Sexualities

Douglas Schrock, J. Edward Sumerau and Koji Ueno

Over the past 65 years, understandings of sexuality have gone through a kind of revolutionary change. Interrogating sexual variation is no longer confined to a clinical paradigm of psychopathologies. Sexualities are now generally understood as socially constructed, historically contingent, and embedded in a hierarchy reinforced by political, organizational, interactional, and cultural processes. Sociological social psychology has played a demonstrable—although often forgotten—role in this transformation.

Reflecting a trend in the social sciences more generally, there has been an explosion of sociological studies of sexuality over the past few decades. For example, of the 3,818 journal articles that came up in our search of LGBT keywords (including homosexual and homosexuality) in the sociology area of the database *Web of Knowledge*, a majority have been published in the last decade, 83 % have been published since 1990, and more were published in 2011 alone than at any time before 1980. Although most contemporary research implicitly draws on our concepts and approaches, it rarely engages sociological so-

D. Schrock (✉) · K. Ueno
Department of Sociology, Florida State University, 511 Bellamy Building, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2270, USA
e-mail: dschrock@fsu.edu

J. E. Sumerau
Department of Sociology, University of Tampa, 401 Kennedy Blvd, Box Q, Tampa, FL 33606, USA

cial psychology in substantive ways. Although an optimist might view this as a triumph reflecting the assimilation of our ideas (see e.g., Fine 1993), we view it as limiting both sexuality scholarship and social psychology.

This fragmentation can be seen in textbooks and academic journals, which arguably perpetuate the problem. Because our standard undergraduate textbooks and handbooks of social psychology too often neglect the topic, budding sexuality scholars may search for what they perceive as more welcoming subfields. Marginalizing sexuality in such texts may also be linked to its relative scarcity in our flagship journal, *Social Psychology Quarterly*. Such underrepresentation may very well reflect authors choosing to submit their papers elsewhere more than it does editorial policy. Contemporary scholars now have a growing number of journals specializing in sex research to submit their work, and these journals typically emphasize empirical contributions more than theory (Weis 1998). In addition, most sexuality articles in mainstream sociological outlets appear in journals such as *Gender & Society, Social Problems*, *Sociological Perspectives*, and *Sociological Quarterly* (ASA Committee on the Status of GLBT Persons in Sociology 2009), which generally do not hold authors accountable for their knowledge of or contribution to sociological social psychology.

We believe that making room for sexuality in our work will enable us to more justifiably embrace the label sociological social psychologists. Although sexual behavior generally happens be-

hind closed doors, sexual identities are personally salient and thus shape our choices, interactions, and life course. Furthermore, like gender, race, class, and age, sexual identities are socially salient; they shape how we are treated in both subtle and overt ways. Such treatment, in turn, shapes our subjective experience and social opportunities. It may be true that one can more easily conceal membership as a sexual minority than statuses based on socially defined bodily insignia such as skin color. However, although strategic concealment—if successful—may offer some protection, it can entail unintended personal, emotional, and social costs. Social psychological explorations into sexual inequalities must thus be sensitive to how sexuality is similar to, different than, and intertwined with other forms of oppression. Coming to terms with sexuality in our research—whether based on survey, experimental, or ethnographic methods—has the potential to enrich sociological social psychology.

Because most sexuality scholarship uses but does not generally incorporate or attempt to spell out implications for social psychology, we will not restrict our review to the explicitly social psychological. Instead, we will attempt to link key themes in existing sexuality research with the social psychology of inequality. Here we have chosen to focus on the experiences of and attitudes towards sexual minorities within and in relation to different social contexts, including family, school, work, religion, public life, and health care. We focus on the aforementioned contexts with the hope that deepening social psychologists' understanding of the diversity of sexuality research will spark some questions that are more grounded in and focused on building our own analytic traditions.

We direct attention to studies that most clearly speak to social psychological approaches to inequality. From interactionist traditions, we understand that ethnographers can unpack how meaning, emotion, and interactional processes reproduce and challenge inequality (e.g., Anderson and Snow 2001; Fields et al. 2006; Schwalbe et al. 2000). We also bring with us an understanding of the social structure and personality perspective, which has examined how one's position in

hierarchies such as race, class, and gender shape subjectivity (Hughes and Demo 1989; Rosenberg and Pearlin 1976; Schwalbe and Staples 1991). Sociological social psychology's group processes tradition, based on formal theorizing and experimental methods, has provided insight into the causes and consequences of interactional inequalities (Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999)—although this tradition is least represented in sexuality research (but see Johnson 1995; Webster et al. 1998). Furthermore, following other social psychologists (see, e.g., Howard and Renfrow in this handbook; Wilkins 2012), we bring sensitivity to how sexual inequalities are entwined with systems of race, class, gender, and age.

Because we focus on inequalities based on sexual identities rather than sexuality per se, we adopt the notion of heteronormativity as an organizing frame through which to view the research we review. Coined in 1991 by Warner, heteronormativity generally refers to a discourse or ideology that defines heterosexuality and traditional gendered presentations as culturally ideal and normal. Heteronormativity thus symbolically marginalizes all other sexual variations as well as non-traditional doings of gender. The links between sexism and heteronormativity have deep historical roots going back to the medical construction of the category 'homosexuality,' which in the U.S. involved defining gender deviance as evidence of "sexual inversion" (Greenberg 1988). It is a "loose coupling," however, as reproducing or challenging one does not necessarily equate with doing the same to the other.[1]

---

[1] On the one hand, homophobia can be "a weapon of sexism" (Pharr 1988); people often use anti-LGBT slurs, for example, to target those who deviate from patriarchal norms. Sexism, in turn, can be a weapon against the sexually marginalized as is the case with patriarchal definitions of manhood and womanhood as exclusively heterosexual. On the other hand, reproducing or challenging women's oppression (e.g., heterosexual men engaging in domestic violence or the women's movement working against it) does not necessarily reproduce or challenge the oppression of sexual minorities. Similarly, reproducing or challenging inequality between sexual minorities and others (e.g., working for or against LGBT marriage rights) does not necessarily reproduce or challenge male dominance in the same way.

Although postmodernists initially dominated discussions of heteronormativity, sociologists are increasingly bringing the concept into their empirical research. Contemporary sociological research has shown, for example, that heteronormativity can be examined as part of interactional processes, socialization, organizations, and so on (see, e.g., Kitzinger 2005; Martin 2009; Mc-Queeney 2009). Social psychologists who understand that sexuality constitutes a system of inequality similarly have many opportunities to further develop empirically-grounded knowledge of heteronormativity. As should be clear from our review, heteronormativity influences our lives from birth to death by shaping our private thoughts and feelings as well our relationships and the organizations we inhabit. Social psychologists can employ our well established and developing approaches to provide unique insights into how heteronormativity operates and is reproduced, which can contribute to more general sociological and public discourse. Such research would also provide opportunities to move social psychology forward, as was the case with classic scholarship, which developed many insights that became central in the conceptualization of heteronormativity.

Social Psychology in Classic Sexuality Research

Before discussing contemporary research that examines specific institutional and interactional contexts of sexual inequality, we review how early sexuality research addressed social psychology and how subsequent developments marginalized it. We first discuss research in the interactionist tradition that taught us how sexual identities are socially constructed, stigmatized, and sometimes disconnected from sexual behavior. We then address how classic research reflecting the social structure and personality tradition countered dominant perceptions of sexual minorities as mentally ill. Next we examine early experimental work that sparked interest in understanding attitudes toward gays and lesbians. We then show how feminist and postmodernist

perspectives as well as AIDS research became less engaged with social psychology. Although these early scholars did not address heteronormativity per se, in hindsight their research provides insight into its processes. We end by discussing the development of the concept of heteronormativity and how it is becoming a mainstream if not dominant frame among sociologists interrogating sexual inequalities.

Building on Kinsey (1948, 1953), who taught us that sexual behavior, desires, and identities could be distinct, early sociological research focused on the process of non-heterosexual identity construction in the heteronormative society. Sociologists Leznoff and Westley (1956) examined how members of homosexual groups in Chicago socially validated their sexual selves and mitigated psychological distress derived from living as criminalized people. Goffman (1963) wrote that sexual minorities often strategically manage a discrediting stigma imposed on them by others (see Link et al., this volume). Garfinkel's (1967) study of the transsexual Agnes emphasized the taken-for-granted production of gender identity, which hinges on the power of social accountability and the cultural prescription of the gender binary (i. e., the assumption that humans are, from birth, naturally and socially always either male or female). Using interactionist understandings of identity, Humphreys (1970) examined the rituals and social organization of men's restroom sexual encounters, showed how many of the men were married to women, and declared that the only "harmful effects [stemmed from] police activity." Working within and developing interactionist approaches, these and other early works (see, e.g., McCaghy and Skipper 1969; Plummer 1975; Reiss 1961; Weinberg and Williams 1975) suggested that sexual and gender identity and behaviors were more fluid than previously thought. This work also suggests that heteronormativity operates via interactional, cultural, and state regulatory processes.

Resonating more with social structure and personality traditions, other research employed questionnaires and survey methods to, for example, test formal propositions surrounding sexual identities, attitudes, mental health, and behaviors.

An important precursor was the psychologist Hooker's (1957) study in which she gave the results of a sample of unidentified gay and straight men's personality tests to clinical evaluators (including two who created the tests) and found that clinicians could not tell the groups of men apart, subverting justifications of homosexuality as mental illness. Additional research employed questionnaires and found, for example, that gay men did not necessarily possess more psychological problems than a comparison group of straight men (Weinberg and Williams 1974).[2] Although contemporary research with more sophisticated sampling procedures offers some contradictory findings (as we detail below), this classic work established survey methods for studying sexuality and mental health. More broadly, it demonstrated how social psychology can counter heteronormativity embedded in dominant cultural, organizational, legal, and psychiatric discourses that frame LGBT people as inherently pathological and in need of psychiatric regulation, incarceration and prosecution, and organizationally-mandated invisibility.

After a coalition of activists and members of the American Psychiatric Association applied enough pressure to have homosexuality redefined as not in-and-of-itself a mental illness (Kutchins and Kirk 1997), some social psychologists strategically turned their attention to those who, in some circles, might be called pathologically heteronormative. Early research on college students found that the most prejudiced were also more sexually conservative with regard to heterosexual practices, held more stereotypical gender beliefs, and suffered more guilt over their own sexual feelings (Dunbar et al. 1973). Echoing contemporary findings concerning heterosexual people's attitudes regarding homosexual behavior (see, e.g. Herek et al. 2005), some early studies also found that heterosexual men were more likely to hold anti-homosexual views than

women (Glassner and Owen 1976) and that those who were more politically conservative and religious and had less educated parents were often more heterosexist, racist, and sexist (Henley and Pincus 1978). Early experimental research found that interacting with a self-presented-as-gay confederate lessened latter-secured measures of sexual prejudice (Pagtolunan and Clair 1986). This early work was primarily initiated by psychological social psychologists, and they have developed it into an impressive industry of study that rarely enters contemporary sociologists' social psychological discourse. Classic as well as contemporary work on attitudes shows who supports heteronormativity and how they might change, complementing the LGBT movement's focus on reframing prejudiced others as more problematic than the targeted.

Gagnon and Simon's 1973 book *Sexual Conduct*, which pulls together the preceding decade of their collaborative work, was arguably the most significant blow to biological and Freudian approaches to sexuality, and they used and developed sociological social psychology in the process. Trained at Chicago, they combined symbolic interactionism's emphasis on language, meaning, and the reflexive self with Kenneth Burke's dramaturgy to develop the concepts of sexual scripts: discursive repertoires that defined the who, what, where, and how of sexuality. Instead of seeing sexual "drives" as biologically-based and needing to be socially controlled, they argued that all sexual interactions, feelings, and identities were experienced and filtered through socially constructed scripts people are socialized to adopt. They focused on the "interpersonal scripts," which people use to navigate sexual interactions, and "intrapsychic scripts," which people use in their internal dialogs. Later they developed the notion of "cultural scenarios," or culturally dominant sexual scripts, to better account for intersubjectivity (Simon and Gagnon 1986). Writing about sexual minorities, they derided sexologists' focus on etiology or the alleged causes of homosexuality, arguing that it was the "least rewarding of all questions" (Gagnon and Simon 1973, p. 132). By eviscerating essentialism, Gagnon and Simon helped negate

---

[2] Other early survey research that resonated broadly with a social structure and personality approach include Williams and Weinberg's (1971) analysis of gay men discharged from the military and Akers et al.' (1974) anlayiss prisonors and same-sex sexual behavior.

a key meme of heteronormativity—the myth that LGBT people are biologically abnormal.

