and Schwalbe 2009) predicated upon socially constructed notions of what it means to be a gendered sexual being. Further, scholars note ways individual, interpersonal, and institutional experiences are shaped by and shape gender and sexual inequalities (Martin 2004) while intersecting with racial (Collins 1990), sexed (Davis 2015), classed (Padavic and Reskin 2002), and religious (Moon 2004) inequalities. Although these efforts have invigorated understandings of cisgender, monosexual, and to a lesser extent (though growing, Schilt and Lagos 2017) transgender and intersex experience, our discipline has thus far granted gender and sexual uidity much less attention (see Sumerau and Mathers 2019).

For the purposes of this discussion, we de ne gender uidity as experiences of one•s own gender as neither man nor woman, both man and woman, or acknowledging change over the life course between and beyond these options, including such categories as nonbinary, agender, and genderqueer. We de ne sexual uidity as having a sexual/romantic object choice not structured by the man/woman binary, including those who •love a person, not a genderŽ and many who consider themselves bisexual, pansexual, ambisexual, or queer. Even if a person remains nonbinary or bisexual for life, we refer to these categories as • uidŽ because they exist outside the solidi cation of stable, static gender constructions and object-based sexualities (for de nitions of relevant terminology, see Table 1).

As with other populations that have been historically marginalized in science (Collins 1990; Rich 1980; West and Zimmerman 1987), few present sociological studies (within or beyond symbolic interactionist traditions) focus on uidity. Monro, Hines, and Osborne (2017), Schilt and Lagos (2017), and Darwin (2017), for example, demonstrate that scholarship overwhelmingly focuses on binary or static sexual and gender populations (see also Sumerau and Mathers 2019). However, sociologists have, in some cases, explored uidity in relation to gender (shustel 2017), sexuality (Silva 2017), or both (Pfef027 TD [(2782.53339.4(o).1(wn)-338.7(ge7(a)-ut)-252.5

TABLE 1. Conceptual Terminology[a]

Term	De“nition [b]
Gender binary	The social and biological classification of sex and gender into two distinct oppositional forms of masculine and feminine selfhood.
Trans[c]	A Latin prefix meaning “on the other side of.” Often used as a prefix before “man” and/or “woman,” or as a prefix before the word “gender” to

TABLE 1. Continued

Term	De“nition [b]
Mono	A Latin prefix meaning “one,” “only,” or “single.” Sometimes used before the words “sexual” or “amorous” to refer, respectively, to (1) person who experiences attraction to only one sex or gender and/or (2) a person who engages in relationships with only one person at a time.
Bisexual	A term referring to people who experience attraction to people with genders

a uid standpoint can provide necessary insights into these dynamics. In order to frame these examples in a useful way for future study, we explore the experiences of our respondents at the intersection of current„often isolated„literatures on cis, trans, hetero, and homonormativities. In fact, we only utilized data examples that have been interpreted as evidence of cis-, trans-, hetero-, and homonormativities in prior empirical works to show how such existing work implicitly reveals the foreclosure of uidity. Our analysis thus synthesizes and responds to calls for greater theoretical and empirical inclusion of sexual and gender diversity by examining the shape of most recent literature from a uid standpoint and outlining patterns of social activity„or common ways of accomplishing shared results intentionally or otherwise (Blumer 1969)„whereby people maintain static, binary sexual, and gender normative systems. (For de nitions of normative systems and literature on these systems, see Table 2.)

