5

This chapter explores collegians' sexual identity formation through the lenses of feminist theory, intersectionality, poststructuralism, and queer theory.

Critical and Poststructural Perspectives on Sexual Identity Formation

J. Michael Denton

College campuses have long been spaces of sexual activity, exploration, and the formation and regulation of sexual identities and practices (Bailey, 1999; Dilley, 2002; Holland & Eisenhart, 1990). Until recently, students were presumed to be heterosexual—a supposedly natural and default state. Unfortunately, for most of U.S. history, when students (or faculty/staff) were found engaging in nonheterosexual behaviors or affections, they were considered threats and punished (Dilley, 2002). However, the college environment still provided individuals opportunities to meet others interested in and engage in—usually covertly—same-sex sex (Dilley, 2002; Marine, 2011).

The sexual and gender activism of the 1960s and 1970s, legal gains (such as Roe v. Wade), medical advances (such as the birth control pill), and new psychological approaches (such as de-pathologizing homosexuality) spurred many college students to reconsider traditional sexual norms, forge new kinds of intimate relationships, and demand changes in institutional policy (Bailey, 1999). Likewise, scholars reconsidered how sexual identity forms (Marine, 2011). Developmental models initially focused on homosexual (the term in use then) identity, leaving heterosexual identity unexplored until decades later. Heterosexuality was the presumed norm from which other sexual identities diverged; still, these models offered paths of *positive* homosexual development, a substantial departure from previous theories. These new models (notably Cass, 1979; Troiden, 1979) affirmed the dignity of and provided ideas to support homosexual students.

During the next decades, scholars refined and expanded developmental theories on gay and lesbian identity (Renn, 2015). However, higher education researchers largely ignored contemporary critical and poststructural scholarship on sexual identity. For example, Rich (1980) revealed that the supposedly natural state of heterosexuality functions as a "political institution" (p. 637). Yet few developmental researchers

incorporated Rich's (1980) insight about *compulsory heterosexuality*. With notable exceptions, most research on collegians' sexuality remains firmly rooted in developmental perspectives (Renn, 2015). Critical and poststructural theories, however, offer crucial insights into sexual identity.

In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of developmental theories and their limitations. I then discuss sexual identity formation using key concepts from critical and poststructural paradigms, concluding with implications for practice.

Terminology

Sexual orientation as used in the developmental literature refers to "the preponderance of sexual or erotic feelings, thoughts, fantasies, and/or behaviors one has for members of one sex or the other, both, or neither" (Savin-Williams, 1998, p. 3). *Orientation* suggests an innate, inner drive. Most developmental theorists consider orientation to be relatively unchangeable (Savin-Williams, 1998). Orientation is a psychological construct, critiqued by poststructural and critical scholarship.

As used in developmental research, sexual identity "represents an enduring self-recognition of the meanings that sexual feelings, attractions, and behaviors have for one's sense of self" (Savin-Williams, 1998, p. 3). *Sexual identity* reflects the predominant language in critical and poststructural scholarship but finds a somewhat different meaning there. In this literature, to claim a sexual identity means to associate oneself with a term (such as gay or straight) that has a certain meaning within a particular historical, social, and political context that may not be associated with one's inner life. Halperin (2012) remarked how sexual identity categories can actually de-sexualize sexuality by expressing "almost a euphemism, … rather than an erotic subjectivity or a sexual behavior" (p. 75).

Poststructural and some critical scholars distinguish between the way people socially position themselves, sexual cultural practices, and sexual feelings and dispositions. A person might identify as heterosexual but may indulge same-sex fantasies or engage in same-sex sexual practices sometimes. Such feelings or behaviors do not indicate that such a person is "actually" bisexual or "in denial," but rather demonstrate the inadequacy of sexual identity categories to describe the constellation of individuals' erotic attachments, desires, and practices (Butler, 1990, 2006; Dilley, 2005). Furthermore, many identity categories rely on binary distinctions that support heterosexuality as the default (and preferred) sexuality (Sedgwick, 1990). Critical and poststructural perspectives work to destabilize heterosexual naturalness. Because this chapter examines critical and poststructural theories, I chose *formation* to distinguish from psychological development and to highlight the multiple forces that form our sexual identities.