Although sociological interest in sexual scripts has increased in recent years—more articles have addressed the topic since 2007 than in all previous years—Gagnon and Simon and social psychology more generally were largely neglected in sexual scholarship as it dramatically expanded in the 1980s and 1990s. Their constructionist stance did not resonate with some in the gay liberation movement who, no longer defined as mentally ill, believed that a version of essentialism (e.g., "we were born this way") might discursively protect them from increasingly organized and vehement evangelicals who painted homosexuality as a sinful lifestyle choice that should be altered with holy, or therapeutic, intervention. In addition, many influential feminist theorists beginning to address sexuality preferred psychoanalytic approaches, took issue with Gagnon and Simon's antiquated gender language, and viewed them—as well as symbolic interactionism more generally—as unable to address social structure and power (Jackson and Scott 2010). For example, McIntosh (1968), who thought Gagnon and Simon went too far with their constructionism, nonetheless argued homosexuality was not a "condition," but a role that was historically constructed, culturally variable, and embedded in a system of social control. Rich (1980) termed that system "compulsory heterosexuality," which she argued not only othered non-heterosexuals and channeled people toward heterosexuality, but also facilitated women's dependence on men and thus male dominance. Thus while moving further away from sociological social psychology per se, second wave feminists developed an approach that resonates with Warner's notion of heteronormativity.

The early 1980's saw the emergence of a practical, deadly, and immediate crisis in the form of AIDS. Outside of academia, this brought many lesbians and feminists who had previously distanced themselves from gay men to work with them in creating support networks and an egalitarian and militant activist community (Gould 2009). Inside academia, the crisis and resulting federal funding for AIDS research led many researchers without a background in or a desire to contribute to critical theories of sexuality to turn their attention to the issue, which fostered an industry of relatively atheoretical empirical research (Irvine 2003). This research industry's focus on strict empiricism also led to a distancing from social psychology.

At the same time as AIDS research blossomed, many sexuality scholars moved even further from away from social psychology after the publication of Foucault's (1978) *History of Sexuality*, which analyzed institutional discourses of sexuality as constituting power. As Seidman (2009) points out, Foucault's basic approach was adopted and altered by feminist theorists who viewed Rich's structural approach as not leaving room for agency, resistance, and sexual variations that do not center on the gender of preferred sexual partners. Rubin (1984) notably argued that sexuality was not just what people did with their bodies but it constituted a kind of status hierarchy system in which a "charmed circle" of sexual acts are deemed appropriate and all others are subordinated. Others, including Butler (1989) who argued that sex and gender were "performances" that could be subverted through, for example, drag and transsexuality, were particularly influential in developing what is now called queer theory.

Although postmodernism made important strides in developing our understanding of sexuality as a system of inequality, it generally misappropriated or ignored key social psychological understandings, which arguably helped them abandon the empirical world (see Schwalbe 1993). By detaching discourse from and privileging it over humans who—we assume—not only signify, but also have selves, emotions, bodies, and agency that play a role in actual interactional encounters that unfold under real material circumstances and have social and personal consequences, believers in Blumer's (1969) "obdurate reality" are, essentially, cast as possessing false consciousness. From this perspective, there is little need for social psychology as it is merely another discourse falsely claiming a foothold on the "truth."

On the other hand, queer theorists important-ly brought us the concept of heteronormativity, which is key to the approach we take here. As mentioned earlier, heteronormativity refers to an assumption that heterosexuality and traditional gendered performances and identification as culturally ideal and normal—all others are sub-ordinated (Warner 1991). A focus on power and inequality are thus central to this conception, and it leaves room for understanding both agency and variations in heteronormativity across time and social contexts. In many ways, we see the roots of this formulation in early sexuality research and theorizing grounded in sociological social psychology, which also emphasized agency, stig-ma, power, language, and, more generally, social constructionism (see Hollander and Abelson; Link et al.; Thye and KAlkoff; Wilkins et al., this volume).

However, as postmodernism came to domi-nate theoretically engaged sexuality scholar-ship, sociological social psychology became neglected (but see Plummer 1995 for a notable exception). The dangers here, which are evident in much sexualities research, include: (1) incon-sistently using key social psychological concepts in ways that convolute analyses (such as imply-ing 'identity' is the self-concept, an interactional construction, and a social representation as if these are all the same thing); and (2) reinvent-ing or neglecting social psychological concepts that could help make sense of the phenomena under investigation (such as "discovering" that when sexual minorities imagine others judging them it shapes their feelings [see Cooley 1902, the "looking glass self"]); and (3) missing leads embedded in social psychological research that could move sexuality scholarship in new direc-tions (such as how the salience of sexual identity may shape a plethora of attitudes, emotions, and behaviors). More generally, as Plummer (2010) suggests when discussing symbolic interaction-ism, social psychology may be able to provide a unifying language to the relatively fragmented contemporary study of sexuality.

As a "sensitizing concept" (Blumer 1969) that places sexual inequalities at its center and allows for an examination of subjectivity, interaction,

culture, and organizations and institutions, we believe that incorporating an understanding of heteronormativity into sociological social psy-chology is a particularly promising path. Sociolo-gists of gender and sexuality, most notably, have increasingly published empirical research—in mainstream general and specialty journals— about, for example, heteronormativity in fami-lies (Martin 2009, Solebello and Elliott 2011), schools (Myers and Raymond 2010; Ripley et al. 2012), culture (Martin and Kazyak 2009), religious organizations (McQueeney 2009; Sum-erau 2012), health and aging (Rosenfeld 2009), and everyday life (Kitzinger 2005; Nielsen et al. 2000). Such work importantly shows that hetero-normativity need not be confined to postmodern theorizing; it can be used and developed by soci-ologists grounded in the empirical world.

With a few notable exceptions, including Berkowitz's (2011) development of a symbolic interactionist approach to heteronormativity, re-searchers bringing heteronormativity into con-temporary sociological discourse have tended to neglect explicitly engaging with the traditions of sociological social psychology. We, however, believe that bringing sociological social psychol-ogy to bear on this phenomenon may allow so-cial psychologists to once again play a key role in sexuality scholarship. In our following over-view of contemporary research on family, educa-tion, work, religion, public life, and health, we will highlight sociological social psychological lessons about heteronormativity. We hope that doing so will encourage others to further develop our understandings of sexual inequalities and so-cial psychology.

Family

"The family" is a battleground in the larger cul-ture, as it is in the lives of many sexual minorities (see Lively et al., this volume). In this section, we first examine research that reveals how defini-tions of and attitudes toward LGBT families have changed over time and are linked to other axes of inequality. We then explore how heterosexism is reproduced in heterosexually-headed families,

how this shapes LGBT people's experiences, and how some families try to become more accepting when a member comes out of the closet. Finally, we review research on how LGBT people create their own families, experience familial conflict, and become parents and raise children. In doing so, we focus attention on what this research reveals about how heteronormativity is reproduced and challenged.

Social psychological research demonstrates how heteronormative attitudes reflect historically fluid "social representations" (see Moscovici 1984) of "the family." Powell et al. (2010), for example, found that randomly sampled respondents' definitions of what "counted" as family had a significant impact on their attitudes toward extending legal rights and protections to sexual minorities. People who held inclusionist definitions centered on the quality of relationships and those who defined the family as the presence of children were significantly more likely than those who restrict family definitions to religiously and state-sanctioned matrimony to support sex-same couples possessing rights to adopt, marry, and pass on partner benefits. They also found that in just a 3-year span, from 2003 to 2006, the percentage of the sample holding inclusionist views rose from 25 to 32 %, and the percentage of the sample holding exclusionist definitions of the family fell from 45 to 38 %. Consistently, 2006 and 2008 GSS data also shows increased support for gay and lesbian marriage rights and benefits.

Additional research has unearthed how heteronormative attitudes toward same-sex marriage are linked to other aspects of inequality, including race, gender, age, class, and politics. Brumbaugh et al. (2008) found that men, non-whites, and older people are less likely to approve of legalizing same-sex marriage than women, whites, and younger people, and that parents who had never lived with partners outside marriage or cohabitation were strongly oppositional. McVeigh and Diaz (2009) found that people from communities that emphasized traditional familial structures and patriarchal gender ideologies and had higher levels of residential instability and high crime rates were more likely to vote to ban same-sex marriage. Further, Heath (2009) found that as

pressure for marriage equality intensified, many politicians responded by implementing heteronormative legislation (e.g., the Defense of Marriage Act) and some hosted government-sanctioned marriage workshops intended to foster heteronormative family life. Overall, attitudinal survey research has helped sociological social psychologists better understand how widely heteronormative attitudes are shared, how they are linked to our definitions of social institutions and intersections of race, class, and gender, and how they can change over time.

Research has also taught us how heteronormativity is reproduced in and transmitted to children in family contexts. (see Kroska, this volume) Examining sexual meanings parents convey during leisure activities, for example, Martin (2009) found that mothers often convey heteronormative assumptions when talking to their children and presuppose their children's heterosexuality. Further, Kane (2006) showed that parents, especially heterosexual fathers, police gender non-conformity in their boys (but less so for girls), such as wearing pink or playing with dolls, because of the fear of them becoming gay. Similarly, McGuffey (2008) found that fathers of boys sexually abused by adult men worked to shut down their sons' emotional expression due to fears of developing homosexuality. Solebello and Elliot (2011) revealed that fathers actively attempt to channel sons' alleged sexual drives toward heterosexuality, but are less vehement about controlling daughters, who are believed to have more passive sexual natures. In addition to these informal lessons from parents, when children engage in leisure activities, such as watching TV or videos marketed to them, they learn that heterosexual love is ideal and magical and that male characters express sexual desire in part by sexually objectifying females (Martin and Kazyak 2009). Similar, though not identical, findings are seen in analyses of children's books (see, e.g., McCabe et al. 2011). Overall, such research shows how heteronormativity in familial contexts is often intertwined with sexism. Whether through parent-child interactions or media consumption, family socialization involves the privileging and con-

ditioning of traditionally gendered heterosexual selves.

Considering the aforementioned research, it should not be surprising that LGBT children and adults, often have difficulties with their families of origin. For example, family members sometimes verbally abuse children whose non-heterosexual orientation is known, and closeted children often live constant fear of discovery and judgment (D'Augelli et al. 2005). Sexual minorities also face resistance when coming out to family members, experience implicit and explicit threats, and are forced to continually re-articulate and justify their sexual identity (Adams 2011). Further, African-American lesbian girls (Miller 2011), lesbian women with children (Almack 2007, 2008), bisexual women and men (McLean 2007), and lesbian women and gay men planning commitment ceremonies (Smart 2007) similarly experience tension and emotional turmoil over making strategic choices surrounding the presentation of their sexual selves. Echoing Plummer's (2010) work, these studies reveal the importance of critically examining how heteronormativity impacts LGBT people's familial dilemmas, identities, and emotions.

Another line of research helps us understand how heteronormativity persists even when parents of sexual minorities attempt to become more accepting when their children come out. In her ethnographic study of one such group, for example, Fields (2001) found that parents attending support groups worked to redefine their gay and lesbian children as well as their identities as parents as morally worthy. While partially subverting the privileging of heterosexuality, Fields points out that their identity work—or the process whereby these people, individually and collectively, gave meaning to themselves and others (Schwalbe and Mason-Schrock 1996)—involved constructing their children as better than other, presumably more deviant, sexual minorities. For example, they claimed their sons were traditionally masculine and daughters traditionally feminine. These actions inadvertently reproduced heteronormative distinctions. In a similar fashion, Broad et al. (2004) revealed how similar parent

support groups managed stigma by reproducing heteronormative conceptualizations of "real" family values (see also Broad 2002). These studies show the continued value of ethnographic approaches, which reveal that even when identity construction appears to subvert familial heteronormativity, parents may use and thus reproduce this ideology in attempts to construct moral selves and mitigate shame.

Research on sexual minorities shows how they may resist heteronormativity by creating their own romantically-based families, which can counter the dominant assumption that families are exclusively heterosexual. Survey research has documented an increasing trend whereby LGBT couples are forming committed, long-term romantic relationships (Biblarz and Savci 2010; Powell et al. 2010). Utilizing GSS data from 1988 to 2002, for example, Butler (2005) found that cultural and structural changes in the U.S. facilitated rising numbers of openly-identified lesbian and gay partnerships, and that women were forming same-sex partnerships at a greater rate than men. Research on gay and lesbian families has also found many similarities with heterosexual families. For example, gay and heterosexual men experience similar fidelity struggles over the life course (Green 2006), and same-sex partnerships are not significantly different than opposite-sex relationships in terms of their stability (Kurdek 1998). In addition, lesbians and gay men report similar levels of relationship satisfaction when compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Patterson 2000). And, like heterosexual families, race, class, and gender shape the privileges and disadvantages of same-sex families (Browne 2011).

However, like heterosexual couples, gay and lesbian relationships may involve asymmetrical interactional processes that create what experimental social psychologists might call power and prestige orders (see e.g., Berger and Fisek 1970). Similar to straight relationships, interpersonal hierarchies within LGBT relationships are rooted in conflicts about extended families, financial decisions, parenting strategies, and job demands, or differences stemming from

racial, religious, cultural, and economic backgrounds (see Patterson 2000). Kurdeck (1994), for example, found that both non-heterosexual and heterosexual couples typically fought over power, politics, personal flaws, distrust, and distance—emotional or physical—between partners. However, larger sexual inequalities are also a source of tension for same-sex couples, as they deal with the effects of sexual marginalization (Kurdek and Schmidt 1987) and differences surrounding coming out to others (James and Murphy 1998). Such conflicts may escalate to violence, which like in heterosexual relationships is gendered and correlated with other issues. For example, urban gay men with substance abuse issues are more likely to enact and experience domestic violence than other sexual minorities (McCarry et al. 2008). Gay relationship violence in some ways mirrors the cycle of violence in heterosexual couples, as researchers have found that it is characterized by dependence, jealousy, and control (McCarry et al. 2008). Victims' fear often prevents them from expressing emotional and sexual desires (Heintz and Melendez 2006). Research on relationships points to the importance of unpacking how power works in gay and lesbian families, as well as how heteronormativity in other contexts shapes this process.

