Appendix
Research Methodology

This research project explored what happened when junior and senior high school students at an arts-focused charter school, which explicitly strived to create and maintain a queer-friendly context, opted to take a semester-long course focused on LGBTQ+-themed literature. The school was a public charter high school in a midsize Midwestern city. It had been founded in 2002. Since then, it had been ranked by the state department of education as effective and more recently as excellent. The school’s articulated vision was to “sustain a progressive teaching and learning culture that thrives on safety, acceptance, and inclusion, rigorous academics, a commitment to the arts, and college preparedness.” Building on this foundation, the school effectively achieved a reputation for recruiting students who struggled to survive as students in local public schools, particularly LGBTQ+ students. School personnel communicated an expectation that students would not act homophobically or transphobically, complementing these statements with school-wide policies and practices.

A little over three hundred students enrolled at the school during the years of this study. Approximately 56 percent received free or reduced-priced lunch, a statistic commonly used as an indicator of economically disadvantaged and impoverished students. In terms of race and ethnicity, 56 percent of students identified as white, 26 percent as African American, 10 percent as multiracial, 6 percent as Latina/o, 1 percent as Asian, and 1 percent as Pacific Islander, according to the school’s demographic data. Administrators at the school estimated that 30 percent of the student population identified as LGBTQ+.

Negotiating entry to the school was facilitated by existing friendships. I had a close friend who taught at the school closer to when the school
first opened. Through that friend, I had come to know others who taught at the school. One current teacher at the time had become a close friend as well. Through these friendships I had come to know the principal and assistant principal. I proposed the course to them, offering to teach it for free and asking for the cost for books and the freedom to make it into a research study. They were enthusiastic about the project, so I designed the curriculum. These efforts resulted in three semester-long (eighteen-week) elective English language arts courses offered to juniors and seniors. The course fulfilled one semester of students’ English language arts requirements for those who elected to take it. I taught it three times between January 2015 and May 2016. In the first term, Ryan Schey, then a doctoral student and now a colleague and friend, joined me. (I discuss our roles more below.) The course as a whole centered on literature, including a wide range of genres and modes, representing diversity among LGBTQ+ people and characters. In response to this literature, students produced writing ranging from informal journal entries to formal essays and multimedia presentations. Each semester comprised approximately five units of study, each about a month long, and each with different focal texts and assignments (see tables 2–4). Focal texts included fiction and nonfiction, novels and short stories, and multimedia and traditional print texts. Like most if not all classes in the school, this one typically met four times weekly, with the final class session of each week being an extended double-blocked period, totaling about 240 minutes per week.

All students enrolled in the course were invited to participate in the study. None were required to do so. Among the thirty-two students who took the class, thirty-one participated in the study. (The one who did not was prohibited by her parents and repeatedly articulated her frustration.) Over the three semesters, the class became increasingly racially diverse and decreasingly diverse in terms of sexual and gender identities. To be more specific, in the first class all but one of the students identified as white, and the one biracial student was Asian and white. Among the students in the first class, there were three students who explicitly and consistently identified as gay and one who explicitly and consistently identified as trans. Moreover, there was quite a bit of experimentation and play in terms of sexuality and gender. In the third class, about half of the students identified as white and half as people of color. Only two of the ten students in this class identified as gay, and none of them identified as transgender. The two gay students, however, were experimental and playful in terms of gender expression. The second class comprised eight students. Five
Table 2. Units and related reading and writing assignments for the spring 2015 course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Focal texts</th>
<th>Complementary texts</th>
<th>Texts created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book talks of a collection of LGBTQ+-themed young adult literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Goodreads</em> 2015 list of YAL with LGBT themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>wrapped up in books</em> 2015 list of new releases in LGBTQ YAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nonfiction</strong> <em>Beyond Magenta</em> by Kuklin (2014)</td>
<td>Video of Susan Kuklin talking about her work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Article about Leelah Alcorn's suicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GLAAD Transgender 101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GLAAD #RealLiveTransAdult article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Goodreads</em> list of YAL with trans themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collection of book reviews from the <em>Journal of LGBT Youth</em></td>
<td>Individual book reviews; collective book review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued on next page*
Table 2. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Focal texts</th>
<th>Complementary texts</th>
<th>Texts created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Memoir  | Excerpt from *Mean Little Deaf Queer* by Galloway (2009)  
  20 Straws: Growing Up Gay (Gjestvang & Youth Video OUTreach, 2007)  
  “It’s Not Just the Aces That Are Wild” by Sedaris (2003)  
  Woodson’s (2014) letter to herself in Letter Q  
  Excerpt from *Fun Home* by Bechdel (2006)  
  Joe Kita article on writing memoirs | Video of Terry Galloway talking about her work  
  Video of Alison Bechdel talking about her work  
  Collection of memoir resources | Memoirs/autobiographies |
| Fiction | *Aristotle and Dante*  
*Discover the Secrets of the Universe*  
by Sáenz (2012)  
  *Brooklyn, Burning*  
Collections of journal entries  
Collections of journal entries |
|---|---|---|---|
| Short Stories | “The Honorary Shepherds”  
by Maguire (1994)  
“Am I Blue?”  
by Coville (1994)  
“My Virtual World”  
by Block (2009)  
“A Word from the Nearly Distant Past”  
by Levithan (2009) | David Hockney’s 1961 painting *We Two Boys Together Clinging*  
Mark Doty reading his poem “A Display of Mackerel”  
Short stories | David Hockney’s 1961 painting *We Two Boys Together Clinging*  
Mark Doty reading his poem “A Display of Mackerel”  
Short stories |
| Essay |  |  | Argumentative essay in the form of a collective video |

