ON POST-STRUCTURALİST THERAPY AND DE-LİMİTİNG GENDER FROM BİNARY
(Dr. Filiz ÇELİK)

Abstract:

Gender non-binary, gender variant or gender plural are the terms used to accommodate the population that associate their gender identity outside the male and female binaries of gender dichotomy. Current psychotherapy practices are evolving to accommodate non-traditional, non-determinist and non-oppressive new terminologies to work with a gender pluralistic worldview. The ontological and epistemological shift from positivist approach to therapeutic issues to post-structuralist shift brought language afore as the site of power and meaning. Family and systemic psychotherapy is a particular cohort in the world of psychotherapy that operates with a social constructivist, deconstructive and post-structuralist epistemology. Distanced from pre-determined notions of pathology and well-being family and systemic psychotherapists work with power and knowledge using the language as site that power and knowledge is both used and produced to introduce systemic changes. A cisgender therapist adopting a post-structuralist position can access local realities of the individuals and families yet remain too focused on gender variance/pluralism and may lose their holistic approach. It is recommended that a post-structuralist therapist working with gender issues adopts an integrative approach as sees gender issues not central but integral to systems to create systemic changes.

Keywords: psychotherapy, post-structuralism, gender non-binary, gender-variant, gender plural, minority stress, family and systemic psychotherapy, reflexivity, epistemology and ontology.

1. Introduction

A post-structuralist epistemology is an extensively executed way of viewing the world around us (Berman, 1988) and it is a highly significant concept in the formation of an approach for a therapist in family and systemic psychotherapy (de Shazer and Berg, 1992; Friedman 1993). A non-binary view of gender is congruent with the postulation of the post-structuralist perspective where a multitude of realities are viewed as constructed and of equal validity. In writing about the complexity of gender issue and the associated limitations to gender identification, Judith Butler - in her book *Gender Trouble* (2007) - focuses on language and power. Language is a site that uses and produces power simultaneously. Post-structuralism analyses the process of production of realities within language and power. Through these analyses refute the notion regarding existence of realities regarding universal rules or general laws of explaining behaviour. Instead post-structuralism places such realities in context through highlighting how they are advantaged by powerin and through the language privileged by contexts such as culture, tradition, institutions. Butler uses such deconstructive approach in retelling society's grappling with gender non-binary/variant. Butler describes thisthrougha rejection of "the claims of totality and universality and the presumption of binary structural oppositions

that implicitly operate to quell the insistent ambiguity and openness of linguistic and cultural signification" (1990:40).

Holding a non-binary view of gender is not only challenging - because it refutes the discourse of a binary view of gender that dominated the entirety of human history until recently (Hare-Mustin and Marecek, 2008) - but also because despite the more accepting and accommodating environment of recent years, the issue still remains extremely controversial and challenging. Recently, there has been considerable attention given to the training of family and systemic psychotherapists working with power and knowledge in the therapy room to address the issues of gender, discourse and culture (McGoldrick& Hardy, 2008; Esmiol, Knudson-Martin &Delgado, 2011; Dickerson, 2014). In discussing these challenges, this paper will be divided into three sections: the first section will look at post-structuralism and its epistemological and ontological implications in the therapy setting; the second part will focus on the meaning and implications of holding a gender non-binary view;and the third section will focus on the therapeutic process with clients who may or may not be holding a non-binary view of gender.

2. <u>On Being a Post-Structuralist Therapist:</u>

A post-structuralist therapist needs to constantly review their own positions of power and knowledge and monitor their own emotive states in relation to issues that they are working with. Given this, I started my own reflection by questioning my choice of topic for this article. I have selected this particular title for this article with excitement because I consider myself to be a post-modern therapist, for me thisencompasses being a social-constructivist, *post-structuralist*, de-constructivist. My post-structuralist position means that I am open to multiple versions of realities and trained to work with co-existence of multiple realities in the therapy room. This can be done by accepting the subjective realities that have been brought to me as a therapist –through agreeing to the realities of my clients and joining in with their meanings - orby acknowledging that I, as a person,have refuted their realities but as a therapist have stayed with them. However, after I started the process of constructing my article, I began to further question what is post-structuralism and how one is to become a post-structuralist therapist? More strongly, I started to think about my work with gender variant/non-binary people and started to reflect on these experiences through a post-structuralist lenses.