Importantly, our work also responds to requests for greater incorporation of sexual and gender complexity in symbolic interactionism in recent years (see Marques 2019; Mathers 2017; Schilt 2016; Sumerau, Mathers, and Lampe 2019). Reviewing interactionist engagement with sexualities over time, for example, Plummer (2010) called for greater engagement between interactionist theorizing and the complexities and possibilities of emerging sexualities in society. Likewise, Darwin (2017) examined the online experiences of gender uid participants, and in so doing, called for interactionists to take seriously the complexity of gender diversity beyond

mutually exclusive masculine and feminine categories while working to position others in the same categories. In doing so, the authors spurred scholarship showing the many ways people constructed and enforced a wide variety of femininities and masculinities predicated upon assumptions about genitalia, appearance, static location within one of only two gender options, and other factors. Further, scholars demonstrated many ways gender patterns, mostly cisgender, were embedded and enforced via interpersonal (Schrock and Schwalbe 2009), organizational (Padavic and Reskin 2002), and institutional (Martin 2004) interactions and structures. Although rarely noted at the time (Connell 2010), these studies rested heavily upon notions of gender as a static or binary (woman/man only) phenomenon (West and Zimmerman 2009).

More recently, emerging scholars have problematized such patterns within literatures. Whereas prior scholarship typically sought to understand transgender (Schilt and Lagos 2017) and intersex (Davis 2015) experiences through static-binary models, frameworks, and theories, more recent scholarship critiques the systematic devaluation of transgender experience through the structural (Westbrook and Schilt 2014), ideological (Sumerau, Cragun, and Mathers 2016), and interpersonal (Mathers 2017) enforcement of cisnormativity. Further, such studies incorporate some transgender (Sumerau and Cragun 2015) and intersex (Davis 2015) experience, and demonstrate that transgender people face signi cant health (Miller and Grollman 2015), religious and nonreligious (Cragun and Sumerau 2017), educational (Nowakowski, Sumerau, and Mathers 2016), and workplace (Schilt 2010) marginalization due to societal patterns of cisnormativity that posit noncisgender (regardless of identi cation on the gender spectrum) people as de cient, unnatural, unexpected, and even dangerous (Schilt and Westbrook 2009). Such studies reveal the importance of understanding not only how people interactionally enforce cisnormativity and a static binary, but also how they do identities in the broader transgender umbrella and between cis and transidentities (Connell 2010).

While some have seized on this opportunity to move scholarship away from binary notions of gender (Pfeffer 2014), others have reconceptualized cisgender and transgender as a new binary framework (see Schwalbe 2014). Although the former option holds the potential to continue calls to eradicate gender inequalities by emphasizing the socially constructed nature of gender binaries (see Collins 1990; Rich 1980; Smith 1987), the latter option runs the risk of erasing gender uidity in much the same way all transgender people were erased in the past (Darwin 2017) by reinstalling another gender binary rather than embracing the spectrum (Serano 2007). Rather than repeating the past, we suggest sociology may bene t more from revising prior patterns.arg.4(e).2,-2the ansgeDsgender and the fa TD [(Mor)14o(h).2(a-(the)89.8(wak)1st

more likely to also be sexually uid (Hemmings 2002), and because systematic patterns of hetero- and homonormativity rely heavily upon both cisnormative assumptions about the xity of gender, and mononormative assumptions that desires are always informed by binary conceptions of others• gender as only man or woman (Yoshino 2000). Before lesbian/gay life became more normalized, bi+ people faced similar outcomes to gays and lesbians, but today, for example, sexually uid people (throughout the bi + and queer spectrums of identities [Eisner 2013]) currently lag far behind lesbian/gay people in health (Jeffries 2014), income and wealth (Badgett, Durso, and Schneebaum 2013), scienti c and media representation (Monro, Hines, and Osborne 2017), social acceptance (Cragun and Sumerau 2015), and familial and relationship acceptance (Moss 2012). Further, sexually uid people are more likely to experience violence and mental health issues (Worthen 2013) and less likely to be out of the closet (Scherrer, Kazyak, and Schmitz 2015). In many wa.6(,)-288.5(s)ly

that facilitate similar outcomes. In this article, we demonstrate efforts likely to happen whenever people invested in maintaining binary gender and sexuality forestall or otherwise avoid the existence of gender and sexual uidity, a pattern we call foreclosing uidity. We see analyses of foreclosing uidity as a step toward moving scholarship beyond binary-based foci to systematic sociological analyses of the entirety of sexual and gender diversity in society.