Studies on cognitive, emotional, and negotiated processes highlight how heteronormativity constrains lesbians' and gay men's decisions and attempts to become families with children. For example, Berkowitz and Marsiglio (2007) found that while gay fathers' decisions to become parents in some ways were similar to those of straight men, they also wrestled to make sense of how they would handle the risk of being stigmatized as "the gay pedophile," the possible bullying that their children might experience, and the discrimination they themselves would likely experience in the adoption process. Researchers have indeed found that adoption agencies negatively compare same-sex couples to "idealized" opposite-sex couples (Connolly 2002) and that same-sex couples face higher standards than heterosexuals and heterosexist remarks from service providers (Ross et al. 2008). Organizational heteronormativity has also limited lesbian

women's opportunities to claim donated sperm (Riggs 2008). Consequently, some women seek donation outside medical clinics, which fosters additional psychological distress (Nordqvist 2011) and struggles regarding how to define known donors and their future roles (Haimes and Weiner 2000). Despite such obstacles, sexual minorities have increasingly brought children into their lives, and in doing so they are countering dominant heteronormative definitions of the family in important ways (e.g., Ryan and Berkowitz 2009).

Research on sexual minorities' parenthood illustrates how heteronormativity may be challenged or unintentionally reproduced. Drawing on their own experiences in heteronormative contexts, for example, lesbian parents may strategically teach their children how to handle bullying and adopt egalitarian values (Nixon 2011). While some lesbian couples create egalitarian families, others create inequitable divisions of household labor and childcare that mirror patriarchal traditions (Sullivan 1996). Further, some lesbian women may inadvertently reproduce gendered ideals of motherhood by, for example, devaluing household and care work and establishing inequitable divisions of labor within the home (Dalton and Bielby 2000). In fact, such stereotypes may shape their identities, role expectations, and parental negotiations (Padavic and Butterfield 2011).

Importantly, the rise of visibly gay and lesbian families has also fostered cultural debates as well as empirical research about childhood development in a heteronormative society. At the cultural level, sexual minority families are often stigmatized due to commonly held assumptions that girls learn best from mothers and that boys require the guidance and teaching of male role models (see, e.g., Powell et al. 2010). Bos et al. (2012) first investigated adolescents raised with and without male role models in lesbian families, and their analysis showed that the two groups achieved comparable scores in psychological, social, behavioral, emotional and gender role trait development.

Cultural bias can lead even the most methodologically flawed and debunked studies about the

alleged problems of children of gay and lesbian families (e.g., Regnerus 2012) to generate considerable media attention. More rigorous studies consistently show that children of lesbian and gay parents are no different than children of heterosexual parents in terms of psychological development, but are generally ignored (e.g., American Psychological Association 2005; Goldberg 2010; Perrin and Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child, Family, Health 2002). Research also shows that it is the quality of parenting, not the sexual identity of parents, that predicts successful child development, and that children may benefit in some ways from same-sex parental arrangements (see also Biblarz and Stacey 2010; Stacey and Biblarz 2001). Overall, as a recent longitudinal study of adolescents (Bos et al. 2012) reveals, most research demonstrates that the heteronormative discourse about "harmed children" in sexual minority families is more myth than empirical reality.

Education

Educational contexts provide lessons in not only the "three Rs," but also the reproduction and sometimes the challenging of heteronormativity. In this section, we will first address heteronormativity in the official curriculum as well as peer culture. We will then address research on how school life affects adolescent sexual minorities' emotional life and academic success. In addition, we examine research that shows how LGBT youth may ameliorate negative consequences by collaborating with heterosexual allies and supportive others. And finally, we examine studies of college to show how heteronormativity shapes heterosexuals' identity work, the construction of safe spaces, and academic success.

Researchers have revealed the importance of educational settings in the reproduction and challenging of sexual inequalities. Examining educational policies, lesson plans, and legislative decisions in high schools in North Carolina, for example, Fields (2008) found that the legal promotion of abstinence-only sex education policies resulted in the deletion of sexual minorities

from lessons about sexual behavior, health, and, more generally, marriage. Using ethnographic methods, Fields further revealed an implicit heteronormative curriculum in which teachers and administrators ostracized sexual minorities, reinforced traditional gender hierarchies, and marginalized students of color.

Fieldwork in other schools has also revealed that students are involved in reproducing heteronormative school cultures, which often overlaps with reproducing sexism. For example, heterosexual girls use a variety of conversational methods, including gossip and teasing, to construct and police heterosexual feeling rules about romantic love (Simon et al. 1992). In addition, heterosexual boys claim positions of power by mobilizing a "fag discourse," creating a hostile environment for sexual minorities and non-gender conforming students, and denigrating things deemed womanly or feminine (Pascoe 2007; Smith 1998). Consistently, survey research on sexual minority students sampled from community outreach and the internet has found that heterosexist harassment is common: about 85 % report being verbally harassed and 40 % report being physically harassed because of their sexual identities (GLSEN 2009).

The social structure and personality approach helps us examine how heteronormative high school cultures impact students' psychological states. For example, studies based on the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health ("Add Health") reported that sexual minority students, especially boys, perform more poorly than other students in terms of grade point average, passing courses, and behavioral adjustment (Pearson et al. 2007; Russell et al. 2001). The impact of heteronormative school cultures was more clearly demonstrated in another Add Health study that compared school performances across schools (Wilkinson and Pearson 2009). This study found that sexual minority students' academic disadvantages are greater in schools with a strong heteronormative climate—nonurban schools and schools where students emphasize religion and football culture. Another Add Health study shows that the timing of same-sex sexual development impacts educational attainment (Ueno et al. 2013b). For example, women

who report their first same-sex sexual experience in young adulthood attain lower levels of education than those who report their first experience in adolescence and those without such experiences (Ueno 2010c).

Sexual minority youth, however, may counter some of the negative psychological effects of heteronormativity through forging friendships. Sexual minority youth do not necessarily have fewer friends than other groups, and having more of them lessens the psychological damage resulting from conflicts with peers and parents (Ueno 2005). Friendships with heterosexuals, however, are gendered: straight girls are more likely than straight boys to befriend sexual minorities (Ueno 2010a). Further, some evidence suggests that sexual minority youth experience segregation between straight and sexual minority friends in their networks (Ueno et al. 2012), in part because they choose to remain closeted or downplay their sexual orientation in heteronormative school contexts and turn to community organizations to meet other sexual minorities (Herdt and Boxer 1993; Wright and Perry 2006).

Although often facing opposition (Berbrier and Pruett 2006), high school students have increasingly formed Straight-Gay Alliances, organizations in which sexual minority students can meet each other as well as accepting straight students (see, e.g., Miceli 2005). Research has found that sexual minorities attending schools with these organizations are, when compared to those without them, less likely be bullied or to attempt suicide (Goodenow et al. 2006) and less likely to abuse alcohol and report psychological distress (Heck et al. 2011). Overall, such research suggests that although sexual minority students face significant problems in heteronormative school contexts, many create friendships and organizations that lessen negative effects.

Studies of higher education reveal that heteronormativity is both reproduced and challenged on campus. For many LGBT youth, going to college provides geographical distance from unsupportive families, more anonymity and more active LGBT groups that enable them to feel connected and authentic (see Renn's 2010 review). Yeung et al. (2000, 2006), for example, examined how some gay college men create fraternities that on the one hand foster self-acceptance and promote social acceptance of gay students, but also tend to adopt normative gender presentations to "fit in" with their heterosexual counterparts. Some evidence suggests that college students are becoming more accepting of sexual minorities. Comparing the experiences of openly gay athletes on sports teams in 2000 and 2010, for example, Anderson (2011) found that athletes in the later cohort experienced less heterosexism and more vocal support from teammates and coaches. LGBT student organizations are increasingly moving from a confrontational politics to one that emphasizes social activities and symbolic assimilation (Ghaziani 2011), which may offer important support but also unintentionally leave larger heteronormative structures safe.

Research on heterosexual students illustrates how heteronormativity affects not only the identities of people who resist but also those who conform. Outside of safe spaces, research has found that heteronormativity is central to how heterosexual students construct identity. Research findings include that Black men define themselves in opposition to stereotypes of effeminate gay men (Ford 2011) and women rugby players denigrate lesbian athletes (Ezzell 2009). Heteronormative culture can also, ironically, involve the co-option of gay and lesbian styles and behaviors. For example, Hamilton (2007) shows that while some straight college women in dorm settings othered lesbian women's inability and lack of desire to attract male erotic attention, they publicly engaged in same-sex erotic activity in order to attract heterosexual men's attention. Heteronormativity can shape academic work as well, whether it is reflected in heterosexual students' distancing from sexual minorities in their assignments (De Welde 2003) or their exaggerations of the frequency of LGBT content in the courses of openly gay professors (Ripley et al. 2012). Overall, such work shows constructing collegiate heterosexual selves is intertwined with constructing "others."

Supporting the idea that sexual minorities in college may be relatively insulated from the worst effects of heteronormativity, however, research finds that they are more likely than het-

erosexual students to graduate. For example, the GSS and the National Health and Social Life Survey both show that adults who report same-sex contact hold higher educational degrees than others (Laumann et al. 1994; Turner et al. 2005). Census studies report similar results using the gender of resident partner as a measure of sexual orientation (Baumle et al. 2009; Black et al. 2000). These results may be interpreted in a few different ways. For example, sexual minorities may seek to overcome anticipated discrimination in the labor market by earning high credentials (Hewitt 1995). It is also possible that education promotes positive views on same-sex sexuality (Ohlander et al. 2005), which may reduce institutional constraints on same-sex behaviors or increase its reporting on surveys. A recent study shows that this tendency for higher educational attainment is more pronounced among gay men who report delayed sexual development (first same-sex experience in young adulthood as opposed to adolescence), perhaps because it reflects stronger commitment to the conventional society, which generally facilitates the educational attainment process (Ueno et al. 2013b).

Work

Examining work contexts sheds additional light on how heteronormativity is linked to other axes of inequality. In this section, we first examine how sexual identities interact with gender to shape occupational segregation and earnings. Second, we address research on hiring, discrimination, and firing that suggests sexual minorities disproportionately face troubles at work. We also address interpersonal dynamics at work, the differently gendered consequences for transwomen and transmen, and how race and class shape sex work.

Studies of occupational segregation highlight how heteronormativity creates social distance between sexual minorities and heterosexuals. The GSS shows that when compared to heterosexual women, sexual minority women are overrepresented in craft, operative, and service occupations and underrepresented in managerial,

professional, technical, administrative support, and sales occupations (Badgett and King 1997; Blandford 2003). Sexual minority men are overrepresented in professional, technical, administrative support, and sales occupations and underrepresented in managerial, craft, and manufacturing occupations. Studies based on census data show similar results (see e.g., Antecol et al. 2008; Baumle et al. 2009). A recent young adult study shows that sexual minorities and heterosexuals are segregated even at the occupational title level (Ueno 2013a).

Research on earnings demonstrates how heteronormativity creates disparities in economic resources. Studies based on 1990's GSS data (Berg and Lien 2002; also see Badgett 1995; Black et al. 2000; Blandford 2003) and 1990 Census data (Allegretto and Arthur 2001; Clain and Leppel 2001; Klawitter and Flatt 1998) have revealed that, relative to their heterosexual counterparts, sexual minority women have about a 30 % earnings premium and sexual minority men have a 22 % penalty. Analysis of multiple waves of GSS data and 2000 Census data suggests the gaps may be shrinking to some extent (Antecol et al. 2008; Baumle et al. 2009; Daneshvary et al. 2007; Jepsen 2007). Scholars have attributed these differences in occupational placement, status, and earnings to several factors including discrimination (Badgett and King 1997), sexual minorities' occupational choices based on perceived "gay friendliness" (Berger 1982; Harry and DeVall 1978; Hewitt 1995), and having occupational plans less restrained by traditional gender specialization (Berg and Lien 2002; Black et al. 2000).

Research on hiring and firing finds that one's status as a sexual minority hinders success, showing that organizational heteronormativity operates through organizational leaders' and authorities' decision-making. In one of the most rigorous studies to date, Tilcsik (2011) sent two almost identical resumes with male names to over 1,700 job openings and found that listing one's experience as a treasurer of the "Gay and Lesbian Alliance," when compared to listing being the treasurer of the "Progressive and Socialist Alliance," decreased the chances of being

asked for an interview by 40 % (11.5 % for "socialist" men vs. 7.2 % for "gay" men). Although we have not found equivalent studies comparing presumably lesbian and straight women in the U.S., a similarly designed study examining this question in Austria found that of the over 600 clerical jobs applied for, lesbian applicants were called back about 12–13 % points less often than straight women (Weichselbaumer 2003).

