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Homophobia in a hockey team

I wish there didn’t have to be gay people

Oh! Everyone’s gay!

I’m told that I’ll end up being gay because I’m a hockey player
Homophobia in a hockey team

Sullivan claims it’s in the water in her house ’cause she lives with Speedo, Skippy, and do you know Lucy Harris from the thirds? … She blames the water.
Homophobia in a hockey team

I hate it when they go round, though, and they’re like, um, who’s snogged a girl, who’s slept with a girl, and I’m like, Oh for God’s sake I don’t want to know!
you talk about children or something and you can see their eyes sparkle you know they’re not [gay], and probably when they’ll leave university they’ll go back to normal, but it is definitely a peer pressure thing
CDA: logics of homophobia

• The ‘recriminalization’ of gay sex in the late 20th Century in legislative and media texts (Morrish 1997)
  – portrayal of gay sex as a serious offence
  – the use of the word ‘family’ as ‘a codeword for heterosexuality’ (Morrish 1997, p. 339)
  – the development of ‘lesbian’ as a stereotype linked to insidious political correctness
  – the need to protect the purported vulnerability of boys who face the risk of being ‘enticed’ into gay sex
Institutionalised homophobia in documentation produced by the US-based, conservative Christian Family Research Council (FRC) (Peterson 2010)

- Homophobia is sustained by a ‘logic of deviancy’, which ‘differentiates heterosexual subjects from gay and lesbian subjects by classifying as normative and nonnormative various behaviours, activities and practices’ (Peterson 2010, p. 260)

- A ‘logic of deviancy’ as an alternative to a ‘logic of sin’ (p. 262)
I wish there didn’t have to be gay people

...in hockey

Local social structures

‘conceptual systems that support homophobic attitudes are based upon and inextricably linked to participants’ ideas about how they fit within a structured set of social relationships’

(Clark 2012, p. 85)
Logic in communities: a new approach to CDA

- Logic forms a framework within which members conceptualise their identities and places within a social hierarchy
- These conceptual systems and social hierarchies are performatively produced
- They can be accessed through an analysis of participants’ logic
Sara: I’m told that um I’ll end up being gay because I’m a hockey player.

(0.9)

Nemo: Really:

Sara: I’ve been told that ever since I was thirteen

(0.8)

Sammy: N-no, [because] you can be a hockey player and still [like guys]

Sara: [And]

(0.5) pulled a girl

Nemo: No, [neither have I]

Sara: [never, ever,] wouldn’t

(0.2)

Sammy: No

Sara: and (0.2) all my lads have bets on how long it’ll take me because I joined

Midland hockey!

(0.4)

( ): hh

Sammy: Ah ha! .hh (0.2) Oh my God.

Sara: ’Cause Christy only did last year.

(0.6)

Nemo: Wha-

(0.4)

Sara: Christy pulled a girl last year

Nemo: DID SHE::? ((laughs))

Sara: [her housemate]

Sammy: [Christy Evans]
A logic of homophobia

(1) If Sara is a hockey player, she will end up being gay
(2) Sara is a hockey player
(3) Therefore, Sara will end up being gay
Synthetic propositions

(1) All men are mortal
(2) Socrates is a man
(3) Therefore, Socrates is mortal

based upon empirical experience: the men I meet are mortal, but I can imagine other worlds in which men are immortal
A logic of homophobia

(1) If Sara is a hockey player, she will end up being gay
(2) Sara is a hockey player
(3) Therefore, Sara will end up being gay

The synthetic interpretation
– All hockey players end up being gay
– Has implications for individual identities
Analytic propositions

(1) If Jim is a bachelor, he is unmarried
(2) Jim is a bachelor
(3) Therefore, Jim is unmarried

not based upon empirical experience, but contained within the meaning of the word ‘bachelor’
A logic of homophobia

(1) If Sara is a hockey player, she will end up being gay
(2) Sara is a hockey player
(3) Therefore, Sara will end up being gay

The analytic interpretation

– The term ‘hockey player’ entails the feature ‘gay’
– Has implications for the larger community of hockey players at Midland
Synthetic or analytic?

(1) If Sara is a hockey player, she will end up being gay
(2) Sara is a hockey player
(3) Therefore, Sara will end up being gay
The synthetic interpretation

How to refute the argument:

(1) All hockey players end up being gay
(2) Sara is a hockey player
(3) Therefore, Sara will end up being gay

Challenge premise (1)
The synthetic interpretation

How to refute the argument:

(4) If someone is both a hockey player and not gay, then not all hockey players are gay
(5) Sara is not gay
(6) Sara is a hockey player
(7) Therefore, not all hockey players are gay
The synthetic interpretation

(4) If someone is both a hockey player and not gay, then not all hockey players are gay
(5) Sara is not gay
(6) Sara is a hockey player
(7) Therefore, not all hockey players are gay
The synthetic interpretation

Why this additional evidence?