As we argue throughout, foreclosing uidity emerges as a generic social process whenever people seek to, intentionally or otherwise, interpret themselves or others in static, binary, mutually exclusive concepts or categories. Such interpretations rely upon existing systems of norms that promote cisgender, monosexual based hetero-sexuality as natural, static, and taken for granted in society. However, transgender people may also rely upon and reproduce emerging norms concerning what it means to be acceptable as a transgender person (for discussion of transnormativity, see Johnson 2015, 2019; Ruin 2016). Further, lesbian/gay people, as noted in sociological analyses since the 1990s, may rely upon and reproduce patterns of activity de ned as a manner of being acceptably nonheterosexual (for discussion of homonormativity, see Duggan 2004; Mathers, Sumerau, and Cragun 2018). Here, we argue that all these

TABLE 3. Sex, Gender, and Sexuality Identities of Study Participants

	Nonbinary Subsample (%)	Full Sample (%)
Sex at birth (n)	(114)	(292)
Intersex	0.9	1.0
Female	87.7	70.9
Male	11.4	28.1
Gender (*n*)	(115)	(294)
Gender queer	37.4	16.7
Nonbinary	35.7	20.7
Intersex	0.0	1.7
Agender	18.3	10.5
Gender neutral	5.2	3.7
Bi gender	2.6	1.4
Cross dresser	0.9	0.3
Transman	0.0	23.5
Transwoman	0.0	21.4

TABLE 4. Demographics of Study Participants

	Non-binary Subsample (%)	Full Sample (%)
Race/Ethnicity (n)	(110)	(283)
Non-Hispanic White	87.3	79.2
Non-Hispanic Black	2.7	7.4
Hispanic White/Black	2.7	6.0
Asian	1.8	1.1
Native American	1.8	1.8
Mixed	3.6	4.6
Religion (n)	(98)	(250)
Christian	13.3	16.8
Muslim	5.1	8.4
Jewish	5.1	5.2
Buddhist	3.1	3.2
Pagan	19.4	15.6
Sikh	1.0	0.4
Nonreligious	53.1	50.4
Social class (n)	(111)	(284)
Lower class	33.3	35.2
Middle class	64.0	63.0
Upper class	2.7	1.8
Income (n)	(101)	(264)
Less than $20,000 per year	53.5	50.0
$20,001–$40,000 per year	25.7	29.2
$40,001–$60,000 per year	12.9	10.2
$60,001–$80,000 per year	5.0	4.2
$80,001–$100,000 per year	2.0	2.3
Over $100,000 per year	1.0	4.2
Degree (n)	(114)	(288)
Less than high school	1.8	1.4
High school (GED)	13.2	13.2
Some college	27.2	29.5
College degree	35.1	33.3
Master's	16.7	16.3
Professional (JD/MD)	0.9	3.1
PhD	5.3	3.1
Medical service access (n)	(109)	(277)
Never	1.8	2.2
Less than once a year	8.3	7.6
About once a year	33.0	24.9
About once a month	36.7	41.2
About once a week	11.9	9.0
About every day	0.9	0.4
Few times a year	7.3	14.8
Open about transgender identity (n)	(88)	(238)
Yes	89.8	87.8
No	10.2	12.2
	Nonbinary subsample (mean)	Full sample (mean)
Age	28.54	31.10
Age at which they came out	21.91	23.05

TABLE 5. Open-Ended Survey Questions

1	Would you please share any notable positive and negative experiences you have had with religious leaders?
2	Would you please describe any notable positive and negative experiences you have had with lesbian, gay, bisexual, asexual, pansexual, transgender, queer, genderqueer, heterosexual, or polyamorous (LGBTQIAP) groups?
3	Would you please share any notable positive and negative experiences you have had with cisgender people?
4	Would you please share any notable positive and negative experiences you have had with groups or organizations that are not explicitly religious or explicitly LGBTQIAP?
5	Would you please share any notable positive and negative experiences you have had with healthcare?

gender identity, and the age at which they began to openly identify as such. Unlike many surveys (Westbrook and Saperstein 2015), all demographics are self-reports. Participants also responded to open-ended questions (see Table 5); these responses provide the data utilized in this article. They also represent responses from sexually and gender uid people living in every region of the United States.