The stereotyped gendered character of organizations and jobs (see, e.g., Acker 1990) and the presumed gendered deviance of sexual minorities may help explain these patterns. Although it is unclear in Weichselbaumer's (2003) aforementioned study whether the mismatch between the stereotypically feminine "nature" of clerical work and stereotypically masculine "nature" of lesbians played a role, Tilcsik's (2011) aforementioned study suggests that it may. He found that call-back discrimination of the presumed-to-be gay men was most severe in stereotypically masculine occupations, suggesting that a perceived mismatch between stereotypically gendered jobs and sexual minorities may play a role in such discrimination. Tilcsik also points to the importance of social context because jobs located in conservative Midwestern and Southern states and in places without laws against LGBT discrimination most often passed over presumably gay candidates. Heteronormativity at work may thus vary according to how organizations are locally gendered as well as the larger political climate.

Studies based on self-reports provide further evidence of how heteronormativity operates through labor market discrimination. For example, one survey study found that about one-third of LGBT people report experiencing occupational discrimination based on sexual identities (Ragins et al. 2003). Furthermore, a study based on Harvard's Midlife Development in the U.S. survey found that sexual minorities are more than four times as likely as heterosexuals to have been fired from jobs (Mays and Cochran 2001). These findings may indicate employers' intentional discrimination, but they also resonate with experimental social psychologists' findings that, relative to heterosexuals, sexual minority status operates as a "diffuse status characteristic"

and reduces performance expectations (Johnson 1995; Webster et al. 1998; see also Ridgeway and Nakagawa, this volume).

Studies addressing the interpersonal dynamics in work contexts give us additional insight into how heteronormativity operates via social interaction. Comparing confederates applying in person for service jobs who wore a "Texan and Proud" or "Gay and Proud" cap, Hebl et al. (2002) found that the potential employers treat the presumed gay applicants more negatively (spending less time with them, having less eye contact, and acting more standoffish, nervous, and hostile). Qualitative research has shown that sexual minorities in the corporate world (Wood 1994), law enforcement (Miller et al. 2003), and academia (Taylor and Raeburn 1995), for example, often face such interpersonal problems. Even in explicitly "gay friendly" workplaces, out sexual minorities can be targeted with harassment and stereotyping, creating additional dilemmas surrounding self-presentation (Guiffre et al. 2008). Survey research suggests that being out at work can lead to more job satisfaction, but it can also cause workers to experience more job-related anxiety (Griffith and Hebl 2002). In her comparison of sexual minority teachers in California and Texas, Connell's (2012) research shows that California teachers used statewide anti-discrimination laws as interactional resources to shut down and thus limit insults and slights. Overall, research highlights the usefulness of integrating analyses of workplace processes, policy and political context, and psychological consequences.

Much less is known about transsexuals at work, but studies suggest that heteronormativity can, if they pass, benefit women who become men (but not vice versa), although this may be racialized. Gagne et al. (1997) suggest that trying to transition from one sex category to another at work can lead to being harassed or fired and that transsexuals often seek employment elsewhere when they transition, settling for lower-paid work. Qualitative research on the experiences of those who have already transitioned suggests that transmen (women who become men) are given more respect by coworkers and bosses than they had as women, and those transitioning from men

to women have more difficulty than they used to, although status as a racial minority can make things worse (Schilt 2006; Schilt and Connell 2007). Some recent survey research on 114 trans-sexuals finds that transmen receive more positive reactions from coworkers than transwomen and that coming out at work for both increases job satisfaction, lessens anxiety, and bolsters commitment (Law et al. 2011). Studies of trans-sexuals at work thus can provide insight into the workings of male privilege and remind us how it is racialized.

Alongside mainstream occupational contexts, researchers have also examined issues of inequality in sex work. Following Bernstein (2007), these studies situate sex work within multiple systems of economic, gendered, sexual, and racial consumerism, and seek to understand how sexual minorities manage the occupational dilemmas and dynamics of sexual marketplaces. In a quantitative analysis utilizing online data from male escort websites, for example, Logan (2010) found that white skin brought a premium. Socioeconomic class is key as well, as is found in the trend of well-off gay men "renting" lower class sex workers—often referred to as Chavs or Rent Boys—in order to experience temporary relief from normative depictions of polished, tasteful, and sophisticated homosexual manhood (Brewis and Jack 2010; Ozbay 2010). Such work suggests that even though same-sex sex work has become more technologically sophisticated than it used to be, class inequality remains as key now as it was when Reiss (1961) wrote his classic article on "queers and peers."

Religion

Religious organizations and leaders often give heteronormativity a gloss of morality, helping to justify and perpetuate sexuality-based injustice. While notable exceptions have emerged in the past 50 years, many religions implicitly and explicitly reinforce heteronormative attitudes through their operations within and beyond churches (Barton 2012). In this section, we first discuss studies of mainstream religious discourse

on sexual minorities and how religiosity is linked to prejudice. We then address research on how LGBT people work to integrate their sexual and religious identities. We end by reviewing how heteronormativity is both challenged and sometimes reproduced in ethnographic studies of LGBT churches.

Social psychologically speaking, one way to think about religion is as a discourse that, if adopted or used at strategic moments, can shape subjectivity (Sharp 2010). Like many discourses, spokespeople may use or alter it to define who is in and out, which may shape their own as well as believers' and subordinates' emotions. Some religious leaders prescribe spiritual care to fix those "afflicted" with such "deeply ingrained sexual disorders" as same-sex attraction (Comstock 1996; see also Wilcox 2001). In the 1980's, for example, leaders in the Catholic Church defined homosexuality as an "objective disorder," and characterized same-sex genital contact as "intrinsically disordered" (Yip 1997a). The U.S. Presbyterian Church changed its constitution to bar non-heterosexuals from positions of authority (Burgess 1999). At the more local level, religious leaders may denigrate sexual minorities via official statements and debates in which they selectively appeal to religious ideals (Djupe et al. 2006) and the "best interests" of their organizations (Olson and Cadge 2002), and stoking fear of the alleged sexual outsiders (Cadge and Wildeman 2008). Such othering can foster sympathy or righteousness as well, thereby demarcating a status hierarchy (see Clark 1987).

Quantitative research suggests that one process through which heteronormativity is reproduced involves internalizing its ideology via adopting popular currents of Christianity. Experimental research has shown, for example, that religious people are less likely to offer help to sexual minorities in distress (Mak and Tsang 2008), and that Christian fundamentalism is the strongest predictor of prejudice toward gay men (Rowatt et al. 2006). If controlling for right-wing authoritarianism, Christian values are linked to positive attitudes toward sexual minorities as people, although negativity remains in relation to same-sex acts and "lifestyles" (Ford et al. 2009).

Similarly, survey research consistently shows that hostility toward sexual minorities is stronger among people who have high levels of religiosity (Adamczyk and Pitt 2009; Mavor and Gallois 2008), Christian belief (Laythe et al. 2001, 2002), Biblical fundamentalism (Sherkat et al. 2011), and conservative Protestantism (Burdette et al. 2005). Although some religious organizations have tried to become more welcoming (see, e.g., Adler 2012; Moon 2004), these studies make clear that religion is often key in reproducing heteronormative attitudes.

Studies of Christian sexual minorities often focus on how they integrate their seemingly incompatible Christian and sexual identities, which can challenge and reproduce heteronormativity. Lesbian (Mahaffy 1996), gay (Yip 1997a), and transgender (Schrock et al. 2004) Christians' identity work may involve, for example, reinterpreting scriptural prohibitions against homosexuality (for a review of psychological literature in this vein see Rodriguez 2010). Racially subordinated gay Christians have additional cultural meanings to contend with, as research on African-American (Pitt 2010) and Latino (Rodriguez and Ouelette 2000b) gay men has demonstrated. Sexual minorities may learn such strategies in support groups (Thumma 1991), inclusive congregations (Rodriguez and Ouellette 2000a), and newsletter narratives (Loseke and Cavendish 2001). Such work shapes not only self-definitions but also emotional experience (Moon 2004; Wolkomir 2006). While such work often challenges the pillar of heteronormativity that privileges heterosexuals, it often reinforces the pillar of gender differentiation.

Interactionist-oriented ethnographers have also shown how heteronormativity is reproduced and sometimes challenged on the ground floor of LGBT churches. For example, some alternative churches have been found to be inclusive places where members promote healing and social change (Leong 2006) and engage in and affirm counter-heteronormative embodiment through creating a culture that supports queering fashion, cultivating physical intimacy, and transgendering demeanor (Sumerau and Schrock 2011). In addition, research finds that some LGBT churches counter heteronormativity by transforming public religious events into opportunities to renegotiate oppressive power dynamics (Valentine et al. 2010) and having leaders proselytize religious, racial, class, gender, and sexual egalitarianism (Sumerau forthcoming). On the other hand, LGBT centered or affirming churches may also reproduce heteronormative conceptions of manhood, monogamy, and motherhood (McQueeney 2009) and such sexism may lead to an exodus of women (Wilcox 2009). Ethnographers have also shown how the introduction of traditional male leaders may be the impetus to transform an LGBT church's organizational culture from an egalitarian to a more heteronormative one by reinforcing hegemonic manhood, the gender binary, and the subordination of women (Sumerau 2012). Overall, ethnographers of religion show that heteronormativity operates as a form of "joint action" (Blumer 1969) that is always in flux.

Public Life

Outside of formal institutions is what Lofland (1998) describes as the public realm or public life. Such spaces include streets, bars, parks and the like, in which people are often (but not always) strangers or known merely as presumed members of social groups. The anonymity afforded in such contexts, it seems, can embolden those who choose to police or enforce heteronormativity. In this section, we first address research on the extent and variation of public harassment and violence against sexual minorities. We then explore studies of perpetrators as well as the consequences for victims. Next we address how some sexual minorities may adapt to public difficulties through passing and emotion management. Finally, we briefly address the formation of alternative subcultural spaces, and how they can both challenge and reproduce heteronormativity.

Research on public life has shown how heteronormativity operates through what Feagin (1991) called "public discrimination" in his classic work on the interactional workings of racial dominance. One notable national survey using random sampling techniques (Mays and Cochran 2001),

for example, found that LGB people are significantly more likely than heterosexuals to be treated with less respect and courtesy, receive poorer service in restaurants and stores, called names or insulted, and threatened or harassed. They also found that women bore a disproportionate share of the anti-LGB public discrimination, with differences in poor service in stores and restaurants most striking (27.0 % of L/B women vs. 4.2 % G/B men). A study based on a national probability sample of LGB adults found that about 20 % were criminally victimized (physically attacked or mugged) and that 50 % had been verbally harassed based on their status as sexual minorities; gay men were significantly more likely than lesbians to report being physically attacked or robbed (Herek 2009).

Studies that use purposeful sampling of transgender populations find similar evidence of public discrimination. A non-random national survey of over 400 transgender people found that in their lifetimes, approximately 55 % had been insulted, 23 % had been followed, 20 % assaulted without and 10 % assaulted with a weapon, and 8 % had been harassed and arrested by the police while on public streets (Lombardi et al. 2001). Doan's (2007) study of one urban area found that of 149 transmen and women surveyed, within the past year, 25 % had been targeted with hostile comments and 18 % had been physically harassed. Taken together, these and other studies on public discrimination of LGBT people—see especially Katz-Wise and Hyde's (2012) meta-analysis of 386 of them—shows that a key way heteronormativity is reproduced in everyday life involves aggressive facework.

It is also important to examine research on perpetrators of such acts because it helps to understand who most internalizes and polices heteronormativity. According to Comstock's (1991) extensive research, perpetrators of anti-gay violence are mostly male (94 %) and under 28 years old (88 %). They are often at an age in which they are overly concerned with proving their manhood, and thus are similar to the generally young white men perpetrating raced-based hate crimes (Kimmel 2007). One of the few studies based on in-depth interviews with perpetrators reveals that

gay bashing men felt that it provided "honor, status and power over dishonorable others" and was a means for "attaining a new manhood" (van der Meer 2003, p. 162). In a complementary fashion, psychologists have shown that men's (but not women's) anti-gay prejudice is linked to their gendered self-esteem (Falomir-Pichastor and Mugny 2009) and the bolstering of their heterosexual masculinity (Czrnaghi et al. 2011). Heteronormative policing in public may thus be a means through which young men work together to put on compensatory manhood acts (Schrock and Schwalbe 2009).

Research on LGBT victims demonstrates how such heteronormative micro-aggressions in turn shape their subjective life. For example, using diary methods to examine the everyday life and emotional well-being of LGB people, Swim et al. (2009) show that experiencing more everyday "heterosexist hassles" (e.g., exclusionary or hostile acts) is significantly associated with increases in "end of the day" anger and anxiety, and decreases in collective self esteem (their evaluation of the worth of LGB people as a group) and their personal identification with the LGB community. A survey study of over 2,200 LGB people in an urban city found that those who were victims of hate crimes were significantly more likely than the others to suffer from posttraumatic stress, depression, anxiety, anger, fear of crime, and a low sense of mastery (Herek et al. 1999). Such research shows how the public policing of heteronormativity "gets under the skin" (Taylor and Repetti 1997).