In my inquiry I found a descriptionof post-structuralism (taken from apublication of the University of Chicago Law School)that resonated most with my understanding of it:

> Poststructualism is a style of critical reasoning that focuses on the moment of slippage in our systems of meaning as a way to identify –right there, in that ambiguous space – the ethical choices that we make, whether in our writings or in everyday life, when we overcome the ambiguity and move from indeterminacy to certainty of belief in an effort to understand, interpret, or shape our social environment. (Harcourt, 2007: 1)

Post-structuralism is often understood through its connection to structuralism. Harcourt (2007) explains that although post-structuralism builds on structuralism it also refutes it. Structuralism paid attention to language and postulated that meanings are not attached to the terms but emerge from the relationships between the terms. A definition of structural linguistics, by Levi-Strauss, (1967:37 cited in Harcourt, 2007:4) divides structural linguistics into four components:

> First, structural linguistics shift from the study of *conscious* linguistic phenomena to the study of their *unconscious* infrastructure; second, it does not treat *terms* as independent entities, taking instead as its basis of analysis *the relations* between terms; third, it introduces the concept of system…; finally, structural linguistics aim at discoveringgeneral laws…which would give them an absolute character.

The final characteristics of linguistic structuralism offer something akin to an existence of collective unconscious - where a reality can be deducted or inducted as by-products of culture and history (Shalvery, 1979). This final characteristic also forms the very basis of the emergence and development of post-structuralism. Linguistic structuralism's goal was to find patterns and structures which would explain behaviour. However, as Piaget (1968 [2015]: 5) suggests, the belief or insistence in discovery of structure would only aid the process of formalisation. Post-structuralism shares the first three elements of structuralism and then diverge from structuralism through the fourth element through searching for clues in language to evidence that patterns of structure and its influence and thus invalidates it. Post-structuralism acknowledges and refutes that positivist assumptions continue to control our thinking, attitudes and behaviours through our conformity to what is identified as moral or political principles and attempts to reduce them to an intersubjective reality that can be refuted by individual choice and ethics.

Post-structuralism rejects any notions that universal rules or laws can be identified and sees meanings deriving from relationships. These relationships, emerging from language, are produced through power/knowledge dynamics and are identified as discourses. Foucault, a very prominent figure of post-structuralism - suggests that "we must conceive of discourse as a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform or stable" (1979:100). Discourses varyin essence and quality as they are applied to under different circumstances and producingdifferent assumptions or judgement. Yet discourses are powerful in how we relate to the world, they provide imagined ontological ideas to be shared and thus contribute to a particular discourse.

Post-structural theory approaches a discourse as a concept to use in analysing the relationship of power/knowledge. Discourse represents internalised assumptions, taken-for-granted notions about the functioning of the world (Dickerson, 2016). When we think of socialcategories such as gender we experience numerous discourses that privilege patriarchal society through describing the female and feminine in terms of disempowerment andthrough marginalising those outside the binary descriptions of gender. As a therapist, we do not only work with these discourses but contribute to

construction and destruction of these discourses from a position of privilege – because in the therapy room we may not be able to avoid being seen as occupying aposition of power.

3. Post-Structuralism and Gender Non-Binary:

Family and systemic psychotherapy has, increasingly in the past few decades, developed to become more accommodating to integrate more diverse views of the family (Walters, Carter, Papp &Silverstein, 1988; Goldner, 1988). Although both the theory and practice of family and systemic psychotherapy started to develop integrating aspect of family from divorce, ethnic and cultural diversity to sexuality, the integration of gender-pluralism (non-binary/variant) seems to remain in the margins until the end of the last century.A title of an article from a publication of the Association for Family Therapy and Systemic Practice 'Lesbians, gay men and family therapy: a contradiction in terms?' by Malley and Tasker (1999) illustrates this. After almost two decades the climate seems to have changed and has become more accepting and accommodating of the needs of families who have a constitution which may not conform to the normative standards of a family that dominated, until recently,global 'definitions' of a family.