Our analysis emerged in an inductive fashion (Kleinman 2007). We utilized broad, open-ended questions to allow respondents to share as much or as little as they wanted, but we had no way of knowing ahead of time what, if anything, they might write. We began with full reviews, open coding processes, and comparison of all data. While working with other analyses from the overall dataset for a larger book project (see Sumerau and Mathers 2019), we recognized an opportunity to examine gender and sexual uidity speci cally created by the participation of many people identifying in one or both of these ways. As we are each sexually uid people and two of the three of us are also gender uid, we became interested in what analyses of sexual and gender uidity (almost entirely absent from sociology or symbolic interactionism to date) might tell us about sexual and gender experiences and norms. As such, we created two datasets„one only contained gender uid respondents and the other only contained sexually uid respondents.

After the second round of coding these two sets, however, we noted shared experiences for those who were both sexual and gender uid that were not entirely shared with others. We created a new dataset that only includes people who identify as both sexually and gender uid. To analyze these data, we went through the entirety of the responses, outlining shared patterns of experience and observation, and went back through six more times seeking variations in relation to race, class, sex, religious, and age identities. We noted an overwhelming pattern of experiencing, naming, and discussing erasure from the expectations and norms of others. We further noted that such experiences were not tied to only one form of sexual, gender, or otherwise social normativity (i.e., a systematic pattern of social norms that pervades an entire society, Warner 1999), but rather, such experiences revealed intersections between norma-

one, distinct system of sexual and gender norms). We thus sought to examine this intersection.

To this end, we went back through the data sorting it into recurring themes. Collectively, the themes were labeled to capture the most common experiences in the data (Charmaz 2006). Participants reported constant attempts by others to make them pick a side or conform. They further revealed that such efforts operated not just as a result of one normative system, but in relation to cisnormativity, transnormativity,

foreclosing uidity that occur across a multitude of interactional settings, contexts, and populations as well as in relation to multiple systems of sexual and gender normativity that each, ultimately, rely upon the ability to categorize others as members of binary, distinct, and mutually exclusive categories. Taken together, the experiences our participants share af rm prior scholarship on the societal operation of sexual and gender normativities and reveal the possibility of unifying such areas of study through a systematic study of foreclosing uidity.

Cisnormativity

Much like other transgender people, uid people face considerable pressure to conform to cisnormativity (Serano 2007). Research reveals many ways laws (Westbrook and Schilt 2014), media (Schilt and Westbrook 2009), religion (Sumerau and Cragun 2015), and other social structures are constructed in ways that require and maintain cisnormativity that erases transgender existence and experience.

(2009) discuss, such ignorance provides the foundation for cisnormativity in contemporary society.

cisnormativity (see also Schilt and Westbrook 2009 for similar). Such efforts to reinforce cisgender norms and foreclose uid possibility.

Respondents also echoed studies concerning how cisnormative social structures„ like sex segregated bathrooms (Mathers 2017) and workplaces (Schilt 2010)„ negatively in uence daily life. A nonbinary bisexual provides an example:

> The conference was a nightmare for me. After the rst round, delegates are required to identify as a man or a woman to run as a delegate.

An agender queer shared a similar sentiment:

> I get stared at in bathrooms all the time, yelled at occasionally, and have been roughly grabbed. Bathrooms are now stressful places.

Although bathrooms have received some attention in recent years (see also Sumerau and Grollman 2018), many respondents also noted workplaces where uidity was problematic, like the gender uid queer who wrote, •I was red because of wearing a [chest] binder. I was often told I need to dress fem.Ž As Mathers (2017) notes, workplaces ranging from the academy to the coffee shop often enforce cisnormativity and foreclose uidity through such enforcement via reactions to clothing, appearance, and other aspects of demeanor.