Public discrimination is a key reason many sexual minorities try to pass in public, which provides further insights into the workings of heteronormativity. Passing hinges on conforming to cultural standards of "doing gender" (West and Zimmerman 1987) for both gay men and lesbians as well as transmen and women. For gay men and lesbians, however, conforming involves keeping their desired identity private while for transsexuals it involves having their desired identity publicly affirmed (see, e.g., Gagne et al. 1997). For transsexuals, this may involve retraining, redecorating, and reshaping the body to coincide with binary notions of gender, which in turn

shapes self-monitoring, feelings, and role-taking (Schrock et al. 2005). Because of the aforementioned risks, trying to pass can be emotionally tumultuous, leading newly-defined transsexual women, for example, to use cognitive (e.g., personal pep talks) and bodily strategies (e.g., deep breathing or smoking) to manage fear and shame, which if expressed could draw strangers' unwanted attention (Schrock et al. 2009). Such passing, however, can both challenge heteronormativity by subverting the assumption that one's medically assigned-at-birth sex category determines one's gendered presentation and identification while reproducing it by maintaining the link between gendered identification and self-presentation.

Due to the inequalities that LGBT people face, they have created semipublic "safe spaces," such as support groups, to work on self-acceptance and find relief from heteronormativity embedded throughout public life (see, e.g., Thumma 1991; Wolkomir 2006). Research on transgender support groups has shown, for example, how members engage in emotion work strategies that mitigate shame and fear while fostering authenticity, solidarity, and pride, which could prime them for social movement recruitment—though such work may symbolically reproduce sexual, classed, racial, and gendered hierarchies (Schrock et al. 2004). Through interactional rituals, such support groups can also teach transsexuals, for example, how to tell gendered stories of childhood, denial, and coming out that are deemed by community members and medical gatekeepers as authentically signifying transsexuality (Mason-Schrock 1996). Due in part to the public proliferation of sexual identities (Plummer 1995), transwomen's narrative construction may also involve linguistically "defetishizing" erotic crossdressing, "queering" straight sex, and "straightening" gay sex in order to distance them from male heterosexual, gay, or erotically-driven transvestite identities (Schrock and Reid 2006). In semipublic, sexual minorities may thus both cope with the subjective consequences of heteronormativity while selectively using part of its discourse to produce sexual selves.

Studies of semipublic subcultural establishments and organizations have revealed how subverting some dominant heteronormative assumptions may also reproduce meso-level hierarchies. Drawing on Goffman and Bourdieu, Green (2011) shows in his study of erotic hierarchies in an urban gay enclave that race, age, body type, personal style, and indicators of wealth shape one's status as desirable. He also shows how men use role-taking to assess their own position in the hierarchy, they work behind the scenes to maximize desirability by strategically working on their bodily fronts, and they interactionally reproduce such hierarchies with others in rituals involving deference, demeanor, and facework. Others (Johnson and Samdahl 2005) have found, for example, that on Lesbian Night at a usually male-dominated gay country western bar, male patrons marginalized women patrons, creating a gendered status order. These and similar studies (Hennen 2008; Weinberg and Williams 1975) show how subcultural attempts to create alternatives to heteronormativity's dominance in other social arenas may also include legitimating masculinist self-presentations and men's differentiation from and subordination of women. Of course, organizations in the community, especially overtly political ones, have members who attempt to organize themselves non-hierarchically and also fight against heteronormativity as well other intertwined systems of oppression. The point here is merely that sociological social psychological approaches might be able to help us better unpack how such processes work, and how subjectivity may be implicated in what happens before, during, and after the action occurs.

Health

In this section, we first review research suggesting how heteronormativity shapes medical practices. We then address how such heteronormativity colors cultural definitions of HIV/AIDS as well as related attitudes, and how this, in turn, shapes sexual minorities' identity work. We then examine health disparities between sexual minorities and heterosexuals, focusing on prevalence

and social psychological explanations. Finally, we address how heteronormativity shapes end-of-life care and the experiences of the bereaved.

Although medical practitioners often adopt interpersonal strategies in order to "de-sexualize" interactions with patients (Giuffre and Williams 2000; Smith and Kleinman 1989), they often interactionally reproduce heteronormativity. For example, LGBT youth in health clinics may face practitioners who ignore sexuality issues when treating them but "out" them to officials and family members (Travers and Schneider 1996). Further, non-birthing lesbian mothers are often forced to account for or explain their presence to medical staff, and nurses may deny them parental status (Goldberg et al. 2011). Researchers have also found that medical practitioners draw on heteronormative gender ideals to justify "sex testing" alleged transsexual athletes (Cavanagh and Sykes 2006) and surgically "correcting" infants with ambiguous genitalia (Roen 2008). Institutional heteronormativity thus may involve monitoring and regulating of the "cultural insignia" of sex (see Garfinkel 1967).

Research on HIV/AIDS illustrates how heteronormativity also shapes cultural and personal constructions of illness. As many have pointed out, public discourse on AIDS defines it as a gay men's disease (see e.g., Esacove 2010). Such discourse leads many heterosexuals to falsely believe that uninfected men can sexually transmit HIV to each other (Herek et al. 2005). AIDS discourse is thus tied to the marginalization of gay men. Some gay men, in turn, view regular HIV testing as part of their "gay identity" (Coleman and Lohan 2009), signifying being responsible sexual beings (Lee and Sheon 2008) or "self love" (Malebranche et al. 2009). Further, if infected with the virus, gay men's identity work may involve emphasizing fraternal bonds and masculine achievement (Lev and Tillinger 2010), a renewed sense of morality and responsibility (Davis 2008), and a sense of empowerment and mission to educate others (Sandstrom 1990). Thus, although the socially constructed meaning of AIDS often stigmatizes all gay men, the infected negate some of the stereotypes (i.e., irre-sponsible and immoral) by emphasizing, in part, hegemonic manhood.

Studies of health disparities demonstrate to what extent and though what process heteronormativity creates inequalities in physical and mental well-being between sexual minorities and heterosexuals. According to Meyer's (2003) meta-analysis, sexual minority adults are 2.3 times as likely as heterosexual adults to report having mood disorders such as major depression and anxiety, and they are 2.1 times as likely to report problems with substance abuse within the past year. Youth studies suggest that mental health disparities already exist in early life stages—sexual minority youth report significantly higher levels of depressive symptoms and drug use than do heterosexual youth (Hatzenbuehler et al. 2008; Russell et al. 2002). In order to understand such health disparities in a sociological way, it is important to engage sociological social psychology more fully.

One approach has been to incorporate work in the "stress process" tradition (Pearlin et al. 1981). Grounded in the social structure and personality perspective (McLeod and Lively 2007), this framework proposes that social structure creates individual and group variations in types of stressors, the level of stress exposure, the vulnerability to stress exposure, and the level of available resources to cope with stressors. Research in this vein has found that sexual minorities' worse mental health is partly explained by their greater exposure to violence (Russell and Joyner 2001; Ueno 2010b), discrimination (Mays and Cochran 2001; Ueno 2010a), and, for sexual minority youth in particular, conflicts with peers and parents (Ueno 2005). Additional portions of the disparities in mental health can be attributed to sexual minorities' depleted coping resources, including familial support and psychological resources such as mastery and self-esteem (Ueno 2010b). These studies suggest that heteronormative processes in various contexts have measurable psychological effects that arguably limit resistance, depending on how they are managed.

Some mechanisms that account for mental health disparities lie outside the stress framework, and they address sexual inequality in other

ways. For example, as shown in a study based on a community sample of Miami-Dade County, sexual minorities' higher levels of substance use is largely explained by their friends' substance use and permissive attitudes (Ueno 2010b). Although the cross-sectional study does not allow for causal interpretations, it is consistent with research documenting drug use among some patrons of gay bars and clubs (Green 2003; Kipke et al. 2007). These institutions have long served as the primary haven for sexual minorities to escape from discrimination in heteronormative social arenas and develop alternative support networks (Achilles 1967). In this sense, sexual minorities' higher substance use may be viewed as a collective strategy some use to manage the subjective consequences of social subordination. Such collective adaptations often unintentionally reproduce inequality (Schwalbe et al. 2000), and in this case it may also cut short or hinder the quality of life of the heteronormatively subordinated.

The last genre of research we will address in this section reveals how heteronormativity operates during end-of-life processes. Elderly sexual minorities may be forced to seek help from relatives who sometimes turn their backs quietly and sometimes respond with overt hostility (Brotman et al. 2003). Those who came to terms with their sexual identities before Stonewall often remain closeted to such relatives, adding to their emotional burdens (see Rosenfeld 2003). Many turn to "families of choice" (Weeks et al. 2001; Weston 1991) composed of present and former partners and friends in the community. Relatives and medical professionals may "disenfranchise" such families, however, not allowing them to make decisions regarding care and treatment (Almack et al. 2010). Because many sexual minorities live alone in their later years (Heaphy et al. 2003) and many lose connection to the LGBT community, it is not uncommon to face death in relative isolation (see, e.g, Brotman et al. 2003). Heteronormativity impacts bereaved partners as well, as they might be denied making sure the funeral wishes of the deceased are carried out, and are often refused family and bereavement leave or partners' social security benefits (Hash and Netting 2007). Although the growth of community organizations for elderly LGBT people has allowed more to die with dignity and support in recent years, heteronormativity too often influences the death passage as much as it does life.

Future Directions

Sociological social psychology was central in transforming our understanding of sexuality as essentially social rather than rooted in biology or psychological deficiencies. As the study of sexuality expanded in the social sciences, however, social psychology became less explicitly relevant. Sexuality scholarship primarily consisted of relatively atheoretical empirical work or was framed in postmodern terms or as contributing to other specialty areas, such as gender or the family. As we have shown, however, much contemporary work resonates with or uses social psychological concepts and approaches.

The danger of losing sight of the sociological social psychological influence behind contemporary sexualities scholarship goes beyond neglecting to give credit to those who deserve it. Rather, it opens the door for misusing or misunderstanding social psychological concepts or approaches, reinventing the wheel, and, more generally, missing opportunities to further both sexuality scholarship and social psychology. As studies of sexuality increasingly examine various situated processes and subjective consequences, the field is becoming increasingly fragmented. Sometimes it is hard to figure out, for example, what studies of street harassment and mental health, subcultural hierarchies of desirability, and religious organizations and attitudes have in common. Using a sensitizing concept like heteronormativity that directs our attention to inequalities can be helpful, but explicit engagement with diverse yet complementary social psychological approaches may also be key to providing more coherence. Moving forward may be as simple as using other approaches to contextualize and make sense of particular findings, developing multi-methodological approaches, or more explicitly integrating social psychology and sexuality scholarship.

Further, social psychologists might be able to advance our understanding of sexual inequalities by working together rather than pursing more narrowly defined projects. What might happen, for example, if social psychologists working from different traditions approached the same issue, such as discrimination at work? By conceptualizing sexual identity as a diffuse status, group processes researchers may be able to unpack how organizational context and composition shape the evaluation process. Those working from the social structure and personality approach may provide insight into how employers internalize heteronormative ideology, incorporating it into their self-concepts, and how this manifests during the evaluation process. Further, ethnographers may reveal the interactional processes through which employers foster hierarchies between heterosexual and sexual minority workers, how they account for heteronormative evaluations, and the role of emotional expression or repression in the process. Each perspective may be able to provide complementary insights, piecing together processes that together constitute a more complete picture of how heteronormativity operates.

Bringing together the study of sexual inequalities and social psychology can also enrich social psychology in numerous ways. Key theoretical advances in various social psychologies, including, for example, ethnomethodology and gender studies (e.g, Garfinkel 1967) and interactionist approaches to stigma (e.g., Plummer 1975) have developed while studying sexual minorities. As social psychologists bring diverse questions and conceptual tools to study sexuality, there is room for a multitude of conceptual innovations. In-depth analyses of sexual minorities may also have implications for the development of the social psychology of inequalities more generally. Because sexuality is intertwined with race, class, gender, age, and disability, incorporating an intersectional sensibility may enable social psychologists to better illustrate how various axes of inequality are similar, different, and linked (see Howard and Renfrow, this volume).

There are many ways in which social psychologists can use and build on our traditions as we move forward. For example, although ethnographers have continued to uncover various methods of sexual identity work in many contexts, comparative analyses may allow us to better understand generic processes occurring across settings and how they may be linked. Additionally, research often provides insights into the emotional lives of sexual minorities but usually avoids engaging sociological social psychology's perspectives on emotions. With its foci on status hierarchies and other relevant matters (e.g., identity, emotion, dependence, etc.), experimental research has the potential to unpack heteronormative processes in a rigorous fashion, yet it remains underutilized in sexuality research. Considering the structural and personal salience of sexual identities, work that substantively engages the social structure and personality paradigm, including identity theory and research on self-esteem, efficacy, mattering and the like must also play a stronger role as we move forward. Of course, we also need to have more data available that enables us to pursue all these fronts, which may require doing a better job avoiding heteronormative research designs.