When appropriate, I use identity-specific terminology (for example, lesbian, bisexual). Yet, identity labels carry with them raced, classed, and other cultural meanings (Stewart & Howard-Hamilton, 2015). Therefore, a label such as *gay* is inappropriate for many students based on their other identities. In my best attempt to use an encompassing term, I choose *queer*. *Queer*, once a slur, enjoys reclaimed use by some (Cawthon & Guthrie, 2011). Although imperfect, *queer* refers to many different sexual identities, desires, and practices marginalized or erased by heterosexual society (Renn, 2015).

Developmental Theories of Sexual Orientation Identity Development

Substantial overviews of the various developmental models and theories of sexual orientation identity abound (for example, Bilodeau & Renn, 2005; Cawthon & Guthrie, 2011); I only briefly address them here. Cass (1979) and Troiden (1979) provided some of the first models of positive homosexual identity development. Into the next decades, others built on those theories. Savin-Williams (1998) offered developmental trajectories for young gay men. McCarn and Fassinger (1996) addressed racial dynamics and lesbian identity and distinguished between individual and group member identity. Fassinger and Miller (1997) applied these ideas to gay men.

D'Augelli (1994) significantly reconceptualized gay, lesbian, and bisexual identity development by emphasizing the cultural context and the dynamics of identity processes. Stevens (2004) offered one of the few models that explicitly accounts for the college environment in the development of gay college men. Dilley (2005, 2010), recognizing the limits of identity categories, developed a typology of nonheterosexual college men. Research on bisexual identity development is lacking (Dugan & Yurman, 2011).

Reflective of its dominant status, investigation of heterosexual identity development began much later. Worthington, Savoy, Dillon, and Vernaglia (2002) provided a complex picture of the factors affecting the development of a heterosexual identity. Since then, research has expanded to consider variations of heterosexual identity (Morgan, 2012; Thompson & Morgan, 2008).

These developmental models offer one theoretical lens for how students form sexual identities. Although many were important for their time, new research broadens developmental understandings of sexual identity. I now examine these theories' limits.

Limitations of Developmental Theory

Significant issues exist with the continued use of stage theories and developmental models found in student affairs sexual identity research. Rhoades

(1997) argued that developmental theory sacrifices complexity in favor of "universal explanations" of sexual identity (p. 477). For example, many developmental models fail to account for intersections of identities (for example, race, gender, ability, class) in relationship to sexual identity (Renn, 2015). Furthermore, much of the research used today is dated, with questionable relevance to our current historical context. These theories and models do not account for historical, cultural, and social forces that change constructions and understandings of sexual identity (Abes, 2007; Abes & Kasch, 2007).

As noted, most of these theories presuppose heterosexuality as a default state from which homosexual identity diverges. Even current research on heterosexuality invents new variations of heterosexuality rather than questioning the *category* of heterosexual. These practices tacitly position heterosexuality as more natural and less constructed than other sexual identities (Dilley, 2005).

Finally, developmental theory springs from psychological frameworks that presuppose a singular, core self outside of historical context or social location (Dilley, 2005; Winkle-Wagner, 2012). Critical and poststructural theorists have compellingly challenged the notion of an enduring, presocial (that is, essentialist) self. Furthermore, psychology has long been used to pathologize queer people (Halperin, 2007). The assumptions of developmental theory too readily lead to labeling students as immature, dysfunctional, or unhealthy (Halperin, 2007; Rhoads, 1997; Winkle-Wagner, 2012).

Some issues with developmental theory lie less with the models themselves than how practitioners understand and apply them. Being informed about critical and poststructural perspectives helps educators be nuanced in their understanding and judicious in their application of developmental theories.

Critical and Poststructural Frameworks on Sexuality

Critical and poststructural paradigms offer ways of understanding sexual identity formation within historical, cultural, and social power dynamics that resist normalized notions of sexuality. Feminist, feminist of color, poststructural feminist, queer, crip, quare, and queer of color scholars have produced compelling work on sexual identity. Some of these perspectives distinguish between sex, gender, sexuality, and sexual identity, whereas others collapse some of these categories (such as sex/gender) or see these terms as more closely intertwined. I provide an overview of their divergences and convergences.

Feminism. Feminism is scholarship concerned with the subordination of women (Halley, 2006). A primary concern of feminism has been men's sexual dominance over women, justifying sexual violence and limiting women's expressions of sexuality (Halley, 2006). Later feminist thought

(such as Rubin 1984, 2011) differentiates between sexuality and gender oppression, but many feminists still connect these concepts in women's subordination.

