

Queer Theory, Intersectionality, and LGBT-Parent Families: Transformative Critical Pedagogy in Family Theory

April L. Few-Demo, Áine M. Humble, Melissa A. Curran, Sally A. Lloyd

Version Post-print/Accepted manuscript

Citation (published version) Few-Demo, A., Humble, A. M., Curran, M. A., & Lloyd, S. (2016). Queer theory, intersectionality, and LGBT-parent families: Transformative critical pedagogy in family theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 8(1), 74-94. doi:10.1111/jftr.12127

Publisher's Statement This article may be downloaded for non-commercial and no derivative uses. This article appears in the *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, a journal of the National Council on Family Relations; copyright National Council on Family Relations.

How to cite e-Commons items

Always cite the published version, so the author(s) will receive recognition through services that track citation counts. If you need to cite the page number of the **author manuscript from the e-Commons** because you cannot access the published version, then cite the e-Commons version **in addition to** the published version using the permanent URI (handle) found on the record page.

This article was made openly accessible by Mount Saint Vincent University Faculty.



Few-Demo, A., **Humble, A. M.**, Curran, M. A., & Lloyd, S. (2016). Queer theory, intersectionality, and LGBT-parent families: Transformative critical pedagogy in family theory. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 8(1), 74-94. doi:10.1111/jftr.12127

This is an author-generated post-print of the article- please refer to published version for page numbers

Winner of the 2017 Wiley Prize in Family Science (Alexis Walker Award)

Abstract

We discuss how we can move the family studies field and our teaching of family theories from covering the “facts” that LGBT-parent families exist to a critical conversation that incorporates conceptual tools, language, and theoretical insights from queer and intersectionality theories. Our attempt to move this conversation is through the presentation of a model of curricular change for teaching family studies theories courses (i.e., shifts from LGBT-parent exclusion, compensatory addition of LGBT-parent families, and LGBT-parent families as disadvantaged, to a focus on queer and intersectional scholarship and a continuing postmodern paradigm shift). We discuss how instructors can engage in critical feminist-oriented self-reflexivity and transformational pedagogy.

Keywords: feminism, intersectionality, LGBT-parent families, queer theory, teaching, theory

Queer Theory, Intersectionality, and LGBT-parent Families:

Transformative Critical Pedagogy in Family Theory

An estimated 37% of LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender)-identified adults have had a child at some time in their lives (Gates, 2013), with these adults raising around 2 million children under the age of 18 (Perrin, Siegel, & The Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health, 2013). Decades of research show that children raised by same-sex parents and children raised by different-sex parents fare equally well (Manning, Fetto, & Lamidi, 2014). Children's well-being is affected by their relationships with their parents, their parents' sense of competence and security, and the presence of social and economic support for the family, and much less affected by the gender or sexual orientation of their parents (Perrin et al.). However, although there are many similarities between LGBT-parent families and heterosexual families, some important differences also exist due to the "social effects of heteronormativity" (Stacey, 2013, p. vii). Moreover, differences exist *among* LGBT-parent families, characterized in terms of complex networks of both different-gender and same-gender past and present relationships, and navigations of family passages of divorce, separation, repartnering, and death (Ross & Dobinson, 2013). Differences also exist based on parents' sexual or gender identities, the circumstances of when they became parents, future family transitions, and other factors such as race, ethnicity, class, and geographical location (e.g., Gates, 2013).

The growing visibility and within-group variance of LGBT-parent families highlight two needs for family studies as a discipline. First, we need to more fully include these families in our teaching, as students need to understand complex issues regarding sexual orientation and gender identity to be competent and caring human service professionals (Kupalanka, Goldberg, & Oswald, 2013). Second, we need relevant theoretical frameworks that capture processes within LGBT-parented families. Many theory textbooks focus on theories developed from

heteronormative assumptions or observations, and such theories may not be relevant or complete with regards to sexual minority families.

For this special issue on LGBT-parent families, we describe how family theory can be stretched and challenged when family scholars and teachers utilize queer and intersectional perspectives, and are truly inclusive of LGBT-parent families in their teaching of family theories. Our focus is motivated by the exciting scholarship and theorizing that has emerged in the last decade about this understudied group of families, and our reflection on what can occur when we are truly inclusive of these families and of ways to study them has resulted in the presented model of family theory curricular change. We argue that simply adding LGBT-parent families is not enough to transform a curriculum so that it is both truly inclusive of LGBT-parent families and challenging of the heteronormative status quo, and we explain how queer theory and intersectionality offer the most possibilities in this regard.

Our main audience for this article is individuals who are already using queer theory and intersectionality in their teaching, particular those teaching family theory courses. However, scholars and teachers who are unfamiliar with queer theory or intersectionality and who wish to explore new possibilities for teaching their family theory courses will also benefit from a consideration of our model, particularly phases two and three. To both groups, our invitation is to engage in dialogue with us as we consider what happens to our work when queering, intersectionality, and LGBT-parent families are moved from the margin to the center. Ultimately, our question is how do we move the field from discussing the “facts” that these families exist, to a critical conversation about the conceptual tools, new languages, and theoretical upheavals that must be developed to decenter heteronormativity, contest gender and sexuality binaries, conduct intersectional analyses, and utilize research on LGBT-parent families to inform the field writ large. Our attempt to move this conversation forward is done so by our presentation of a model

of curricular change for teaching family theory courses.

To begin this conversation, we first briefly describe our own positionality. All four of us are mid- or late-career academics. Our doctoral training is primarily in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) programs, and both Authors 1 and 2 have some Women's Studies education. Author 1 was trained earlier on in graduate school about queer and/or intersectionality theories and scholarship by obtaining a graduate certificate in Women's Studies and having Black feminist scholars as mentors, while the rest of us (Authors 2, 3, and 4) sought this knowledge during our academic careers once we were teaching family theory courses (Author 2 also completed a Women's Studies minor as part of her doctoral program, and was introduced to queer theory and intersectionality theory, but for many years struggled with how she could incorporate this knowledge into her own family studies scholarship and teaching). We have varying levels of experience teaching family theory courses (at undergraduate and graduate levels), and with integrating queer and intersectional scholarship specific to LGBT-parent families. Finally, we all teach or have taught in HDFS departments. Author 4 also taught within a Women's, Gender and Sexuality program.

Brief Description of Queer Theory and Intersectionality

We begin with a brief description of queer theory and intersectionality, as we use terms from these perspectives in the earlier parts of this paper. We discuss both queer theory and intersectionality in detail in the description of phase four of our model. *Queer theory* posits that because there is fluidity and diversity in gender and sexual identities and behaviors over the life course, human nature cannot be captured holistically by simple binaries. Queer theory provides a lens for extricating the various factors that feed into heteronormativity and for understanding how structural elements contribute to certain individuals and families being entitled over others (Oswald, Blume, & Marks, 2005). Within queer theory is a deep analysis of heteronormativity,

an ideology that “promotes gender conventionality, heterosexuality, and family traditionalism as the correct way for people to be” (Oswald et al., p. 143). This ideology influences all families, and it has particular implications for LGBT-parent families, who often face significant and pervasive levels of prejudice and discrimination (Oswald et al.). *Intersectionality* is a theoretical framework that guides data interpretation and methodological considerations; it compels us to examine the process by which individuals negotiate competing and harmonious social identities, as well as the fluidity, variability, and temporality of interactive processes that occur between and within multiple social groups, institutions, and social practices (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Few-Demo, 2014; Hancock, 2007).

A Model of Curriculum Change

To understand how LGBT-parent families and their experiences can be fully integrated into family theory curricula, we propose a model (see Table 1) that shows five possible phases of inclusion, and which includes the incorporation of queer theory and intersectionality perspectives in phase four. Our development of this model is strongly influenced by Schuster and Van Dyne’s (1985) and Tetreault’s (1985) articles on women’s studies curriculum transformation. Like them, we posit that boundaries between phases are permeable and that the phases are not necessarily experienced in a linear fashion or that each phase is exclusively experienced by an educator. Instructors might bridge across more than one phase as they question and revise pedagogical approaches to teaching family theory; they may move back to earlier phases at times if they encounter resistance from students or if internalized positivism and heteronormativity rise to the surface. Additionally, instructors, students, and institutions bring multiple identities and histories into both classrooms and curricula. The level of faculty colleague and institutional support may create a climate that enhances or constrains a particular phase of curricular development, and instructors and students alike negotiate around and within their own identities, belief systems,

and familiarity with scholarship on LGBT-parent families (Kovalanka et al., 2013).

In the following sections, we describe the first four phases of the model, leaving the fifth phase for our concluding comments. Before doing so, however, we would like to point out two things about the model with regard to (a) the language used for the title, and (b) the inclusion of both queer families and the two theories. First, we purposefully did not use the term “stages” given its implication of linearity, yet we chose the term “phases” with reservations, as even this term might imply a “progression” not in line with the tenets of queering. Ultimately, our intent here is to describe different arenas for self-reflection, and not a proscriptive trek. Each instructor’s personal journey with pedagogy will intersect here in unique ways; depending on the instructor’s training, experience, identities, and the student body and structural supports/constraints, each may travel a very different path. Second, although queer families can be included in a family theories course without queer and intersectionality theories, we argue that a fully nuanced and critical approach to the theoretical study of LGBT-parent families cannot occur without using queer theory and intersectionality theory to study them. Thus, both *queer families* and *queering processes* are included in this model.

