

Australian Psychologists' Understandings in Relation to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, and Intersex (LGBTQI) High School Students' Experience of Bullying, 'Inclusive' Service Delivery, and the Impact of 'Heteronormativity'

Zare Edwards
Lester Watson
Charles Sturt University

Ten percent of high school students identify as LGBTQI and often experience very high rates of sexual/gender diversity bullying, negatively impacting their academic engagement and mental health outcomes. Evidence suggests these bullying rates are increasing worldwide, with the Australian experience exacerbated by recent Marriage Equality Plebiscite backlash, and regressive educational bullying intervention policy changes. In response to increased calls for psychological service support, the APS and industry experts have recommended psychologists develop their reflexivity regarding LGBTQI clients; practice inclusively; and situate LGBTQI youth's experience within the wider social context. Psychologists' understandings regarding these issues and recommendations are currently untapped. To contribute to the knowledge base, the understandings of 10 psychologists currently working with adolescents were explored, via semi-structured interviews utilising Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. Findings revealed Australian-trained psychologists lack exposure to LGBTQI inclusive educational discourses, hampering capacity to understand students' experience, and practice inclusively. Participants were challenged to identify and theoretically explain structural drivers of LGBTQI identity based discrimination, such as heteronormativity, leaving them unable to situate students' experience within the wider social context. Compounding these incapacities, findings suggested psychologists are inadequately trained in reflexive practice in ways that engage them on a personal, theoretical, and professional level.

LGBTQI youth are significantly over-represented in mental health diagnoses, substance abuse, self-harm and suicide (Semp & Read, 2015). International (Espelage & Swearer-Napolitano, 2008) and national (Smith et al., 2014) research reveals the 10% of high school students identifying as LGBTQI (Hillier et al., 2010) experience very high rates of bullying due to gender/sexual diversity (Ullman, 2016). These rates are currently increasing (Jones & Lasser, 2017), with high school being cited as the primary, most harrowing site for discrimination and harassment (Smith et al., 2014).

In school settings more than two thirds of this group report enduring verbal abuse, and more than a fifth, physical abuse (Jones & Lasser, 2017). A recent Australian survey found 90% exposed to physical abuse at school considered suicide in response (Smith

et al., 2014). In 2017, reports of physical and verbal assaults from LGBTQI youth doubled, driven by backlash from the Australian Marriage Equality Postal Survey and the damaging nature of the 'no' campaign (Karp, 2017).

Preceding this event was the shutting down of Safe Schools Coalition Australia (SSCA), creator of the 'Safe Schools' (SS) evidence-based inclusive bullying program aiming to reduce homophobic, transphobic and intersex prejudice through representation and support for diversity (SSCA, n.d.). Initiated in 2010, SS enjoyed bipartisan political support (Smith et al., 2014). Due to its success, it expanded nationally on a voluntary opt-in basis with participation from schools increasing robustly to 545 by 2016 (Davey, 2016). However, in 2015 some conservative MPs, in conjunction with the Australian Christian Lobby Group,

canvassed the Australian Government to order a review of SSCA and the SS program (McGaw, 2015).

The resultant review recommended no major changes, finding the SS program to contain suitable content, language, and consistency with SSCA aims and national curriculum (Louden, 2016). However, the SSCA was closed down, and educational policy was reverted to recommend general, non-specific bullying programs (Kang, 2017). These traditionally employed interventions are criticised for insufficiently considering LGBTQI students' experience (Clarke, Ellis, Peel, & Riggs, 2012), promoting heteronormative individualising discourses that reduce complex gender/sexual power relations to a binary conceptualisation of a problematic bully in relation to a weaker victim (Marston, 2015).

LGBTQI youth report challenges accessing mental health services (Semp & Read, 2015). In a recent Australian survey up to 50% of LGBTQI youth claim interaction with psychologists was negative. Twenty five per cent stated they would avoid accessing services due to expectation of ignorance around issues important to them (Smith et al., 2014). Reported barriers include fear of discrimination, rejection, breaches of confidentiality (Davies, 2015), pivotal topics such as sexual orientation not being addressed, and negative reaction in response to sexual orientation disclosure (Semp & Read, 2015).

Scholars suggest heteronormativity – the assumption that heterosexuality, predicated on the 'conventional' gender binary, is the only normal and 'natural' expression of sexuality – underlies the barriers to addressing the issues important to LGBTQI youth (Walton, 2011). This article reports on a research project that examined the perceptions of psychologists' working with adolescents regarding their understandings about LGBTQI students' experience of bullying in high school, what 'inclusive' service delivery means, and the impact of heteronormativity.

Australian Psychological Society Stance on LGBTQI Issues

As a profession, psychology has a long history of damaging pathologising conceptions about, and treatment of, LGBTQI people. Psychological theories, research, and teaching remain overwhelmingly characterised by heteronormative assumptions (Neville & Henrickson, 2005) in which heterosexuality is constantly presented as the norm, failing to acknowledge and legitimise diversity (Clarke et al., 2012).

Developmental factors leave adolescents highly susceptible to social exclusion behaviour and attitudes (Horn, 2007). They grapple with sexuality and gender identity issues at a time of peak negative peer influence, confusion, and vulnerability to negative appraisal of themselves (Brechwald & Prinstein, 2011).

Consequently, those who access psychologists' services require practitioners capable of highly informed supportive exploration of relevant sexual, gender, and identity issues (National LGBTI Health Alliance, 2014).

Evidence suggests despite psychology governing bodies' policy statements in support of inclusivity, current (mostly well-intentioned) professionals reflect the wider heteronormative culture and are consequently too ill-informed to situate LGBTQI youth's experience within it, and work effectively with them (Semp & Read, 2015). For this reason, the National LGBTI Health Alliance (2014) espouses support must be explicit in every interaction, from advertising, to intake, to treatment methods. However, to date, there is relatively little scholarship exploring service provision for LGBTQI youth (Semp & Read, 2015), with the Australian Psychological Society (APS, 2017) acknowledging the need to redress the serious lack of extant literature.

Significantly, adolescents are most frequently enrolled in psychological services by their parents in relation to depression, anxiety and bullying (Rickwood, Deane, & Wilson, 2007), so it is unlikely they have the opportunity to determine if services will be

receptive to LGBTQI issues. It is also overwhelmingly common for LGBTQI adolescents to be grappling with identity issues without parental knowledge (National LGBTI Health Alliance, 2014). LGBTQI youth claim they need explicit recognition of diversity in mental health settings to feel comfortable exploring their issues (Semp & Read, 2015), highlighting the need for all psychologists to be culturally and clinically competent for working with this marginalised group (Rickwood et al., 2007).

The APS (2017) recognises inclusive service delivery, characterised by LGBTQI affirmative policies, processes and practices, is paramount for successfully and effectively engaging LGBTQI youth. Their 'Ethical Guidelines on working with Sex and/or Gender Diverse Clients' require psychologists to understand the consequences of unfair discrimination and stereotyping (APS, 2016). Accordingly, the APS (n.d.) espouses that practitioners need to practice organisational, systemic, and social change in support of LGBTQI clients. They also outline in their 'Tips for psychologists and others working with LGBTQI+ students and communities' (2017), that psychologists need to understand the impact of marginalisation and victimisation on LGBTQI youth, and develop reflective practice around working with these clients. However, there is a lack of literature regarding psychologists' understandings of what this means, how they conceptualise achieving it, or how they practice it (Semp & Read, 2017). Scholars have suggested that to be truly effective in supporting LGBTQI students facing gender/sexuality based bullying (Preston, 2014), psychologists may need the ability to identify and critique the heteronormative social systems of power that seemingly invisibly drive and enforce these phenomena (Ellis, 2007).

Research Aims

Accordingly, the research questions aimed to examine and understand: how psychologists discursively construct/describe the position of LGBTQI youth in relation to school bullying; their conceptualisation of 'inclusive' service delivery; and their

recognition of heteronormativity and the systems of power that substrate it (Frohard-Dourlent, 2016). The research questions, and their inherent analysis of heteronormativity, rest on concepts such as power, discourse, and discursive practices (Walton, 2011). To describe and analyse these in greater detail, the theoretical lens utilised, a Foucauldian approach informed by a Queer Theory (QT) epistemology, is briefly outlined below.

Theoretical Lens: A Foucauldian Approach

Foucault considered power and knowledge to be inextricably intertwined (Mansfield, 2000). He suggested power relations, and their sanctioned forms of knowledge 'naturalise' certain identities, while framing others as 'deviant', or fail to represent them at all. These 'understandings' are deployed via discourses and discursive practices (Willig, 2013) through institutions such as schools and universities (Downing, 2008).

