrow, S. L. (2000). First do no harm: Therapist issues in psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. In R. M. Perez, K. A. DeBord, & K. J. Bieschke (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients* (pp. 138-156). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Morrow, R. B., & Gill, D. L. (2003). Perceptions of homophobia and heterosexism in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 74*, 205-214.

- Moustakas, C. (1990). *Heuristic research: Design, methodology, and applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Muller, L. E., & Hartman, J. (1998). Group counseling for sexual minority youth. *Professional School Counseling, 1*(3), 38-41.
- Murray, S. O. (1992). *Oceanic homosexualities*. New York: Garland.
- Murray, S. O. (1995). *Latin American male homosexualities*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Murray, S. O. (1996). *American gay*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Murray, S. O. (2000). *Homosexualities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Neimeyer, R. A. (1998). Social constructionism in the counselling context. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 11*, 135-149.
- Nichols, M. (Director/Executive Producer). (2003). *Angels in America* [Television mini-series]. New York: HBO Television.
- Norrick, N. R. (1993). *Conversational joking: Humor in everyday talk*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Nylund, D. (2004). When in Rome: Heterosexism, homophobia, and sports talk radio. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 28*, 136-168.
- O'Connell, D. C., & Kowal, S. (1995). Basic principles in transcription. In J. A. Smith, R. Harré, & L. van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 93-105). London: Sage.
- O'Connor, M. (1992). Psychotherapy with gay and lesbian adolescents. In S. Dworkin & F. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Counseling gay men and lesbians: Journey to the end of the Rainbow* (pp. 3-21). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and

Development.

- O'Dell, S. (2000). Psychotherapy with gay and lesbian families: Opportunities for cultural inclusion and clinical challenge. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 28*, 171-182.
- Offord, B., & Cantrell, L. (1999). Unfixed in a fixated world: Identity, sexuality, race and culture. *Journal of Homosexuality, 36*(3/4), 207-220.
- Ohnuki-Tierney, E. (1984). "Native" anthropologists. *American Ethnologist, 11*, 584-586.
- O'Neill, B. (2002). "...we didn't connect at all": The experiences of a gay client. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 14*, 75-91.
- Otake, T., & Cutler, A. (2003). Evidence against "units of perception". In S. P. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research* (pp. 59-84). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Outsports. (2007). Retrieved February 8, 2007, from <http://www.outsports.com/nba/20062007/0208amaechireaction.htm>
- Packard, T. (2006). Practical eclecticism. *PsycCritiques* (Electronic Collection: 2006-06397-026).
- Palma, T. V., & Stanley, J. L. (2002). Effective counseling with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Journal of College Counseling, 5*, 74-89.
- Patton, M. J. (1989). Problems with and alternatives to the use of coding schemes in research on counseling. *Counseling Psychologist, 17*, 490-506.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Paul, J. P., Catania, J., Pollack, L., Moskowitz, J., Canchola, J., Mills, T., et al. (2002). Suicide attempts among gay and bisexual men: Lifetime prevalence and antecedents. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*, 1338-1345.
- Pearson, Q. M. (2003). Breaking the silence in the counselor education classroom: A training seminar on counseling sexual minority clients. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 81*, 292-300.
- Pedersen, P. B. (1995). The culture-bound counsellor as an unintentional racist. *Canadian Journal of Counselling, 29*, 197-205.
- Pedersen, P. B. (2001). Multiculturalism and the paradigm shift in counselling: Controversies and alternative futures. *Canadian Journal of Counselling, 35*, 15-25.
- Pelose, G. C. (1987). The functions of behavioral synchrony and speech rhythm in conversation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 20*, 171-220.
- Peplau, L. A., & Garnets, L. D. (2000). A new paradigm for understanding women's sexuality and sexual orientation. *Journal of Social Issues, 56*, 329-350.
- Peräkylä, A. (2005). Analyzing talk and text. In N. K. Denzon & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 869-886). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peräkylä, A., & Vehviläinen, S. (2003). Conversation analysis and the professional stocks of interactional knowledge. *Discourse & Society, 14*, 727-750.
- Peterson, J. L. (1995). AIDS-related risks and same-sex behavior among African American men. In B. Greene & G. M. Herek (Eds.), *AIDS, identity, and community* (pp. 85-104). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perez, R. M., & Amadio, D. M. (2004). Affirmative counseling and psychotherapy with

- lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. In C. Negy (Ed.), *Cross-cultural psychotherapy: Toward a critical understanding of diverse clients* (pp. 301-325). Reno, NV: Bent Knee Press.
- Petitpas, A. J., Giges, B., & Danish, S. J. (1999). The sport psychologist-athlete relationship: Implications for training. *Sport Psychologist, 13*, 344-357.
- PFLAG. Retrieved January 4, 2007, from <http://www.pflag.org>
- PFLAG Canada. Retrieved January 4, 2007, from <http://www.pflagcanada.ca>
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 488-514.
- Phinney, J. S. (1996). Understanding ethnic diversity: The role of ethnic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 143-153.
- Phinney, J. S., & Rosenthal, D. A. (1992). Ethnic identity in adolescence: Process, context, and outcome. In G. R. Adams, T. P. Gulotta, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), *Adolescent identity formation: Advances in adolescent development* (pp. 145-172). London: Sage.
- Pinar, W. F. (1998). Introduction. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Queer theory in education* (pp. 1-47). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Piper, A. (2002). Some people have credit cards and others have giro cheques: “Individuals” and “people” as lifelong learners in late modernity. In M. Toolan (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: Critical concepts in linguistics* (pp. 329-359). New York: Routledge.