Phase 1: LGBT-Parent Family Exclusion

In the first phase, *LGBT-Parent Family Exclusion*, typical family theories such as family systems theory and the life course perspective are discussed, and heteronormative families (e.g., a married mother and father, or divorced heterosexual parents, raising their biological children) are exclusively used as examples and thus presented as “universals” of family life. LGBT-parent families are absent in the curriculum, and this absence is likely neither noticed by the teacher nor commented on by students.

Often instructors teach their family studies courses without mentioning or discussing LGBT-parent families (Hackman, 2012, as cited in Kovalanka et al., 2013) due to a variety of

factors. First, instructors may teach as they were taught, based on formal education likely “rooted in a positivist tradition that emphasizes deduction, proposition building, and empirical findings” as well as objectivity (Daly, 1990, p. 88). These instructors might feel that there was nothing wrong with their approach, and deny that their choices of theories and topics were political or exclusionary in any way. Authors 3 and 4 were trained this way while earning their doctorates; in the programs they attended (in the early 1980s and the early 2000s), there was not a single lecture (much less a course) on LGBT families, feminism, queer theory, or intersectionality. Author 2 had a similar experience in the 1990s and early 2000s, although she took a master’s level theory course that included the topic of critical theory and recalls a couple of classes on lesbian and gay (but not bisexual or transgender) issues in her doctoral program (primarily within her Women’s Studies minor). Second, instructors may refrain from including such content due to varying levels of discomfort around teaching issues related to sexual orientation and/or gender identity (Kivalanka et al., 2013) or their own internalized heterosexism or homophobia. Third, student resistance or anticipated student resistance may also be a barrier, as well as how supportive one’s teaching environment is of including such content (Kivalanka et al., 2013).

Textbooks can influence content covered in a theory course (Murry, Rosenblatt, & Weiling, 2006). Contemporary introductory textbooks typically cover the same theories. For example, Chibucos, Leite, and Weis (2005), Smith and Hamon (2012), and White, Klein, and Martin (2015) all have chapters on symbolic interactionism, social exchange, family systems, ecological, conflict, family development/family life course, and feminist theory in their introductory books. None of these textbooks include chapters on queer theory or intersectionality. Instructors could add supplemental materials, but may also choose to stay away from sources assumed to be too advanced for undergraduate students, who may already be resistant to taking a family theory course (Daly, 1990). Alternatively, some might choose to only

cover these theories with graduate students. Moreover, both new and seasoned scholars find queer theory or intersectionality difficult to understand and thus shy away from them (Kovalanka et al., 2013). However, if instructors do not mention LGBT-parent families, it is unlikely that they will even attempt to talk about these theories in their courses.

An instructor's awareness of the heteronormative nature of pedagogical examples signals the conditions under which a transition to the next phase can occur. This awareness could occur through one's own recognition of the disjuncture between course content and the reality of families' experiences and configurations, occasional student comments (such as from queer and out students and their allies), or feedback from colleagues. However, change can be intimidating, and small steps may be what helps an instructor to move forward in a comfortable way. Thus, transitioning into talking about queering processes may simply start with instructors occasionally mentioning an LGBT-parent family, as they start to avail themselves of LGBT-parent families research. Some may think that the mere mention of LGBT-parent families makes their course "inclusive." They would, understandably, find it stressful to engage in conversations with students who question and desire conversations more suited to phase three or four of our model.

Phase 2: Compensatory Inclusion of LGBT-Parent Families

In the second phase, *Compensatory Inclusion of LGBT-Parent Families*, the family theory instructor recognizes the absence of LGBT-parent families, and now moves beyond the absence or occasional mention of them. Family theories developed from heteronormative families' experiences (e.g., family systems theory) are still a focus, but LGBT-parent family studies are now included as examples. Authors 2, 3, and 4 recall going through this phase of compensation, as the literature on LGBT-parent families developed and grew.

Typically motivated by a "liberal desire for equity within the status quo" (Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985, p. 20), the instructor intentionally seeks out LGBT-parent family research that

has been studied with commonly used theories. These theories can have applicability to LGBT-parent families; as Dilworth-Anderson, Burton, and Klein (2005) note, “for contemporary families, new ideas may emerge from existing theoretical traditions as well as from emerging perspectives” (p. 45). However, the dynamics and development of LGBT-parent families are assumed to be similar to those of heteronormative families, and the theories themselves are neither questioned nor challenged as to their applicability to LGBT-parent families. Typical theories that focus on internal dynamics of families can reinforce a societal status quo that is sexist and conservative (Osmond, 1988, as cited in Daly, 1990) as well as heteronormative.

Many of the theories emphasized in family theory texts have been used to study gay and lesbian-parent families, and so examples will likely reflect these theories. However, because research on bisexual-parent families and transgender-parent families is quite rare (Downing, 2013; Hines, 2006; Ross & Dobinson, 2013), these families will likely be absent from theorizing in this phase. Studies can combine or integrate multiple theories (Bengtson, Acock, Allen, Dilworth-Anderson, & Klein, 2005), and a number of scholars studying LGBT-parent families have done so, such as Goldberg’s (2007b) study of disclosure practices, which was influenced by symbolic interactionism, the life course perspective, and queer theory.

Instructors focusing on the *life course perspective* would draw attention to the timing of events and the importance of taking a longitudinal perspective on families (Bengtson & Allen, 1993). They might comment on Goldberg’s (2007b) findings about the ways in which adult children raised by gay and lesbian parents disclosed their parents’ sexual orientations to others and how particular attention was given to “elements of time (e.g., the timing of parents’ disclosure, change in participants’ disclosure practices, key transition points or turning points)” (p. 109). A different life course focus might explore how the relationships between a child, parents, and a donor(s) can change over the course of everyone’s lives (Goldberg & Allen,

2013a; Telingator, 2013), or present research about transgender parents who consider the ontogenetic development of their adult children before undergoing a gender transition so that their children are better able to understand this turning point (White & Ettner, 2004).

Family systems theory (Whitchurch & Constantine, 1993) draws attention to the complex relationships found in LGBT-parent families. Research on LGBT-parent families with known donors exemplifies theoretical assumptions about family systems parts being interrelated and thus a change in one part of a family system affects other parts of the family system. Telingator (2013) presents a compelling clinical vignette demonstrating how a lesbian couple's anxieties about their child's known sperm donors (a gay couple known to the mothers prior to their daughter's birth) were picked up by their daughter, which in turn confused and angered the daughter as she attempted to make sense of the relationships in her family. If mixed-orientation marriages (couples who stay together after one of them comes out as gay, lesbian, or bisexual) are included, the instructor might discuss Schwartz's (2012) study, which drew on systems theory to provide counseling advice for those working with couples in mixed-orientation marriages. Schwartz (2012) described various considerations to work through; showing how such potentially "disruptive" input into the family system can be negotiated through feedback to create a renewed sense of homeostasis.

Symbolic interaction theory (Blumer, 1969; Mead, 1934) would draw attention to how people make sense of and interpret their immediate and broader situations. Families are actively constructed rather than essentially created (Oswald et al., 2005). An instructor in Phase 2 might discuss Berkowitz and Marsiglio's (2007) study about how gay men come to see themselves as fathers, which draws on symbolic interaction, noting the "social processes by which the men assign meaning to situations, events, others, and themselves as they encounter facets of everyday life and the procreative realm" (p. 368), and how they made sense of their traditional

reproductive capabilities. Likewise, Kelly (2004) examined various legal court cases pointing to a disjuncture between how families and legal systems defined parenthood.

These typical theories clearly can be used to highlight unique features of LGBT-parent families. In this phase, students may be open to hearing about LGBT-parent families because they are discussed with theories used to study heterosexual families. This might allow the presentation of material to “feel safe” and be less likely to raise any student defensiveness or anger (although it likely that internalized transphobia could make the inclusion of content about transgender parent families more challenging than content about lesbian and gay parenting). However, these theories have limits as to how they inform us about families’ lives, particularly LGBT-parent families, given that they were largely developed from studies of heterosexual, middle-class White families (Biblarz & Savçi, 2010; Oswald et al., 2005).

A move to the next phase could begin with an instructor realizing that theories focusing on internal family dynamics are insufficient to properly study LGBT-parent families, and a developing openness to including macro theories that fall under a critical paradigm. Starting to develop a feminist consciousness that includes a commitment to family diversity and a focus on the social construction of gender as key features of one’s research and teaching (Thompson & Walker, 1995) could be an impetus. Feminist pedagogical work such as that by Allen (e.g., 1995, 2000, 2007) may encourage them to be more reflexive about their pedagogical choices. Such reflection might lead to a realization that education is no longer just about tolerance or acceptance of family diversity (queer as an adjective, as in *queer* families), but that it also needs to assist students in “creat[ing] new ways of being in the world” (Allen, 1995, p. 136) (queering as a verb, as in *queering* families or family processes).

Phase 3: LGBT-Parent Families as Disadvantaged

In the third phase of family theory curriculum change, *LGBT-parent Families as*

Disadvantaged, the instructor's locus of analysis now changes from how LGBT-parent family dynamics are similar to their heterosexual counterparts to a critical examination of their *disadvantaged* social location relative to heteronormative families. Driven by social justice concerns, instructors "begin redefining their intellectual responsibility. . . they broaden their inquiry to the historical and cultural context as the means for understanding the results they found at stage 2" (Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985, p. 21). Commonly used theories are still included, but now also critiqued for their applicability to all families, and the historical contexts in which they were developed are critically unpacked (Doherty, Boss, LaRossa, Schumm, & Steinmetz, 1993; Murry et al., 2006). Such an unpacking can set the stage for the addition of macro-focused critical theories to study LGBT-parent families, such as feminist theory and minority stress theory. Author 2, for example, recalls encouraging students in her 2002 undergraduate theory course to read Oswald's (2000) paper on heterosexism in weddings as an example of critical theory, although this article did not focus on LGBT-parent families.

