The Discourses of Homosexuality in the Police.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts
in Psychology at
Massey University.

Angelique C. Praat.

1994

The present study examined the discourses of homosexuality in the police, using the discourse analytic method developed by Potter and Wetherell (1987). The study asked how police officers constructed gay men using their discourses and why gay men should or should not be employed by the police. Eight police officers were interviewed. Analysis revealed officers drew on three distinct discourses to construct gay men. The effeminate discourse associated homosexuals with effeminate behaviours. The deviant discourse associated homosexuals with behaviours that are morally and legally proscribed, and the discourse of conditional acceptance was used by officers to positively present, while voicing reservations about homosexuals. These discourses formed the linguistic resources officers used to construct types of homosexuals that were subsequently rejected as potential police officers. Several arguments were used to justify the conclusion that homosexuals were unsuited to the police. These related to the internal and external pressures impinging on the department, with regard to the employment of homosexuals. The implications of the discourses are discussed with reference to gay men, the police and the ideologies of heterosexism and gender.

Foreword

Since the early 1960's gay men and lesbians have been active in their pursuit of civil rights in New Zealand. My interest in issues relating to homosexuality stems from a broader concern with the areas of social justice and sexuality, and a curiosity regarding the heterosexual response to homosexuality. This response was a much published phenomenon during the production of my thesis, a result of the proposed amendment to the Human Rights Act of 1977, which sought to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The police were chosen as the focus of the research, partly because of the vociferous opposition to the proposed law changes registered by the Minister of Police, and partly because the traditional stereotypes of the police and gay men stand in direct contrast to each other. How were officers making sense of the very public debate regarding the employment of homosexuals by the police, and other issues connected to homosexuality?

Discourse analysis offered an alternative to the traditional social psychological approaches to the study of attitudes and prejudice. In exploring police responses to homosexuality, discourse analysis allowed a detailed examination of the complex accounts officers constructed in explanation of a variety of issues related to homosexuality. At times it was difficult to embrace the discursive framework, which largely stands in opposition to the quantitative methodologies in which I was firmly entrenched, however, the experience has been a positive one.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to my supervisor Keith, who supported and challenged me throughout the production of this thesis, and gave me confidence in my work. Thanks also to Kit, Jen and Wanda for their invaluable friendship and help along the way.

I would like to thank the members of the New Zealand Police who participated in this study, especially the officer who was instrumental in locating interviewees. Without their cooperation this thesis would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (continued)

Table of Contents (continued)

Table of Contents (continued)

I. INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The homosexual community has long been the object of institutional, moral and social castigation and discrimination. With the demedicalisation of homosexuality in psychology and psychiatry in the early 1970's (Conger, 1975), research in this area has increasingly centred on the study of attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. The present study takes a new look at this area, investigating how the language used by a small number of police officers describes and evaluates homosexuals. The emphasis is on a fine-grained analysis of language use in a specific social and political context, rather than the production of analytic conclusions that may be generalised to an entire population.

This chapter provides an overview of the empirical research and theory relating to attitudes toward homosexuals. The assumptions inherent in traditional attitudinal and cognitive research are challenged using arguments from discursive perspectives, and two studies sharing similar methodological and theoretical qualities with the present study are discussed. Finally, the social and legal backgrounds of the current study are presented.

Previous research has focused on attitudes toward homosexuals. Researchers have concentrated on attaining a numerical index of the degree of 'homophobia', and have correlated this index with a range of psychological, demographic and social variables hypothesised to be significant in explaining the differences in opinion regarding homosexuals. There are several problems and discrepancies within this body of research and these will be discussed following a brief review of the literature.

Attitudinal Research

Psychological Variables

A traditional sex role orientation has consistently been associated with negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Hansen, 1982; Kurdek, 1988; Lieblich & Friedman, 1985; McDonald & Games, 1974; McDonald, Huggins, Young & Swanson, 1972; Stark, 1991; Whitely, 1987). A common explanation of this finding is the negative attitudes are a response to behaviour that is seen to threaten the traditional sex role structure. The negative response stems from the belief that gay men are feminine and lesbians are masculine and therefore challenge traditional sex roles (McDonald, Huggins, Young & Swanson, 1972). Condemnation of homosexuality is thus used as a tool to maintain gender conformity.

Related to sex role orientation is the concept of psychological androgyny, which refers to a person's self-definition as masculine, feminine or androgynous. Researchers report mixed results regarding the relationship between psychological androgyny and attitudes toward homosexuality. Hansen (1982) and Kurdek (1988) found no relationship between psychological androgyny in men and attitudes toward homosexuals, while self-defined feminine women exhibited more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than other women. In contrast, Whitley (1987) found less masculine men and less masculine women had less negative attitudes toward homosexuals than their study counterparts. It seems that beliefs about sex roles (sex role orientation) are a better indicator of negative attitudes toward homosexuality than personal adherence to a specific gender role (psychological androgyny).

Less negative attitudes toward homosexuality have also been associated with a liberal attitude to sexual behaviours (Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Nyberg & Alston, 1976/77; Smith, 1971). Negativity toward homosexuality has been seen as part of a generally conservative attitude to sexuality (Church, 1967 in Ficarrotto, 1990; Nyberg & Alston, 1976/77). Finally, a negative correlation has been found to exist between an

authoritarian personality and homosexuality (Larsen, Reed & Hoffman, 1980; McDonald & Games, 1974; Smith, 1971).

Demographic Variables

Findings have been mixed regarding age and homosexuality. Some researchers report that younger people are more tolerant of homosexuals (Bowman, 1983; Hong, 1984; Irwin & Thompson, 1978; Jensen, Gambles & Olsen, 1988) while others report that younger people are more intolerant (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Kurdek, 1988; Whitley, 1987). Levitt and Klassen (1974) found age was not a significant factor in attitudes toward homosexuals. These findings become less anomalous when one considers the range of subjects' ages in these studies. Those researchers reporting greater tolerance among young people, have typically used a public survey encompassing a wide age range on which to base their conclusions, while those reporting older subjects as more tolerant have used a college population where the spread of ages lies between 18 to 24 years. In the latter case the difference in attitudes may be better attributed to time spent in college where exposure to liberal ideas and the chance to meet homosexual people may be greater (Whitley, 1987).

Level of education obtained and tolerance for homosexuals have shown a consistent positive correlation in a number of studies (Bowman, 1983; Hong, 1983, 1984; Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Irwin & Thompson, 1978; Jensen, Gambles & Olsen, 1988; Nyberg & Alston 1976/77). Irwin and Thompson (1978) explain this finding with reference to research that points to the importance of education for the development of liberal attitudes.

People who come from or live in small towns or rural areas exhibit less tolerance of homosexuals than do people coming from larger centres (Irwin & Thompson, 1978; Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Nyberg & Alston, 1976/77; Stephan & McMullin, 1982). This finding is consistent with research demonstrating that people who live in large urban areas, hold generally more liberal attitudes to behaviour that may be considered as deviating from the norm (Stephan & McMullin, 1982). In examining the evidence

regarding education, city size and attitudes toward homosexuals, Nyberg and Alston (1976/76) suggest that liberal attitudes are a function of one's social environment, rather than a function of one's generation or age. The influence of social environment is further demonstrated in the finding that people who believe their peers hold positive attitudes to homosexuality are also likely to espouse positive attitudes (Larsen et al, 1980).

Several studies have shown men to be more negative in their attitudes toward homosexuals than women (Hansen, 1982; Hong, 1983,1984; Kite, 1984; Kurdek, 1988; Larsen, Reed & Hoffman, 1980; Lieblich & Friedman, 1985; Maret, 1984; Stark, 1991). This finding maybe explained in terms of the way society puts more pressure on men than women to conform to established sex role norms. Thus men are more likely to rebuke non-heterosexual behaviour because it is seen as an aberration of traditional sex roles (Lieblich & Amia, 1985; Stark, 1991). Other studies have found no sex differences in relation to attitudes toward homosexuals (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Irwin & Thompson, 1978; Jensen, Gambles & Olsen, 1988; Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Nyberg & Alston, 1976/77). In a meta-analytic review of the literature regarding sex differences, Kite (1984) found that the observed sex difference decreased as sample size increased indicating that obtained sex differences may be biased by sampling error.

Social Variables

Having contact with or knowing a homosexual has been consistently positively correlated with tolerance of homosexuals (Bowman, 1983; Duncan, 1988; Gentry, 1987; Hansen, 1982; Lance, 1987; Pagtolun-An & Clair, 1986). In explanation of this finding, Lance (1987) and Herek (1984a) suggest that contact with homosexuals breaks down the previously held negative cultural stereotypes of homosexuals, leading to a more positive evaluation of, and increased comfort with homosexuals.

Another consistent finding is the influence of religiosity on attitudes towards homosexuals. Generally, people who have some degree of religious affiliation are more likely to hold negative attitudes towards homosexuals. This is seen as a result of

Christianity's proscriptiveness regarding homosexuality, based on interpretation of various Bible passages (Bowman, 1983; Gentry, 1987; Hong, 1983,1984; Jensen et al, 1988; Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Maret, 1984; Nyberg & Alston, 1976/77)

Problems

Although the research does allow some general conclusions to be drawn about attitudes toward homosexuality and homosexuals, this area is not without problems. From a quantitative perspective, the study of prejudice against homosexuals has been criticised on both methodological and definitional levels. Kite (1984) and Kite and Deaux (1986) assert the advancement of research into attitudes towards homosexuals and homosexuality has been hindered by the absence of an adequately developed measuring instrument with demonstrated validity. Specifically, they note some authors have used only one item to obtain a subjects response to homosexuality while others have used scales including a number of items. It seems unlikely that these authors are measuring the same constructs given this variation. An examination of the literature discussed above bears out this criticism. Six studies of the twenty three examined used one item to assess a subjects approval or agreement with homosexuality. This was the most common form of assessment followed by the use of the index of homophobia (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980), a multi-item scale developed to measure affective responses to homosexuals. Kite & Deaux (1986) assert that instruments have been used with little regard for their validity or establishing continuity within the field.

Further criticisms relate to the content of the measurement scales. Different scales tap one or more of the affective, cognitive and attitudinal responses to homosexuality. This is seen by some authors to reduce conceptual clarity (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Kite & Deaux, 1986) and lead to faulty conclusions about the nature of attitudes toward homosexuals (Herek, 1984b).

In part these problems may be a reflection of the definitional crises evident in this research area. Several terms have been applied to research regarding prejudice against homosexuals, the most popular of these has been 'homophobia' first coined by Weinberg

(1972, cited in Hudson and Ricketts, 1980). He defined homophobia as a dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals. However several authors have recommended that homophobia be dropped as a term defining prejudice against homosexuals for two reasons. Firstly, over time homophobia has been used to refer to any kind of negative response or action directed at homosexuals, and thus its precision has been compromised (Herek, 1984a; Hudson & Ricketts 1980; Fyfe, 1983; Neisen, 1990). Secondly, the 'phobia' part of the word connotes a fear of homosexuals akin to a phobic reaction, that is considered inappropriate as a description of the subject area. Few if any responses to homosexuals may be characterised as phobic in the clinical sense of the word. Responses may be better understood in terms of a social prejudice like that of racism. Thus some authors have introduced the concept of 'heterosexism' to emphasise the social nature of responses to homosexuals (Neisen, 1990; Herek, 1992).

Attitudes and Discourse

In their discussion of attitudes in traditional social psychology, Potter and Wetherell (1987) note the lack of an adequate definition of attitude in the literature. They draw on Mc Guire's (1985: p. 239, cited in Potter and Wetherell, 1987) basic definition: that when people are expressing attitudes they are giving responses which "locate objects of thought on dimensions of judgement". Thus defined Potter and Wetherell (1987) note three major difficulties plaguing traditional attitudinal research. The first relates to the object of thought, or the object of the attitude research. The basic problem lies in the way that people interpret a given definition of a category that they are required to assess. Here Potter and Wetherell are saying that people may have different understandings of the object of research. Thus the attitude analyst, can not be sure that the participants definition of the object, is consistent with his or her own definition, or that participants share a common definition of the object. This inconsistency raises the question- what is being studied and can any reliable conclusions be drawn from such research?

The second difficulty is the way in which data gathered from research participants is transformed into the categories of the analyst. Potter and Wetherell give an example from Marsh's (1976) study of attitudes to immigrants in Britain. Marsh relabelled a dimension running from 'completely sympathetic' to 'completely unsympathetic' to 'very positive' through to 'very hostile'. Potter and Wetherell state that there is no reason to make such a transformation and that the words 'hostile' connote an active disposition to the group, while 'lacks sympathy' connotes a person without an active disposition. The third problematic area is that participants responses are taken by the researcher to indicate the underlying attitude of the participant. The assumption is, that people carry around immutable and enduring categories and evaluations of those categories in their heads. If this was the case one would expect a person to espouse very similar if not the same attitude over a number of occasions. Discourse analysts have found this not to be the case, and explain the variation within a person's account with reference to the functions that the individual is trying to perform. Thus an individual's attitude may vary according to whether he or she is responding to the researchers expectations, or convincing the researcher that he or she is a liberal person for example. Potter and Wetherell (1987) propose that discourse analysis is able to avoid the pitfalls associated with traditional attitudinal research by approaching the study of "attitudes" using a different set of assumptions.

Discourse analysts avoid making the assumption that people share the same understanding of the 'object of thought' or category under evaluation, by focusing on the way individuals actively construct the "object" they are speaking about. Potter and Wetherell (1987) argue that the object of thought and evaluation of the object are virtually impossible to separate meaningfully. This is because in the course of expressing an evaluation, individuals are typically creating the nature of the object. For example, the following was in response to a question asking Carl what he thought about having homosexuals in the police.

> Carl: ...I categorise homosexuals as being, as falling into four categories. One your overt, overtly um dressing up as females ah types. Two the effeminate males... now I'm opposed to homosexuals who perform dressing up as women being part of the police service because I'm quite convinced, that the vast majority of the public will not accept that person...

In this extract, Carl tells us he is opposed to certain types of homosexual being in the police. His evaluation is they are not suited. In the course of giving us his evaluation, Carl has also constructed a certain type of homosexual, built around the suggestion that some homosexuals are cross-dressers and effeminate. Carl has thus constructed the object 'homosexual', in the process of giving his opinion on having them in the police.

Through examining the context in which evaluations are couched, the discourse analyst can avoid making simplistic interpretations, and can focus instead on the action orientation of the individual's speech. From this perspective variation in the account of the individual is expected as she or he constructs a version of reality according to the function of her or his account. The analyst is provided with more information with which to make sense of, and reveal the organisation and function of an individual's account.

The preceding section has described social and demographic variables related to heterosexuals who have participated in empirical studies of attitudes toward homosexuals. The question remains, what are the psychological processes involved in the evaluation of homosexuality and gay people?

I would now like to turn your attention to the theories used to account for prejudice against homosexuals. Cognitive theories will be addressed first followed by two theories based on a functional approach to the study of prejudice which are akin to the model of analysis employed in the present study.

Cognitive Theories of Prejudice

Social Identity Theory

Hamner (1992) draws on social identity theory (Brown & Turner, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) in order to explain why homosexuals are targets of discrimination and violence. Social identity theory holds that individuals derive positive self-esteem through identification with their social ingroups, and the manner in which their ingroups are evaluated compared to other groups (outgroups). Self-esteem is thus acquired through the building up and delineation of an individuals ingroup compared to salient outgroups. A positive ingroup image fosters high ingroup prestige and a concomitant rise in group members self esteem.

The process of distinguishing the ingroup from the outgroup is thought to cause and also result in group conflict. Individuals are treated and responded to as representatives of their groups rather than as individuals, with this trend becoming more prevalent as conflict escalates.

Hamner (1992) contends that social identity theory is useful in explaining several characteristics of anti-gay discrimination and violence. Firstly, social identity theory suggests a possible motivation for discrimination- a desire to increase positive self-esteem. Through the denigration of homosexuals, the perceived status of the attacking ingroup is elevated with a concomitant rise in the self esteem of the perpetrators. Social identity theory also provides an explanation of why homosexuals are targets for discrimination. Hamner asserts that because gays are ascribed very little status as a group in a predominantly heterosexual society, they are a relevant outgroup for all heterosexual groups regardless of that groups social status.

Hamner notes there are several limitations of this theory and offers an improved model of the ingroup-outgroup dynamics based on a synthesis of social identity theory, societal level and individual psychological theories of prejudice. He makes reference to Herek (1992) in suggesting that certain economic and social changes in history have led to the

categorisation of individuals based on their sexual orientation, and stigmatisation of non-heterosexual individuals. The further linkage of sexual orientation with gender roles which provided the stereotypes of gay men as feminine and lesbians as masculine, has meant gay people have a low social standing. They have thus become a relevant outgroup for all heterosexual members of society.

At an individual level Hamner asserts personal factors must be examined to determine the likelihood that an individual would indulge in discriminatory behaviour to elevate his or her self esteem, and degree of identification with the ingroup.