* This video does not relate to the unit on fiction as much as it pertains to a school event, a panel on race, that happened the day before, during the time of the fiction unit.

YAL, young adult literature.
Table 3. Units and related reading and writing assignments for the fall 2015 course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Focal texts</th>
<th>Complementary texts</th>
<th>Texts created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                  | *Brother Outsider* (film by Singer et al., 2003) | “Emily Dickinson” from *Chloe plus Olivia* (Faderman, 1995)  
“I, Too, Sing America” and “Café: 3 AM” by Langston Hughes  
“A Supermarket in California” and “America” by Allen Ginsberg  
“Adrienne Rich: From Twenty-One Love Poems” from *Chloe plus Olivia* (Faderman, 1995)  
“Audre Lorde: From Zami: A New Spelling of My Name” from *Chloe plus Olivia* (Faderman, 1995) | Statements of how students want to contribute to LGBTQ+ communities |
| Memoir       | Beyond Magenta  
by Kuklin (2014) | Some Assembly Required  
by Andrews (2014) | Collections of journal entries |
|--------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
|              | Excerpts from Fun Home  
by Bechdel (2006) | Rethinking Normal  
|              |                  | “Ring of Keys” and “Telephone Wire” from the musical Fun Home by Kron & Tesori (2015) | Videos of memoirs from previous students |

| Fiction      | If You Could Be Mine  
by Farizan (2013) | “Literature from the Heart,” a review of Cart & Jenkins's The Heart Has Its Reasons,  
by Greenblatt (2011) | Collections of journal entries |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
|              | Aristotle and Dante Discover the Secrets of the Universe  

| Essay        |                  |                  | Essays                      |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Focal texts</th>
<th>Complementary texts</th>
<th>Texts created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| History and Poetry | *Out of the Past* (film by Dupre, 1997/2005)  
*Brother Outsider* (film by Singer et al., 2003) | “I Hear America Singing”  
by Whitman and image of the author  
“Emily Dickinson”  
from *Chloe plus Olivia* (Faderman, 1995) and image of Dickinson  
“I, Too, Sing America” and “Café: 3 AM”  
by Hughes and image of the author  
“A Supermarket in California” and “America”  
by Ginsberg and image of the author  
Excerpts from *I Must Resist: Bayard Rustin’s Life in Letters* edited by Long (2012) and image of Rustin  
“Adrienne Rich: From *Twenty-One Love Poems*”  
from *Chloe plus Olivia* (Faderman, 1995) and image of Rich  
“Audre Lorde: From *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name*” from *Chloe plus Olivia* (Faderman, 1995) and image of Lorde | Collections of journal entries |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memoir</strong></td>
<td>Beyond Magenta</td>
<td>by Kuklin (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excerpts from Fun Home by Bechdel (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letters by Levithan and Woodson from Letter Q (2014)</td>
<td>Collections of journal entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiction</strong></td>
<td>If You Could Be Mine</td>
<td>by Farizan (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Where Will You Be?” by Parker (1978) and image of the author</td>
<td>Statements of how students want to contribute to LGBTQ+ communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huey P. Newton's 1970 speech to the Black Panthers about gay liberation and women's liberation (BlackPast, 2018) and image of Newton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statements of how students want to contribute to LGBTQ+ communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Ring of Keys” and “Telephone Wire” from the musical Fun Home by Kron &amp; Tesori</td>
<td>Videos of memoirs from previous students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Focal texts</th>
<th>Complementary texts</th>
<th>Texts created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
“My Virtual World” by Block (2009)  
“The Honorary Shepherds” by Maguire (1994)  
“A Word from the Nearly Distant Past” by Levithan (2009)  
“I Miss Toni” by Reed (2016; *Snap Judgment*, snap 8)  
“The Danger of a Single Story” by Adichie (2009) | David Hockney’s 1961 painting *We Two Boys Together Clinging* |
| **Essay**  |                                     |                                                                                       | Essays         |
identified as white, and three as people of color. Their sexual identities were more varied and specific than those articulated in the other two classes: three identified as straight, one as bisexual, one as pansexual, one as fluid, one as gay, and one as asexual and homoromantic. I say all of this knowing that their identities changed throughout our time together. For that reason, when I reference a student in the book, I describe them as I experienced them in terms that matter for the featured conversation and for the particular part of the book.