Intersectionality. Many feminists of color objected to the lack of race and class analysis in feminist thought, giving rise to intersectionality (Collins, 2005). Intersectional perspectives "view race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and age, among others as mutually constructing systems of power" (Collins, 2005, p. 11) That is, various forms of oppression such as sexism, racism, and heterosexism are interconnected, define, and perpetuate each other. Although often not recognized, the intersectional works of Lorde and Anzaldúa—among others—articulated concepts found later in queer theory (Hames-García, 2011). Among their many interests, Lorde and Anzaldúa explored the lives of lesbian women of color. Anzaldúa (2012) described her personhood as *la mestiza,* the borderland dweller who develops a consciousness that breaks down dualities. She also described a new developmental path called *conocimiento* that traces a cyclical journey of personal and social awareness expansion (Anzaldúa, 2002).

Intersectionality challenges educators to see how students live multifaceted lives and encounter oppression—or enjoy privilege—in different aspects of their lives. For instance, Black queer students may feel excluded from Black heterosexual spaces and also from White queer spaces. Higher education scholars increasingly use intersectionality to understand college student populations. Harris (2003) applied intersectionality to discuss "the double (and sometimes multiple) burden that Black male homosexuals face at PWCUs [primarily White colleges and universities]" (p. 49). Patton and Simmons (2008) drew on Lorde in their analysis of Black lesbian students' management of multiple identities at a historically Black college or university (HBCU). Abes (2012) employed intersectional and developmental analyses with one of her lesbian participants. Abes (2012) found intersectionality better considered lived experience *and* power dynamics than queer theory.

Poststructuralism. Poststructuralism argues that the complex interworking of cultural, social, and institutional relationships determine how people can self-identify in socially recognized and validated ways (Namaste, 1996). A web of social structures determines how we understand ourselves (Namaste, 1996). Poststructuralism emphasizes how individuals and social structures (for example, governmental, educational, and scientific institutions) use language, symbols, and other forms of representation to exercise power (or, discourse, Seidman, 2008). Discourse makes possible but also limits and excludes various kinds of identities.

A current example of the exercise of discourse is the success of certain organizations reframing same-sex marriage as the primary concern of gay and lesbian politics (Warner, 1999). Recently, the Supreme Court of the United States legalized same-sex marriage. The discourse used by same-sex marriage activists, echoed in Justice Kennedy's opinion, demands access

to marriage through homosexual gay and lesbian identities and practices that reproduce heterosexual norms and values (that is, homonormativity, Duggan, 2003). Although many gay and lesbian collegians feel affirmed by this discourse, and possess self-concepts aligned with heterosexual norms, students whose sexual identities and practices are queer(er) may find themselves delegitimized and excluded. In short, certain gay and lesbian identities and relationships have been affirmed; other sexual identities and relationships remain invalidated and may be pushed further to the margins.

Poststructural Feminism and Queer Theory. Poststructural feminism departs from feminism by questioning the presumption of a universal woman and the assumptions of feminism (Alcoff, 1988). This questioning of gender has implications for how sexual identity forms. For instance, how might educators serve and support the sexual identity formation of students who do not fit conventional ideals of womanhood?

Queer theory has roots in poststructural feminism (Halley, 2006; Turner, 2000). Queer theory also emerged from other disciplines and queer and AIDS activism (Berlant & Warner, 1995). Scholars working under the umbrella of queer theory generally share an interest in the interplay between the domains of "politics, desire, gender, sexuality, representation" (Turner, 2000, p. 4). In particular, queer theorists typically critique sexual and gender norms and identity (Wiegman & Wilson, 2015).

Queer of color critique examines how race, class, and sexuality are interlocked (Cohen, 2005). Johnson (2005) named Black queer of color critique *quare theory* after his grandmother's pronunciation of "queer." However, scholars of many races contribute to queer of color commentary (Hames-García, 2011). Another response to queer theory is *crip theory*, an examination of sexual identity and disability (McRuer, 2006).

Poststructuralism remains an underused paradigm in higher education research on sexual identities. Narui (2011), however, provided a Foucauldian analysis of Asian American gay, lesbian, and bisexual college students' sexual identity. Narui's (2011) participants dealt with multiple, interlocking discourses about bisexuality, homosexuality, and Asian Americans.