Feminist theory is well suited to studying LGBT-parent families, as it challenges a monolithic notion of family (Thompson & Walker, 1995) and "addresses the exploitation, devaluation, and oppression of marginalized groups in our society" (Chabot & Ames, 2004, p. 349). Yet, it is not necessarily always included in family theory curricula due to some scholars' views—likely those coming from positivistic standpoints—that it is too ideological. Murry et al. (2006) pointed out that *all* theories are ideological in nature and some are just more overtly ideological than others. They argued that feminist theory should be part of a core group of theories included in family theory courses.

Some LGBT-parent studies reference feminist theory in a general way, such as Goldberg and Allen's (2007) study of lesbian couples' views of men's involvement with their children. They asked, "given that lesbian couples live in a society that strongly values fathers and bemoans

their absence, how do they negotiate the socially constructed nature of parenthood?" (p. 354).

Other LGBT-parent families researchers have used more specific feminist theories such as multiracial feminism (Mezey, 2008, 2013), standpoint feminism (Berkowitz, 2009), transfeminism (Lev & Sennott, 2013), and feminist transnational frameworks (Berkowitz, 2013). These feminist perspectives are particularly important given the predominance of LGBT-parent research involving only White families, even though White same-sex couples are less likely to be raising children than Black or Latino same-sex couples (Moore & Brainer, 2013).

Sexual minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003) posits that LGBT-parent families experience a variety of general, proximal, and distal stressors that accumulate over time to create a unique form of stress. The instructor could use research examples such as King, Huffman, and Peddie (2013), who describe how the minority stress experienced by LGBT-parent families may intensify negative work-to-family conflict if they have less access to alternative childcare (e.g., grandparents) in the event of an emergency (their regular childcare being unavailable).

Using critical theories such as feminist and sexual minority stress theory can raise challenges for both students and instructors. Like the resistance students demonstrate when instructors in women's studies course focus on women's disadvantage relative to men (Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985), students in this phase may show anger and/or resistance to this particular approach. "The classroom heats up because the material introduced. ... begins to reveal the 'invisible paradigms' on which the old syllabi rest" (Schuster & Van Dyne, p. 21). Students may confront an instructor or refuse to participate in class discussions or complete assignments, yet transformed thinking is possible over time (Lester, 2008).

There are two possible limitations to this phase. First, although macro theories are important in drawing students' attention to how broader sociohistorical contexts influence LGBT-parent families' experiences, the focus on disadvantage may be problematic, reinforcing

these families' marginalized status within a heteronormative context. Moreover, this type of lens can constrain researchers from asking different kinds of questions, such as those regarding the strengths and resiliency of such families or the heteronormative status quo involved in much family research. Second, LGBT-parent families may often be studied or discussed as "a group," without the diversity within them adequately explored, and such generalizations can be problematic. For example, the experiences of transgender-parent families versus lesbian or gay parents can be quite different, as a result of having to deal with "various forms of transphobia, medical pathologization, and lack of adequate health-care services" (Downing, 2013, p. 105). Using the term "LGBT" without really exploring and adequately representing transgender parents in a study marginalizes these parents. Although instructors in this phase may have a better understanding of sexual orientation issues, they may still have limited knowledge about transgender families and lack confidence to include them as examples. They can also be limited by what is available to them in the research.

A move to the next phase might thus be initiated by factors such as the instructor beginning to pay closer attention to the diversity of experiences found within LGBT-parent families, moving away from a focus on pathology, and recognizing queer not only as an adjective (through the inclusion of queer families using a variety of micro- and macro-focused theories) but also as a *verb* — as a *social process* (i.e., *queering*). Developing a good understanding and confidence in teaching about queer theory and intersectionality is also critical for paving the way for instructors' inclusion of these perspectives in their family theory courses.

Queer theory is a relatively new theoretical framework for family studies, and a "controversial" (and even "uncomfortable") one for some people (Allen, 2005; Bengtson, Allen, Klein, Dilworth-Anderson, & Acock, 2005), and educators may not be familiar with the possibilities it offers or how to use it as an analytic tool. Similarly, the complexities of theoretical

and methodological analyses centering on intersectionality have slowed its full incorporation into family theory (Few-Demo, 2014; McCall, 2005). Limited formal education in these theories may be a barrier for some educators (Kovalanka et al., 2013). Education can come in a variety of forms, including formal readings and courses, as well as conversations and discussion with colleagues who study LGBT-parent families.

Author 4 recalls the pivotal role played by such discussions as she worked to incorporate queer and intersectional perspectives into her courses. Author 3 was influenced by a colleague in her department (name omitted here) and his graduate students who studied LGBT families. Author 2 received mentoring early on in her master's degree from (name omitted), a researcher focused on critical theory. Although she was trained to think about families with a feminist-oriented intersectional lens early in her career, Author 1 also was inspired to study queer theory (which she found quite daunting at first) and LGBT family life by working with colleagues (names omitted) and graduate students who were already invested in integrating queer theory into family studies. Further, Author 1 was already sensitized to intersectionality and heteronormativity due to her exposure to Black feminist mentoring specifically by (two names omitted) and their insistence that she "consume" feminist scholarship, poetry, and activist writings by Audre Lorde, Adrienne Rich, the Combahee River Collective, bell hooks, Michelle Wallace, Sapphire, Barbara Smith, and Patricia Hill Collins. Finally, we all have been influenced by the continued development of the Feminism and Family Studies section of the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR), which has provided rich conversations and resources for our continued immersion into these literatures and theories, such as the "Feminist/Queer Family Theory Discussion" at NCFR's 2013 conference.

Phase 4: Critical Engagement of Queer and Intersectionality Scholarship

In this fourth phase, *Critical Engagement of Queer and Intersectionality Scholarship*, an

instructor continues to utilize feminist, minority stress, and critical family theories, but now reframes the teaching of family theories so that the course recognizes the full plurality of LGBT-parent families' experiences (e.g., critical discourse about the differences between “L,” “G,” “B,” and “T”) as well as “complicates” them. LGBT-parent families are fully incorporated into the course, and queer theory and intersectionality theory are now used to move beyond the vulnerability of LGBT-parent families to unpack the social construction of gender, sexuality, and family, to critically examine the interactive process of intersecting social locations and institutional constraints, and to acknowledge diverse ways of resiliency.

Another transformational process occurs: the instructor's own continuing reflexive process about the utility and appropriateness of using these theories explicitly together. A different level of transformational consciousness is engaged in this contemplative phase; all four authors are currently involved in such reflection, dialogue, and wrestling with these theories and how to teach them, despite our varying levels of graduate school preparation and immersion in the teaching of family theories. To describe this fourth phase, we have integrated a presentation of each theory with examples of how instructors might use the theory and research on LGBT-parent family in their family theories courses. We first present queer theory with LGBT-parent families exemplars, followed by intersectionality theory and LGBT-parent families exemplars.

Queer Theory and LGBT-parent families exemplars. Queer theory involves destabilizing and disrupting what is known and taken for granted about families. The word “queer” has had varying definitions, including “differing in some odd way from what is usual or normal” (Oswald, Kuvalanka, Blume, & Berkowitz, 2009, p. 43). Queering calls attention to social acts, practices, and ideas that construct and define what is normal, and leads us to question the values of such constructions (Oswald et al., 2005, 2009). Lesbian mothers, for example, can “queer” a public breastfeeding experience by having the mother breastfeeding her child say to

her child after she has finished breastfeeding, “now go to your mama” (Berkowitz, 2009, p. 120). Thus, queer theory brings complexity to how we conceptualize family structure, composition, roles, and processes. Queer theory opens up the door to asking different kinds of questions about families and critiquing typical theories used to study them (Goldberg, 2007a). Berkowitz (2009) presents the following example: “Rather than posing a research question like how do gay fathers negotiate their identities, a researcher using queer methodologies might query how the category gay father has been constructed and maintained in existing family scholarship” (p. 124).

A central aim of queer theory is the analysis of heteronormativity (Berkowitz, 2009). Heteronormativity is an ideology promoting the “correct” ways (i.e., gender conventionality, heterosexuality, and family traditionalism) for people to act and believe (Oswald et al., 2005). Such an ideology is problematic because it is a system of privilege, derived from history and represented in cultural beliefs, rules, rewards, and sanctions that promote and reinforce heterosexuality and marginalize those who deviate from it. Moreover, heteronormativity relies on binaries for gender (“real” males and “real” females versus gender “deviants”), sexuality (“natural” sexuality versus “unnatural” sexuality), and family (“genuine” families versus “pseudo” families). Queer theory resists or deconstructs heteronormativity by challenging binaries (Oswald et al.). Thus, instead of emphasizing or reinforcing binaries, it relies on complexity in gender, sexuality, and families, recognizing tensions that can exist between heteronormativity and queering, and also noting that “there is no simple continuum with heteronormativity on one end and queering on the other” (Oswald et al., 2005, p. 150).