Working with these young people, I tried to answer evolving research questions. I started with a broad ethnographic, what-happens-when question: What happens when junior and senior high school students at an arts-focused and queer-friendly charter school opt to take an LGBTQ+-themed literature course? There were also subquestions about the nature of the classroom context they created together, how they did so, and how they positioned themselves and one another and with what consequences. Implicit in these questions were assumed questions about how the students talked about sexual and gender identities, as well as how they talked about mutually constitutive (Winnubst, 2006) or intersecting (Crenshaw, 1991; Hill Collins, 2019) identities, like race and religion. There were also questions that I started forming while conducting the study—questions about how they talked about family, most prominently. Ultimately, I maintained the overarching question:

- What happens when junior and senior high school students at an arts-focused and queer-friendly charter school opt to take an LGBTQ+-themed literature course?

But I developed the following supporting questions, while taking David Bloome's Discourse Analysis in Education course:

- What were the students and teacher(s) in the course using their reading, writing, and talk about diverse LGBTQ+-themed literature to do?
- What were the consequences of their actions and reactions?

And these questions became more specific as I studied Ahmed:

- How were the students and teacher(s) in the course using their reading, writing, and talk about diverse LGBTQ+-themed literature to move in relation to one another?
What were the consequences of such movement, not just among one another but among broader communities?

To answer them, I drew on a hybrid of methodologies: teacher research (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993, 2009) and ethnography (Blommaert & Dong, 2020; Heath & Street, 2008). This hybridity was most evident in the first of the three semesters. In this semester, Ryan Schey accompanied me, doing coursework for a doctoral course on ethnography and a research apprenticeship, both of which I taught. He foregrounded an ethnographic participant observer role, taking field notes (Emerson et al., 2011), recording classroom interactions, and collecting course materials and student work. I adopted more of a teacher-research stance (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993, 2009), taking primary responsibility for designing and implementing the curriculum, assessing student work, and interviewing students. In the second and third semesters, I assumed both sets of responsibilities. I designed and implemented curriculum, assessed student work, and interviewed students while also taking field notes, recording classroom interactions, and collecting course materials and student work. Ryan, however, continued on the project as a research assistant, organizing the data I constructed.

All things considered, like snow days and senior internships, I taught and studied 187 days. Of these, 75 percent were single blocks of just under fifty minutes, and the remaining 25 percent were double blocks of about ninety minutes. All 187 days were documented with field notes and the collection of course materials and student work. In the first term, Ryan took very detailed field notes during and after class. In the second and third terms, I took anecdotal records during class and developed them into field notes (Hubbard et al., 1993), usually in my car in the parking lot after class.

As I developed rapport with students, I felt more comfortable asking their permission to record our class discussions. In the earlier days of each term, I would ask to record audio. As we got to know one another better, I would ask to record video. In the first two terms this was prompted by students’ presentations at the conclusion of the first units. In the third term it was prompted by a particularly invigorating conversation. Ultimately, thirty-three classes were audio recorded and 106 were video recorded. These were all indexed by Ryan.