Abes (2007, 2009) and Abes and Kasch (2007) queered their analysis of lesbian college students' identity to account for heterosexual oppression in development. Jones, Abes, and Kasch (2013) reconceptualized the Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity (MMDI) using queer theory, leading to the queered MMDI (Q-MMDI). The Q-MMDI provides a visual for understanding how queer theory radically alters developmental theory. Denton (2014) used queer theory to frame his study of gay college men living with HIV and Foucauldian concepts to describe participants' strategies for navigating homophobia and HIV stigma. Means and Jaeger (2013) used quare theory to understand Black gay male collegians' experiences at HBCUs. These students' narratives challenge White-centric notions of liberation and "coming out" (Means & Jaeger, 2013). Additionally, Means and Jaeger (2015) applied

constructivist and quare theory analysis to one Black gay male student's negotiation of spiritual and sexual identities.

Important Critical and Poststructural Perspectives on Sexual Identity Formation

Having explained critical and poststructural perspectives, I present key concepts from these lines of inquiry regarding sexual identity formation. Many of these concepts stem from multiple theoretical perspectives (for example, feminist *and* queer).

The Social Construction of Sexuality. Perhaps the most fundamental concept among critical and poststructural theorists is that society impacts sexual identification. Although sexual desires and attractions might exist beyond consciousness, the ways in which we conceptualize and categorize our desires, attractions, and behaviors stem from social institutions. A prime example is this chapter: this work exists because many educators believe that sexual identity is an important facet of modern student life. Additionally, this chapter influences how educators understand sexual identity.

Foucault's History of Sexuality. Foucault noted that Western society has made sexuality a fundamental aspect of our self-understanding. Foucault (1990) explained how mid-19th-century concerns about sexual behaviors and practices led to the creation of *scientia sexualis*, or science of sex, and certain sexual categories. This science of sex resulted in exhaustive surveillance of—and discourse about—sex. Heterosexuals began to monitor their families for healthy sexual behaviors. Identity categories including *the homosexual* were created. Thus, from Foucault's (1990) point of view, processes of "coming out" do not fight power by expressing a personal truth, but participate in powerful institutional discourses.

Nonetheless, the category of *homosexual*, although originally considered pathological and criminal, created an identity through which people could assert themselves in previously unavailable ways. Developmental theories exemplify this tension. They contributed to important discourses asserting nonpathological gay and lesbian identity but tacitly codified heterosexuality as the default norm, beyond identity.

The Construction of Heterosexuality. Following in Foucault's thought, Sedgwick (1990) established that many conceptualizations of sexual identity support heterosexuality as the dominant sexual identity. Heterosexuality cannot exist without homosexuality to define it; yet the existence of homosexuality threatens the stability of heterosexuality (Sedgwick, 1990). Heterosexuality seems natural and normal, but operates as cultural norms based on gender binaries, reproduction, and romantic love (or *heteronormativity*, Berlant & Warner, 1998). Directors of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) centers face heteronormativity when superiors demand, sometimes through job threats, that LGBT advocacy remain discreet

or nonthreatening to heterosexuals. This suppression may make queer students feel unsafe to express their identity.

Gender and Sexual Identity. Important distinctions exist among gender, sex, sex acts, and sexual desire (Rubin, 1984, 2011). Yet these differences, as well as a concept of multiple genders, often go unexamined in developmental theory. Judith Butler's work destabilizing gender has strong implications for sexual identity. Butler (1990/2006) observed that gender identities that do not align along normative sex-gender lines remain unrecognized. Despite cultural beliefs that sex (genitalia) make gender (being a man or woman), gender is an unstable construct not linked to sex (Butler, 1990, 2006). For Butler (1990, 2006), gender is performative. Different from a *performance*, or something acted consciously, *performativity* means that people create gender through "a *stylized repetition of acts*" every day, often without thought (Butler, 1990, 2006, p. 191). Or as Butler explained, "we act and walk and speak and talk in ways that consolidate an impression of being a man or being a woman" (Big Think, 2011). These gender-constituting acts are arbitrarily defined by society and never performed perfectly or repeated exactly. Thus, gender is inherently unstable.

If sexuality involves desiring a person of a certain gender, then destabilized gender erodes the homo/heterosexual binary. Sexual acts, desires, and identities begin to proliferate with the destabilization of gender (Turner, 2000). Development theories assume a straight line of sex-gender-desire-action and fail to account for variation at any of these points. Students' gender identities and desire for certain genders may not correspond with assumed sexual identities. With this understanding, educators can create inclusive spaces and refrain from judgments about students' "true" sexual identities based on norms about sexuality and gender.