- Platzer, H. K. (2006). *Positioning identities: Lesbians' and gays' experiences with mental health care*. Edmonton, AB: Qual Institute Press.
- Plummer, K. (1975). *Sexual stigma: An interactionist account*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Plummer, K. (1995). *Telling sexual stories*. London: Routledge.
- Plummer, K. (2003). Queers, bodies and postmodern sexualities: A note on revisiting the "sexual" in symbolic interactionism. *Qualitative Sociology*, 26, 515-530.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). Narrative expression. In D. E. Polkinghorne (Ed.), *Narrative knowing and the human sciences* (pp. 13-36). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1991). Narrative and self-concept. *Journal of Narrative & Life History*, 1, 135-153.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8, 5-23.
- Pomerantz, A. M. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis* (pp. 57-101). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. M. (2000). Interviews and identity: A critical discourse perspective. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 16, 25-37.
- Pomerantz, A. M., & Fehr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk, (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, Vol. 2 (pp. 64-

- 91). London: Sage.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (1988). Racial consciousness development among White counsellor trainees: A stage model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 16(4), 146-156.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (1998). Charting a course for research in multicultural counseling training. *Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 43-68.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (2001). *Handbook of multicultural counselling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pope, M. (1995). The “salad bowl” is big enough for us all: An argument for the inclusion of lesbians and gay men in any definition of multiculturalism. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73, 301-304.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., Liu, W. M., Toporek, R. L., & Brittan-Powell, C. S. (2001). What's missing from multicultural competency research: Review, introspection, and recommendations. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7, 121-138.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., Ligiéro, D. P., Brittan-Powell, C.S., Liu, W. M., et al. (2002). Client perspectives of multicultural counseling competence: A qualitative examination. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 30(3), 353-393.
- Poskiparta, M., Kettunen, T., & Liimatainen, L. (1998). Reflective questions in health counseling. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8, 682-693.
- Potter, J. (1998). Qualitative and discourse analysis. In A. S. Bellack & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Comprehensive clinical psychology* (pp. 117-144). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Potter, J. (2002). Two kinds of natural. *Discourse Studies*, 4, 539-542.

- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1994). Analyzing discourse. In A. Bryman & R. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 47-65). New York: Routledge.
- Prieur, A. (1998). Bodily and symbolic constructions among homosexual men in Mexico. *Sexualities, 1*, 287-298.
- Prus, R. (1998). Respecting the human condition. In C. Grills (Ed.), *Doing ethnographic research: Fieldwork settings* (pp. 21-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pronger, B. (1998). Post-sport: Transgressing boundaries in physical culture. In G. Rail (Ed.), *Sport and postmodern times* (pp. 277-298). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Pronger, B. (1999). Outta my endzone: Sport and the territorial anus. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 23*, 373-389.
- Pronger, B. (2000). Homosexuality and sport: Who's winning? In J. McKay, M. A. Messner, & D. Sabo (Eds.), *Masculinities, gender relations, and sport* (pp. 222-244). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pronger, B. (2002). *Body fascism: Salvation in the technology of physical fitness*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Psathas, G., & Anderson, T. (1990). The 'practices' of transcription in conversation analysis. *Semiotica, 78*, 75-99.
- Queen, R. M. (1997). "I don't speak Spritch": Locating lesbian language. In A. Livia & K. Hall (Eds.), *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality* (pp. 233-256). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Queen, R. M. (2002). A matter of interpretation: The 'future' of 'queer linguistics'. In K. Campbell-Kibler, R. J. Podesva, S. J. Roberts, & A. Wong (Eds.), *Language and*

- sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice* (pp. 69-86). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Quiroga, J. (2000). *Tropics of desire: Interventions from queer Latino America*. New York: New York University Press.
- Reed-Danahay, D. E. (1997). Introduction. In D. E. Reed-Danahay (Ed.), *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social* (pp. 1-18). New York: Berg.
- Rendle-Short, J. (2004). Showing structure: Using *um* in the academic seminar. *Pragmatics*, 14, 479-498.
- Resides, D. L. (1998). The thing not named: How do lesbians experience graduate school? *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences*, 58(12-A). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 9817565)
- Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Journal of Women in Culture & Society*, 5, 631-660.
- Richards, D. A. J. (1999). *Identity and the case for gay rights: Race, gender, religion as analogies*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Richardson, D. (1993). Recent challenges to traditional assumptions about homosexuality: Some implications for practice. In L. Garnets & D. C. Kimmell, *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences* (pp. 117-129). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as another* (K. Blamey, Trans.). Chicago: University Press of Chicago.
- Rimmerman, C. A. (2002). *From identity to politics: The lesbian and gay movements in*