An exemplar demonstrating gender and queer theoretical constructs is Berkowitz and Ryan’s (2011) study, which explored how gay and lesbian parents constructed their children’s gender identities and how their children enacted those identities. Many of the participants in their study sought to reduce the risk of gender assessment by others by responding to cultural gender

discourses in ways that confirmed those dominant narratives. Gay fathers actively constructed gender for their daughters by dressing them in pink clothing and lesbian mothers gave their sons “masculine” sounding names. Parents sought out different-sex role models for their children. However, the authors’ application of a queer lens allowed for the examination of how some of the parents also engaged in “subtle and often nuanced ruptures” (p. 347) of binary notions of gender, sexuality, and family. For example, even though one mother wanted to ensure that her son got the male role model that he desired, she queered notions of kinship by noting that the role model could be an uncle or a male friend, disrupting the notion that a father is necessary. Similarly, a father queered female gender role models by describing how he engaged in a menstruation talk with his teenage daughter rather than passing the task along to her grandmother. Although such situations were rare, Berkowitz and Ryan noted that “they are far from inconsequential. Through the naming and unpacking of these queer ruptures, scholars can better grasp the potential lesbian and gay families can hold for challenging the heteronormative gender order” (p. 347).

Another exemplar is Folgerø’s (2008) study of queer families, which highlights how parents can simultaneously reproduce hegemonic views about gender, sexuality, and kinship, while also challenging taken for granted stable categories. This study described several family constellations, including two fathers who challenged traditional notions of kinship ties and biologically related families. To avoid having a potentially threatening situation in which there was one biological father and one social father for their two children (a situation they feared would compromise their egalitarian relationship), the parents involved three other people to create their family: a biological mother living with a social mother, and a biological father known to the parents but not yet known to the child. In doing so, they “[made] the notions of genetic and social kinship less consistent and fixed” (p. 135). This family reframed the notion of

family not as one that was biologically and romantically determined by two people, but one that emerged out of intentional conversations and negotiations involving five adults.

Thus far, this section has mostly been about gay and lesbian parent families. Until recent years, the “B” and the “T” from LGBT were ignored or marginally mentioned in LGBT-parent families research (Downing, 2013; Ross & Dobinson, 2013). Bisexual-parent families provide a context to examine fluidity of sexual attraction, parenting processes that embrace some elements of or reject heteronormative standards, and secrecy as a means of resistance (Power et al., 2012; Ross & Dobinson, 2013). Power et al. (2012) observed how family structure impacts the family relationships of bisexual parents, noting that their experiences may be similar to those of lesbian or gay parents who are parenting in the context of a same-sex relationship, or similar to those of a single parent who does not identify as heterosexual. However, they note that these experiences become distinctly different from same-sex couples or lesbians and gay men in instances where bisexual-identifying adults are parenting in the context of a different-sex relationship.

Transgender families diverge from applying typical family theories to their processes because gender and sexuality are not necessarily “fixed data points” of analysis. Transgender parents challenge gender practices that deem certain parenting behaviors as inherently male or female; they may also evidence flexibility regarding a variety of both masculine and feminine gender role behaviors for their children (Ryan, 2009). Transgender families face unique challenges that differ significantly from lesbian, gay, and bisexual parents (Downing, 2013). These families interact with social institutions differently, often facing discrimination (Lev, 2010): transgender parents experience transphobia, medical pathologization, decreased access to appropriate health care services, and a lack of informal support from the general community as well as from some lesbian and gay communities. Some transgender families who are isolated from biological kin networks, much like some lesbian and gay-parent families, develop new

social support networks that function as “families of choice,” purposely constructing families in ways that do not rely on biological kin (Downing, 2013). How fictive kinship networks deliver forms of social support, to whom, and the timing of these supports, are only beginning to be explored in terms of how these families sustain family identity.

Another type of family rarely discussed, yet one that also challenges “taken-for granted interconnections between marriage, gender, and heterosexuality” (Wolkomir, 2009, p. 496) is mixed-orientation marriages: two-parent families in which one parent is heterosexual but the other parent is only attracted to people of the their own sex (i.e., they are not bisexual). These are couples who stay together despite their known and acknowledged different sexual orientations. Many of them have children, yet little research exists on these families.

Finally, queering also can be applied as a strategy to study many types of individuals and families, not just LGBT-parent families. For example, siblings who care for and raise one another may be considered a queer family, as it is more traditional for parents to care for children. Open adoption has been described as queer, as it calls into question the typical, taken-for-granted arrangement of adoptive families (MacDonald, 2014). Egalitarian heterosexual couples who break out of gendered roles are queering their families (Oswald et al., 2005) because they destabilize binary and heteronormative notions of gender in marriage.

Intersectionality theory and LGBT-parent families exemplars. Intersectionality is the systematic analysis of the ways in which multiple social identities (e.g., race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality) interact in different contexts over time. Greenwood (2008) offered four tenets of intersectionality to explain the politics of individual and interpersonal processes of identity. First, given that social identities are inextricably complex in nature, conflict among and between multiple identities is inevitable and likely in different contexts (Yuval-Davis, 2006). Second, social identities are grounded in ideological and symbolic domains, such as patriarchy,

heteronormativity, and gendered, racialized, or able-bodied representations (Crenshaw, 1993).

Third, social identities and their interrelated symbolic systems of representation are historically and contextually situated (Crenshaw). Lastly, these social identities are negotiated within self and among others, differentially affected by structures of power over time (Greenwood, 2008, p. 37). An intersectionality theoretical framework brings to our attention that heteronormativity “is more than the processes of patriarchy, heterosexism, and compulsory heterosexuality; it also contains elements of racial and class ‘othering’” (Battle & Ashley, 2008, p. 5).

Heteronormativity is maintained by social and institutional means through “oppressing and marginalizing certain bodies based on certain identity categories” (Battle & Ashley, p. 5).

Intersectionality provides a complex theoretical framework to study how LGBT-headed families engage the foray of the politics of location as racialized, gendered, and sexualized bodies that challenge heteronormative conformity. An intersectional approach disrupts mainstream queer discourses on LGBT family life that have been primarily informed by White middle class individuals and their families. A great example of intersectional feminist analysis is Moore’s (2010) qualitative study of families headed by Black lesbian women. Her study challenged normative thinking about the coming out process and sexual identity development by offering a complex Afrocentric picture of Black lesbian women’s lives as mothers, intimate partners, and friends. Moore described how Black lesbian women purposefully consider racial identity and racial group membership in their creation of a lesbian sexuality. Whereas some White lesbian women may form a lesbian identity that rejects participation with elder family members or church membership, many Black lesbian women actively shape their lesbian identities (and family identities co-created with their lesbian partners) to either preserve or recreate relationships that are important to racial group membership and belonging. There was variation in lesbian identity formation for the women in Moore’s study that was tempered by the

intersection of cultural values, a minority group's historical experience, an individual's sense of belonging to a specific culture, racial/ethnic group's experience, sexual minority group, and intrapsychic factors (e.g., personality, sexual scripts).

Moore's (2010, 2011) exploration of power in mothering and the division of household labor in Black lesbian-headed families complicates the normative picture of the egalitarian lesbian-headed households by adding the nuance of the influence of biological ties in chosen families. She observed that the biological or birth mother tended to have more decision-making power over children's care, activities, and social interactions than did her intimate partner. Moore's (2011) findings provided an exemplar for the examination of power dynamics between lesbian mothers, as most Black lesbian-headed families result from blended families with children who were conceived in heterosexual unions. Ultimately, Moore's studies have shed new light on couple and family relationships by examining how these women negotiated identity through the intersection of race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, class, and culture.

Intersectionality theory also is concerned with how the person interacts with the (re)production of privilege and marginalization created and enforced by social institutions, and conversations about how social forces influence identity processes and power dynamics interpersonally and macrosystemically are critical. For example, Allen's (2007) personal reflection on the dissolution of a same-gender relationship in the context of social inequity highlights the absence of legal protection in LGBT-parent families' divorces, compelling readers to consider the civil right to same-gender divorce, family policies in the aftermath of divorce for LGBT-parent families, and the use of personal narratives as a transformative pedagogical tool. We include this illustration as it compels us and our students to consider the civil rights to same-gender divorce as an example of structural inequality (i.e., denial of *full faith and credit* [see Article IV, Section 1 of the United States Constitution], health insurance, and difficulties in

obtaining a same-sex divorce). That is, this example compels us to consider how individuals and families negotiate conflicts, cooperation, and inequalities that are rooted in cultural discourses and practices and that are expressed in institutional structures (Ferree, 2010).

Contemplating the tensions. Scholars and instructors who truly engage queer theory and intersectionality must critically contemplate their many tensions. Merely adding these theories (or LGBT-parent families) to our work is not enough; instead, we must be willing to continually push our own understanding of these theories by contemplating how these theories both complement and diverge from each other.

Queer theory and intersectionality have different ontologies and are the intellectual products of distinct political movements. Queer theory evolved in the 1990s from two major influences: (a) feminist poststructuralist discourses induced by Judith Butler's problematizing of gender and sexuality and (b) the visible emergence of lesbian and gay politics and activism (Fotopoulou, 2012; Parent, DeBlaere, & Moradi, 2013). Intersectionality has roots in feminism, with its most complex interactions (i.e., interactions of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, geography) with institutions and social practices first articulated by minority racial/ethnic or multicultural feminists (Hochreiter, 2011). Queer theory questions the assumptions of identity politics (i.e., McCall's (2005) intracategorical approach or Ferree's (2010) locational intersectionality) in that it rejects the notion that sexuality is a stable social location. Herein lies the heart of the debate; some practitioners of intersectionality argue that certain stable "critical essences" are necessary to fully unmask the influence of complex interactions of covert and overt structural social inequalities and discourses for marginalized individuals and political collectivities. Queer theory, alternatively, has a goal of making visible the fluid nature of the social categories of sexualities and gender, deconstructing the underlying power struggle that creates gendered and sexualized hierarchies, and emphasizing the artificiality

of categorical boundaries (Fotopoulou, 2012). By elucidating the complexity and fluidity of social categories, queer theory allows researchers to examine “the gray areas” of how family identity, process, rituals, and communication are enacted and performed (Chevrette, 2013). Queer theory problematizes the stability and functionality of traditional labels and traditional ways of relating through a lens that also examines how different kinds of power exist in interpersonal relationships and social practices.