Discourse is defined as the exercise of meaning making and prioritising of certain forms of knowledge and identity through shared communications (Stainton-Rogers, 2003) such as language, text, policy, practices (Ramazanoglu, 1993), but also through silences, and the absence of representation (Walton, 2011). These discourses shape collective and individual thought, identity and behaviour, creating 'subject positions', as individuals (Spargo, 1999), as students, and as emerging psychologists (Allen, 2010). Foucault suggested our subject positions invisibly influence what actions and behaviours we can conceptualise and express for ourselves, and others, personally and professionally (Parker, 1992). Discursive practices are the behaviours and actions that transfer meaning and reflect systems of thought and power (Springer & Clinton, 2015). They refer to the systemised bodies of knowledge, intertwined with and created by discourse, that are steeped in spoken and unspoken codes, conditions and rules (Young, 1981).

Foucault (1977) believed transmission of power and knowledge via dispersed discourses, such as the framing of sexuality/

gender/identity, and discursive practices (e.g. bullying), sculpt our individual subjectivities (thoughts, feelings, preferences) (Mansfield, 2000). Foucault (1970) termed the invisible process, transmission, and understandings deployed via discourse and discursive practices, the 'positive unconscious of knowledge'. Foucault suggested these levels of knowledge, which elude consciousness (Springer & Clinton, 2015), are fundamental to the embedding of discourses and discursive practices, such as heteronormativity, in our social understandings, and to the formation of our own identities, and the formation of our conceptions of others identities (subjectivities) (Foucault, 1970). While Foucault theorised extensively on these conceptions regarding sexuality, he was criticised for comparative silence regarding 'gender' (McLaughlin, 2003). Queer theory addresses this conceptual gap.

Queer Theory

QT extends Foucault's understandings regarding power, knowledge, discourse, discursive practices (Minton, 1997) to place equal emphasis on critiquing conceptualisations of both sexuality and gender. Butler (1990) has highlighted the importance of examining 'performativity', which refers to stylised repetitions of gestures, movements, embodiments, and behavioural patterns that are socially constructed, sanctioned, and regulated.

QT suggests we are 'interpreted' through these, with roles and meanings ascribed to us (Preston, 2014). The 'interpretation' reflects and upholds 'normal, healthy' interior subjectivities organised around 'acceptable' expressions of gendered and sexual being (Mansfield, 2000). 'Norming' and 'naturalisation' of these categories occurs invisibly via 'positive unconscious of knowledge' transmission (Springer & Clinton, 2015). It is this performativity that is believed to substrate 'heteronormativity' (Butler, 1990).

QT suggests heteronormativity is embedded in all social structures (Ansara & Hegarty, 2011), routines and circumstances of everyday life (Frohard-Dourlent, 2016),

naturalising and privileging heterosexist identity (Lorenzetti, Wells, Logie, & Callaghan, 2017). In school settings it occurs invisibly via constructed traditions, use of facilities, classroom habits, administrative practices, curriculum content, and 'normal, sanctioned' student-teacher, student-student interactions (Preston, 2014). These same considerations can be transferred to psychologists' rooms (Walton, 2011). They produce and reproduce, affirm and reject, categories of gender and sexual identity (Allen, 2010).

Application of Theory

A QT informed Foucauldian approach prioritises understanding how discourses about identities are culturally and historically situated (Parker, 1992). The politically driven shutting down of SSCA and SS could be seen as a re-assertion of heteronormative power relations (Pratt, 2011), serving to re-legitimate certain forms of knowledge regarding sexual and gender identities (Rhodes, 2015). From this perspective, bullying experienced by LGBTQI students can be understood as the heteronormative social system of power at work, targeting 'non-conforming' individuals (Payne, Smith, & Goble, 2014). The individualising discourse about bullying underpinning current educational policy and practice also informs psychologists' practice (Payne et al., 2014). Do psychologists, and the institutions that train them, recognise the importance of supporting LGBTQI youth to understand their experience within the broader social context? Does the deployment of heteronormativity via 'positive unconscious of knowledge' produce an 'innocent' unexamined harmful ignorance on the behalf of psychologists preventing provision of truly inclusive services?

This research sought to contribute to literature on these topics, with the overriding aim to improve psychologists' understandings of LGBTQI students' experience of bullying, as well as their own personal and professional reflexive capacities, and so enhance the provision of truly inclusive service to LGBTQI adolescents.

Research Design

Methodology

The epistemology and theoretical base utilised, QT informed Foucauldian approach, share pivotal conceptualisations and theoretical understandings around the central tenets such as discourse, discursive practices, and heteronormativity. This makes them ideally suited for congruency in providing the 'language and format' to answer the research questions.

This approach encourages deep critical reflection on deployment of power via constructions of knowledge (discourses), attempting to identify and illuminate discursive practices (Clarke et al., 2012). It is pivotally interested in the relationship between discourses and institutions (Preston, 2014), the possibilities (subject positions) these dynamics offer (McLaughlin, 2003), and how these processes influence subjectivities of psychologists and LGBTQI students. It critiques and deconstructs categorisations of gender and sexuality (Butler, 1990). Perhaps most importantly in this research, this approach strives to make visible the 'positive unconscious of knowledge' in relation to psychologists' understandings.

Participants

Following ethics approval (from Charles Sturt University; Protocol Number H18030), 10 research participants were recruited from email invitations sourced by searching for potential participants within the APS's website in the 'Find a Practitioner' section. The prerequisite for recruitment was being a fully qualified and registered psychologist experienced in working with adolescents. The group comprised two General Psychologists and eight Clinical Psychologists, whose ages spanned from mid-twenties to early seventies. Two participants had three years' experience in the field, with the rest ranging from sixteen to thirty plus years. Participants were from Regional NSW, Regional Queensland, Tasmania, Canberra, Sydney and Brisbane.

Method

Data was collected via semi-structured interviews conducted individually by the first

author via telephone or video-conferencing, and were audio recorded and transcribed. To preserve confidentiality of participants, all personal and organisational identifiers were removed in the transcription process and individuals were assigned pseudonyms. The method of data analysis utilised, Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA), is drawn from the theoretical approach adopted, and so was eminently congruent, operating within the same conceptualisations of power, knowledge, discourse, and discursive practices (Parker, 1992). The FDA steps utilised were drawn from Willig (2013) and Parker (1992).

Analysis and Discussion

Identify Discursive Constructions

The first research question focused on capturing psychologists' understandings of LGBTQI students' experience of bullying by examining their discursive constructions. How was bullying of LGBTQI students being thought about and spoken about? Was bullying of LGBTQI students perceived as an individualised act, or was it situated within the wider social context?

When asked to consider who bullies who and why, all interviewees understood bullying phenomena to occur in response to difference in the face of norms and hierarchies that were reflective of broader social forces:

...the epicentre of this social hierarchy, um, that gets sort of created...the group that establishes themselves as popular, and as kind of the norm, and...I'm sure that those norms come from general sort of societal expectations, um, and then...the other is kind of defined as...whatever is different from that... (Terri)

...largely being around the um, social um, hierarchy that occurs...so a lot of positioning...a lot of the bullying is around social position... (Kris)

...in my experience, it's about difference...it's about being targeted if you don't fit in with the popular norms of the day. (Jay)

These generalised understandings about bullying behaviour reflected consideration of

these acts being reinforcers of hierarchies of power and privilege via policing of social norms by other students (Walton, 2011). Participants were situating these phenomena within the wider social context as recommended by the APS and industry experts. However, they often did not conceptualise LGBTQI students' experience of bullying as being any more targeted and driven by social 'norms' than generic adolescent bullying:

I don't think gay would be anything to be picked on for... (Lindsay)

Um, no, I wouldn't think so. (Beau)

This discrepancy between acknowledging wider social context and societal norms as drivers for bullying generally, yet seemingly being unable to identify the consequent heightened impact for LGBTQI students, suggests a level of contradiction for psychologists in their conceptualisations. There appeared to be dissonance in thinking about drivers for adolescent bullying in general, compared to understandings around LGBTQI students' experience of bullying specifically.