Sexual and Racial Identity. Most sexual identity development theories fail to consider racial identity. However, in the United States, discourses of sexuality and race have long worked together to maintain heterosexual and White supremacy. Concerns in early scientific texts about interracial sex and procreation (that is, miscegenation) accompanied concerns about "deviant" sexuality (Somerville, 2000). Both miscegenation and homosexuality were "characterized as ultimately harmful to the nation" (Dunning, 2009, p. 10). Conversely, although improving the lives of many Black people, Black Nationalism and the Black Arts Movement rendered "queer sexuality as a 'white disease'" (Dunning, 2009, p. 7). Caught among lines of racism from White people and homophobia in their own communities, Black gays and lesbians have developed strategies to resist oppression (Dunning, 2009; Johnson, 2004).

Race and sexuality are not limited to White/Black dynamics. Shah (2003) explored discourses equating Chinese immigrants with sexual diseases and deviance. Muñoz (1999) articulated the cultural practices of queers of color to navigate the "cultural logics of heteronormativity, White supremacy, and misogyny" in his concept of *disidentification* (p. 5). To

disidentify is neither to identify with available cultural discourses of identity nor to counteridentify, or oppose them. Disidentification tries to make the shamed aspects of the self "sexy and glamorous" (Muñoz, 1999, p. 3). Although scholars have contributed to an understanding of race and sexual identity in college students, more research is needed. Campus cultures around race and sexuality affect the way students feel comfortable identifying or feel safe to explore their identities. Educators can shape those dynamics and support students on the margins of campus cultures.

Sexuality and Disability. Sexual identity developmental theories typically suppose able-bodied students. However, McRuer's (2006) theorization of *compulsory able-bodiedness* explained that heterosexuality and able-bodied identity are "simultaneously the ground on which all identities supposedly rest" (p. 9). Society demands that citizens conceal disability to be considered productive members of the labor force and place similar covering demands on queer sexual identities. Yet ability, like sexuality and gender, is unstable; many fail the dictates of able-bodiedness.

A clear implication from this line of thought is we rarely consider the sexuality of students with disabilities or the disabilities of queer students. Students are often presumed as fully able bodied or heterosexual. Educators can question the demands placed on students to conform to normative ideas about sexual identity and ability. Furthermore, questioning unexamined moral judgments and stigmatizing beliefs about illness and certain sexual identities may lead to changes in our approaches to students.

Implications for Practice

Translating these concepts into practice is challenging; however, many of them emerged from social change movements. I offer some possible applications. Question language and assumptions made in programs, organizations, and surveys about how students' sexualities and identities align. When advising students, help them make meaning of their own sexual self-concept rather than fitting them into an identity. Educators often discuss promoting healthy sexuality, but *healthy* frequently smuggles in heteronormative values and judgments (Halperin, 2007). Instead, assist students in developing their own sexual ethic and support students engaging in consensual but marginalized sexual practices, such as sex work.

Professionals can examine how spaces, policies, and programs promote heteronormative culture. Create spaces for students to discuss sexuality and sexual practices openly, reserving judgment. As mentioned previously, advocates—and anyone initiating reform—may face resistance ranging from indifference to hostility. Coalitions of knowledgeable and supportive faculty, staff, alumni, and community organizations are necessary to dismantle oppressive campus environments for students of diverse sexual identities.

Conclusion

Complex social conditions affect collegians' sexual identity in affirming and oppressive ways. Educators can use the concepts presented here to inform the creation and assessment of institutional policies, environments, and curricula and to view student identity differently (Renn, 2015). Researchers of collegians' sexual identities increasingly use critical theories, but developmental studies remain prevalent. I echo earlier calls encouraging more complex study of sexual identities and how these theories are applied in student affairs practice (Abes, 2007; Rhoads, 1997).

References

Abes, E. S. (2007). Applying queer theory in practice with college students: Transformation of a researcher's and participant's perspectives on identity, a case study. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *5*(1), 57–77.

Abes, E. S. (2009). Theoretical borderlands: Using multiple theoretical perspectives to challenge inequitable power structures in student development theory. *Journal of College Student Development*, *50*, 141–156.