Queer theory and intersectionality afford family studies with the opportunity to use a forward thinking integrative theoretical framework. Queer theory is a theory of “radical deconstruction” and “radical subversion” (Green, 2007, pp. 28-29), providing researchers with permission to imagine the complexity of relationships through the analysis of diverse identities, family structures, performativities, and processes. An intersectionality lens stretches the tenets of queer theory to consider how other inextricable social identities such as race, ethnicity, class, age, and culture intersect with sexuality and gender (Battle & Ashley, 2008). Whereas queer theory may help explain the fluidity of identity and difference, intersectionality theory provides a framework for understanding the ways in which intersecting identities are conflictual/harmonious between and within groups, in addition to contextualizing (racialized) transgressive politics (Battle & Ashley; Few-Demo, 2014). Both theories embrace inclusivity while emphasizing the need for the analysis of within-group variance and power dynamics. These theories encourage the family science field to embrace both interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinary; meaning, there are multiple ways of building family science knowledge about LGBT-parent families’ experiences and multiple pathways for collaboration to extend the field. Halberstam (2003) argued that “a consciously cultivated multidisciplinary offers a much needed detour around [disciplinarity] debates and encourages. . . scholars to use the methodologies that best match their projects rather than finding projects that allow them to use

the discipline-appropriate methods” (p. 263). Queer theory and intersectionality complement and embolden a more inclusive analysis of family processes, behaviors, and outcomes.

If we consider utilizing queer theory and intersectionality theory with more commonly used family theories, symbolic interactionism and social constructionism seem like natural complements (Few-Demo, 2014). Because queer and intersectionality theories both allow fluidity and variance in operationalization and process, family theory instructors who use a symbolic interactionist or phenomenological approach might find an integration with queer and intersectional lens to be successful in providing a more holistic picture of a phenomenon because these instructors “would [likely] be less concerned with identifying axiomatic propositions” due to their acknowledgement of the “emergent, dynamic nature of families and their susceptibility to historical change” (Daly, 1990, p. 88). Daly’s comments about the pervasiveness of positivistic thinking still ring true, as noted by multiple authors in the 2005 *Sourcebook of Family Theory & Research* (Allen, 2005; Bengtson, Allen, et al., 2005; Oswald et al., 2005).

Elements of Self-Reflexive Transformational Pedagogy

Integrating queer and intersectional frameworks in family theories curricula requires deep and engaged self-reflexivity. Self-reflexivity is inherently a feminist practice that brings to light personal biases, contingencies in context, and theoretical grounding that inform one’s worldview (Allen, 2000), and it is a process undergirding our model for transformational pedagogy. In the remainder of this section, we present our definition of transformative pedagogy, a process we have envisioned as having five elements of moving into and within critical engagement.

In the first element, **one acknowledges the prevalence of heteronormativity and cisnormativity in traditional means of teaching family theories (e.g., structure of textbooks, marginalization of feminist and queer theories)**. The edited 2005 *Sourcebook* was the first collection of articles on family theory that included an article about queer theory (Oswald et al.’s

article on “Decentering Heteronormativity”). Heteronormativity was mentioned in this article; however, cisnormativity was a queer concept that was not labelled as such but was somewhat described in the discussion of gender. *Cisnormativity* is the assumption that all individuals are cissexual and gender-invariant throughout the life span (Bauer et al., 2009). For example, a person who is born with male genitalia, assigned to be “male,” and who grows up identifying as a man and feeling “male” is cisgender. What is noteworthy about Oswald et al.’s seminal work is that family theory books published after 2005 make no reference to it, or to queer theory. Intersectionality was described in the *Sourcebook* in De Reus, Few, and Blume’s (2005) article on multicultural and critical race feminisms; it was finally introduced as a key concept of feminist theory (emerging out of third-wave feminism) in the fourth edition of White et al.’s (2015) text. However, no current introductory textbooks have chapters on queer theory or intersectionality; this marginalization of these theoretical frameworks certainly reflects the fact that “theorizing is inherently political” (Bengtson, Allen, et al., 2005, p. 613).

For Element two, **one commits to a conscious, self-reflexive engagement of queer and intersectional theories that also involves students engaging a similar process.** This element reflects an instructor’s resistance to the persistent multigenerational pedagogical focus on traditional family structures, processes, and change, which has led to indoctrination of theories that purport and support a normative bar of White heteronormativity and cisnormativity as an acceptable, normal way of “being” and “doing.” One wrestles with the implications that a queer and intersectional lens can bring to a philosophy of science in HDFS. In this element, an instructor begins to design exercises that provoke students to ponder the politics of social location (De Reus et al., 2005), matrices of oppression and privilege, and the conceptualization of difference as different, not as a deviant or aberrant means of “being” and “doing” family.

To advance both a queer and intersectionality framework that is inclusive, instructors

need to be creative in fostering opportunities that encourage students to consider how individuals and groups, who are situated by multiple social locations that may overlap and/or conflict in specific contexts, negotiate systems of privilege, oppression, opportunity, conflict, and change across the life course and geography (Choo & Ferree, 2010; Ferree, 2010; Hancock, 2007; Lloyd, Few, & Allen, 2009). Instructors could begin this discussion with the recognition that an intersectional analysis first requires understanding identity as a simultaneous, ongoing developmental and social process. Once students learn to situate themselves and others in social context, an instructor can guide a class discussion about how individuals and groups as social entities interact with the constraints and privileges that social institutions sanction in both historical and contemporary contexts. This constant questioning of commonly used theories and social structures should be normalized so that LGBT-related issues are not relegated to a focus that is only explored during a singular week or module (Kuvallanka et al., 2013).

Teaching from this critical perspective provides students with opportunities to engage in self-reflexive and communal ways of learning new knowledge about difference, power, and privilege in families. Moreover, scholars benefit from this different focus. As Berkowitz (2009) concluded in her paper about lesbian and gay parenting theorizing:

We as scholars still have much to learn from diverse family constellations. We researchers [family scholars] should keep in mind the implications our treatment of lesbian and gay parenting has on the broader scholarship of gender, sexuality, and families. . . . After all, just as Judith Stacey (1996) argued, all our families are queer; lesbian and gay families simply show us this with added intensity. (p. 129)

For Element three, instructors work to truly incorporate these theories throughout the curriculum, **as they engage transformational pedagogy**. The focus here can be a curricular design phase that incorporates the instructor's evolving level of comfort with teaching/infusing

an intersectional-queer lens; constant self-reflexivity; and commitment to making students accountable for achieving transformational learning objectives, that is, becoming critical thinkers capable of examining self-biases. Using the Allen, Floyd-Thomas, and Gillman (2001) model as a model of transformational pedagogy, we list five objectives here for student learning: (a) approach the study of families critically and experientially through shifting interdisciplinary perspectives; (b) scrutinize how the private institution of the family acts as a microcosm of public institutions historically, politically, socially, spiritually, and economically; (c) deal with multicultural voices in their own contexts and integrity without imposing an overarching one-dimensional framework; (d) discover the areas in which dialogue can happen between these diverse groups as we simultaneously respect the points at which each perspective differs; and (e) examine the identity politics configuring one's own family dynamics, taking into account social stratification such as race, class, gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

Thinking more specifically about transformative pedagogy, two other steps are relevant. First, instructors can practice self-reflexivity as they prepare their syllabi (Allen, 2000; Freire, 1997), while also anticipating student resistance (hooks, 1994). To this latter point, McIntosh (1995) noted the unwillingness of those with invisible privileges to deconstruct the nature of their unearned advantages and reconstruct power systems on a much larger basis. Further, Collins' (1996) social analysis process is relevant: a process through which those willing to engage in the human transformation of systems of oppression learn how these systems function. It requires an analysis of ways in which "systems of domination are erected, legitimized, reinforced, and transformed over time" (Collins, p. 263). Instructors can charge students to be accountable with achieving the learning objectives of the course, which should include engaging a critical stance toward the theorization of families.

Second, instructors can prime the class toward having a critical social justice frame that is

inclusive of different ways of thinking about families and theorization. We suggest that instructors set up the course as one that will sequentially build on identifying and deconstructing privilege in both theory and lived experience. Thus, the instructor overtly names that a learning objective or student competency in the theories course will be the mastery of intersectional, queer, critical thinking skills. Instructors may begin with a Social Strata Inventory exercise recommended by Allen et al. (2001) to help students situate themselves within the metaphorical intersectionality matrix (De Reus et al., 2005) to deconstruct privilege and oppression. The inventory could direct a conversation about how queer theory and intersectionality problematize more commonly used family theories, as well as explore how theories about families resonate with us, why we gravitate to certain theories as opposed to others, and how a queer and intersectional lens grants us a far more inclusive picture of families (Allen et al.).

