"I Love You for You no Matter": Managing the Parent-Child Relationship Through Relational Identity Claims in Coming-Out Conversations

Johanna Caroline Heleen Rietveld

S4788427

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen

PSB3E-BT15: Bachelor Thesis

Supervisor: Dr. J. H. Ole Gmelin

Second evaluator: Prof. Annette Mülberger Rogele

In collaboration with: Chloe Iris Serbetsoglou, Jessica Louise Groos, Kayleigh Grotenboer,

Melissa Schmitz & Michael Teofil Marcu

August 25, 2025

A thesis is an aptitude test for students. The approval of the thesis is proof that the student has sufficient research and reporting skills to graduate, but does not guarantee the quality of the research and the results of the research as such, and the thesis is therefore not necessarily suitable to be used as an academic source to refer to. If you would like to know more about the research discussed in this thesis and any publications based on it, to which you could refer, please contact the supervisor mentioned

Abstract

The conversation within the parent-child relationship regarding the coming-out of the child is a moment for potential relational strain and repair. Previous research has studied relational dynamics retrospectively, but how conflict management is constructed through conversations in real-time has never been studied. This study addresses this gap using real-time coming-out conversations between parent and child, to unravel how relational identity claims are constructed to manage the parent-child relationship after coming-out. A qualitative, observational study was conducted, drawing on symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology, both grounding relational identity-work. Data consisted of nine coming-out conversations between gay men and one parent, posted voluntarily on YouTube and transcripts were analyzed using Iterative Micro-Identity Content Analysis. Recurrent relational identity claims showed two key patterns emerging from the data: affection as repair by the parent and the relationship positioned as a safe space to talk by the child. Findings highlight the importance of the parent-child relationship in coming-out conversations and deepen the understanding of the management of conflict induced through coming-out in real-time. Future research can further explore conflict management in conversations with sensitive disclosures in all sorts of relationships.

Keywords: identity, relational identity, relational identity-work, relational identity claims, qualitative methods, symbolic interactionism, discursive psychology, daily interactions, Iterative Micro-Identity Content Analysis, coming-out, coming-out conversations

"I Love You for You no Matter": Managing the Parent-Child Relationship Through

Relational Identity Claims in Coming-Out Conversations

We position ourselves and our relationships through language and interaction in daily life. *Relational identity* emerges in these exchanges as people use talk to negotiate and construct the status of their relationship, Agne termed this as 'relational identity-work' (2025). Through this process, a shared relational identity is formed, and thus talk can be studied to see how this identity is negotiated (Agne, 2025). This study focuses on the parent-child relationship, as important relationships such as families are shaped through such identity-work (Agne, 2025). How parents and children position themselves in relational identity, is shaped by multiple factors, including the child's developmental stage. In adolescence, identity formation is central, particularly during Erikson's stage of "Identity vs. Role confusion" (Erikson, 1968; Arnett, 2015). While striving for autonomy in this stage, most adolescents stay embedded in family life, where parental encouragement of independence often evokes conflict between parent and child, which requires relational repair (Noller & Callan, 1991; Adams & Marshall, 1996).

A crucial part of identity development is sexual development, with *coming-out* (CO) as a milestone, bringing emotional risk and relational tension between the person disclosing and the one being disclosed to (Cass, 1979; Li, 2022; Tyler & Abetz, 2020) due to stigma regarding sexual minorities (Li, 2022; Maltempi et al., 2024). Research until now has examined CO retrospectively, focusing on how relationships are restored after disclosure (Tyler, 2015). Yet little is known about how CO conversations unfold in real time. This study addresses that gap by analyzing live CO interactions, using relational identity-work, drawing on symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology (Agne, 2025; Francis & Adams, 2018; Wetherell & Edley, 2014). This leads to the central research question: How do parents and

adolescents construct relational identity claims to manage the parent-child relationship after disclosing the child's sexuality?