Abes, E. S. (2012). Constructivist and intersectional interpretations of a lesbian college student's multiple social identities. *Journal of Higher Education*, *83*(2), 186–216.

Abes, E. S., & Kasch, D. (2007). Using queer theory to explore lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*, *48*, 619–636.

Alcoff, L. (1988). Cultural feminism versus post-structuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *13*(3), 405–436.

Anzaldúa, G. (2002). Now let us shift … the path of conocimiento … inner work, public acts. In G. Anzaldúa & A. Keating (Eds.), *This bridge we call home: radical visions for transformation* (pp. 540–578). New York: Routledge.

Anzaldúa, G. (2012). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: San Lute Books.

Bailey, B. (1999). *Sex in the heartland.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Berlant, L., & Warner, M. (1995). What does queer theory teach us about X? *PMLA*, *110*, 343–349.

Berlant, L., & Warner, M. (1998). Sex in public. *Critical Inquiry*, *24*, 547–566.

Big Think. (2011, June 6). *Judith Butler: Your behavior creates your gender* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/Bo7o2LYATDc.

Bilodeau, B. L., & Renn, K. A. (2005). Analysis of LGBT identity development models and implications for practice. In R. L. Sanlo (Ed.), *New Directions for Student Services: No. 111. Gender identity and sexual orientation: Research, policy, and personal perspectives:* (pp. 25–39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2006). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity* (Routledge classics series). New York: Routledge.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *4*(3), 219–235.

Cawthon, T., & Guthrie, V. (2011). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students. In M. J. Cuyjet, M. F. Howard-Hamilton, & D. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Multiculturalism on campus: Theories, models, and practices for understanding diversity and creating inclusion* (pp. 291–326). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Cohen, C. J. (2005). Punks, bulldaggers, and welfare queens: The radical potential of queer politics? In E. P. Johnson, & M. G. Henderson (Eds.), *Black queer studies: A critical anthology* (pp. 21–51). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Collins, P. H. (2005). *Black sexual politics: African Americans, gender, and the new racism*. New York: Routledge.
D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of lesbian, gay, and bisexual identity development. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives on people in context* (pp. 312–333). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Denton, J. M. (2014). *Beyond identity: Gay college men living with HIV*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Miami University, Oxford, OH.
Dilley, P. (2002). *Queer man on campus: A history of non-heterosexual college men, 1945–2000*. New York: RoutledgeFarmer.
Dilley, P. (2005). Which way out? A typology of non-heterosexual male collegiate identities. *Journal of Higher Education*, *76*(1), 56–88.
Dilley, P. (2010). New century, new identities: Building on a typology of nonheterosexual college men. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, *7*, 186–199.
Dugan, J. P., & Yurman, L. (2011). Commonalities and differences among college gay, lesbian, and bisexual students: Considerations for research and practice. *Journal of College Student Development*, *52*, 201–216.
Duggan, L. (2003). *The twilight of equality?: Neoliberalism, cultural politics, and the attack on democracy*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Dunning, S. K. (2009). *Queer in black and white: Interraciality, same sex desire, and contemporary African-American culture*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Fassinger, R. E., & Miller, B. A. (1997). Validation of an inclusive model of homosexual identity formation in a sample of gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *32*(2), 53–78.
Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.
Halley, J. (2006). *Split decisions: How and why to take a break from feminism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Halperin. D. M. (2007). *What do gay men want? An essay on sex, risk, and subjectivity*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
Halperin, D. M. (2012). *How to be gay*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
Hames-García, M. (2011). Queer theory revisited. In M. Hames-García & E. J. Martínez (Eds.), *Gay Latino studies: A critical reader* (pp. 19–45). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Harris, W. G. (2003). African American homosexual males on predominantly White college and university campuses. *Journal of African American Studies*, *7*(1), 47–56.
Holland, D. C., & Eisenhart, M. A. (1990). *Educated in romance: Women, achievement and college culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
Johnson, E. P. (2004). Mother knows best: Black gay vernacular and transgressive domestic space. In W. L. Leap & T. Boellstorff (Eds.), *Speaking in queer tongues: Globalization and gay language* (pp. 251–278). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Johnson, E. P. (2005). "Quare" studies, or (almost) everything I know about queer studies I learned from my grandmother. In E. P. Johnson & M. G. Henderson (Eds.), *Black queer studies* (pp. 124–157). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Jones, S. R., Abes, E. S., & Kasch, D. (2013). Queer theory. In S. R. Jones & E. S. Abes, *Identity development of college students: Advancing frameworks for multiple dimensions of identity* (pp. 191–212). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Marine, S. B. (2011). *Stonewall's legacy: Bisexual, gay, lesbian, and transgender students in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
McCarn, S. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Revisioning sexual minority identity formation: A new model of lesbian identity and its implications for counseling and research. *Counseling Psychologist*, *24*, 508–534.