Compounding this discrepancy, some participants appeared to discursively construct LGBTQI students' experience in a way that deflected from the sexual/gender identity nature of bullying, minimising the student's experience, and framing the individual as potentially over-reactive:

...ah, I don't know that it would be different...it can be perceived I think by the person who is being bullied, if they are...coming under the LGT, they are going to perceive it being for that reason perhaps, um, whereas in reality, that's just the thing that stands out the most for the bully to target. (Del)

...they have a framework for themselves, a narrative about talking about themselves, where they are the victim, um, they're the helpless one... and I do wonder how they present with their peers, psychologically, to have this repeated narrative... (Lindsay)

The contradiction participants displayed in framing of bullying generally, compared to LGBTQI students specifically, as well as

questioning legitimacy of the bullied individual, reveal subtle, unconscious, unnoticed exercising of heteronormative power (Burke, 2013). Discursive constructions used by participants about LGBTQI youth focussed on individual needs and deficits, rather than questioning environment or external factors:

...the bullying is one thing, but how is this person feeling about their sexuality within that, now their sexuality is, it's already a problem, because most people don't accept it anyway...a lot of times, it's actually them coming to terms with their own sexuality...rather than other people... (Sam)

This form of discursive construction can be seen to sustain invisible processes of marginalisation by applying an individualising discourse that makes the student responsible for the way others react to them and turns the sexualised nature of bullying into a critique of the student's self-acceptance, deflecting attention from constrictive heteronormative norms. In a related example, LGBTQI youth sexual/gender identity was discursively constructed as a 'choice':

...I'm not necessarily saying that same sex attraction or gender identity is a choice, um, but you can certainly choose not to be, you'd be very uncomfortable, but you can choose not to be... (Sam)

These kinds of discursive construction that make the student responsible for the very architecture of their identity, and capacity to choose, draw heavily on individualist notions of agency, placing responsibility for experience squarely with the bullied youth. These kinds of unnoticed individualised discursive constructions reveal how well-intentioned psychologists can perpetuate discriminatory dominant discourses unawares.

A majority of the psychologists' discursive constructions about LGBTQI youth centred on forms of individualism and the bullied individual's responsibility towards the 'aggressor':

...often the reason we are being bullied has little to do with us, and its more about the person doing it, but I do always say to them...we always have to do a certain amount of soul searching and self-reflection, so if somebody is bullying us, or being mean to us...we do need to have a little stop and a think, well, what has my behaviour been like...so if we are able to help the person see something from someone else's point of view, they can sometimes have the bullying stopped simply by reacting in a different way. (Del)

While supporting capacity for self-reflection is desirable, ideally that would be fostered within explanation that situates bullying within the wider social context, to glean what is and is not the student's individual responsibility. Discursive construction of bullying for youth that places sole focus on them to resolve it, can contribute to 'learned helplessness' if social context is not accounted for (Marston, 2015). In addition, some participants also tended to discursively construct LGBTQI youth as being responsible for others in general:

...if they are always like, well you need to accept me, well, they need to accept that sometimes people aren't going to accept how they are, there's differences and all sort of varieties of people, and sometimes people just can't accept how someone else is, so the other person has to accept... (Jay)

Accompanying psychologists' individualistic focus was a primary concern to build youths' resiliency to deflect bullying:

...do they know how to handle bullying in a constructive way, to make it stop, or to protect themselves in the longer term...yeh, just looking at strengthening up their resiliency factors... (Beau)

These discursive constructions focused on supporting students to take responsibility for the bullying act, changing their behaviour to deflect it, taking responsibility for lack of acceptance from others, as well as building resiliency for coping in the face of

aggression, can all be understood as framing that supports heteronormative status quo, through commitment to a binary, individualised conceptions of bullying and sexuality.

A focus on resiliency building, while seemingly an obvious skill set to nurture, if not provided within an overarching context of explanation accounting for social and cultural drivers of bullying, has been touted as a mechanism of disempowerment for marginalised populations (Marston, 2015). At a time developmentally when self-efficacy is at its lowest, desire for 'belonging' is greatest, and feeling socially bewildered is commonplace, to place the onus on LGBTQI students to take the situation in hand, can prime them for feelings of failure and shame, as well as social and academic disengagement (Moore & Prescott, 2012). Ideally, psychologists would have nuanced understanding of these issues from their training (Rhodes & Langtiw, 2018), however, all but one of the participants consistently employed individualised discursive constructions about bullying of, and interventions for, LGBTQI students:

...it's having the social skills, being able to regulate their emotions, so that they are able to, in that moment, cope with something in a more appropriate way, so that it may not escalate a situation. (Del)

These discursive constructions focussed on the bullied 'victim', requiring them to resolve discrimination one bully at a time, rather than pointing towards, and being able to deconstruct for their young clients in a potentially empowering and depersonalising way, complex gendered and sexualised power relations embedded within schools and wider culture (Frohard-Dourlent, 2016). This contradiction between psychologists discursively constructing bullying generally as being driven by social forces, yet succumbing to individualisation of the issue regarding LGBTQI students, may reflect a major heteronormative factor underpinning the seeming intractability of LGBTQI bullying (Walton, 2011) – an incapacity, theoretically and in practice, to situate

discrimination and marginalisation within the broader social context. These contradictions certainly appear to echo current disparity between governmental and educational policy regarding their official discourses espousing 'inclusivity', with the actual lived experience of increasing incidences of LGBTQI identity based bullying and the shutting down of the SSCA. Scholars suggest despite psychology governing bodies espousing inclusivity, well-intentioned psychologists have not been availed of the critical reflexivity skills to critique heteronormative culture, and consequently remain too ill-informed to work effectively with LGBTQI youth (Semp & Read, 2015). The individualistic discursive constructions discussed above, and their contradictions, potentially reflect this suggestion.

To explore psychologists' discursive constructions around inclusive service delivery, they were first asked if LGBTQI students faced extra barriers accessing mental health services. All interviewees confirmed they understood LGBTQI students to face significant barriers, which included lack of training and understanding on psychologists' behalf and lack of accessible relevant services:

Yeh...definitely...um, we're not necessarily trained in LGBTQI population, so if their main concern was around their identity, their sexual orientation, gender, um, we would want to refer them on...in [location] specifically there aren't many services...young people, if they are in [location] region, have no ability to access services if that is their main concern, those identity kind of issues. (Jacq)

Other barriers noted were general community ignorance about relevant issues and available services, fear of heteronormative reactionism, and feelings of shame:

Absolutely...how to access services, if parents aren't advocating on their behalf, and then...just not, not knowing what services for mental health exist generally, and then even beyond that, not knowing what exists for, particularly LGBTQI young

people...I think, sexuality is such a taboo issue to begin with, that I think so many people just have this shame like, to the point that it is not even conscious to them that they are making a choice to like not seek that out, it's almost like they just shut down before they even acknowledge to themselves that they need that sort of support and that space to explore...fear of judgement, fear of shame, um, parents and important people in life finding out and responding unfavourably (Terri).

Participants' conceptions regarding barriers for LGBTQI youth attempting to access services clearly considered historical and social context:

I'm sure historically it feels like... systematically that's something that's not really welcomed or accepted to sort of talk about, and I guess that still probably happens in clinical presentations now...yeh, it's probably not something that is initially openly disclosed, so yeh, probably that feeling, of just how to talk about it, and then, um, what someone is going to think about that... (Beau)

Also expressed was psychologists' awareness of challenged capacity for adolescents, due to age, resources, and developmental factors, to seek and initiate truly inclusive treatment:

...I think they would have an additional barrier of, how do they know who to go and talk to, how do they know, and is a 13 year old confident to ring up and say I need to speak to a psychologist, do you have a psychologist who is happy to work with, and to actually put it out there, rather than feeling that it is some dark secret... (Del)

These barriers are particularly pertinent given that developmental factors at this age make them highly susceptible to social exclusion behaviour and attitudes (Horn, 2007). Possibly making them more vulnerable to risk of accessing psychological services without sufficient inclusivity is that they are primarily enrolled by their parents (Rickwood et al., 2007), who are very

frequently unaware of their identity and sexual orientation issues (National LGBTI Health Alliance, 2014).