Categorisation and Biocultural Evolution

Mihalik (1991) proposes a model of cognitive and perceptual processing that holds that humans are predisposed to judge each other on an "us-them' descriptive axis- a legacy of our neurobiological evolution. As a result of natural selection these axes have taken on an emotional valence such that "us" has taken on a positive association and "them" a negative one. With the development of the neo-cortex humans have experienced an evolutionary trend towards plasticity of behaviour. The criteria for inclusion in "us-them" categories is therefore no longer dictated solely by genetic relationships, but evaluations are also based on sociocultural considerations. Thus group boundaries are flexible and exist as social representations of reality in the consciousness of the evaluator. Social representations are a product of the neuropsychological processing of the environment and social conditions.

Mihalik asserts that the emotional negativity associated with homosexuals may be characterised either by pity and devaluation or fear and hatred. The former (pity and devaluation) results from the evaluation of homosexuals as having no choice with regard to their sexual orientation, that is they were born homosexual, and being of little threat to society. Holders of these attitudes are referred to as heterosexists and may respond to homosexuals by inhibiting their chances to get ahead in society, as their belief is that they are superior to homosexuals. In contrast those whose emotional negativity is

characterised by fear and hatred, referred to as homophobes, believe that homosexuals are malicious and dangerous. Their response to homosexuals is more likely to be one of active repression. Of the two emotional valences, a homophobic reaction would have more serious consequences for homosexuals and ultimately our sociocultural evolution.

Master Status Theory

Master Status theory holds that a characteristic of a person may become so dominant, that the individual is perceived in terms of the dominant characteristic (Hughes, 1945 cited in Jenks, 1986). With regard to homosexuality, this means that as homosexuals are seen as deviant in their sexual preference, they may subsequently be judged as deviant on other social and psychological dimensions.

In an examination of Master Status Theory, Jenks (1986) tested the hypothesis that homosexuals and atheists are perceived as general deviants in American culture. The comparison groups were Republicans and Catholics. One hundred and forty six white university students answered a 24 item questionnaire that asked them to evaluate the four groups on a number of characteristics, and also canvased their own opinions of various issues. Results of the study indicated that homosexuals and atheists were considered deviant by a vast majority of participants- homosexuals slightly more so. Homosexuals were assessed as belonging to a lower social class, to have a greater need for psychological counselling, to be more liberal, have had more permissive parents and to use drugs more frequently than all other groups. They were also rated as being more dissatisfied with their friends, job and life in general than the non-deviant groups, but not atheists. Jenks (1986) concluded that groups labelled as deviant in one dimension were also seen as deviant in dimensions not related to the dominant dimension.

Support for the proposition that homosexuals are seen to deviate from what is considered normal comes from two studies. These differ from Master Status theory in that a homosexual orientation was not considered deviant per se. However, homosexuals were seen as different in some ways, to heterosexual people. Page and Yee (1985) asked

eighty-five undergraduate students to describe a male and female homosexual adult and a 'normal' adult using 41 adjective rating scales, each of which had a masculine and feminine pole. The adult homosexual male was considered significantly different to the normal adult on 27 of the 41 scales and was viewed less favourably. Lesbians were viewed more favourably than gay men but were rated as significantly different to a normal adult on eleven of the 41 scales. In a study assessing stereotypes of gay men and lesbian women, Kite and Deaux (1987) found subjects believed gay man to be similar to female heterosexuals and lesbians to be similar to male heterosexuals. Thus gay man and lesbian women may be seen to transgress the traditional sex role structures.

The common thread of the cognitive research discussed here, is that homosexuals are categorised as a homogeneous group. Because of the beliefs or cognitions attached to the homosexual category, homosexuals are at the very least regarded as different to heterosexuals, and in the worst case, regarded as inferior and a group deserving punishment and retribution.

Although, there is support for the premise that homosexuals are stereotyped or categorised as different to heterosexuals within cognitive research, some researchers have challenged the hypothesised connection between negative stereotypes or beliefs about homosexuals, and attitudes toward homosexuals. Jackson and Sullivan (1989) examined the role of cognition and affect in evaluations of homosexuals and found that while both factors predicted evaluations of homosexuals to some extent, affect was the stronger predictor. Strangor, Sullivan and Ford (1991) reported similar results from two later studies, and were able to add that among their subjects, personal beliefs were better predictors of a negative attitude toward homosexuals, than consensual culturally shared stereotypes. This research suggests that more than just cognitive processes are at work in the expression of negative attitudes toward homosexuals. It indicates the importance of considering individuals' personal beliefs and feelings about social groups, instead of explaining personal prejudice as a by product of identification with a larger social group.

Potter and Wetherell (1987) further criticise the assumptions of cognitive research and its predominance in explanations of prejudice.

Categories and Discourse

Potter and Wetherell (1987:120) criticise traditional categorisation research for difficulties that they see arising from three problematic basic assumptions regarding the process of categorisation, and the failure of researchers to consider "categorisation as a social practice involving certain sorts of language use".

The first of these assumptions is the inevitability of biased categorisation. According to categorisation theorists, distorted stereotypes are seen as stemming from basic adaptive cognitive processes which simplify perceptual information, by relegating it to relevant categories. Potter and Wetherell (1987) draw on the work of Billig (1985) to criticise this first assumption. Billig (1985) employed a dialectical strategy to critique the rigid, mechanistic model of cognitive processing proposed by categorisation theorists. A dialectical strategy involves searching for an opposing psychological process. Billig identified and described 'particularisation' as the process in opposition to categorisation. Particularisation is defined as;

> "the process by which an individual stimulus might be extracted from a category, or by which it is distinguished from the category in the first place. Above all it covers the processes by which a particular stimulus is treated as a particular or special case"
>
> (Billig, 1985; 82)

Billig asserted that the process of particularisation is present wherever categorisation is evident, and that the relationship between particularisation, categorisation and prejudice is a complex one. He challenged the basic assumption that prejudice is the outcome of cognitive processes that simplify and distort perceptual stimuli to fit into preformed categories, by asking how individuals come to hold prejudiced attitudes against people whom they had never had contact with, that is, never perceived. Billig suggested a more useful model may be that of the prejudiced belief becoming a way to organise perceptual information.

Billig moved beyond a conceptualisation of prejudice based purely on a cognitive-perceptual model, to look at prejudice in relation to language. He noted that although

categorisation is formulated as common to all organisms, it is non-sensical to speak of animals as being prejudiced. Prejudice is unique to humans and thus it is necessary to examine language, a skill that differentiates us from all other animals. He asserted that the expression of prejudiced beliefs should be considered a central element of prejudice, as it is possible for humans to voice intolerant opinions while showing no evidence of perceptual distortions hypothesised to be the basis of such beliefs. Through the linking of prejudice to language, Billig challenged some of the tenets of the categorisation model. In contrast to simplifying and distorting information, language can be used to create a category or draw attention to the details of a situation. The existence of linguistic categories do not predispose an individual to voice only prejudiced thoughts, as would be expected if prejudice and categories were linked. An individual is also capable of expressing tolerant thoughts with his or her discourse. Billig argued that the linking of prejudice to categorisation by cognitive theorists has not addressed the issue of how linguistic categories may be used to express tolerant evaluations.

A rhetorical approach would look at the way categorisation and particularisation (forms of discourse) are used to justify or negate opinions and behaviours in specific contexts. It would also examine the content or topics of arguments expressed in those contexts, and how new accounts are evoked in response to unique justifications and situations. The rhetorical approach would not assume prejudice is inevitable, but would focus on the way the form and content of language is used to support and negate expressions of prejudice and tolerance.

The important point to note is that the idea of categorisations biasing perceptions is replaced in discourse analysis with the notion that categories are actively constructed and used for many different performative effects. Thus discourse moves away from a focus on cognitive processes and examines instead the consequences of the individuals categorical constructions.

The second assumption is that categories have a fixed structure. This assumption is based on the theory of prototypes which claims that an individual is recognised as belonging to a category by matching his or her characteristics to the prototype of that

category held within the brain of the beholder. These characteristics are believed to be organised hierarchically within a prototype. This conceptualisation of category is undermined by examining the variation that exists within individuals' accounts of category members. Potter and Wetherell (1987) demonstrate this variation with reference to their research that investigated middle class white New Zealanders' accounts of Maori. A list of adjectives used to describe Maori, evidence the contradictions found in these accounts. Within a discursive framework the theory of prototypes is replaced with the idea of "categories carrying a cluster of category-based attributes" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987:132). This notion of category is conceptually distinct from that of prototype theory in that the "cluster of category-based attributes" is not considered a mental image that biases perception. Rather category-base attributes are seen as a pool of resources in the form of expectations and associations that may be used in social practice to construct categorical accounts to bring off specific performative effects. Thus an analysis of categories in accounts requires the identification of the cluster of attributes and an examination of how the attributes are inserted and made effective within a discourse.

The third assumption is categories are pre-formed and enduring. This assumption is subject to the same criticisms that are levelled at prototype theory and attitudinal research. That is, it cannot be sustained in the face of inconsistencies and variability within category accounts. If categories were preformed and enduring one would expect consistency within and between individuals' accounts as they would be drawing on the same cognitive schema at every point in time. Analytic practice has shown this not to be the case (Potter & Wetherell, 1987)- a phenomenon which may be explained with reference to the functional orientation of the speaker.

The weaknesses inherent in the quantitative and cognitive approaches discussed above have sparked alternative models for looking at the issues of prejudice against homosexuals. These take the form of the functional and discursive studies outlined below.

The Alternatives

Herek's Functional Approach to Attitudes

Herek (1984a, 1986a,1987, 1991 & 1992) provides an alternative approach to the study of peoples' attitudes toward homosexuality. He proposes that attitudes can be understood in terms of the psychological needs or functions they serve. Here the idea that people hold a fairly constant attitude toward prescribed phenomena still exists but the emphasis is on why people hold these attitudes. Herek (1992) conceptualises negative attitudes and behaviours toward homosexuals as an individual expression of a wider ideology of heterosexism. Heterosexism is defined as;

> 'an ideological system that denies, denigrates and stigmatises any non-heterosexual form of behaviour, identity, relationship or community.' (Herek, 1992;89).

Apart from the individual expression of heterosexism (called psychological heterosexism), Herek contends that heterosexism is built into many societal customs and institutions (called cultural heterosexism). Heterosexism is culture and time specific, having arisen form the overlap of the ideologies of sexuality and gender at the end of the nineteenth century. It is seen as constantly evolving through human interaction. Herek's notion of heterosexism is a valuable tool for examining expressions of prejudice against homosexuals and was used as a reference for the present study.

With regard to psychological heterosexism, the basis of Herek's theory is a review and application of the functional perspective to attitudes, and the content analysis of essays written by 205 heterosexual college students about their attitudes toward homosexuality. In examining these essays Herek (1987) identified three groups of functions:

> (1) Attitudes serving evaluative functions helped an individual organise his or her experience of gay people (experiential evaluative function), or anticipated meetings with gay people (anticipatory evaluative function). The evaluations of gay people based either on experience, or heresay help the individual plan his or her behaviour with regard to gay people in the future.

(2) Attitudes serving social identity functions benefit the individual by increasing his or her self esteem. An attitude serving a value-expressive function benefits the individual by enabling him or her to express a belief that is commensurate with important values central to his or her self-concept thus increasing self-esteem. An attitude serving a social-expressive function benefits the individual by allowing him or her to identify more strongly with, and gain acceptance of a specific social group. The common basis of social identity functions is that homosexuals are treated as a symbol, a way of expressing important facets of the self.

(3) Finally, attitudes serving an ego-defensive function benefit the individual by lowering his or her anxiety associated with unconscious psychological conflicts related to sexuality and gender. Herek (1992;155) writes the ego-defensive function 'is summarised in the notion that heterosexuals who express anti-gay prejudice do so out of fear that they themselves are latent homosexuals'. By externalising their fear onto homosexuals heterosexuals are able to reject the unacceptable aspect of self and thus lower anxiety levels.

The significance of Herek's work for the present study lies in its theoretical and methodological overlaps. Firstly, on a theoretical level, both studies sought to investigate the way in which heterosexism and tolerance were constructed, and how they link into the wider contexts of ideology and power. Secondly, on a methodological level, the responses of the subjects' were unrestricted and presented in a non-specified format. The interpretations and evaluations of the subjects could be analyzed in the context of the subjects' frame of reference. Finally, the present study has in common with Herek a functional perspective, though it differs in that the discourse approach used in this study "shifts the emphasis from a search for underlying entities -attitudes- which generate talk and behaviour to a detailed examination of how evaluative expressions are produced in discourse" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987:55).

Discourse Analysis

McCreanor (in press) studied public submissions to The Homosexual Law Reform Select Committee that explicitly opposed law reform. Using procedures derived from a number of discourse analytic studies, McCreanor identified eight inter-related themes in his sample. In common with the present study McCreanor emphasised the role language plays in constructing the social world. Thus the eight themes he identified in his research were conceptualised as resources deployed to construct and maintain specific positions with regard to homosexual law reform. The resources were organised around the following themes: (1) Homosexuality- homosexuality as an abnormal, learned behaviour; (2) Religion- homosexuality as a sin in need of cleansing; (3) Health- homosexuality as unhealthy and the cause of many sexually transmitted diseases; (4) Law and Morality- Changing the law will encourage homosexuality; (5) Rights- Rights of homosexuals will be obtained at the expense of rights of heterosexuals; (6) The Wedge- if reforms are granted homosexuals will demand more rights that will adversely effect the whole of society; (7) History- historically the demise of nations has been linked to social acceptance of homosexuality; (8) Military- New Zealand's security will be compromised if law reform occurs. Through the combination of one or more of these linguistic resources, authors were able to negatively construct homosexuals and homosexuality to suit the purpose of their arguments.

In the present study a discourse analytic methodology was employed. As was the case for McCreanor (1993) the language used by the interviewees was analysed with regard to its function, that is, the purposes of assembling the language in a certain way and the consequences the construction has for the object of the interview. Also in common with McCreanor is the theoretical position that social reality is constructed with language. From this perspective it is non-sensical to speak of a single reality as people construct many realities depending on what they are trying to achieve through their language use. The present study examined police persons discourses regarding homosexuality. Specifically, the study was guided by the following questions;

- How do police persons construct homosexuals through their language?
- Should homosexuals be allowed in the police force ? Why? Why not?

Significance of the Present Study.

This study is significant at a theoretical and social level. As was demonstrated above, research into peoples' evaluations of homosexuality has focused largely on the attitudes of people toward homosexuality measured in a uni-dimensional way using quantitative methodology. To increase reliability and validity of these studies it has been necessary to limit the amount of variability in the data provided by subject participants and thus denude the studies of the context in which anti- and pro-gay evaluations are expressed. These procedures, while contributing information related to demographic and social variables of study samples, do not allow researchers to explore the functions of the attitudes and how people construct their evaluations of homosexuals. This study using in-depth interviewing and discourse analysis puts attitudes, evaluations and inconsistencies in context and provides a theoretical base which makes sense of the wealth of data available.

At a social level this study is significant in that the participants were derived from an institution serving the public. The police were targeted for use in this study for a number of reasons. Firstly there is a lack of data examining the attitudes of police persons' toward homosexuality. Secondly, in their role as legal and moral protectors in our society the police are mandated to apply and uphold the law irrespective of their own personal values. How do individuals make sense of this potential dilemma? Thirdly the police are highly visible. How does the institution deal with issues such as homosexuality and gay rights while maintaining its credibility as servers of the general public. These questions will be addressed and analysed in an effort to illuminate the construction of homosexuality within the police force.

The following section provides the current legal and social context for the present study.

The Legal System

The Rise of Anti-homosexuality in Christian and Secular Law.

New Zealanders' inherited their legal system and several of their laws and values from England (Talbot, 1985). It is therefore worth tracing back the roots of the current legal system in New Zealand, as it sheds some light on where current stereotypes and antipathy toward gay men and lesbians were derived. Greenberg and Bystryn (1982) assert that homosexuality was generally accepted in the ancient Mediterranean world until the rise of an ascetism that repudiated all forms of sexual pleasure, and was associated with philosophies and religious ideologies based on dualism. This ascetism was adopted by the Romans and was influential in early Christian theology. Thus the early Church was hostile to homosexuality, though all forms of sexual activity were rejected, even within marriage. This rigid attitude to sexuality was tempered during the third and fourth century, as it was thought to hinder recruitment to the Church. Sexual activity in marriage was begrudgingly accepted. All other forms of sexual activity were rejected. Homosexuality was no more severely punished than any other form of non-marital or extra-marital sexual activity which indicates that homosexuality was not considered a particularly heinous crime. This trend continued in both Christian and secular law through to the eleventh century when antagonism to homosexuality was renewed by the ecclesiastics. By the mid-thirteenth century repudiation of homosexuality was codified in secular law also, usually requiring the death of the sodomite. Around the same time homosexuality was first characterised as a crime against nature (Miller & Romanelli, 1991).

Evidence of the secularisation of anti-sodomite laws in England come from the 'Fleta' written about 1300 and two treatises dealing with the implementation of Royal Law that advocate sodomites should be buried alive (Crane, 1982; Greenberg & Bystryn, 1982). However men indulging in anal intercourse and fellatio were primarily handled by the Church courts, until they were abolished in the sixteenth century. In 1533, English parliament passed a statute making homosexuality a criminal offence punishable by death. The death sentence for sodomy was eliminated in 1861 though Crane (1982)

notes the criminal law pertaining to homosexuality was widened, and homosexuality was beginning to be defined in terms of a mental illness (also Bhugra, 1987). These were the laws the colonists brought with them to New Zealand in the 1800's.

New Zealand Law

Under the Crimes Act of 1908, homosexual sexual activity or buggery as it was referred to in the act, was punishable by life imprisonment with hard labour. The convicted could also be whipped between one and three times according to his age. Those convicted of attempted buggery, or assault with the intention to commit buggery, or indecent assault could be sentenced for up to ten years imprisonment with hard labour and be flogged between one and three times according to age. Interestingly, these offences were categorised as crimes against morality and described in the margins as an unnatural offence.

In 1941 the Crimes Act of 1908 was amended with the abolishment of flogging.

In summary of the Crimes Act of 1961, Hodge (1985) stated that all sexual activity between males was a crime even if the activity was mutually consented to by both parties and both parties were adults. Anal intercourse both heterosexual and homosexual was a crime as was letting premises to known homosexuals. 1974 saw Venn Young introduce the Crimes Amendment Bill into parliament, which sought to decriminalise consensual homosexual acts between males over 21 years. Twenty four members of parliament did not vote on the bill and it was defeated in July 1975 by five votes (National Gay Rights Coalition of New Zealand, 1980). In 1977 sexual orientation was rejected as a grounds for discrimination in the Human Rights Commission Act.

In 1986, the much debated Homosexual Law Reform Act came into existence. This act amended the Crimes Act of 1961 by revoking the sanctions against consenting sexual activity between adult males over the age of 16 years. This was a major milestone for the homosexual community although the act stopped short of amending the Human

Rights Commission Act of 1977 through inclusion of sexual orientation as a grounds of discrimination.

However seven years later, in 1993, Associate Health Minister Catherine O'Regan proposed amendments to the Human Right Act, such that discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, or the presence in the body of organisms capable of causing illness would become illegal. Vociferous opposition to the bill came from John Banks the Minister of Police and Graham Lee who pressed for Armed Services exceptions to the proposed extensions to the Human Rights Act. It was against this recent history that I conducted my interviews with members of the police.

The Human Rights Amendment Bill was passed on July 28th, 1993 and came into force on the first of February 1994. Bills excepting the police from sexual orientation amendments were defeated (One Network New, July 28, 1993). It is now illegal for people to discriminate against homosexuals in a number of areas, including recruitment into the police.

The Public

Little research had been conducted on public attitudes toward homosexuality in New Zealand prior to the 1970's. In 1974 a public opinion survey showed the decriminalisation of homosexual acts between consenting males was supported by 53% of the population (National Gay rights Coalition of New Zealand, 1980). Bowman (1983) reported the findings of 322 interviews conducted in the Wellington and Hamilton electorates in 1977. Subjects were asked a range of questions about issues relating to homosexuality and basic demographic information. In this study three quarters of the subjects agreed that homosexuals should have their choice of occupations, should be protected by law and that homosexuality should be decriminalised. With specific regard to the present study, 69% of respondents agreed with the employment of homosexuals in the police, 2% were unsure and 28.5% disagreed. Overall, holders of positive attitudes to homosexuals tended to be young with

no religious affiliation, or affiliation with mainstream Christian denominations. They were more likely to know homosexuals personally and to have a higher occupational status. Compared with similar studies conducted at the same time in other areas of the world, New Zealanders held fairly liberal attitudes (Bowman, 1983).

Two studies have been commissioned independently with regard to homosexuals in the police. AGB McNair (1992) was commissioned by the New Zealand AIDS Foundation to conduct a survey of the New Zealand populations' attitudes and awareness of discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation. From their previous research into issues relating to sexual orientation, AGB McNair reported that New Zealanders held broadly liberal and tolerant attitudes toward homosexuals with regard to employment and tenancy agreements. This trend seems to be consistent with their latest research which revealed that nine-tenths of New Zealanders thought that law should not allow dismissal of employees based on their sexual orientation. A similar number of people stated they had no objection to working with homosexuals, while just under four-fifths of respondents believed that employers should not legally be allowed to refuse to employ a person based on their sexual orientation. In relation to employment in the police, 76% of respondents declared people should not be denied entry to the police solely on the grounds of homosexuality. The same number responded negatively to a question asking if there confidence in the police handling of a matter involving the respondent would drop if a homosexual officer dealt with the situation. 74% of respondents revealed their confidence in the police would not drop if homosexual officers were allowed into the force. These results are similar to those recorded by the National Research Bureau, commissioned by the Police to survey public attitudes toward homosexual officers dealing with a variety of policing situations. 76% of those interviewed reported they would still have confidence on the police if homosexuals were employed. This figure represented a drop in public confidence of 19% if known homosexual were not members of the police. For every question but one regarding the search of a person, more people stated gay officers would be acceptable than not (Dominion, May 4th, 1993).

With regard to the present study, the important point to note is both studies found the majority of the public in favour of having homosexuals in the police. That a small

minority of the population finds homosexuals and homosexuality unacceptable is evident in the results of McCreanor's (in press) analysis of public submissions to the Homosexual Law Reform Bill. Negative stereotypes and misconceptions of homosexuals exist in spite of empirical research to the contrary (Gonsiorek, 1982, 1991; Herek, 1991; Meredith & Reister, 1980; Newton, 1978; Ross, Paulsen & Stalstrom, 1988).

The Police

As far as I am aware, there has been no empirical research examining attitudes of police persons to homosexuality or homosexuals in New Zealand. However two studies have broached this area. Niederhoffer (1967) found homosexuals were ranked the second most disliked clientele by a sample of New York Police officers. After examining the evidence relating police dislike of homosexuals to an authoritarian personality, Niederhoffer concluded that the policemens' repudiation of homosexuals was a reflection of society's negative attitude to that group. Fretz (1975), in a test of a semantic differential assessing attitudes towards sexual behaviours, found that his police sample gave the most unfavourable ratings to the concept homosexual. Homosexuals received the highest ratings on bad, worthless, cruel, mysterious and strange in comparison to groups of teachers, parents, university undergraduates and nursing students.

These studies are dated and may not be applicable to the current cultural context in New Zealand. Given the amount of media coverage on the issue of homosexuals in the police and homosexuality generally, it is difficult to say what will emerge from the results of the present study.

The following chapter outlines the methodology used to examine the discourses employed by a small number of police officers in New Zealand.

II. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.

The purpose of this chapter is to familiarise the reader with a form of social analysis that takes language as its subject. Discourse analysis as espoused by Potter and Wetherell (1987), Potter, Wetherell, Gill and Edwards (1990), Wetherell and Potter (1989), is the method employed for the analysis of the present study and as such deserves discussion. In the first section an outline of the three major foci of discourse analysis is given and Potter and Wetherell's unit of analysis, the interpretative repertoire is introduced. Following this, a number of criticisms of discourse analysis are rehearsed and replied to, using arguments consistent with a discursive approach. The final section outlines the reasons that discourse analysis was chosen for the purposes of the present study.

Potter and Wetherell on Discourse Analysis

" This is perhaps the first step in successful discourse analysis, the suspension of belief in what one normally takes for granted, as we begin to think about how a practice is constructed and what it assumes rather than seeing it as a mere reflection of an unproblematic reality."

(Potter & Wetherell, 1987:104)

The above quote captures the principal tenet of discourse analysis- a denial of the existence of a singular reality in favour of the perspective that many realities are constructed with the language people use every day.

Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Potter, Wetherell, Gill and Edwards (1990) briefly overview the history of the term discourse analysis and the way it has been variously applied to describe a large body of diverse work. This sets the background in which they discuss the rationale behind their own definition of discourse analysis. The term discourse analysis was adopted by Potter and Wetherell to allow for the "cross fertilisation" from other fields of discourse (see Potter et al, 1990). Potter and Wetherell (1987:7) broadly define discourse "to cover all forms of spoken interaction, formal and

informal, and written texts of all kind." Thus discourse analysis is the examination of any of these forms of discourse. Three major foci for research that could mark out a new social psychological orientation are suggested.

Function

Potter and Wetherell's (1987) perspective on function has been influenced by three strands of thought. From ethnomethodology and speech act theory comes the focus on the way language is used to perform functions. That is language is used to do things, for example persuade or request. The functions performed by language use may be specific, for example requesting a ride home (an interpersonal function), or global, for example presenting a new product to emphasise its best features. Wetherell and Potter (1989) state that language function may be conceptualised as existing on a continuum with the interpersonal functions of language representing one end, and the wider consequences of language characterising the opposite end. The analysis of the function or the purpose of language depends on the analyst reading the context. It is not always evident from a passage of discourse what function is being performed by the speaker. For example the phrase "It is cold in here" may be describing the state of the environment, or it may be requesting that the listener close the window or turn on the heater. Whether the phrase was descriptive (in discursive terms, constructing the environment) or a request may only be gauged by reading it in its discursive context.

The performative aspect of language function is supplemented by post-structuralist theory. Here the wider unintended consequences of a person's discourse come into focus. As Wetherell and Potter (1989) write a person may not deliberately formulate their discourse to have a specific effect or understand the implications of their discourse. He or she may just be doing what comes naturally. Thus, analysis of function involves generating hypotheses about the purposes and consequences of language and looking for the linguistic evidence to support the hypotheses. As functions are not usually directly available to the researcher, and become evident only after some analysis and interpretation of the discourse, the functions of a discourse are seen as an endpoint of analysis. Functions are elucidated through an examination of variation in language use.

Variation

Language will vary according to the function that the speaker wishes to perform, and as speech is typically orientated to a multiplicity of functions, variation is evident over time and between speakers. For example within the discourse of homosexuality, negative or positive aspects of being gay may be highlighted in a speakers account depending upon whether the speaker is justifying discriminatory practices, or impressing on the listener his or her liberal perspective. Variation in accounts is used by the discourse analyst to determine the function of the language, as discourse will vary systematically as a consequence of the function of the language (Potter et al, 1990). Thus the identification of variation within a discourse will help the analyst to decipher the function being performed by the speaker, and the possible consequences of the way in which the language is constructed.

Construction

A third contention of discourse analysis is that people "use their langauge to construct versions of their social worlds" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987:33). To perform certain functions, accounts are constructed using a selection of the individual's linguistic resources. The selection of linguistic resources may vary according to the function being performed, though the choices may not be made at a conscious level. Potter and Wetherell (1987), Potter et al (1990), and Wetherell and Potter (1989), in line with post-modernism, note that at any time a person's discourse may be subject to powerful social constraints and an individual may not be aware of the consequences of his or her discourse. Also in line with post- modernism and Parker's (1989, 1990) formulation of discourse analysis, is the assertion that language is constructed and constructive. Language is constructive in that the world is dealt with and accessed through language-use. The account of one person will be different to that of another person experiencing the same event. Thus language in a sense creates the world of the individual. "Reality" is constructed in that neither account may be seen as the more accurate or true account of the event, as both are assembled according to the functional orientation of the individual. A constructionist approach negates a realist position in which accounts may

be gauged as a more or less accurate reflection of reality, or an individuals mental processes, by demonstrating the variation of accounts both across individuals discourses and within their discourses.

Interpretative Repertoires

From the analysis of the construction of accounts and their varying functions, Potter and Wetherell (1987) present a case for the existence of interpretative repertoires. An interpretative repertoire is defined as "....a recurrently used system of terms used for characterising and evaluating actions, events and other phenomena. A repertoire .... is constituted through a limited range of terms used in a particular stylistic and grammatical construction. Often a repertoire will be organised around specific metaphors and figures of speech.." (Potter & Wetherell, 1987:149).

Discourse analysis does not stop with the identification of interpretative repertoires, but seeks to demonstrate the way in which repertoires are deployed in social practice to actively construct the "object" of discourse according to the function that the speaker wishes to perform. Potter et al (1990) claim that this conceptualisation of interpretative repertoire highlights the flexibility with which discourse is used, while cautioning the prospective analyst that people are not always aware of the effects of their discourse and at any time the use of certain discourses may be subject to powerful constraints.

A Critique of Discourse from an Extra-discursive Perspective.

Abrams and Hogg (1990) specifically set out to critique Parker's (1990) formulation of discourse analysis. Their criticisms may also be addressed to discourse analysis at a general level.

(A) Representativeness of data

The first of these is with regards to the representativeness of research findings generated within a discourse analytic methodology. Abrams and Hogg (1990) note that the reader of discourse analysis has no way of knowing what is included in the presentation of discursive research and therefore cannot ascertain if the evidence presented is representative of the data, or judge the validity of the conclusions. Within a quantitative framework, statistical techniques and a methodology with an emphasis on precision (in the definition of the object) and replicability of results, lends some confidence to the accuracy and representativeness of the data. Their argument is that discourse analysis would become more "persuasive and informative" should discourse analysts integrate some of the other social science methods.

Several points may be made in response to Abrams and Hogg's (1990) concern over the representativeness of discourse analysis. Firstly, Potter and Wetherell (1987) state that it is an aim of discourse analysts to present research findings in a manner which allows the reader to evaluate the analysts interpretations. The analyst provides a representative sample of data from the field in which they are working, and an interpretation that explains the connection between theoretical conclusions and specific passages from the data. As the whole analytic process is laid open to the reader, discourse analysis is more rigorous in its attempt to make explicit the operations of analysis and thereby allow the reader to judge the validity of the researchers' claims (Potter & Wetherell, 1987,1994). Precision as understood by researchers working in a traditional framework, is supplanted in a discursive approach, by attention to a fine grained examination of what people are using their discourses to accomplish and the linguistic tools with which they make their discourses effective.

Parker (1990:230) notes that in speaking of statistical techniques and the replicability of results Abrams and Hogg (1990) are appealing to the "real". However the "reality" is not directly accessible to the psychologists who study it as communication is not the "transfer of intentions from one individual head to another". Reality (one reality) is brought into the existence by the psychologists who construct it. With regard to Abrams and Hogg's (1990) suggestion that discourse analysts integrate some of the current social sciences method so that discourse can become more persuasive and informative, the following point may be taken from Parker (1990:230):

> "To translate terms from discourse analysis into dependent variables ...would simply replace a focus on the organisation of language with traditional attempts to define, predict and control "behaviours", "cognitions" etc. (things which are not really there) (*that is objects which are constructed and treated as if they are real)*. Words in Italics added.

(B) Discourse and Power

In relation to the discursive assertion that discourses reproduce power relations and prevent the eventuation of other practices, Abrams and Hogg (1990) ask what effect actually arises from particular discourses. Abrams and Hogg assert that to make sense of the discourse, cognitive elements such as memory and perception must be taken into account, as a discourse that is not accessible (understandable) or relevant to the subject will have no effect. Likewise, social and motivational processes (purpose, objectives, functions) implicated in the creation of certain discourses should be attended to. Abrams and Hogg suggest that the discourse analyst should not make assumptions about the nature of a particular discourse (for example is it racist or not) but go back to the source of the data and inquire about the accuracy of the interpretation.

(C) Discourse as an Alternative

A third concern of Abrams and Hogg (1990) is that social psychological process which they see as integral to the maintenance of specific ideologies, may not be taken into account by discourse analysts. They point to the large amount of literature which demonstrates that the context in which discourse is embedded may be more important for the comprehension of meanings than the linguistic features of communication, and the role of other social psychological processes that influence the way in which discourse is received and worked with. Abrams and Hogg (1990:223) suggest that discourse analysis should be regarded as "a powerful addition to the battery of methods available" and not as an alternative to existing social science methodologies and explanations of social practice.

Both the criticisms noted in (B) and (C) above may be related to Potter and Wetherell's non-cognitive form of analysis. Potter and Wetherell (1987) argue that the pitfalls associated with traditional social psychology and cognitive research can be avoided by bracketing off the issue of the relationship between utterances and mental states and refocusing research efforts on discourse itself. Thus language is taken as the object of research and is analysed in terms of the construction of accounts and the function of these constructions. Potter and Wetherell do not deny the efficacy of cognitive science but argue that it is possible to carry out meaningful social psychological research and explanation at a linguistic level. Potter and Wetherell are thus offering discourse analysis as an alternative to other methodologies and schools of thought within the social sciences. They do not argue that other research practices should be abandoned in favour of discourse analysis, though they do note several inadequacies existent in the social psychological literature (see chapter one, 'Attitudes and Discourse' and 'Categories and Discourse').

The focus on language it seems precludes an examination of cognitive and motivational processes. Therefore Abrams and Hogg's (1990) concern with discourse analysts lack of consideration regarding other social psychological processes, seen as integral to the analysis of ideology, would in their perspective be well founded. This however is not

the perspective taken by discourse analysts. Potter and Wetherell (1987) deal with this criticism by remarking that the workings of the mind are constituted in practice as a person expresses him or herself discursively. Discourse analysts therefore do not make a distinction between the "mental" and the "non-mental" thus the position of cognitions and motivations in relation to discourse becomes a non-issue.

(D) Functionalism

One of the major tenets of Potter and Wetherell's discourse analysis is that language is used to perform a function. That is a discourse can be analysed and understood in terms of the speaker's functional orientation. Bower (1988) notes that Potter and Wetherell's (1987) functional position is not without it's critics and that to some, for example Hempel (1965 cited in Bower, 1988), the function of language should refer to the causes of an utterance rather than the consequences of the utterance. Specifically Bower (1988) poses the question, why do people choose certain repertoires ? What is the derivation of the functions that language is constructed to perform ?

Two points may be made with regard to the above criticism of Potter and Wetherell (1987). The first is that language is taken as the focus of investigation and problems are examined in terms of their function and construction. Language is not seen as an external referent to underlying motivations and mental processes. Function in this perspective emphasises the "action and outcome oriented nature of discourse analysis" (Potter et al, 1990). Thus function is not used in the sense of explaining the causes of discourse, rather the effects of it- the action produced by rhetorical constructions. Unfortunately the way in which the function of language is written about often seems inconsistent with their use of the term to connote the consequence of language rather than the cause. For example the following excerpt is taken from Potter and Wetherell (1987:33):

> "A persons account will vary according to it's function. That is it will vary according to the purpose of the talk. For example, if we take two descriptions of a particular individual, we will expect them to vary in accordance with the feelings of the person doing the describing."

This is from Potter et al (1990:207):

> "What is picked out in talk depends on the orientation and interests of the speaker."

In these examples the composition of an individual's rhetoric is determined by the function the speaker wishes to perform. This would seem to take the focus from the effect or consequences of the language back to the determinates or underlying causes of the language. This is a conclusion which is incongruent with Potter and Wetherell's (1987) and Edwards and Potter's (1992) non-cognitive perspective. How is this incongruity reconciled ?

The second point to note is that Potter and Wetherell (1987) do not make a distinction between mental and non-mental processes. As stated earlier, in their perspective the workings of the mind are constituted in practice as a person expresses him or herself discursively. Thus asking where functions are derived from or whether they are the cause or consequence of discourse becomes a non-issue.

(E) Dialogue in practice

> "In part the study of discourse, is an analysis of this rhetorical struggle" (Potter & Wetherell, 1990:207).

Potter and Wetherell (1987) claim that discourse can be understood in terms of the verbal interactions between speakers. Thus if an utterance takes the syntactic form of a question, but is treated by the addressee as an accusation the discourse analyst is justified in taking the utterance as an accusation. The meaning of the utterance is understood by examining it in it's rhetorical context. Bower (1988) is uncertain as to whether this dialogical orientation to discourse is followed through in practice. Firstly Bower questions Potter and Wetherell's (1987) practice of attributing an interpretation or account to a single person given their claim that meanings are disclosed in the examination of dialogue.

Secondly Bower (1988) notes that in Discourse and Social Psychology there are few instances where the accounts of the interviewees are put in the context of the interviewers questions and responses when Potter and Wetherell (1987) are explaining the function of a discourse, or identifying an interpretative repertoire. This is in contrast to other situations, for example, the analysis of everyday conversation where the contribution of all participants in the conversation are considered. Bower (1988) states that it would seem that all participants in a verbal interaction only come into focus outside of the context of an interview with a discourse analyst. Thus Bower (1988) asserts that Potter and Wetherell (1987) do not pay enough attention to the part played by the interviewer in constructing accounts upon which they base their analyses.

The first criticism may be a valid point in relation to the analyses of spoken rhetoric, where verbal interaction does take place, but it can not be extended to all discourse analyses, as by definition many forms of discourse, written and spoken are subject to analysis. It should also be noted that analysis is rarely based on one source only, thus an interpretative repertoire is not exclusive to a single person or account. An interpretative repertoire is an "abstraction from practices in context" (Potter et al, 1990:209). It is in effect a resource pool built around a common theme and using specific linguistic tools which may be invoked by individuals to construct an "object" according to the individuals' functional orientation.

There can be no objection to Bower's (1988) second criticism in relation to Potter and Wetherell's (1987) dialogical orientation. It would seem it is born out by other examples of their work, such as their discussions of race relations in New Zealand (1984, 1989). This is a criticism which should be kept in mind by the discourse analyst- the contribution that he or she is making to the construction of 'X'.

(F) Discourse analysis and social relations

With regard to the context of discourse analysis, Bower (1988) makes the suggestion that Potter and Wetherell (1987) should consider the effect of "pre-existing social relations" between the participants in a discourse. He notes that Potter and Wetherell would probably respond to this suggestion by claiming that social relations are accomplished by the participants in their interaction, rather than existing prior to the interaction. Bower criticises this position on two counts: (1) Their are occasions where verbal interactions are related to pre-existing social relations. Bower (1988:189) gives the example "I dub thee Sir Walter" ; and (2) Categorisations may be constructed in discourse to perform certain functions but this is a different issue from those of: (a) who a person is prior to the interview (man, woman, belonging to an ethnic group, occupation); and (b) whether the social relations influenced by these variables effect the use of available discourses. For example, in relation to the present study, what effect did the relation of young female student and a mature male police officer have on the discourses produced within the interview?

This criticism may be replied to using the notion of constraints. Social relations may act as a constraints as to what sort of discourses are employed. Whether constraints are actually recognised by participants in an interaction is an issue that could be evidenced within the context of the interaction. To acknowledge the effect of social relations would be to assume certain constraints are working in a given situation between two "types" of people, and that people perhaps recognise the constraints and work within them. Potter and Wetherell's (1987) focus on the construction and function of language allows one to examine the flexible use of language and therefore is not limited to what one might expect given the pre-existing social relations. Their approach may be conceptualised as a "lets wait and see approach" rather than making assumptions about the nature of discourse based on what a person is perceived to be (a social construction in itself) prior to the moment of interaction.

(G) Discourse and reality

Bower (1988) further criticises Potter and Wetherell (1987) for not looking beyond discourse, and entertaining the possibility that factors inhabiting the extra-discursive realm may have implications for the generation of discourses. Bower (1988) suggests this consideration of extra-discursive matter would require Potter and Wetherell (1987) taking a position in relation to realism. In particular Bower (1988) discusses the possibility that the contradictions evidenced in individual's discourses are not related solely to the function of the language but exist in "reality".

To reassert Potter and Wetherell's (1987) contention that reality is a social construction runs the risk of turning this issue into a circular argument. The point is, from this discourse analytic perspective, we do not have access to reality except through our language- there is no direct link to reality, and thus one could not ascertain whether a contradiction exists in reality as opposed to as a function of speech because no one account of reality can be taken as true or accurate. Thus within Potter and Wetherell's (1987) approach, as Bower (1988) points out, there are no concessions made to realism as this would be incompatible with their understanding of language.

Summary

From the above discussion the strengths and weaknesses of a discursive method of analysis may be seen. For the subject matter of this thesis, discourse analysis is more appropriate to traditional forms of analysis for several reasons.

[1] Through the analysis of discourses produced in interviews, the problems plaguing traditional attitudinal and categorical research outlined above may be avoided.

[2] The content of discourses are not constrained in accordance with the researchers conceptualisations of the topic and participants are free to explain their positions on homosexuality.

[3] Using a non-cognitive approach to analysis circumvents the issues of whether a person is telling the "truth" about his or her views of homosexuality, and if his or her accounts are accurate.

[4] A constructionist view of language allows the analyst to investigate and explain the variation usually associated with individuals' accounts as a consequence of the individuals' functional orientation.

[5] A functional approach to language emphasises the action orientation of an individuals' accounts and enables the researcher to pursue the possible consequences of a particular interpretative repertoire.

[6] Discourse analysis provides guidelines for the systematic investigation of individuals' accounts without the loss of content associated with reductionist forms of analysis.

[7] Discourse analysis takes the accounts of individuals in context, with a focus on the devices used to make language effective.

III. METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

This section provides an outline of the research process followed in the present study. Potter and Wetherell (1987) are examined with reference to one other school of discourse analysis in current use in social psychology, that presented by Parker (1989, 1990). Parker's arguments are used as a point of comparison to critique and elucidate the approach proposed by Potter and Wetherell.

The Research Process.

Research questions.

The original research questions of the present study addressed the issues of the construction and function of police persons' discourse of homosexuality in a general way. They asked:

- How do members of the police use discourse to construct evaluations of the homosexual community and make sense of issues related to homosexuality?
- What functions or purposes do these accounts serve?

Due to the wealth of data collected from study participants and the limited time to conduct analysis, the original research questions were redefined to narrow the focus of the study. They became:

- How do police persons construct 'homosexuals' with their language?
- Should homosexuals be allowed in the police? Why? Why not?

Participants.

Contact was made with the police and eight officers agreed to take part in the study. Of the eight officers, four were constables, and four were of higher rank. Officers came from a variety of policing backgrounds, including forensics, the traffic service, administration, community relations and street patrol duties.

Interviews.

Prior to data collection a pilot interview was conducted with an ex-police officer. This interview was used to refine the interview schedule employed in data collection. A copy of the interview schedule is provided in appendix A. Eight interviews were conducted. Consent to use the interviews for the purpose of research was obtained from participants preceding each interview. The interviews were conducted by the author of the research and recorded on 60 minute audio cassettes. Each interview was approximately one hour in length. Interviews were transcribed using a tape deck and an Apple Macintosh Classic computer.

Coding.

All data was coded according to eighteen loosely defined categories derived from several readings of the interviews. Detailed analyses were conducted with ten of the original coding categories, relevant to the redefined research questions.

Conceptual Issues in Analysis.

The method of analysis of the present study represents a blend of the analytic procedures proposed by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Parker (1990). Parker's suggestions were drawn on to supplement Potter and Wetherell's analysis guidelines. The following discussion outlines Parker's approach and presents Potter and Wetherell's response to it. Finally my own position in relation to these analytic issues is discussed.

Parker on Discourse Analysis.

Parker (1990) sets out seven criteria for identifying discourses, and examines the issues of institutions, power relations and ideologies with regard to discourses. While Parker (1990:191) acknowledges the definition of discourse provided by Potter and Wetherell (1987) to be helpful he also notes that it becomes difficult for the novice researcher to identify specific discourses using their definition and ten step methodology, as he or she realises that "each step rests on a bedrock of "intuition" and "presentation'". Parker proposes that his seven criteria may be used to "fill a gap" in the practice of discourse analysis.

Parker starts with a basic working definition of a discourse as "a system of statements which constructs an object" (Parker, 1990:191) and qualifies this by his seven criteria that should enable the user to engage with and in discourse analysis. Parker states that a certain amount of conceptual groundwork must be undertaken before analysis proceeds and it is necessary to revisit early stages of the analysis as it develops to make sense of the phrases that have been selected.

A discourse is a coherent system of meanings.

Parker enlarges upon and refines this statement by comparing it to and distinguishing it from the concept of interpretative repertoires used by Potter and Wetherell (1987). It is similar in that both his statement and Potter and Wetherell's concept refer to the identifiable selection of linguistic tools (for example metaphors) used to construct a discourse, but Parker cautions the reader about three facets of the interpretative repertoire: (1) that Potter & Wetherell's reference to grammatical constructions could lead to undue emphasis on formalising to the detriment of context; (2) that their definition gives substance to the idea that there is a finite set of terms to be identified for a particular discourse and; (3) the use of the term repertoire has connotations from behaviourism which may be avoided by simply calling groups of related statements and linguistic tools "discourses". Parker's final point in relation to his first criterion is that it is necessary for researchers to bring their prior knowledge of discourses to their analyses.

A discourse is realised in texts.

Parker broadens the application of discourse analysis with his second criterion. "Texts are delimited tissues of meaning reproduced in any form that can be given an interpretative gloss" (Parker, 1990:193). Discourses are identified in texts, which put simply could be anything from a poster, speech, or stained glass to give but a few of Parker's examples. It is the transformation of these texts into a written and spoken form that allows the discourse to become identifiable and thus examined for its meanings. Parker (1990) asserts that the two prepatory steps of discourse analysis are to transform our objects of analysis into texts and locate our texts in discourses, to make them accessible to discourse analysis.

A discourse reflects on its own way of speaking

The third criterion is concerned with the phenomena exhibited when people comment on their choice of language- thus reflecting on their own rhetoric and marking out a discrete discourse. For the analyst this stage of research may develop in the following three steps: (1) it allows the analyst to think about the language used; (2) it enables the analyst to take the discourse as an object; and (3) it helps the analyst to evaluate the term used to describe the discourse.

A discourse refers to other discourses

In the analysis of discourse, the researcher draws on other discourses. The contradictions within a discourse allow us to ask what other discourses are being utilised in the text.

A discourse is about objects

Parker asserts that discourse requires some degree of objectification and within discourse there are two identifiable levels of objectification. The first is that discourse constructs objects and thereby gives them a "reality". The second is that discourses may be reflected upon and thus may be taken as objects. "A discourse then is about objects and discourse analysis is about discourses as objects" (Parker, 1990:197).

A discourse contains subjects

Although readers of discourse have an independent "reality" outside discourse, discourse positions the reader as a subject and thus gives the subject another "reality". Three questions may be asked with regard to the way the subject is positioned in relation to discourses:

(1) What does the subject have to do to hear the discourses? In Parker's words, what "role" does the subject have to assume to hear the message?

(2) What rights does the subject have to use a discourse? Parker gives the example of non-medical persons at a doctors surgery being positioned as patients as the use of a medical discourse in this context is appropriate to the medical staff.

(3) What position does the subject take in relation to a discourse itself?

A discourse is historically located

The point that Parker makes here is that the "structure and force" of a discourse can only be understood in terms of other examples, and the history of that discourse.

These criteria Parker describes as necessary and sufficient for identifying specific discourses and then goes on to alert the reader to three more facets of discourse that should be considered in a research project. Stated briefly these are:

(1) That discursive practices are those that reproduce institutions;

(2) That discourses reproduce (propagate) power relations, though discourses do not necessarily contain power;

(3) Discourses have ideological effects, though Parker cautions the reader against assuming that all discourses are ideological, and that the analyst should try and discern which discourses are ideological and which are truthful. Ideology should not be taken as an object but as a "description of relations and effects" particular to a place and located in history (Parker, 1990:202).

The Reply

In reply to Parker's (1990) conceptualisations of an analysis of discourses Potter, Wetherell, Gill, and Edwards (1990) discuss three points upon which they do not concur with Parker.

The first of these is with regard to the tendency of Parker's approach to reify discourses- that is to treat discourses as objects. The problem with this approach, Potter et al (1990) claim, is that the focus of analysis becomes that of abstract discourse operating on abstract discourse, thus neglecting the social context in which the discourse is embedded, the action being performed by the language, and the ways in which the language is made effective in that context.

This reification of discourses has important implications for analytic practice. Potter et al (1990) assert that it is precisely the inattention to social context and social practices implied in Parker's conceptualisations that lead to his confusion regarding Potter and Wetherell's (1987) own ideas for analytic practice. Potter and Wetherell (1987) focus on discourse with respect to the specific contexts and practices being performed and the constructions used to make a discourse effective. In contrast Parker's reified version of discourses allows him to describe discourses without attending to the specifics of social context and linguistic and grammatical tools, that are used to mobilise discourses which is seen by Potter et al (1990) to weaken his analysis.

With regard to analytic practice Potter et al (1990) also take issue with a number of the criteria Parker (1990) proposes can enable the analyst to identify discourses. The first of these is the translation of texts into written form in which discourses can then be located. According to Potter et al (1990) this could amount to a large part of the interpretive work being completed at an early stage, generating the type of "idealised data" that is common in traditional social psychology. Secondly Parker is commended for his acknowledgement of the categories and intuitions an analyst brings to his or her research, but then subsequently criticised for placing too much emphasis on this point by making it a criterion for identifying discourses. Parker's use of reflexivity to

pinpoint discourses (discourses refer to themselves providing a base for recognition and commentary) is supplanted by Potter et al's question of "What function does a reflexive construction serve?" The reflexive construction is not taken at face value to identify a discourse. Finally Potter et al (1990) wonder what role is left for analysis in Parker's framework and state that it would seem that the commonsense of the analyst is replacing analytic practice.

The third point of non-concurrence between Potter et al (1990) and Parker (1990) is the way in which Parker (apparently) takes an individuals commonsense notions and ideas to have their own related discourses. Thus our commonsense becomes reified as objects of analytic interest. Potter et al (1990) assert that this conceptualisation of discourses precludes an investigation of our commonsense constructions of "objects", and suggest that suspending our ideas can lead to fruitful analytic practice. Potter et al (1990) give the example of Parkers formulation of scientific discourse derived from commonsense, and compare this to the two scientific discourses (contingent and empirical repertoires) identified by researchers working without a commonsense basis for the understanding of scientific discourse. Potter et al (1990) conclude that discourse analysis may be better practised by avoiding building in commonsense assumptions at an early stage of the analysis. In effect this means not equating our commonsense ideas with an associated discourses.

In reply to Parker's criticisms of Potter and Wetherell's use of the term interpretative repertoire, Potter et al (1990) note that the study of grammar may help elucidate the nature of specific repertoires and that a "limited range of terms" is meant only to emphasise the recurrence of terms that people use in the construction of an "object". Potter and Wetherell (1987) have found this to be the case in analytic practice. Potter et al further suggest that the use of the prefix interpretative, negates the connotations that the term repertoire has with behaviourism. Finally Potter et al note that attention to interpretative repertoires is only part of their overall analysis of discourse which also includes on a wider scale, issues of ideology and exploitation and at a narrower level the tools and devices which makes discourse effective.

The following section outlines the position taken in relation to the methodological concerns discussed above, and then discusses the analytic process of the present study.

The Present Study

Research Emphasis.

One of the primary differences in the methodologies espoused by Parker and Potter and Wetherell, is the formers stronger emphasis on the wider consequences of discourses and their historical location. In contrast, Potter and Wetherell tend to emphasise the local context of their data and the devices used to bring the discourses to life. In the presentation of the current research, I have tried to address both aspects of discursive concern.

Objectification.

Potter et al (1990) criticise Parker for objectifying discourses arguing that this process may result in a lack of clarification of the local linguistic devices that make a discourse effective. However, I think objectification of identified discourses is necessary to some extent so that discourses may be described in a coherent manner, and distinguished from other discourses.

Text, reflexivity and commonsense.

With regard to Parker's explanations of the way in which texts, reflexivity and commonsense operate in discourse, I share the reservations voiced by Potter et al (1990). Parker asserts, discourses may be recognised in texts, and I would agree that this may be the case. However if the researcher is the medium through which the texts are transformed into discourses for analysis, it would seem at least some of the interpretative work is conducted at this preliminary stage. In effect this may result in the kind of idealised data characteristic of traditional social psychology (Potter et al, 1990).

Parker's notions of reflexivity, and commonsense constructions, having their related discourses are, beneficially challenged by examining the functions that are served by their use. Thus neither a reflexive statement (a comment on the discourse in use), nor a commonsense construction is taken as indicative of a particular discourse. With regard to commonsense constructions for example, the common category 'homosexual', is not constructed from one homosexual discourse. Rather a combination of three distinct discourses may be drawn on by speakers to construct a description or evaluation of homosexuals, commensurate with the functions they wish to perform.

Discourse and the discourse analyst.

Potter et al (1990) do not take exception to Parkers assertion that an analyst brings his or her preconceptions and assumptions of an area to analysis. It is important for the analyst to recognise and acknowledge these assumptions. The acknowledgement facilitates, for the reader of discursive reports, an appreciation of the conclusions reached by the analyst, given his or her personal perspective of the research.

Analysis

In the present study each extract was examined for features of it's construction and function. Both the commonalities and differences in form and content of accounts were taken into consideration in the identification of discourses. Interpersonal functions and the wider functions of discourse, such as the maintenance of institutions and ideologies were explored where appropriate. The common themes of the interviews are referred to as discourses rather than interpretative repertoires, as the term discourse has been employed by both the Parker and Potter and Wetherell schools of discourse analysis. The results of the analysis are presented in the following two chapters, which address each of the research questions in turn. I have tried to present these chapters in such a way that the reader may evaluate the quality and validity of my analytic conclusions, as suggested by Potter and Wetherell (1987).

IV. THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF HOMOSEXUALS

David: ...probably they're in general they're misunderstood ..*mm*.. as a group of people

Interviewer: By the police or generally sort of ?

David: Just by the total public ..*mm*.. they just don't a lot of people just don't have any any thought beyond ther- the first thought homosexual and that's it they ..*right*.. they just loose control at that point [extract 1]

Elaine: ...and I think working you know [with homosexuals] I don't really think it would do anything for the morale of the guys too because they are just dead set against it and that's all there is to it you know it's just homos [laugh]..*yeah*.. you know bloody homos you know ..*yeah*.. and that's it that's all there is to it so um they wouldn't make life easy at all ..*mm*.. for homosexuals there's nothing I don't think there is anything in the next hundred years that's going to change their minds you know and ah they just won't accept ..*mm*.. it... [extract 2]

Interviewer: So you think that if somebody came out as being homosexual um they would be judged solely on the basis of their sexual preference..

Brian: I think so

Interviewer: .. And any merit

B: And any merit they had oh I I can hear the comments "oh you know he wasn't a bad cop but he's queer "...[extract 3]

What it is about homosexuals that prompt negative responses such as those given above. In this chapter I hope to provide one answer to this puzzle by addressing the first of the research questions;

"How do police persons construct homosexuals
through their discourse?

I would like to point out that this examination of discourses is limited to discussions of gay men. Although some participants did recognise lesbians in their definitions of homosexual, discussions tended to centre around discourses of gay men. Perhaps this was because lesbians were not construed as 'problems' within the police and therefore were not focused upon by participants. The purpose of this analysis is to describe the discourses speakers used to construct 'types' of homosexuals, and reveal the underlying functions of the constructions.

I would like to suggest that the above quotes are not based purely on a dislike for a particular sexual orientation per se. Rather these responses are based on constructions of homosexuality that associate homosexuals with a number of undesirable or unacceptable characteristics. The source of these characteristics are the effeminate, deviant and conditional acceptance discourses discussed in this chapter.

The effeminate repertoire or discourse is discussed first followed by the deviant discourse and the conditional acceptance. A brief conclusion summarises the main points of the chapter and prepares us for further analysis in chapter five.

Effeminism.

The discourse of effeminism was organised around a central metaphor that associated homosexuality with a range of mannerisms considered by speakers to be effeminate. The most commonly offered descriptions of the "stereotypical", "overt" or "effeminate" homosexual, included references to an effeminate or "la di da" way of speaking; an effeminate way of walking and standing (swinging the hips and bending the wrist) and in the extreme cross-dressing. The base of the effeminate repertoire was further expanded through the linking of homosexuals with behaviours traditionally associated with the female domain. All participants in the study used the effeminate discourse at some stage in their interviews.

The association of effeminism with homosexuals was achieved and strengthened in a variety of forms of discourse, facets of which were used independently or combined. The first of these forms involved the direct pairing of homosexuality and effeminism within a text.

> David: I don't know there's something about gay men that so that it's rather obvious to me anyway ..*mm*.. not always but um a lot of them are
>
> Interviewer: Mm.. so you think there is a stereotypical sort of gay man
>
> David: Oh yeah there are oh there is the stereotypical gay women as well as there is the the macho image of heterosexual man and the feminine image of um everyones' ideal woman.....
>
> Interviewer: So how are they different from straight people ?
>
> David: Gay men ? Um some are overtly gay and some are are obviously not ..*mm*.. the overtly ones to me are um are visible in their appearance and the way they walk ah the way they sit almost almost feminine but not feminine ..*mm*.. and they generally speak a lot with their hands ..*mm*.. and with their eyes and in some you get a very feminine form of speech but not not always ..*mm*.. um yeah it's you can probably go into it a lot with men but that's sort of the general appearance..*mm*.. and I'll be wrong occasionally... [emphasis added: extract 4]

The most important point of this extract, relates to the association or confusion between sexual orientation and non-sexual behaviours. That is the link created between homosexuality and effeminate mannerisms. This extract contributes to the association in two ways. Firstly, David generalises the association by describing "a lot of" homosexuals as obvious in their sexuality from his experience. This sets up the implication that gay people are likely to be effeminate. Secondly, in his last sentence David gives a list of characteristics with which homosexuals may be recognised. The implication here is that effeminate mannerisms are indicative of gay people, therefore effeminate people are likely to be homosexual. The blending of sexual orientation and non-sexual behaviours is likely to have implications for both gay and effeminate people.

The association provides a base for arguments that reject individuals on the basis of their effeminate behaviours. Effeminate people may not be accepted because their mannerisms may be seen to breach traditional gender roles, or because effemininity is taken as an indication of homosexuality, or both. Gay people may be rejected because it is thought likely that they will display the same effeminate characteristics. Whenever the effeminate discourse is used in association with homosexuality the effect is to strengthen the existing stereotype which may be employed to the detriment of homosexuals. This association was used by some persons in the current study to construct a type of homosexual considered unsuitable for policing for a number of reasons (discussed in the following chapter).

The blending of sexual with non-sexual behaviours was one of the patterns found by McCreanor (in press) in his discursive analysis of submissions to the New Zealand Homosexual Law Reform Bill. He found the association of homosexuality with a number of 'abnormal' behaviours was used to construct a description of homosexuals that justified the maintenance of legal sanctions against them. Herek (1992) explained the association of effeminism and homosexuality in terms of the overlap between the ideologies of sexuality and gender, of which heterosexism is a component. Herek asserts heterosexuality is synonymous ideologically with 'normal' masculinity and femininity, while homosexuality is synonymous with a breach of 'normal' gender roles. Gay men are stereotyped as effeminate despite the lack of inherent links between adherence to a specific gender role and sexual behaviours.

The second form of discourse that strengthened the association of effeminism with homosexuality, involved a comparison between the homosexual and the macho heterosexual man. Closely allied with a description of the homosexual man based on the discourse of effeminism, was a parallel discourse which constructed the nature of the typical policeman. Comparisons between the ideal policeman and the homosexual man were made directly or were implicit in the construction of either group.

Below is an example of an implicit comparison of the homosexual man, formed when a description of the ideal policeman is given and homosexuals are construed as effeminate by implication.

> Henry: ...males or men you think as being you know the rock solid part of the relationship or or whatever and you know the well as far as policemen go you they they're supposed to be the you know the strong arm of the law and and these sort of things and and anything that looks a little bit different like like a faggot or a gay you think oh yuk you know that's not that's not being manly if you like... [extract 5]

This extract is part of Henry's explanation why homosexuals are not generally acceptable. Here the construction of the policeman is built around a metaphor of strength ("rock solid", "strong arm..") while homosexuals are portrayed as unmanly, the antithesis of a good policeman. This extract hints at one of the arguments some police persons used to reject homosexuals as candidates for police duties- that is, the homosexuals' effeminate dispositions make them unsuitable for demanding police work. This theme is continued in the following extract, where the association of homosexuality with effeminate behaviours is expressed through the construction of types of homosexuals, who are subsequently rejected as potential officers.

> Interviewer: Well what would you think about having homosexuals in the police force?
>
> Carl: I categorise people I put them into groups and I I think there are different types of homosexuals and we're talking about males or females or both
>
> Interviewer: Take both yeah
>
> Carl: Take both alright well if I can talk about males to start with um I I cat- I categorise homosexuals as being as falling into four categories one your overt overtly um dressing up as female ah types two the effeminate males....now I'm opposed to homosexuals who perform dressing up as women being part of a police service because I I'm quite convinced that the vast majority of the public will not accept *..mm..* that person as a police officer....I think people are um suited to certain types of occupations um we don't we wouldn't all make good male hairdressers *..mm..* we're not all cut out to be soldiers *..mm..* and I think that ah people who um are born as a boy but prefer to be women or who have you know quite openly um drag queen

> type desires ah are not suited to be police officers and people who are trying to uphold the law so I'm strongly opposed to that type of um homosexual being part of the service that I I means a lot to me ..*mm*.. the effeminate homosexual the man who has effeminate manners um I have a less stronger view that he shouldn't be a police officer...and I think it's preferable that they that they seek an occupation which perhaps is more compatible with their um manner their habits and their their way of life ..*mm*.. now that's two categories.. [extract 6]

Carl draws on an effeminate discourse to construct his first two categories of homosexuals, both of which he finds unsuitable for police duties. This division of homosexuals into types serves two purposes. Firstly, on the basis of his categorisations, Carl enables himself to systematically reject homosexuals according to his constructions before even assessing their potential as police officers. Secondly, Carl can not be seen as rejecting homosexuals on the whole, but only a few types of homosexuals, based on the requirements of policing. Thus Carl appears to retain an open mind while simultaneously providing grounds for rejecting homosexuals as police officers.

The reasons homosexuals should not be accepted into the police are dealt with extensively in the next chapter. However three arguments are presented in this extract and so will be discussed briefly. The first two arguments, that homosexuals are unsuited to police work, and the public will not accept effeminate homosexuals as police officers, serve to deflect responsibility for not having homosexuals into the police away from the police department. In the first case the onus is on the homosexuals to change their habits to conform to police standards, requiring no change on the part of the police. In the second case the prejudice of the public prevents the police from recruiting homosexuals as they would not be accepted. Finally, Carl introduces the concept that effeminate homosexuals would cause a decline in the calibre of the police with his last argument relating to his own personal pride in the police. Again the police department as a whole can not be held responsible for this negative implication concerning homosexuals, as the decline in policing standards is connected to Carl's personal opinion rather than a statement reflecting the feeling of the entire police department.

Also evident in this extract is the confusion discussed earlier regarding homosexuality and effeminism. Here the association extends to cross dressing and transsexualism. In

doing this, Carl may be associating homosexuality with behaviour people find even less acceptable and so arguments maintaining the suitability of homosexuals to policing become more tenuous.

The above passage demonstrates Carl's use of the effeminate discourse to construct a type of homosexual he suggests the police can not employ. In contrast, in the following extract Alan states that whether a person is homosexual or not is not the issue. Rather the concern is with any individual who displays effeminate mannerisms regardless of his or her sexual orientation. Thus the focus is taken off sexual orientation and placed on behaviour.

> Alan: ...the fact that they're homosexual of heterosexual or whatever ah and this is what I was getting at earlier we might well have a person who is a real red blooded heterosexual ..right.. and there's no homosexual things but mannerisms and nods and bits and pieces of him is something that will bring the police into ridicule ..*right*.. so he's not acceptable we'll accept an applicant who is better ..*right*... the best man for the job pardon the pun best person for the job man or woman ..*yeah*.. the best person is the person we want to select [extract 7]

In this extract Alan reveals that it is not homosexuality per se that the police object to, but effeminate mannerisms. These are the things that will bring the police into disrepute or ridicule. Alan's construction achieves two functions. The first is a positive presentation for the police. The police do not judge individuals on the basis of their sexual orientation which could be seen as discriminatory, but on their suitability as officers which is a criteria against which <u>all</u> candidates are evaluated. Anyone with "abnormal "mannerisms could be rejected not only homosexuals. Secondly, these people are declined entry because the public will ridicule them as officers. The police are construed as bound by this external constraint which, in effect, amounts to prejudice (of the public) validating a discriminatory practice (rejection by the police). This is the same argument used by Carl.

The above is in contrast to the following extract, where an admission of homosexuality by a seemingly "normal" male, provokes reconsideration of his suitability for the police, and prompts the use of alternative discourses.

> Interviewer: I can so what if somebody flew through all your tests and then said at the end I'd like you to know that I am gay ?
>
> Alan: He would create to me that would create a problem ah personally I would prefer if he didn't tell us *..mm..* Alright ? and I'd have to ask myself why if it's not an issue why does he want to tell me ?*..mm...* Alright ? Why does he want to tell me ? ah and I haven't struck that problem and until I strike it I don't know what the answer would be *..mm..* but personally I think my ..view would be I'd still come back and say is he suitable for joining the police or not and as I say I still don't know what is the test for gayness *..mm...* and that's my worry [extract 8]

Alan makes it clear in this extract that the fact that a person is gay is a reason to reconsider suitability of the candidate. Alan's reference to the "test for gayness" is consistent with his construction of gay people as deviant (this is discussed in the next section of this chapter). Thus even if a person does not display any effeminate mannerisms but is gay, their recruitment into the police is unlikely. It would seem that where one discourse (the effeminate discourse) can no longer be used to sustain an argument against homosexuals being in the police, another more insidious discourse is employed to uphold the contention (the deviant discourse).

Deviance.

With this discourse homosexuality was equated or juxtaposed with paedophilia, flashing, promiscuous sex and other sexual behaviours generally considered inappropriate or illegal. Homosexuality was also compared with other socially undesirable behaviours such as smoking dope and was talked of as being abnormal.

All participants in the present study talked about these stereotypes. However, only four of the eight interviewees actively employed a deviant discourse to explain the nature and behaviour of homosexuals. In these cases the discourse was used to construct a type of

homosexual attributed with one or more of the above described characteristics, to illustrate the homosexuals' unsuitability for certain kinds of work. The following extract exemplifies a form of the deviant discourse, where homosexuality is brought into disrepute by associating it with undesirable sexual behaviours.

> Interviewer: If there was a test for gayness you'd incorporate it into assessment?
>
> Alan: Well prob- probably one of the things is um if there was a test you'd like to do maybe a test for heterosexuals a test sexual perversion to the police to the policemen it's it's a way of life for us see at the moment we're dealing with rape ..*mm*.. we've got a couple of bad rapes ..*mm*.. what creates a rapist [alright?
>
> Interviewer: If I] knew
>
> Alan: Yeah right what what creates a rapist you know um a heterosexual who is a potential rapist we we should be- I've locked a policeman up for it you know ? great pleasure in doing so ..*mm*.. ....so we- we've got just as much concerns of recruiting a heterosexual who is going to cause the police concern through their sexual activity as well ..*mm*.. ah ?? the policeman who's a tom cat ah the policeman who um is overtly exposing himself or herself ..*mm*.. those types of people are as much a concern to us as they are so we've got ah we even have women ah and we have ?? from men in the police who are always in the opportunity to dress in a way that will expose as much of their um what they shouldn't expose ah to captivate an action to captivate a reaction from people around them they flaunting themselves all the time ..*mm*.. that's not normal behaviour that's not homosexuality but it's abnormal behaviour do we want them in the police and the answer is no we don't want them either.. [extract 9]

Alan does not answer the interviewers question with any conviction. Instead, Alan quickly refocuses the discussion on unacceptable sexual behaviours. Two functions are served by this move in discourse. The first is, officers are construed as strenuous upholders of the law, even when it means punishing their own, and secondly Alan demonstrates that it is not only homosexuals that the police do not want to recruit. Police concern encompasses a whole raft of abnormal or inappropriate sexual behaviours. By implication homosexuality is associated with rapists, and later grouped with heterosexual behaviours that also cause the police concern. Alan makes it clear

that homosexuals are not wanted in the police, any more than rapists, exhibitionists or promiscuous heterosexuals.

Two further points of note are the three point list that has been combined with a contrast at the end of paragraph two, and the puzzle solver. These rhetorical devices have been associated with positive audience responses (Atkinson, 1984: Heritage & Greatbatch,1986). In this extract the three point list was combined with a contrast (that's not normal behaviour that's not homosexuality but it's abnormal behaviour) based on normality. This emphasises the police intolerance of all abnormal behaviour not just homosexuality, and reinforces the association of homosexuality with inappropriate sexual behaviours. The puzzle solver ("do we want them in the police and the answer is no we don't want them either..") further reinforces the categorisation of homosexuals with undesirable behaviour, as people who flaunt themselves are considered abnormal, and, like homosexuals, unworthy of police duties.

The deviant discourse was also used in the construction of episodes where the police and the alleged homosexual community have met. Two extracts are cited below to demonstrate how the deviant behaviour police deal with may be constructed to achieve different effects.

> Frank: ...mind you we we have various grades *..mm..* and the grades that we are dealing with here are ah are what ones in that we speak about in public would probably be categorising you know we'd probably be talking about these guys they're good and girls they're good people love their children ah you know good church goers and all this sort of business and we're talking about them in general terms whereas with us there are that bastard that does knock off boys *..mm..* that scout master that is there for this purpose and we have dealt with that guy and we have this reflected mentality alright what makes that guy that is bumming these boys any different than that guy up there who's shown a bit of class about being homosexual what is the difference there and that really is not able to be ascertained um from you know just ah where we are at at the moment but there's a question [extract 10]

This extract follows on from a discussion where Frank extolled the virtues of homosexual people, thus the passage may be seen as qualifying the preceding account.

The concept of grades of homosexuals that strongly permeates the rest of Frank's account is introduced in this extract. Firstly Frank constructs the grade of homosexual that society would see as good in general terms and contrasts this with police experience of 'homosexuals' who apparently indulge in paedophile behaviour. The linking of these grades of homosexual is achieved when Frank wonders what the difference is between the 'good' and 'bad' grades. As no-one can ascertain what the difference is at present, officers need to be suspicious of all homosexuals. The implication of the linkage is that all homosexuals may have that propensity toward child molestation and at the very least suspicion is warranted and justified.

Frank has moved from a positive categorisation of homosexuals he attributes to the public, to a wholly negative portrayal, characteristic of the police. However the police can not be blamed for their suspicion of homosexuals as it is based on their experience of them. Perhaps Frank would be less concerned with the tendencies of 'homosexuals' if he reexamined his account that equates homosexuals with paedophiles. In contrast to Frank's construction of sex offenders, is the following passage:

> David: Well I think there's a difference there there are heaps of deviant um males and females out there *..mm..* it's bloody frightening *..yeah..* to think what's out there but I wouldn't I wouldn't say that our deviants what what in the police we would call deviants I wouldn't call them um um homosexual *..mm..* that's that's um tarring everyone with the same brush *..yep..* and I they are they are definitely sick in their own minds n- I mean mentally sick *..mm..* whereas a to me homosexuality is not um mental sickness *..no,no..* it's um something quite different *..mm..* and I I probably couldn't put a name to it but it's it's a lifestyle it's how they live whereas the other ones it's um what they do for kicks [extract 11]

The feature of this passage that immediately strikes the reader is that David does not consider the deviants the police deal with to be homosexual. This is the major difference between David's and Frank's account. Frank construes the 'deviants' seen by the police as homosexual, while David draws on a 'mental illness' and 'what they do for kicks' argument to describe offenders.

The implications of these different constructions are very significant for the way descriptions of homosexuals are produced and responded to by society. Frank asserts that it is homosexuals committing offenses such as child molestation. Beyond this first association, Frank's account also implies that all homosexuals could have a pre-disposition towards paedophiliac behaviour. With this extract as a referent, how many people would be prepared to trust homosexuals working with children and perhaps any man working with children?

David's account negates the assertion that homosexuals are deviant and instead construes homosexuality as a lifestyle. This account exemplifies none of the negative constructions of homosexuals demonstrated in Frank's discourse. Homosexuality is described as how some people live; it is not something to abhor, or be suspicious of. If this was the discourse predominantly disseminated in society, the response to homosexuals working in any environment could be one of acceptance.

The comparison of these extracts is important for two reasons. Firstly it demonstrates how accounts vary according to whom you talk to and the function he or she wants to perform. Secondly it stands in sharp contrast to the deviant discourse discussed in this section.

Finally an extract from Brian is included to show how the deviant discourse was drawn on to explain how <u>other</u> members of the police department viewed homosexuality. This form often involved the officer's personal negation of the stereotype.

> Brian: Well there seems to be a the impression that I get the one that goes out to the public is that ah particularly homosexuals and as I say ah I don't really think I'm in a position to talk about any lesbian members but as far as homosexuals go they seem to be giving out this impression that there's men out there ah that want to touch up any member of the public and make advances to any member of the public that they possibly can ..*mm*.. or they're going to go out in a patrol car with you and they're going to try and throw themselves on you ..*mm*.. now I I believe that I have a reasonable knowledge of homosexuals I've actually got some very good friends who are homosexual and it's just not like that ..*mm*.. people don't understand... [extract 12]

In this extract Brian explains how the police department give the public the wrong impression of homosexuality. He draws on the deviant discourse to construct the message of sexual impulsivity and promiscuity, supposedly characteristic of homosexuals that the police department disseminates. The interesting feature of this extract is that, though Brian is a police officer he has placed himself outside the main body of the police responsible for anti- homosexual messages. Thus Brian is not construed as prejudiced as is the remainder of the police department. Further Brian negates the negative portrayal with opinions consistent with his personal experience of gay persons.

From this section it is hoped that the reader will have an appreciation of how damaging the association of homosexual with deviant behaviour may be for the homosexual community. For those people who remain unconvinced I would suggest re-reading some of the extracts provided, substituting your own sexual orientation for homosexual.

Conditions of Acceptance.

The discourse of conditional acceptance was usually formed by the speaker declaring acceptance of gay people, combined with a denunciation of a number of aspects of homosexuality which he or she found distasteful or intolerable. This would seem to indicate a rather obvious and inconsistent use of language by the speakers. However, the speakers displayed an orientation to the inconsistencies, attested to by their employment of a selection of linguistic devices. These devices were designed to allow the speakers to present positively, while still voicing some reservations about homosexuals. Such arguments ultimately indicated a lack of acceptance of homosexuals, and invalidated homosexuality as an alternative sexual orientation.

The most common form of the conditional acceptance discourse was characterised by the speaker stating that he or she had "no problem" with homosexuals, followed by a qualification of this statement. Qualifiers or provisos were prefixed with 'as long as', 'but if', or 'providing that'. The speaker then introduced one or more of the qualifiers that featured in the discourse of conditional acceptance, or alternatively a new discourse

was employed, such as deviance or effeminism. The result was the negation of the original statement of tolerance.

The provisos stipulated in the conditional acceptance discourse were either merit based or dependent on homosexuals keeping their sexuality to themselves. These conditions or their variants were also used together as the following example demonstrates.

> Gwen: ..homosexuality I've really got no problems with them whatsoever you know as long as they keep their you know their sexuality to themselves ..*right*.. um as long as it doesn't come out in the job ..*mm*.. I mean say if they if they are able to pass all the exams all the physical side they've got no reason why they shouldn't be in the job more than what I have ..*right*.. you know we're on equal terms just their sexuality is a bit different than mine.. [extract 13]

The most striking feature of this passage is Gwen's assurance that she has no problems with homosexuality, followed by a string of conditions that make them acceptable. Inconsistency in Gwen's discourse is smoothed over with the prefixes "as long as" and "if". The first two conditions, that homosexuals keep their homosexuality to themselves and out of the job relate to the visibility or more accurately the invisibility of homosexuality. Acceptable homosexuals are those who actively conceal their sexual orientation.

The proviso that homosexuality does not come out in the job, raises the questions how would homosexuality be expressed in the job? How would it effect the individuals aptitude as an officer? This condition seems to imply that if an officer is homosexual he or she is likely to behave inappropriately or unprofessionally on the job, or alternatively the publics inability to interact with a homosexual officer would mean a compromise in policing standards.

The last proviso Gwen expresses regarding homosexuals' entry being contingent on the officers ability to pass the exams, serves to demonstrate that Gwen is able to evaluate an individual on a merit basis rather than their sexual orientation. Thus Gwen is positively construed as objective, and rational.

Conditions of acceptance were also constructed using aspects of some of the other discourses described in this section, for example the deviant discourse. The following extract is part of a response to a question asking about the reasons behind Frank's opinions of homosexuals

> Frank: ...at this stage of my life I'm saying alright I'll let him prove to me or her prove to me that they are what they are you know I'll accept them for what they are and they keep themselves to themselves in their own circle but if they come out of that and go to that lower class ah then they're in big trouble... [extract 14]

The first feature to note in this extract is the apparent equation of proof with acceptance. While acceptance implies the absence of conditions or expectations placed on the individual, proof implies an individual actively seeking to impress upon the evaluator his or her worthiness. The use of the word proof along with the conditions stipulated further on in the extract call into doubt, the extent to which Frank is willing to "accept" a homosexual person. A further effect of this construction is that the impetus for acceptance is taken off Frank and placed on the homosexual who now has to prove himself to Frank.

The second feature of this extract is one shared by extract fourteen discussed above. That is, acceptable homosexuals are those that keep their sexuality to themselves. As with extract fourteen, this indicates a reluctance for people to modify their own views or behaviours of what is normal or acceptable practice to allow for homosexuality. It is not acceptance that is offered in this case it is tolerance.

The most insidious association existent in this extract is established in the final condition that Frank places on his acceptance of homosexuals- that they do not "go to that lower class". The lower class referred to, was part of Frank's earlier construction of homosexuals as child molesters- which he suggested came as a reflection of his experience of "homosexuals" as a police officer. Frank is drawing on the deviant discourse described in the previous section.

It would seem reasonable not to recruit people that may have the potential to become child molesters where the authority of the position could be abused. However the reasonableness of the argument breaks down when one considers that Frank has constructed people who molest children as homosexuals rather than paedophiles, and that with the present argument Frank has implied that all homosexuals have the potential to "go to that lower class". In this extract Frank has effectively moved from a position of accepting homosexuals to a position where he implies homosexuals have the potential to become criminals- a complete shift in discourse.

The structures of the conditional acceptance discourse were used in circumstances, apart from stating a personal opinion, as illustrated in the above extracts. The following passage illustrates how conditions may be applied in the explanation of the behaviour of others.

> Interviewer: Right so given that you've just said that what sort of response would an officer get if up until then nobody had suspected they were homosexual but they came out and said I'm homosexual and they'd done their job well up until then ?
>
> Alan: He'd well he'd well basically get the bumthrush ..*Yeah ?*.. ah pardon the play on the words [laughter] yeah he he would um slowly be ostracised peer group pressure would um get him out but at the same token providing um probably that's a little bit harsh ah yeah no we'll go back and recap- if he starts saying hey I'm queer as nutty fruitcake I'm a homosexual and I expect you all to love me ah as a person peer group pressure would um would get rid of him ah but if he ? if he didn't make an issue of it and just got on and did his job quietly and confidently and competently I don't really think that would happen .. [extract 15]

The most striking aspect of this extract is the change in the line of argument from an outright rejection of homosexual officers to a conditional tolerance of them based on the manner in which they come out, and their merits as an officer. To achieve this, two linguistic devices of the conditional acceptance discourse are used: "but at the same token", lets the reader know a change in the nature of the argument is going to take place and prepares the reader for possible contradiction; "providing um....if he

starts....but if he..." functions to allow the speaker to draw on different lines of argument without seeming inconsistent as specific conditions apply.

With the change in position of the police from rejection to acceptance, a positive self-presentation function is achieved. Officers are reconstructed as tolerant of gays, rather than as unable to see past a persons sexual orientation. They are also constructed as objective and rational as the criterion for acceptance becomes the homosexual's merit as police officers.

A second consequence is that the responsibility for homosexuals being in the police changes from contingency on the anti-gay actions of the police, to the way in which the homosexual officer comes out, whether he expects acceptance, and how good he is at being a police officer. Thus a homosexual is able to be evaluated not on the basis of his sexuality but on criterion set by the police. The question arises why should a revelation of homosexuality necessitate an evaluation of a persons ability as an officer.

Another notable feature is that the police are virtually invisible in this extract except for a reference to peer group pressure and an even less identifiable, "I don't really think that would happen". This construction achieves two functions. Firstly, as Alan is an older policeman, high up in the hierarchy, he is unlikely to be in the peer group that would ostracise a homosexual officer. Thus Alan isolates himself from possible discriminatory practice. Secondly, the reference to peer group pressure, a faceless, unidentifiable entity, serves to play down the association of police acting in discriminatory manner.

Summary

With this chapter I have identified three discourses, commonly used in the construction of homosexuality. These were the discourses of effeminism, deviance and conditions of acceptance. The effeminate discourse associated homosexuals with characteristics usually associated with the feminine gender role. In ideological terms it may be seen to represent a blend of the ideologies of gender and sexuality that are the broad basis for an ideological heterosexism, that denigrates any non-heterosexual form of expression (Herek, 1992). The effeminate discourse provided a linguistic basis for constructions that stigmatised homosexuals as breaching traditional gender roles, adding to the evaluation of homosexuals as abnormal and therefore unsuitable for police duties.

The discourse of deviance equated or associated homosexuals with a range of undesirable behaviours. As with the effeminate discourse, officers were able to draw on discourse of deviance to construct a type of homosexual most people would reject as members of the police . A wider consequence of this discourse is the perpetuation of a stereotype of homosexuality based on a lack of distinction between homosexuality and behaviours that are considered inappropriate.

Conditions of acceptance was a discourse employed by officers to ostensibly state their acceptance or tolerance of homosexuals, while voicing reservations about their employment by the police. The reservations or provisos used in this discourse constructed a less than complimentary description of homosexuals, while its use enabled officers to present themselves in a positive light.

The following chapter presents the ways in which the discourses of effeminism, deviance and conditional acceptance were used in the construction of arguments that deny homosexuals entry into the police force.

V. WHY HOMOSEXUALS SHOULD NOT BE POLICE OFFICERS

WHY HOMOSEXUALS SHOULD NOT BE POLICE OFFICERS

Initially this chapter was to be used for presenting the explanations police officers provided for the exclusion or inclusion of homosexuals in the police department. However after careful analysis, I have found that the vast majority of accounts were organised around the premise that homosexuals, or at least certain types of homosexuals, should not become members of the police department. Thus this chapter has a narrower focus, addressing the question why homosexuals should be excluded from the police department.

Based on arguments related to the character of homosexuals or the response homosexuals would receive from various groups on entering the police department, all interviewees expressed concerns about the enlistment of homosexual officers. Often the reservations were not connected to a personal dislike of homosexuals, but a recognition of problems arising from the employment of them.

1. INTERNAL PRESSURE

The following set of accounts relate to pressures placed on homosexuals from within the department. Officers predicted that gay men would be harassed by their peers and other members of the police, if they were allowed to join the department. This internal pressure was referred to in explanations of why policing would not be the most suitable job for homosexuals. Officers further suggested peer pressure was used to maintain the status quo of dislike of homosexuals. For those officers who used this discourse, it was a way of explaining how the police operated to exclude homosexuals, while preserving their own integrity as "gay sympathizers". A reference to peer pressure blamed no-one specifically and allowed officers to exclude themselves from the heterosexist mass, and/or construct themselves as victims of an overwhelming pressure to conform to the anti-gay precedents inherent in the police department.

They wouldn't be welcome..

The first two extracts illustrate how peer pressure would come to bear on homosexual officers. This discourse was centred around the claim that the employment of homosexuals by the police, would be to the detriment of the gay individuals and in some cases the officers who worked with them. It appealed to the wellbeing of gays through an expression of concern regarding how they would be treated within the police. The following is part of a response to a question asking Elaine what she thought about having homosexuals in the police

> Elaine: ...personally I've got no problem with doing it but I can see how it would really stir up a hornets nest if if it came to light you know *..yeah, yeah...* and I think working you know I don't really think it would do anything for the morale of the guys too because they are just dead set against it and that's all there is to it you know it's just homos [laugh]*..yeah..* you know bloody homos you know *..yeah..* and that's it that's all there is to it so um they wouldn't make life easy at all *.mm..* for homosexuals there's nothing I don't think there is anything in the next hundred years that's going to change their minds you know and ah they just won't accept *..mm..* it and they'll show that they can not they wouldn't be able to separate it *..mm..* so it wouldn't be pleasant it wouldn't be a pleasant environment for them to work in it wouldn't be pleasant to ah be working around them because of it really *.mm* .. mm.. [extract 1]

Elaine states that working with homosexuals would mean a drop in the morale of the guys because they are just dead set against homosexuality. The implication is that homosexuals should not be employed because some officers would not be able to handle working with gay men. If homosexuals were not employed because of this situation, the police could be seen as condoning discriminatory behaviour, instead of addressing the prejudice against gays within the department. It should be noted that Elaine does not include herself in the group of officers who would have a problem with working with gays. This form of discourse is common among officers who recognise the prejudice against homosexuals in the department, but do not personally adhere to the prejudice (see extract 2 below). In addition, Elaine's reference to 'the guys' also excludes female officers from the group of police who would discriminate against homosexuals. This implies that female officers would be more accepting of gays, than their male

counterparts, and that problems relating to the integration of gay men would probably stem from male officers.

After making a case for the morale of non-homosexual officers, Elaine appeals to the well-being of homosexuals who may enter the police department. Because of the negativity surrounding homosexuality in the police, gay officers would receive pressure from their peers and their lives as police officers would be made difficult. The implication is that it would be better if homosexuals did not join because they would have a hard time in the police. Elaine also asserts that nothing in the next hundred years will change the officers minds. This is a dim outlook for the future of gays within the police.

In the following extract, Gwen describes the reaction to a homosexual officer coming out, giving details on how they could be removed from the police department.

> Gwen: .....oh he's just a homosexual he's just gay *..mm..* he's a faggot we don't want anything to do with him and they will they'll just push him straight out and they'll make you know there'll be come to a stage where he will he will leave of his own accord *..mm..* only because he he won't get jobs promotion will be turned down because he's got this thing written across his folder saying you know his personal file this guys he's a you know a homo we don't want that sort of stuff in the job *..mm..* and the taunt- you know the ridicule he would get from other people if he's I think so high up he probably wouldn't he definitely wouldn't get the respect from his juniors if everyone knew you know whereas a cop on the street definitely would not get backup [extract 2]

With the first sentence in this extract Gwen constructs a picture of the verbal response to a gay officer. "Oh he's just homosexual he's just gay he's a faggot..."...using this form of discourse the officer ceases to be an individual made up of many different facets. He is summed up by his sexual orientation and subsequently rejected. "He's just a.." implies the person is not worthy of respect and thus warrants poor treatment. This implication is reinforced by the use of the word faggot.

Another feature of this extract is the contradiction between a gay officer being "pushed out" and "leaving of his own accord". Gwen explains this contradiction by describing how a homosexual officer would be subject to pressure once he had disclosed his sexual orientation. The police department would not need to fire a gay officer if sufficient pressure was applied. Pressure would come in the form of promotion denials, ridicule from peers, lack of respect from junior officers, and a lack of back-up for the cop on the street. The officer would be judged on his sexual orientation. The police department however would not be accused of discrimination on this basis, as the life of the homosexual would be made so difficult that he would leave under the pressure. This is significant because it would be difficult to prove police condemnation of homosexuality.

It is interesting that in this account pressure would come from all sections of the police department except from Gwen herself. The extract implies that the collective view of the police with regard to homosexuality is a negative one.

Living up to expectations.

Below is an example of how pressure within the police department may be brought to bear on its members to maintain the status quo.

> Gwen: ...you get guys talking about faggots to each other um unless they're really honest with each other you know they'll always say oh I hate them ra ra ra and they all have the same the same you know perceive it to be exactly the same you know the same image of them ....yet guarantee deep down they wouldn't think that at all ..*mm*.. there'll be something tota- oh I think they're alright but I'll tell you that in private I don't want to tell you that in front of my mates cause there's the big rag chase ?? you know it is shit I think it's rubbish but I you know as I say in regard to having them in the job no problems whatever [extract 3]

The interesting feature of this extract is that officers do not despise homosexuals, rather they act in accordance with what is apparently expected of them and enforced through peer pressure. Gwen explains that officers will always speak about homosexuals in a

negative way to their mates (that is, publicly), but deep down (privately) they would think homosexuals alright. This benign view of homosexuals is not usually expressed because of possible backlash from mates.

Three effects are achieved through this construction. Firstly Gwen excluded herself from the peer pressure and as a holder of negative attitudes in speaking of guys, this is consistent with her lack of objection to having homosexuals in the job.

Secondly, Gwen does not include female officers in her construction of the way in which officers hide their tolerance for gay men. Perhaps this is an indication that women are not subject to the same pressures to conform in the police. Alternatively, women may choose to ignore the 'rag chase' and express their tolerance regardless of the repercussions.

Thirdly, though officers espouse anti-homosexual views and subject suspected homosexuals in the police to adverse pressure because of their sexuality, the responsibility for such action is taken from individual members of the department. As officers are faced with pressure to conform to expectations of the department, they are forced to appear anti-homosexual though deep down they are actually tolerant of homosexuality. To be openly pro-homosexual is to create problems for yourself as the following extract also demonstrates.

> Brian: ....Unfortunately people that have got a more liberal attitude to the homosexuality can't stand up for for people that come out and say they are (homosexual) just like myself I I have made my thoughts known a couple of times I've been shouted down *..mm..* and to be honest I wouldn't be prepared to make a stand ah because of the effect that it might have on my my position in the department I've got a wife children I'm into this I'm in for this job until I retire and I don't really want something to rock the boat *..mm..* I have to be realistic

Brian states that to make his liberal position known in the police department could result in damage to his police career. The implications of this are that the anti-homosexual behaviour of officers can not be taken at face value, as they may only be conforming to expectations - they can not be held entirely responsible for their actions. As officers

are unlikely to 'be honest' about their 'true' feelings with regard to homosexuals, the status quo of intolerance will remain unchallenged, thus leaving homosexuals beyond the scope of recruitment or employment by the police - unless they stay in the closet.

Hierarchy

One form of account offered by officers for not having homosexuals in the police was organised around a central claim that the 'hierarchy' did not want homosexuals in the department. This claim was supported by explanations as to why the hierarchy was against the employment of homosexuals. References were made to the length of time senior officers had been in the service, how they probably locked up people for homosexuality as younger officers, and how they were active at a time when society was less tolerant of homosexuality and homosexuals. Perhaps not surprisingly this account was drawn on exclusively by officers not in the 'hierarchy'. Some of these elements are illustrated in the extract below, where Brian is speaking about people in the department who try and portray homosexuality in a bad light.

> Interviewer: Within the department do you think that's coming from the top or is it something that exists among the street cops or..
>
> Brian: I would suggest that it it starts at the top ah because if you look at the hierarchy the people who are at the top have been in the department for a number of years *..mm..* so when they were junior officers on the street they a lot of them would have locked people up for homosexuality *..mm..* and of course that that stays with them and they have an influence on the on the way that the the department thinks *..mm..* and it comes down the line *..mm..* of course the police department is a predominantly male orientated organisation *..mm..* and it's macho very macho that would have something to do with it as well we're all big strong tough men's men *..mm..* Kiwi men we don't like poofdas sort of thing all that ah and I really wonder if if if you spoke to a lot of staff members in the way that you're speaking to me if that would really come through particularly younger ones we're we're getting more well educated younger people in the department *..mm..* who might hide their personal thoughts because it doesn't fit in with the with the broadcast image *..mm*

Brian suggests that negativity towards homosexuals starts at the top of the hierarchy of the police and filters down through the rest of the department. With this construction Brian effectively refocuses the responsibility for not allowing gays into the police from the peer pressure gays receive at a street level and shifts it to the decision makers. This function is reinforced when Brian suggests that perhaps some staff members especially younger officers bury their tolerance of homosexuals to fit in with the 'broadcast image'. The hierarchy sets the standard and officers live up to it, helped along by peer pressure.

However Brian also explains how the hierarchy come to espouse such views. This is related to the hierarchy's experience of serving at a time when homosexuality was illegal and far from condoned in society. Brian also cites the macho character of the police department in the conditioning of the 'hierarchy' in their anti-homosexual expressions. In drawing on a 'lay-social psychological' explanations of the hierarchy's anti homosexual 'attitudes', Brain constructs an account of the hierarchy as products of their environments. Thus they are also excused the responsibility of the anti-homosexual portrayal they project to some extent. While helping us to understand the negative portrayal of homosexuality by police, Brian's description of the police as a predominately male organisation implicitly constructs homosexuals as effeminate. Because police men are macho they detest any man who transgresses the macho ideal. Homosexuals are disliked because they are constructed as overstepping the masculine-feminine gender boundaries.

A final consequence of this account is that as older officers or the hierarchy move through the organisation there may be a time in the future when homosexuals are accepted by the police.

2. Society

Within the discourse of society, accounts were constructed with reference to the external pressures faced by the police and homosexual officers, should homosexuals gain employment in the police. The common function of these arguments was to place the responsibility for denying gays entry to the police with the public. The police were absolved from this responsibility and were constructed as complying with the public demand. It was because of external constraints that the police could not employ homosexuals, factors that lay beyond police control. In essence, this was a case of prejudice (of the public) being used as a warrant for discriminatory practice - that is the denial of people who are homosexual into the police.

The welfare of officers

> Alan: ...it's it's the the offenders or the people who are drunk they use it as weapon to goad the police into doing action and they home in on it ...*right*... and they're trying to antagonise the police attending at the scene and people who are working say look I don't need to work with a partner that's got mannerisms or idiosyncrasies that cause me embarrassment ...*mmm*... and we've got police officers they dislike going out on patrol with partners who have got ...*right*... mannerisms because it just creates a situation unnecessarily ...*right*... .... so we believe we believe deep down that the recruitment of open homosexuals or gay people who are subject to ridicule .*mmm*... ah is doing a disservice to our regular staff ..*right*.. now 20 years time or 50 years down the track if homosexuality and people who are openly gay becomes far more acceptable than it is well we might have to revisit ..*right*.. but at the present point in time I don't really ..*mm*.. think the situation is necessary [extract 6]

The primary function of this account, is to provide an argument against the employment of 'open homosexuals'. One interesting feature is that the focus is on mannerisms of 'open homosexuals', rather than sexual orientation. This would seem to indicate that the officer does not have reservations about homosexuality per se. However as was demonstrated in the discussion of the effeminate repertoire, mannerisms aside, sexual orientation is a concern for this officer.

A second point of interest is that although it is ultimately the police department's decision whom they employ, the decision to recruit open homosexuals is effectively taken out of their control. This is achieved by reference to the interest of their staff who are harassed by a public intolerant of people with idiosyncrasies. The police can not be blamed for an informal policy of not hiring 'open homosexuals' if this means a compromise in the working conditions of their regular staff. One could argue whether embarrassment is an adequate reason for not employing homosexuals.

Finally the introduction of a temporal aspect in Alan's closing sentences, conclusively connects the denial of entry of open gays to the police to the public, whose current non-acceptance of "openly gay" people perpetuates a climate in which they can not be employed. However Alan is constructed as open to change should the public become more accepting.

The public will lose confidence

This reply came in response to the question "What would you think about having homosexuals in the police force ?

> Carl: ...now I'm opposed to homosexuals who perform dressing up as women being part of a police service because I I'm quite convinced that the vast majority of the public will not accept *..mm..* that person as a police officer and surveys have shown that you know there would be a loss of confidence in the police and I more importantly I treasure our integrity I mean I've I've worked for 31 years in a in a honourable profession *..mm..* and I would not like to see it undermined by ..mm.. this um pursuit of civil rights which means that inverted commas gay people should be police officers or anything else....the effeminate homosexual the man who has effeminate manners um I have a less stronger view that he shouldn't be a police officer I I again I believe that ah the main stream public would not be overly impressed...the third category that's the masculine type of homosexual who admits being um that way inclined I I don't have any opposition to him being in the police *..mm..* if he can sustain the pressure that um I believe he would receive except that he would it would be most desirable that he doesn't undertake certain types of police activity um and the survey that's been undertaken recently quite clearly shows that the public have varying views as to to whether they want homosexual police to be involved

> in certain types of police work um I don't think it matters so much if that police officer is a traffic officer who um no sorry if that police officer is operating in the public eye like he is um on patrol and his activities are are seen by all all to view I do have a major problem if he is um sorry I do have a problem if he is involved in sexual abuse cases or searching people because I believe that ah they will be open to criticism and complaints against them which may be hard to hard to refute....[extract 7]

As noted in the section on effeminism, the categorisation of homosexuals into types allows Carl to disregard homosexuals as candidates for the police on the basis of his construction of them. In this extract, the types are based in the effeminate discourse and the discourse of conditional acceptance where masculine homosexual officers are acceptable if they are limited to certain tasks and are good stress managers.

The most striking feature of this extract is Carl's ability to effectively warrant keeping homosexuals out of the police using references to the public's non-acceptance of gay officers. His construction serves the function of moving the responsibility for potential discriminatory practice from the police, to the public, over which the police have no control. Not only is Carl personally convinced that the public would not accept a homosexual officer, but surveys have shown that the public would lose confidence in the police if homosexuals were employed. Carl's citation of surveys achieves the purpose of lending objective and factual support to his contention and further reinforces the assertion that it is the public who hinder the employment of homosexuals as officers.

Gill (1993) found males working in radio, used similar 'factual' constructions citing the publics dislike of female voices to account for the small number of female broadcasters. As was the case in the present study, this type of construction was used to remove the responsibility for behaviour that could be considered discriminatory from the agency involved, to elements beyond the control of the agency (the public).

Embedded in Carl's argument that the public would not accept homosexuals as police officers is the implication that homosexuals are not able to be trusted with certain activities. This is particularly evident in the second qualifier of Carl's lack of opposition to having homosexuals in the police- that homosexuals do not undertake certain types

of police activity. Carl states that it would be acceptable for homosexual officers to undertake jobs where they can be seen by the public, but undesirable for gay officers to work in sexual abuse cases or searching people. The main implication Carl's concerns with homosexuals and certain kinds of police work, is that gays need to be watched or supervised to carry out tasks involving matters of a sexual nature, or where personal contact is made, and are therefore untrustworthy and/or unprofessional. Carl explains that gays working in some jobs may be open to criticism and complaints which may be hard to refute. The implication is that because the officer is gay it would be difficult to refute such criticisms. The question needs to be asked- How does homosexuality effect the officers ability to conduct himself ?

Blackmail

Frank summarised his thoughts about having homosexuals in the police as follows:

> Interviewer: So how does all this relate to homosexuality?
>
> Frank: If a cop is homosexual there is that propensity for him to be blackmailed ..*right*.. and not to be accepted by the public because he's known to be homosexual ..*right*.. and because they don't appreciate just what's cooking there ..*mm*.. and the cop concerned might not fully appreciate himself where he is and doesn't mean to say when he joins on day one that he's going to stay where he is you know he might develop to be a bad homosexual or he might be just a straight homosexual ..*mm*.. and keep things goodly? for him um but there he could change ..*mm*. so there is that propensity there ..*mm*.. that area of mistrust [extract 8]

Frank's concern is that if homosexuals became police officers, members of the public will be able to blackmail them, thus leaving the police vulnerable. Whether or not this would be the case is not an appropriate question for this study, however for blackmail to occur one condition must be present. That is the police must not accept their homosexual members. If homosexuality was accepted by the police, blackmailers would not have grounds for making a threat against a homosexual officer, as the officer would have nothing to fear from the exposure of his sexual orientation. Thus by their

intolerance, the police department is placing itself in a vulnerable position. The impetus for change lies with the police, rather than the homosexuals.

Another notable feature of this extract is that Frank accounts for the public's non-acceptance of homosexual police officers with reference to their lack of understanding of homosexuality. Frank earlier explained how the public had a negative impression of homosexuals, which contributed to their intolerance of homosexuality. It would seem however, that Frank is susceptible to using the same negative constructions of homosexuals as exemplified by his concerns that a cop may develop from a good homosexual, in which state he joins the department, to a bad homosexual. This propensity for changing from good to bad, is the basis of mistrust of homosexuals. With this construction Frank implies that all homosexuals may have a pre-disposition to become bad (a description reminiscent of Franks's construction of homosexuals as child molesters) and thus it is better not to employ them as officers. The point I would like to make is that sexual orientation may not be taken as an indicator of deviance as is implied by this construction. It is not surprising that people mistrust homosexuals given the uncomplimentary descriptions they are associated with.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has presented an array of arguments used by police officers to justify keeping homosexuals out of the police force. The arguments generally related to accounts organised around the pressures within the police, and those impinging on the police with regard to the employment of homosexuals. The common function of all these arguments has been to warrant the exclusion of homosexuals from the police, thereby maintaining the heterosexual status quo.

These discourses have profound implications for gay officers serving in the police and gay men considering joining the police. Certainly, the negative responses voiced about gays should be taken into account by gay officers before any decision is made regarding the disclosure of a homosexual orientation. It would seem that even though the law has

changed to prevent discrimination in recruitment on the grounds of sexual orientation, there are social processes within the department that could effectively work to disadvantage gay officers. Through the association of gay men with effeminate behaviours, it is likely that effeminate men could also be targets of the negative social and professional sanctions expressed in the discourse of internal pressure.

The existence of the discourse of internal pressure raises questions about the effectiveness of laws protecting the rights of of gay people, given that there may be powerful discourses working against their successful integration into the police. Although protection by law is a start, it would seem that the police culture that maintains the anti-homosexual discourses should be directly challenged. Additionally, I question the utility of officers privately accepting homosexuals, if the result of their actions in public is to maintain discrepant power relations, favouring heterosexuals.

The discourses presented in this thesis do more than maintain the institution of the police. Through the linking of homosexuality with a range of inappropriate or undesirable behaviours, unflattering stereotypes of gay men have been perpetuated, with concomitant implications for the ideologies of gender and heterosexism, and ultimately gay men.

With regard to gender, the stigma attached to effeminate behaviour means that effeminate men, and gay men associated with effeminate behaviour may be forced to constantly monitor their own behaviours and change them in accordance with appropriate gender role expectations. Thus the association of effemininity with homosexuality may be used as a tool to maintain gender conformity. Furthermore, the effeminate discourse may be used to construct a type or types of homosexuals who may be subsequently rejected as candidates for policing.

The association of homosexuality with 'bad' behaviours, implicitly constructs heterosexuality as the desirable and normal sexual orientation. Homosexuality is thus negated as a valid sexual orientation and heterosexuals are given a justification for discriminating against gays. The ideology of heterosexism is therefore reinforced,

making it more difficult for gay people to enjoy equity and equality in a predominantly heterosexual institution.

It is the combination of the separate discourses discussed that produce powerful accounts of homosexuals and their role in the police. Through their own social constructions of gay men, officers were able to justify the inclusion or exclusion of homosexuals in the police, with reference to the internal and external pressures impinging on the department. Through the use of these different discourses, officers were able to place the responsibility for the acceptance or rejection of homosexuals within departmental culture, with the public and exclude themselves from anti-homosexual discourses. The deconstruction of these accounts has served to illuminate and describe the social discourses that give rise to expressions of both tolerance and prejudice within a small number of police officers.

However there are limitations associated with the present project. The focus on the discourses associated with gay men in a police sample, has placed the discourses associated with lesbians beyond the scope of the present study. A further limitation relates to the small number of officers interviewed for the study, all of whom came from the same police district. The research findings therefore are not generalisable to the entire policing body. However, it has been possible to present a detailed account of the discourses used by the group of officers who participated in the study.

Future research should explore the range of accounting devices used in society. This research would be a useful compliment to the present study, as the anti-gay opinions of the public were used as a justification for rejecting gay men as potential police officers. It would also be interesting to explore the discourses of lesbians in the police, and further examine the discourses of gay men given that the law has changed since the data for the present study was collected. Currently the law in New Zealand protects the rights of people of all sexual orientations under the Human Rights Act of 1994. Through the examination of homosexual discourses in society perhaps the wider problems of prejudice against gay men and lesbians could be confronted in a meaningful way.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

The Discourse of Homosexuality within the Police Force
Interview Schedule.

1. Thanks for agreeing to help me out with my study. I'd be interested to know what your reaction was on learning about the study? What did you expect ? What motivated you to take part ?
   - What aspect of homosexuality interests you?

2. I'd like to start off by getting you to tell me a bit about yourself and your career as a member of the police force.
   - What does that involve?

3. I'll jump right in now and ask you- what is homosexuality? What comes to mind when you hear 'homosexual' and 'homosexuality'?
   - Is it just a different sexual preference or a different lifestyle?
   - Are gays different to straits? How?
   - Are homosexuals a homogeneous group?

4. What are your views on homosexuals and homosexuality?
   - Have your attitudes changed over time?
   - What has influenced the change?

5. In your capacity as a police officer and member of the public, what has been your experience of gay people?
   - Is the deviance you have experienced homosexual deviance?
   - How has this contact influenced your attitudes?

11. What sort of treatment would a gay person receive on reporting harassment or bashing?
    - Do levels of sympathy differ among clients?

12. I'd like you to describe for me the typical gay man and gay woman?
    - Are homosexuals identifiable? How?
    - How are they different from Hets? e.g. jobs,style?
    - Has the stereotype changed over time? How?

13. How much truth do you think there is in the stereotype?
    - Are lesbians or gay men perceived more negatively? Why? By whom?

14. What do you think is the basis for the variation in sexual preference? Why are there hets, homs and bisexuals?
    - Difference in constitution/ upbringing/experience?
    - Deviance or a natural variation?

15. What do you know about homosexual relationships?
    - How are they different and the same to hets?
    - Where do children and marriage fit in?

16. How do you think the homosexual community is placed in society? How visible are they?

17. Do you think that homosexuals enjoy the same rights as everyone else in society? How are they discriminated against?
    -Employment- working with children/ Your kids?
    -The army, what are the issues?
    -Parenting, idoption, donoring, custody cases
    -Should sex orientation be included in the Human Rights Commission Act?

18. How would you feel if your kids came out as being homosexual?

19. What factors do you think contribute to anti-gay sentiment in society? How prevalent is anti-gay sentiment?
    - Who are more likely to be anti-gay ?
    - What role does the media play?
    - Established order/ old world values
    - Visibility of homosexuals ?

20. Well we're coming to the end of or time together, is there anything that you would like to add or ask before we finish?

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M.A., (1990). The context of discourse: Let's not throw out the baby with the bathwater. *Philosophical Psychology, 3*, 219-225.

AGB McNair. (1992). *Awareness of and Attitudes to Discrimination on Grounds of Sexual Orientation: A Survey of the New Zealand Population.* Wellington: Author.

Aguero, J.E., Bloch, L., & Byrne, D. (1984). The relationships among sexual beliefs, attitudes, and homophobia. *Journal of homosexuality, 10*(1/2), 95-107.

Bhugra, D. (1987). Homophobia: a review of the literature. *Sexual and Marital Therapy, 2*(2), 169-170.

Billig, M. (1985). Prejudice, categorisation and particularisation: from a perceptual to a rhetorical approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 15*, 79-103.

Bower, J. (1988). Review essay. *British Journal of Social of Social Psychology, 27*, 185-192.

Bowman, R. (1983). Beyond the pink triangle: the New Zealand public's attitudes toward homosexuality. In M. Mill, S. Mast, R. Bowman & C. Carr-Gregg (Eds.), *Shades of Deviance: a New Zealand Collection.* (pp. 99-113). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press Ltd.

Brown, R.J., & Turner, J.C. (1981). Interpersonal and intergroup behaviour. In J.C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup Behaviour.* (pp. 33-65). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Conger, J. (1975). Proceedings of the American Psychological Association Incorporated for the year 1974: Minutes of the Annual Meeting of Council Representatives. *American Psychologist, 46*, 950-956.

Crane, P. (1982). *Gays and the Law.* London: Pluto Press.

Crimes Act. (1908). Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer.

Crimes Act. (1961). Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer.

Crimes Amendment Act. (1941). Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer.

Duncan, D.F. (1988). Effects on homophobia of viewing a gay-themed film. *Psychological Reports, 63*, 46.

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology.* London: Sage

Ficarrotto, T.J. (1990). Racism, sexism and erotophobia: attitudes of heterosexuals to homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 19*(1), 111-116.

Fretz, B.R. (1975). Assessing attitudes toward sexual behaviours. *The Counseling Psychologist, 5*(1), 100-106.

Fyfe, B. (1983). 'Homophobia' or homosexual bias reconsidered. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 12*(6), 549-554.

Gentry, C.S. (1987). Social distance regarding male and female homosexuals. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127*(2), 199-208.

Gill, R. (1993). Justifying injustice: broadcasters' accounts of inequality in radio. In E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Discourse Analytic Research: Repertoires and Readings of Texts in Action.* (pp. 75-94). London: Routledge.

Goodyear, R.K., Abadie, P.D., & Barquest, K.A. (1981). Ascription of negative traits based on sex role and sexual orientation. *Psychological Reports, 49*, 194.

Gonsiorek, J.C. (1991). The empirical basis for the demise of the illness model of homosexuality. In J.C. Gonsiorek & J.D. Weinrich (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research Implications for Public Policy.* (pp. 115-136). California: Sage Publications.

Gosling, M. (May,1993). Gays would lower trust in police- poll. *Dominion.* p. 10.

Hamner, K.M., (1992). Gay bashing: a social identity analysis of violence against lesbians and gay men. In G.M. Herek & K.T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men.* (pp. 179-190). California: Sage Publications.

Hansen, G.L. (1982). Androgyny, sex role orientation and homosexism. *The Journal of Psychology, 112*, 39-45.

Hansen, G.L. (1982). Measuring prejudice against homosexuality (homosexism) among college students: a new scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 117*, 233-236.

Herek, G.M. (1984a). Beyond 'homophobia': a social Psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*(1/2), 1-21.

Herek, G.M. (1984b). Attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: a factor analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*(1/2), 2-17.

Herek, G.M. (1986b). On heterosexual masculinity: some psychical consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*(5), 563-577.

Herek, G.M. (1986c). The social psychology of homophobia: toward a practical theory. *NYU Review of Law and Social Change, 14*(4), 923-934.

Herek, G.M. (1987b). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology, 50*(4), 285-303.

Herek, G.M. (1991). Stigma, prejudice and violence against lesbians and gay men. In J.C. Gonsiorek & J.D. Weinrich (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research Implications for Public Policy.* (pp. 60-80). California: Sage Publications.

Herek, G.M. (1992a). The social context of hate crimes: notes on cultural heterosexism. In G.M. Herek & K.T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men.* (pp. 89-104). California: Sage Publications.

Herek, G.M. (1992b). Psychological heterosexism and anti-gay violence: the social psychology of bigotry and bashing. In G.M. Herek & K.T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men.* (pp. 149-169). California: Sage Publications.

Heritage, J., & Greatbatch, D. (1986). Generating applause: a study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology, 92,* 110-157.

Hodge, W.C. (1985). *Homosexual Law Reform: Questions and Answers Concerning the Legality of Male Homosexual Conduct in New Zealand.* Auckland: University of Auckland.

Homosexual Law Reform Act. (1986). Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer.

Hong, S.M. (1983). Sex, religion and factor analytically derived attitudes toward homosexuality. *Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage and Family, 4,* 142-150.

Hong, S.M. (1984). Australian attitudes toward homosexuality: a comparison with college students. *The Journal of Psychology, 117*, 89-95.

Hudson, W.W. & Ricketts, W.A. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality, 5*(4), 357-372.

Human Rights Act. (1993). Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer.

Human Rights Commission (1985). *Public Statement on the Homosexual Law Reform Bill.* Wellington: Author.

Human Rights Commission Act. (1977). Wellington: New Zealand Government Printer.

Irwin, P., & Thompson, N.L. (1978). Acceptance of the rights of homosexuals: a social profile. *Journal of Homosexuality, 3*(2), 107-121.

Jackson, L.A., & Sullivan, L.A. (1989). Cognition and affect in evaluations of stereotyped group members. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 129*(5), 659-672.

Jenks, R.J. (1986). Perceptions of two deviant and non-deviant groups. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 126*(6), 783-790.

Jensen, L., Gambles, D., & Olsen, J. (1988). Attitudes to homosexuality: a cross cultural analysis of predictors. *The International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 34*(1), 47-57.

Kite, M.E. (1984). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Homosexuality, 10*(1/2), 69-81.

Kite, M.E., & Deaux, K. (1986). Attitudes to homosexuality: assessment and behavioural consequences. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology,7*(2), 137-162.

Kite, M.E., & Deaux, K. (1987). Gender belief systems: homosexuality and the implicit inversion theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11*, 83-96.

Kurdek, L.A. (1988). Correlates of negative attitudes toward homosexuals in heterosexual college students. *Sex Roles, 18*(11/12), 727-738.

Lance, L.M. (1987). The effects of interaction with gay persons on attitudes toward homosexuality. *Human Relations, 40*(6), 329-336.

Larsen, K.F., Reed, M., & Hoffman, S. (1980). Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality: a likert-type scale and construct validity. *The Journal of Sex Research, 16*(3), 245-257.

Levitt, E.E., & Klassen, A.D. (1974). Public attitudes toward homosexuality: part of the 1970 national survey by the Institute of Sex Research. *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*(1), 29-43.

Lieblich, A., & Friedman, G. (1985). Attitudes toward male and female homosexuality and sex-role stereotypes in Israeli and American students. *Sex Roles, 12*(5/6), 561-570.

Maret, S.M. (1984). Attitudes of fundamentalists to homosexuality. *Psychological Reports, 55*, 205-206.

McCreanor, T. (In press). Why strengthen the city wall when the enemy has poisoned the well: an assay of anti-homosexual discourse in New Zealand.

MacDonald, A.P., & Games, R.G. (1974). Some characteristics of those who hold positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*(1), 9-27.

MacDonald, A.P., Jr, Huggins, J., Young, S., & Swanson, R.A. (1972). Attitudes toward homosexuality: preservation of sex morality or the double standard? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40*, 161-

Meredith, R.L., & Reister, R.W. (1980). Psychotherapy responsibility of homosexual clinical examination of socially deviant behaviour. *Professional Psychology, 11*, 174-193.

Mihalik, G.J. (1991). From anthropology: homosexuality, stigma and biocultural evolution. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy, 1*(4), 15-29.

Miller, D.J., & Romanelli, R.E. (1991). From religion: heterosexism and the golden rule. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy, 1*(4), 45-64.

National Gay Rights Coalition of New Zealand. (1980). *A Report to Members of the International Gay Association on Conditions for Lesbian Women and Gay Men in New Zealand.* Wellington: Author.

Neisen, J.H. (1990). Heterosexism: redefining homophobia for the 1990's. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy, 1*(3), 21-35.

Newton, D.E. (1978). Homosexual behaviour and child molestation: a review of the evidence. *Adolescence, 13*, 29-33.

Niederhoffer, A. (1967). *Behind the Shield: The Police in Urban Society.* New York: Anchor Books.

Nyberg, K.L., & Alston, J.P. (1976/1977). Analysis of public attitudes toward homosexual behaviour. *Journal of Homosexuality, 2*(2), 99-107.

Page, S., & Yee, M. (1985). Conceptions of male and female homosexual stereotypes among university undergraduates. *Journal of Homosexuality, 12*(1), 109-118.

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

Parker, I. (1990a). Discourse: definitions and contradictions. *Philosophical Psychology, 3*(2),189-204.

Parker, I. (1990b). Real things: discourse, context and practice. *Philosophical Psychology, 3*(2), 227-233.

Potter J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour.* London: Sage Publications.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1994). Analysing discourse. In A. Bryman & R.G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing Qualitative Data.* (pp. 47-66) London: Routledge.

Potter, J., Wetherell, M., Gill, R., & Edwards, D. (1990). Discourse: noun, verb or social practice. *Philosophical Psychology, 3*(2), 205-217.

Ross, M.W., Paulsen, J.A., & Stalstrom, O.W. (1989). Homosexuality and mental health: A cross cultural review. *Journal of Homosexuality, 15*, 131-152.

Smith, K.T. (1971). Homophobia: a tentative personality profile. *Psychological Reports, 29*, 1091-1094.

Stark, L.P. (1991). Traditional gender role beliefs and individual outcomes: an exploratory analysis. *Sex Roles, 24*(9/10), 639-650.

Stephan, G.E., & McMullin, D.R. (1982). Tolerance of sexual non-conformity: City size as a situational and early learning determinant. *American Sociological Review, 47*, 411-415.

Strangor, C., Sullivan, L.A., & Ford, T.E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition, 9*(4), 359-380.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Talbot, D. (1985). *Homosexual Women and Men in Australia and New Zealand: A Resource Book.* Perth, Western Australia: Gay Counselling Service W.A..

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1986, September). *Majority group representations of race relations in New Zealand.* Paper presented at the B.P.S. Social Psychology Section Annual Conference, University of Sussex, England.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook.* London: Sage.

Whitley, B.E. (1987). The relationship of sex-role orientation to heterosexuals attitudes toward homosexuals. *Sex Roles, 17*(1/2), 639-650.