McRuer, R. (2006). *Crip theory: Cultural signs of queerness and disability*. New York: New York University Press.
Means, D. R., & Jaeger, A. J. (2013). Black in the rainbow? "Quaring" the black gay male student experience at historically black universities. *Journal of African American Males in Education*, *4*(2), 124–140.
Means, D. R., & Jaeger, A. J. (2015). Spiritual borderlands: A black gay male college student's spiritual journey. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *52*(1), 11–23.
Morgan, E. M. (2012). Not always a straight path: College students' narratives of heterosexual identity development. *Sex Roles*, *66*, 79–93.
Muñoz, J. E. (1999). *Disidentifications: Queers of color and the performance of politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
Namaste, K. (1996). The politics of inside/out: Queer theory, poststructuralism, and a sociological approach to sexuality. In S. Seidman (Ed.), *Queer theory/sociology* (pp. 194–212). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
Narui, M. (2011). Understanding Asian/American gay, lesbian, and bisexual experiences from a poststructural perspective. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*(9), 1211–1234.
Patton, L. D., & Simmons, S. L. (2008). Exploring complexities of multiple identities of lesbians in a Black college environment. *Negro Educational Review*, *59*, 197–215.
Renn, K. A. (2015). Higher education. In G. L. Wimberly (Ed.), *LGBTQ issues in education: Advancing a research agenda* (pp. 141–159). Washington, DC: AERA.
Rhoads, R. A. (1997). A subcultural study of gay and bisexual college males: Resisting developmental inclinations. *Journal of Higher Education*, *68*(4), 460–382.
Rich, A. (1980). Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs*, *5*(4), 631–660.
Rubin, G. S. (1984). Thinking sex. In C. S. Vance (Ed.), *Pleasure and danger: Exploring female sexuality* (pp. 143–178). Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Rubin, G. S. (2011). Thinking sex. In G. S. Rubin (Ed.), *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin reader* (pp. 137–181). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Savin-Williams, R. C. (1998). *And then I became gay: Young men's stories*. New York: Routledge.
Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Seidman, S. (2008). *Contested knowledge: Social theory today* (4th ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Shah, N. (2003). Perversity, contamination, and the dangers of queer domesticity. In R. J. Corder & S. Valocchi (Eds.), *Queer studies: An interdisciplinary reader* (pp. 121–141). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
Somerville, S. B. (2000). *Queering the color line: Race and the invention of homosexuality in American culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Stevens, R. A. (2004). Understanding gay identity development within the college environment. *Journal of College Student Development*, *45*, 185–206.
Stewart, D. L., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2015). Engaging lesbian, gay, and bisexual students on college campuses. In S. J. Quaye & S. R. Harper (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 121–134). New York: Routledge.
Thompson, E. M., & Morgan, E. M. (2008). "Mostly straight" young women: Variations in sexual behavior and identity development. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*(1), 15–21.
Troiden, R. R. (1979). Becoming homosexual: A model of gay identity acquisition. *Psychiatry*, *42*, 362–373.
Turner, W. (2000). *A genealogy of queer theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Warner, M. (1999). *The trouble with normal: Sex, politics, and the ethics of queer life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wiegman, R. & Wilson, E. A. (2015). Introduction: Antinormativity's queer conventions. *Differences*, *26*(1), 1–25.

Winkle-Wagner, R. (2012). Self, college experiences, and society: Rethinking the theoretical foundations of student development theory. *College Student Affairs Journal*, *30*(2), 45–60.

Worthington, R. L., Savoy, H. B., Dillon, F. R., & Vernaglia, E. R. (2002). Heterosexual identity development: A multidimensional model of individual and social identity. *Counseling Psychologist*, *30*, 496–531.

J. MICHAEL DENTON is the program coordinator and an instructor for the college student affairs program at the University of South Florida.

Copyright of New Directions for Student Services is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.