An instructor could also pair the Social Strata Inventory with Mezey's (2008) research, which used multiracial feminism to demonstrate how race and class influence both Black and Latina lesbians' decisions to become mothers, as an activity to deepen one's exploration of intersectionality. Mezey (2008) described how Black families have "overcompensated" for the racism and racialized sexuality they have historically faced by developing more "puritan beliefs that encourage homophobia" (p. 259). This, in turn, makes it difficult for Black lesbians to come out to their families, which are an important future source of support within the context of being mothers, in contrast to White lesbians, whose racial privilege can make the decision to become parents easier. Thus, the risk of losing not only support from their families of origin but also the buffering protection received from their communities (including their churches) from the hardships of ongoing societal racism, and ultimately the potential loss of their ethnic identities, is something that strongly factors into Black lesbians' decision to become mothers.

However, instructors could push their students' understanding of the intersection of race,

culture, and historical context further by emphasizing an intersectional lens to explore the within-group variance experienced by Black lesbian families. For instance, many Black lesbian women become mothers while in prior heterosexual unions, so that their family structures often reflect the challenges and strengths of blended or step-families (Moore, 2012). In addition, Glass and Few-Demo's (2013) research on Black lesbian families indicated that informal support from families of origin was complexly nuanced and sustained whether or not a lesbian partner was present. This sustained social support was tied either to the families of origin's sense of social obligation to care for children present in the family or their recognition that the lesbian partner was a caring partner to their family member.

Instructors also could assign scholarly articles and activities that help students to explore privilege and interactions with social forces (e.g., institutional constraints as a result of interactions with criminal justice system and legislative policies that target, exclude, exploit, and/or disenfranchise racial-ethnic, gender, and sexual minorities). Scholarly resources include McIntosh's (1989) discussion and activity on white privilege and McGeorge and Carlson's (2011) three-step model to help mental health professionals examine heteronormative assumptions, institutional heterosexism, and heterosexual privilege. In two papers published in the *Journal of Marriage and Family's* 2010 Decade in Review issue, scholars focused exclusively (Biblarz & Savçi, 2010) or in part (Cherlin, 2010) on individuals in LGBT families. Goldberg and Allen's (2013b) edited handbook about LGBT-parent families is another important resource. Such resources should be assigned at the beginning of the course and also interweaved throughout the course as a means to critique typical theories and classroom conversations that gravitate toward privileging heteronormativity.

Element four is **the willingness to face trials by fire, meaning one bolsters the courage to face student resistance**, if and when it occurs. Instructors may face potential student

resistance to any “ideological” or “epistemological” change to that which has engendered programmatic success and community acceptance. Instructors may experience particularly high student resistance as students attempt to confront the analysis of structural disadvantage (Schuster & Van Dyne, 1985). Student resistance may also be related to the instructor’s standpoint—that is, whether or not the educator has insider or outsider knowledge of the topic being discussed. On one hand, those of us who are heterosexual or cisgender have the privilege of not having to fear or think about coming out to our classes, but we may also, at times, contemplate whether we can truly speak about issues without having the authenticity upon which to speak to the topic. Thus, we need to think carefully about we present such material. On the other hand, those who have insider status may have the authenticity, but have other concerns such as stereotyping (lack of intersectional understanding) by students (e.g., if you are African American, assumptions are made about your religious affiliation). Moreover, although coming out as a sexual minority to students has many pedagogical benefits, it can have unintended negative results—Russ, Simonds, and Hunt (2002), for example, found that students perceived gay instructors to be less credible than heterosexual instructors.

We do want to acknowledge the complexity of student resistance. Three points are important here. First, when asked about the impact of more gay and lesbian parents raising children today, the percentage of overall individuals stating that this was a “bad thing for society” decreased from 50% to 35% in four years, with similar rates of decreases for individuals aged 18 to 29 in the same four years (47% to 28%; Pew Research Center, 2011). Second, there is research that indicates that students now appear to be more accepting of LGBT individuals compared to findings of prior research on acceptance (Banauch, Burgess, & Muse, 2010). For instance, contemporary female students are more supportive of sexual minorities (e.g., Jenkins, Lambert, & Baker, 2009). However, mixed results in studies of this nature and this variation of

acceptance may be due to interacting, complex relationships among race, religiosity, sex, political ideology, gender attitudes, and geographical location (Banauch et al., 2010; Pew Research Center, 2011; Woodford, Silverschanz, Swank, Scherrer, & Raiz, 2012). Thus, student resistance to teaching and discussion of LGBT-parent families may be less pronounced now than in previous years. Third, our collective experience is that one of the best ways to negotiate student resistance, if present, is to cultivate buy-in with activities that guide students to identify why certain assumptions and tenets do not fit contemporary family structure and process, because of fluid or dynamic changes in environmental and developmental contexts. In exercises that are partially constructed by students, ground rules could be created with an understanding that differences will emerge and biases (e.g., racism, homophobia, classism, sexism) will be revealed and unpacked. In these ways, students with varying levels of resistance understand the exercise, the ground rules, and the expectation that not everyone in the classroom will respond in the same ways to the information presented by the instructor.

A classroom example of group work involving queer theory involves having students come up with their own examples for situations in which the family binary is the one that is assumed or stressed (heteronormative perspective), as well as how they could adapt that situation to emphasize the need for a complex family (queer theory) using assigned empirical articles or lectures about queer theory. Another example to illustrate queer theory in the classroom for students may involve instructing them to act in ways that violate gender norms (Kupalanka et al., 2013; Nielsen, Walden, & Kunkel, 2000), such as women smoking cigars or men wearing nail polish or holding parties to sell household items such as food containers (Nielsen et al.). Nielsen et al.'s exercise was both a research project and an opportunity for students to learn about gender, power, and privilege, and they showed that when individuals act in ways that violate gender norms, men were typically homosexualized and women heterosexualized. As part of

group work, instructors could ask students to think critically about ways in which individuals and families act that violate gender norms and how they might lack power or lose privilege when compared to individuals and families who behave in ways that adhere to a cisnormative gender binary. Students could analyze a case study about LGBT-parent families using a commonly used family theory such as family systems as well as queer theory to elucidate the differences and similarities that may emerge about LGBT-parent families.

Students can also be invited to think about how to apply an intersectional lens to LGBT-parent families. For example, events such as British Columbia's 2013 decision to allow more than two parents on a birth certificate (see Rolfsen, 2013) or empirical articles can be used as a backdrop for students to create or evaluate case studies that demonstrate an understanding of how intersectionality operates among LGBT-parent families. Berkowitz and Ryan's (2011) work can be used to illustrate how lesbian and gay parents feel accountable for constructing gender appropriately with their children, and also show that such constructions intersect with the child's race and/or ethnicity. About one gay couple, they stated: "Gender expectations are race-specific; Simon and Theo are not just raising a boy, they are raising a Black boy, who will be subject to racist assumptions about Black masculinity" (p. 340). An intersectional approach adds complexity to how we teach about the sexuality and sexual identity of diverse individuals and families by incorporating multiple social identities and how these social identities interact with institutions. In enacting these kinds of analyses, instructors can encourage students to expand beyond what they think they understand about queer theory and intersectionality to be even more inclusive when it comes to understanding families. Framing these activities in a group context can push students to challenge one another's biases as well as provide *teachable moments* for peer tutoring. In this way, the responsibility for confronting prejudices or ignorance is a shared responsibility instead of the instructor's responsibility alone. Other discussion points to cultivate

debate among students that directly addresses intersectionality is content concerning mixed-race identities and allegiances, cultural appropriation, internalized and overt biases, and discrimination (see <http://www.autostraddle.com/its-time-for-white-feminists-to-stop-talking-about-solidarity-and-start-acting-240166/>).

The fifth and final element consists of **making a commitment to begin a discourse on curricular change in our home departments**. This commitment involves developing a strategy to engage colleagues in discussions about creating learning environments that are inclusive, intersectional, and queer throughout courses in undergraduate and graduate programs. Our goal is not to suggest a complete overhaul of any one family studies program, but instead to have readers consider ways in which queer and intersectionality theories can be incorporated in such ways as to truly reflect inclusive family science that make sense in one's home department. Supports outside of the home department, such as at the college level, can also influence strategies for curricula change in our teaching and scholarship. Two of us (Authors 1 and 3), for example, are in colleges in which faculty are honored yearly for exemplary work in promoting diversity and an inclusive environment within the classroom, college, and campus.

Conclusion

Our goal has been to describe how the teaching of family theories can be stretched and challenged when we use queer and intersectional perspectives, and are truly inclusive of LGBT-parent families. We have presented a model of family theory curricular change that includes queer as both an adjective (queer families) and as a verb (queering), and we have presented ideas for transforming our pedagogy. Such paradigmatic change cannot be limited to courses on family theory; we hope that these shifts occur throughout HDFS curricula, from introduction to methods to statistics. This requires us to address a myriad of both theoretical and methodological questions and logistics raised by queer and intersectional theories. The power of these

perspectives to incorporate fluidity, hybridity, and multiplicity presents clear challenges to how we conceptualize and enact our work as scholars and teachers.

If we have met this goal, we believe that we have also demonstrated how these theories have transformed us as family studies scholars and “gatekeepers” as teachers of family theories. Notably, we have all “entered” this process model of family theory curricular change at different points and have moved back and forth through the model. We continue to engage in critical self-reflexivity as teachers and proponents of these more recent theoretical frameworks of which we humbly admit we are still eager students. We view ourselves as “works in progress” who are engaged in a journey of constant exploration and reflection.

Queer and intersectionality theories open up seemingly boundless opportunities to revise, modify, and expand current knowledge on family functioning. Queer theory facilitates the “transgressive power of resisting” and the questioning of taken-for-granted social categories (Downing, 2013, p. 106). Intersectionality provides a framework to explore the intricacies of power dynamics within discriminatory discourses and interactions, whereas queer theory provides a lens to analyze those individual and family processes that transcend normative notions of gender and sexuality identity and development and incite discriminatory practices (Battle & Ashley, 2008; Halberstam, 2005). Both theories allow family researchers to imagine the multiplicative interactions of social positionalities and identities. Such imaginings, we hope, will indeed lead to the proposed fifth phase of “paradigm shift,” which might even include a further queering of our phase model itself.

Earlier, we posed the question of what might occur when we use research on LGBT-parent families, and queer and intersectional lenses, to inform the field writ large. A myriad of fascinating questions arise. What happens when we decenter heterosexual expression, and the overwhelming emphasis in family studies on different sex partners? Could we envision a family

theories course taught at phase 4 that would only include content on LGBT families, a course that would essentially be the opposite of phase 1—what kind of impact would that have? Such a suggestion seems counter intuitive given our argument for inclusion, however it raises intriguing questions. As noted earlier, queer theory involves destabilizing and disrupting what is typically taken for granted, and so we consider this idea “food for thought” even though it might not actually be acted upon. How might we theorize about issues such as romantic communication, parenting, love, relational power, attachment, and spending time together in new ways, if we stopped assuming that heterosexuality, or gender constructions, or Whiteness were at the center of it all? How does an emphasis on the complexity of identities and positionalities fundamentally shift our theorizing?

What this paradigm shift will look like is very difficult to predict. Certainly, it would involve fluidity, expansion, and uncertainty. We must be prepared for the ambiguities that are inherent here, and weave them into both our teaching and theorizing, and increase our comfort with saying to our students “I don’t know – let’s talk about the possibilities.” And we must be prepared for the sense of loss that Schuster and Van Dyne (1985) so eloquently described: “a reluctance to give up what had seemed most stable, efficient, authoritative, transcendent of contexts, and free of ideological or personal values—in short, a fear that feminist critique means a loss of subject matter and methodology with no compensating gain” (p. 25).

We hope we can use these theories to push us to ask different questions about families. Such questions will be important for us as scholars and teachers to address both in our empirical research and in our classrooms. Further, we invite our colleagues to continue this dialogue as well. With such a paradigm shift, we will find new understandings about the wide diversity of families today and in the future.

References

- Allen, K. R. (1995). Opening the classroom closet: Sexual orientation and self-disclosure. *Family Relations, 44*, 136-141.
- Allen, K. A. (2000). A conscious and inclusive family studies. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*, 4-17.
- Allen, K. A. (2005). Pushing the boundaries of the *Sourcebook*. In V. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 628-629). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Allen, K. A. (2007). Ambiguous loss after lesbian couples with children break up: A case for same-gender divorce. *Family Relations, 56*, 175-183.
- Allen, K. R., Floyd-Thomas, S. M., & Gillman, L. (2001). Teaching to transform: From volatility to solidarity in an interdisciplinary family studies classroom. *Family Relations, 50*, 317-325.
- Battle, J., & Ashley, C. (2008). Intersectionality, heteronormativity and black lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) families. *Black Women, Gender, and Families, 2*, 1-24.
- Bauer, G. R., Hammond, R., Travers, R., Kaay, M., Hohenadel, K. M., & Boyce, M. (2009). "I don't think this is theoretical; this is our lives": How erasure impacts health care for transgender people. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care, 20*, 348-361.
- Baunach, D. M., Burgess, E. O., & Muse, C. S. (2010). Southern (dis)comfort: Sexual prejudice and contact with gay men and lesbians in the South. *Sociological Spectrum, 30*, 30-64.
- Bengtson, V. L., Acock, A. C., Allen, K. A., Dilworth-Anderson, P., & Klein, D. M. (2005). Theory and theorizing in family research: Puzzle building and puzzle solving. In V. L. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.),

- Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 3-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bengtson, V. L., & Allen, K. R. (1993). The life course perspective applied to families over time. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 469-499). New York: Plenum Press.
- Bengtson, V. L., Allen, K. A., Klein, D. M., Dilworth-Anderson, P. & Acock, A. C. (2005). Controversies and firestorms: An epilogue. In V. L. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 613-630). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Berkowitz, D. (2009). Theorizing lesbian and gay parenting: Past, present, and future scholarship. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 1, 117-132.
- Berkowitz, D. (2013). Gay men and surrogacy. In A. E. Goldberg & K. A. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 71-86). New York: Springer.
- Berkowitz, D., & Marsiglio, W. (2007). Gay men: Negotiating procreative, father, and family identities. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 366-381.
- Berkowitz, D., & Ryan, M. (2011). Bathrooms, baseball, and bra shopping: Lesbians and gay parents talk about engendering their children. *Sociological Perspectives*, 54, 329-350.
- Biblarz, T. J., & Savçi, E. (2010). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 480-497.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chabot, J. M., & Ames, B. D. (2004). "It wasn't like 'let's get pregnant and go do it' ": Decision making in lesbian couples planning motherhood via donor insemination. *Family*

Relations, 53, 348-356.

Cherlin, A. (2010). Demographic trends in the United States: A review of research in the 2000s.

Journal of Marriage and Family, 72, 403-419.

Chevrette, R. (2013). Outing heteronormativity in interpersonal and family communication:

Feminist applications of queer theory “beyond the sexy streets.” *Communication Theory*, 23, 170-190.

Chibucos, T. R., Leite, R. W., & Weis, D. L. (2005). *Readings in family theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Choo, H. Y., & Ferree, M. M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: A critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities.

Sociological Theory, 28, 129-149.

Collins, P. H. (1996). What’s in a name: Womanism, Black feminism, and beyond. *Black Scholar*, 26(1), 9-17.

Crenshaw, K. (1993). Demarginalizing the interaction of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and anti-racist politics. In D. Weisberg (Ed.), *Feminist legal theory: Foundations* (pp. 383-411). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Daly, K. J. (1990). Issues in teaching family theory at the undergraduate level. *Family Science Review*, 3(2-3), 87-96.

De Reus, L., Few, A. L., & Blume, L. B. (2005). Multicultural and critical race feminisms:

Theorizing families in the third wave. In V. L. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 447-468). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dilworth-Anderson, P., Burton, L. M., & Klein, D. M. (2005). Contemporary and emerging

- theories in studying families. In V. L. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 35-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Doherty, W. J., Boss, P. G., LaRossa, R., Schumm, W. R., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1993). Family theories and methods: A contextual approach. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 3-30). New York: Plenum Press.
- Downing, J. B. (2013). Transgender-parent families. In A. E. Goldberg & K. A. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 105-116). New York: Springer.
- Ferree, M. M. (2010). Filling the glass: Gender perspectives on families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 72, 420-439.
- Few-Demo, A. L. (2014). Intersectionality as the “new” critical approach in feminist family studies: Evolving racial/ethnic feminisms and critical race theories. *Journal of Family Theory and Review*, 6, 169-183.
- Folgerø, T. (2008). Queer nuclear families: Reproducing and transgressing heteronormativity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 54, 124-149.
- Fotopoulou, A. (2012). Intersectionality queer studies and hybridity: Methodological frameworks for social research. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 13(2), 19-32.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. B. Ramos, Trans., New rev. ed.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1970).
- Gates, G. (2013). *LGBT parenting in the United States*. The Williams Institute. Retrieved March 3, 2015, from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/LGBT-Parenting.pdf>

- Glass, V. Q., & Few-Demo, A. L. (2013). Complexities of informal social support arrangements for Black lesbian couples. *Family Relations*, 62, 714-726.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2007a). (How) does it make a difference? Perspectives of adults with lesbian, gay, and bisexual parents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77, 550-562.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2007b). Talking about family: Disclosure practices of adults raised by lesbian, gay, and bisexual parents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 100-131.
- Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. R. (2007). Imagining men: Lesbian mothers' perceptions of male involvement during the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 352-365.
- Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. R. (2013a). Donor, dad, or...? Young adults with lesbian parents' experiences with known donors. *Family Process*, 52, 338-350.
- Goldberg, A. E., & Allen, K. A. (Eds.). (2013b). *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice*. New York: Springer.
- Green, A. I. (2007). Queer theory and sociology: Locating the subject and the self in sexuality studies. *Sociological Theory*, 25, 26-45.
- Greenwood, R. M. (2008). Intersectional political consciousness: Appreciation for intragroup differences and solidarity in diverse groups. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 36-47.
- Halberstam, J. (2003). Reflections on queer studies and queer pedagogy. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 45(2), 361-364.
- Halberstam, J. (2005). *Queer archives in a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hancock, A. M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5, 63-79.
- Hines, S. (2006). Intimate transitions: Transgender practices of partnering and parenting.