- the United States.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ritter, K. Y., & Terndrup, A. I. (2002). *Handbook of affirmative psychotherapy with lesbians and gay men.* New York: Guilford Press.
- Robinson, T. L. *The convergence of race, ethnicity, and gender: Multiple identities in counseling* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Romero, D., & Chan, A. (2005). Profiling Derald Wing Sue: Blazing the trail for the multicultural training, racial attitudes, and attributions of poverty among graduate counseling trainees. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83*, 202-213.
- Rotella, R. J., & Murray, M. M. (1991). Homophobia, the world of sport, and sport psychology consulting. *Sport Psychologist, 5*, 355-364.
- Rothblum, E.D. (2000). Sexual orientation and sex in women's lives: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Journal of Social Issues, 56*, 193-204.
- Rotheram-Borus, M. J., & Fernandez, M. I. (1995). Sexual orientation and developmental challenges experienced by gay and lesbian youth. *Journal of Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior, 25*, 26-34.
- Roulston, K. J. (2006). Close encounters of the 'CA' kind: A review of literature analysing talk in research interviews. *Qualitative Research, 6*, 515-534.
- Roulston, K. J., Baker, C. D., & Liljestrom, A. (2001). Analyzing the researcher's work in generating data: The case of complaints. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*, 745-772.
- Rowe, W., Bennett, S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (1994). White racial identity models: A critique and alternative proposal. *Counseling Psychologist, 22*, 129-146.
- Rushdie, S. (1999). *The ground beneath her feet.* New York: Henry Holt.
- Russell, J. S., & Bohan, G. M. (1999a). Introduction. In G. M. Bohan & J. S.

- Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 1-10). New York: New York University Press.
- Russell, J. S., & Bohan, G. M. (1999b). Implications for clinical work. In G. M. Bohan & J. S. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 31-56). New York: New York University Press.
- Rust, P. C. (1996). Finding a sexual identity and community: Therapeutic implications and cultural assumptions in scientific models of coming out. In E. D. Rothblum & L. A. Bond (Eds.), *Preventing heterosexism and homophobia* (pp. 87-123). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rust, P. C. (2001). Two many and not enough: The meanings of bisexual identities. *Journal of Bisexuality, 1*, 31-68.
- Sabnani, H. B., Ponterotto, J. G., & Borodovsky, L. D. (1991). White racial identity development and cross-cultural counsellor training: A stage model. *Counseling Psychologist, 19*, 72-102.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation* (Vols. I & II) (G. Jefferson, Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language, 50*(4), 696-735.
- Said, E. W. (1994). *Representations of the intellectual*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sampson, E. E. (1993). Identity politics: Challenges to psychology's understandings. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1219-1230.
- Sarbin, T. R. (1986). *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct*. New York: Praeger.

- Sarbin, T. R. (1997). The poetics of identity. *Theory & Psychology*, 7, 67-82.
- Sartelle, J. (1994). Rejecting the gay brain (and choosing homosexuality). *Bad Subjects: Political Education for Everyday Life*, 14. Retrieved December 28, 2006, from <http://bad.eserver.org/issues/1994/14/sartelle.html>
- Savin-Williams, R. C. (1998). "... and then I became gay:" *Young men's stories*. New York: Routledge.
- Savin-Williams, R. C. (2005). *The new gay teenager*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Savin-Williams, R. C., & Diamond, L. M. (2000). Sexual identity trajectories among sexual-minority youths: Gender comparisons. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 29, 607-627.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1982). Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 71-93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Between micro and macro: Contexts and other connections. In J. C. Alexander, B. Giesen, R. Munch, & N. J. Smelser (Eds.), *The micro-macro link* (pp. 207-236). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 26, 99-128.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Turn-organization: One intersection of grammar and interaction. In E. Ochs, E. A. Schegloff, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Interaction and grammar* (pp. 52-133). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8, 289-327.

- Scheurich, J. J. (1995). A postmodern critique of research interviewing. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8, 239-252.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (2001). Discourse marker: Language, meaning, and context. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 54-75). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (2001). Introduction. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton, (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 1-10). New York: Routledge.
- Schindler, N. (Producer). (2000). *Queer as folk 2: Same men, new tricks*. [Television series]. Channel 4: Red productions.
- Schlichter, A. (2004). Queer at last? Straight intellectuals and the desire for transgression. *GLQ: A Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies*, 10, 545-564.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schourup, L. (1999). Discourse markers. *Lingua*, 107, 227-265.
- Schwartz, S. J. (2001). The evolution of Eriksonian and neo-Eriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. *Identity*, 1, 7-58.
- Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sedgwick, E. K. (1993). Queer performativity: Henry James' The Art of the Novel. *GLQ: A Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies*, 1, 1-16.
- Seidman, I. (1998). A structure for in-depth, phenomenological interviewing. In I.