Increasingly, we are now witnessing and encountering the narratives of gender variant/non-binary in the media (Hosie, 2017). As the gender non-binary/variant share their experience publicly they make their claim to a collective perception of themselves from the margins of the society to more mainstream and in doing so challengethe predominantly hetero-normative culture.As gender-non binary gains increasing recognition, its implications in the language are being discussedfurther, for example: the American Dialect Society voted to use "they" as their gender neutral singular pronoun in 2015 (cited in Butler, 2018). Furthermore, the February 2018 edition of the magazine *Context*(for family therapy and systemic practice in the UK) devoted an entire issue to working systemically with trans, non-binary and gender expansive people. Currently, social media giant Facebook offers its users 71 gender options with an added feature to choose a pronoun (Williams, 2014). Although through such recognition it is now possible to work within agender pluralistic framework, this does not reflect a global trend. Despiteagreater acceptance of gender pluralism (gender non-binary/variant) in the past few decades in majority of the countries of the western hemisphere,in other countries the trend continues to be, alarmingly, inan opposite direction (Addison and Coolhart, 2015).

A gendered discourse heavily dominated the field of family and systemic psychotherapyfor which Sutherland, Lamarre and Rice, (2017) say that there is an absence of guidance in how to address the issues of gender and power. Post-structuralism - owing to its epistemological underpinnings - does not accept any discourse at its face valuebut analyses and deconstructs it. This process renders what a positivist paradigm accepted as "out there" "discoverable" reality to be non-existent and irrelevant. Reality is nothing more than a subjective perception/experience of knowledge. However, knowledge produces realities/illusions of realities because knowledge, or claims to have knowledge, either comes from having power or creates power. The aforementioned limitation of family and systemic psychotherapy can be linked to its emergence

associated with the social work movement,in the first half of the last century, which was aiming for better functioning families (Lappin, 1988) and the inherent obsession of first-order cybernetics in identifying patterns to account for family dysfunction (Palazzoli et al., 1981).

Since the introduction of social constructivism into family and systemic psychotherapy, considerationof multiple realities as subjective experiences of individuals hasbeen possible. Building on this premise, a systemic therapist, adopting a post-structuralist position, works simultaneously with a multitude of realities held by the individual/s in the therapy room and beyond. Within the post-structuralist framework, these multiple realities, including ones belonging to descriptions of gender and sexuality, are regarded as being produced in language (Sutherland, Lamarre and Rice, 2017). Within a post-structuralist framework, a binary view of gender is socially constructed and maintained through power of knowledge held by discourses relating to it. A post-structuralist framework does not participate in a discourse that holds this particular view of gender. Yet working with a post-structuralist framework is fraught with difficulties, as a binary-view of gender has been part and parcel of human history with a "patriarchal bone". Nealy (2008:289) resonates experiences of LGBT to those of migrants and says: "Much like immigrants in a new country, lesbians and gay men find themselves surrounded by a heterosexual history and culture that is not their own". Whether their gender identity and sexual orientations match their clients, or not, the same is the case for a therapist working with gender non-binary/variant clients.

4. <u>On Being a Reflexive Therapist:</u>

Power and privilege are attached to social categorisations of gender, ethnicity, race, social class, religion, migration history, geography, sexual orientation and mental health status (McGoldrick, Giordano &Garcia-Preto, 2005). Paying attention to my own experiences of privilege and disadvantage in working with gender-variant clients, and my own awareness of how I internalised sexism, feminism and patriarchy and how I respond to them (McDowell et al., 2007; Hardy, 2008) is an exercise that I practice to 'improve my reflexive muscle' as a therapist.