Interviews were also conducted at the start and end of each term. Overall, I conducted twenty-eight introductory student interviews, Ryan
conducted one, and two participants were not interviewed at the start of their semesters. These interviews were somewhat structured. In the early interviews of the final term, Jenna and Khalil asked to be interviewed together, and they were. Overall, I conducted twenty-two concluding student interviews, and seven student participants were not interviewed at the end of their semesters. I did not conduct concluding interviews with the two students who did not interview initially. When students were not interviewed, it seemed to be because we could not find a time that would work; the semester always seemed busier toward the end, as exams, internships, and graduation were priorities. The interviews comprised mostly follow-up questions based on our semester together. Some of the questions were for all student participants, but others were completely individualized. Again, Jenna and Khalil were interviewed together. Surprisingly, to me, they brought along their close friend. She stayed and participated in the interview, but because she never returned the consent form I gave her I excluded her words from the data set. The only two students who were not interviewed initially asked to be interviewed together at the close of the term, and I welcomed the opportunity. In addition to the student participant interviews, several staff interviews were conducted at the end of the first term as a part of a video project Ryan and I were doing with the juniors, since the seniors were doing internships. Ryan conducted one of these, and Parker conducted three more. All of the fifty-five interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

Ryan organized these data, including field notes, course materials, student work, interview recordings and transcripts, audio and video recordings, and indexes. He organized them chronologically so that each class was represented by all of the data for that day. He did this for all three semesters.

In the summer of 2015, Ryan and I listened to and watched, together, the forty-six recordings to identify events for transcription. At this point, “events” was loosely defined, drawing on our regular engagement with literacy events (Heath, 1983; Street, 1999). In the summer of 2016, I reviewed the ninety-three recordings and their indexes to select events for transcription. Among these transcripts, I selected 210 events for transcription. They represented 112 days of class. Some days are represented multiple times and others not at all. I removed six events that no longer seemed pertinent to the study. That left 204 in the data set. These processes—conducting field work, collecting or constructing data, and organizing data—are all always interpretive and therefore analytic, but the more explicit methods of analysis were conducted on this data set.
I coded the transcripts of the classroom discussions iteratively and recursively, in a constant comparative method (Heath & Street, 2008). Codes sometimes broke into more codes, other times collapsed into one another, and still other times dissipated all together. When I recoded the complete data set, I worked with fourteen codes. As I started clustering the events into codes, I revised them to eleven codes. Seven of these focused on mutually constitutive (Winnubst, 2006) or intersecting (Crenshaw, 1991; Hill Collins, 2019) identities: race, class, sexuality and gender, religion, linguistic diversity, immigration status and experiences, and mental health and illness. Four focused on themes such as family, internalized hatred, violence, and vulnerability. Working with these, I created three tables that became integral to my analysis:

1. First, I created a table of all transcribed events and a brief description of the discussion represented in each. I noted, on this table, the discussions that I found particularly compelling. These were 39 of the 204.

2. The next table I created was one of all transcribed events and the codes found within. I noted, on this table, codes that seemed particularly pronounced in events. At this point, there were eleven codes.

3. Finally, I created a table comprising events that I noted as compelling and organized them into categories by the pronounced codes in them. I included events that I understood as central to the categories as well as those I understood as peripheral.

This third table was my guide for the next step in my analysis, in which I created a document for each central event on the table. By this time, I was just starting to understand the events as encounters, as I define in the introduction of this book.

I called these documents prewrites. I titled each with the overarching theme—that is, how it was organized in the third table; the date of the encounter represented; a brief title for the encounter; and the codes represented in the encounter. Each goes on to describe the encounter, to list the speakers in the encounter, to discuss analytic points I considered while drafting, and to include the transcript of the encounter. When I finished creating the cluster of prewrites on any given code, as represented on the
third table, I wrote a memo (Glaser, 1978) trying to move myself toward the argument I was trying to make with that particular code.

As I created these documents, both the prewrites and the memos, I drafted and revised the codes and their order. In doing so, I began to craft my argument. As I was doing this, I would sometimes realize that certain encounters belonged in other categories, and I would move them where they belonged. I made peace with some encounters belonging in multiple categories. Sometimes, as I started to shape my arguments, I would realize that a central encounter really was becoming more peripheral, and vice versa. I would move them accordingly. Other times, I would remember an encounter that was missing from a theme, and I would search for it and add it. In this way, sometimes encounters that I had not initially noted as compelling would be pulled in, and vice versa. All of this was iterative and recursive. Throughout this, I revised and refined the categories.