Like many transgender women and men (Castañeda 2015), respondents found medical settings to be some of the most cisnormative domains. A nonbinary queer attests:

> My wife•s general practitioner was very confused by us and had never heard of the hormone therapy my wife was already on.

Another nonbinary queer shared:

> I•ve had non-consensual exams performed on me by doctors who wouldn•t take no for an answer. I•ve been misgendered and told I couldn•t possibly need services since I•m a man, woman, etc. I•ve been assumed to be a cis man who only has receptive anal sex.

Others wrote about cisnormativity built into medical procedures and policies. In such cases, they shared how uid identities„gender as well as sexual„often created confusion and frustration for medical staff that in uenced care. For example, an agender queer stated:

> Healthcare refuses to pay for my surgery because of my non-binary identity even though surgery here is covered for transsexual people. For non-binary, though, healthcare regards me as mentally ill.

Another agender, queer provided an example of such barriers:

> I could not get past gate keeping. I was treated as a dependent who needed parents• permission even though children are able to access transition services

> without parents• permission here because it•s a private matter. I could not even start on a low dose because I wasn•t planning to change my legal gender, though I had transitioned socially.

In each of these examples, we see the same patterns of cisnormativity noted by transmen and transwomen in prior literature (for reviews, see Johnson 2015, 2019) also nds voice as a foreclosure of uid possibilities in the lives of uid people.

While sociologists and others are beginning to recognize how cisnormativity constrains the lives of transgender women and men (Miller and Grollman 2015), cisnormativity also forecloses uidity. In fact, cisnormativity itself relies upon such foreclosure (see also Sumerau and Mathers 2019). Alongside scholarship beginning to explore transexperiences across the spectrum (Connell 2010), these ndings suggest there is much to be learned by more fully incorporating uid people into analyses of daily life itself and cisnormativity speci cally (Darwin 2017).

Transnormativity

With increased recognition in academia and media over the past few years, an emerging topic within transgender communities concerns the formation of transnormativity (Ruin 2016; Schilt 2016; Sumerau and Mathers 2019). While this term is a source of heated debate, it typically refers to gender normative discourse that transgender women and men adopt in pursuit of civil rights and necessary medical care (Stryker 2014). This includes adopting notions of gender as essential, inborn, and static in much the same way homonormativity rests upon adopting notions of sexualities as essential, inborn, and static (Castañeda 2015). Put simply, it is the latest example of political assimilation to cisgender, monosexual, and heterosexual norms by arguing rights should be conferred to nonconformists only if they •cannot helpŽ

face of immediate dangers (Ruin 2016). This may also be because, while very few respondents shared many positive experiences with cisgender people, most wrote about at least some and sometimes mostly positive experiences with transgender women and men (Sumerau, Mathers, and Lampe 2019). As Abelson (2016) notes, it could also be because •samenessŽ to societal norms is often an important strategy for transgender people navigating much of social life in the United States at present (see also Sumerau and Mathers 2019). In any case, our data suggest this is either an emerging issue yet to reach the potency of other normativities, or„as it was

While discussions have only begun about transnormativity (Sumerau and Mathers 2019), our respondents• observations suggest foreclosure of uidity in the broader society may provide one key to analyzing these shifting gender politics. In much the

efforts improved some political outcomes for some lesbian/gay people, and at the same time, often reproduce patterns of racism (McQueeney 2009; Ward 2008), sexism (Sumerau, Padavic, and Schrock 2015), cissexism (Fetner 2008), religious privilege (Barton 2012), reproductive privilege (Heath 2012), and middle class respectability (Padavic and Butter eld 2011), the monosexual and monogamous (i.e., mononormative) requirements and effects of such patterns have received little attention (see also Sumerau and Mathers 2019; Sumerau, Mathers, and Lampe 2019). Here, we explore how patterns of activity de ned as homonormative in prior studies also foreclose uidity via assumptions of biphobia and monosexism.