Before I beganmy research for this article, I considered myself a post-strucralist therapist and justified my position of not having a binary view of the male and the femaleas normative and/or universal. Having to challenge hetero-normative discourses waspart of my position as a humanist and as a social activist and surely as a therapist. After working on this article I continue to hold the aforementioned position however,I nowpay more attention to my role as a therapist through considering;

i- <u>Being a cisgender therapist with gender pluralist view and gender variant/non-binary clients:</u>

I realized that I hold a view that suggests matching a therapist with clients whohave similar experiences is desirable. After realising that I have this view I started to think about how I feel in relation to my experiences of working with gender variant/non-binary clientswho described their gender/sexual identities as gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, transgender,

intersex, bi-curious, bi-oral. My unprocessed response was that I have not encountered any undue discomfort or felt/sensed shortcomings of my skills. Yet I think about how I may be perceived by clients who may suspect or know (self-disclosure) that I am cisgender.

Through de Shazer and Berg's (1992) article I focused on the linguistic perspective and pragmatism of being a post-structuralist therapist through linguistic turnthinking about how therapy within language and language within therapy work. In thinking about my realities and the realities of the clients and their adjoining (intersubjectivity) and disjoining (objectivity versus subjectivity) my focus shifted onto how language is used, the dialog and monolog in the conversation and therapy as conversation (Berg and de Shazer, 1993). Taking from a post-structuralist position as a therapist helps me understand the experiences of my clients as unique to them and toavoid unifying their non-heteronormativity as one category. I acknowledge that their ways of being, who they are in LGBT Plus are their unique experiences and my role requires me to understand these experience without creating or belonging to homogeneous categories. In positioning myself as a post-structuralist therapist I firstly refer to the not-knowing position of the therapist (Anderson and Golishian, 1988; 1992; Larner 2000) and secondly to use the approach, method, technique of Burnham (1990).

A therapist's organisation of the self in a not-knowing position gives the client an expert position and reduces the risk of the therapist becomingover-confident in their knowledge of the client's circumstances. Anderson and Goolishan (1992:30) explains this as:

> …therapist are always prejudiced by their own experience but…they must listen in such a way that their pre-experience does not close them to the full meaning of the client's descriptions of their experience…To do otherwise is to search for regularities and common meaning that may validate the therapist's theory but invalidate the uniqueness of the client's stories and thus their very identity.

I find the above description of Anderson and Goolishanvery useful, because their suggestions help me to be more reflexive and so to better understand the pragmatics of how I position myself when working with gender variant/non-binary clients. However, I realise that I do not only find myself prejudiced by my own experiences but also by a lack of own experiences too. In overcoming this, I take refuge in the not-knowing position and ask my clients for information so that I can better understand them. In my personal experience and opinion this has proved to be therapeutic. This has not only given my clients a voice to describe/define their experiences as they consider fit but also triggers a conversation to start looking at their experiences of being described and categorised by others - from members of their family to colleagues and to members of institutions such as those in the education and health sectors. Furthermore, what emerges is that they are pushed behind their gender identities and are seen only as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgenderedetc. and their other concerns, issues, problems and any other challenges

they face are often disregarded or seen as only extension of their gender identities and/or sexual preferences. Such treatment often results in these populations reporting feelings of loss of dignity and even identity. Though they are recognised and acknowledged as gender variant/non-binary their various struggles in life is are reduced to be an extension of only their gender variant identities.

ii-   Working   with gender non-binary/variant clients

In the process of researching and writing this article I realised how my almost militant passion to work against normative discourses - including hetero- normative discourse - at times had made me oblivious to my limitations. I started to question if my social activism and political stance on the issue could ever be enough for me to work with gender non-binary as a confident therapist. I began to analyse my work in terms of Approach, Method and Technique (ATM) as postulated by Burnham (1990).

Burnham explains that the approach of the therapist is more than their theoretical base but is also informed by their values and assumptions about their own race, religion, ethnicity, class, culture, ability/disability, intellect and gender. As a trainee psychotherapist, I am encouraged to explore my own judgements and appraise them contextually. I aim to identify where my judgements come from, how they are formed, how I think that they serve my purpose? Viewing gender as non-binary aligns with my social and political stance, as I believe gender to be socially constructed. I find the relationship with the type of genitalia and sexual orientation and behaviour to be socially constructed and view a binary view of gender (when imposed on the gender non-binary) asoppressive and participation in the maintenance of this view unethical.