Our hope is that 20 years from now those reviewing what sociological social psychology tells us about sexual inequalities will involve less discussion about how sexuality studies implicitly use or have implications for social psychology and more discussion about how social psychology explicitly engages in sexuality research. This would require more social psychologists to come out as interested in sexuality, which unfortunately still carries risks. Sexuality scholars continue to face challenges with regard to funding agencies (Kemptner 2008), political and cultural arenas (Stombler 2009), and departmental and university cultures and decision makers (Taylor and Raeburn 1995). Social psychologists may be able to help here as well, if we use our knowledge of the dynamics of heteronormativity to pragmatically intervene.

References

Achilles, N. (1967). The development of the homosexual bar as an institution. In J. Gagnon & W. Simon (Eds.), *Sexual Deviance*. New York: Harper & Row.

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139–158.

Adamczyk, A., & Pitt, C. (2009). Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context. *Social Science Research, 38*(2), 338–351.

Adams, T. E. (2011). *Narrating the closet: An autoethnography of same-sex attraction*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Adler, G. (2012). An opening in the congregational closet? Boundary-bridging culture and membership privileges for gays and lesbians in Christian religious congregations. *Social Problems, 59*(2), 177–206.

Akers, R. L., Hayner, N. S., & Gruninger, W. (1974). Homosexual and drug behavior in prison: A test of the functional and importation models of the inmate system. *Social Problems, 21*(3), 410–422.

Allegretto, S. A., & Arthur, M. M. (2001). An empirical analysis of homosexual/ heterosexual male earning differentials: Unmarried and unequal? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 54*(3), 631–646.

Almack, K. (2007). Out and about: Negotiating the layers of being out in the process of disclosure of lesbian parenthood. *Sociological Research Online, 12*(1). http://www.socresonline.org.uk/12/1/almack.html.

Almack, K. (2008). Display work: Lesbian parent couples and their families of origin negotiating new kin relationships. *Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association, 42*(6), 1183–1199.

Almack, K., Seymour, J., & Bellamy, G. (2010). Exploring the impact of sexual orientation on experiences and concerns about end of life care and on bereavement for lesbian, gay and bisexual older people. *Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association, 44*(5), 908–924.

American Psychological Association. (2005). *Lesbian and gay parenting*. Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, E. (2011). Updating the outcome: Gay athletes, straight teams, and coming out in educationally based sport teams. *Gender & Society, 25*(2), 250–268.

Anderson, L., & Snow, D. A. (2001). Inequality and the self: Exploring connections from an interactionist perspective. *Symbolic Interaction, 24*(4), 395–406.

Antecol, H., Jong, A., & Steinberger, M. (2008). The sexual orientation wage gap: The role of occupational sorting and human capital. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 61*(4), 518–543.

Badgett, M. V. L. (1995). The wage effects of sexual orientation discrimination. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 48*(4), 726–739.

Badgett, M. V. L., & King, M. C. (1997). Occupational strategies of lesbians and gay men. In A. Gluckman & B. Reed (Eds.), *HomoEconomics: capitalism, community and lesbian and gay life* (pp. 73–86). New York: Routledge.

Bar-Lev, S., & Tillinger, E. (2010). A life worth living: Israeli and American homosexual men performing masculinity on HIV/AIDS bulletin Boards. *Men and Masculinities, 15*(5), 299–327.

Barton, B. (2012). *Pray the gay away: The extraordinary lives of bible belt gays*. New York: New York University Press.

Baumle, A. K., Compton, D. R., & Poston, D. L. Jr. (2009). *Same-sex partners: The demography of sexual orientation*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Berbrier, M., & Pruett, E. (2006). When is inequality a problem? Victim contests, injustice frames, and the case of the office of gay, lesbian, and bisexual student support services at Indiana University. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35*(3), 257–284.

Berg, N., & Lien, D. (2002). Measuring the effect of sexual orientation on income: Evidence of discrimination? *Contemporary Economic Policy, 20*(4), 394–414.

Berger, R. M. (1982). *Gay and gray: The older homosexual man*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Berger, J., & Fisek, H. M. (1970). Consistent and inconsistent status characteristics and the determination of power and prestige orders. *Sociometry, 33*(3), 287–304.

Berkowitz, D. (2011). Maternal instincts, biological clocks, and soccer moms: Gay men's parenting and family narratives. *Symbolic Interaction, 34*(4), 514–535.

Berkowitz, D., & Marsiglio, W. (2007). Gay men: Negotiating procreative, father, and family identities. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 69*(2), 366–381.

Bernstein, E. (2007). *Temporarily yours: Intimacy, authenticity, and the commerce of sex*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Biblarz, T. J., & Savci, E. (2010). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 72*(3), 480–497.

Biblarz, T. J., & Stacey, J. (2010). How does the gender of parents matter? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 72*(1), 3–22.

Black, D., Gates, G., Sanders, S., & Taylor, L. (2000). Demographics of the gay and lesbian population in the United States: Evidence from available systematic data sources. *Demography, 37*(2), 139–154.

Blandford, J. M. (2003). The nexus of sexual orientation and gender in the determination of earnings. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 56*(4), 622–642.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bos, H., Goldberg, N., Van Gelderen, L., & Gartrell, N. (2012). Adolescents of the national longitudinal lesbian family study: Male role models, gender role traits, and psychological adjustment. *Gender & Society, 26*(4), 603–638.

Brewis, J., & Jack, G. (2010). Consuming chavs: The ambiguous politics of gay chavinism. *Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association, 44*(2), 251–268.

Broad, K. L. (2002). Social movement selves. *Sociological Perspectives, 45*(3), 317–336.

Broad, K. L., Crawley, S. L., & Foley, L. (2004). Doing 'real family values': The interpretive practice of families in the GLBT movement. *Sociological Quarterly, 45*(3), 509–527.

Brotman, S., Ryan, B., & Cormier, R. (2003). The health and social service needs of gay and lesbian elders and their families in Canada. *The Gerontologist, 43*(2), 192–202.

Browne, K. (2011). "By partner we mean…": Alternative geographies of 'gay marriage'. *Sexualities, 14*(1), 100–122.

Brumbaugh, S. M., Sanchez, L. A., Nock, S. L., & Wright, J. D. (2008). Attitudes toward gay marriage in states undergoing marriage law transformation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 70*(2), 345–359.

Burdette, A. M., Ellison, C. G., & Hill, T. D. (2005). Conservative Protestantism and tolerance towards homosexuals: An examination of potential mechanisms. *Sociological Inquiry, 75*(2), 177–196.

Burgess, J. P. (1999). Framing the homosexuality debate theologically: Lessons from the Presbyterian Church (USA). *Review of Religious Research, 41*(2), 262–274.

Butler, J. (1989). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, A. C. (2005). Gender differences in the prevalence of same-sex sexual partnering: 1988–2002. *Social Forces, 84*(1), 421–449.

Cadge, W., & Wildeman, C. (2008). Facilitators and advocates: How mainline Protestant clergy respond to homosexuality. *Sociological Perspectives, 51*(3), 587–603.

Cavanagh, S. L., & Sykes, H. (2006). Transsexual bodies at the Olympics: The International Olympic Committee's policy on transsexual athletes at the 2004 Athens Summer Games. *Body & Society, 12*(4), 75–102.

Clain, S. H., & Leppel, K. (2001). An investigation into sexual orientation discrimination as an explanation for wage differences. *Applied Economics, 33*(1), 37–47.

Clark, C. (1987). Sympathy biography and sympathy margin. *American Journal of Sociology, 93*(2), 290–321.

Coleman, C., & Lohan, M. (2009). Men who have sex with men and partner notification in Ireland: Beyond binary dualisms of gender and healthcare. *Current Sociology, 57*(2), 211–230.

Comstock, G. D. (1991). *Violence against lesbians and gay men*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Comstock, G. D. (1996). *Unrepentant, self-affirming, practicing: Lesbian/gay/bisexual people within organized religion*. New York: Continuum.

Connell, R. (2012). Transsexual women and feminist though: Toward new understanding and new politics. *Signs, 37*(4), 857–881.

Connolly, C. (2002). The voice of the petitioner: The experiences of gay and lesbian parents in successful second-parent adoption proceedings. *Law & Society, Review, 36*(2), 325–346.

Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

D'Augelli, A. R., Grossman, A. H., & Starks, M. T. (2005). Parents' awareness of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths' sexual orientation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 67*(2), 474–482.

Dalton, S. E., & Bielby, D. D. (2000). "That's our kind of constellation": Lesbian mothers negotiate institutionalized understandings of gender within the family. *Gender & Society, 14*(1), 36–61.

Daneshvary, N., Waddoups, C. J., & Wimmer, B. S. (2008). Educational attainment and the lesbian wage premium. *Journal of Labor Research, 29*(4), 365–379.

Davis, M. (2008). The 'loss of community' and other problems for sexual citizenship in recent HIV prevention. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 30*(2), 182–196.

De Welde, K., & Hubbard, E. A. (2003). "I'm glad I'm not gay!": Heterosexual students' emotional experience in the college classroom with a "coming out" assignment. *Teaching Sociology, 31*(1), 73–84.

Djupe, P. A., Olson, L. R., & Gilbert, C. P. (2006). Whether to adopt statements on homosexuality in two denominations: A research note. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 45*(4), 609–621.

Doan, P. (2007). Queers in the American city: Transgendered perceptions of urban spaces. *Gender, Place and Culture, 14*(1), 57–74.

Dunbar, J., Brown, M., & Amoroso, D. M. (1973). Some correlates of attitudes toward homosexuality. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 89*(2), 271–279.

Esacove, A. W. (2010). Love matches: Heteronormativity, modernity, and AIDS prevention in Malawi. *Gender & Society, 24*(1), 83–109.

Ezzell, M. B. (2009). "Barbie dolls" on the pitch: Identity work, defensive othering, and inequality in women's rugby. *Social Problems, 56*(1), 111–131.

Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., & Mugny, G. (2009). "I'm not gay…I'm a real man!": Heterosexual men's gender self-esteem and sexual prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(9), 1233–1243.

Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Antiblack discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review, 56*(1), 101–116.

Fields, J. (2001). Normal queers: Straight parents respond to their children's "coming out.". *Symbolic Interaction, 24*(2), 165–167.

Fields, J. (2008). *Risky lessons: Sex education and social inequality*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Fields, J., Copp, M., & Kleinman, S. (2006). Symbolic interactionism, inequality, and emotions. In J. E. Stet & J. H. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of the sociology of emotions* (pp. 155–178). New York: Springer.

Fine, G. A. (1993). The sad demise, mysterious disappearance, and glorious triumph of symbolic interactionism. *Annual Review of Sociology, 19,* 61–87.

Ford, K. A. (2011). Doing fake masculinity, being real men: Present and future constructions of self among black college men. *Symbolic Interaction, 34*(1), 38–62.

Ford, T. E., Brignall, T., VanValey, T. L., & Macaluso, M. J. (2009). The unmaking of prejudice: How Christian beliefs relate to attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 48*(1), 146–160.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: An introduction, volume 1*. New York: Random House.

Gagne, P., Tewksbury, R., & McGaughey, D. (1997). Coming out and crossing over: Identity formation and proclamation in a transgender community. *Gender & Society, 11*(4), 478–508.

Gagnon, J., & Simon, W. (1973). *Sexual conduct: The social sources of human sexuality*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ghaziani, A. (2011). Post-gay collective identity construction. *Social Problems, 58*(1), 99–125.

Giuffre, P. A., & Williams, C. L. (2000). Not just bodies: Strategies for desexualizing the physical examination of patients. *Gender & Society, 14*(3), 457–482.

Giuffre, P., Dellinger, K., & Williams, C. L. (2008). "No retribution for being gay?": Inequality in gay-friendly workplaces. *Sociological Spectrum, 28*(3), 254–277.

Glassner, B., & Owen, C. (1976). Variations in attitudes towards homosexuality. *Cornell Journal of Social Relations, 11*(2), 161–176.

GLSEN. (2009). National School Climate Survey. http://www.glsen.org/binary-data/GLSEN_ATTACHMENTS/file/000/001/1675-2.pdf.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Goldberg, A. E. (2010). *Lesbian and gay parents and their children: Research on the family life cycle*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Goldberg, L., Harbin, A., & Campbell, S. (2011). Queering the birthing space: Phenomenological interpretations of the relationships between lesbian couples and perinatal nurses in the context of birthing care. *Sexualities, 14*(2), 173–192.

Gould, D. (2009). *Moving politics: Emotion and act up's fight Against AIDS*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Green, A. I. (2003). "Chem friendly": The institutional basis of "club drug" use in a sample of urban gay men. *Deviant Behavior, 24*(5), 427–447.

Green, A. I. (2006). Until death do us part? The impact of differential access to marriage on a sample of urban men. *Sociological Perspectives, 49*(2), 163–189.

Green, A. I. (2011). Playing the (sexual) field: The interactional basis of systems of sexual stratification. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 74*(3), 244–266.

Greenberg, D. F. (1988). *The construction of homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Griffith, K. H., & Hebl, M. R. (2002). The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: "Coming out" at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6), 1191–1199.

Haimes, E., & Weiner, K. (2000). "Everybody's got a dad…": Issues for lesbian families in the management of donor insemination. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 22*(4), 477–499.