Respondents were well accustomed to homonormative patterns of biphobia and

(McQueeney 2009), our respondents report experiencing such patterns from monosexual others (see also Barringer, Sumerau, and Gay 2017). As such, our respondents• uidity complicates settings wherein monosexism and biphobia operate as part of creating and presenting a more heteronormative friendly version of lesbian/gay life

> The older gays are really conservative, and you see this a lot online too. They•re slow to adopt inclusive language, and a lot of lesbians are terfs[6] and hate trans-femmes.

Another genderqueer queer offered a summary of such patterns:

> I felt out of place because it•s mainly monogamous, cisgender, gay-or-lesbian people. There were very few who identi ed as bisexual, pansexual, there were very few transgender people, and there was never any mention of non-binary genders. Sex positivity was never discussed, and polyamory/nonmonogamy was nonexistent or invisible.

In each of these cases, uidity is foreclosed as restrictive, binary notions of sexualities„even in sexual minority communities„reproduce patterns of exclusion and •otheringŽ (Schwalbe et al. 2000) for those who do not or cannot conform to binary, mutually exclusive sexual and gender categorization. These patterns suggest that while homonormativity has aided some aspects of nonheterosexual social recognition, one of the ways it has done so has been through the reinforcement of static, binary categories and the foreclosure of uidity. In fact, much like heteronormativity renders all BLGQ experience problematic, homonormativity renders sexual uidity problematic. As such, there may be much to learn about inequalities through examination of homonormative foreclosures of uidity (see also Mathers, Sumerau, and Cragun 2018).

CONCLUSIONS

We have used the reported experiences of sexual and gender uid people to reveal patterns wherein others„regardless of intentions„maintain static binary sexual and gender categories, which we refer to as foreclosing uidity. Although contents of these patterns may vary across settings, our analyses suggest foreclosing uidity may be a common process also embedded in prior scholarship in these areas. Speci cally, our respondents note examples termed cis-trans-hetero-homo normative in prior research that also foreclose or remove the possibility of uidity in social life. Our combined empirical and literature analysis above thus provides a conceptual framework for exploring the ways people„intentionally or otherwise„marshal gender and sexual normativities, effectively erasing, shutting out, or otherwise foreclosing the possibility and existence of gender and sexual uidity.

Our ndings also have implications for understanding how people accomplish foreclosure of uidity in a wide variety of contexts. First, uid experiences mirror many ways heteronormativity and cisnormativity negatively impact the lives of other LGBTQ [8] people (Schrock, Sumerau, and Ueno 2014) and demonstrate the importance of extending analyses to uid populations. Second, uid experiences reveal negative effects of homonormativity and transnormativity, and raise dif cult ques-

may all be based on foreclosing uidity in the creation of mutually exclusive normative systems. Although our presentation and demonstration of uid standpoints is unique at this point in sociology, as a •sensitizing conceptŽ (Blumer 1969), foreclosing uidity provides a pattern of social activity researchers may explore in a wide variety of settings and literatures going forward.

Our ndings also have implications for the continued development of sociologies of gender and sexual uidity within and beyond symbolic interactionist traditions (shuster 2017). While sociologists have begun mapping many contours of cisgender, transgender women and men•s, lesbian/gay, intersex, feminine, and masculine experience related to interlocking systems of oppression, uid experiences have received much less attention (Barringer, Sumerau, and Gay 2017). This is especially important considering ndings that cisgender, heterosexual, and lesbian/gay people each tend

positive reactions to lesbian/gay cisgender people (Cragun and Sumerau 2015), they are observing the results of foreclosing uidity. Turning attention to such uid experience may dramatically expand sociologies of sexual and gender inequalities. Further, interactionists examining the patterns and processes that lead to such results could provide insights into methods for changing such patterns in society.