At the level of method and technique, I refer to the social constructionist /not knowingposition of the therapist (Anderson and Goolishan, 1988). In exercising this, I organise myself to be curious and irreverent (Cecchin et al, 1992). I use techniques of hypothesising (Cecchin, 1987; Selvini, Boscolo, Cecchin&Prata, 1980)and circular questioning and interventive interviewing (Tomm, 1987a, 1987b, 1988, 1998). I treat communication as a performative act and try to access the layers of contexts embedded through the lenses of aCo-ordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) (Pearce and Cronen, 1980). I stay vigilant to how I construct my circular questions (my intent and purpose) so as to understand how these different layers embedded in a speech act are complementing analog communication, what they are telling me about the episode and to which contexts they are associated with. Through using CMM in my method and technique I look for how the meanings imported to the therapy room coordinates (or not coordinates and stand out as incongruent to their context).To remain curious, I refer to the postulation of Pearce (2004: 50-51) in my management of meaning through coherence and mystery and value commitments and accordingly treat the stories of others and my own as in the process, incomplete, biased and inconsistent. I treat all the stories embedded in their own local contexts and therefore valid in these contexts yet simultaneously may be valid or invalid in other contexts. I search for the cultural, historical, ethical and institutional contexts markers from the speech act of my clients and remain curious about

the connections of the speech acts and/or episodes to these contexts and thus attempt to encourage my clients to engage in curiosity and irreverence to their own stories, as well as my interpretations of their stories.

In working with gender variant clients, I refer to the three dimensions of the contextual consciousness as laid out by Esmiol, Knudson-Martin & Delgado "(a) consciousness about the inherent power differentials in a person's social contexts, including gender, race, socioeconomic status, and sexual orientation; (b) sensitivity to clients' unique experiences within these different contexts; and (c) attention to the intersection of the larger context with clients 'relational processes and presenting issues "(2012; 574). Although in many ways I do not treat the gender non-binary/variant clients any different to other clientpopulations in my approach method and technique, I work with an awareness that gender non-binary/variant people have a long history of oppression and that their systems include people who are not gender variant/non-binary. I am aware of the minority stress coming from the effects of social oppression of heterosexist and from the internalised effects of homophobia to their experiences of marginalisation and discrimination, their lifestyles and choices being reduced to biological anomalies or mental health problems, lack of legal protection of their status and identities and not being able to benefit from equal opportunities (Otis, Rostosky, Riggle&Hamrin, 2006; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz & Russell, 2017).

5. **Conclusion**

A scarcity of literature, exploring gender non-binary experiences,is to be further addressed in the field of systemic and family therapy (Blumer, Green, Knowles and Williams, 2012; Addison and Coolhart, 2015). Now that the experiences of the gender non-binary/variant are becoming less marginalised,perhaps there is space available to further explore the topic, create resources to campaign for the rights of this population and develop innovative ways to work with this population in the therapy setting. A particular duty falls upon those who regard themselves as family therapiststo include families with gender non-binary /variant members into their theoretical and practical bases.

Currently, the integration of gender non-binary/variant is only managed through taking a post-structuralist epistemological stance. In doing so, a question emerges: is being critical of one discourse not producing the creation of another? Are we not reconstructing self and the subject in deconstructing the existing/previous? A discursive approach allows locating the problem within the culturally and historically structured discourses (White and Epston, 1980). Yet does it also result in therapy becoming a place for of self-construction? Through interviewing clients, we continue to create or contribute to the creation of discourses consciously or unconsciously.

Post-structuralism sees power as a product of knowledge and is critical of social distribution of power and ask questions about what knowledge from power is emerging, how this knowledge is constructed, how the discourses using particular knowledge are rationalised? The role of the post-structuralist therapist is to continue to

askepistomological questions totheir clients and themselves about how we know what we believe as truth to be true? What makes it true? What institutions endorse what claims to be truth as valid? How and why do we participate in holding thisknowledge as true and maintain thispower over asociety. How can we be critical of that? What would be the outcome of such a critical approach? When it comes to working with gender then where and when we need to ask ourselves questions and reflect on our acceptance and rejections of our clients' participation in particular claims of knowledge and truth?