Hamilton, L. (2007). Trading on heterosexuality: College women's gender strategies and homophobia. *Gender & Society, 21*(2), 145–172.

Harry, J., & Devall, W. (1978). Age and sexual culture among homosexually oriented males. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 7*(3), 199–209.

Hash, K. M., & Netting, F. E. (2007). Long term planning and decision making among midlife and older gay men. *Journal of Social Work in End-of-Life and Palliative Care, 3*(2), 59–77.

Hatzenbuehler, M. L., McLaughlin, K. A., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2008). Emotion regulation and internalizing symptoms in a longitudinal study of sexual minority and heterosexual adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*(12), 1270–1278.

Heaphy, B., Yip, A., & Thompson, D. (2003). *Lesbian, gay, and bisexual lives over 50*. Nottingham: York House Publications.

Heath, M. (2009). State of our unions: Marriage, promotion, and the contested power of heterosexuality. *Gender & Society, 23*(1), 27–48.

Hebl, M. R., Foster, J. B., Mannix, L. M., & Dovidio, J. F. (2002). Formal and interpersonal discrimination: A field study of bias toward homosexual applicants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*(6), 815–825.

Heck, N. C., Flentje, A., & Cochran, B. N. (2011). Offsetting risks: High school gay-straight alliances and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth. *School Psychology Quarterly, 26*(2), 161–174.

Heintz, A. J., & Melendez, R. M. (2006). Intimate partner violence and HIV/STD risk among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(2), 193–208.

Henley, N. M., & Pincus, F. (1978). Interrelationship of sexist, racist, and anti-homosexual attitudes. *Psychological Reports, 42*(1), 83–90.

Hennen, P. (2008). *Faeries, bears, and leathermen: Men in community queering the masculine*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herdt, G. H., & Boxer, A. (1993). *Children of horizons: How gay and lesbian teens are leading a new way out of the closet*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Herek, G. M. (2009). Hate crimes and stigma-related experiences among sexual minority adults in the United States: Prevalence estimates from a national probability sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(1), 54–74.

Herek, G. M., Gillis, J. R., & Cogan, J. C. (1999). Psychological sequelae of hate-crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology, 67*(6), 945–951.

Herek, G. M., Widaman, K. F., & Capitanio, J. P. (2005). When sex equals AIDS: Symbolic stigma and heterosexual adults' inaccurate beliefs about sexual transmission of AIDS. *Social Problems, 52*(1), 15–37.

Hewitt, C. (1995). The socioeconomic position of gay men: A review of the evidence. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 54*(4), 461–479.

Hooker, E. (1957). The adjustment of the male overt homosexual. *Journal of Projective Techniques, 21*(1), 18–31.

Hughes, M., & Demo, D. (1989). Self-perceptions of black Americans: Self-esteem and personal efficacy. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*(1), 132–159.

Humphreys, L. (1970). *Tearoom trade: Impersonal sex in public places*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Irvine, J. M. (2003). "The sociologist as voyeur": Social theory and sexuality research, 1910–1978. *Qualitative Sociology, 26*(4), 429–456.

Jackson, S., & Scott, S. (2010). Rehabilitating interactionism for a feminist sociology of sexuality. *Sociology, 44*(5), 811–826.

James, S. E., & Murphy, B. C. (1998). Gay and lesbian relationships in a changing social context. In C. J. Patterson & A. R. D'Augelli, *Lesbian, gay and bisexual identities in families: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 99–121). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jepsen, L. K. (2007). Comparing the earnings of cohabiting lesbians, cohabiting heterosexual women, and married women: Evidence from the (2000) Census. *Industrial Relations, 46*(4), 699–727.

Johnson, C. (1995). Sexual orientation as a diffuse status characteristic: Implications for small group interaction. *Advances in Group Processes, 12***,** 115–137.

Johnson, C. W., & Samdahl, D. M. (2005). "The night they took over": Misogyny in a country-western gay bar. *Leisure Sciences, 27*(4), 331–348.

Kane, E. W. (2006). "No way my boys are going to be like that!" Parents' responses to children's gender nonconformity. *Gender & Society, 20*(2), 149–176.

Katz-Wise, S. L., & Hyde, J. S. (2012). Victimization experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sex Research, 49*(2–3), 142–167.

Kemptner, J. (2008). The chilling effect: How do researchers react to controversy? *PLoS Medicine, 5*(11), 1571–1578.

Kimmel, M. (2007). Racism as adolescent male rite of passage: Ex-Nazis in Scandinavia. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 36*(2), 202–218.

Kinsey, A. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.

Kinsey, A. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.

Kipke, M. D., Weiss, G., Ramirez, M., Dorey, F., Ritt-Olson, A., Iverson, E., & Ford, W. (2007). Club drug use in Los Angeles among young men who have sex with men. *Substance Use and Misuse, 42*(11), 1723–1743.

Kitzinger, C. (2005). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social Problems, 52*(4), 477–498.

Klawitter, M. M., & Flatt, V. (1998). The effects of state and local antidiscrimination policies for sexual orientation. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 17*(4), 658–686.

Kurdek, L. A. (1994). Conflict-resolution styles in gay, lesbian, heterosexual nonparent, and heterosexual parent couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*(3), 705–722.

Kurdek, L. A. (1998). Relationship outcomes and their predictors: Longitudinal evidence from heterosexual married, gay cohabiting, and lesbian cohabiting couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*(3), 553–568.

Kurdek, L. A., & Schmitt, J. P. (1987). Perceived support from family and friends in members of homosexual, married, and heterosexual cohabiting couples. *Journal of Homosexuality, 14*(3–4), 57–68.

Kutchins, H., & Kirk, S. (1997). *Making us crazy. DSM: The psychiatric bible and the creation of mental disorders*. New York: The Free Press.

Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the united states*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Law, C. L., Martinez, L. R., Ruggs, E. N., Hebl, M. R., & Akers, E. (2011). Trans-parency in the workplace: How the experiences of transsexual employees can be improved. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(3), 710–723.

Laythe, B., Finkel, D., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2001). Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism: A multiple-regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 40*(1), 1–10.

Laythe, B., Finkel, D. G., Bringle, R. G., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2002). Religious fundamentalism as a predictor of prejudice: A two-component model. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41*(4), 623–635.

Lee, S., & Sheon, N. (2008). Responsibility and risk: Accounts of reasons for seeking an HIV test. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 30*(2), 167–181.

Leong, P. (2006). Religion, flesh, and blood: Recreating religious culture in the context of HIV/AIDS. *Sociology of Religion, 67*(3), 295–311.

Leznoff, M., & Westley, W. A. (1956). The homosexual community. *Social Problems, 3*, 257–263.

Lofland, L. H. (1998). *The public realm: Exploring the city's quintessential social territory*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Logan, T. D. (2010). Personal characteristics, sexual behaviors, and male sex work: A quantitative approach. *American Sociological Review, 75*(5), 679–704.

Lombardi, E. L., Wilchins, R. A., Priesing, D., & Malouf, D. (2001). The gender violence: Transgender experiences with violence and discrimination. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42*(1), 89–101.

Loseke, D. R., & Cavendish, J. C. (2001). Producing institutional selves: Rhetorically constructing the dignity of sexually marginalized Catholics. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 64*(4), 347–362.

Mahaffy, K. A. (1996). Cognitive dissonance and its resolution: A study of lesbian Christians. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 35*(4), 392–402.

Mak, H. K., & Tsang, J. (2008). Separating the "sinner" from the "sin": Religious orientation and prejudiced behavior toward sexual orientation and promiscuous sex. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 47*(3), 379–392.

Malebranche, D. J., Fields, E. L., Bryant, L. O., & Harper, S. R. (2009). Masculine socialization and sexual risk behaviors among black men who have sex with men: A qualitative exploration. *Men and Masculinities, 12*(1), 90–112.

Martin, K. A. (2009). Normalizing heterosexuality: Mothers' assumptions, talk, and strategies with young children. *American Sociological Review, 74*(2), 190–207.

Martin, K. A., & Kazyak, E. (2009). Hetero-romantic love and heterosexiness in children's G-rated films. *Gender & Society, 23*(3), 315–336.

Mavor, K. I., & Gallois, C. (2008). Social group and moral orientation factors as mediators of religiosity and multiple attitude targets. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 47*(3), 361–377.

Mays, V. M., & Cochran, S. D. (2001). Mental health correlates of perceived discrimination among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(11), 1869–1876.

Mason-Schrock, D. (1996). Transsexuals' narrative construction of the "true self". *Social Psychology Quarterly, 59*(3), 176–192.

McCabe, J., Fairchild, E., Grauerholz, L., Pescosolido, B., & Tope, D. (2011). Gender in twentieth-century children's books: Patterns of disparity in titles and central characters. *Gender & Society, 25*(2), 197–226.

McCaghy, C. H., & Skipper, J. K. (1969). Lesbian behavior as an adaptation to the occupation of stripping. *Social Problems, 17*(2), 262–270.

McCarry, M., Hester, M., & Donovan, C. (2008). Researching same sex domestic violence: Constructing a survey methodology. *Sociological Research Online, 13*(1).

McGuffey, C. S. (2008). "Saving masculinity": Gender reaffirmation, sexuality, race, and parental responses to male child sexual abuse. *Social Problems, 55*(2), 216–237.

Mcintosh, M. (1968). The homosexual role. *Social Problems, 16*(2), 182–192.

McLean, K. (2007). Hiding in the closet? Bisexuals, coming out and the disclosure imperative. *Journal of Sociology, 43*(2), 151–166.

McLeod, J. D., & Lively, K. J. (2007). Social psychology and stress research. In W. R. Avison, J. D. McLeod, & B. A. Pescosolido (Eds.), *Mental health, social mirror* (pp. 275–303). New York: Springer.

McQueeney, K. (2009). "We are God's children, y'all": Race, gender, and sexuality in lesbian-and-gay-affirming congregations. *Social Problems, 56*(1), 151–173.

McVeigh, R., & Diaz, M. D. (2009). Voting to ban same-sex marriage: Interests, values, and communities. *American Sociological Review, 74*(6), 891–915.

Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*(5), 674–697.

Miceli, M. S. (2005). Morality politics vs. identity politics: Framing processes and competition among Christian right and gay social movement organizations. *Sociological Forum, 20*(4), 589–612.

Miller, S. J. (2011). African-American lesbian identity management and identity development in the context of family and community. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58*(4), 547–563.

Miller, S. L., Forest, K. B., & Jurik, N. C. (2003). Diversity in blue: Lesbian and gay police officers in a masculine occupation. *Men and Masculinities, 5*(4), 355–385.

Moon, D. (2004). *God, sex & politics: Homosexuality and everyday theologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moscovici, S. (1984). The phenomenon of social representations. In R. M. Farr & S. Moscovici (Eds.), *Social representations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Myers, K., & Raymond, L. (2010). Elementary school girls and heteronormativity: The girl project. *Gender & Society, 24*(2), 167–188.

Nielsen, J. M., Walden, G., & Kunkel, C. A. (2000). Gendered heteronormativity: Empirical illustrations in everyday life. *Sociological Quarterly, 41*(2), 283–296.

Nixon, C. A. (2011). Working-class lesbian parents' emotional engagement with their children's education: Intersections of class and sexuality. *Sexualities, 14*(1), 79–99.

Nordqvist, P. (2011). "Dealing with sperm": Comparing lesbians' clinical and non-clinical donor conception processes. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 33*(1), 114–129.

Ohlander, J., Batalova, J., & Treas, J. (2005). Explaining educational influences on attitudes toward homosexual relations. *Social Science Research, 34*(4), 781–799.

Olson, L. R., & Cadge, W. (2002). Talking about homosexuality: The views of mainline Protestant clergy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 41*(1), 153–167.

Ozbay, C. (2010). Nocturnal queers: Rent boys' masculinity in Istanbul. *Sexualities, 13*(5), 645–663.

Padavic, I., & Butterfield, J. (2011). Mothers, fathers, and "mathers": Negotiating a lesbian co-parental identity. *Gender & Society, 25*(2), 176–196.

Pagtolun-an, I. G., & Clair, J. M. (1986). An experimental study of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Deviant Behavior, 7*(2), 121–135.

Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, you're a fag: Masculinity and sexuality in high school*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Patterson, C. J. (2000). Family relationships of lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*(4), 1052–1069.

Pearlin, L. I., Lieberman, M. A., Menaghan, E. G., & Mullan, J. T. (1981). The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 22*(4), 337–356.

Pearson, J., Muller, C., & Wilkinson, L. (2007). Adolescent same-sex attraction and academic outcomes: The role of school attachment and engagement. *Social Problems, 54*(4), 523–542.

Perrin, E. C., & The American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health. (2002). Technical report: Coparent or

second-parent adoption by same-sex parents. *Pediatrics, 109*(2), 341–344.

Pharr, S. (1988). *Homophobia, a weapon of sexism*. Inverness: Chardon Press.

Pitt, R. N. (2010). "Killing the messenger": Religious black gay men's neutralization of anti-gay religious messages. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 49*(1), 56–72.

Plummer, K. (1975). *Sexual stigma: An interactionist account*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Plummer, K. (1995). Telling sexual stories in a late modern world. In N. K. Denzin (Ed.), *Studies in symbolic interaction* (Vol. 18, pp. 101–120). JAI Press.

Plummer, K. (2010). Generational sexualities, subterranean traditions, and the haunting of the sexual world: Some preliminary remarks. *Symbolic Interaction, 33*(2), 163–190.

Powell, B., Bolzendahl, C., Geiss, C., & Steelman, L. C. (2010). *Counted out: Same-sex relations and Americans' definitions of family*. New York: Sage.

Ragins, B. R., Cornwell, J. M., & Miller, J. S. (2003). Heterosexism in the workplace: Do race and gender matter? *Group & Organization Management, 28*(1), 45–74.

Regnerus, M. (2012). How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships: Findings from the new family structures study. *Social Science Research, 41*(4), 752–770.m

Reiss, A. J. (1961). The social integration of queers and peers. *Social Problems, 9,* 102–120.

Renn, K. A. (2010). LGBT and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. *Educational Researcher, 39*(2), 132–141.

Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian experience. *Signs, 5*(4), 631–660.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Smith-Lovin, L. (1999). The gender system and interaction. *Annual Review of Sociology, 25,* 191–216.

Riggs, D. W. (2008). Lesbian mothers, gay sperm donors, and community: Ensuring the well-being of children and families. *Health Sociology Review, 17*(3), 226–234.

Ripley, M., Anderson, E., McCormack, M., & Rockett, B. (2012). Heteronormativity in the university classroom: Novelty attachment and content substitution among gay-friendly students. *Sociology of Education, 85*(2), 121–130.

Rodriguez, E. M. (2010). At the intersection of church and gay: A review of the psychological research on gay and lesbian Christians. *Journal of Homosexuality, 57*(1), 5–38.

Rodriguez, E. M., & Ouellette, S. C. (2000a). Gay and lesbian Christians: Homosexual and religious identity integration in the members and participants of a gay-positive church. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 39*(3), 333–347.

Rodriguez, E. M., & Ouellette, S. C. (2000b). Religion and masculinity in Latino gay lives. In P. M. Nardi (Ed.), *Gay masculinities* (pp. 101–129). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Roen, K. (2008). "But we have to do something": Surgical "correction" of atypical genitalia. *Body & Society, 14*(1), 47–66.

Rosenberg, M., & Pearlin, L. I. (1976). Social class and self-esteem among children and adults. *American Journal of Sociology, 84*(1), 53–77.

Rosenfeld, D. (2003). *The changing of the guard: Lesbian and gay elders, identity and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rosenfeld, D. (2009). Heteronormativity and homonormativity as practical and moral resources: The case of lesbian and gay elders. *Gender & Society, 23*(5), 617–638.

Ross, L., Epstein, R., Goldfinger, C., Steele, L., Anderson, S., & Strike, C. (2008). Lesbian and queer mothers navigating the adoption system: The impacts on mental health. *Health Sociology Review, 17*(3), 254–266.

Rowatt, W. C., Tsang, J., Kelly, J., LaMartina, B., McCullers, M., & McKinley, A. (2006). Associations between religious personality dimensions and implicit homosexual prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 45*(3), 397–406.

Rubin, G. (1993 [1984]). Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality. In H. Abelove, M. A. Barale, & D. Halpern (Eds.), *The lesbian and gay studies reader* (pp. 143–179). Routledge.

Russell, S. T., & Joyner, K. (2001). Adolescent sexual orientation and suicide risk: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(8), 1276–1281.

Russell, S. T., Seif, H., & Truong, N. L. (2001). School outcomes of sexual minority youth in the United States: Evidence from a national study. *Journal of Adolescence, 24*(1), 111–127.

Russell, S. T., Driscoll, A. K., & Truong, N. (2002). Adolescent same-sex romantic attractions and relationships: Implications for substance use and abuse. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*(2), 198–202.

Ryan, M., & Berkowitz, D. (2009). Constructing gay and lesbian parent families "beyond the closet.". *Qualitative Sociology, 32*(2), 153–172.

Sandstrom, K. L. (1990). Confronting deadly disease: The drama of identity construction among gay men with AIDS. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 19*(3), 271–294.

Schilt, K. (2006). Just one of the guys? How transmen make gender visible at work. *Gender & Society, 20*(4), 465–490.

Schilt, K., & Connell, C. (2007). Do workplace gender transitions make gender trouble? *Gender, Work, and Organization, 14*(6), 596–618.

Schrock, D., & Reid, L. (2006). Transsexuals' sexual stories. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 35*(1), 75–86.

Schrock, D., & Schwalbe, M. (2009). Men, masculinity, and manhood acts. *Annual Review of Sociology, 35,* 277–295.

Schrock, D., Holden, D., & Reid, L. (2004). Creating emotional resonance: Interpersonal emotion work and motivational framing in a transgender community. *Social Problems, 51*(1), 61–81.

Schrock, D., Reid, L., & Boyd, E. M. (2005). Transsexuals' embodiment of womanhood. *Gender & Society, 19*(3), 317–335.

Schrock, D., Boyd, E. M., & Leaf, M. (2009). Emotion work in the public performances of male-to-female transsexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 38*(5), 702–712.

Schwalbe, M. L. (1993). Goffman against postmodernism: Emotion and the reality of the self. *Symbolic Interaction, 16*(4), 333–350.

Schwalbe, M. L., & Mason-Schrock, D. (1996). Identity work as group process. In B. Markovsky, M. Lovaglia, & R. Simon (Eds.), *Advances in group processes* (Vol. 14). Greenwich: JAI Press.

Schwalbe, M. L., & Staples, C. L. (1991). Gender differences in sources of self-esteem. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 54*(2), 158–168.

Schwalbe, M., Godwin, S., Holden, D., Schrock, D., Thompson, S., & Wolkomir, M. (2000). Generic processes in the reproduction of inequality: An interactionist analysis. *Social Forces, 79*(2), 419–452.

Seidman, S. (2009). Critique of compulsory heterosexuality. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 6*(1), 18–28.

Sharp, S. (2010). How does prayer help manage emotions? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 73*(4), 417–437.

Sherkat, D. E., Powell-Williams, M., Maddox, G., & Mattias de Vries, K. (2011). Religion, politics, and support for same-sex marriage in the United States, 1988–2008. *Social Science Research, 40*(1), 167–180.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*(2), 97–120.

Simon, R. W., Eder, D., & Evans, C. (1992). The development of feeling norms underlying romantic love among adolescent females. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 55*(1), 29–46.

Smart, C. (2007). Same sex couples and marriage: Negotiating relational landscapes with families and friends. *Sociological Review, 55*(4), 671–686.

Smith, G. W. (1998). The ideology of "fag": The school experience of gay students. *Sociological Quarterly, 39*(2), 309–335.

Smith, A., & Kleinman, S. (1989). Managing emotions in medical school: Students' contact with the living and the dead. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 52*(1), 56–69.

Solebello, N., & Elliott, S. (2011). "We want them to be as heterosexual as possible": Fathers talk about their teen children's sexuality. *Gender & Society, 25*(3), 293–315.

Stacey, J., & Biblarz, T. J. (2001). (How) Does the sexual orientation of parents matter? *American Sociological Review, 66*(2), 159–183.

Stombler, M. (2009). In the hot seat. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2009*(5), A31–A33.

Sullivan, M. (1996). Rozzie and Harriet? Gender and family patterns of lesbian coparents. *Gender & Society, 10*(6), 747–767.

Sumerau, J. E. (2012). "That's what men are supposed to do": Compensatory manhood acts in an LGBT Christian church. *Gender & Society, 26,* 461–487.

Sumerau, J. E. (Forthcoming). Mobilizing race, class, and gender discourses in a metropolitan community church. *Race, Gender, and Class*.

Sumerau, J. E., & Schrock, D. P. (2011). "It's important to show your colors": Counter-heteronormative embodiment in a metropolitan community church. In C. Bobel & S. Kwan (Eds.), *Embodied resistance: Challenging the norms, breaking the rules*. Nashville: University of Vanderbilt Press.

Swim, J. K., Johnston, K., & Pearson, N. B. (2009). Daily experiences with heterosexism: Relations between heterosexist hassles and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 28*(5), 597–629.

Taylor, V., & Raeburn, N. C. (1995). Identity politics as high-risk activism: Career consequences for lesbian, gay, and bisexual sociologists. *Social Problems, 42*(2), 252–273.

Taylor, S. E., & Repetti, R. L. (1997). Health psychology: What is an unhealthy environment and how does it get under the skin? *Annual Review of Psychology, 48,* 411–447.

The Committee on the Status of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Persons in Sociology. (2009). Report on the status of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons in sociology. Prepared for the American Sociological Association.

Thumma, S. (1991). Negotiating a religious identity: The case of the gay Evangelical. *Sociological Analysis, 52*(4), 333–347.

Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Employment discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology, 117*(2), 586–626.

Travers, R., & Schneider, M. (1996). Barriers to accessibility for lesbian and gay youth needing addictions services. *Youth & Society, 27*(3), 356–378.

Turner, C. F., Villarroel, M. A., Chromy, J. R., Eggleston, E., & Rogers, S. M. (2005). Same-gender sex among U.S. adults: Trends across the twentieth century and during the 1990's. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 69*(3), 439–462.

Ueno, K. (2005). Sexual orientation and psychological distress in adolescence: Examining interpersonal stressors and social support processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 68*(3), 258–277.

Ueno, K. (2010a). Patterns of cross-orientation friendships in high schools. *Social Science Research, 39*(3), 444–458.

Ueno, K. (2010b). Mental health differences between young adults with and without same-sex contact: A simultaneous examination of underlying mechanisms. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 51*(4), 391–407.

Ueno, K. (2010c). Same-sex experience and mental health during the transition between adolescence and young adulthood. *Sociological Quarterly, 51*(3), 484–510.

Ueno, K., Wright, E. R., Gayman, M. D., & McCabe, J. M. (2012). Segregation in gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth's personal networks: Testing structural con-

straint, choice homophily, and compartmentalization hypotheses. *Social Forces, 90*(3), 971–991.

Ueno, K., Peña-Talamantes, A. E., & Roach, T. A. (2013a). Sexual orientation and occupational attainment. *Work and Occupations, 40*(1), 3–37.

Ueno, K., Roach, T. A., & Peña-Talamantes, A. E. (2013b). The dynamic association between sexual orientation and educational attainment. *Advances in Life Course Research*, forthcoming.

Valentine, G., Vanderbeck, R. M., Andersson, J., Sadgrove, J., & Ward, K. (2010). Emplacements: The event as a prism for exploring intersectionality; A case study of the Lambeth Conference. *Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association, 44*(5), 925–943.

Van der meer, T. (2003). Gay bashing: A rite of passage? *Culture, Health, and Sexuality, 5*(2), 153–165.

Warner, M. (1991). Introduction: Fear of a queer planet. *Social Text, 29***,** 3–17.

Webster, M. J., Hysom, S. J., & Fullmer, E. M. (1998). Sexual orientation and occupation as status. *Advances in Group Processes, 15,* 1–21.

Weeks, J., Heaphy, B., & Donovan, C. (2001). *Same sex intimacies: Families of choice and other life experiences*. London: Routledge.

Weichselbaumer, D. (2003). Sexual orientation discrimination in hiring. *Labour Economics, 10*(6), 629–642.

Weinberg, M. S., & Williams, C. J. (1974). *Male Homosexuals: Their problems and adaptations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weinberg, M. S., & Williams, C. J. (1975). Gay baths and the social organization of impersonal sex. *Social Problems, 23*(2), 124–136.

Weis, D. L. (1998). The use of theory in sexuality research. *Journal of Sex Research, 35*(1), 1–9.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*(2), 125–151.

Weston, K. (1991). *Families we choose: Lesbians, gays, kinship*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilcox, M. M. (2001). Of markets and missions: The early history of the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches. *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation, 11*(1), 83–108.

Wilcox, M. M. (2009). *Queer Women and religious individualism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wilkins, A. C. (2012). Becoming black women: Intimate stories and intersectional identities. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 75*(2), 173–196.

Wilkinson, L., & Pearson, J. (2009). School culture and the well-being of same sex-attracted youth. *Gender & Society, 23*(4), 542–568.

Williams, C., & Weinberg, M. S. (1971). *Homosexuals and military: A study of less than honorable discharge*. Oxford: Harper & Row.

Wolkomir, M. (2006). *Be not deceived: The sacred and sexual struggles of gay and ex-gay christian men*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Wood, J. (1994). *The corporate closet*. New York: Free Press.

Wright, E. R., & Perry, B. L. (2006). Sexual identity distress, social support, and the health of gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Homosexuality, 51*(1), 81–109.

Yeung, K., & Stombler, M. (2000). Gay and Greek: The identity paradox of gay fraternities. *Social Problems, 47*(1), 134–152.

Yeung, K., Stombler, M., & Wharton, R. (2006). Making men in gay fraternities: Resisting and reproducing multiple dimensions of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society, 20*(1), 5–31.

Yip, A. K. T. (1997). Dare to differ: Gay and lesbian Catholics' assessment of official Catholic positions on sexuality. *Sociology of Religion, 58*(2), 165–180.