Then, I went through the third table, prewrites, and memos. I paid attention to peripheral stories in earlier themes. Then I perused all encounters with the code that led to the theme to see whether the argument held, fell apart, or got more complicated. I added and deleted encounters as appropriate. I went through field notes, too, to identify pertinent encounters that were not transcribed. Throughout this process, I kept revising categories in relationship to one another. For example, I separated sexuality and gender into two separate categories and moved some of internalized hatred into the sexuality category and some of it into the race category. Violence was in many ways about internalized hatred, so when I moved that part to sexuality, the violence category was insubstantial, particularly since I made the decision not to share some stories of violence to avoid positioning my students as victims. I merged linguistic diversity and immigration status and experiences because the two were so intertwined, and I ultimately excluded them from this book because they demand analysis beyond the focus of this book. I also pulled the class and mental health and illness categories because they were less substantial, not because they were less important. Finally, it turned out that vulnerability was woven throughout all of the categories more than being a stand-alone one.

In shifting to writing, I first focused on one category at a time. I read and reread the prewrites. I organized and reorganized them. I identified all complementary data, like course materials, student work, and interview transcripts, that I needed to be able to tell the stories. Working across data sources allowed me to triangulate my findings. Then I wrote,
category by category, chapter by chapter. I also organized and reorganized the resulting chapters as my argument developed. This eventually brought me to the organizational structure of the book as you see it.

After all of the chapters were drafted and organized, I went through the whole and identified each encounter and the people involved in it. Then I looked closely at how those people move in that encounter—when people moved, from where and to where, and why. I considered where they were in relation to others and with what consequences. I drew on Ahmed to reflect on the past encounters that informed the focal one and to imagine the potential future encounters that the focal one could open up. I wrote about these considerations and reflections after each encounter. Not surprisingly, it turns out the encounters cannot be dichotomized into those where there is movement and those where there is not; sometimes there is just a little teetering, for example, and sometimes the provocation for moving matters, whether it is a pushing or pulling, and who is doing the provoking. Sometimes there is just a little “give,” to use Ahmed’s word. I tried to represent that complexity in my writing. Then, at the end of each chapter, I studied the collection of encounters to explore the idea of ethical versus unethical, that is, to make some judgment about which of the encounters I understood as ethical and which I did not and why, again drawing on Ahmed. Again, not surprisingly, it turns out the movement, or even the stances, cannot be dichotomized into ethical and unethical, at least not only. Often it is more complicated than that. I tried to represent that complexity in my writing.

Throughout this process, I had several people read the report in part or in whole. Most significantly, several of these readers were students represented in the report. Whether they read parts or the whole, they tended to focus on the sections that represented them. They provided feedback on my representation and interpretation. Their feedback was invaluable. As is typical in ethnographic research, this analytic process was much messier and much less linear than this description conveys (Blommaert & Dong, 2020); still, it was systematic and intentional (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993).

The entire study was shaped by the fact that I identify as a white, queer, cis woman. In keeping with Blommaert and Dong’s (2020) notion of ethnography as “necessarily critical and counter-hegemonic” (p. 10), I strove to interrogate and dismantle oppressive power relations. In an effort to do so, in and beyond the context of this study, I have worked diligently to acknowledge my privileges, discover related blind spots, and educate
myself in ways that compensate for my experiential and epistemological shortcomings defined by my whiteness and cisgender identity, in particular. I understand this as lifelong work and recognize that in this study I am, as always, in process. This is my limitation; this is a limitation of the researcher.

There are other limitations defined by the study’s design. Ethnographies, while stellar at providing complexity and nuance, do not even strive for generalizability. This is also true for teacher research. Further, teacher research is tied tightly to the focal pedagogy and curriculum, as it is in this study, and pedagogy and curriculum are, ideally, deeply human and therefore never uniform, much less perfect. This is the nature of documenting practice. So, the accounts I share are not images of perfect teaching. They are just teaching. Real teaching, shaped by innumerable decisions made in split seconds with and among a group of adolescents within the constraints of the institution of schooling. This is a limitation of the research.

In other words, this study, like any study, is limited. Its limitations are why your study is needed: to supplement, complement, even debunk this and other studies. None of them stand alone. None of them do it all. They work together to helps us make sense of one another, to make sense of ourselves, so that we might encounter one another, move closer to one another, ethically.