To fully understand the persistence of gender and sexual inequalities, we must analyze attempts to erase gender and sexual uidity and examine the insights from previous literature revealed by uid perspectives. This will require systematically investigating sexual and gender uidity as well as the factors that lead some people to marginalize uidity and others to embrace it. To this end, interactionists focused on the construction and change of meanings„gendered, sexual, or otherwise„over time and between settings may be especially well suited to leading the charge. As our analysis reveals, patterns of foreclosing uidity emerge from the intersection of multiple, interlocking systems of sexual and gender normativity. Unraveling and comparing variations in the ways these systems work separately and together may deepen our understanding of gender and sexual inequalities as well as provide numerous possibilities for social change. To do this, however, we will need to systematically

Adams, Tony E. 2011. . Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Avishai, Orit. 2008. ••Doing Religion• in a Secular World: Women in Conservative Religions and the Question of Agency.Ž 22:409…433.

Badgett, M.V. Lee, Laura E. Durso, and Alyssa Schneebaum. 2013 . Los Angeles, CA: The Williams Institute.

Barringer, M.N., J.E. Sumerau, and David Gay. 2017. •Examining Differences in Identity Disclosure between Monosexuals and Bisexuals.Ž 37(5):319…333.

Barton, Bernadette. 2012. . New

Johnson, Austin. 2019. •Rejecting, Reframing, and Reintroducing: Trans People•s Strategic Engagement with the Medicalisation of Gender Dysphoria.Ž
41(3):517…532.

Kleinman, Sherryl. 2007.
. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marques, Ana Cristina. 2019. •Displaying Gender: Transgender People•s Strategies in Everyday Life.Ž
42(2):202…228.

Schilt, Kristen and Danya Lagos. 2017. •The Development of Transgender Studies in Sociology.Ž
43:425…443.
Schilt, Kristen and Laurel Westbrook. 2009. •Doing Gender, Doing Heteronormativity: •Gender
Normals,• Transgender People, and the Social Maintenance of Heterosexuality.Ž
23(4):440…464.
Schippers, Mimi. 2016. . New
York: NYU Press.
Schrock, Douglas and Michael Schwalbe. 2009. •Men, Masculinity, and Manhood Acts.Ž
35:277…295.
Schrock, Douglas P., J. Edward Sumerau, and Koji Ueno. 2014. •Sexualities.Ž Pp. 627…654 in
, edited by Jane D. McLeod, Edward J.
Lawler, and Michael L. Schwalbe. New York: Springer.
Schwalbe, Michael L. 2014. . Boulder, CO:
Paradigm.
Schwalbe, Michael, Sandra Godwin, Daphne Holden, Douglas Schrock, Shealy Thompson, and
Michele Wolkomir. 2000. •Generic Process in the Reproduction of Inequality: An Interac-
tionist Analysis.Ž
79(2):419…52.
Seidman, Steven. 1
Sexuality.Ž
7 9(xts)]TJ /F3 1 Tf14.2929 0 TD -.00319Tc [41

, Vol. 6, edited by Patricia Gagne and Richard Tewksbury. New York: Elsevier Science Press.
Ward, Jane. 2008. . Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
Ward, Jane. 2015. . New York: NYU Press.
Warner, R. Stephen. 1995. •The Metropolitan Community Churches and the Gay Agenda: The Power of Pentecostalism and Essentialism.Ž Pp. 81…108 , edited by Mary Jo Neitz and Marion S. Goldman. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
Warner, Michael. 1999. . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
West, Candace and Don Zimmerman. 1987. •Doing Gender.Ž 1(2):125…151.
West, Candace and Don Zimmerman. 2009. •Accounting for Doing Gender.Ž 23(1):112…122.
Westbrook, Lauren and Aliya Saperstein. 2015. •New Categories Are Not Enough: Rethinking the Measurement of Sex and Gender in Social Surveys.Ž 29(4):534…560.