- Sociology*, 40, 353-371.
- Hochreiter, S. (2011). Race, class, gender? Intersectionality troubles. *Journal of Research in Gender Studies*, 1(2), 49-56.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, M., Lambert, E. G., & Baker, D. N. (2009). The attitudes of Black and White college students toward gays and lesbians. *Journal of Black Studies*, 39, 589-613.
- Kelly, F. (2004). Nuclear norms or fluid families? Incorporating lesbian and gay parents and their children into Canadian family law. *Canadian Journal of Family Law*, 21, 133-178.
- King, E. B., Huffman, A. H., & Peddlie, C. I. (2013). LGBT parents and the workplace. In A. E. Goldberg & K. A. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 225-240). New York: Springer.
- Kuvalanka, K. A., Goldberg, A. E., & Oswald, R. F. (2013). Incorporating LGBTQ issues into family courses: Instructor challenges and strategies relative to perceived teaching climate. *Family Relations*, 62, 699-713.
- Lester, T. (2008). "Talking about sexual orientation, teaching about homophobia" – Negotiating the divide between religious belief and tolerance for LGBT rights in the classroom. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*, 15, 399-417.
- Lev, A. I. (2010). How queer! The development of gender identity and sexual orientation in LGBTQ-headed families. *Family Process*, 49, 268-290.
- Lev, A. I., & Sennott, S. L. (2013). Clinical work with LGBTQ parents and prospective parents. In A. E. Goldberg & K. A. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 241-260). New York: Springer.
- Lloyd, S. A., Few, A. L., & Allen, K. R. (Eds.). *Handbook of feminist family studies*. Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

- MacDonald, A. (2014, June 20). *Love, anger and pride: How Ann-Marie MacDonald learned to let go of the past*. Retrieved July 7, 2014, from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/relationships/how-ann-marie-macdonald-learned-to-let-go-of-the-past/article19273142/#dashboard/follows/>
- Manning, W. D., Fetro, M. N., & Lamidi, E. (2014). Child well-being in same-sex parent families: Review of research prepared for American Sociological Association Amicus Brief. *Population Research and Policy Review, 33*, 485-502.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs, 30*, 1771-1800.
- McGeorge, C., & Carlson, T. S. (2011). Deconstructing heterosexism: Becoming an LGB affirmative heterosexual couple and family therapist. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 37*, 14-26.
- McIntosh, P. (1989, July/August). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom, 10-12*.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 674-697.
- Mezey, N. J. (2008). The privilege of coming out: Race, class, and lesbians' mothering decisions. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 34*, 257-276.
- Mezey, N. J. (2013). How lesbians and gay men decide to become parents or remain childfree. In A. E. Goldberg & K. A. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 59-70). New York: Springer.
- Moore, M. R. (2010). Gendered power relations among women: A study of household decision

- making in Black, lesbian stepfamilies. *American Sociological Review*, 73, 335-356.
- Moore, M. R. (2011). *Invisible families: Gay identities, relationships, and motherhood among Black women*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Moore, M. R. (2012). Intersectionality and the study of Black, sexual minority women. *Gender & Society*, 26, 33-39.
- Moore, M., & Brainer, A. (2013). Race and ethnicity in the lives of sexual minority parents and their children. In A. Goldberg & K. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 133-148). New York: Springer.
- Murry, V. M., Rosenblatt, P. C., & Weiling, E. (2006). College professors' conversations about teaching family theories. In V. L. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 569-591). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nielsen, J. M., Walden, G., & Kunkel, C. A. (2000). Gendered heteronormativity: Empirical illustrations in everyday life. *Sociological Quarterly*, 41, 283-296.
- Oswald, R. F. (2000). A member of the wedding? Heterosexism and family ritual. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17, 349-368.
- Oswald, R., Blume, L. & Marks, S. (2005). Decentering heteronormativity: A model for family studies. In V. L. Bengtson, A. C. Acock, K. R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, & D. M. Klein (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theory & research* (pp. 143-165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oswald, R. F., Kuvalanka, K. A., Blume, L. B., & Berkowitz, D. (2009). Queering "the family." In S. Lloyd, A. Few, & K. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of feminist family studies* (pp. 43-55). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parent, M. C., DeBlaere, C., & Moradi, B. (2013). Approaches to research on intersectionality:

- Perspectives on gender, LGBT, and racial/ethnic identities. *Sex Roles*, 68, 639-645.
- Perrin, E. C., Siegel, B. S., & The Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health. (2013). Promoting the well-being of children whose parents are gay or lesbian. *Pediatrics*, 131, e1374-e1383.
- Pew Research Center. (2011, May 13). *Most say homosexuality should be accepted by society*. Retrieved March 3, 2015, from <http://www.pewresearch.org/2011/05/13/most-say-homosexuality-should-be-accepted-by-society/>
- Power, J. J., Perlesz, A., Brown, R., Schofield, M. J., Pitts, M. K., McNair, R., & Bickerdike, A. (2012). Bisexual parents and family diversity: Findings from the work, love, play study. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 12, 519-538.
- Rolfesen, C. (2014, February 6). *Della Wolf is B.C.'s 1st child with 3 parents on birth certificate*. Retrieved February 11, 2014, from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/della-wolf-is-b-c-s-1st-child-with-3-parents-on-birth-certificate-1.2526584>
- Ross, L. E., & Dobinson, C. (2013). Where is the “B” in LGBT parenting? A call for research on bisexual parenting. In A. E. Goldberg & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parented families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 87-103). New York: Springer.
- Russ, T., Simonds, C., & Hunt, S. (2002). Coming out in the classroom... an occupational hazard?: The influence of sexual orientation on teacher credibility and perceived student learning. *Communication Education*, 51, 311-324.
- Ryan, C. (2009). *Helping families support their lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) children*. Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development.
- Schuster, M. R., & Van Dyne, S. R. (1985). Stages of curriculum transformation. In M. R. Schuster & S. R. van Dyne (Eds.), *Women's place in the academy: Transforming the*

- liberal arts curriculum* (pp. 13-29). Totowa, NJ: Rowan & Allanheld.
- Schwartz, L. B. (2012). Mixed-orientation marriages: Coming out, staying together. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 8, 121-136.
- Smith, S. R., & Hamon, R. R. (2012). *Exploring family theories* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stacey, J. (1996). *In the name of the family: Rethinking family values in the postmodern age*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stacey, J. (2013). Foreword: LBGT-parent families: From abnormal to nearly normative, and ultimately irrelevant. In A. E. Goldberg & K. A. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. v-viii). New York: Springer.
- Telingator, C. (2013). Clinical work with children and adolescents growing up with lesbian, gay, and bisexual parents. In A. E. Goldberg & K. A. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-parent families: Innovations in research and implications for practice* (pp. 261-274). New York: Springer.
- Tetreault, M. K. T. (1985). Feminist phase theory: An experience-derived evaluation model. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 56, 363-384.
- Thompson, L., & Walker, A. J. (1995). The place of feminism in family studies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 847-865.
- Whitchurch, G. G., & Constantine, L. L. (1993). Systems theory. In P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), *Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach* (pp. 325-352). New York: Plenum Press.
- White, J. M., Klein, D. M., & Martin, T. F. (2015). *Family theories: An introduction* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- White, T., & Ettner, R. (2004). Disclosure, risks and protective factors for children whose

parents are undergoing a gender transition. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 8, 129-145.

Wolkomir, M. (2009). Making heteronormative reconciliations: The story of romantic love, sexuality, and gender in mixed-orientation marriages. *Gender & Society*, 23, 494-519.

Woodford, M. R., Siverschanz, P., Swank, E., Scherrer, K. S., & Raiz, L. (2012). Predictors of heterosexual college students' attitudes toward LGBT people. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 9, 297-320.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and feminist politics. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13, 193-209.

Table 1.

Phases of LGBT-Parent Families Integration into Family Theory Curriculum

Phase	Description of Integration
<i>Phase 1:</i> LGBT Parent-Family Exclusion	Heteronormative families’ experiences are presented as universal. The instructor discusses only typical family theories, and uses only heteronormative families as examples. No questions are raised about LGBT-parent families at this point, as they are absent in the curriculum.
<i>Phase 2:</i> Compensatory Addition of LGBT-Parent Families	A recognition that LGBT-parent families have been absent from the discourse. The instructor begins to regularly incorporate examples of them into the curriculum. Typical family theories are still used, but some LGBT-parent family research is included as examples of these theories.
<i>Phase 3:</i> LGBT-Parent Families as Disadvantaged	The universality of typical theories to study all families begins to be questioned. The instructor increasingly incorporates LGBT-parent families into the curriculum, and includes macro theories such as feminist theory and minority stress theory to study LGBT-parent families and understand their disadvantage as a group.
<i>Phase 4:</i> Queer and Intersectionality Scholarship	Full incorporation of LGBT-parent families. The instructor continues to use macro theories such as feminist theory, and now includes queer theory and intersectionality theory. The complexity of LGBT-parent families is examined, with the L, G, B, and T separated out from each other; heteronormativity is unpacked and examined. Experiences are explored within a variety of contexts based on factors such as race/ethnicity, class, and geographical location. Content moves beyond a focus on LGBT-parent families’ vulnerability. Transformational pedagogy is used, which involves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of cisnormativity and heteronormativity in traditional teaching of theory • Commitment to self-reflexive engagement • Engagement in transformational pedagogy • Willingness to face trials by fire, or bolstering the courage to face student resistance, if present • Commitment to working toward curricular change beyond theory courses
<i>Phase 5:</i> Continuing Paradigm Shift	Queer theory and intersectionality are used to increasingly broaden, contextualize, and “complicate” the study of families. The instructor uses queer theory and intersectionality to ask different questions about <i>all</i> families, and it becomes more clear what scholars can gain in understanding about all families in doing so, not just LGBT-parent families. This phase is in motion. Fluidity, expansion, and possible uncertainty are present.