In summary, it is important to find a way to incorporate experiences of minority populations into therapy training, practice and culture. It is vital to fight the system that has criminalised and pathologised such experiences since biblical times. I also ask many questions ofmyself as a trainee therapist –including, if by focusing on a gender-pluralist discourse I maybe undermining the identity politics built on the binary view of gender (Monro, 2005). A gender-pluralist approach is congruent with feminism but I still question whethersuch an approach may limit my attachment to feminism and my focus on the experiences of the female not being able to use their female identity as agency. I started this articleby sayingthat researching and writing it had given gave me more questionsthan answers. Concluding it,I am left with a sense of internal conflict; a conflict between not wanting to give up on my privilege for fighting for a women's agency that benefits from a binary view of gender and one that privileges me, professionally, by holding a post-structuralist position that includes having a non-binary view of gender. Perhaps working with an agenda to consolidate what creates conflict, is a way forward for me to overcome some of the challenges posed to me as a trainee, systemic psychotherapist, adopting the non-binary/variant view of gender in the therapy room?

Bibliography

Addison, S. A., & Coolhart, D. (2015). Expanding the Therapy Paradigm with Queer Couples: A Relational Intersectional Lens. *Family Process*, 435-453.

Anderson, H., & Goolishian, H. (1992). The client is the expert: a not-knowing approach to therapy. In S. McNamee, & K. J. Gergen, *Therapy as social Construction* (pp. 25-39). London: Sage.

Anderson, H., & Goolishian, H. A. (1988). Human systems as lingusitic sytems: Preliminary and evolving ideas about the implications for clinical theory. *Family Process*, 371-393.

Berg, I. K., & de Shazer, S. (1993). Making Numbers Talk: Language in Therapy. In S. Friedman (Ed.), *The New Language of Change: Constructice Colloboration in Psychotherapy* (pp. 5-25). New York: The Guildford Press.

Berman, A. (1988). *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: The Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Blumer, M. L., Green, M. S., Knowles, S. J., & Williams, A. (2012). Shedding light on thirteen years of darkness: content analysis of articles pertaining to transgender issues in marriage/couple and family therapy journals. *Journal of Marital Family Therapy*, 244-256.

Burnham, J. (1992). 'Approach - Method- Techniques: Making Distinctions and Creating Connections' . *Human Systems*, 3-26.

Butler, C. (2018). The social construction of non-binary gender identity. *Context: The Magazine for Family Therapy and Systemic Practice in the UK*, 27-28.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* . New York: Routledge.

Cecchin, G. (1987). 'Hypothesising, Circularity and Neutrality Revisited: An Invitation to Curisoty'. *Family Process*, 405-413.

Cecchin, G. (1992). *Irreverence: A strategy for therapists' survival.* London: Karnac.

de Shazer, S., & Berg, I. K. (1992). Doing therapy: A post-structural re-vision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 71-81.

Dickerson, V. (2014). The advance of poststructuralism and its influence on on family therapy . *Family Process*, 401-414.

Esmiol, E. E., Knudson-Martin, C., & Delgado, S. (2011). Developing a contextual consciousness: Learnign to address gender, societal power, and culture in clinical practice . *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* , 573-588.

Friedman, S. (Ed.). (1993). *The New Language of Change: Constructive Collaboration in Psychotherapy.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Goldner, V. (1988). Generation and gender: normative and covert hierarchies . *Family Process*, 17-31.

Harcourt, B. E. (2007, March 12). An Answer to the Question: 'What is Poststructiualism?'. *Public Law and Legal theory Papers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Public Law & Legal Theory Workign Paper No: 156.

Hardy, K. V. (2008). On becoming a GEMM therapist: Work harder, be smarter, and never discuss race. In M. &. Hardy (Ed.), *Re-visioning family therapy: Race, culture, and gender in clinical practice* (2nd ed., pp. 461-469). New York: Guilford Press.

Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Marecek, J. (1988). The Meaning of Difference: Gender Theory, Postmodernism, and Psychology. *American Psychologist* , 455-464.

Hosie, R. (2017, December 13). *The Independent Newspaper.* Retrieved March 25, 2018, from Transgender Man gives Birth to Healthy Baby Five years Aftger Having First Child As A Woman: https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/transgender-man-gives-birth-baby-first-child-woman-kaci-sullivan-wisconsin-a8107481.html

Lappin, J. (1998). Family therapy: A structural approach. In R. A. Dorfman, *Paradigms of Clinical Social Work* (pp. 220-252). London and New York: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Larner, G. (2000). Towards a common ground in psychoanalysis and family therapy: on knowing not to know. *Family therapy*, 61-82.

Malley, M., & Tasker, F. (1999). Lesbians, gay men and family therapy: a contradiction in terms? . *The assocation for Family therapy and Systemic Practice* , 3-29.

McDowell, T., Ingoglia, L., Serizawa, T., Holland, C., Dashell Jr, J. W., & Stevens, C. (2007). Raising Multicultural Awareness in Family Therapy Through Critical Conversations. *Journal of Marital adn Family Therapy*, 399-411.

McGoldrick, M., & Hardy, K. V. (Eds.). (2008). *Re-visioning family therapy: Race, culture, and gender in clinical practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

McGoldrick, M., Giordano, J., & Garcia-Preto, N. (2005). Overview: Ethnicity and family therapy. In M. McGoldrick, J. Giordano, & N. Garcia-Preto (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (pp. 1-40). New York: Guilford Press.

Monro, S. (2005). Beyond Male and Female: Poststructuralism and the Spectrum of Gender. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 3-22.

Nealy, E. C. (2008). Working with LGBT Families. In M. McGoldrick, & K. V. Hardy (Eds.), *Re-Visioning Family Therapy: Race, Culture, and Gender in Clinical Practice* (pp. 289-300). London: The Guilford Press.

Otis, M. D., Rostosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D., & Hamrin, R. (2006). Stress and relationship quality in same-sex couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 81-99.

Pearce, W. B. (2004, January 7). *The Coordinated.* Retrieved February 15, 2018, from http://cmminstitute.net/sites/default/files/documents/The-Coordinated-Management-of-Meaning-2004.pdf

Pearce, W. B., & Cronen, V. E. (1980). *Communication, action, and meaning: The creation of social realities.* Praeger.

Piaget, J. (1968 [2015]). *Structuralism.* (C. Maschler, Trans.) London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Shalvery, T. (1979). *Claude Levi-Strauss: Social Psychothreapy and the Collective Unconcious.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Sutherland, O., Lamarre, A., & Rice, C. (2017). The Primacy of Discourse in the Study of Gender in Family Therapy. *Family Process*, 669-685.

Tomm, K. (1987a). Interventive interviewing: Part I. Strategizing as a fourth guideline for the therapist. *Family process*, 3-13.

Tomm, K. (1987b). Interventive interviewing: Part II. Reflexive questioning as a means to enable self-healing. *Family process*, 167-183.

Tomm, K. (1988). Interventive interviewing: Part III. Intending to ask lineal, circular, strategic, or reflexive questions?. *Family process*, 1-15.

Tomm, K. (1998). A question of perspective. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 409-413.

Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., & Russell, S. T. (2017). Coping With Sexual Orientation–Related Minority Stress. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 484-500.

Walters, M., Carter, B., Papp, P., & Silverstein, O. (1988). *The Invisible Web: Gender Patterns in Family Relations.* New York: Guildford Press.

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative Means to Therapeutic Ends.* London: Norton.

Williams, R. (2014, June 27). *Facebook's 71 gender options come to UK users.* Retrieved from The Telegraph: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/10930654/Facebooks-71-gender-options-come-to-UK-users.html

Williams, R. (2014, June 27). *Facebook's 71 gender options come to UK users.* Retrieved from The Telegraph: