



THE FACULTY OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL SCIENCES

PLUGGING IN TO QUEER IN GOTHENBURG

An Emotion and Power-Sensitive In-depth Group Study on Being Queer in Gothenburg

Johanna Jaring

Thesis:	30 hec
Program and/or course:	Gendering Practices, Master's Programme
Level:	Second Cycle
Semester/year:	St/2018
Supervisor:	Elin Lundsten
Examiner:	Mathias Ericson
Report no:	

Abstract

Thesis: 30 hec
Program: Gendering Practices, Master's Programme
Level: Second Cycle
Semester/year: St/2018
Supervisor: Elin Lundsten
Examiner: Mathias Ericson
Report No:
Keyword: Queer, Gothenburg, Emotion, Power, Research Process, Diffraction, Intra-activity

Purpose: This study aims to extend the existing knowledge of how different queer persons experience being queer in Gothenburg and in extension, attend to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production.

Theory: The study applies Donna Haraway's situated knowledge, Sara Ahmed's queer phenomenology and theory on what emotions *do*, and Karen Barad's theory of intra-action and diffraction.

Method: The study is based on an in-depth group consisting and of four queer persons living in Gothenburg and the individual journals that were written by the participants after each of the four meetings. With its basis in the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*, the in depth-group discussions revolved around experiences of being queer in Gothenburg. The material from the in-depth group and the journals is analysed through a diffractive reading by applying the process of plugging in.

Result: The study concludes that Gothenburg is still a straight and cis space where some queer bodies feel more comfortable and are able to affect the city's work with questions regarding LGBTQ more than others. Further, the study forms an understanding of the importance of attending to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production to enable an understanding of why a certain knowledge is produced in place of another.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the organisations, groups, and communities, that to my knowledge, helped me share my invitation for participation: RFSL Göteborg, Transformerig RFSL, RFSL Ungdom Sydväst, West Pride, HBTQ-studenter Göteborg, Agenda: Jämlikhet, Hånget, Kvinnofolkhögskolan Göteborg, Vänner i Väst, United Sisters Göteborg och Hellmans Drengar.

I would also like to give a special thanks to my supervisor Elin Lundsten of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Gothenburg for your comments, insights, and especially your support, caring words, and advice during the time I was struggling the most.

Finally, I would like to express my utmost gratitude to the participants in my study. Not only would my thesis have been impossible without your participation, time, and energy, but I want to especially acknowledge and thank all of you for creating a safe, trusting, and developing space from which I have learnt a lot.

Table of content

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Research Overview.....	2
2.1 Feminist Epistemological Debate.....	2
2.2 Power Relations and Emotions in Knowledge Production in LGBTQ Research	6
2.3 LGBTQ Research in the Context of Gothenburg	8
3. Aims.....	12
4. Research Questions	13
5. Theory	13
5.1 Situated Knowledge	13
5.2 Emotions	15
5.3 Queer Phenomenology.....	18
5.4 Materiality.....	20
6. Method and Methodological Considerations.....	21
7. Plugging in to Queer in Gothenburg.....	27
8. Conclusion	50
9. Further Remarks	54
References	55
Appendix 1 – Invitation for Participation.....	60
Appendix 2 – Information Regarding Ethical Considerations.....	61
Appendix 3 – Introduction of the Study.....	62
Appendix 4 – Original Quotes.....	63

1. Introduction

In 2013 the City of Gothenburg instituted the first municipal LGBTQ-council in Sweden and the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Rights' (RFSL) municipal survey that was conducted 2014, ranked Gothenburg as number one out of Sweden's municipalities in terms of their work with LGBTQ (umbrella term for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans*, and queer persons) questions (Jacobson, 2014, p. 3; Jonsson, 2015, p. 33). Further, in 2017 the city had developed *The City of Gothenburg's Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021* (own translation, original title, *Göteborgs Stads plan för att förbättra hbtq-personers livsvillkor år 2017- 2021*). The plan focuses on five areas: Vulnerability and Discrimination, Meeting Places and Inclusive Spaces, Associations and Organisations, Communication, and HR and Competence (Göteborgs Stad, n.d.a). Thus, the city of Gothenburg has led the way of municipal work regarding LGBTQ. However, in the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg* (own translation, original title, *Normbrytande liv i Göteborg*), Ellie Nordfelt, who is a member of the LGBTQ-council, raises the concern that the council will become an alibi, something that politicians and public officials can point to but that does not change much in reality (Jacobson, 2014, p. 49). Based on this contradictory image of the city, I find Gothenburg to be an interesting and important context for further research with a focus on LGBTQ. Within this context, this study sets out to extend the existing knowledge of experiences of being queer in Gothenburg. Here I believe a clarification is in order, the term queer stems from a critique of the different norms, including the hetero and cis norm, that rule our lives and divide us into categories. Thus, it is a term that moves away from identity politics and categories that are based on normative assumptions about sexuality and gender (Norrhem, Rydström & Markusson Winkvist, 2015, pp. 30-34). The participants in this study does not, as such, necessarily identify as queer, the term is rather used to include bodies and identities that in different ways deviate from the hetero and cis norm. With that clarified, this study gathers four queer persons, including myself, living in Gothenburg, in the context of an in-depth group that met on four occasions to discuss different experiences of being queer in Gothenburg. The discussion in the in-depth group took its starting point in the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*. I consider the report as a good point of departure due to its influential role in the city's work regarding LGBTQ, as it has served as the basis for *The City of Gothenburg's Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021*, which applies to all of the city's boards and administrations (Göteborgs Stad, n.d.a, p. 4). In extension, the study aims to attend to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production. This second

aim is based on my understanding that knowledge production is relational, contextual, and always interacting with different power structures, which also is a crucial point of departure in feminist methodology (Liinason & Cuesta, 2014, p. 24). I consider the inclusion of emotions to be of importance since I understand emotions as a vital factor in the creation of collective bodies, as such, affecting how we in the in-depth group form relationships with one another. In other words, our emotions toward one another are factors that condition our relationships with one another and the context within which the knowledge is produced, thus, affecting what knowledge that is produced (Ahmed, 2004a). The data that is produced within the in-depth group and through the individual journals that were written by all participants after each meeting, will be analysed with emotion and power-sensitive theories through a diffractive reading.

2. Research Overview

This chapter will offer an outline of the fields of research that I consider this study to be in dialogue with, namely: the feminist epistemological debate, research concerning power relations and emotions in knowledge production in the field of LGBTQ research, and LGBTQ research in the context of Gothenburg.

2.1 Feminist Epistemological Debate

The following overview of the feminist epistemological debate does not claim to be exhaustive, a mapping of this extensive debate that is in dialogue with a myriad of different strands and stretches over half a century does not fit within the time and space limits of this study. This overview should rather be thought of as a tool to situate the epistemological understanding of this study.

Epistemology is a term that refers to criteria for the production of knowledge and definitions of what science is, and in the field of feminist research we need to understand that there is no single feminist epistemology. The field of feminist research, in terms of epistemology, is in dialogue with a myriad of different strands, such as positivism, Marxism, critical realism, and postmodern philosophy. However, a mutual starting point for most of the different feminist epistemological positions is a criticism, although formulated differently, of the *object* of research that is found in traditional research, as well as the position of the researcher as a neutral

knower. The different strands in feminist epistemology that are presented in the following overview should not be understood as to refer to a historical development but rather as epistemological positions that all still actively applied within today's feminist research and that run in parallel throughout the history of feminist research (Lykke, 2010, pp. 125-127).

Feminist empiricism, a concept introduced by Sandra Harding, is a project that aims to make women's experiences, perspectives, conditions of life, and contributions to society and culture, visible via empirical research. Further, this entails analyses of how gender relations and gendered power orders condition women's lives and how traditional research often construct Man as the human norm. The construction of Man as the human norm is explained to be based on gender bias, which has been allowed to interfere with the process of knowledge production and as such, obstruct the ideals of objectivity and value neutrality. However, the male gender bias in science can be corrected by a stricter adherence to the existing methodological norms within knowledge production, as such, leaving these norms unchallenged (Harding, 1993, p. 51; Lykke, 2010, pp. 128-129; Harding, 1986, pp. 24-25).

Feminist standpoint epistemology rejects the feminist empiricist idea that objectivity can be achieved by a stricter adherence to the existing methodological norms within knowledge production. Thus, arguing that there is a need for a new conception of objectivity and in extension, mechanisms for understanding how power structures interfere with knowledge production (Intemann, 2016, p. 261). Feminist standpoint theory originated in Marxist feminism, where it set out to understand how power structures, such as the patriarchy and capitalism, shape and limit knowledge production. In this way standpoint theory found inspiration in Marxist epistemology and its theorisations of the standpoint of the oppressed as a privileged perspective in terms of epistemology. However, feminist standpoint theory has developed to include a variety of different standpoints and not just that of the Marxist worker (Intemann, 2016, pp. 261-262). Within this strand, Harding has been influential by arguing that rigorous feminist reflections on knowledge production can challenge pre-feminist, taken for granted, epistemological understandings, and that feminist standpoint epistemology offers the best ground for such reflections. Further, Harding argues that knowledge claims are always socially situated and that the failure to critically interrogate this situatedness makes knowledge claims less objective (Harding, 1993, pp. 52, 54). Other influential voices who have been vital for the development of standpoint theory are Black feminist theorists, such as Kimberlé Crenshaw, bell hooks, Patricia Hill Collins, and Audre Lorde. This by stressing that a feminist 'standpoint' must be understood and applied in ways that capture the ways in which sexism

intersects with other power structures and systems of oppression (Geerts & van der Tuin, 2013, p. 173; Intemann, 2016, p. 262).

Feminist postmodernism is based on a critique of feminist empiricism and feminist standpoint theory as being universalising, telling ‘one true story’ (Geerts & van der Tuin, 2013, p. 173) Based in this critique, postmodern epistemology is a self-reflexive strand that sets out to problematise and deconstruct the traditional foundations of scientific knowledge production and understands science as discourse, narrative, or a ‘story-telling practice’ and can as such be understood as an (anti-)epistemology (Lykke, 2010, pp. 130-131). Here, Judith Butler’s work and critique of the use of subject positions, such as woman, as stable and a common identity, has been vital for the development of feminist postmodern thought (Geerts & van der Tuin, 2013, p. 174). Butler argues that feminist empiricist and standpoint epistemological practices have a naïve relationship to the notion of ‘women,’ in terms of their use of the category as foundational and taken for granted both in the sense of the category as a possible object of research and as subjects doing research. Butler believes that this unreflective use of the category of both ‘women’ and ‘men’ mobilises a performative power that fixes and normatively confirms the categories, and in turn, their implication in a heteronormative and two-gender model. As an answer to this problematic epistemological practice, Butler argues for the starting point of feminist research to be a problematisation of these categories and norms. Further, postmodernist feminist theorists are critical about the use of the notion of ‘experience’ and argue that feminist empiricism and feminist standpoint theory apply experience as a spontaneous, authentic, and discursively unmediated encounter between the individual and the world. Postmodern theorist, on the other hand, understand and focus on the subject as decentred, unstable, and re/produced in and by discourse. A further criticism of especially classical standpoint feminist epistemology is its difficulty to politically and theoretically handle the multiplicity of different standpoints, such as gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, and geopolitical location, as they intersect. A postmodernist solution to this problem of accounting for intersectionality has been to focus on ‘small stories,’ situated in local contexts rather than the grandmaster narratives as presented by standpoint feminism, which only offered one theoretically determined path to emancipation for all women (Lykke, 2010, pp. 130-133).

Within the feminist debate on epistemology the postmodern strand has however received critique for its political and moral relativism in terms of the understanding that any given ‘small story’ is as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ as another, an understanding that in some ways can be counterproductive to the feminist goal of emancipation and social justice. An answer to this potential counterproductivity has for some feminist theorists been found in feminist

postconstructionism, which commits to transgress gender de/constructionism by thinking through the links between discourse and materiality (Lykke, 2010, pp. 133-134). Donna Haraway's *situated knowledge* is a good example of such transgression. Haraway criticises the positivist understanding of objectivity that separates the knower from everybody and everything, an unmarked position that represent while escaping representation, it sees everything from nowhere, the god-trick. This criticism also includes the use of categories, such as 'women,' as fixed. To avoid such fixation, Haraway makes use of 'the subjugated' and argues that the self is always split, multidimensional, and contradictory and therefore not able to be squashed into cumulative lists of different categories. However, Haraway notes that the relativism of social constructionism and particular postmodern projects, is not the answer to the totalisation of positivism (Haraway, 1988, pp. 577, 581-586). Rather, we need to understand the subjugated as open nodal points that encompass a variety of social and cultural inclusion and exclusion, thus a diversity of different bases for resistance and epistemologically privileged positions to understanding the mechanisms of subjugation. This implies an epistemological understanding of partial perspective that is not based in any given or fixed category but in a mobile multiplicity of critical localisations in the partial perspective of different subjugated groups. Further, this understanding entails that the knower should practice partial objectivity in their articulation of reality, which in turn, encompasses being accountable for this articulation and the reality-producing effects it has (Lykke, 2010, pp. 133-135). Another influential voice within the strand of postconstructionism is Karen Barad, who builds on among others Haraway, to theorise around the relationship between discourse and materiality with the help of the concept of *intra-activity*. Intra-activity is explained as the relationship between discourse, human and non-human bodies, nature, culture, and technologies, where all of these aspects mutually transform each other. (Göransson, 2012, p. 30). As such, neither material phenomena nor discourses are ontologically or epistemologically prior, to exist is not an individual endeavour but a result of our intra-actions with the world (Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 266; Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 531). Applying this understanding to knowing, Barad states that knowing and being cannot be separated, they are interdependent and as such constituting an *onto-epistemology*, knowing in being (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 539). Knowing is never done in isolation since it is always affected by material and human forces coming together. As such, Barad's onto-epistemology decentres the researcher as the knowing subject as well as the dichotomy between discourse and matter (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 539; Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 271; Palmer, 2011, p. 8). To conclude, what this outline has shown is that even though there are a myriad of different feminist epistemological positions, they all

set out to transform scientific knowledge production (Lykke, 2010, p. 143). Further, I find it important to note that there is no clear line that divides the different strands and that they have contributed to the development of one another. However, as will be made clear in the chapter of theory, this study is epistemologically placed within the strand of postconstructionism.

2.2 Power Relations and Emotions in Knowledge Production in LGBTQ Research

What follows is an outline of valuable research that in different ways pay attention to power relations and emotions in knowledge production in the field of LGBTQ research. In this overview I have applied the terms LGBT and LGBTQ as used in the different studies I refer to.

Drawing from their experiences of a Participatory Action Research (PAR) project with LGBTQ young people, M. Alex Wagaman and Ira Sanchez explore the challenges and opportunities of the theoretical shift in the approach to knowledge production that PAR entails. The project that the authors base the following reflections on consisted of eight LGBTQ-identified young persons, who collectively identified the research topic of intra-community bigotry, designed a research study, collected, and analysed data. By extension, the initiator and facilitating researcher of the project, Wagaman, aimed to identify the value of PAR for working with young LGBTQ people. Based on reflections after the project had ended, Wagaman and Sanchez initiated the exploration of their experiences of the process that the research team engaged in. The importance of such an exploration is based on the lack research on such processes, which is said to be due, partly, to the exclusion of such reflections in the final research product, where word limits do not allow for such discussions (Wagaman & Sanchez, 2017, pp. 79-82). Based on this, the objectives of their paper are to engage researchers in thinking differently about their research; examine the potential of a reflective research process and; to personify PAR by placing the researchers' experiences at the forefront in order to contribute to knowledge about the process. To explore their experiences during the research process, the authors use duoethnography, which is a method where researchers can critically examine their experiences of an incident without having to resolve differences or agree on a conclusion. Further, the authors give a detailed description of the process of writing and reflecting on each other's pieces (Wagaman & Sanchez, 2017, p. 83-84). During these duoethnographic reflections, three main *praxes* were identified: explicitly acknowledging and negotiating power in the research process; the team's iterative process of learning together and from one another; and recognising aspects of the research process in which the burden of vulnerability was shared by those involved (Wagaman & Sanchez, 2017, pp. 85-89). These praxes are exemplified by written pieces from

both authors, which are in dialogue with each other. These pieces are further connected to general discussions around each of the three praxes, these discussions however, lack a dialogue with theory. There is for example an obvious lack of theorisation around the concepts of power and vulnerability. The focus of these general pieces is rather on presenting the value of such reflections for social work research. This focus is in line with the objectives of the paper as presented above, however the lack of ‘theorizing from practice,’ as the authors themselves refer to, is unsatisfying (Wagaman & Sanchez, 2017, pp. 82, 85-93).

With the basis in two PAR projects, the first is a UK-based photo project around LGBT mental health and the second, a Spanish trans-community narrative project with the aim of making visible gender variant subjectivities outside of the frame of pathology, Katherine Johnson and Antar Martínez Guzmán raise reflexive questions around their own involvement within these two projects. These post-structuralist informed reflections are based in the observations that, within the projects there is an inconsistent relationship between participation and empowerment. Further, co-produced artifacts that results from the projects and in turn produce meaning and action, mutate as they are utilized for different purposes, as such creating new forms of meaning and actions (Johnson & Martínez Guzmán, 2013, pp. 410-411, 414). Johnson and Martínez Guzmán further reflect on the researcher’s ‘own starting points as we enter the field of action research by considering naturalized definitions of who is vulnerable or marginalized as both the *object* and field of social transformation’ (Johnson & Martínez Guzmán, 2013, p. 414, emphasis in original). I find this last point of reflection to be of most value based on its attention to possible objectification of LGBTQ research participants. The authors highlight that the identity positions from where the research relationship is constructed, in this case LGBT mental health service users, are often not called into question. These are identity positions that are conceived in a particular manner by the researcher and as such attribute the group with specific identities and traits. Individuals in the group however, do not necessarily recognise themselves within these identity positions. Thus, when these preconceived definitions are not reflected upon, the research reproduces authority discourses and as such not leaving much space for social transformation (Johnson & Martínez Guzmán, 2013, pp. 416-417).

Alison L Bain and William J Payne examine the limitations of what co-production and collaboration of knowledge can mean within contemporary scholarly practices by making use of the concept of *queer de-participation*. The authors draw on their experience of a queer feminist PAR project that aims to create an enriching and safe queer, social space for young people in Toronto, Canada, which in turn developed into a co-authored conference paper and a

journal article. In the construction of a singular narrative about their collective project, in the form of a journal article, the authors became acutely aware of the power dynamics inherent in such a project. Bain and Payne argue that, in the case of their project, these power dynamics led to accelerating dynamics of de-participation which to some extent eroded the inclusive politics of the initially applied feminist participatory methodology. This argument is based on the decision of the authoring group to revise the article after receiving critique from peer reviewers. This revision excised the work of one co-author completely and muted descriptions of emotions that accrued during the research process. Such revision is according to Bain and Payne plays of power and as such, publishing is both a production and an erasure of knowledge and in this project it worked to reinforce the power and status differences between non-academic and academic co-authors (Bain & Payne, 2016, pp. 330-331, 334, 336-338).

It is no coincident that all of the studies that I have outlined above are PAR projects since PAR is a research practice that aims to challenge power relations in research (Wagaman & Sanchez, 2017, p. 80). However, as Wagaman and Sanchez, as well as Alexandra Zavos and Barbara Biglia (2009, pp. 153, 155) points out, in their paper that aims to emphasise the importance of attending to the research process (without having a specific focus on LGBTQ), that ideas about the situatedness of knowledge production and that knowledge is always collectively constructed have remained as theoretical propositions that are not embodied in practice. In practice, these theoretical propositions usually imply ‘using qualitative methods and/or specifying the gender/class/race of the researcher, as if that were more than enough in order to assume a political stand within the research project’ (Zavos & Biglia, 2009, p. 155). And even more so, I would like to add, a lack of practical application of theoretical understandings of emotions in knowledge production. Thus, there is a gap between theory and practice yet to be filled.

2.3 LGBTQ Research in the Context of Gothenburg

Before starting the outline of LGBTQ research in the context of Gothenburg, I want to clarify that this is not an exhaustive presentation of the research that has been done in the field of LGBTQ in Gothenburg, but rather a general overview of main aspects that have been covered within the field, especially within the last ten years. Further, the different research projects I have reviewed, all have in common a focus on Gothenburg as the context of the research, as such, LGBTQ research that is done in Gothenburg but do not contextualise itself in Gothenburg, has not been of interest.

When talking about LGBTQ in the context of Gothenburg, Arne Nilsson is always well worth mentioning. With a focus on the 20th century, Nilsson has produced several studies of homosexuality in Gothenburg (Nationella sekretariatet för genusforskning, 2004). One of these studies, the book *A Different City. Female and Male homosexual life 1950-1980*, (translation of title by Lützen, 2003, original title, *En annan stad. Kvinnligt och manligt homoliv 1950–1980*) co-authored with Margareta Lindholm, centres around lesbian and gay life in Gothenburg from 1950 to 1980. By interviewing 15 women and 15 men, Nilsson and Lindholm illustrates how gay life was performed differently in different places in Gothenburg, such as at gay clubs, in the city, at work, and in the home, this by asking the question of how the participants looked upon themselves and each other and the kind of life they took part in. The book makes clear that there is a distinction between acts and identities, thus taking part in lesbian and gay life did not necessarily entail identifying as lesbian or gay, such identification rather developed as those categories became more essentialised, e.g. when special organisations for lesbians and gays were created. Further, a difference can be noted in what is discussed by the women who were interviewed and the men. The women focus on their networks and how they met with other lesbians in private homes, whereas the men discuss their experiences of meeting other men in public spaces in the city (Lützen, 2003). In terms of less historical work, I first of all want to highlight the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*, which has been a starting point for this study. The report aims to collect knowledge about the life conditions of people who identify as LGBTQ in Gothenburg and concludes that although Gothenburg, to some extent, allows for openness, safety, respect, and inclusion, the presence of a stable norm of heterosexuality also leads to violence, discrimination, hate, and harassment. Further, there is a lack of trust towards the City of Gothenburg, as an administrative body, due to bad and insufficient encounters with and experiences of the city's different services. These encounters and experiences can in turn be understood as consequences of a lack of competence and knowledge around LGBTQ in some of the city's services. One of the areas where this is most evident is the city's knowledge and work with LGBTQ and vulnerability to violence, for example domestic violence and honour related violence and oppression. The author, Maria Jacobson further notes that based on time and budget constraints, the report should rather be considered as an investigation that does not claim to be exhaustive, and thus there is still a need for more research on the topic of LGBTQ in Gothenburg (Jacobson, 2014, pp. 5, 13). Another report worth mentioning is the region of Västra Götaland's study on experiences of LGBTQ persons in the meeting with the region's different services, especially health care services. This report also concludes that there is a need for efforts to develop knowledge and competence around sexuality and gender identity within

the region's services (Västra Götalandsregionen, 2012, p. 5). RFSL's study on LGBTQ persons experiences of care at test clinics in Gothenburg comes to the same conclusion (Orre, 2014).

An overwhelming majority of the studies conducted at bachelor's and master's level have been done within the field of social work, but there are studies to be found in fields of human rights, Health and Care Science, Cultural Science, public administration, and pedagogy. Within the field of human rights, Sara Olténg (2015) explores and compares how different administrations and companies within the City of Gothenburg interpret and work with the concept of human rights, including LGBTQ. Olténg concludes that the concept is understood differently by different officials, administrations, and companies, but that the investigated units do not use a human rights-based language in their budgets or daily work. Mozhgan Jalali (2010), within the field of Health and Care Science, investigates how partners to pregnant women in lesbian relationships experience midwifery treatment in maternal health care, in Gothenburg and Bohuslän, during pregnancy. The study concludes that the experiences vary a lot, but that there is a general need for more knowledge among midwives on the situation and experience of partners to pregnant women in lesbian relationships during pregnancy. In Lovisa Perman's (2017) Gothenburg-based bachelor's thesis in Cultural Science, we can read about lesbian identity formations and the importance of separatism. Within the field of public administration, Kerstin Sättil (2016) undertakes a discourse analysis of the City of Gothenburg's work for inclusive urban planning, this analysis includes the aspects of gender and sexuality and concludes that the two examined official documents within the discourse of urban planning in Gothenburg, both contribute to the construction of dichotomies and exclude some groups. Another study within the field of public administration is Nathalie Tapper's (2016) evaluation of LGBTQ-certified practices in the region of Västra Götaland. The study concludes that the investigated practices in Västra Götaland are realistically developed and have a positive effect in terms of how LGBTQ persons experience the services. Further, Tapper makes some general reflections around the identity of the researcher but argues that being an LGBTQ-identified researcher has not affected the result of the study in terms of wanting a particular result. However, Tapper argues that it made the target group more accessible and affected the development of trust (Tapper, 2016, p. 22). Another study on the topic of LGBT-certification is Anna Nordén's (2014) thesis, which investigates what ideas and norms around gender and sexuality that are conveyed by the staff at two LGBT-certified youth centres (*fritidsgårdar*) in Gothenburg, and in extension, what the consequences are of these ideas, from a queer theoretical perspective. Just like Tapper, Nordén reflects on the position of the researcher or the situatedness of the researcher. In terms of this thesis, the situating of the researcher is done by

a general statement that Nordén as the author of the thesis, with an interest in norm criticism, LGBTQ, and pedagogy and that is read as female, white, and relatively young, can have had an effect on the interviews (Nordén, 2014, pp. 15-17). Within the field of pedagogy, one other study has been conducted, Elin Elversson and Frida Jacobson's (2014) thesis on how teachers in and around Gothenburg practice sex and relationships education in terms of preventing harassment and discrimination of LGBT persons. Within the field of social work, Jessika Fredin (2010) analysis ideas about the concepts of family, parenthood, and gender among nurses at Child Health Care Centres in Gothenburg and the region of Västra Götaland. Through the theoretical perspective of social constructivism, Fredin finds the norm of heterosexuality to be highly present in the nurses' understandings of the concepts. Fredin highlights that social constructivism gives and understanding of interviews, as a method for data collection, as social interactions where knowledge is constructed, and as such it is important to reflect on one's own role in the interview. Within this context, the author argues that the quality of the interactions affects the process of knowledge production and exemplifies this by explaining how one of the interviews conducted in the study only led to short and non-exhaustive answers. This, in turn, made it hard for the author to interpret the informant's understanding. However, the reflection stops there and Fredin does not further develop how variations in terms of the quality of the interactions have affected the interpretation of data and in turn the result (Fredin, 2010, pp. 23-25). Another study with a social constructivist perspective is Johan Hagström, Erik Ridelius, and Tina Warneflo's (n.d.) thesis that investigates the treatment of LGBT persons in primary health care by analysing discursive practices around gender and sexuality among counsellors in Gothenburg. The result of the study indicates that the implementation of anti-discriminatory and equality work is inadequate. There are several other studies with a social or feminist constructivist perspective within the field of social work including: Erik Hornby's (n.d.) thesis on masculinity and sexuality in team sports in and around Gothenburg; Linda Gustafsson's (2012) study on how social service workers in Gothenburg focus on making clients, including LGBT persons, feel comfortable when talking about questions regarding sexuality; Johanna Andersson and Sandra Östlundh's (2012) investigation of what young people in the region of Västra Götaland request in terms of preventative and health promotional efforts regarding sexual health; Evelina Svensson's (2013) examination of the possibility for an integrated LGBTQ perspective in elderly care in Gothenburg and Stockholm; and Johan Persson's (2013) study on how homosexual men in Gothenburg experience the encounter with society. Finally, I want to highlight Khalid Rashid's (2013) exploration of the professional recognition of

LGBTQ persons vulnerabilities under collective patriarchal violence and oppression, a study which partly focuses on Gothenburg.

As can be seen from this overview, the majority of studies have a social constructivist perspective and none of the studies apply a postconstructivist epistemological understanding. Further, although some of the studies make attempts of reflecting upon the position of the researcher and the context in which the knowledge has been produced, none of the studies specifically attends to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production. In addition, there is a lack of research with an intersectional focus, where only Svensson's examination of the possibility for an integrated LGBTQ perspective in elderly care in Gothenburg and Stockholm and Rashid's exploration of the professional recognition of LGBTQ persons vulnerabilities under collective patriarchal violence and oppression, can be said to have an intersectional focus. Finally, none of the studies published after the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*, mention the report.

3. Aims

This study is based on an in-depth group consisting of four queer persons living in Gothenburg and the individual journals that were written by the participants after each of the four meetings. With its basis in the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*, the in depth-group discussions revolved around experiences of being queer in Gothenburg. Based on the discussions that emerged during these four meetings, this study aims to extend the existing knowledge of how different queer persons experience being queer in Gothenburg and in extension, attend to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production. I intend to meet these aims by applying emotion and power-sensitive theories and methodologies and by analysing the material through a diffractive reading.

The author of the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg* notes that there is a need for further research with a focus on LGBTQ in the context of Gothenburg. Further, there is no previous research that addresses the report. The attentiveness to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production in turn, rests on its central role in feminist methodology and the fact that there is still a lack of research that applies this methodology in practice. Based on this lack, this study's contribution to the field of Gender Studies is an exemplification and extended understanding of how such methodological considerations can be put to practice.

Finally, I would like to highlight that a guiding understanding of this study has been that knowledge production is a gendering practice, a practice that has real-life consequences.

A feminist researcher who engages in diffractive analysis is committed to understanding how we as researchers are responsibly engaged in shaping the future for humans, non-humans and the material environment in our production of knowledge, because productions of knowledge are also productions of reality that will always have specific material consequences. (Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 278)

4. Research Questions

- What understandings of being queer in Gothenburg emerge out of a diffracting reading of the in-depth group discussions and individual journals?
- How can emotions and power relations be understood in the process of knowledge production in the study?

5. Theory

In this chapter I will outline the theories that I have applied to understand and discuss the process of knowledge production, data collection, and data analysis.

5.1 Situated Knowledge

Using the metaphor of vision, Haraway sketches out a feminist, embodied objectivity, that of situated knowledge. This doctrine of objectivity reclaims the sensory system of vision by insisting in its embodied nature. This move challenges the positivist myth of a gaze that signifies the unmarked position of Man and White, that claims to have the power to see but not be seen, the god trick. Moving away from this false vision that transcends all limits and responsibility, entails a move towards particular and specific embodiment, a partial perspective. Thus, such feminist objectivity is built on limited location and situated knowledge, which does not allow a splitting of subject and object nor an understanding of vision as passive. This situatedness supports knowledge production that can be held accountable, so being situated must entail not being tempted to romanticise and/or appropriate the visions of the less powerful, the subjugated, while claiming to see from their perspectives. To see from below does not guarantee 'innocent,' adequate, sustained, objective, transformative accounts of the world. This would be to fall into the trap of the god trick, being nowhere while claiming to see everything,

a denial of responsibility and critical reflections. Situated knowledge must therefore be understood as partial, locatable, and critical knowledge production that allows for webbed connections, that is, shared conversations. Further, this partial perspective is not just about acknowledged and self-critical partiality or self-identity (Haraway, 1988, pp. 576, 580-585). ‘One cannot ‘be’ either a cell or a molecule – or a woman, colonized person, laborer, and so on – if one intends to see and see from these perspectives critically’ (Haraway, 1988, p. 585). This since ‘being’ is much more complex and the fusion of one’s different identities does not entail positioning. Where one sees from is always a question of power, which one needs to be accountable for, even when the account is from the position of ‘oneself.’ ‘Self-knowledge requires a semiotic-material technology to link meanings to bodies’ (Haraway, 1988, p. 585). The self is thus split and contradictory, splitting instead of ‘being’ is about heterogeneous multiplicities that cannot be squashed into cumulative lists. This calls for an understanding of subjectivity as multidimensional and in turn, so is vision. The self is always partial and thus never original nor finished but always constructed. One cannot ‘be’ in all positions simultaneously nor wholly in any, which allows for the ability to join with another and see together but without claiming to be another. Connecting this to objectivity:

A scientific knower seeks the subject position, not of identity, but of objectivity, that is, partial connection. [...] Subjugation is not grounds for an ontology; it might be a visual clue. Vision requires instruments of vision; an optics is a politics of positioning. Instruments of vision mediate standpoints; there is no immediate vision from the standpoints of the subjugated. Identity, including self-identity, does not produce science; critical positioning does, that is, objectivity. (Haraway, 1988, p. 586)

When connecting this understanding to the struggle over what counts as rational knowledge one must recognise that this is a struggle over how to see. As mentioned, where one sees from is always a question of power, and positioning in turn, implies responsibility for one’s enabling practices. Thus, moral and politics should guide the discourse about what counts as rational knowledge. However, within this struggle, universalist accounts and local knowledges cannot be understood as two mutually exclusive ends of a dichotomy. The struggle is better imagined as a map of tension and resonance between these both ends. Webbed connections, the joining with another, can be systematic. Local knowledges are in tension with productive structurings which creates unequal exchanges (Haraway, 1988, pp. 585-588). To exemplify, ‘gender is a field of structured and structuring differences, in which the tones of extreme localization, of the intimately personal and individualized body, vibrate in the same field with global high-tension emissions’ (Haraway, 1988, p. 588). Thus, embodiment cannot be

understood as fixed vision, but rather as inflections in orientation and responsibility for differences in fields of meaning. In other words, objectivity is a process that entails continuous power-sensitive, critical interpretation. By extension, this non-fixation, partiality, opens up for connections and 'better' accounts of the world (Haraway, 1988, pp. 588-590).

5.2 Emotions

According to Sara Ahmed's theorisation on what emotions *do*, emotions shape the 'surfaces' of individual and collective bodies, in other words, bodies take the shape of the contact that they have with others and objects. Important to this argument is the understanding that we do not have positive or negative feelings toward something or someone because these objects or others are inherently good or bad, but because they seem beneficial or harmful to us. In turn, whether we perceive this something or someone as beneficial or harmful depends upon how we are affected by them. Thus, the attribution of an object or others as beneficial or harmful involves a reading of the contact with that object or other. Further, contact involves the subject, but also histories that are prior to the subject. (Ahmed, 2004a, pp. 1, 4-6). To develop the argument further, Ahmed makes use of the common psychological example of a child and a bear. The child sees the bear and is afraid, but why? Even if it is the child's first 'real' encounter with a bear, the child is still afraid, this due to the image we have of bears as animals to be feared. This is an image that is shaped by cultural histories and memories. Thus, fearsomeness is not in the bear itself, but it is fearsome to someone. Hence, the fear is neither in the child, but it is about how the child and the bear come in contact. This contact is shaped by past histories of contact, that when not available in the present, makes the bear apprehend as fearsome. However, this particular bear also makes and leaves an impression. Emotions, in this case fear, shape the surface of bodies in relation to objects and others in the sense that emotions involve relations of 'towardness' or 'awayness' to objects and others (Ahmed, 2004a, pp. 7-8).

The 'aboutness' of fear involves a reading of contact: the child reads the contact as dangerous, which involves apprehending the bear as fearsome. We can also note that the 'reading' then identifies the bear as the cause of the feeling. The child becomes fearful, and the bear becomes fearsome: the attribution of feeling to an object (I feel afraid because you are fearsome) is an effect of the encounter, which moves the subject away from the object. Emotions involves such affective form of reorientation. (Ahmed, 2004a, p. 8)

Thus, emotions are not something that is either inside or outside us, it is rather through emotions, how we respond to objects and others, that the surfaces and boundaries that

distinguish the outside from the inside are created. 'I' and 'we' are shaped by contact with others as an effect of impressions left by others. In other words, emotions create the boundaries and surfaces that allow the individual and the social to be perceived as objects. However, Ahmed argues that it is not emotions that *cause* the forming of the surface (Ahmed, 2004a, pp. 10-11, 24).

Rather, it is through the flow of sensation and feelings that *become* conscious as pain and pleasure that different surfaces are established. For example, say I stub my toe on a table. The impression of the table is one of negotiation; it leaves its trace on the surface of my skin and I respond with the appropriate 'ouch' and move away, swearing. It is through such painful encounters between this body and other objects, including other bodies, that 'surfaces' are felt as 'being there' in the first place. To be more precise *the impression of a surface is an effect of such intensification of feeling*. I become aware of my body as having a surface only in the event of feeling discomfort (prickly sensations, cramps) that become transformed into pain through an act of reading and recognition ('it hurts!'), which is also a judgement ('it is bad!'). The recognition of a sensation as being painful (from 'it hurts' to 'it is bad' to 'move away') also involves the reconstitution of bodily space, as the reorientation of the bodily relation to that which gets attributed as the cause of the pain. (Ahmed, 2004a, p. 24, emphasis in original)

Thus, bodies and worlds materialise or take shape, through the intensification and interpretation of such sensation. However, we might not only interpret the sensation of an impression or encounter, but also the other that we encounter to have certain characteristic. If we are hurt in an encounter with an other, the 'it hurts' may become 'you hurt me' and in a further step 'you are hurtful'. So not only do such readings create borders between ourselves and others, they also give others meaning (Ahmed, 2004a, pp. 24-25, 28). In other words, 'materialisation takes place through the 'mediation' of affect, which may function in this way as readings of the bodies of others' (Ahmed, 2004a, p. 28).

With this in mind, we can move toward an understanding of how the skin of the collective takes shape. The perception of 'you hurt me,' or the other as causing the emotional response involves a contact between the self and others that in turn is shaped by previous histories of contact (Ahmed, 2004b, p. 31). For example:

a white racist subject who encounters a racial other may experience an intensity of emotions (fear, hate, disgust, pain). That intensification involves moving away from the body of the other, or moving towards that body in an act of violence, and then moving away. The 'moment of contact' is shaped by past histories of contact, which allows the proximity of a racial other to be perceived as threatening, at the same time as it reshapes the bodies in the contact zone of the encounter. These histories have already impressed upon the surface of the bodies at the same time as they create new impressions. (Ahmed, 2004b, p. 31)

Thus, we can understand emotions as performative since they both repeat past associations and generate their object. 'Hate may generate the other as the object of hate insofar as it repeats associations that already read the bodies of others as being hateful. [...] in reading the other as being hateful, the subject is filled up with hate, as a sign of the truth of the reading' (Ahmed, 2004b, p. 32). Further, such affective responses entail the alignment of the self with and against other others. Negative attachments to, for example, racial others are simultaneously redefined as positive attachments or 'feelings-in-common' with other others, a collective, those who are recognisable as 'white.' Thus, encounters with, in this case, racial others and the emotion of hate accompanying the encounter and the reconstitution of bodily space, does align the 'I' with the 'we' ('likeness'), as well as the 'you' with the 'them' ('unlikeness') (Ahmed, 2004b, pp. 26-27, 32-33). Further, within the encounter outlined above, the body that is read as being hateful, the racial other, is (temporarily) fixed in their skin, assuming the character of the negative. Thus, as the white body moves away it also seals the other as the object of hate. (Ahmed, 2004a, pp. 57-58).

Moreover, Ahmed discusses the connection between emotions and feminism in the sense that pain can move us towards feminism. However, stories of pain can only be 'shared' when we do not assume that they are the same stories. A feminist collective can thus not be formed on the grounds of identity or sameness but on a reading of the relation between affect and structures in such a way that it undoes the separation between the self and others. Further, feminism requires anger, which comes about through the interpretation of the pain as wrong. This entails an understanding of feminist action as reaction, an understanding which is crucial to not conceal the histories that come before the subject. However, anger is not just defined in relation to a past, to what we are against, but also as an opening of the future, the something that we are for. Feminism involves a reading of the cause of anger, in other words, feminism moves from anger to an interpretation of what one is against. Thus, connections are made between the object of anger and broader structures and hence a language that responds to that which one is against is created, this is a language that allows the object of anger to be renamed and be brought into a feminist world. It is clear that different feminists have and are naming that which they are against differently, but what is shared is the 'directionality' of the emotion. Within these different processes of naming, feminists have recognised that the something which they are against does not have the contours of an object that is given (Ahmed, 2004a, pp. 174-176).

This lack of residence is implicit in the argument that gender permeates all aspects of social life and that it is in this sense 'worldly.' Anger hence moves us by moving us outwards: while it creates an object, it also is not simply directed against an object, but becomes a response to the world, as such. [...] Anger against objects or events, directed against this or that, moves feminism into a bigger critique of 'what is', as a critique that loses an object, and opens itself up to possibilities that cannot be simply located or found in the present. (Ahmed, 2004a, p. 176)

According to Ahmed, this loss of object is what allows feminism to become a movement since it is an opening up for actions that are not fixed by the object that we are against in the present. However, it is not just as easy as that our anger will be accepted and received as reasonable and hence we need to continue to repeat why our anger is reasonable. Even more importantly, we need to recognise that we ourselves as feminists are in the position where we might be the ones not accepting the anger of other feminists. This is a question of the conditions of whose anger that can be turned into action and requires us as feminists to accept that our positions might evoke other's anger and hence opening up our own position for critique and being uncomfortable (Ahmed, 2004a, pp. 176-178).

5.3 Queer Phenomenology

Ahmed develops the understanding of being uncomfortable or disorientated further by making use of phenomenology since it enables an understanding of how bodies are shaped by histories. Ahmed suggests that orientation is about making the strange familiar by extending the body into space, and that disorientation occurs when such extension fails, which might make the body feel 'out of place.' The failure of bodies to extend is caused by a misfit between the body and the shape of the space, a shape or 'direction' that is acquired through how bodies inhabit it. However, bodies also acquire direction through inhabiting space. In this way, inhabiting spaces by following lines, determines what comes into view, being that which resides in those spaces. Following a specific line makes some things reachable and others unreachable. When we are 'in line' we are directed toward that which is already faced by others. Facing the same direction as others allows the body to extend into space since that space has already taken their shape. So, depending of which lines we follow, different worlds come into view and by following and repeating the directionality of a line over time the body acquires the very shape of the direction. These lines, in turn, are created by being followed, thus lines are performative (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 11-16, 56).

This understanding of direction and orientation is crucial to how we understand the relationship between bodies and objects. We perceive objects only insofar as our orientations

allow us to see them, thus it depends on what way we are facing. Objects, in turn, affect what we do and how we inhabit space. Hence, other objects are relegated to the background in order to keep us in the 'right' direction. However, we cannot understand the object as just there, the object too has to arrive for an encounter to be possible. Arrival takes time and work and this is also what shapes the object. In other words, social action or the actions that are performed on and with the object shape the object. Further, whether bodies make use of certain objects or not depends on the work that the body does, we use objects as tools to extend the reach of our actions. So, objects have to be near enough to be in view and be put to use in our actions, this understanding is however complicated by that such actions are what bring objects near. Thus, action is dependent on how we inhabit space and involves the co-dwelling of objects and bodies (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 27-32, 38-44, 52). So, being 'in line' allows bodies to extend into space, an extension that allows action with the help of objects that extends the body's reach. If we consider this in terms of sexuality, to be 'in line' is to be on 'the straight line,' that of heterosexuality. Heterosexuality is repeated over time and with force, by being a social requirement for intelligible subjectivity, so that it becomes the norm for sexual orientation, heteronormativity. (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 79, 85). So, heteronormativity shapes what bodies can do, by repeatedly tending toward some objects the body becomes contorted which enables some actions and restricts the body's capacity for other kinds of action. Thus, sexual orientation is not only a matter of which objects that we orientate ourselves toward, it is also about ways of inhabiting the world, one's relation to the world, how we extend through our bodies into it. Sexual orientation affects what we can do, where we can go, and how we are perceived. So, tending toward 'straight objects' the body develops 'straight tendencies,' tendencies that enable action, extending into space. Here we need to remember that it is not only bodies that become straight, so do spaces. As mentioned, spaces are shaped through how bodies inhabit it. Further, we also need to understand that it is not just a specific direction of desire which is normalised, it also involves the naturalisation of two sexes that are complementary (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 70, 67, 84, 91-92, 100).

Spaces are not neutral, they fit some bodies more than others. Bodies that do not orientate themselves toward the ideal sexual object do not extend the shape of the world and as such are stopped in their actions. The feeling of not extending into space or not fitting, can be one of disorientation, being uncomfortable, awkward, out of place, and unsettled (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 20, 91, 160; Ahmed, 2004a, p. 148). It can also be a matter of everyday negotiation of dealing with 'perceptions of others, with the 'straightening devices' and the violence that might follow when such perceptions congeal into social form' (Ahmed, 2006, p. 107). Thus, to

not orientate oneself toward the ‘right’ object affects how we live in the world, we extend differently which also means that certain objects and others are within our reach. These are objects and others that might not be reachable from the straight line (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 91, 102-103). Further, Ahmed reminds us of the importance of intersectionality to understand how bodies are in or off line.

Given that relationships of power ‘intersect,’ how we inhabit a given category depends on how we inhabit others. There are ‘points’ in such intersections, as the ‘points’ where lines meet. A body is such a meeting point. To follow one line (say whiteness) will not necessarily get you too many points of one does not or cannot follow others. [...] At the same time, bodies that pass as white, even if they are queer or have other points of deviation, still have access to what follows from certain lines; being white as a queer would still make some things reachable that would not be reachable for those of us who are of color. (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 136-137)

So different bodies have unequal capacities to move forward and up in society, which can be understood as how hierarchies are reproduced over time even though this reproduction sometimes fails and bodies that do not have privileged capacities do move up (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 137-138). With this understanding, I think it is important to highlight that a category, for example lesbian, which is used as a frequent example by Ahmed, does not mean sameness. ‘Lesbians also have different points of arrival, different ways of inhabiting the world’ (Ahmed, 2006, p. 100).

5.4 Materiality

Barad’s work on *posthumanist performativity* and the concept of *intra-activity* helps to further the understanding of the dialectical relationship between bodies, objects, and space that is sketched out by Ahmed. Intra-activity is explained as the relationship between discourse, human and non-human bodies, nature, culture, and technologies, where all of these aspects mutually transform each other. As such, these aspects cannot be understood as separated from one another, such separations are only temporary (Göransson, 2012, pp. 23-30). In other words, neither material phenomena nor discourses are ontologically or epistemologically prior, to exist is not an individual endeavour but a result of our intra-actions with the world. Agency is as such an entangled state and not something that someone or something has, agency is a quality that emerges in-between two or more bodies (human or non-human) as they engage, a state of becoming with each other. Thus, Barad recognises the agency of material bodies in such intra-actions. Another important concept in Barad’s work is *diffraction*, which has its origin in physics where it is understood as the result of the combining effects when waves overlap (Lenz

Taguchi, 2012, pp. 266, 270-271; Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, pp. 530-531; Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, p. 268). ‘This can be illustrated with the rolling, pushing and transformation of waves in the sea’ (Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 270). ‘It is this movement of overlapping, where the waves change in intra-action with an obstacle and with each wave accumulating, which signifies diffraction. Diffraction effects are effects of interferences, where the original wave partly remains within the new after its transformation’ (Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 271). Applying this understanding to knowing, Barad states that knowing and being cannot be separated, they are interdependent, and as such constituting an *onto-epistemology*, knowing in being (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 539). ‘We don’t obtain knowledge by standing outside the world; we know because we are *of* the world. We are part of the world and its differential becoming’ (Barad, 2007, as cited in Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 539). Knowing can thus not be understood as only a human practice since knowing entails one part of the world making itself comprehensible to another, this is what Barad calls material-discursive intra-activity. Knowing is never done in isolation since it is always affected by material and human forces coming together. As such, Barad’s onto-epistemology decentres the researcher as the knowing subject as well as the dichotomy between discourse and matter (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 539; Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 271; Palmer, 2011, p. 8).

6. Method and Methodological Considerations

In this chapter I will present the methods that I have applied in terms of data collection and analysis and their methodological implications based on the theories as presented in the previous chapter.

Undertaking any kind of research and deploying different kinds of methods always entails ethical considerations, which in the context of research with human subjects usually is normalised through the discussion of informed consent and minimising harm (Detamore, 2010, p. 169). This discussion is applied in the Swedish context as well and I have followed the guidelines presented by the Swedish Research Council by informing my participants about the aims and methods of my research through my invitation (see Appendix 1) and personal communication before the first meeting (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002). In addition to stating the aims and methods of the project in the invitation, I also found it important to highlight that the discussions would be shaped by our different interests and not only be revolved around topics

of my interest. Further, the participants received written information regarding ethical considerations (see Appendix 2). This information included standard considerations about anonymity, voluntary participation, and that material could be deleted and/or not used upon request. Further, the information highlighted that our discussions would be considered as shared material and could be used by any of the participants in future research, work, or activism, that is, with the consent of all participants to such further distribution of the recorded material. In addition to this written information, the participants were also given an oral explanation of the information upon the first meeting, followed by a common discussion on how we would handle the topics of discussion in terms of communicating them outside of the group.

For me however, research ethics expanded beyond these normalised guidelines and guided me through my choice to develop a project that would be attentive to the process of knowledge production, where the relationships between and among me and the participants, and the context where we produce knowledge together was brought into focus. However, it was not until I found Mathias Detamore's (2010) work on queer(y)ing research ethics, that I came to understand that I was using (queer) ethics as a method. Queer ethics as presented by Detamore is a method that is based on a politics of intimacy, which entails the understanding that research with human subjects inevitably calls for relationships between the researcher and the participants and that these relationships need to be understood as intimate. Thus, queer ethics rejects liberal understandings of autonomous individuality in research, and knowledge understood as observation, and instead highlights and cultivates the entanglements between researcher and participants. This disruption of the norm of autonomous individuality is what makes this ethics queer, imagining new ways of understanding relationships in knowledge production, and thus producing knowledge differently. Knowledge is understood as co-produced and dependent on the relationships between and among researcher and participants. When these bonds are deployed differently than within traditional research, where the researcher and participants are separated, political spaces can be created in which new kinds of knowledge can be (co)produced. Before, but even more so after having encountered queer ethics as a method, I have understood and used my invitation and my first contact with the project's participants as a part of the method for data collection, in the sense that I have used these as an opening for the creation of trust and intimacy that hopefully could be appreciated as mutually positive. As mentioned, I wanted the invitation to highlight that the discussions would be shaped by our different interests and not only be revolved around topics of my interest. I also wished to convey my understanding of how we all would develop different relationships with one another and the importance of this. Further, I tried to make clear that I am a queer

person myself, all this as a method, if one can call it that, to initiate trust and intimacy. During the initial correspondence with the people who contacted me regarding participation, I saw the importance of introducing myself and my background, as well as being clear about my sexual identity. This since I wanted to highlight that my general interest for the topic is based in my own experiences as a queer person, but also to initiate the process of getting to know each other and hopefully creating some trust by showing that I was willing to be open about myself. I found this openness on my side to be important since I also wanted them to shortly explain why they were interested in participating. The introduction of myself that was sent to everyone who was interested in participating contained my age, pronoun, sexual identity, why I moved to Gothenburg, my academic background, and interests. Further, the introduction included a brief explanation of how I came into the topic of the thesis and my aims (see Appendix 3). In hindsight, I believe that my invitation could have made my understanding of the importance of intersectionality clearer. I wanted to make sure that I did not just reach out to organisations and forums that focus on LGBTQ in general, but to organisations that have a more precise intersectional focus as well. However, in terms of the people who contacted me, an overwhelming majority were for example white. It is impossible for me to determine why this was, but I do believe that if my invitation had been formulated with a clearer intersectional focus, the project would have been more welcoming and interesting to a wider audience. To use Ahmed's thinking, the invitation extended the reach of some bodies more than others. Further, even though I made sure to reach out to a variety of organisations and forums, I do recognise that to see my invitation you had to be in some way already involved with one of these organisations or forums. Two of the participants contacted me after seeing my invitation through these organisations or forums while the third one heard of my study through a mutual contact.

Apart from guiding my choice of focus for this project, ethical considerations were at the basis of my decision to apply focus groups, or rather an in-depth group that would meet on four occasions, as a method for data collection, where the starting point for discussion in the group would be the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*, which we all read. I considered the report as a good point of departure due to its influential role in the city's work regarding LGBTQ, as it has served as the basis for *The City of Gothenburg's Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021*, which applies to all of the city's boards and administrations (Göteborgs Stad, n.d.a, p. 4). In terms of my choice of method I understood in-depth groups to be a good fit with Detamore's queer ethics due to the potential of focus groups in general and in-depth groups in particular, since it enables the development of deeper and

trusting relationships, to create spaces of solidarity where individual experiences are collectivised through sharing and dialogue and understood to have social causes. Thus, the personal becomes political, which allows for a co-production of strategies that could challenge these social, economic, and political circumstances (Bedford & Burgess, 2001, p. 121; Kneale, 2001, p. 136; Wilkinson, 1999, p. 75; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2014, pp. 321-322, 335; Montell, 1999, pp. 50-51). In-depth groups also provide opportunities for relatively free-flowing and interactive dialogues between participants, which restricts the power of the researcher to set the agenda of the conversation. In turn, this gives participants the opportunity to influence the topics of discussion, and thus directing the focus towards questions that are important to them (Wilkinson, 1999, pp. 70-71). Further, my choice to apply an in-depth group as a method for data collection was based on its contextual characteristic, where individuals are understood to be interacting with each other in a specific context, in this case the in-depth group meetings, within which meaning-making, or put it differently, knowledge, is co-constructed and negotiated (Wilkinson, 1999, pp. 64-68). Thus, in accordance with feminist (onto)-epistemology, queer ethics, and the method of in-depth groups, I understand knowledge as contextual and a co-production between the researcher and participants, as well as materiality (Haraway, 1988, pp. 585-588; Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, p. 539; Detamore, 2010, p. 178; Wilkinson, 1999, pp. 64-68; Montell, 1999, pp. 50-51).

I will develop this understanding of knowledge as contextual and a co-production a bit further by applying the theories and concepts as presented in the previous chapter. Using Haraway's metaphor of vision, I see the in-depth group meetings as a space where different embodied and partial perspectives meet in shared conversation. However, this conversation between local knowledges does not take place without being affected by power structures, structures that render some visions more powerful than others. Further, the knowledge that we produce in our shared conversation cannot be claimed to represent the whole queer community in Gothenburg, this would be to fall into the trap of the god trick. As Haraway puts it 'there is no immediate vision from the standpoints of the subjugated' (Haraway, 1988, p. 586). In terms of queer, I understand this as that there is no true experience or knowledge that can be derived from the position of being a queer person. Rather, there are different experiences and knowledges that are dependent on our contacts with objects and others and how we fit into different spaces, if we speak in Ahmed's terms or as Barad puts it, dependent on our intra-actions with discourse, human and non-human bodies, nature, culture, and technologies. So, in our joint visions, contact, or intra-actions, we co-produce new knowledge which is contextual in the sense that it is affected by interference of material and human forces, where our original,

'individual' experiences and knowledges partially remain in the new knowledge. An obvious material that has interfered in our intra-actions is the report that we all read and before I move on, I find it appropriate to state that I gave the participants a few questions to keep in mind while reading the report: Is your experience of Gothenburg in line with what is presented in the report? Are there any aspects that are missing? Which voices are visible in the report (is it for example, homosexual, bisexual, trans*, queer, intersex, asexual, people of colour, people with variations in functionality and so on)?

With my understanding of knowledge stated, I want to return to the methods that I have applied for data collection and analysis. I believe that applying an in-depth group, with its focus on relationships, co-production and its contextual characteristic would allow me to examine intra-actions during the meetings, and thus fulfil my aim of attending to emotions power relations in the process of knowledge production. To further enable this attention to emotions and power relations, I chose to apply journaling as second method for data collection. This was journals written by all participants, including myself, after each group meeting. These journals focused on thoughts, feelings, and questions that arose during and after the meeting and took their starting point in the questions: how was the group dynamics; was there any topic or question that was especially rewarding and/or hard to discuss; and what types of emotions did the discussions evoke? I had access to all the participants' journals and they had access to mine but not to each other's. I chose to structure it this way to make the participants more comfortable with addressing sensitive and difficult situations and topics, knowing that I would not discuss what they had written unless they themselves addressed it in the group. For me, these journals offered an opportunity to examine relationships, intra-actions, and emotions that I could not detect during the actual meetings. In line with Ahmed's discussion on emotions, I understand emotions as a vital factor in the creation of collective bodies, as such, affecting how we in the in-depth group form relationships with one another. I understand that the contact we have with each other is already shaped by histories of contact that has shaped the images we have of others as well as objects, which affects how we read our contact with each other during the meetings. In other words, depending on previous histories of contact we can experience our encounters with each other in several ways; as fear, pain, happiness, trust, and so on. However, our encounters also create new impressions that could challenge these previous histories. Since I understand knowledge as a co-production and as contextual, our relationships and emotions toward one another affect the knowledge that is produced and as such they are important to attend to.

Understanding knowledge production as co-produced and contextual and that knowing is never done in isolation but is always affected by the interference of material and human forces, I turn away from a reflexive methodology to one of diffraction. As explained above, diffraction effects are effects of interference. ‘Diffraction as a methodology then is about studying how differences get made in such a process and the effects that differences make; what is excluded and how these differences and exclusions matter’ (Lenz Taguchi, 2012, p. 271). In other words, it is about studying activities and encounters that evoke transformation and change in the agents involved. Within such a study the researcher cannot be understood as to think or reflect upon the data on their own or at a distance from the data. The researcher and the data need to be understood as entangled, where the researcher sets out to identify the intra-actions that emerge in-between the researcher and the data, which in turn are effects of the data, theory, methodology, and the researcher intersecting (Hultman & Lenz Taguchi, 2010, pp. 535-536; Palmer, 2011, p. 8). To allow such a diffractive reading of the data I have made use of the process of *plugging in* as presented by Alecia Y. Jackson and Lisa A. Mazzei (2013). This is an approach that rejects the idea that the voices in data ‘speak for themselves’ or that it is possible to try to figure out what the voices really mean, where these voices are understood as the source of meaning which allow the researcher to construct a coherent narrative based on themes and patterns that emerge from the data. This rejection is based on the understanding that the story that is told is always told in place of another. Data is as such partial and incomplete and always in a process of a retelling and remembering. This understanding that the data could have been something else, makes themes and patterns as a representation of the essence of the participants impossible. Plugging in, on the other hand, is described as process of arranging, organising, and fitting together literary machines, that is, data, theory, methodology, and so on, to produce something new (Lenz Taguchi, 2012, pp. 269-270; Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, pp. 262-263).

Imagine this production of knowledge—emerging as assemblage, creation from chaos—not as a final arrival but as the result of plugging in: an assemblage of ‘continuous, self-vibrating intensities’ that required discarding the tripartite division between a field of reality (the world) and a field of representation (the book) and a field of subjectivity (the author). Rather, an assemblage establishes connections between certain multiplicities drawn from each of these orders, so that a book has no sequel nor the world its object nor one or several authors as its subject. (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, p. 263, emphasis in original)

Thus, plugging in is a process to see what gets made, and thus not to understand a given meaning. In this process, data and theory constitute or make one another. Inspired by Jackson

and Mazzei's description of their process of plugging in, I have plugged data from the in-depth group and the written journals into the theories and concepts I have presented in the previous chapter, and vice versa, and in extension tried to show how they constitute one another. In terms of the data from the in-depth group, I want to clarify that I transcribed the audio recorded discussions word by word, not leaving out any parts, this to not discard any part before initiating the process of plugging in. Moving on, I constructed a set of analytical questions, which emerged as I was reading the data, informed by the theories and concept that I have applied, this as a tool to plug theory into data and in turn, back into the theory. These questions will be made visible throughout the analysis. With the help of Jackson and Mazzei, I understand that when plugging data, theory, other's readings of theory, my memories of the in-depth group meetings, the report, my 'shifty self' as a researcher, my personal experience of being a queer person, and so on, into one another, something new is produced. Something new that can only be signified as temporary meaning which can transform at any moment when new machines are plugged in. Thus, the machines that are plugged in constitute one another while also creating something new (Jackson & Mazzei, 2013, pp. 263-265).

7. Plugging in to Queer in Gothenburg

I want to clarify a few points before heading into my analysis, I have made the choice not to divide this chapter into subchapters since I believe such division would encourage a thematic reading of the data, which, as I have stated in the previous chapter, I am consciously avoiding. I have rather tried to guide the reader through how the process of plugging in has allowed for new questions and perspectives to emerge as I have plugged specific parts of the data into a specific theoretical perspective or concept. Further, all the names of the participants have been changed, only I appear with my real name. Finally, I think it is useful to clarify that not all participants attended all four meetings, during the first meeting the group consisted of me, Alex, and Eric and on the second, third, and fourth meeting the group consisted of me, Alex, and Maria. With that stated, I want to start this chapter off by jumping straight into a discussion from the last in-depth group meeting. I asked how the participants wanted me to describe them in the thesis and if I even should mention their sexual and gender identities.

Alex: That's a tricky one really, because it's like, you colour the whole thesis at once for a line of thought that will still be obvious and then it [queer] becomes a bit more normalised if you don't present like, yeah well, lesbian woman, heterosexual man. No,

I believe more in like going with ‘This is this person, this and that,’ without naming. (own translation, for original quote see Appendix 3, quote 1)

Johanna: Yeah, I don’t really see what purpose it would serve, or of course it serves a purpose. (Quote 2)

Alex: Now I’m thinking that the person or persons that read will be affected at once by the ideas they have about how such a person should be. (Quote 3)

First of all, I wanted to discuss this matter with the participants since I see the importance of self-identification, and as such I did not want to describe the participants in ways that they themselves do not feel comfortable. Secondly, I wanted us to discuss what such naming, self-identified or not, does. Reading Alex’s line of thought, Barad pops into my head and asks: *How is it that words have come to be perceived to mirror pre-existing phenomena and what are the consequences of this?* Barad argues that language has been granted too much power in terms of how we understand the world and how it is constructed. The representationalist belief that words have the power to represent pre-existing things is so embedded in Western culture that it almost seems natural. Things or beings are understood to exist as individuals with inherent attributes that precede their representation. Ian Hacking traces the problem of representations all the way back to Democritus’ theory of atoms and the void, which opened up for the possibility of a gap between representation and that which is being represented. Fast forwarding to René Descartes, Joseph Rouse argues that representationalism is a Cartesian by-product, a consequence of the division between ‘internal’ and ‘external.’ Thus, the asymmetrical faith in our access to representations over things is well-entrenched in Western culture and knowledge, applying both to traditional realist ideas as well as social constructivist (Barad, 2003, pp. 801-806). When plugging Alex’s argument into Barad’s discussion of representationalism, we can understand how people have preconceived notions of how a lesbian woman or a heterosexual man should be, as if these individuals or bodies had inherent attributes. Such representationalist ideas are understandable if we consider the tradition of such line of thought in Western culture, but they are not necessary, and they do have consequences. If we hold on to the idea that bodies, for example lesbian bodies, have inherent attributes we certainly would miss out on the different experiences of different lesbian bodies. An understanding of lesbian as a given category would allow knowledge production to simply be a matter of ‘add lesbian and stir,’ a project that echoes in feminist empiricism as outlined in chapter 2. Such use of categories as foundational and taken for granted, fixes and normatively confirms categories, as well as making categories seem unified and based on sameness, I thank Butler and other postmodernist feminist theorists for this critique. However, having plugged Barad into Alex’s thoughts, I have to take this critique

and understanding a step further. Barad argues that Michel Foucault's theorisation of power, and hence Butler's elaboration of Foucault's work, fails in accounting for the body's historicity, where materiality plays an active role in the workings of power. With Barad in my back, I want to suggest that a use and an understanding of categories as fixed with inherent qualities, misses out on how intra-actions between discourse, human and non-human bodies, nature, culture, and technologies, enact differential senses of being (Barad, 2003, pp. 808-809, 817). Having preconceived understandings of how a lesbian should be, thus loses sight of the dynamic process of intra-activity 'in the ongoing reconfiguring of locally determinate causal structures with determinate boundaries, properties, meanings, and patterns of marks on bodies' (Barad, 2003, p. 817). In turn, I understand that it is intra-actions that give, in this case, different lesbian bodies different experiences. Based on plugging Alex's argument into Barad's discussion on representationalism and the theory of intra-activity, I choose not to present me and the participants by stating our different sexual and gender identities. I refrain from this to avoid enabling preconceived assumptions about our different experiences. However, as you can see in the quote above, I do believe that naming serves a purpose. I drift into Haraway's situated knowledge, 'subjugation is not grounds for an ontology; it might be a visual clue' (Haraway, 1988, p. 586). Within the context of my statement, I see that Haraway's discussion gives me an understanding of how identity positions give clues about how different bodies are affected unequally by productive structurings. For example, 'gender is a field of structured and structuring differences, in which the tones of extreme localization, of the intimately personal and individualized body, vibrate in the same field with global high-tension emissions' (Haraway, 1988, p. 588). But, as Haraway continues, situated knowledge is not just about acknowledged self-identity, stating 'I am a lesbian woman' is simply not enough since 'being' is much more complex and the fusion of one's different identities does not entail positioning. The self is split and contradictory and about heterogeneous multiplicities that cannot be squashed into cumulative lists. So, plugging me and Haraway into Alex and Barad, I motivate my choice not to present our different identities on the grounds that such a list would not entail positioning and that it might encourage preconceived understandings of our different experiences.

Haraway further argues that where one sees from is always a question of power, which one needs to be accountable for. With this argument, I would like to turn the attention back to the very first in-depth group meeting. The following quote is from Alex's journal after this first meeting:

I participated in another group interview two, three years ago, where an older, white, cis male, who was gay, got such huge amount of room to speak, and especially with the report as the basis for discussion, I was a little worried that it would happen again. Because of that, I initially got a bit hesitant towards Eric just by seeing him (prejudiced, I know, but a step in the right direction is admitting it to yourself) since I got flashbacks from the previous discussion. But I was positively surprised, he listened and could recognise himself in my stories and vice versa, and that felt really good. (Alex's journal, 15/3/18, quote 4)

In his journal entry, Eric raised the same topic, he was worried that he would take or be given too much space due to a privileged position. With Haraway over my shoulder, I am asking: *How do we create webbed connections or shared conversations in knowledge production?* I believe that Eric's reflections on his own position and taking accountability for it, serves as a basis for the creation of webbed connections. Plugging Eric's reflections into Haraway, I see the importance of acknowledging that even if one 'naturally' inhabits a vision from below, of the less powerful, in this case, as a queer person, this is not an 'innocent' position. It is not a position that is exempt from accountability for one's enabling practices. Queer as a category is an open nodal point that encompasses a diversity of different visions and social and cultural in/exclusion. These different in/exclusions, where one is positioned materially-discursively in time, space, body, and historical power relations allow one to 'see' a specific part of reality (Lykke, 2010, pp. 5, 135). Claiming to see on behalf of a whole category, especially from a privileged position within that category, would be to romanticise and/or appropriate the vision of other queer persons that are positioned differently, and thus see another reality. To make such a claim would be to make one's position unlocatable, thus falling into the trap of the god-trick. As Haraway puts it, 'one cannot relocate in any possible vantage point without being accountable for that movement. Vision is *always* a question of the power to see – and perhaps of the violence implicit in our visualizing practices' (Haraway, 1988, p. 585, emphasis in original). Plugging this understanding into Eric's reflections, I see that having a position of privilege always risks claiming or be given too much room to see, and thus blinding others. To avoid such blinding of others, there is a need for self-knowledge, which requires a semiotic-material understanding of how one is positioned in time, space, body, and historical power relations. This is an understanding that subjectivity is split and contradictory, one is not just a queer person but one's position is structured by gender, race, nationality, class, functionality, age, and so on (Haraway, 1988, pp. 585-587; Lykke, 2010, p. 5). Further, 'there is no way to 'be' simultaneously in all, or wholly in any. [...] The split and contradictory self is the one who can interrogate positionings and be accountable, the one who can construct and join rational conversations' (Haraway, 1988, p. 586). Eric does just this, he interrogates his own positioning

and understands that his semiotic-material position gives him privileges and he takes accountability for it by being attentive to the space he claims and is given during the conversation with others. He is thus able to join with others and see together through partial connections, without claiming to be the other. This is a ground for power-sensitive conversation, a joining of partial views and halting voices into one collective position, a view from somewhere (Haraway, 1988, pp. 586, 589-590). My own position as both the researcher and a participant have implied a struggle to find a balance between the two. As Haraway argues, there is no way to 'be' simultaneously in both these roles, or wholly in any of them. From my journal following the first meeting:

What I have been struggling with before, during, and even now after the first meeting is my role as on the one hand, researcher and on the other, a part of the group. I find it hard to find a balance between keeping the discussion going and at the same time, sharing my own experiences and opinions. I'm afraid that my questions to keep the discussion going sometimes are too suggestive and formulated in such a way that opens up to certain answers and not others. I'm well aware of that the questions and themes I raise inevitably are affected by my experiences, my academic background, and my preparatory work with the thesis, but before the next meeting I find it important to think about how I should proceed to enable that everyone in the group gets a chance to raise what they find important while my leading role is reduced. (my journal, 15/3/18, quote 5)

I cannot say that I ever really found that balance, maybe it is not possible. However, with the help of Haraway, I understand that my position as the researcher gives me the power to direct what the group will see and that where I chose to direct our vision is based on my position within the queer community, my privileged background within academia, my privileged position in society that enabled me to get into academia, the theoretical understanding that I have gained within academia, and so on. At the basis of this study is my critical reading of the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg* and *The City of Gothenburg's Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021*, a reading that formed an understanding of these two documents as insufficient, an understanding that is coloured by my own positioning. This critique, in turn, has directed our vision from the beginning, blinding visions that are contempt with the City of Gothenburg's work within the field of LGBTQ. Thus, the knowledge that is produced within this study is affected by my critical standpoint. However, I have throughout the meetings been attentive to the space I claim in terms of directing our vision and encouraged the other participants to ask questions and raise topics that they find relevant. I see this attentiveness as an opening for shared power-sensitive conversations. In spite of this attentiveness, I do recognise that my position as the researcher has positioned me as the one

who ‘naturally’ should and was expected to ask new questions as the discussion on a topic faded out. As an attempt to make my position visible, I have throughout the analysis included explanations of how we got into the discussions that are presented. Further, I see the responsibility of power-sensitive conversation in the context of this study as two-folded, on the one hand, each and every one of us participating in the in-depth group need to be accountable for our different enabling practices toward each other and on the other hand, we need to be accountable for whose vision is missing within the group and what we as a group are not able to see. As a group, one collective position, we have a partial perspective which allows us to see a specific part of reality. The fact that all of us pass as white and have normative functionality impact how we are positioned and what part of reality we can see, and thus we cannot claim to see for the whole queer community in Gothenburg. As such, the knowledge we produce must be open to join with others and be accountable for what reality-producing effects our knowledge engenders (Lykke, 2010, p. 135). Plugging this argument into Barad’s concept of intra-activity, when our bodies and the report intra-act a certain kind of knowledge is produced, where our different material-discursive positionings partly remain within the new knowledge after its transformation.

Before moving on from the journals of Eric and Alex that followed the first meeting, I want to take a closer look at Alex’s entry and plug it into Ahmed’s theory of emotions. *How can our emotions toward each other in the group be understood?* Without an understanding of what emotions *do*, Alex’s judgment of Eric could seem rash or as they themselves put it, prejudiced. However, if we follow Ahmed’s line of thought we can understand that Alex’s emotions toward Eric, the immediate hesitation, is based on Alex’s previous encounters with individuals that are read as sharing the same position as Eric. As Ahmed clearly states, we do not have positive or negative feelings toward someone because this other is inherently good or bad, but because of how we are affected by them in terms of benefit or harm. This attribution of the other as beneficial or harmful, in turn, involves a reading of the contact we have with this other. The specific previous encounter that is mentioned in the journal entry can be understood as causing a feeling of discomfort, where the white, gay cis male in the group interview is read as the cause of that discomfort. In turn, as Ahmed suggests, the response to discomfort is to move away from the person causing that discomfort. With the emotional reading of the white, gay cis male in the group interview as causing discomfort, the hesitation towards Eric, who we can presume is read as sharing the same position, becomes less rash. It can be understood as a hesitation to make contact with someone who, based on previous encounters, might make Alex feel uncomfortable. Reading Alex’s entry through Ahmed, I do believe that Alex’s awareness

that their hesitation towards Eric is based on a previous encounter makes a difference. As Ahmed argues, contact is shaped by past histories of contact, that when not available in the present, makes the other seem to have the characteristics of past encounters. However, Alex's awareness that the moment of contact with Eric is shaped by past histories of contact, leaves an opening for reading Eric differently than the man from the previous group interview. Thus, Alex does not move away from Eric and they can join in a discussion or a shared conversation.

Staying plugged into Ahmed's work on what emotions *do*, a later discussion comes to mind, due to limitations of space I am not able to present the full discussion here, as I do not want to choose just some quotes from the discussion, I will summarise the conversation. During the third meeting Maria brought up the question of what Pride¹ should, that it does not have to be all commercial but neither an event where you boo at political parties in the Alliance². Alex agrees and talks about two occasions when there was some tension in the Pride parade when the police section of the parade and the pink-black section walked past each other. Maria continues to say that people should put political opinions about the police aside and try to remember why we all are taking part in the parade. Alex agrees that conflicts should be avoided but reminds us that the first Pride was a riot. I agree with Alex and add that I do feel some frustration when political parties, that in their everyday politics do not do much in terms of improving the lives of queer persons, attend Pride. Alex agrees and gives the example of how strange it is that political parties who voted against removing forced sterilisation of trans* persons in 2013, feel like they should attend Pride, and goes on to name one of the parties that did. As the discussion continues, I raised the question of the current political climate and the presence of the Sweden Democrats³ and how it might affect the city's work with questions regarding LGBTQ. This discussion further divided the group, we all agreed that their presence could have negative effects on this work, but it became clear that we had quite different opinions about how the Sweden Democrats should be handled in the political debate. The discussion further got into the norm of whiteness in the queer community. Leaving the meeting, I had a nagging feeling of having done a poor job as a researcher by initiating a discussion that had led to potentially sensitive topics.

¹ Referring to West Pride, a yearly festival held in Gothenburg that aims to create safe meeting places for LGBTQ persons and to highlight norms and the life conditions of LGBTQ persons (see <https://westpride.se/english>).

² A Swedish political alliance that consist of four parties that are traditionally placed on the right side in the left-right political spectrum (for more information see <http://www.alliansen.se/>).

³ A Swedish political party with a nationalist and social conservative ideology (see <https://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/l%C3%A5ng/sverigedemokraterna>).

Johanna: However, I have been thinking a bit about if I made the others uncomfortable when I brought up topics around the current political climate and questions around race. To what extent did they themselves have the opportunity to choose if they did or did not want to discuss these potentially sensitive topics? I felt that we, during the meeting agreed with each other or at least could understand each other in most of what we discussed around these two topics, but would they be comfortable to express opinions that necessarily are not line with mine within these topics? Have I expressed my opinions in such a way that limits others from having other opinions? (my journal, 3/4/18, quote 6)

Having read my journal entry, Maria wrote:

It feels easier and easier to discuss in the group. We talked about a couple of topics that are/can be pretty sensitive in many contexts. Almost always when it comes to politics among young adults I very rarely [*sic*] meet someone with my opinions (regarding political affiliation), which automatically makes me take a step back from clearly expressing some things. It is a given that I agree with some things (in the conversations around race e.g.), however, a bit fleetingly, topics where brought up (that I unfortunately can't remember) where a specific political affiliation was mentioned and portrayed as negative in LGBTQ contexts... there I took a step back immediately and just nod or say 'mm.' Don't [*sic*] dare to say anything, thinking [*sic*] that my opinions in this case maybe aren't going to be so well received. (Maria's journal, 10/4/18, quote 7)

Having read my entry before writing theirs, Alex's journal following the third meeting also became more of an answer to my thoughts. Just as Maria, Alex had felt uncomfortable and further that it was hard to find a common ground with Maria during discussion around these topics.

Alex: It is hard for me to have a fruitful discussion when I don't really understand where the other one is coming from. (Alex's journal, 10/4/18, quote 8)

Upon the following meeting, I decided to address these discussions by just asking if it made them feel uncomfortable, my hope was that this quiet open question and without addressing what they had written in their individual journals, would allow for a conversation, to the extent that they felt comfortable, around how they felt about the last meeting. First of all, I wanted to acknowledge that I do understand that these are sensitive topics and that it was never my intention to initiate a discussion that would make them uncomfortable. Additionally, I hoped that such a conversation would enable a better understanding of where we all are coming from, a conversation where we all dared to speak our minds.

Maria: As I wrote to you [Johanna], when it comes to political affiliation, then it's a bit like 'ah ah' [no-sound], since I have always or almost my entire life taken a step back in those particular situations since I don't have the opinion of... my prejudice... of the LGBTQ community and then I take a step back. (Quote 9)

Johanna: I didn't want to bring up what you [Maria] had written since I didn't know if that was okay or not but as I understood it... I didn't understand that you were as uncomfortable as you actually were, before I read it. (Quote 10)

Maria: Yeah, no.

Alex: It was like I wrote to you [Johanna], I felt like I didn't give you an opportunity to speak since I notice how you took a step back. Then it was like 'Should I talk even more now?' and then it became like some sort of rant and then you [Johanna] are of course affected by where you stand. (Quote 11)

Johanna: Well yeah, that's how it is, and I can't deny that. (Quote 12)

Alex: Exactly and then I understood even more that... and that I have also understood in retrospect that it must have been even more uncomfortable for you [Maria] but I just 'Blah, blah, blah!' (Quote 13)

[Maria and Johanna laugh]

Alex: It's that I was reflecting about in my journal entry too. Just like you [Maria] are saying, party politics, I don't discuss that with like people at work since I know that it will only lead to problems because you have so many, well, preconceptions and thoughts and 'This sort of person is like this and this sort of person is like this,' so it's... but at the same time I think it's a really important topic to discuss, especially in the context where it's the politicians that we have elected that is in this council and I thought it was a good question to ask 'Okay, but how will it be when a party that we know, on paper, is hostile towards people like us, how are you like supposed to handle that?' And it's like really hard to avoid, that the mood gets tense but then I don't know... I'm so used to it by now it feels like. I come from a tiny village in --- [name of county] where the rule is very blue, which I'm not and then to grow up as the person I became was like, it was just to assert oneself. (Quote 14)

Maria: A cat among the stoats [A Swedish idiom meaning a person in a context where that person is of lesser descent than the others]. (Quote 15)

Alex: Yeah well, sort of like that and then you like go back to that role, if I don't assert myself then no one will listen and that is a sort of thing that is always hard to manoeuvre around. (Quote 16)

Being plugged into Ahmed, I understand that both Maria's and Alex's previous contact with others in the context of political discussions have shaped how they act and read their contact with each other, as seeing each other as political others. Having felt discomfort in these encounters before and having read the political other as the cause of that discomfort, both Maria and Alex move away from the other since the political other is perceived as 'threatening' or maybe better put, as someone who may cause discomfort. In the case of Maria this 'awayness' involves taking a step back and retreating into silence, while for Alex it involves, what they

themselves call a rant and not giving Maria a chance to speak. By reading this discussion through Ahmed, I understand the emotions that Maria and Alex have toward each other as performative, since these emotions both repeat past associations and generate their object. 'Hate may generate the other as the object of hate insofar as it repeats associations that already read the bodies of others as being hateful. [...] in reading the other as being hateful, the subject is filled up with hate, as a sign of the truth of the reading' (Ahmed, 2004b. p. 32). To be clear, when applying this quote from Ahmed in this context, I am not suggesting that the emotions of Maria and Alex involve hate, but rather discomfort, the political other is read as being discomfoting. Further, not only do Maria and Alex move away from each other, but me and Alex move toward each other, and here I want to be clear, Maria also moves away from me as I am also read as the cause of discomfort. Moving away, how we respond to others is what creates the surfaces of and boundaries between 'I', 'we' ('likeness'), and 'them' ('unlikeness'). Alex and I form a 'we' insofar as we share feelings about political others, a form of likeness. As I write this, I cannot help but to feel like a 'bad' researcher, one who has failed to be an objective observer that does not take sides. It is uncomfortable to write this, to make visible those parts of the research process that is usually hidden from view. I understand why we usually leave this part out, because it is painful, however, I try to remind myself that I do not understand the researcher's position as one of an objective observer. My position as a researcher is not innocent, it is a privileged position and whether I make it visible or not, my positioning and practices do affect the knowledge that is produced. As Ahmed suggest, we must be willing to stay uncomfortable within feminism (and in the queer movement). By including this part of the research process, I try to stay uncomfortable and allow for my position to be critiqued or as Haraway might put it, being accountable for my position, at least in the aftermath of the situation. Having the position of the researcher, a position of power, being the leader and initiator of these discussions, I could have, first of all, tried to avoid such sensitive topics and further, I could have interrupted the discussion and changed the topic when I started to notice the tension and felt a bit uncomfortable myself. Even though I did not fully understand the extent to which the others felt uncomfortable, I cannot deny that I felt a tension. However, my personal political values got in the way and got the best of me. I agreed with what Alex said and they agreed with what I said, we confirmed each other's vision, and in the midst of that, I was not accountable for how I was blinding the vision of Maria and thus, disrupting the possibility for a shared conversation. By plugging this situation into both Ahmed and Haraway, I understand it as an example of the close relationship between emotions and power in the process of knowledge production. I cannot claim that I handled the situation outlined above as

it 'should' have been handled, however, I do believe that the method of journaling opened up for an opportunity to better understand how the participants, including myself, were affected by the situation. Further, having addressed the situation, I believe that the group could take a step towards each other through giving both ourselves and the others a better understanding of why we reacted as we did. By reading this discussion through Ahmed, I form the understanding that if we had not had this second conversation around how we felt and why we felt this way, it would have made the following discussion take another direction. I base this in the understanding that we would have fixed the political other as having the character of the negative and as such, withholding the creation of a 'we.' With Ahmed still over my shoulder, I also want to allow for a different reading of Eric's reflections around his own position that followed the first meeting. As mentioned, Ahmed discusses the connection between emotions and feminism and staying uncomfortable within feminism. It is not just as easy as that our feminist (queer) anger will be accepted and received as reasonable. Ahmed argues that we ourselves, in this case queer persons, might be the ones not accepting or blocking the anger of other queer persons. This is a question of the conditions of whose anger that can be turned into action and requires us as queer persons to learn to hear the anger of others and not to return that anger in the form of defensiveness of one's own position. We need to accept that our positions might evoke others' anger and hence opening up our own position for critique and for being uncomfortable. I believe that Eric's reflections about his own positioning can be read as a willingness to be uncomfortable and accepting that his own position might block the voice (vision) of others. In the context of this argument, Ahmed suggest that the tendency of some feminists (queer persons) to resist hearing the anger of others is a sign that 'what we are against' cannot be relegated to the outside. We need to be careful not to construct ideals that others need to embody to pass as a queer person, such ideals would position some queer persons as hosts, who condition which others that should receive the hospitality of love and recognition (Ahmed, 2004a, p. 178; Ahmed, 2006, p. 179). I want to plug this line of thought into a discussion that occurred during the first meeting, revolving around not always feeling welcome in the queer community. This discussion arose as we were discussing the invitation to my study and I stated that I chose not to use the term the queer community since I see that just because you are a queer person it does not follow that you feel as a part of the community. Alex questioned what the queer community is and argued that it is often very excluding.

Eric: But I find that so difficult, the 'us' and 'them.' The society consists of us and them and if something, I think that LGBTQ enforces us and them. (Quote 17)

Alex and Johanna: Yes!

Eric: Have we [queers] not learned by being a ‘them’ is society? Now we’re constructing an us and them even more in our own human group, and that can drive me crazy! (Quote 18)

Johanna: Can you give any examples of how that’s done? (Quote 19)

Eric: Well, to some extent this thing with the LGBTQ-council and the QX gala⁴, it’s like nice, white homosexual men and they’re at the top and then we’re there once again, the scale of whiteness [...] We construct, and now I say we, a whole bunch of things all the time to separate us and them (Quote 20).

Alex: I feel exactly the same, it’s a bit like being back in secondary school, it’s the cool lesbians and then the lipstick-lesbians that are not really sure that they are [lesbian] or not and they’re not taken that seriously and then there’s bisexuals who are like ‘Hello! I exist!’ All these groupings drive me crazy and how one should be and act. ‘You’re not gay enough.’ ‘You’re not butchy enough.’ [...] You’re just like ‘Can I be enough somewhere?’ And it’s so hard to find that context because there is so much, especially this ‘Not being gay enough’. You’re like ‘Excuse me for seeing people.’ Now they’re treating me like society in general because I sleep with the wrong person (Quote 21)

Johanna: Yeah, I feel exactly the same thing, I don’t feel welcome in lesbian spaces since I don’t identify as lesbian I’m not gay enough, I’m not lesbian enough. (Quote 22)

The discussion continuous with all three of us realising that we share the feeling of not always feeling safe, accepted, or at home in the queer community due to the different norms that exists within the community. As mentioned above, Ahmed argues for the danger of constructing ideals, norms, or a line for how a queer life should be lived. With Ahmed over my shoulder, I ask: *What kind of commitment would a queer commitment be?* This question points to Ahmed’s discussion on what queer politics, a queer commitment, should be and the refusal to accept that there is only one way of deviating from the ‘straight line,’ and here I would like to add, the ‘cis line’ (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 172-179).

Alex: There I believe a lot in education and especially sex and relationships education, I don’t even think I had any of that in school, our teacher was ‘sick.’ But if you already there make it clear that you can love who ever and there is no ‘If a girl likes a girl, they’re lesbian’ you’re like ‘Hm, no!’, so you don’t... It’s not a question about making those orientations invisible either but to make it even more normative that you can love who you want! ‘This is this if it is a vagina and this is... you can think about this if it is a penis’. (Quote 23)

Johanna: Or if it’s something in-between. (Quote 24)

⁴ QX is a Swedish publisher that was established 1995 to guarantee that media covers and monitors the LGBTQ community. The QX Gay Gala in turn, celebrates and acknowledges events and happenings during the previous year (see <https://www.qx.se/info/>).

Alex: Yeah, exactly! If you go about in this way instead so you don't 'This is how lesbians are'. (Quote 25)

To summarise our discussions in just one short line, queer norms exclude those of us who deviate from these norms or in other words, deviate from the hetero- and cis-norm differently than the 'right' way. Plugging our discussion into Ahmed to answer the question of what a queer commitment should be, I want to suggest that it should be a non-normative non-normativity. Here I want to be clear, by this I do not mean that this is a commitment to reject queer bodies and lives that do not deviate from the hetero- and cis-norm in the 'right' way, what I am suggesting is rather the opposite. Quoting Ahmed, 'if anything, I would see queer as a commitment to an opening up of what counts as a life worth living [...] It would be a commitment not to presume that lives have to follow certain lines in order to count as lives, rather than being a commitment to a line of deviation' (Ahmed, 2006, p. 178). Thus, a commitment, applying to the queer community as well as institutions, administrations, and organisations working with questions regarding LGBTQ, that recognises that there are different ways of deviating from the straight and cis line (Ahmed, 2006, p. 176). By plugging our discussions into Ahmed, the importance of addressing the question of openness emerges. During the same meeting I asked if they feel like it is up to them to address questions regarding LGBTQ at, for example the workplace because no one else does it. This discussion drifted into the question of openness not always being an option. Here, Gays in Angered⁵ was used as an example.

Eric: That you have to hide in basements and other venues where no one sees. [...] There's still a fear among those that are there while going to and from that room. (Quote 26)

In the context of a queer commitment, I see this as a vital aspect, that 'open deviation' is not simply available as a political option for everyone, given how we are positioned differently in society. To be 'in line' with the straight and cis line allows, as Ahmed argues, the body to extend into space, an extension that allows for action. Deviation from those lines then, shatters our involvement in a straight and cis world and for some, such commitment to deviation is not psychically or materially possible or sustainable. Thus, for a queer commitment to be a commitment to a certain kind of deviation is to perform an injustice to those whose lives are

⁵ Gays in Angered is an organisation that was established in 2012. The organisation targets LGBTQ persons in the ages of 13-30 that have a connection to the district Angered in Gothenburg (see <http://gbg.agendajamlikhet.se/organisationer/gays-in-angered-1>).

lived differently. Fusing Ahmed with Haraway, I see a queer commitment, in the context knowledge production, as joining in shared conversation through partial connection without claiming to be the other. Further, a commitment that ignores different ways of deviating from the straight and cis line would allow those who are straight and cis to stay in their line (Ahmed, 2006, pp. 174-179). I think Ahmed puts it very well, 'it is not up to queers to disorientate straights, just as it is not up to bodies of color to do the work of antiracism' (Ahmed, 2006, p. 177).

This last line directs my mind towards the discussion around the norm of whiteness in the queer community, which, as mentioned, I brought up during the third meeting.

Johanna: I also believe that there's a huge sense of discomfort in the Swedish context to talk about the norm of whiteness. Race is a word that is barely used in Swedish. (Quote 27)

Alex: No, god no! (Quote 28)

Johanna: I believe that a lot of people are very... think that it's uncomfortable to discuss and that we're 'colour blind' in Sweden, so I think that can have a part in it as well. We can't sit and discuss a POC's [person of colour] experience but we still have to... in a white space I think it's important to discuss that aspect. (Quote 29)

Maria: Is it so charged that you don't dare to talk about it, with fear of the reaction of others? Do you [Johanna] understand what I mean now? (Quote 30)

Johanna: Yeah, you mean like if you would address it people would maybe assume 'Well, you're thinking about race. You're think about skin colour.' (Quote 31)

Maria: Yeah, sort of like that. It's so charged that you don't dare to, you stay away from the discussion and that just reproduces this norm of whiteness. (Quote 32)

Johanna: Yeah, Sweden has never dealt with its colonial past and racist history and it's very much like 'Yeah but we are colour blind, we don't see colour. I think that people who are black and people who are white have the same rights and I don't see that there's a difference' even though there is a huge difference in terms of life conditions. (Quote 33)

Maria: Does this reproduce the whole thing? The whole question, that this attitude just makes it worse? (Quote 34)

Alex: I believe that you have to think beyond that and have to think that if I address this question in a room full of white people then I will get this 'Woah, we don't talk about that!' but if I would address it in a good context where it's of... where it's relevant, I believe that if I... if there's one or more persons that are not white, they would rather feel seen. We have to take our responsibility. People who are white have interpretative prerogative when it comes to almost everything and if we don't talk about it, no one talks about it because no one listens [...]. This thing with leading the way but they [POC]

have to go... like we can remove the blockade and let through and then we have to take a step back and let them continue to walk. (Quote 35)

Being plugged into Ahmed's discussion of a queer commitment, I see that our discussion highlights the importance of accepting that our positions might evoke others' anger and hence opening up our own position for critique and for being uncomfortable. As Ahmed argues, it is not up to bodies of colour to do the work of anti-racism, being queer persons who pass as white, we need to address the norm of whiteness in the queer community, even though this might be uncomfortable. However, and now I turn to Haraway, we cannot claim to be the other, we cannot speak from the perspectives of queer people of colour, but we need to be accountable for the space that we claim and how this space blinds others and take a step back.

Staying plugged into Ahmed's argument that it is not up to queers to disorientate straights, I ask: *Being queer in Gothenburg, do we have to disorientate straights?* During the second meeting, I raised the question of having encountered hetero- and cis-normativity in the City of Gothenburg's different services, this discussion came to focus mostly on sexual health care service.

Alex: I said I didn't have a partner and then they asked if I used protection when having sex and I said no and then they looked at me like 'Oh god, you're going to have all diseases in the whole world.' 'Well okay, what are your thoughts around that?', a bit nervously and you're like 'Because I only have sex with people who have a vagina and the risk is so low so having to bother with dams, I'm sorry but no.' [...] It wasn't until I had said this that this health staff [*sic*] could move on. (Quote 36)

Johanna: I have experienced the same thing, that they ask, 'Do you have sex?' 'Yes' and then it is just presumed that it is vaginal penetration sex between man and woman. (Quote 37)

Maria: No, it's the same thing there really, that yeah well, I look feminine and identify as lesbian yes, but that's an equation that doesn't add up for people in some way because you can't be feminine and lesbian rather... (Quote 38)

Johanna: It should be visible? (Quote 39)

Maria: Yeah, sort of like that, Once again the categories. So, it is the same thing there, they presume that my ex is a guy but no not that... then I've just not debated it. (Quote 40)

Johanna: No, on the one hand you should not have to out yourself every time you use some sort of service. Do I have to be the one who addresses it? 'It's you who should be helping me, you're sitting here with knowledge within your field. Do I have to, first off, out myself in every such situation and do I have to sit there and teach you that you can't presume who I have sex with or how I identify?' (Quote 41)

We all have experiences of sexual health care as heteronormative and that even if we do not always do, there is a need for us to disorientate straight assumptions within this service or as Ahmed might put it, space. Being plugged into Ahmed, I understand, in this case, the space of sexual health care as straight. As Ahmed reminds us, it is not only bodies that become straight, so do spaces. Just as bodies acquire shape or ‘direction’ through inhabiting space, spaces acquire direction through how bodies inhabit it, directions or lines are thus performative. We need to remember that heterosexuality is repeated over time and with force, by being a social requirement for intelligible subjectivity, so that it becomes the norm for sexual orientation, heteronormativity. Through the performativity of lines and heterosexuality as the requirement for intelligible subjectivity, I form an understanding of how bodies that have become straight inhabit spaces of sexual health care, and thus giving these spaces a straight direction, while at the same time, the straightness of those spaces force heteronormativity upon the bodies that enter these spaces. As Ahmed argues, following lines determines what comes into view, being that which resides in those spaces. When our queer bodies enter spaces of sexual health care, the health care staff see heterosexual bodies because that is what the space allows them to see. Our queer bodies do not fit the shape of the straight sexual health care spaces, which might cause a feeling of being out of place or being uncomfortable, I at least, recognise this feeling of discomfort of having to deal with the perception of others and having to disorientate this straight perception. The need for us to disorientate straights and straight spaces also, to some extent, apply to our different workplaces, being employed both within the City of Gothenburg and by other companies and organisations. I return to the first meeting and the question that I raised about feeling like it is up to you to address questions regarding LGBTQ.

Alex: It [LGBTQ] isn’t brought up really, it’s only when it comes to personal matters. I’m a very open person and I never feel that it’s my responsibility to in any way represent who I am or the group I belong to, more that I am open, then I can talk, then I can make my voice heard and know that others recognise themselves in that but maybe doesn’t want to or have the possibility or feel safe in living that way. I’m a part of the communication department, so from time to time I at least get questions about materials and PowerPoints, ‘Everyone is white, all are straight couples, stop!’ and then they listen, so they know that... and I’m in the equality committee and stuff like that so they recognise what I know and makes use of those experiences but it’s absolutely not a focus of the company to actually exercise influence, that I have to take care of myself in that case. (Quote 42)

Eric: They [the City of Gothenburg] are so happy about the report and ‘Tick in that box’ and it’s my experience of the seven years I was in the City of Gothenburg, that it’s often that mentality. When I worked with it, I was the one who had to speak for a whole city district and when I changed districts that work faded out and then I’m like ‘Tick in that

box... that disappeared. And now, who will pick it up? No one' and then, it [the report] is needed but the City of Gothenburg doesn't take the next step and I notice that a bit when I'm working at --- [name of current workplace] with a perspective where I become the perspective. When I'm at the meetings, then the others start to talk about my perspective to show that they do work with it but when I'm not at the meetings, the perspective is not mentioned and then it's sort of the same thing there, that the once leading have a lack of knowledge, which makes them content with just having the perspective and then you don't incorporate it in other things naturally. (Quote 42)

From the second meeting again, Maria talks about experiences from working at a municipal preschool:

Johanna: Yeah, we talked about that last time, knowledge from an early age. Do you receive any directives from the City of Gothenburg regarding that you should work with questions of gender? (Quote 44)

Maria: Not... We do have the curriculum and that is... now I can't remember what it says but it's this with ethnicity and sexual orientation and like that to do with [*sic*]. (Quote 45)

Johanna: Mm, based on the grounds of discrimination. (Quote 46)

Maria: Exactly, they're in there and then, preschools in the City of Gothenburg, or at least some, wanted to be a part of EuroPride now so now we have gotten human rights as a general focus in EuroPride, to work with. (Quote 47)

Johanna: But it's left to the individual preschools to...? (Quote 48)

Maria: Oh, yes! It's often gender in general that a lot of preschools have as a focus. [...] Well yeah, there's a lot of work done around gender but there are no special directives like that except from the curriculum and the diversity and equal treatment policy is based on the grounds of discrimination and that is re-established each year. (Quote 49)

We might not feel that it is and should be our responsibility to disorientate straights or hetero- and cis-normative spaces, services and workplaces, but nevertheless we all have experiences of such a need and that it is often left to individuals themselves to do the work of equality. This is a need, that a lot of times forces us to be out in our deviations if we are to correct and direct these different practices off their straight line. As Ahmed argues, such responsibility demands too much of queer persons. During our discussions, suggestions of how to avoid individual responsibility to disorientate straights or hetero- and cis-normative spaces, services and workplaces, were raised and once again it revolved around knowledge and education. I asked Eric about how he experienced the process of equality work in the context of municipal schools, as he has worked as a teacher. From his experience, this work is insufficient, and I go on to ask him what he thinks is needed for the work to improve.

Eric: Knowledge among the highest bosses! (Quote 50)

Alex: Yes!

Eric: I see so much engagement from below, among teachers, pedagogues in general and they feel like ‘I might not be good enough or knowledgeable enough about this’ and then you don’t dare to or don’t have the time to do it and principals and preschool directors don’t have the knowledge of how to provide opportunities and the bosses above them knowledge to push the Head of Unit to then be able to provide opportunities [*sic*]. So, it’s a vicious circle in the executive line, the knowledge is inadequate there so it’s there that the focus should be. (Quote 51)

Johanna: Who should supply this knowledge? (Quote 52)

Eric: There’s always somebody who can supply it. Preferably I would like to see that you build it yourself, that you direct it and then it should not end up as ‘Now it’s the ‘gender pedagogue’ that directs it’ but that you own it, I feel like a lot of people tend to buy LGBTQ- certifications, so you buy knowledge. ‘Give me knowledge’ and then you don’t make use of it. When it’s completed nothing is done and it’s used like ‘Yeah, we are LGBTQ-certified’ and it’s marketing instead of actually developing and owning the knowledge yourself and it’s that you need help with. There you can need external expertise around how to develop the knowledge ourselves so that we can own it, so that it doesn’t become ‘Here, read, study. Now you’ve got it,’ you still haven’t got it. So, to develop your own knowledge, owning your knowledge and in that system, you need help from the outside to develop that knowledge. (Quote 53)

Alex: And this thing with LGBTQ-certification, to keep it on-going! That you have to be certified once a year like almost all other things have to be certified one a year. Like district health care clinics, how big is your employee turnover, you have to... you can’t have a folder and a little rainbow flag and just ‘Now we’re LGBTQ friendly!’ This whole certification... maintain it then! (Quote 54)

The point that it is not our responsibility to disorientate straights should not however, be confused with the need for opportunities for queer persons in Gothenburg to affect the city’s work regarding LGBTQ questions. Everyday situations are full of ‘opportunities’ to disorientate straights, but this is not the opportunities that we need.

Before heading back into our discussions on the opportunities that we feel that we have in terms of affecting the City of Gothenburg’s work with questions regarding LGBTQ, I want to give a brief background to the city’s work with these questions. According to the City of Gothenburg, the city aspires to be open and inclusive and to concretise the work towards making Gothenburg a city for all, *The City of Gothenburg’s Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021* has been developed. This plan applies to all the city’s boards and administrations and is based on the recommendations that are given in the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*. Further, as a part of the work to improve the life

conditions of LGBTQ persons in Gothenburg, the city's LGBTQ-council plays an important role. The council role is to, from a norm critical perspective, monitor matters that affect the lives of LGBTQ persons in Gothenburg, with the aim to secure LGBTQ persons human rights by applying a LGBTQ perspective in all the city's services and operations. The council consists of 19 members, 6 of these members represent the political parties in the municipal executive committee and the remaining 13 members represent the LGBTQ community in Gothenburg. During 2018, the council will have five meetings, which are all open to the public (seats are limited). During the first 15 minutes of these meetings, the public have the opportunity to ask questions and have a dialogue with the council. In addition to these meetings, the council are obliged to have an open meeting, Open Hearing, with the public once a year, where everyone is welcome to bring thoughts and suggestions on how Gothenburg can become a more open and inclusive city. However, no decisions are made during these meetings, but the thoughts and suggestions of the public are documented for the council's future work (Göteborgs Stad, n.d.b; Göteborgs Stad, n.d.a, p. 4, Göteborgs Stad, n.d.c). Having this in mind, I want to head back into our discussions, but before moving into our quite critical discussions around opportunities for queer persons in Gothenburg to affect the city's work with questions regarding LGBTQ, I want to give the City of Gothenburg some praise. During the third meeting, Maria raised a very valid point.

Maria: And I can also that it's very easy to concentrate on that this, and this, and this is bad, this, and this, and this is wrong. Well absolutely, that's possible but how far have we actually come? What have we actually achieved? Or the City of Gothenburg in this case, what have they achieved? How much progress has been made? What has happened already? The positive. (Quote 55)

Alex: No, exactly. I mean, I'm from a small --- [name of county] village and if I were to go to the district health care centre and see that there's a rainbow flag, I would have cried of happiness, so I still think that a lot of instances put a lot of effort into it and I think that the treatment has become better even in health care, which is difficult. I also understand that this thing about thinking differently, it's really hard. I too think it is, so I still want to give the City of Gothenburg credit and I also think that it's a really good idea, this thing with the LGBTQ-council... even if I think that it should be implemented differently, but it's still something you can change and not something that needs to be established. (Quote 56)

I agree with both Maria and Alex, we do need to recognise how far we and the City of Gothenburg have come, but as Ahmed suggests, we must stay uncomfortable and keep politics of equality open to critique.

During our discussions it became evident that the majority of the group were not aware of the council's existence. Up until I read *The City of Gothenburg's Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021*, I had never heard of the council, and both Eric and Maria were introduced to the council through my study. Alex was the only one who had heard of the council before, through their work with West Pride. Further, none of us had been to an Open Hearing. Before our fourth meeting, the LGBTQ-council announced that they would host a talk between themselves and the queer community of Gothenburg, which would revolve around how Gothenburg can become a better LGBTQ city. According to the invitation, the council wanted to gather thoughts, suggestions, and ideas from the community around how to improve their work (<https://www.facebook.com/events/160949887903937/>). During the fourth meeting we discussed what suggestions and questions we had for the council and Maria wanted to formulate a question around the council's insufficient communication with the public.

Maria: I didn't even know that it [the LGBTQ-council] existed until I saw your first invitation thing to this. 'Okay, there's such a thing', sort of, 'That's nice, I wonder what they do.' I had no idea, I haven't lived in this city for very long, but I have still had contact with Gothenburg now and then and it's still something that you are a part of. I'm not very involved and stuff like that but that's due to private reasons, but they [the LGBTQ-council] aren't very visible, maybe they should be. (Quote 57)

Johanna: You shouldn't have to be super involved either for information that's relevant to you to reach you. (Quote 58)

Alex: No, the reason that I know of it is since I'm involved in West Pride and then it pops up of course, but otherwise I would probably not have known of it. (Quote 59)

Johanna: My thought is that a LGBTQ-council should mean that we in the LGBTQ community have an opportunity to affect what is happening within this council but if you don't even know about it, what is the function? (Quote 60)

Alex: It's a way of making the group visible even if I'm not... and I have to admit that I haven't actively looked into what they work with and what this council can have implied, but that is what becomes so double when you discuss LGBTQ, that, yeah, it's an integral part but if we don't have a LGBTQ-council then it [LGBTQ] is not visible. If not visible, it doesn't exist, sort of. So sometimes I think that the function maybe is just 'But we have a LGBTQ-council' [laughs], because this group or we exist, just to make it visible sort of. (Quote 61)

Here, Ahmed's queer phenomenology pops into my head and I ask: *Which bodies do the LGBTQ-council, as a space where the queer community of Gothenburg can affect the city's work with LGBTQ questions, extend?* I do understand that there are 13 members on the council that are supposed to represent us, the queer community of Gothenburg, a community, if one can

call it that, that consists of very different positioned individuals and separate communities. During the first meeting Alex discussed their experience of the hierarchies in different LGBTQ organisations and how their boards and councils are not very representative. Eric also recognised this:

Eric: I see the people who are there in the council and the people who work for the LGBTQ community, it's the same people who are at all councils and meetings all the time. I'm really glad that they do that, because I don't have the energy to be involved, I was so involved in secondary school and high school and no, I don't have the energy. But it's dangerous when it's the same people all the time, then it's the same perspective. It's not first-hand information, which makes me feel that some of them have become a bit like politicians since they are so used to that context and know how you should express yourself, because you are in these meetings with politicians and then you lose this thing with grass-roots. (Quote 62)

However, the meetings are open to the public, the queer community, and at least once a year there is an Open Hearing, but who are these meetings and hearings accessible to? During the fourth meeting we continued to discuss the accessibility of the invitation and the talk that had just been announced.

Alex: How is the LGBTQ-council going to work with reaching and including LGBTQ persons that live in society in the work that the LGBTQ-council does? Because I don't think that it's enough to make a Facebook event... I don't even know if they posted it in English, it's a quite difficult title, like it's not... (Quote 63)

Johanna: Sorry, you mean the invitation to... (Quote 64)

Alex: Yes, this thing at Världskulturmuseet. It's not enough to make a Facebook event. [...] You have to do more! (Quote 65)

Johanna: Yes, and I also think... it doesn't feel like you can expect... that they expect that there will be a lot of people either, since like how are you going to structure it and get everyone's opinions then? Are we going to sit there and raise our hands or are we going to write a note? If it's a hundred people, which would not be a strange thing if it would gather a hundred people [*sic*]. How are you going to gather everyone's opinions and have are you going to prioritise them? (Quote 66)

Alex: Also, how comfortable are you to raise your hand in front of a hundred people and out yourself around people you don't know. (Quote 67)

Johanna: Yeah exactly. Like it is... to stand in front of local politicians and establish people in the LGBTQ community that are a part of the LGBTQ-council, I think that is frightening. (Quote 68)

Alex: Indeed, so it doesn't really feel like it's good... that it's not really there I think that we should meet, rather more like that we talked about last time when we talked

about having some sort of ‘youth centre’ but a LGBTQ councillor, maybe not... but someone that is out in the different city districts because it’s also like if you live in Angered and are financially strained, are you supposed to go from Angered to the city centre and risk getting caught? I mean, Korsvägen is a hub for [ticket] inspectors in the city. Host it in Angered, show some sort of will to reach the public, so I don’t feel like you do when you host it at Världskulturmuseet. (Quote 69)

Plugging this discussion into Ahmed’s queer phenomenology and having the question of which bodies the LGBTQ-council extend, still in mind, I ask the further questions of who has access to the invitation and who feels comfortable with attending the talk? As Alex argues, a Facebook event is not enough, and I agree. However, I do know that the council also announced the talk on their website and through, at least some personal invitation, and these are just the channels that I am aware of, there could have been more. However, there were only around 30 people who attended the talk (Stadsledningskontoret Göteborgs Stad, 2018, p. 1). Being plugged into Ahmed, I understand the invitation as an object, an object that can be used as a tool to extend the reach of one’s actions, in this case, the action of affecting the council’s work. However, we perceive objects only insofar as our orientations allow us to see them. To perceive the invitation, one would already have to be orientated towards the LGBTQ-council through local politics or an LGBTQ organisation for example. If we got as far as perceiving the invitation, we also have to be comfortable in the room where the talk takes place. As Alex argues, one would have to be comfortable with outing oneself and as I have already argued, open deviation, that this talk implies, is not an option that is available to everyone. Thus, the talk does not extend the reach, or in other words, allow for action of queer persons who cannot be open in their deviation or that due to other reasons does not feel comfortable with outing oneself in front of people that they do not know. As such, the LGBTQ-council extends some bodies more than others or as Haraway would put it, the council blinds the vision of some queer persons. Based on this, I see a need for the council to extend the opportunities and spaces for shared conversation, spaces where different queer bodies can feel comfortable. For as Haraway reminds us, vision is always a question of power, if we get blinded so does our experience of the world. We cannot possibly believe that we are able to create politics and policies that makes all lives liveable if we do not know what makes different lives unliveable.

As my mind drift into Haraway and visions that are blinded in equality work and knowledge production, I come to think of the question: *Whose vision gets blinded in the report Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg?* During the first meeting I asked how the report addresses different norms.

Alex: I think that it's a bit too general regarding that perspective as well. Functionality is mentioned just in passing. Whiteness, not at all and for me who don't identify within the binary gender system or as lesbian or gay or bisexual, the only or the tiny, tiny, tiny thing that could apply to me is these questions regarding health care and the question if you have a boyfriend, which I have encountered, of course. But that is the only thing in the whole report that I can relate to. It doesn't feel like anyone talked to 'my group' if you put it that way. (Quote 70)

Johanna: Does that entail being invisible, that you're not a part of the group that you're a part of in this report [*sic*]? (Quote 71)

Alex: A bit like that. It... In some way it [the report] is still gender binary. There's trans* persons but only within the gender binary. (Quote 72)

During the second meeting, which was Maria's first, me and Alex gave a summary about what we had been discussing during the first meeting and Alex pointed out that they do not feel included in the report due to its gendered language, Maria agreed about the report's binary language.

Maria: Over all, the understanding of trans* person felt like it was from a physical... well, that the thing between the ears doesn't match what's between the legs, but trans* persons is an umbrella term. (Quote 73)

Alex: Just like you're [Maria] saying, that it's [the report] so focused around, on the one hand, the binary and on the other, that you should have some sort of dysphoria. (Quote 74)

Maria: Yeah, exactly.

Alex: And you don't have to have that! [laughs] And that also seems to be a thing that also is important to learn from the beginning, 'Yeah, you're born in a body and then you are given a gender at birth but you don't have to be uncomfortable with your body or you don't have to change it just because you feel a certain way', so you learn that instead and that you highlight that in the report, that even that is connected to gender stereotypes, 'That if I'm a man, I should have a flat chest' and then you surgically remove breast that you maybe didn't have any issues with, just that you want to also pass in this gender... trans-gender norm in some way. (Quote 75)

Through this discussion, we can understand that non-binary bodies and identities, as well as queer bodies of colour or with non-normative functionality get blinded in the report. This blinding restricts what the report can claim to see, and thus what *The City of Gothenburg's Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021* can see, since it is based on the report. Hence, the City of Gothenburg needs to open up for shared conversations by taking accountability for their positioning and what that allows them to see.

8. Conclusion

Applying a diffractive methodology, I do not see the understandings that have emerged from the analysis of the data to represent an essence of the participants' experiences, and thus the analysis is not a process of figuring out what the participants really mean. The understandings that have emerged from the analysis is rather the result of arranging, organising, and fitting together literary machines, that is, data, theory, methodology, my memories of the in-depth group meetings, the report, my 'shifty self' as a researcher, my personal experience of being a queer person. This is a process that produces something new, new understandings of being queer in Gothenburg, which, in turn, extend the existing knowledge of how different queer persons experience being queer in Gothenburg. Thus, through plugging the data from the in-depth groups and our individual journals into Haraway's situated knowledge, Ahmed's queer phenomenology and theory on what emotions *do*, and Barad's theory of intra-action and diffraction, understandings of being queer in Gothenburg have emerged. These are understandings that highlight that norms within different queer communities in Gothenburg make some bodies feel unsafe, not at home or not accepted. Thus, there lies a danger in constructing ideals that others need to embody to pass as a queer person, ideals that position some queer persons as hosts, who condition which others that should receive the hospitality of love and recognition. This danger calls for a commitment, applying to the queer community as well as institutions, administrations, and organisations working with questions regarding LGBTQ, that recognises that there are different ways of deviating from the straight and cis line. As this understanding emerged another followed, an understanding of the importance of accepting that our positions might evoke others' anger and hence opening up our own position for critique and a willingness to be uncomfortable. As queer persons who pass as white, we need to address the norm of whiteness in the queer community, even though this might be uncomfortable. However, we cannot claim to be the other, we cannot speak from the perspectives of queer people of colour, but we need to be accountable for the space that we claim and how this space blinds others and take a step back. Further, another understanding emerged, that we as queer persons have experienced a need to disorientate straight assumptions within the City of Gothenburg's services and spaces, such as the space of sexual health care. This need to disorientate straights and straight spaces also extends to our different workplaces, being employed both within the City of Gothenburg and by other companies and organisations. To avoid such individual responsibility to disorientate straights or hetero- and cis-normative

spaces, services and workplaces, the need for knowledge and education was highlighted, above all, knowledge among the highest executives of organisations and companies and further, the importance of internal development and ownership of knowledge, and to continuously attend to and improve this knowledge. Plugging the data into the mentioned theories, an understanding of the lack of opportunities for queer persons in Gothenburg to affect the city's work with questions regarding LGBTQ emerged, the LGBTQ-council extends some bodies more than others. These are bodies that are already orientated towards the LGBTQ-council through local politics or an LGBTQ organisation for example. Further, these are bodies that feel comfortable within the spaces that are provided by the council and can be open in their deviation. Thus, the council blinds some visions and experiences of the world or in this case, of being queer in Gothenburg. Further, an understanding of how the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg* blinds some visions emerged, these include the visions of non-binary persons, people of colour, and bodies with non-normative functionality. I believe that the understandings that emerged from a diffractive reading of the data, extends the existing knowledge of how different queer persons experience being queer in Gothenburg.

Through the use of emotion and power-sensitive theories and methodologies, I have also been able to form an understanding of emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production in this study. This includes an understanding of the importance of acknowledging that even if one 'naturally' inhabits a vision from below, of the less powerful, in this case, as a queer person, this is not an 'innocent' position that is exempt from accountability for one's enabling practices. Where one is positioned materially-discursively in time, space, body, and historical power relations allow one to 'see' a specific part of reality and having a position of privilege always risks claiming or be given too much space to see, and thus blinding other queer persons. To avoid such blinding of others, there is a need for self-knowledge and an interrogation of one's own position. In turn, such self-knowledge and interrogation enable accountability for one's position by being attentive to the space that one claims and is given during the conversation with others. Through such attentiveness one can join with others and see together through partial connections, without claiming to be the other. Through the emotion and power-sensitive theories and methodologies that I have applied, I have also strived to form an understanding of my own position as both the researcher and a participant. I have come to understand that there is no way to 'be' simultaneously in both these roles, or wholly in any of them. My position as the researcher gives me the power to direct what the group will see and where I chose to direct our vision is based on my position within the queer community, my privileged background within academia, my privileged position in

society that enabled me to get into academia, the theoretical understanding that I have gained within academia, and so on. Further, my critical reading of the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg* and *The City of Gothenburg's Plan to Improve the Life Conditions of LGBTQ persons year 2017-2021*, a reading that formed an understanding of these two documents as insufficient, has directed our vision from the beginning, blinding visions that are contempt with the City of Gothenburg's work within the field of LGBTQ. Thus, the knowledge that has been produced within this study has been affected by my critical standpoint. I have throughout the meetings been attentive to the space I claim in terms of directing our vision and encouraged the other participants to ask questions and raise topics that they find relevant. I see this attentiveness as an opening for shared power-sensitive conversations. However, I do recognise that in spite of this attentiveness, I have continuously directed our vision through the questions that I have asked and the topics that I have brought up for discussion. During this study, I have come to understand the responsibility of power-sensitive conversation as two-folded, on the one hand, all the participants needed to be accountable for our different enabling practices toward each other and on the other hand, we needed to be accountable for the visions that were missing within the group and what we as a group were not able to see. Thus, this study does not claim to see for the whole queer community in Gothenburg. The knowledge that is produced within the context of this in-depth group is dependent on how our bodies and the report intra-act with the theories and methodologies that are applied, where our different material-discursive positionings partly remain within the new knowledge after its transformation.

Throughout this study, I have come to understand that past histories of contact shape how we act and read the contact we have with one another in the group. When we encounter someone that is read as sharing the same position as someone who has previously made us feel uncomfortable, in the case of this study, a person with a privileged position in the queer community or a political other, we might feel hesitant to make contact or even move away from this other that may cause discomfort. In this way, I have come to understand emotions as performative, they both repeat past associations and generate their object. Further, how we respond to others is what creates the surfaces of and boundaries between 'I', 'we' ('likeness' and 'towardness'), and 'them' ('unlikeness' and 'awayness'). A 'we' is formed insofar as we share feelings about others, a form of likeness. This 'towardness' and 'awayness' has obvious consequences for the knowledge that is produced. When forming a 'we,' there is a risk of blinding the visions of those who are not included in this 'we' and as such, disrupting the possibility for a shared conversation. Based on this, I have formed an understanding of the close relationship between emotion and power in the process of knowledge production. Further, if

we as researcher are not attentive to such emotions and power relations we might just miss out on why a certain type knowledge is produced in place of another. Here I see the usefulness of the method of journaling, as it opened up for an opportunity to better understand how the participants, including myself, were affected by different situations and the consequences of these situations. If we as researcher miss out on addressing emotions and situations that cause discomfort, the group might not be able to form a 'we' or a shared conversation. Throughout this study, I have formed an understanding of the importance of accepting that we as queer persons might be the ones not accepting or blocking the anger of other queer persons. This is a question of the conditions of whose anger that can be turned into action and requires us as queer persons to learn to hear the anger of others and not to return that anger in the form of defensiveness of one's own position. We need to accept that our positions might evoke others' anger and hence opening up our own position for critique and for being uncomfortable. I think that Alex's last journal entry highlights this queer commitment well.

There's one more thing, in addition to what I mentioned this Wednesday, that I gained as an experience – maybe the most important one? No matter how different me and another LGBTQ person might be, we have to support each other. Solidarity with my peers. (Alex's journal, 13/4/18, quote 76)

The results of this study are not generalisable, however, it offers new understandings of being queer in Gothenburg. These are understandings that call for a queer commitment that recognises that there are different ways of deviating from the straight and cis line. It is a call that encourages the City of Gothenburg, as well as the queer community to extend their efforts to include different queer bodies in shared conversation, these are shared conversations that would not blind the visions of those who do not feel comfortable in or that cannot reach the existing spaces for conversation. Further, this study offers an example of how emotions and power relations in research can move from theory to practice. With these results, this study offers a postconstructivist and diffractive understanding of how different queer persons experience being queer in Gothenburg, and thus adds to the existing knowledge that to date has mostly been based on a social constructivist epistemological understanding. Further, this study initiates a dialogue with the report *Norm-breaking Lives in Gothenburg*, a dialogue that up until now has been lacking in the field of LGBTQ research in the context of Gothenburg. Finally, this study points to the importance of attending to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production and exemplifies how this can be done in practice. This is a contribution to the field of LGBTQ research in the context of Gothenburg as well as the field of Gender

Studies in general, since such methodological understandings up until now has mostly remained as theoretical propositions that are not embodied in practice.

9. Further Remarks

Based on the limitations of this study, I see a need for further research on how differently positioned queer persons experience being queer in Gothenburg, especially in terms of how one's sexual and/or gender identity intersects with race and functionality and experiences of being non-binary in the context of Gothenburg. In extension, I see a need for research that addresses the norm of whiteness and functionality within the queer community in Sweden since such research is still very scarce. Further, it would be highly interesting to explore how differently positioned queer persons in Gothenburg experience the existing opportunities of dialogue with the City of Gothenburg and the LGBTQ-council and how this dialogue could be improved. How can the dialogue between the LGBTQ-council and the queer community be reimagined so that it would extend differently positioned bodies? I also see a need for further research that is attentive to emotions and power relations in the process of knowledge production. Discussion around emotions and power relations in research is still mostly theoretical, and thus there is a need to put these discussions into practice.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2004b). Collective Feelings: Or the Impressions Left by Others. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(2), 25-42. doi:10.1177/0263276404042133
- Ahmed, S. (2004a). *Cultural Politics of Emotions*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Andersson, J., & Östlundh, S. (2012). *Sexuell hälsa, ungdomar och unga vuxna: En studie om efterfrågade insatser i det preventiva och hälsofrämjande arbetet med sexuell hälsa i Västra Götalandsregionen* (Master's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/31457/1/gupea_2077_31457_1.pdf
- Bain A. L., & Payne, W. J. (2016). Queer de-participation: Reframing the co-production of scholarly knowledge. *Qualitative Research*, 16(3), 330-340. doi:10.1177/1468794115619002
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs*, 28(3), 801-831. doi:10.1086/345321
- Bedford, T., & Burgess, J. (2001). The focus-group experience. In M. Limb, & C. Dwyer (Ed.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers* (pp. 121-135). London: Arnold.
- Cahill, C. (2007). Doing Research with Young People: Participatory Research and the Rituals of Collective Work. *Children's Geographies*, 5(3), 297-312. doi:10.1080/14733280701445895
- Detamore, M. (2010). Queer(y)ing the Ethics of Research Methods: Toward a Politics of Intimacy in Researcher/Researched Relations. In C. J. Nash, & K. Browne (Ed.), *Queer Methods and Methodologies: Intersecting Queer Theories and Social Science Research* (pp. 167-182). Farnham: Ashgate publishing limited.
- Elversson, E., & Jacobson, F. (2014). *"Alla cyklar likadant ändå": En studie om sex och samlevnadsundervisningens roll mot diskriminering och trakasserier av hbt-personer på högstadiet* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för utbildningsvetenskapligt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/38238/1/gupea_2077_38238_1.pdf
- Fredin, J. (2010). *Föreställningar om familj, föräldraskap och kön: En kvalitativ studie om BVC-sjuksköterskors föreställningar* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/23095/1/gupea_2077_23095_1.pdf
- Geerts, E., & van der Tuin, I. (2013). From Intersectionality to Interference: Feminist Onto-epistemological Reflections on the Politics of Representation. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 41(3), 171-178. doi: 10.1016/j.wsif.2013.07.013

- Gustafsson, L. (2012). *Snacka sex på socialkontoret: En kvalitativ studie med fokus på om socialsekreterare arbetar för att klienter ska känna sig bekväma med att ta upp frågor av sexuell karaktär på socialkontoret* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/29061/1/gupea_2077_29061_1.pdf
- Göransson, M. (2012). *Materialiserade sexualiteter: Om hur normer framträder, förhandlas och ges hållbarhet*. Göteborg & Stockholm: Makadam Förlag.
- Göteborgs Stad. (n.d.a). *Göteborgs Stads plan för att förbättra hbtq-personers livsvillkor år 2017- 2021*. Göteborg: Göteborgs Stad.
- Göteborgs Stad. (n.d.b). *HBTQ*. Retrieved 2018-08-12 from http://goteborg.se/wps/portal/start/kommun-o-politik/hallbar-stad--oppen-for-varlden/manskliga-rattigheter/hbtq!/ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfljo8ziQw0NAi2cDB0N3C0sDAwcnQ18XZ1N_QwtfMz1wwkpiAJKG-AAjgb6BbmhigBmUNIx/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/
- Göteborgs Stad. (n.d.c). *Göteborgs Stads HBTQ-råd*. Retrieved 2018-08-12 from http://goteborg.se/wps/portal/start/kommun-o-politik/kommunens-organisation/kommunstyrelsen/goteborgs-stads-hbtgrad!/ut/p/z1/hY7NCsIwEISfptsxrR18RbxB8WLBWnNRVqJaaFtShoN-PTWo6A4t2G-YQYUFKD68tGY0je2L9vJn1V6OXE80pJL3G7EGiUtKaNVhrRLIP8HqCnGH5Ile1BN1bFw7RgyjkmS0kxwjiKdxzF_78u-EmRAOX3TTjt2d9Ot2vthXEQYYQiBGWtNq9moI_zWqO3oofgAYeiK50Hn8gXpbItR/dz/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/
- Hagström, J., Ridelius, E., & Warneflo, T. (n.d.). *"Folk som inte är HBT-personer är rätt ointresserade av HBT": En kvalitativ studie av kuratorers bemötande av HBT-personer i primärvården* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/24013/1/gupea_2077_24013_1.pdf
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599. doi:10.2307/3178066
- Harding, S. (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (1993). Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity'? In L. Alcoff, & E. Potter (Ed.), *Feminist Epistemologies* (pp. 49-82). New York & London: Routledge.
- Hornby, E. (n.d.). *"Är du böj eller?": En studie om maskulinitet och sexualitet inom lagidrotten* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/23089/1/gupea_2077_23089_1.pdf

- Hultman, K., & Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). Challenging Anthropocentric Analysis of Visual Data: A Relational Materialist Methodological Approach to Education Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(5), 525-542. doi:10.1080/09518398.2010.500628
- Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2013). Plugging One Text into Another: Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(4), 261-271. doi:10.1177/1077800412471510
- Intemann, K. (2016). Feminist Standpoint. In L. Disch, & M. Hawkesworth (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory* (pp. 261-282). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobson, M. (2014). *Normbrytande liv i Göteborg: Lägesrapport om hbtq-personers livsvillkor 2014*. Kalmar: Leanders Grafiska AB.
- Jalali, M. (2010). *Hur upplever medmammor i ett lesbiskt förhållande mötet med barnmorskan inom mödrahälsovården?* (Master's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för vårdvetenskap och hälsa, Göteborgs Universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/22750/1/gupea_2077_22750_1.pdf
- Johnson, K., & Martínez Guzmán, A. (2013). Rethinking Concepts in Participatory Action Research and Their Potential for Social Transformation: Post-structuralist Informed Methodological Reflections from LGBT and Trans-Collective Projects. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 23(5), 405-419. doi:10.1002/casp.2134
- Jonsson, L. (2015). *RFSL:s kommunundersökning 2015*. Stockholm: RFSL.
- Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2014). Focus Group Research: Retrospect and Prospect. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 315-340). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kneale, J. (2001). Working with groups. In M. Limb, & C. Dwyer (Ed.), *Qualitative Methodologies for Geographers* (pp.136-150). London: Arnold.
- Lenz Taguchi, H. (2012). A Diffractive and Deleuzian Approach to Analysing Interview Data. *Feminist Theory*, 13(3), 265-281. doi:10.1177/1464700112456001
- Liinason, M., & Cuesta, M. (2014). Subjective Emotions, Political Implications: Thinking Through Tensions and Contradictions in Feminist Knowledge Production. *Ex aequo – Portuguese Journal of Women's Studies*, 29, 23-38. doi:10.22355/exaequo.2014.29.00
- Lützen, K. (2003). A Different City. Female and Male homosexual life 1950-1980. *NORA – Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 11(3), 187-188. doi:10.1080/08038740310004327
- Lykke, N. (2010). *Feminist Studies: A Guide to Intersectional Theory, Methodology and Writing*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Montell, F. (1999). Focus Group Interviews: A New Feminist Method. *NWSA Journal*, 11(1),

44-71. Retrieved from:

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&sid=dc33652-96fa-4fd3-b055-c8d10974ab05%40sessionmgr4007>

- Nationella sekretariatet för genusforskning. (2004). *Porträtt: Arne Nilsson*. Retrieved 2018-07-26 from <https://www.genus.se/nyhet/portratt-arne-nilsson/>
- Nordén, A. (2014). *Vilka normer förmedlas?: En undersökning av fritidsledares arbete på två hbt-certifierade fritidsgårdar* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för pedagogik och Specialpedagogik, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/36612/6/gupea_2077_36612_6.pdf
- Norrhem, S., Rydström, J., & Markusson Winkvist, H. (2015). *Undantagsmänniskor: En svensk HBTQ-historia med utblickar i världen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.
- Olténg, S. (2015). *Att tolka och arbeta med mänskliga rättigheter: en jämförelse mellan förvaltningar och bolag i Göteborgs Stad* (Master's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för globala studier, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/41004/1/gupea_2077_41004_1.pdf
- Orre, C. (2014). "Vi ringer om det är nåt": *Bemötande och vård av hbtq-personer på testningsmottagningar i Örebro, Göteborg och Malmö*. Stockholm: RFSL.
- Palmer, A. (2011). 'How Many Sums Can I Do?': Performative Strategies and Diffractive Thinking as Methodological Tools for Rethinking Mathematical Subjectivity. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology*, 1(1), 3-18. Retrieved from: <http://su.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:474425/FULLTEXT03.pdf>
- Perman, L. (2017). *Bara få vara sig själv: Att erfara lesbiskhet* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för kulturvetenskaper, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/52487/1/gupea_2077_52487_1.pdf
- Persson, J. (2013). *Manlig Kärlek: En studie om homosexuella mäns upplevelser av att passera med sin sexuella läggning i vardagen* (Master's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/35024/1/gupea_2077_35024_1.pdf
- Rashid, K. (2013). *Oppressed Pride: Exploring the professionals recognition towards LGBTQ persons vulnerabilities under collective patriarchal violence and oppression* Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available: https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/33151/4/gupea_2077_33151_4.pdf
- Stadsledningskontoret Göteborgs Stad. (2018). *Anteckningar från Göteborgs Stads HBTQ-råds öppna möte 2018-04-28*. Retrieved 2018-08-14 from http://goteborg.se/wps/wcm/connect/b8719f55-b732-48f0-b2c8-38341c3a1fc7/HBTQ_anteckningar_180428.pdf?MOD=AJPERES
- Svensson, E. (2013). *Förutsättningar för ett integrerat HBTQ-perspektiv i äldreomsorgen: En fallstudie av tre implementeringsprojekt* (Master's thesis). Göteborg: Institutionen för socialt arbete, Göteborgs universitet. Available:

https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/33158/1/gupea_2077_33158_1.pdf

Säthil, K. (2016). *Att planera en stad för fler: En diskursanalys av Göteborgs stads arbete för inkluderande stadsbyggnad* (Master's thesis). Göteborg: Förvaltningshögskolan, Göteborgs universitet. Available:

https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/51499/1/gupea_2077_51499_1.pdf

Tapper, N. (2016). *Spelar hbtq-diplomeringen någon roll?: En utvärdering av hbtq diplomeringen med fokus på Västra Götalandsregionen* (Bachelor's thesis). Göteborg: Förvaltningshögskolan, Göteborgs universitet. Available:

https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/44553/1/gupea_2077_44553_1.pdf

Vetenskapsrådet. 2002. *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistic-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Västra Götalandsregionen. (2012). "Jag ska inte behöva outa mig själv varje gång jag har ett samtal": Om bemötande av lhbtq-personer i Västra Götalands län. Vänersborg: Västra Götalandsregionen.

Wagaman, M. A., & Sanchez, I. (2017). Looking through the magnifying glass: A duoethnographic approach to understanding the value and process of participatory action research with LGBTQ youth. *Qualitative Social Work*, 16(1), 78-95. doi:10.1177/1473325015595855

Wilkinson, S. (1999). How Useful Are Focus Groups in Feminist Research? In R. S. Barbour, & J. Kitzinger (Ed.), *Developing Focus Group Research* (pp. 64-78). London: Sage Publications.

Zavos, A., & Biglia, B. (2009). Embodying Feminist Research: Learning from Action Research, Political Practices, Diffractions, and Collective Knowledge. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 6(1-2), 153-172. doi:10.1080/14780880902901380

Appendix 1 – Invitation for Participation

Deltagare sökes för att diskutera hbtqia+-personers livsvillkor i Göteborg

Rapporten har arbetats fram under relativt kort tid och ska betraktas som en översiktlig lägesrapport med framåtsyftning. Den visar på förslag till förbättringar av Göteborgs stads arbete och ger rekommendationer som förhoppningsvis kan innebära att hbtq-personers rättigheter stärks. De kan också fungera som diskussionsunderlag för det fortsatta arbetet på hbtq-området. Rekommendationerna ges av mig som utredare/rapportförfattare och delas inte nödvändigtvis av hbtq- samhället eller Göteborgs stad.

Citatet är hämtat från rapporten *Normbrytande liv i Göteborg* vars rekommendationer ligger till grund för *Göteborgs Stads plan för att förbättra hbtq-personers livsvillkor*. Trots att planen redan är framtagen så saknas det fortfarande kunskap på området och genom min masteruppsats i Gendering Practices vid Göteborgs universitet, så hoppas jag att vi tillsammans kan bidra med kunskap på området. Jag söker därför personer som är intresserade av att delta i en fokusgrupp där hbtqia+-personers livsvillkor i Göteborg kommer att diskuteras. Diskussionen kommer att utgå ifrån rapporten *Normbrytande liv i Göteborg* men växer sedan fram och utvecklas efter våra intressen. Tillskillnad från traditionell användning av fokusgrupper så kommer denna grupp att träffas vid flera tillfällen, fyra stycken totalt. Syftet med att träffas vid ett flertal tillfällen är att möjliggöra en djupare diskussion och större deltagande samt för att kunna analysera vad som händer när vi diskuterar. Anledningen till att jag anser att en sådan analys är viktig är att det finns olika synsätt och erfarenheter bland såväl forskare som deltagare i all typ av forskning och att dessa olikheter, skilda uppfattningar, personers olika förhållanden till varandra och vad detta leder till sällan ges tillräckligt med uppmärksamhet, vilket i sin tur riskerar att ge en missvisande bild av forskningsresultatet. För att möjliggöra den analysen så kommer alla deltagare ombes att efter varje träff skriva kortare ”dagboksinslag” med tankar, känslor och reflektioner. Du behöver inte ha någon erfarenhet av universitets- eller högskolestudier, de enda kraven är att du är hbtqia+-person (paraplybegrepp för homosexuella, bisexuella, trans*-personer, personer med queera uttryck och identiteter, personer med intersexvariationer, asexuella samt personer som anser sig höra till denna grupp men som inte vill definiera sig som något av de ovannämnda) och bor i Göteborg. Träffarna kommer att äga rum under vecka 11–15 (2018) men kommer att schemaläggas mer specifikt efter när vi alla kan.

Om du är intresserad av att delta eller vill ha mer information om projektet så kontakta mig gärna!
Tack för din uppmärksamhet!

Johanna Jaring

Email: xxx

Appendix 2 – Information Regarding Ethical Considerations

Diskussionstillfällena kommer att spelas in via ljudupptagning för att sedan användas som material i min uppsats. I uppsatsen så kommer jag inte att använda mig utav era riktiga namn men det betyder inte att jag kan garantera full anonymitet. T.ex. så kan händelser som diskuteras under våra träffar redan vara kända av personer utanför vår diskussionsgrupp och därför finns det en risk att dessa personer kan identifiera vem som berättar om händelsen (om händelsen omnämns i uppsatsen) och på så sätt även andra saker som just den personen har sagt och som omnämns i uppsatsen. Vidare kommer gruppen tillsammans att komma överens om hur vi ska förhålla oss till att diskutera det som tas upp under våra diskussionstillfällen utanför gruppen.

Gruppen kommer tillsammans att komma överens om spridning av materialet inom gruppen efter att samtliga träffar har genomförts. En sådan eventuell spridning innebär att det vi diskuterar och kommer fram till, alltså den kunskap som produceras under diskussionstillfällena skulle kunna användas av alla, om så önskas, i framtida uppsatser, rapporter, aktivism eller annat arbete. Innan samtliga i gruppen är överens om en spridning av delar av eller hela materialet så kommer det endast innehas av mig. Här vill jag förtydliga att uppsatsen som jag skriver inte tillhör det delade materialet eftersom det är något som jag skriver individuellt och som kommer innehålla mer än det som diskuteras när vi träffas.

Medverkan kan avslutas närsomhelst under studiens gång och om det skulle vara så att ni vill att delar av ljudinspelningen av någon anledning ska raderas så kommer det ske. ”Dagboksinsläggen” kommer läsas av mig och även användas som material i uppsatsen för att diskutera våra olika uppfattningar, tankar och känslor kring situationer som uppstår och frågor som vi diskuterar. I min uppsats så kommer jag att tydliggöra vad ni faktiskt har sagt och skrivit och vad som är mina tolkningar. Ni kan även i efterhand be mig att radera och inte använda mig av delar av eller hela inlägg. Jag kommer även i största möjliga mån ge er tillfälle att läsa och kommentera på mina analyser innan uppsatsen publiceras (uppsatsen kommer dock att skrivas på engelska eftersom masterprogrammet som jag läser är engelskspråkigt).

Appendix 3 – Introduction of the Study

Utöver ett grundläggande intresse för hbtqia+-frågor så har min uppsats växt fram ur en analys av både den nationella strategin för lika rättigheter och möjligheter oavsett sexuell läggning, könsidentitet eller könsuttryck och Göteborgs Stads plan för att förbättra hbtq-personers livsvillkor år 2017-2021 (samt rapporten som ligger till grund för planen). Genom mina analyser så har jag hittat en del svagheter som jag anser är viktiga att arbeta vidare med och därför kommer diskussionerna i fokusgruppen att utgå ifrån rapporten Normbrytande liv i Göteborg (som jag kommer att be alla att läsa men mer instruktioner om läsningen kommer att ges då jag inte tycker att det är nödvändigt att läsa alla delar i rapporten). Förhoppningen är att våra diskussioner kring rapporten och hbtqia+-personers livsvillkor i Göteborg leder till kunskap och ett material som Göteborgs Stad kan använda för att utveckla sitt arbete. Dock är inte syftet med min uppsats att endast redovisa resultatet av våra diskussioner utan även att reflektera kring vad som händer när vi träffas och diskuterar. Sådana reflektioner inkluderar frågor som vad det finns olika synsätt och erfarenheter i gruppen och hur de i sin tur leder till att personer har olika förhållanden till varandra vilket gör att vi har olika känslor och upplevelser av frågorna som diskuteras, gruppdynamiken och olika situationer som uppstår. Anledningen till att jag anser att sådana reflektioner är viktiga är för att uppmärksamma i vilken kontext och vilka förhållanden som våra diskussioner och våra slutsatser växer fram.

Appendix 4 – Original Quotes

Quote 1:

Alex: Den är klurig alltså, för det är såhär, man färgar ju hela uppsatsen direkt för ett resonemang som ändå blir självklart och då blir det [queer] ju lite mer normaliserat om man inte presenterar såhär, ja men, lesbisk kvinna, heterosexuell man. Nej, jag tror nog ändå mer på att liksom köra bara ”Det här är den personen, si och så”, utan att just benämna.

Quote 2:

Johanna: Ja, jag ser inte riktigt vad det skulle fylla för funktion, eller det är klart att det fyller en funktion.

Quote 3:

Alex: Nu har jag tänkt att den eller dem som läser kommer bli färgade på en gång av vad man har för idéer om hur en sån här person ska vara.

Quote 4:

Jag var med i en annan gruppintervju för två-tre år sedan där en äldre vit cis-man som var gay fick så enormt mycket talutrymme, och särskilt med rapporten i grunden till diskussionen, var jag lite orolig att det skulle ske igen. Initialt blev jag då lite avigt inställd till Eric enbart av att se honom (fördomsfullt, jag vet, men ett steg i ledet att bli bättre på det är att erkänna det för sig själv), för jag fick flashbacks från tidigare diskussion. Men jag blev positivt överraskad, han lyssnade och kunde känna igen sig i mina historier såväl som jag i hans, och det var väldigt skönt. (Alex’s journal, 15/3/18)

Quote 5:

Det jag har tampats med före, under och även nu efter första träffen är min roll som dels forskare och dels en del av gruppen. Jag tycker att det är svårt att hitta en balans mellan att hålla uppe en diskussion och samtidigt dela med mig av mina erfarenheter och åsikter. Jag är rädd för att mina frågor som jag ställde för att hålla igång diskussionen i vissa fall var ledande och formulerade på ett sådant sätt så att de öppnade upp för en viss typ av svar medan de stängde ute andra. Jag är väl medveten om att de frågor och teman som jag tar upp oundvikligen är färgade av mina upplevelser, min akademiska bakgrund och mitt förberedande arbete med uppsatsen men inför nästa träff är det viktigt för mig att fundera över hur jag ska gå tillväga för att främja att alla i gruppen har en möjlighet att ta upp de som de tycker är viktigt medan min ledande roll minskar. (my journal, 15/3/18)

Quote 6:

Jag har dock funderat lite på om jag gjorde de andra obekväma när jag tog upp ämnen kring det rådande politiska klimatet och frågor kring ras. Hur pass stor möjlighet hade de själva att välja om de ville eller inte ville diskutera dessa potentiellt känsliga ämnen? Jag kände att vi under träffen höll med varandra eller i alla fall kunde förstå varandra i det mesta när vi diskuterade dessa två ämnen men skulle de känna sig bekväma med att uttrycka åsikter som nödvändigtvis inte stämmer överens med mina inom dessa ämnen? Har jag uttryckt mina åsikter på ett sådant sätt så att det begränsar andra från att ha andra åsikter? (my journal, 3/4/18)

Quote 7:

Det känns lättare och lättare att diskutera i gruppen. Vi pratade om ett par ämnen som är/kan vara ganska känsliga i många sammanhang. Nästan alltid när det kommer till politik bland unga vuxna så är det ytterst sällan [*sic*] jag träffar någon med mina åsikter (gällande partifärg) vilket

gör att jag automatiskt backar från att tydligt uttrycka vissa saker. Vissa saker är självklara att jag håller med om (i samtalen om ras t.ex.) dock kom det lite flyktigt upp ämnen (som jag tyvärr inte minns) där en specifik partifärg kom upp och blev uppmålad som negativ i hbtq-sammanhang... där backade jag direkt och nickar bara eller säger mm. Vågar [*sic*] inte säga något, tänker [*sic*] att mina åsikter i det fallet kanske inte blir så positivt mottagna. (Maria's journal, 10/4/18)

Quote 8:

Det är svårt för mig att föra givande diskussioner när jag inte riktigt förstår vart den andra kommer från. (Alex's journal, 10/4/18)

Quote 9:

Maria: Så som jag skrev till dig [Johanna], när det kommet till politisk färg, då blir det lite såhär "ah ah" [nej-ljud], för att jag har alltid eller nästan hela mitt liv backat i just sådana situationer bara för att jag tillhör inte åsikten som majoriteten av, mina fördomar, av hbtq-samhället och då backar ju jag.

Quote 10:

Johanna: Jag ville inte jag ta upp vad du [Maria] hade skrivit för jag visste inte om det var okej eller inte men så som jag hade uppfattat det... jag hade inte uppfattat att du var lika obekvämt som du faktiskt var innan jag läste det.

Quote 11:

Alex: Det var ju som jag skrev till dig [Johanna], jag kände att jag inte gav dig talutrymme för att jag märkte hur du backade. Då blev det som att "Ska jag prata ännu mer nu?" och så blev det liksom någon sånt här "rant" och sen så färgades ju du [Johanna] givetvis av var du står.

Quote 12:

Johanna: Ja men så är det ju och det kan jag ju inte frågå.

Quote 13:

Alex: Nej men precis och då fattade jag ju än mer att... och det har jag ju också fattat i efterhand, att det måste vara än mer obekvämt för dig [Maria] men jag bara "Bla, bla, bla!"

Quote 14:

Alex: Det är det jag reflekterade över i mitt dagboksinslägg också. Precis som du [Maria] säger, partipolitik, jag diskuterar ju inte det med typ folk på jobbet för att jag vet att det kommer bara att leda till problem för att man har så många ja, fördomar och tankar och "Såhär är en sådan person och såhär är en sådan person", så att det... men samtidigt så tycker jag att det är ett viktigt ämne att ta upp, särskilt i kontexten där det är politiker som vi har valt som sitter i det här rådet och jag tyckte att det var en bra fråga att ta upp att "Okej men hur blir det då när ett parti som vi vet på pappret är fientligt inställda till personer som oss, hur ska man liksom kunna hantera det?" Och det är liksom jättesvårt att undvika, alltså att det blir en obekvämt stämning sen så vet jag inte... jag är så van vid det nu känns det som. Jag kommer från en pytteliten by i --- [namn på län] med ett väldigt blått styre, vilket jag inte är och att då växa upp som den jag är blev liksom, det var bara att hävda sig.

Quote 15:

Maria: En katt bland hermelinerna.

Quote 16:

Alex: Ja men lite så och då blir det ju liksom att man faller tillbaka i den rollen, att om jag inte hävdar mig så lyssnar ingen och den är ju en sådan sak som är evigt svår att parera.

Quote 17:

Eric: Men det där tycker jag är så svårt, just med ”vi” och ”de”. Samhället består av vi och de och någonstans så kan jag tycka att hbtq, om några, upprätthåller vi och de.

Quote 18:

Eric: Har vi [queers] inte lärt oss av att vara ett ’de’ i samhället? Nu ska vi bygga in vi och de ännu starkare i våran egen människogrupp och det kan jag bli helt galen på!

Quote 19:

Johanna: Kan du ge något exempel på hur det görs?

Quote 20:

Eric: Ja, men det är lite det här med hbtq-rådet och QX-galan, det är liksom fina, vita homosexuella män och de är högst upp och då är vi där återigen, vit-skalan. [...] Vi bygger in, och nu säger jag vi, massa olika saker hela tiden för att skilja vi och dom.

Quote 21:

Alex: Jag känner exakt samma, det är ju lite som att vara tillbaka på högstadiet, det är de coola flatorna och sen så är det läppstifts-lesbianerna som egentligen inte vet om de är det eller inte och de tas inte på så stort allvar och sen så är det bisexuella som bara ”Hallå! Jag finns!”. Jag tokig på alla de här grupperingarna och hur man ska vara och hur man ska bete sig. ”Du är inte böig nog”. ”Du är inte butchig nog”. [...] Man bara ”Kan jag få vara nog någonstans?” Och det är så svårt att hitta det sammanhanget för att det finns så mycket, särskilt det här ”Inte gay nog”. Man bara ”Förlåt mig för att jag ser människor”. Nu behandlar dem mig som samhället gör i stort för att jag ligger med fel person.

Quote 22:

Johanna: Ja, jag känner precis samma sak, jag känner mig inte välkommen i lesbiska rum eftersom att jag inte identifierar mig som lesbisk så är jag inte gay nog, jag är inte lesbisk nog.

Quote 23:

Alex: Där tror jag mycket på skola och sexualkunskap särskilt, jag tror inte ens att jag hade något i skolan, vår lärare var ”sjuk”. Men om man redan där gör det tydligt att man kan älska vem som och det finns inga ”Om en tjej gillar en tjej så är de lesbiska” man bara ”Hm, nej!”, så att man inte... Det är ju inte en fråga om att osynliggöra de läggningarna heller men att man gör det ännu mer normativt att du får älska vem du vill! ”Det här är det om det är en vagina och det här är... det här kan man tänka på om det är en penis”.

Quote 24:

Johanna: Eller om det är något mittemellan.

Quote 25:

Alex: Ja precis! Om man går på den vägen istället så att man inte ”Såhär är lesbiska!”

Quote 26:

Eric: Att man får gömma sig i källare eller i andra lokaler där ingen ser. [...] Det är fortfarande en rädsla för de som är med där, till och från det rummet.

Quote 27:

Johanna: Jag tror också att det finns ett väldigt obehag i den svenska kontexten att prata om vithetsnormen. Ras det är ju knappt ett ord som används på svenska.

Quote 28:

Alex: Nej, gud nej!

Quote 29:

Johanna: Jag tror att väldigt många är väldigt... tycker att det är obehagligt att diskutera och vi är "färgblinda" i Sverige, så jag tror att det kan ha med det att göra också. Vi kan ju inte sitta och diskutera en POCs [person of colour] upplevelse men vi måste ju ändå... i ett vitt rum så tycker jag att det är viktigt att man tar upp den aspekten.

Quote 30:

Maria: Är det så pass laddat att man inte vågar prata om det med rädsla för omgivningens reaktioner? Förstår du vad jag menar nu?

Quote 31:

Johanna: Ja, du menar som att om man skulle ta upp det så skulle folk kanske tro att "Jaha, men du tänker på ras. Du tänker på hudfärg."

Quote 32:

Maria: Ja men lite så. Det är så pass laddat att man vågar inte, man håller sig undan diskussionen och det spär ju bara på den här vithetsnormen.

Quote 33:

Johanna: Ja, Sverige har ju aldrig tagit tag i sitt koloniala förflutna och sin rasistiska historia och det är väldigt såhär "Ja men vi är färgblinda, vi ser inte färg. Jag tycker att svarta personer och vita personer har lika mycket rättigheter och jag ser inte att det skulle vara någon skillnad" även fast det otroligt mycket skillnader i livsvillkor.

Quote 34:

Maria: Spär det på hela den här grejen? Hela frågan, att den inställningen bara gör det värre.

Quote 35:

Alex: Jag tror ändå att man måste tänka förbi det och måste tänka om jag lyfter den här frågan i ett rum fullt av bara vita personer så kommer jag få den "Woah, sånt pratar vi inte om!" men om jag skulle lyfta det i en bra kontext där det är av... där det är relevans i det så tror jag att om jag... om det är en eller flera personer som inte är vita så skulle de snarare känna sig sedda. För att vi måste ju också ta vårt ansvar. Vita personer har tolkningsföreträde i princip allt och om vi inte pratar om det så pratar ju ingen om det heller för att det är ingen som lyssnar. [...] Just det här att vi kan leda vägen men de [POC] måste gå... alltså vi kan ta bort blockaden och släppa fram och sen så måste vi backa och låta dem fortsätta gå.

Quote 36:

Alex: Jag sa att jag inte hade någon partner och så frågade de om jag skyddade mig när jag hade sex och då så sa jag nej och så tittade de på mig som "Herregud, du kommer ju ha alla sjukdomar

i hela världen”. ”Jaha, men okej, hur tänker du då?”, lite nervöst och man bara ”För att jag har bara sex med personer som har en vagina och risken är så pass liten så att ska jag hålla på att krångla med slickklappar, jag är ledsen men nej. [...] Det var inte förens som jag sa det som den här sjukpersonalen [*sic*] kunde gå vidare.

Quote 37:

Johanna: Jag har upplevt samma sak, att de frågar ”Har du sex?” ”Ja” och sen så bara antas det att vaginalt penetrationssex mellan man och kvinna.

Quote 38:

Maria: Nej, det är samma sak där egentligen, som att ja men jag ser feminin ut och identifierar mig som lesbisk ja, men det är en ekvation som inte funkar i huvudet på folk på något sätt för att man kan inte vara feminin och lesbisk utan...

Quote 39:

Johanna: Det ska synas?

Quote 40:

Maria: Ja men typ så, återigen kategorierna. Så det är samma sak där, de antar att mitt ex är en kille men nej inte att... då har jag bara inte tagit diskussionen.

Quote 41:

Johanna: Nej, dels ska man behöva outa sig själv varje gång man söker någon form utav tjänst. Ska jag behöva vara den som tar upp? ”Det är du som ska hjälpa mig, du sitter här med kunskap inom ditt område. Ska jag behöva först och främst vara öppen och outa mig i varje sådan situation och ska jag behöva sitta och lära dig att du kan inte [*sic*] utgå ifrån vem jag har sex med eller hur jag identifierar mig?”

Quote 42:

Alex: Det tas ju inte upp egentligen alls, utan det är ju när det kommer till personfrågor. Nu är jag en väldigt öppen person och jag känner aldrig att det är mitt ansvar att på något sätt representera den jag är eller gruppen som jag tillhör utan mest att jag är öppen, då kan jag prata, då kan jag göra min röst hörd och veta att andra känner igen sig i det men kanske inte vill eller har möjlighet eller känner sig trygga i att leva så. [...] Jag en del av kommunikationsavdelningen, så emellanåt så får jag i alla fall frågor om material eller PowerPoints, ”Alla är vita, alla är heteropar, sluta!” och så lyssnar de, så de vet att... och jag är med i jämställdhetskommittén och såna saker så de ser vad jag kan och tar tillvara på de erfarenheterna men det är absolut inte ett fokus från företagets sida att faktiskt påverka, utan det får jag ta tag i själv i så fall.

Quote 43:

Eric: De [Göteborgs Stad] är jätteglad över rapporten och ”Check på den!” och det är min erfarenhet av de sju åren jag var i Göteborgs Stad, att det är ofta den mentaliteten. När jag jobbade med det så blev det jag som fick prata för en hel stadsdel och sen när jag bytte stadsdel då dog arbetet ut och då blir jag så här ”Check på den...den försvann. Och nu, vem tar över? Ingen” och då, det [rapporten] behövs men Göteborgs Stad går inte nästa steg och det märker jag lite när jag jobbar på --- [namn på nuvarande arbetsplats] med ett perspektiv där jag blir perspektivet. När jag är på möten, då börjar de andra prata mitt perspektiv för att visa att de ändå jobbar med det men när jag inte är på mötena då nämns inte perspektivet och då är det lite

samma sak där, just att de styrande har okunskap, vilket gör att de är nöjda med att vi har det perspektivet och sen så bakar man inte in det i det andra som naturligt.

Quote 44:

Johanna: Ja, det pratade vi om sist, kunskap redan från tidig ålder. Får ni några direktiv från Göteborgs Stad att ni ska jobba med genusfrågor?

Quote 45:

Maria: Inte... vi har ju läroplanen och där är det ju... nu kommer jag inte ihåg vad det står men det har ju med etnicitet och sexuell läggning och sådär att göra [*sic*].

Quote 46:

Johanna: Mm, utifrån diskrimineringsgrunderna.

Quote 47:

Maria: Precis, de finns ju med där, sen så ville ju förskolorna i Göteborgs Stad, eller vissa i alla fall, vara en del i EuroPride nu så nu har vi fått mänskliga rättigheter som övergripande fokus i EuroPride att jobba med.

Quote 48:

Johanna: Men det lämnas mycket öppet till enskilda förskolor att...?

Quote 49:

Maria: Oh ja! Det gör det! Sen är ju oftast just genus i stort ett utav de områdena som många förskolor har som fokusområde. [...] Ja men genus jobbas det mycket med men det finns inga speciella direktiv så förutom läroplanen och likabehandlingsplanen utgår ju ifrån diskrimineringsgrunderna och den återupprättas ju varje år.

Quote 50:

Eric: Kunskap hos högsta cheferna!

Quote 51:

Eric: Jag ser så mycket krafter nerifrån, bland lärare, pedagoger i stort och så känner de såhär "Jag kanske inte är tillräckligt duktig och insatt i det" och då vågar man inte eller så har man inte tid för det och rektorer och förskolechefer har inte kunskap om att ge förutsättningar och cheferna ovanför dem kunskap för att trycka på enhetschefen för att sedan ge förutsättningar [*sic*]. Så det är en ond spiral på chefslinjen, där är kunskapen så bristfällig så det är där fokus ska ligga.

Quote 52:

Johanna: Vem borde ge den här kunskapen?

Quote 53:

Eric: Det finns alltid någon som kan ge den. Helst av allt så skulle jag vilja se att man bygger den själv, att man styr över den och då får vi inte hamna i att "Nu är det genuspedagogen som styr den" men att man äger den, för jag känner att många har så lätt att köpa in hbtq-certifieringar och så köper man in kunskap. "Ge mig kunskap" och sen så tar man inte vara på den. När den är genomförd så gör man ingenting och så används det "Ja, vi är hbtq-certifierade" och så är det en marknadsföring istället för att faktiskt bygga upp och äga kunskapen själv och det är det som man behöver stöd i. Där kan man behöva extern expertis kring hur bygger vi upp

kunskapen själva så att vi kan äga den, så att vi inte bara blir ”Här, läs, plugga. Nu kan ni det.”, man kan inte i alla fall. Så bygga sin egen kunskap, äga sin kunskap och i det systemet så behöver man ha utifrån stöd för att kunna få upp den kunskapen.

Quote 54:

Alex: Och det här med hbtq-certifiering, att hålla det löpande! Att man måste certifieras en gång om året som med i princip alla andra saker certifieras en gång om året. Som vårdcentraler, hur stor omsättning har ni inte på personal, ni måste ju...ni kan inte ha en folder och en lite regnbågsflagga och bara ”Nu är vi hbtq-vänliga!” Hela den här certifieringen... upprätthåll det då!

Quote 55:

Maria: Sen kan jag också tycka att det är väldigt lätt att snöa in på att det här och det här och det här är dåligt, det här och det här och det här är fel. Ja absolut, det är möjligt men hur långt har vi faktiskt kommit? Vad har vi faktiskt gjort? Eller Göteborgs Stad i det här fallet, vad har de gjort? Hur långt har arbetet kommit? Vad är det som har hänt redan? Det positiva.

Quote 56:

Alex: Nej, precis. [...] Jag menar, jag kommer ifrån en liten --- [namn på län] håla och om jag skulle gå till vårdcentralen och se att där sitter en regnbågsflagga så hade ju jag gråtit utav lycka, så jag tycker ju ändå att väldigt många instanser jobbar ju väldigt hårt med det och jag tycker att bemötandet har blivit bättre även inom vården, som är svår. Jag fattar också att det är det här med att tänka om, det är ju jättesvårt. Det tycker ju jag också att det är, så jag vill ändå ge Göteborgs Stad ”cred” och sen så tycker jag att det är en jättebra idé, det här med hbtq-rådet... även om jag tycker att det bör implementeras på ett annat sätt men det är ju ändå något som man kan ändra på och inte något som behöver startas upp.

Quote 57:

Maria: Jag visste ju inte ens att det [HBTQ-rådet] fanns förens jag fick se din första inbjudansgrej till det här. ”Jaha, finns det ett sådant” typ, ”Det var ju käckt, undra vad de gör.” Jag hade ingen aningen, jag har inte bott i den här staden jättelänge men jag har ju ändå haft kontakt med Göteborg till och från och det är ändå någonting som en själv är en del av. Jag är inte jätteengagerad och sådär men det är ju liksom av privata anledningar, men de [HBTQ-rådet] syns inte så mycket, det kanske de borde göra.

Quote 58:

Johanna: Man ska väl inte heller behöva vara superengagerad för att information som är relevant för en själv ska nå ut till dig [*sic*].

Quote 59:

Alex: Nej, anledningen till att jag vet om det är ju för att jag är engagerad i West Pride och då dyker det ju upp såklart men annars så hade jag nog inte heller vetat om det.

Quote 60:

Johanna: Jag tänker att ett HBTQ-råd ska betyda att vi i hbtq-samhället ska ha en möjlighet att påverka vad som händer i det här rådet men om man inte ens vet om det, vad fyller det för funktion?

Quote 61:

Alex: Det är ju ett sätt att synliggöra gruppen även om jag inte heller... och sen så får jag också erkänna att jag inte aktivt har letat efter vad de har jobbat med eller vad det här rådet kan ha inneburit men det är ju det som blir så dubbelt också när man diskuterar hbtq, att ja, det är ju en självklar del men om vi inte har ett hbtq-råd då syns det [hbtq] inte. Syns inte, finns inte liksom. Så att ibland så tänker jag att funktionen kanske bara är att "Men vi har ett hbtq-råd" [skrattar], för att den här gruppen eller vi finns, bara för att synliggöra det liksom.

Quote 62:

Eric: Jag ser ju dem som är där i rådet och dom som jobbar för hbtq-samhället, det är ju samma personer som är på alla råd och alla möten hela tiden. Jag är jätteglad att de gör det, för jag orkar inte engagera mig, jag var så engagerad i högstadiet och gymnasiet och nej, jag orkar inte. Men det blir farligt när det är samma personer hela tiden, för då är det fortfarande samma perspektiv. Det blir ju inte förstahandsinformation, vilket gör att jag kan känna att några av dem här har blivit lite politiker för de är så vana i den kontexten och vet hur man behöver uttrycka sig, för det är med politiker som man sitter på de här mötena och då tappar man den här gräsrötter.

Quote 63:

Alex: Hur ska HBTQ-rådet jobba med att nå ut till och inkludera hbtq-personer som bor i samhället i den verksamheten som HBTQ-rådet bedriver? För att jag tycker inte att det räcker med att lägga ett Facebook-inlägg utan... jag vet inte ens om de skrev det på engelska, det är en ganska så svår titel, alltså den är ju inte...

Quote 64:

Johanna: Förlåt, du menar den här inbjudan till...

Quote 65:

Alex: Ja, det här på Världskulturmuseet. Det räcker liksom inte med att göra ett Facebook-event. [...] Man måste nå ut mer!

Quote 66:

Johanna: Ja och jag tänker också... det känns inte som att man kan förvänta... att de förväntar sig att det kommer så mycket folk heller, för hur ska man strukturera upp det och få in allas olika åsikter då? Ska vi sitta där och räcka upp handen eller ska vi skriva en lapp? Är det hundra personer, vilket inte skulle vara en konstig sak om det skulle dra hundra personer [*sic*]. Hur ska man få in allas åsikter då och hur ska man prioritera dem?

Quote 67:

Alex: Också, hur bekväm är man att räcka upp handen framför hundra personer och "outa" sig själv bland folk man inte känner?

Quote 68:

Johanna: Ja, exakt. Alltså det är ju... att ställa sig framför kommunpolitiker och etablerade personer i hbtq-världen som är med i HBTQ-rådet, det är ju skrämmande kan jag tycka.

Quote 69:

Alex: Verkligen, så det känns inte riktigt som att det är en bra... att det är inte riktigt där jag tycker att vi ska mötas, utan det är mer som vi var inne på förra gången när vi pratade om att ha någon typ "ungdomsmottagning" fast en hbtq-rådgivare, kanske inte... men någon som sitter ute i de olika stadsdelarna, för det är också såhär om du bor ute i Angered och har det väldigt

skralt, ska du åka ifrån Angered in till stan och riskera att åka fast? Jag menar, Korsvägen är ju är ju en hubb för alla [biljett]kontrollanter i stan. Lägg det i Angered, visa någon slags vilja att nå ut till folk, så det känner jag inte att man gör genom att lägga det på Världskulturmuseet.

Quote 70:

Alex: Jag tycker att den är lite för generell även ur det perspektivet. Funktionalitet omnämns bara väldigt flyktigt. Vithet, inte alls och jag som inte identifierar mig inom det binära könssystemet eller som lesbisk eller gay eller bisexuell, det enda eller det lilla, lilla, lilla som skulle kunna träffa mig då är det de här frågorna när det är sjukvård och frågan om man har pojkvän, som jag har stött på, såklart. Men det är också det enda i hela rapporten som jag faktiskt kan känna igen i. Det känns inte som att någon har pratat med ”min grupp” i gruppen om man säger så.

Quote 71:

Johanna: Betyder det osynlighet, att man inte ens får känna sig med i den gruppen [hbtq] som man är med i den här rapporten [*sic*]?

Quote 72:

Alex: Men lite så. Det... På något sätt så är den [rapporten] ändå könsbinär. Det är transpersoner men bara inom tvåkönsnormen.

Quote 73:

Maria: Överhuvudtaget, synen på en transperson kändes som att det var från ett fysiskt... ja men att det som är mellan öronen inte passar ihop med det som är mellan benen men transpersoner är ju ett paraplybegrepp.

Quote 74:

Alex: Precis som du [Maria] säger, att den [rapporten] är så upphängd på dels det binära och dels att man ska ha någon slags dysfori

Quote 75:

Alex: Och det behöver man inte ha! [skrattar] Och det verkar också vara någonting som också är viktigt att lära sig från början ”Ja, du föds i en kropp och sen tilldelas du ett kön vid födseln men du behöver inte vantrivas med din kropp eller du behöver inte ändra den bara för att du känner dig på ett visst sätt” så att man lär sig det istället och att man lyfter det i rapporten, att även det är ju knutet till könstereotyper ”Att om jag är man så ska jag ha platt bröstorg” och sen så opererar man bort bröst som man kanske inte hade några problem med, bara det att man ville passera även i den här köns... trans-köns-normen på något sätt.

Quote 76:

Det är ytterligare en sak, utöver de jag nämnde i onsdags, som jag tar med mig som en erfarenhet – kanske den viktigaste? För oavsett hur olika jag och en annan hbtq-person kan vara, måste vi backa varandra. Solidaritet för mina fränder. (Alex’s journal, 13/4/18)