- Seidman (Ed.), *Interviewing as a qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and social sciences* (pp. 9-21). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Seidman, S. (1993). Identity and politics in a “Postmodern” gay culture: Some historical and conceptual notes. In M. Warner (Ed.), *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory* (pp. 105-142). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Seidman, S. (1994). Symposium: Queer theory/sociology: A dialogue. *Sociological Theory*, 12, 166-177.
- Seidman, S. (2003). *The social construction of sexuality*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Seidman, S., Meeks, C., & Traschen, F. (1999). Beyond the closet? The changing social meaning of homosexuality in the United States. *Sexualities*, 2, 9-34.
- Selting, M. (2000). The construction of units in conversational talk. *Language in Society*, 29, 477-517.
- Shawver, L. (2004). Therapy theory after the postmodern turn. In D. Paré & G. Larner (Eds.), *Collaborative practice in psychology and therapy* (pp. 23-39). New York: Haworth Clinical Practice Press.
- Shotter, J. (1993a). *Conversational realities: Constructing life through language*. London: Sage.
- Shotter, J. (1993b). *Cultural politics of everyday life: Social constructionism, rhetoric and knowing of the third kind*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Shotter, J. (1995). In conversation: Joint action, shared intentionality and ethics. *Theory & Psychology*, 5, 49-73.

- Siegelman, M. (1972). Adjustment of male homosexuals and heterosexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 2*, 9-25.
- Silverman, D. (1997). The construction of 'delicate' objects in counselling. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Discourses of counselling: HIV counselling as social interaction* (pp. 63-88). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (Ed.). (2001). Construction of 'delicate' objects in counseling. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 116-137). London: Sage.
- Simoni, J. M., & Walters, K. L. (2001). Heterosexual identity and heterosexism: Recognizing privilege to reduce prejudice. *Journal of Homosexuality, 41*(1), 157-172.
- Sinacore, A. L., & Enns, C. Z. (2005). Multicultural and feminist literature: Themes, dimensions, and variations. In C. Z. Enns & A. L. Sinacore (Eds.), *Teaching and social justice: Integrating multicultural and feminist theories in the classroom* (pp. 99-107). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 181-188.
- Somers, M. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity. *Theory & Society, 23*, 605-649.
- Sophie, J. (1986). A critical examination of stage theories of lesbian identity development. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12*(2), 39-51.
- Speedy, J. (2000). The 'storied' helper: Narrative ideas and practices in counselling and psychotherapy. *European Journal of Psychotherapy, Counselling & Health, 3*, 361-374.

- Speer, S. A. (2002a). What can conversation analysis contribute to feminist methodology? Putting reflexivity into practice. *Discourse & Society*, 13, 783-803.
- Speer, S. A. (2002b). 'Natural' and 'contrived' data: A sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies*, 4, 511-525.
- Speer, S. A. (2002c). Transcending the 'natural'/'contrived' distinction: A rejoinder to ten Have, Lynch and Potter. *Discourse Studies*, 4, 543-548.
- Speer, S. A. (2005). *Gender talk: Feminism, discourse and conversation analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, 'translations' and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19, 387-420.
- Steenbarger, B. (1991). All the world is not a stage: Emerging contextualist themes in counseling and development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 288-296.
- Stein, A., & Plummer, K. (1996). "I can't even think straight": "Queer" theory and the missing sexual revolution in sociology. In S. Seidman (Ed.), *Queer theory/sociology* (pp. 129-144). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stein, T. S. (1996). The essentialist/social constructionist debate about homosexuality and its relevance for psychotherapy. In R. Cabaj & T. S. Stein (Eds.), *Textbook of homosexuality and mental health* (pp. 83-99). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Stelter, R. (2000). The transformation of body experience into language. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 31, 63-77.
- Stivers, T. (2005). Modified repeats: One method for asserting primary rights from

- second position. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 38, 131-158.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strong, T. (2002). Dialogue in therapy's "boderzone". *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 15, 245-262.
- Strong, T. (2005). Understanding in counselling: A preliminary social constructionist and conversation analytic examination. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 33, 513-533.
- Strong, T., & Paré, D. (2004). Striving for perspicuity, talking our way forward. In T. Strong & D. Paré (Eds.). *Furthering talk: Advances in the discursive therapies* (pp. 1-14). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Strong, T., & Zeman, D. (2005). 'Othering' and 'selving' in therapeutic dialogue. *European Journal of Psychotherapy, Counselling & Health*, 7, 245-261.
- Strong, T., & Zeman, D. (in press). Dialogic considerations of "confrontation" in counseling: Micro-analyzing the use of a microskill. *Journal of Counseling & Development*.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1999). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2003). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Sue, D. W., Carter, R. T., Casas, J. M., Fouad, N. A., Ivey, A. E., & Jensen, M., et al. (1998). *Multicultural counselling competencies: Individual and organizational development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sue, S., & Sue, D. W. (1971). Chinese-American personality and mental health. *Amerasia Journal*, 1, 36-49.
- Sullivan, N. (2003). *A critical introduction to queer theory*. New York: New York University Press.
- Sundén, J. (2002). "I'm still not sure she's a she": Textual talk and typed bodies in online interaction. In P. McIlvenny (Ed.), *Talking gender and sexuality* (pp. 289-312). Retrieved January 18, 2007 from <http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/Doc?id=10022278>
- Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered discourses*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Swann, S. K., & Anastas, J. W. (2003). Dimensions of lesbian identity during adolescence and young adulthood. In W. Meezan & J. I. Martin (Eds.), *Research methods with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations* (pp. 109-125). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Sykes, H. (1996). Constr(i)(u)cting lesbian identities in physical education: Feminist and poststructural approaches to researching sexuality. *Quest*, 48, 459-469.
- Tagliamonte, S. (2005). So who? *Like* how? *Just* what? Discourse markers in the Conversations of young Canadians. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 1896-1915.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *The social psychology of minorities*. New York: Minority Rights Group.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G.

- Austin & S. Worschel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Taleghani-Nikazm, C., & Vlatten, A. (1997). Instruction receipt in face-to-face interaction. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 8, 119-131.
- Tanner, L. R., & Lyness, K. P. (2003). Out of the closet, still in the home: Providing queer affirmative therapy for youth and their families. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 5, 21-35.
- Taylor, S. (2001). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 5-48). Bath, UK: Bath Press.
- Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and ethnographic representation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 455-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. London: Sage.
- ten Have, P. (2002). Ontology or methodology? Comments on Speer's 'natural' and 'contrived' data: A sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies*, 4, 527-530.
- ten Have, P. (2004). *Understanding qualitative research and ethnomethodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, N. L., McCandless, B. R., & Strickland, B. (1971). Personal adjustment of male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 78, 237-240.
- Tiefer, L. (1999). Don't look for perfects. In J. S. Bohan & G. M. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 77-84). New York:

- New York University Press.
- Tierney, W.G. (1997). Queer theory as cultural politics. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Academic outlaws: Queer theory and cultural studies in the academy* (pp. 19-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tomm, K. (1988). 'Interventive interviewing: Part III. Intending to ask lineal, circular, strategic, or reflexive questions?' *Family Process*, 27, 1-15.
- Toolan, M. (1997). What is critical discourse analysis and why are people saying such terrible things about it? *Language & Literature*, 6, 83-103.
- Toporek, R. L., & Pope-Davis, D. B. (2005). Exploring the relationships between multi-cultural training, racial attitudes, and attributions of poverty among graduate counseling trainees. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 11, 259-271.
- Troiden, R. (1979). Becoming homosexual: A model of gay identity acquisition. *Psychiatry*, 42(4), 362-373.
- Troiden, R. (1988). Homosexual identity development. *Society for Adolescent Medicine*, 9, 105-113.
- Troiden, R. (1989). The formation of homosexual identities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 17(1-2), 43-73.
- Troiden, R. (1993). The formation of homosexual identities. In L. D. Garnets & D. C. Kimmel (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences. Between men-between women: Lesbian and gay studies* (pp. 191-217). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tsou, A. Y-M. (2002). Understanding the influence of ethnic identity and acculturation

- on psychological adjustment among Chinese American adolescents. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: Sciences & Engineering*, 62(9-B). US: University Microfilms International. (UMI 3026991)
- Turner, W. B. (2000). *A genealogy of queer theory*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Uldall, K. K., & Palmer, N. B. (2004). Sexual minorities and mental health: The need for a public health response. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 8, 11-24.
- Umbach, C. (2005). Contrast and information structure: A focus-based analysis of *but*. *Linguistics*, 43(1), 207-232.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2000). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 2000*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Valentine, D. (2004). The categories themselves. *GLQ: A Journal of Gay & Lesbian Studies*, 10, 215-220.
- van de Mark, B. (2007). Gay Republicans: An oxymoron? *Gay & Lesbian Times*. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from www.gaylesbiantimes.com/?id=6206
- van Dijk, T. A. (1983). Discourse analysis: Its development and application to the structure of news. *Journal of Communication*, 33, 20-43.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997a). The study of discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, Vol. 1* (pp. 1-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997b). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary*

- introduction, Vol. 2* (pp. 1-37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). New York: Routledge.
- van Manen, M. (1997). Human science. In M. van Manen (Ed.), *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy* (pp. 1-34). London, ON: The Althouse Press.
- Vareldzis, B. P., & Andronico, M. J. (2000). Developing a college men's growth group. *Journal of American College Health, 49*, 93-96.
- Vontress, C. E. (1971). Racial differences: Impediments to rapport. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18*, 7-13.
- Wahlström, J. (1990). Conversations on contexts and meanings: On understanding therapeutic change from a contextual viewpoint. *Contemporary Family Therapy, 12*, 455-466.
- Warner, M. (1993). *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Warner, M. (1999). *The trouble with normal: Sex, politics and the ethics of queer life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Warren, P. N. (1974). *The front runner*. Beverly Hills, CA: Wildcat Press.
- Weatherall, A. (2002). *Gender, language and discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Weeks, J. (1995). *Invented moralities: Sexual values in an age of uncertainty*.

- New York: Columbia University Press.
- Weinberg, T. S. (1984). Biology, ideology, and the reification of developmental stages in the study of homosexual identities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10(3/4), 77-84.
- Weinrach, S. G., & Thomas, K. R. (1996). The counseling profession's commitment to diversity-sensitive counseling: A critical reassessment. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 74, 472-477.
- Welch, I. D. (2003). *The therapeutic relationship: Listening and responding in a multicultural world*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Wellard, I. (2002). Men, sport, body performance and maintenance of 'exclusive masculinity'. *Leisure Studies*, 21, 235-247.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 387-412.
- Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology*, 9, 335-356.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*. London: Sage.
- Wheeler, D. P. (2003). Methodological issues in conducting community-based health and social services research among urban Black and African American LGBT populations. In W. Meezan & J. I. Martin (Eds.), *Research methods with gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations* (pp. 65-78). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Whisman, V. (1996). *Queer by choice: Lesbians, gay men, and the politics of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- White, J. E. (1997, May 5). I'm just who I am. *Time*, 149(18), 32-36. New York: Time

- Incorporated. pp. 32-36.
- White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Widdicombe, S. (1998). Identity as an analyst's and a participant's resource. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 191-206). London: Sage.
- Widdicombe, S., & Wooffitt, R. (1995). *The language of youth subcultures: Social identity in action*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). (1995). *Feminism and discourse: Psychological perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). (1996). *Representing the other: A feminism & psychology reader*. London: Sage.
- Williams, C. B. (2005). Counseling African America women: Multiple identities – multiple constraints. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 83, 278-283.
- Willott, S., & Griffin, C. (1997). 'Wham bam, am I a man?': Unemployed men talk about masculinities. *Feminism & Psychology*, 7, 107-128.
- Winslade, J. M. (2005). Utilizing discursive positioning in counselling. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 33, 351-364.
- Winslade, J., Monk, G., & Drewery, W. (1997). Sharpening the critical edge: A social constructionist approach in counselor education. In T. L. Sexton & B. L. Griffin (Eds.), *Constructivist thinking in counselor practice, research, and training* (pp. 228-245). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1969). *On certainty* (G. E. M. Anscombe & G. H. von Wright, Eds., D. Paul & G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Wodak, R. (Ed.) (1997). Introduction: Some important issues in the research of gender and discourse. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and discourse* (pp. 1-20). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (Ed.) (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Retrieved December 10, 2006, from <http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.lib.ucalgary.ca/lib/ucalgary/Doc?id=10080947>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.) (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wolf-Wendel, L. E., Toma, J. D., & Morphew, C. C. (2001). How much difference is too much difference? Perceptions of gay men and lesbians in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 465-479.
- Wong, A., Roberts, S. J., & Campbell-Kibler, K. (2002). Speaking of sex. In K. Campbell-Kibler, R. J. Podesva, S. J. Roberts, & A. Wong (Eds.), *Language and sexuality: Contesting meaning in theory and practice* (pp. 1-21). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Woods, D. (2003). *Transana* (Version 1.22). Available free from the website: <http://www.transana.org>
- Wooffitt, R. (2001). A socially organized basis for displays of cognition: Procedural orientation to evidential turns in psychic-sitter interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 545-563.
- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Woog, D. (1998). *Jocks: True stories of America's gay male athletes*. New York: Alyson Books.
- Woog, D. (2002). *Jocks2: Coming out to play*. New York: Alyson Books.
- Wortham, S. (2000). Interactional positioning and narrative self-construction. *Narrative Inquiry*, 10, 157-184.
- Wright, L. (1994). One drop of blood. *The New Yorker*, July 25, 46-55.
- Yarhouse, M. A. (2005). Constructive relationships between religion and the scientific study of sexuality. *Journal of Psychology & Christianity*, 24, 29-35.
- Yeh, C. J., & Huang, K. (1996). The collectivistic nature of ethnic identity development among Asian-American college students. *Adolescence*, 3, 644-661.
- Yi, K., & Shorter-Gooden, K. (1999). Ethnic identity formation: From stage theory to a constructivist narrative model. *Pyschotherapy*, 36, 16-26.
- Yngve, V. (1970). On getting a word in edgewise. Papers from the sixth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, 567-578.

APPENDIX A

Brief reference list for suicide, risk of suicide, suicidality of minority sexuality persons

References

- Cochran, S. D., & Mays, V. M. (2000). Lifetime prevalence of suicide symptoms and affective disorders among men reporting same-sex sexual partners: Results from NHANES III. *American Journal of Public Health, 90*, 573-578.
- Garcia, J., Adams, J., Friedman, L., & East, P. (2002). Links between past abuse, suicide ideation, and sexual orientation among San Diego college students. *Journal of American College Health, 51*, 9-14.
- Halpert, S. C. (2002). Suicidal behavior among gay male youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy, 6*, 53-79.
- Hirshberger, S. L., Pilkington, N. W., & D'Augelli, R. D. (1997). Predictors of suicide attempts among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12*, 477-497.
- Jobes, D. A., Jacoby, A. M., Cimbolic, P., & Hustead, L. A. T. (1997). Assessment and treatment of suicidal clients in a university counseling center. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 368-377.
- McAndrew, S., & Warne, T. (2004). Ignoring the evidence dictating the practice: Sexual orientation, suicidality and the dichotomy of the mental health nurse. *Journal of Psychiatric & Mental Health Nursing, 11*, 428-434.
- McBee-Strayer, S. M., & Rogers, J. R. 2002). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual suicidal behavior: Testing a constructivist model. *Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior, 32*, 272-283.
- McDaniel, J. S., Purcell, D., & D'Augelli, A. R. (2001). The relationship between sexual orientation and risk for suicide: Research findings and future directions for research

- and prevention. *Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior*, 31(S), 84-105.
- McFarland, W. P. (1998). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual student suicide. *Professional School Counseling*, 1, 26-29.
- Morrison, L. L., & L'Heureux, J. (2001). Suicide and gay/lesbian/bisexual youth: Implications for clinicians. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 39-49.
- Mościcki, E. K., Muehrer, P., & Potter, L. B. (1995). Introduction to supplemental issue: Research issues in suicide and sexual orientation. *Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior*, 25(S), 1-3.
- Paul, J. P., Catania, J., Pollack, L., Moskowitz, J., Canchola, J., Mills, T., et al. (2002). Suicide attempts among gay and bisexual men: Lifetime prevalence and antecedents. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92, 1338-1345.
- Ramefedi, F., French, S., Story, M., Resnick, M. D., & Blum, R. (1998). The relationship between suicide risk and sexual orientation: Results of a population-based study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 88, 57-60.
- Russel, S. T., & Joyner, K. (2001). Adolescent sexual orientation and suicide risk: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 31, 1276-1281.
- Safren, S. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (1999). Depression, hopelessness, suicidality, and related factors in sexual minority and heterosexual adolescents. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 67, 859-866.
- Weissman, M. M., Bland, R. C., Canino, G. J., Greenwald, S., Hwu, H.-G., Joyce, P. R., et al. (1999). Prevalence of suicide ideation and suicide attempts in nine countries. *Psychological Medicine*, 29, 9-17.
- Wichstrøm, L., & Hegna, K. (2003). Sexual orientation and suicide attempt: A

longitudinal study of the general Norwegian adolescent population. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 112, 144-151.

APPENDIX B

Descriptions of sexuality by women with same-sex romantic or physical attraction to other women

Rust, P. C. (2001). Two many and not enough: The meanings of bisexual identities.

Journal of Bisexuality, 1, 31-68.

Savin-Williams, R. C. (2005). *The new gay teenager*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard

University Press.

ambisexual	heterosexual, lesbian tendencies
attracted to females	heterosexual-identified bisexual
attracted to the person	heterosexual with bisexuality
attracted to a special woman	heterosexual with questions
bi-lesbian	lesbian
bi-queer	lesbian-identified bisexual
bisexual	lesbian who has sex with men
bisexual, depends on the person	not straight
bisexual in lesbian relationship	pansensual
bisexual transgender	pansexual
dating/loving a woman	polyfide
dyke	polysexual
female-identified bisexual	questioning
fluid bisexual	queer
gay	unlabeled
heterosexual	

APPENDIX C

Brief reference list promoting conversion therapy

References

- Liszcz, A. M., & Yarhouse, M. A. (2005). A survey on views of how to assist with coming out as gay, changing same-sex behavior or orientation, and navigating sexual identity confusion. *Ethics & Behavior, 15*, 159-179.
- Nicolosi, J. (1993). *Reparative therapy of male homosexuality*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson.
- Nicolosi, J., Byrd, A. D., & Potts, R. W. (2000). Beliefs and practices of therapists who practice sexual reorientation psychotherapy. *Psychological Reports, 86*, 689-702.
- Nicolosi, J., Byrd, A. D., & Potts, R. W. (2000). Retrospective self-reports of changes in homosexual orientation: A consumer survey of conversion therapy clients. *Psychological Reports, 86*(3, Pt2), 1071-1088.
- Rosik, C. H. (2003). Motivational, ethical, and epistemological foundations in the treatment of unwanted homoerotic attraction. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy, 29*, 13-28.
- Spitzer, R. L. (2003). Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation? 200 participants reporting a change from homosexual to heterosexual orientation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32*, 403-417.
- Yarhouse, M. A. (2005). Christian explorations in sexual identity. *Journal of Psychology & Christianity, 24*, 291-292.
- Yarhouse, M. A. (2005). Constructive relationships between religion and the scientific study of sexuality. *Journal of Psychology & Christianity, 24*, 29-35.
- Yarhouse, M. A., Tan, E. S. N., & Pawlowski, L. M. (2005). Sexual identity development and synthesis among LGB-identified and LGB dis-identified persons. *Journal of Psychology & Theology, 33*, 3-16.

APPENDIX D

Recruitment poster

Volunteer Participants Sought

Volunteer participants are sought for a study on what may help conversations about sexuality with mental health care professionals. The purpose of the study is to identify helpful practices in conversations about sexuality between non-dominant sexuality (GLBT – gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered) athletes and mental health care professionals. Your anonymous participation would involve approximately two hours. The first hour would be a conversation about identity and sexuality between yourself and the researcher (PhD candidate in Applied Psychology and sport mental trainer). This is followed by a second hour to discuss possible moments in the first conversation which may have been helpful for you to talk about identity and sexuality.

Outcomes from the study are intended to better inform the practices of mental health care professionals with respect to conversations about sexuality, particularly with GLBT athletes and counselling clients. General results from the study will be made available to you at a later date upon request. All information pertaining to your participation in this study will be kept strictly confidential. For more information, please contact Don Zeman, Division of Applied Psychology, d.zeman@ucalgary.ca, or Dr. Tom Strong, Division of Applied Psychology, strongt@ucalgary.ca.

APPENDIX E

Participant consent form

Research Project Title: Facilitating conversations about sexuality

Participant Consent Letter

Investigator: Don Zeman, D.C., M.Sc., PhD (Cand.), Division of Applied Psychology,
University of Calgary

This consent form, a copy of which has been given to you, is only part of the process of informed consent. It should give you the basic idea of what the research is about and what your participation will involve. If you would like more detail about something mentioned here, or information you feel is insufficiently included here, please feel free to ask. Please take the time to read this carefully and to understand any accompanying information.

The purpose of this research is to identify helpful ways to talk about identity and sexuality between non-dominant sexuality (GLBT – gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered) athletes and mental health care professionals. Participants and the researcher will first have an approximately one-hour video-recorded conversation about identity and sexuality and experiences of them in participants' sports. Further, both you, as research participant, and the researcher will view video recordings of these conversations to highlight what may have been helpful to you. In this way the researcher may learn more about helpful practices from your perspective. From our reviews of your conversation, and micro-analyses of the initial conversation between yourself and the researcher, particular conversational practices that were helpful will be identified. These may then help mental health care professionals who counsel non-dominant sexuality athletes and clients.

Your participation will primarily consist of a one-hour conversation with the researcher (Don Zeman, a trained counsellor, chiropractor, and sport mental health consultant). The videotaped conversation will include discussion of identity and sexuality. During the conversation, the researcher may ask you 1) to reflect upon your understandings or notions of your identity and sexuality, only if this is comfortable for you, 2) how your understandings and experiences have been for you in your sport(s) and, 3) perhaps reflect upon your understandings and meanings of identity and sexuality in relation to those with whom you interact, including past conversations with helping professionals. You will then have an opportunity to view your video-recording so that you may identify three moments or times in the conversation which may have been helpful to you in talking about identity and sexuality.

When convenient for you, the researcher and you will meet within approximately two weeks to view the video-taped conversation. In this audiotaped session you will be asked to point out those moments or sections which you have noted in your own viewing which may have helped make it easier to have this type of conversation. You will be given opportunities to comment on these videotaped segments. Later, the researcher will check back with you to see that he has accurately recorded what you said. The researcher will maintain your confidentiality. Confidentiality is an ethical obligation of the researcher. Video and audiotapes will be kept in locked storage for five years, and all identifying information will be removed from the study's final report. You will also be given a summary report of the study's findings, for your input, prior to their being used in professional articles or conference presentations. Please note, that you may withdraw your participation at any point in this process (i.e., prior to or during the conversation,

prior to or during the audiotaped interview, and prior to or during the final check-back). Should you opt to withdraw, any outcomes from your participation will not be used in the study.

Given that this study involves your participation in conversations which may be unsettling, you may discuss subjects that continue to upset you after the first or second conversation. If you experience distress as a result of your participation in this study, we advise you that the university offers a free confidential counselling service to all current students. The Counselling and Student Development Centre is located at MacEwan Student Centre and, additionally, there are non-cost agencies such as Eastside Family Centre (299-9696), Crisis Counselling (299-9699), or the Distress Centre (266-1605). Referrals to appropriate non-cost counselling services can be made on your behalf. Further, your participation in this research should help counsellors and other mental health care professionals learn about helpful practices, indicating to them ways they can more beneficially use these practices, especially from participant or client perspectives. If, at any time during the research process you wish to withdraw and have all related records of your participation destroyed, this can also be arranged by calling the researcher.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding your participation in the research project and agree to participate as a subject. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the investigator, sponsors, or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent. You may ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation. If you have further questions concerning matters related to this research, please contact: Don Zeman, University of Calgary's Division of Applied Psychology at (403)521-0135 or Dr. Tom Strong (the researcher's academic supervisor for this research project), University of Calgary's Division of Applied Psychology, (403)220-7770. If you have any questions or issues concerning this project that are not related to the specifics of the research, you may also contact the Research Services Office at 220-3782 and ask for Mrs. Patricia Evans.

Participant's Signature

Date

Investigator and/or Delegate's Signature

Date

A copy of this consent form has been given to you to keep for your records and reference.

APPENDIX F

Typical questions in the first conversations

1. What have been your experiences in discussing sexuality or your sexuality?
2. How helpful or hindering have these conversations been?
3. What was helpful or hindering in these conversations?
4. How important have you felt it is to tell others or share with others how you describe your sexuality?
5. How was it for you, while you still competed in your sport, if others knew your sexuality?
6. While you were still in your sport, what attitudes, perspectives, or behaviours did you experience, if anything, in relation to your sexuality?
7. What made it easier or harder for you, in relationship to your sexuality, in your sport?
8. When you first considered your sexuality – that is, being gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, or queer – you may have spoken to someone about this. How did you choose this person or persons? What made it easier to talk to this person or persons?
9. What has been helpful, in your experiences in the past, when considering your sexuality?
10. What has been helpful to you to talk about your sexuality?
11. What, if anything, has been a barrier or a hindrance for you to talk about your sexuality or when considering your sexuality?
12. If you have had any counselling experiences, what have they been like for you?
13. If any of your counselling experiences related to your sexuality, what was that like for you?
14. If there has been anything helpful to you to talk about sexuality or your understanding of your sexuality in our conversation, what might that be?

15. How has this conversation been for you?
16. If there is anything from this conversation that you might consider further, what would that be?