17  Sara: 'Cause Christy only did last year.
18
19  Nemo: Wha-
20
21  Sara: Christy pulled a girl last year
22  Nemo: DID SHE::? ((laughs))
23  Sara: [her housemate]
24  Sammy: [Christy Evans]
The analytic interpretation

(1) If Sara is a hockey player, she will end up being gay
(2) Sara is a hockey player
(3) Therefore, Sara will end up being gay

– The term ‘hockey player’ entails the feature ‘gay’
– Has implications for the larger community of hockey players at Midland
Ad hoc concepts

• ‘concepts that are constructed pragmatically by a hearer in the process of utterance comprehension. The idea is that speakers can use a lexically encoded concept to communicate a distinct non-lexicalized [...] concept’ (Carston 2002, p. 322)

• ‘hearers can pragmatically infer the intended concept on the basis of the encoded one’ (Carston 2002, p. 322)
Ad hoc concepts

• This steak is raw.
  – RAW = uncooked
  – RAW* = less well cooked than the speaker would have liked

(Carston 2002, p. 328)
Ad hoc concepts

• HOCKEY PLAYER = anyone who plays hockey
• HOCKEY PLAYER* = anyone who plays hockey and is known to be gay
Hockey player identity (the analytic interpretation)

1. Sara: I’m told that um I’ll end up being gay because I’m a hockey player.
2. (0.9)
3. Nemo: Really:
4. Sara: I’ve been told that ever since I was thirteen

(1) Being a HOCKEY PLAYER* entails being gay
(2) Sara is a HOCKEY PLAYER*
(3) Therefore, Sara is gay
Hockey player identity (the analytic interpretation)

How to refute the argument

1. Being a HOCKEY PLAYER* entails being gay
2. Sara is a HOCKEY PLAYER*

Challenge premise (2)

Premise (1) remains in tact
Hockey player identity (the analytic interpretation)

17  Sara:  'Cause Christy only did last year.
   (0.6)
19  Nemo:  Wha-
   (0.4)
21  Sara:  Christy pulled a girl last year
22  Nemo:  DID SHE::? ((laughs))

Christy is a HOCKEY PLAYER*
Sammy: h She pulled her housemate how like (1.1) awkward is that gonna be?
Sara: Not at all.
(1.7)
Sammy: Why
( ):
[Yeah but-]
Sara: [('Cause) housemate's (.) pulled Siobhan
(1.4)
Nemo: Wha-? (0.6) Sio[bhan!]
Sammy: [Sio] bhan!
(0.4)
Nemo: NO! ((laughs))
Sara: She's not that quiet reserved girl, she's not that quiet- (0.9) Guys, I'm telling you everything!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Who, do you wanna ask hhh (like a list of all the) girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nemo</td>
<td>Flicka hasn’t. Or G- (0.4) Oh, Ginge might have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sammy</td>
<td>Has Ginge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>((nods head))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sammy</td>
<td>E-oh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ginge is a HOCKEY PLAYER*
Sammy: ‘Cause like Speedo and that lot all have, Sullivan hasn’t though
(1.5)
Sammy: Madness.
(0.6)
Sammy: And then you’ve got Jo and Skippy.
Sara: Yeah, Sullivan claims it’s in the water in her house ’cause she lives with Speedo, Skippy, and do you know Lucy Harris from the thirds?
Nemo: Oh yeah.
(0.9)
Nemo: I-
Sara: She blames the water.
A local conceptual system

• The conceptual system in operation in this community of practice is one that produces a binary opposition between two types of hockey player.
  – HOCKEY PLAYER*
    • members of the Midland hockey team who have pulled girls
  – HOCKEY PLAYER**
    • members of the Midland hockey team who are high achievers in sport, academics and heterosexual desirability
The performative production of a binary

HOCKEY PLAYERS*
- Have pulled girls

participants
performatively
reject / disassociate
themselves with this
concept

HOCKEY PLAYERS**
- Are carefully selected by coaches and peers
- Are recognised as institutionally valuable
- Are attractive to male hockey players
- Are academically successful

participants
performatively
produce these associations
Why two concepts for HOCKEY PLAYER?

- It provides a means of keeping track of which hockey players are (likely to be) gay, thus ensuring that the proportion does not become high enough to threaten the heterosexual image of women’s hockey.
Why two concepts for HOCKEY PLAYER?

• It provides a means of associating heterosexuality with high achievement

   this is a vulnerable perspective

HOCKEY PLAYER* acts as a conceptual container to ‘store’ individuals who are both gay and high achieving
Locally produced conceptual systems

- For this particular community of field hockey players homophobia represents a specifically configured conceptual system – one in which heteronormativity is intrinsically linked to academic and athletic achievement.
Locally produced conceptual systems

- The identification of unique configurations of discourses in particular communities allows for the possibility of local, strategic interventions, which can be targeted at what is identified to be at the heart of the problem in a given community.