...in my experience, a lot of the, um, young people, haven't told their families, um, about what's going on... (Jacq)

When asked to define what inclusivity regarding service provision to LGBTQI youth meant to them, participants discursively constructed it to mean acceptance:

...I think it means that there's, everybody feels um, accepted, I believe that mental health treatment should be available for anyone, for anyone that wants to access it, so there shouldn't be any barriers to entry, that it should feel accessible and approachable for anybody... anyone feels that they can come through the door without that, um, fear of sort of, being turned away, or judgement... (Beau)

and equality;

...I think it is about, treating everyone the same...no matter what...that every single young person that seeks a service from me would be communicated with exactly the same, that if there is something that I am not that sensitive too, that I would be able to create a safe enough environment, for them to be able to tell me about those things...I think it's...that everyone, has a safe place, no matter what is going on for them. (Jacq)

Participants' expressions of what inclusivity meant, acceptance and equality, were very generic and relatively intangible. QT theorists would argue that these generic discursive constructions are 'throw away' terms that allow professionals to feel they are working inclusively, without employing specific evidence-based practices recommended by LGBTQI students and industry experts (Giffney, 2009). Only one respondent demonstrated ability to frame inclusivity as requiring explicit confirmation:

...it's about creating a service that... doesn't wait for them to ask for their

needs in terms of their identity...

advertising as such so it is known that it is going to be supportive of counselling that is informed...just being...informed myself

...keeping myself educated about that and ensuring that there is no...biases ...asking things like that, what are your preferred pronouns...I think as an LGBTQI person if I was looking for a psychologist I wouldn't want to have to go in wondering whether it was going to be a safe and inclusive service, and...tell my whole story before I sort of figured out that that person didn't get it, and then have to try to find someone who was going to be open to that... (Terri)

This participant was the only one who was able to theoretically conceptualise discrimination and marginalisation of LGBTQI students within the broader social context, as well as unpack and discuss the concept, and reality, with adolescents in practice. Tellingly, this psychologist was also the only participant who advertised, on websites and within practice rooms, explicitly working with LGBTQI clients and issues, and gave an option for gender diverse pronouns on intake sheets, all practices supportive of inclusive service provision, as recommended by the APS and industry experts.

Contradictions in discursive constructions about bullying discussed above, were also found in response to the second question that focused on their conceptualisations around inclusivity. While participants all confirmed they understood the barriers LGBTQI youth faced accessing mental health services, and that inclusivity meant promoting acceptance and equality in service access and provision, all but two of the interviewees displayed a lack of consideration when asked if there was anywhere in their practice, rooms, or website where they used visual cues that affirmed LGBTQI identity, or if they used a range of pronouns on intake forms:

Um, nothing that we actually, I don't think there's anything that we

actively, publicise on our website...you raise a good question actually, I'm not sure that any, any of our little blurbs, that we actually have anything on our site or in our rooms...hmm. (Del)

A number of participants responded in ways that could be considered deflective and, as such, invisibly protective of heteronormativity:

No, my rooms are pretty neutral, I don't have posters up about any issues, I don't have anything up about any issues, I could plaster up...Gender Centre, or this that and the other, and then I'll get some 76 year old conservative Christian lady coming in taking offence at it... (Lindsay)

This response demonstrates the psychologist preferencing the potential discomfort of a stereotypical example of an individual whose identity and ideology would likely be heteronormative, above a marginalised population's need for consideration, representation and confirmation. This failure to consider and act in support of LGBTQI clients, in order not to 'offend' others, has frequently been cited as a mechanism by which analysis of discrimination is avoided and, consequently, heteronormativity is upheld (Preston, 2014). Similarly, other participants discursively framed lack of use of explicitly inclusive practices as being about the impossibility of being inclusive to 'all' potential clients:

No, I don't have, on my website I don't have that...I've never really bothered to put that in because I've thought if I do, that means that I've got to put like everyone in then, then I've got to say, so because, I don't, really to highlight one group of people...yeh, no, I don't... (Shain)

Both of these ways of discursively constructing explanations of inaction regarding LGBTQI representation could be suggested to protect heteronormative norms by deflecting critique from wider social practices in unnoticed ways (Allen, 2010). Compounding participants' inability to understand the importance of adopting explicitly inclusive practices was their

reported unawareness of other LGBTQI resources, practitioners, or agencies to refer youth to if necessary:

No, I don't know any particular services off the top of my mind. (Kris)
I haven't done a lot of research into it. (Jacq)

Given that students assume a lack of understanding and expectation of discrimination from psychologists if they do not explicitly advertise inclusivity (Davies, 2015), and that more than 50% of LGBTQI youth that do press forward to access treatment find the services unsatisfactory (Semp & Read, 2015), the above responses are troubling.

All the participants, knowing the subject matter of this research, and having been generous enough to participate, clearly viewed themselves as 'open minded' inclusive practitioners sensitive to the needs of LGBTQI students. A few hundred invitations to participate in this research were disseminated nationally, and if these ten participants, obviously pro-active in support of the research topic, display incapacity to apply truly inclusive practices, what does that say about the field's capacity as a whole to practice inclusively?

When asked if any visual cues of affirmation for LGBTQI students were used in their advertising or practice, psychologists seemed perplexed:

....I don't specifically um, ah, advertise...hmmm, no, I don't have it on my website, which is interesting, but. (Sam)

No...no, not really, no...so there's not, yeh, that's an interesting question, I don't actually have any...well, it's an interesting question. (Kris)

This innocent lack of consideration could be understood as an example of the way heteronormative discursive constructions and practices occur invisibly, as discussed earlier. Foucault (1970) suggests that this 'positive unconscious of knowledge' absorption of common dominant norms can be identified by the surprise or confusion that results from the questioning of behaviour, such as that observed in the participants upon realising

that they have not considered affirming diverse identities in their practice.

To understand the confusion and discrepancies psychologists displayed, FDA recommends attempting to identify the discourses from which these discursive constructions and their contradictions are drawn.

Identify Discourses and Relationships Between Them

The third research question sought to investigate participants' understandings of heteronormativity and awareness of the systems of power that substrate it. Capacity to identify and critique discriminatory structural forces requires critical theoretical, professional and personal reflexivity skills (Alexander & Yescavage, 2009), all recognised components of psychologists' tertiary training. As such, particular attention was paid to participants' tertiary educational experience. The aim was to understand what level of theoretical capacity to situate discrimination and marginalisation of LGBTQI students within wider social context had been imbued, and which educational discourses appeared to be prevalent.

When asked if interviewees felt equipped and supported to address needs of LGBTQI students, and if undergraduate and graduate training had prepared them for this task, all but one psychologist, who was trained overseas, answered in the negative, and emphasised relevant training, if it had been pursued, had been self-sought post-graduation:

Yeh, I don't think I was particularly well supported, to tell you the truth, I had to just go out and get the knowledge, not that I've done a huge amount of training, but I've had to really resource that myself, I don't do a lot of, I haven't actually done a lot of in depth training about that particular population, what I've done has been pretty patchy to tell you the truth...
(Kris)

Respondents also unanimously expressed a dearth of accessible LGBTQI training materials post-graduation as an issue:

I haven't really had great training post graduate study, yeh, just because I don't really think there is much accessible... (Terri)

Participants unanimously recounted lack of representation of LGBTQI identity and experience in Australian tertiary training and beyond. As discussed earlier, individual and communal meaning making and legitimisation of identities (Stainton-Rogers, 2003) is also transmitted by absence of representation (Walton, 2011). This absence points to prevailing 'discourses of omission' in all levels of education and training in which psychologists participate. These discourses of omission result in discursive practices of teaching that are characterised by denial of diversity:

I don't recall doing anything specific, like I remember doing sexuality just as a sort of uni subject, but not, nothing specific... (Beau)

The invisibility of discourses of omission and subsequent discursive practices of teaching characterised by denial of diverse representation, mean students and teachers both, are unaware of heteronormative norms, knowledge, and understandings absorbed and perpetuated through 'positive unconscious of knowledge' (Springer & Clinton, 2015). It is this unnoticed transmission of absence of acknowledgement of diversity, and the reinforced understandings about the 'rightness' of heterosexuality, deployed via discourses of omission and discursive teaching practices of denial, which have long been suggested to drive maintenance and perpetuation of heteronormativity (Lorenzetti et al., 2017). They were also evidenced in the lack of coverage of appropriate interventions to use with LGBTQI students:

I don't feel very equipped at all, um, I've done some very basic training around it, um, in terms of what the LGBTQI community is essentially, what all of those letters stand for, um, the different statistics around seeking mental health, in terms of actual, like intervention, not at all, not at all.
(Jacq)

How would psychologists be capable of

understanding a marginalised group's experience of bullying, or situating their experience within the wider social context, or conceptualising truly inclusive service delivery, via educational delivery defined by discourse of omission regarding diversity? It could be purported that the relationship between discourses of omission and discursive teaching practices of denial prevent capacity for critical thought regarding social drivers of marginalisation for discriminated groups, as well as hamstringing capacity for trainee psychologists to engage in truly critical reflexivity.

Participants' accounts connected the impact of educational discourses of omission and subsequent discursive teaching practices of denial, with an overarching discourse of individuality that appeared to add further challenge to capacity to think critically concerning the research questions. In interviews, all psychologists were informed that the APS (2016; 2017) recommends practitioners develop capacity to situate discrimination and marginalisation within the broader social context for LGBTQI clients. When asked what this meant to them, participants struggled to conceptualise theoretically for themselves, or practically with LGBTQI clients, how they might go about this:

I think that I can't really do that at all...when it comes to wider social perspective, I don't know if I would be equipped...because I'm not, I'm probably not knowledgeable enough, to be able to understand that really... yeh, we definitely come from a place that is more individual than systemic, we don't learn anything about systems, or the wider social systems. (Jacq)

These responses identified a discourse of individualism as substrating their education and practice. The relationship between this individualistic discourse and discursive practices of omission and denial of representation in their tertiary education appeared to result in incapacity to conceptualise more broadly, with the overwhelming response to the question being confusion:

...um, I don't really know what to, um, um. (Pat)

A number of participants confused theoretical and practical ability to situate discrimination and marginalisation of LGBTQI students within the wider social context, for capacity to adopt inclusive practices:

Gosh, um, I would imagine it means, probably, that question that you just asked before, maybe, having things in the clinic which obviously indicate, um, that people are welcome to talk about sexuality, maybe, signs, or whatever that might be, um, gosh...oh look, as you say...maybe making an effort to have the pronouns on the sheet... (Kris)

Participants pointing to uptake of inclusive practices in response to this question was interesting, given they were not actually applying those considerations in their workplaces. This highlighted the possibility that a capacity to theorise about discrimination and marginalisation within the wider social context is necessary to motivate practitioners to adopt inclusive practices. It is possible that the effect of discourses of omission and individuality, and the resulting discursive teaching practices of denial, explain why overwhelmingly participants were failing to adopt inclusive practices; were confused when asked to theorise about social forces; and had such contradictory relationships between their discursive constructions around general adolescent bullying and LGBTQI students' experience of bullying; and the meaning and practice of inclusive service provision.

This possibility is highlighted by the one participant who was trained overseas and demonstrated capacity to theorise about LGBTQI students' experience of bullying in the wider social context, and engage with clients around issues of identity, sexuality, gender, and heteronormativity:

Um, I think it comes back to...that there is, I think a lot of young people in particular, if they haven't been exposed to...these theories around racism, sexism, discrimination,

marginalisation...power dynamics, dynamics of oppression in society... privilege, all of these things, they experience...if they are experiencing bullying, particularly in relation to LGBTQI identification, they don't have that context, they don't have the language to describe what is happening for them, and that's really disempowering... (Terri)

Terri explicitly drew connection between capacity to theorise about structural forces, situating youth's experience within those theoretical conceptualisations, and making critique of power dynamics substrating heteronormativity accessible to them, as potential experiences of empowerment for bullied students:

...so I think by being able to, yeh, locate that this in something larger... that this isn't individual bullying, this is systemic bullying that they are experiencing...that it is bigger than them...I think can give people back a feeling of empowerment rather than feeling victimised and helpless. (Terri)

As discussed earlier, this participant was the only one who was currently utilising all of the inclusive measures, such as diverse pronouns and affirming LGBTQI visual cues in rooms and on their practice website. This connection highlighted the importance of theoretical understanding of social drivers of marginalisation and discrimination, and capacity to unpack bullying phenomena from this perspective with clients, to actual uptake and provision of truly inclusive mental health services.

...the internalised oppression, teenagers are so prone to, I think that is a really powerful one, I've got a client who...is of Indian origin, identifies as queer, but for her that was huge when she was learning about all of this, and kind of differentiating what was external and what was internal oppression, and realising that she actually had it within her control to kind of deprogram herself and let go of all the...oppressing that she was doing upon herself even though she couldn't

change people out there, she could change within her own mind, which I think is like, that was really amazing... if you can come to that, like reach that point, that is like a real watershed. (Terri)

The important difference in this account compared to the responses of all other participants, was that it did not individualise framing of bullying nor assign students responsibility to deal with it, deflect it, be resilient, or acknowledge their status as a victim. Rather, this participant, by situating bullying within the wider social context, gives the youth a framework to understand what they can be responsible for, and what they cannot control, ultimately depersonalising some of the phenomena. The description above recounts a client's personal empowerment, self and cultural awareness, and potential political activity, growing in response to bullying as an act of heteronormative discrimination being unpacked for them, and expanded from the realm of the individual to the social context. This is an example of discrimination and marginalisation being situated in the broader social context, a capacity no other participant displayed.

As mentioned, this interviewee was trained overseas in a 'progressive' tertiary institution, where, unlike the Australian-trained participants, LGBTQI representation and consideration, and broader social context theorising was forefront:

...going up to [overseas institution] and doing my graduate studies there, where there is obviously a really vibrant LGBTQI community...there was a real focus on kind of multi-cultural counselling, on social justice, on all these kind of issues, so I think it was always in the forefront...it was always part of the conversation... (Terri)

From a Foucauldian perspective, this participant's training, defined by discourses of inclusivity, resulted in discursive teaching practices supportive and confirming of diversity, and developed critical personal and professional reflexivity in trainee

psychologists, illustrating the transformative and liberating power inherent in dynamic relationships between discourses and discursive practices when they look beyond omission and individualism (Ramazanoglu, 1993). The focus at this overseas institution on providing alternative educational discourses of inclusivity appeared to be pivotal in fostering a theoretical level of critical reflexivity that seems to be missing in Australia:

...gosh, going back...you touch on it in a way, but you don't really... (Del)
...we are only trained to look at things individually...we are very much intra psychic in our training... (Lindsay)

In this context, a discourse of individualism, and even relationships between different discourses of individualism, can be seen to substrate discursive practices of denial and omission for LGBTQI students, and negate discourses of inclusivity across the educational spectrum.

The apparent invisibility of these individualist discourses and discursive practices, and the 'sense' it makes to psychology students to maintain steadfast intra psychic focus on their clients, in the way they view them, formulate cases, and frame interventions (Rhodes & Langtiw, 2018), could be said to support the perpetuation of unnoticed marginalisation of sexual and gender diversity. This continues to occur because psychologists' professional and personal capacity for critical reflexivity in relation to groups who experience discrimination in the wider social context is not currently being sufficiently fostered in Australia. As such, the relationship between discourses of omission and individuality and discursive teaching practices of denial legitimates knowledge about heterosexual identity, creating and maintaining heteronormative power relations (McLaughlin, 2003). As much as these power relations can confine and 'other' experience of LGBTQI students, they can also confine and limit the self and professional reflexivity, conceptualisations, and practices, of psychologists themselves.

Examine Positioning

This research was interested in ascertaining what subject positions educational and psychology governing bodies, via their official and applied discourses, offer psychologists. Despite official discourses espousing inclusivity from both tertiary institutions and governing psychology bodies, this research has already captured reflections of embodied discourses of omission and individualism from psychologists' accounts. These have revealed consequent limitations on possibilities of subjectivities regarding LGBTQI youths' identity and sexuality. Participants' subjectification and internalisation of these discourses were identified in their contradictory discursive constructions and confusion concerning the research questions. Psychologists' subject positions were characterised by: inability to engage in critical thinking and theorising in relation to LGBTQI bullying and wider social context; inability to explicitly define or understand what inclusivity means; and confusion when questioned about lack of application of inclusive measures in their practices. As such, participants' subject positions could be defined as being underprepared and under-engaged, rather than informed and inclusive. This inability to critically engage with theory could be understood as negatively affecting psychologists' autonomy and capacity as scientist practitioners, in the sense that reflexivity is required for co-creation of understandings and knowledge (Friere, 1968). Without it, psychologists could be described to be positioned as passive, conforming purveyors of dominant norms (Semp & Read, 2015).

To explore positioning more specifically than the general observations noted above, focus was kept on positioning of psychologists regarding discourses of sexuality. Understandings around sexuality are much impacted by reflexive capacity (Krebbekx, 2018). This is particularly pertinent given LGBTQI youths' criticism of psychologists' services lacking explicit addressing and understanding of sexual issues relevant to them (Semp & Read,

2015). Participants' reflections illustrated incapacity to deal with relevant sexually diverse issues specifically:

I guess my training has been pretty generic around adolescence... adolescence in general... (Kris)

Participants' reflections bolstered scholars' suggestions (Clarke et al., 2012) that psychological theory, research and teaching, are still characterised by heteronormative assumptions and discourses positioned within an educational narrative of heterosexual attraction and procreation (Davies & Harre, n.d):

...so I did Masters in 2007...we really only talked about straight couples... (Pat)

Further revealing their positioning as underprepared and, as such, innocently ignorant, through lack of understanding of diversity throughout their education, some participants repeated tendencies previously documented regarding diverse sexuality being a 'choice':

...as to your sexuality, that's something that is of your choice, or choosing, or making... (Jay)

This very heteronormative tendency to regard sexual expression outside of dominant norms as created and controlled by the individual reveals positioning that encourages a startling lack of reflexivity as well as ignorance (Krebbekx, 2018).

To explore understandings regarding LGBTQI youth's request for explicit broaching of sexual issues from psychologists, participants were asked if they thought it was best practice to explicitly discuss sexual/gender identity with adolescents.

Psychologists' displayed positioning characterised by being ill-informed and hesitant:

...if there is something other than heterosexual sex coming up... when I ask about sexuality, I ask about attraction, romantic feelings, I don't ask about...I don't ask specifically, or that sort of thing, I just try to use language that is general. (Kris)

Compounding being positioned as ill-

informed and reluctant to address sexuality, a majority of participants framed explicit enquiry as intrusive:

...I'd be guided by them, rather than making, ah, asking intrusive questions... (Pat)

While it seems sensitive and good practice to be guided by clients, this could potentially be problematic when the client is an LGBTQI teen, possibly primed to feel insecure in disclosing identity. Two participants acknowledged psychologists' positioning as ill-equipped and unprepared in this situation. They confirmed LGBTQI youth's reports that they want practitioners to initiate and informatively and directly engage in discussion around sexuality, and are reluctant to declare it to psychologists if they have not explicitly displayed receptivity and understanding:

...probably where people get stuck is knowing how, where to bring it up, or assess it, I think that's probably the biggest barrier...I've noticed a lot in clinical practice lately, just sexuality, it's just generally not incorporated into therapy very much at all...there's still that awkwardness around talking or asking someone about it, and when the client feels that the therapist is awkward about it then they don't want to bring it up, or they don't want to bring it up, if you don't bring it up, then they don't bring it up... (Beau)

Research evidence already cited describes the developmental sensitivities of adolescence and emergent sexuality as accompanied by vulnerability to self-negative appraisal, confusion, and peak negative peer influence (Brechtwald & Pristein, 2011). Clinical practitioners suggest all these teenage susceptibilities are greatly exaggerated when their sexuality/gender is diverse (National LGBTI Health Alliance, 2014), not because of diversity itself, but because of heteronormative social pressures (Orygen, 2019). Also, knowing the majority of LGBTQI youth that avail themselves of mental health services are enlisted by parents (Rickwood, et al., 2007), who commonly are unaware of their child's identification and

have not offered any support or confirmation (National LGBTI Health Alliance, 2014), it is wholly unsurprising that students are reticent to initiate or direct conversation. Traversing challenges without support of psychologists positioned to be sufficiently engaged, confirming and informed, could be further alienating and isolating, as one participant's account possibly suggests:

...one young person who, um, was experiencing some uncertainty around her sexuality, and the parents weren't supportive of that and, and she, we, we did explore that to some extent, but she ceased treatment fairly quickly. (Kris)

Compounding the hesitation to delve into discussion about sexuality, participants also highlighted the impact of discourses of omission and individualism on their positioning as being under-prepared, in revealing the tendency for students to be responsible for educating practitioners:

...to be honest, when it comes to sexual diversity, you probably learn more from them... (Lindsay)

Once again, the only participant who demonstrated inclusive and informed positioning, and who displayed ability to explicitly address issues of diverse sexuality, was the participant trained overseas in a tertiary institution. This participant was able to articulate how diversity confirming positioning fostered reflexivity, and consequent application of inclusive techniques in practice, enabling students' concerns to be revealed, and sexuality and gender to be explicitly addressed, providing a platform for potentially awkward conversations:

Um, I think so, because I think it's something that they may not feel confident to bring up on their own, I think it is something they often really want to talk about, um...I also have a...like a Likert scale subjective rating of different areas of their life, so it's got, um, my health...like, eating, exercise, sleep, um, family, parents, other family, school, and then things like social and peer relationships, work, hobbies, and it's got gender and

sexuality, um, and so that's a common thing that we have, and we kind of go through and we talk, we talk through why they are giving those ratings and what not, so we, it just opens the door to kind of say...some of them might say, oh yeh, that's a 10, everything is fine, no questions, or they might put a low score and it opens the door to say, oh, why did you put a 3 on that... what's going on for you, sometimes I'll use the um, the graphic of the genderbread person, and kind of say... just in terms of that...just exploring and getting to know who they are, like where would you place yourself on each of these continuums? (Terri)

Participants also reflected their positioning as uniformed and underprepared as problematic when it came to understanding and acting on APS (n.d.) recommendations that psychologists practice organisational, systemic, and social change in support of LGBTQI students. When asked what this recommendation meant to them, respondents once again struggled to interpret and conceptualise, let alone translate and apply those directives into inclusivity measures:

No, I think I might, I would be worried, because I'm not, um, because I'm not, I don't feel well trained, um, I'd be a bit nervous, I think about putting, um, I'd be nervous about advertising myself, I'd feel like I was putting myself out there as an expert, and I'd be worried that I was not prepared, and I know that sounds really wrong. (Kris)

A couple of participants demonstrated awareness of the contradictory positioning that official and applied discourses via tertiary institutions and psychology governing bodies proffer:

So, the APS, after training us just to work with individuals...we are very much intra psychic in our training... now wants us to be community lobbyists, isn't that lovely...it's just unfortunate they forget to train people in that prior to putting it in a policy document... (Lindsay)

This participant's frustration at being positioned to be incapable when it comes to understanding and analysing wider social drivers in LGBTQI bullying, points to the relationship between applied discourses deployed by educational and psychological bodies, psychologists' positioning, and power. To more fully understand these limitations revealed by psychologists, it is pertinent to theoretically examine how they themselves are situated within the wider educational and social context. This is explored via the final step of FDA. Examining Discourse and Power Participants' accounts illustrated how tertiary institutions can be understood as expressors and modifiers of heteronormative power, through deployment of discourses of omission and individualism, concerning LGBTQI identity and experience and the framing of bullying. These discourses influence understandings, knowledge, and actions, through positioning, in all psychologists who pass through them (Pratt, 2011). If they have not been trained to critique them, well-intentioned 'open minded' psychologists can be involved unawares in maintaining and perpetuating power relations that support social regulation, control and marginalisation of LGBTQI students (Burke, 2013). The relationships between discourses of omission, and different forms of delivery of discourses of individualism, can also be understood to underpin incapacity for psychologists to conceptualise or participate in social justice theorising and critique of social and cultural structures more broadly.

To further understand how tertiary institutions might position psychologists as incapable of social justice theorising, thereby maintaining heteronormative power relations, some additional discourses of individualism, other than those which frame bullying as a binary, individualised event, need to be considered.

Scholars have suggested an overarching discourse of individualism is pervasive in all aspects of clinical psychology training (Rhodes & Langtiw, 2018), and this was overwhelmingly

confirmed by participants. The field's concentrated focus on the workings of the mind and individual treatment of intra-psychic processes may have resulted in the exclusion of alternative explanations of distress, whereby ability or willingness to look beyond individual conceptualisations and interventions, to wider societal processes, is unconsidered and prevented or, at best, significantly compromised (Rhodes & Langtiw, 2018). This has resulted in psychological endeavour being confined to 'fixing' individuals or supporting them to 'survive' society, rather than looking to adapt and transform institutions and social and cultural practices within which individuals become identities (Thrift & Sugarman, 2019). In this sense, educational discourses and practices in Australia, driven by discourses of individualism, have historically, and are currently, failing to support psychologists in necessary cultural reflexivity and ability to theoretically identify and critique the forces that drive discrimination. As such, they could be seen as crucial bastions in reproducing heteronormative power relations (Tierney, 2001).

Important to consider in this argument is the marriage between discourses of individualism and neoliberalism in tertiary education provision. Individualism lies at the very core of neoliberal discourse and practice (Devlin, 2013). The neoliberal economic and political ideology, and consequent managerialism, that has comprehensively gained primacy in educational discourse since the 1980's, has fundamentally shifted the way tertiary institutions define themselves (Olssen & Peters, 2007). The continual shift away from a traditional professional culture of open, critical debate and intellectual inquiry has been replaced with primary concern for market driven, economic bottom line performativity and regulated output, operating to keep emphasis off intellectual and humanitarian concern with social justice (Varman, Saha, & Skalen, 2011). This marketisation of education has comprehensively moved discursive teaching practices away from 'being and engaging' in

critical intellectual inquiry and potentially transformative learning, to 'having and purchasing' skills and market place career path stepping stones (Molesworth & Nixon, 2009). In this environment, trainee psychologists commonly cite study motivations as 'vocational', rather than social good (Orr & Orr, 2016). The negative ramifications for students' depth of critical thinking and critical reflexivity are obvious (Orr & Orr, 2016). Without capacity to critically analyse and reflect on dominant discourse and discursive teaching practices, the exercise of power is invisible (Raaper, 2016). From this perspective, examining the way psychologists are situated within current social and academic norms of educational delivery, and the accepted and largely uncritiqued discourses that underpin that, it is understandable that well-meaning, 'open minded' psychologists believe they are capable of inclusive practice, without really knowing what that means, or being especially motivated to find out.

Conclusion

Analysis of psychologists' discursive constructions around bullying and inclusive services for youth revealed discrepancies and contradictions in their conceptualisations. They acknowledged bullying for adolescents in general as socially driven phenomena, yet they framed specific LGBTQI bullying as unremarkable. Participants tended to frame LGBTQI students' experience in ways that victimised, delegitimised, and minimised their experience, supporting the criticisms LGBTQI youth have made regarding low expectations of psychologists' understanding and addressing issues pivotal to them. Participants' accounts deflected from the sexual and gendered nature of LGBTQI students' experience of bullying and focused on the need for this population to be individually responsible for the behaviour of others, and resilient or deflective in the face of aggression.

All of the Australian-trained participants lacked ability to situate LGBTQI students' experience of discrimination within the broader social context, as espoused by the APS and industry experts. Rather, their

communications stayed firmly rooted within traditional heteronormative educational discourses regarding LGBTQI identity and experience, characterised by a generic, binary, individualised framing of bullying, sexuality, and gender. They understood inclusivity to be about acceptance and equality of access, yet demonstrated lack of follow through in implementing APS recommended tangible inclusive practices supportive of diversity. Participants displayed dissonance and surprise when questioned on this, suggesting unconscious, unnoticed exercising of heteronormative forms of power.

All Australian-trained participants reported being insufficiently prepared by their tertiary training, and beyond, to consider the needs of LGBTQI students and to practice inclusively. Participants' responses revealed lack of theoretical understanding about structural drivers of marginalisation and lack of application of reflexivity skills when it came to social forms of discrimination. The main underpinning heteronormative educational discourses identified as driving these incapacities were those of omission and individualism. Discourses of individualism were recognised in a variety of approaches. These spanned from binary, individualist framing of sexuality and bullying keeping focus on LGBTQI students' responsibility for managing bullying experience; to primacy of intra psychic focus in interventions with LGBTQI youth. Educational discourses of omission, regarding LGBTQI identity and experience, were recognised by all Australian-trained participants to have been the defining characteristic of their education. The professional and personal understandings subjectified during their training effectively positioned them to ignore/deny embracing of diversity, or critique of social and structural drivers of discrimination.

Despite official discourses espousing inclusivity from high schools, tertiary institutions, and governing psychology bodies, participants' accounts revealed them to have been positioned to embody the actual

applied discourses employed by these structures, those of omission and individualism. This heteronormative subjectification on the part of psychologists, as well as being characterised by contradictory discursive constructions; inability to understand inclusivity in specific and tangible ways; and dissonance in relation to being questioned about lack of inclusive measures being adopted in their practices; also appeared to be characterised by inability to engage in critical reflexivity and theorising around LGBTQI identity and experience in the wider social context. Subsequently, practitioners' accounts identified them as positioned to be hesitant (to address LGBTQI identity and sexuality issues explicitly), ill-informed (of consideration and understanding of diversity), ill-equipped, and underprepared to practice inclusively. This highlighted the challenge in meeting LGBTQI youth's reports that they want practitioners to initiate and informatively engage in discussion around sexuality, and identity issues relevant to them, in an explicit and direct way. It provides understanding to their reports that they are reluctant to declare identity and sexuality/gender issues to psychologists when receptivity and understanding of diversity has not been explicitly displayed.

Australian-trained participants, all intelligent, experienced, devoted, progressive practitioners, who identified as open minded, and accepting, were at best compromised in their ability to consider and understand the experience of LGBTQI students who are bullied. They also appear to be inadequately supported to practice inclusively, due to insufficient training. The one participant who could situate students' experience in the broader context, and deconstruct the social experience for them, was the only one offering LGBTQI students' empowerment and depersonalisation. This practitioner was also the only one who actually practiced critical reflexivity in connection to the research topic, translated theoretical understanding of processes of discrimination for clients, and consequently applied all the recommended inclusivity measures in

practice. She was trained overseas at a progressive institution that prioritised social justice and support for diversity. It appears Australian-trained psychologists lack exposure to inclusive educational discourses and practices. They lack exposure to recognition and provision of theoretical explanations for structural drivers, mechanisms, and predictors of discrimination, when it comes to diverse sexual and gender identification. They lack support to deconstruct and examine what critical reflexivity is, and means, and how it is 'done'. They lack exposure to educational practices that engage them in reflexivity in a way that bridges personal, theoretical and professional levels.

It is not the intention to judge the participants, but rather to recognise the restrictions of possibility that stem from psychologists' educational positioning as individualism experts in theory and practice. The research hopes to contribute to deconstructing and identifying the invisible processes of marginalisation occurring via the interplay of power and discourse, deployed in tertiary institutions and governing psychology bodies. The resulting knowledges and understandings about LGBTQI identity positions psychologists as underprepared for engaged inclusive service provision. Ideally, the findings will contribute to encouraging examination and engagement with theoretical explanations of discrimination in psychology training, as well as encourage review and application of educational critical reflexivity processes required to truly practice inclusively.

References

- Alexander, J., & Yescavage, K. (2009). 'The scholars formerly known as. ': Bisexuality, queerness and identity politics. In N. Giffney, & M. O'Rourke (Eds.), *Queer interventions: The Ashgate research companion to queer theory* (pp. 49-65). Cambridge: Ashgate Publishing.

- Bisexuality, queerness and identity politics. In N. Giffney, & M. O'Rourke (Eds.), *Queer interventions: The Ashgate research companion to queer theory* (pp. 49-65). Cambridge: Ashgate Publishing.
- Allen, L. (2010). Queer(y)ing the straight researcher: The relationship (?) between research identity and anti-normative knowledge. *Feminism & Psychology*, 20(2), 147-165.
- Ansara, Y., & Hegarty, P. (2011). Cisgenderism in psychology: Pathologising and misgendering children from 1999 to 2008. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 3(2), 137-160.
- Australian Psychological Society. (2016). *Ethical guidelines: Ethical guidelines on working with sex and/or gender diverse clients; Complementing the APS Code of Ethics (13th ed)*. Melbourne: Australian Psychological Society.
- Australian Psychological Society. (2017). *Information sheet: Tips for psychologists and others working with LGBTQI+ people and communities*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychology.org.au/About-Us/What-we-do/advocacy/Advocacy-social-issues/lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender-intersex/Tips-for-psychologists-working-with-LGBTQI-people>
- Australian Psychological Society. (n.d.). *Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex~issues: Key points*. Retrieved from https://www.psychology.org.au/About-Us/What-we-do/advocacy/Advocacy-social-issues/lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender-intersex?utm_medium=PromoTile&utm_source=website
- Brechwald, W., & Pristein, M. (2011). Beyond homophily: a decade of advances in understanding peer influence processes. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 166-179.
- Burke, P. (2013). *The right to Higher Education: Beyond widening Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Clarke, V., Ellis, S., Peel, E., & Riggs, D. (2012). Introducing LGBTQ psychology. In V. Clarke, S. Ellis, E. Peel, & D. Riggs (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer psychology* (pp. 3-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davey, M. (2016, February, 24). *Safe Schools LGBTI program researchers 'receiving abusive emails' after Christian lobby campaign*. Guardian. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2016/feb/24/safe-schools-lgbti-program-researchers-receiving-abusive-emails-after-christian-lobby-campaign>
- Davies, S. (2015). *Good practice guide: Many shades of blue: Enhancing service delivery to address the mental health needs of LGBTI populations*. Queensland Aids Council. Retrieved from <http://heartmatterspsychology.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Good-Practice-Guide-Many-Shades-of-Blue-LGBTI-Mental-Health.pdf>
- Davies, B., & Harre, R. (n.d.). *Positioning: The discursive production of selves*. Retrieved from: <http://www.massey.ac.nz/~alock/position/position.htm>
- Devlin, M. (2013). Bridging socio-cultural incongruity: Conceptualising the success of students from low socio-economic status backgrounds in Australian higher education. *Studies in Distance Education*, 38(6), 939-949.
- Downing, L. (2008). *The Cambridge introduction to Michel Foucault*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, V. (2007). Sexualities and schooling in England after Section 28: Measuring and managing 'at risk' identities. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*, 4(3), 13-30.

- Espelage, D., & Swearer Napolitano, S. (2008). Addressing research gaps in the intersection between homophobia and bullying. *School Psychology Review*, 37(2), 155-159.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: Archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*, (A. Sheridan, Trans). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Friere, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Frohard-Dourlent, H. (2016). 'I don't care what's under your clothes': The discursive positioning of educators working with trans and gender-nonconforming students. *Sex Education: Sexuality, Society and Learning*, 16 (1), 63-76.
- Giffney, N. (2009). Introduction: the 'q' word. In N. Giffney, & M. O'Rourke (Eds), *Queer interventions: The Ashgate research companion to queer theory*. Cambridge: Ashgate Publishing.
- Hillier, L., Jones, T., Monagle, M., Overton, N., Gahan, L., Blackman, J., & Mitchell, A. (2010). *Writing themselves in 3: The third national study on the sexual health and wellbeing of same-sex attracted and gender questioning young people*. Melbourne: ARCSHS.
- Horn, S. (2007). Adolescents' acceptance of same-sex peers based on sexual orientation and gender expression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36, (3), 363.
- Jones, T., & Lasser, J. (2017). School psychological practice with gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex and questioning (GLBTIQ) students. In M. Thielking, & M. Terhesend (Eds.), *Handbook of Australian school psychology: Integrating international research, practice and policy* (pp. 596-611). Switzerland: Springer.
- Kang, M. (2017, December, 8). We have marriage equality, now we need LGBTQI and inclusivity sexuality education in schools. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/we-have-marriage-equality-now-we-need-lgbtqi-inclusive-sexuality-education-in-schools-87501>
- Karp, P. (2017, December 5). Marriage equality survey marred by doubling in reported assaults. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2017/dec/05/marriage-equality-survey-marred-by-doubling-in-reported-assaults>
- Krebbekx, W. (2018). What else can sex education do? Logics and effects in classroom practices. *Sexualities*, 1-17.
- Lorenzetti, L., Wells, L., Logie, C., & Callaghan, T. (2017). Understanding and preventing domestic violence in the lives of gender and sexually diverse persons. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 26 (3), 175-185.
- Louden, W. (2016). *Review of appropriateness and efficacy of the Safe Schools Coalition Australia program resources*. Australian Government Department of Education and Training. Retrieved from <https://docs.education.gov.au/documents/review-appropriateness-and-efficacy-safe-schools-coalition-australia-program-resources>
- McGaw, B. (Winter 2015). Equity in education and curriculum reform [online]. *Zadok Perspectives*, 127, 19-22. Retrieved from <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=259803648668814;res=IELHSS>
- McLaughlin, J. (2003). *Feminist social and political theory: Contemporary debates and dialogues*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mansfield, N. (2000). *Subjectivity: Theories of the self from Freud to Haraway*. New York: New York University Press.

- Marston, K. (2015). Beyond bullying: the limitations of homophobic and transphobic bullying interventions for affirming lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) equality in education. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 33(3), 161-168.
- McGaw, B. (2015). Equity in education and curriculum reform [online]. *Zadok Perspectives*, 127, 19-22. Retrieved from <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=259803648668814;res=IELHSS>
- McLaughlin, J. (2003). *Feminist social and political theory: Contemporary debates and dialogues*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Minton, H. (1997). Queer theory: Historical roots and implications for psychology. *Theory and Psychology*, 7 (3), 337-53.
- Molesworth, M., & Nixon, E. (2009). Having, being and Higher Education: The marketisation of the University and the transformation of the student into consumer. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (3), 277-287.
- Moore, A., & Prescott, P. (2012). Absent but present: A critical analysis of the representation of sexuality in recent youth policy in the UK. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 16 (2), 191-205.
- National LGBTI Health Alliance. (2014). *Working therapeutically with LGBTI clients: a practice wisdom resource*. Sydney, Australia. Retrieved from <https://lgbtihealth.org.au/resources/working-therapeutically-with-lgbti-clients/>
- Neville, S., & Henrickson, M. (2005). Perceptions of lesbian, gay and bisexual people of primary healthcare services. *Issues and Innovations in Nursing Practice*, 55 (4), 407-415.
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. (2007). Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.
- Orr, Y., & Orr, R. (2016). The death of Socrates: Managerialism, metrics and bureaucratisation in University. *Australian Universities Review*, 58(2), 15-25.
- Orygen. (2019). *Clinical practice in youth mental health: Working safely and inclusively with sexuality diverse young people*. The National Centre of Excellence in Youth Mental Health. Retrieved from <https://www.orygen.org.au/Training/Resources/Physical-and-sexual-health/Clinical-practice-points/Working-safely-and-inclusively-with-sexuality-diverse/Orygen-sexuality-diverse-CPP?ext=>.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Payne, E., Smith, M., & Goble, K. (2014). *Bound by bullying: Exploring the limitations of the bullying discourse through in-schools experience and research*. AERA 2014 QuERI Panel: American Education Research Association Conference: Philadelphia. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/6387629/PayneSmithandGoble.QuERIAERA2014>
- Pratt, S. (2011). American power: Mary Parker Follet and Michel Foucault. *Foucault Studies*, 11, 76-91.
- Preston, M. (2014). 'They're just not mature right now': Teachers' complicated perceptions of gender and anti-queer bullying. *Sex Education: Sexuality, Society and Learning*, 16 (1), 22-34.
- Raaper, R. (2016). Academic perceptions of Higher Education assessment processes in neoliberal academia. *Critical Studies in Education*, 57(2), 175-190.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (Ed.). (1993). *Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism*. New York: Routledge.

- Rhodes, D. (2015, April, 17). Making schools safer and more welcoming for LGBTQI students. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/making-schools-safer-and-more-welcoming-for-lgbtqi-students-39858>
- Rhodes, P., & Langtiw, C. (2018). Why clinical psychology needs to engage in community-based approaches to mental health. *Australian Psychologist*, 53, 377-382.
- Rickwood, D., Deane, F., & Wilson, C. (2007). When and how do young people seek professional help for mental health problems? *Medical Journal of Australia*, 187 (7), 35.
- Safe Schools Coalition Australia (SSCA): *Proud to create change in Australian Schools*. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <http://www.safeschoolscoalition.org.au/>
- Semp, D., & Read, J. (2015). Queer conversations: Improving access to, and quality of, mental health services for same-sex-attracted clients. *Psychology and Sexuality*, 6 (3), 217-228.
- Smith, E., Jones, T., Ward, R., Dixon, J., Mitchell, A., & Hillier, L. (2014). *From blues to rainbows: Mental health and wellbeing of gender diverse and transgender people in Australia*. Melbourne: ARCSHS. Retrieved from https://www.beyondblue.org.au/docs/default-source/research-project-files/bw0268-from-blues-to-rainbows-report-final-report.pdf?sfvrsn=6f2e60ea_2
- Spargo, T. (1999). *Foucault and queer theory*. USA: Totem Books.
- Springer, R., & Clinton, M. (2015). Doing Foucault: Inquiring into nursing knowledge with Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. *Nursing Philosophy*, 16, 87-97.
- Stainton-Rogers, W. (2003). *Social psychology: Experimental and critical approaches*. London: Open University Press.
- Thrift, E. & Sugarman, J. (2019). What is social justice? Implications for psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(1), 1-17.
- Tierney, W. (2001). The autonomy of knowledge and the decline of the subject: Postmodernism and the reformulation of the University. *Higher Education*, 41 (4), 353-372.
- Ullman, J. (2016). Teacher positivity towards gender diversity: Exploring relationships and school outcomes for transgender and gender-diverse students. *Sex Education*, 17(3), 276-289.
- Varman, R., Saha, B., & Skalen, P. (2011). Market subjectivity and neoliberal governmentality in Higher Education. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27 (11-12), 1163-1185.
- Walton, G. (2011). Spinning our wheels: Reconceptualising bullying beyond behaviour-focused approaches. Discourse: *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32 (1), 131-144.
- Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology* (3rd ed). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Young, R. (1981). *Untying the text: A poststructuralist reader*. London: Routledge.

Address for Correspondence

Zare Edwards, zareedwards@live.com.au.
Lester Watson, lester.watson@inet.net.au

Author Biographies

Zare Edwards is a Charles Sturt University Australia Graduate in Psychology. Her research is interested in applying Foucauldian theoretical approach, primarily to identify and investigate invisible processes of marginalisation.

Lester Watson is an Adjunct Research Fellow and Sessional Academic in the School of Psychology at Charles Sturt University, Australia. His research is mainly centered around critical psychology with a specific interest in young people who are disadvantaged, marginalised, or experience social exclusion.