Theoretical framework

This study draws on symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology. Firstly, *symbolic interactionism* is presented as a sociological perspective that illustrates the importance of social interaction in shaping the self and understanding social life (Francis & Adams, 2018). Additionally, Branje offers a theoretical statement to illustrate that identity development is shaped by ongoing interactions with close others, rather than occurring in isolation: "Identity development does not take place within a vacuum, but in the context of real-time interactions with important others such as parents and peers" (Branje, 2022). This statement underscores the role of interaction in identity development. Adolescents receive feedback in relationships when talking about identity, and these interactions can be used to strengthen or adjust their identity commitments (Branje, 2022). Language and interaction are the groundwork for forming and communicating identity.

In addition to and building on symbolic interactionism, *discursive psychology* places the emphasis on language, not only treating it as a resource, but as the central idea of how to know what is going on in people's minds (Wetherell & Edley, 2014). People use talk to construct and negotiate their own attitudes, emotions and identities to themselves and their environment. In this study, the language used in interaction in the real time live CO conversations, can reveal what the parent and child are thinking. Thus, looking at the language, the relational identity constructed between the parent and child can be seen. The speakers position themselves and their relational identity through claims made in the language, and this can be studied in the CO conversations.

The parent-child relationship during adolescence

During adolescence, children become more independent, and parents stimulate their children's autonomy, however, this push for independence is also associated with increased levels of conflict between parents and adolescents (Noller & Callan, 1991). *Conflict* is defined as a fundamental disagreement between two or more people (Hall, 1987). A certain amount of conflict in families during adolescence, is normal and even healthy for development when conflict is effectively resolved (Tucker et al., 2003; Lichtwarck-Aschoff et al., 2010; Hall, 1987; Wolcott & Weston, 1994). Conflicts trigger necessary relational adjustments, and transitions; a new but different parent-child relationship is established, one that can endure a lifetime (Lichtwarck-Aschoff et al., 2010; Noller & Callan, 1991). The main reason for parent-child conflict is the child developing into adolescence and adulthood; the child seeks more independence and autonomy, which strides with parental control and can lead to conflicts like curfew, clothing taste, and physical-, social- and sexual development (Hall, 1987; Noller & Callan, 1991; Wolcott & Weston, 1994).

Making sense of their sexual development is often experienced as a challenge by adolescents (Matthews & Salazar, 2012; Rosario et al., 2001). Sexual development is found to be studied using various models focused primarily on sexual-minority youth, often drawing on Erikson's developmental theory (Savin-Williams, 2011). The most influential model to study this has been Cass's homosexual identity formation model (1979). This model is grounded in the assumption that change is driven by interpersonal interactions and outlines six stages, from initial confusion to the eventual synthesis of a homosexual identity into the self (Cass, 1979). However, Cass's model has been widely critiqued for treating sexual identity as a universal, linear process rather than a socially constructed and variable experience (Savin-Williams, 2011). Later work has proposed more flexible and multidimensional approaches, focusing on factors such as self-awareness, self-acceptance, disclosure and integration into broader identity (Horowitz & Newcomb, 2001; Kinnish et al.,

2005). These perspectives stress that sexual identity is dynamic and relational, taking place in the context of ongoing social interactions.

Disclosure and relational dynamics

After making sense of their sexual identity and 'coming-out to oneself' (Floyd & Stein, 2002) a lot of individuals choose to come out. *Coming-out* (CO) is a specific kind of disclosure, where queer individuals disclose their sexual identity to their environment (Ali & Barden, 2015; Cass, 1979; Floyd & Stein, 2002; Pistella et al., 2016). For many queer people, CO is a big milestone in their sexual identity development, and can boost their mental health, make them feel empowered and deepen relationships after disclosure (Ali & Barden, 2015; Cass, 1979; Floyd & Stein, 2002; Pistella et al., 2016). CO is beneficial for the individual and the relationship between them and the person being disclosed to, however, fears of not being accepted puts the relationship at risk (Adams & Marshall, 1996; Ali & Barden, 2015). A child's CO to a parent can generate challenges both in the parent-child relationship and within the parent. Parents may feel fear, sadness or anxiety concerning societal acceptance, their parental role and responsibilities, or the potential loss of connection with their child (Saltzburg, 2004). Because CO challenges expectations and requires parents and children to renegotiate their relationship, it can only be fully understood in the context of broader relational dynamics.

CO represents a specific conflict within the parent-child relationship, as it requires both parties to renegotiate their roles and expectations (Tyler, 2015). More broadly, relational dynamics are changing when conflicts arise, fostered by the tension stemming from the two interrelated identity systems of parents and children (Bosma & Kunnen, 2001; Koepke & Denissen, 2012; Schachter & Ventura, 2008; Tyler & Abetz, 2020). Identity development from the child is accompanied by healthy separateness from the parents; separation-individuation and identity development are interconnected psychosocial tasks (Koepke &

Denissen, 2012). Becoming autonomous while maintaining a secure attachment to their parents is important for optimal development of the parent-child relationship (Koepke & Denissen, 2012). Within this developmental context, CO itself is a relational rupture and sets the stage for either closeness or distance (Tyler & Abetz, 2020). Supportive responses from parents foster openness, trust and ongoing closeness whereas negative or rejecting responses can create distance, silence or conflict (Tyler & Abetz, 2020). Parents may struggle with their own expectations of the sexual identity of their child and need to adjust these after CO (Tyler & Abetz, 2020; Koepke & Denissen, 2012; Schachter & Ventura, 2008), making it difficult for them to be (immediately) supportive.

Current study

This study explores how relational identity is constructed through language and interaction in parent-child relationships, after the *coming-out* (CO) of the child. It examines how parents and adolescents negotiate their relational identity during the critical development stage of adolescence, where identity formation, as described by Erikson's "Identity vs Role Confusion" stage, often leads to conflicts requiring relational repair (Erikson, 1968; Noller & Callan, 1991). Specifically, this study investigates the CO moment, a significant milestone in sexual development that introduces emotional and relational challenges due to stigma (Cass, 1979; Li, 2022) and in turn risks relational strain (Ali & Barden, 2015). Conflicts and CO inside parent-child relationships call for both parties to renegotiate their relationship and it sets the stage for either relational growth or relational strain (Koepke & Denissen, 2012; Schachter & Ventura, 2008; Tylor & Abetz, 2020).

The potential relational rupture and its repair after CO is studied through using real-time CO conversations, addressing the gap in existing retrospective research (Taylor, 2015). The study uses both symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology, to emphasize that identity is formed through interactions (Francis & Adams, 2018) and constructed and

negotiated through talk (Wetherell & Edley, 2014). This study examines the relational

identity between the parent and child, that is constructed through talk in interaction (Agne,

2025). Together, this leads to the central research question: How do parents and adolescents

construct relational identity claims to manage the parent-child relationship after disclosing

the child's sexuality?

Methods

Participants and data

Participants in this study consist of the sons (and parents) in the YouTube videos. The

data is archival, thus limiting the availability of personal information on the participants. The

only information is what can be inferred from the videos. As these are coming-out videos, we

deducted that our participants are homosexual males. The participants' ages seem somewhere

around adolescence or young adulthood. Furthermore, it is likely that English is the native

language of our participants, as this is the language that they spoke with their parents during

the videos.

This study uses a qualitative research approach with an observational and dyadic

design to examine the interactions between a gay son and his parent. Data consisted of nine

coming-out videos of gay sons to their parents, which were collected from the online video

platform YouTube (www.youtube.com). The selected videos were published between 2012

and 2019 and have an average duration of 10,57 minutes (Table 1). The sample was cut down

from 30 to 9 videos by removing videos with poor audio quality and by selecting videos

according to the following criteria: the interaction must last longer than 4 minutes, the

coming-out moment should be preceded by 30 seconds of footage, and the child is only

coming-out to one parent, and not to both, either in person or on the phone. All videos feature

conversations between a gay son and a parent, with six featuring mother-son interactions and

three showing father-son interactions. Among the mother-son interactions, five took place in

person and one occurred on the phone. For the father-son interactions, two were phone calls and one was conducted in person (Table 1). In terms of parents' awareness of recording, two videos showed parents who appeared to show awareness, yet they were unaware of the recording's objective. While most videos offered clear visual quality, two presented limitations: one had reduced visibility due to poor lighting (Ryan), and another showed only a partial view of the son (Rodrigo). As these were published on a public domain, and are archival in nature, no consent needs to be acquired from the publishers/participants of the video to use these videos in our research. A legal consultant deemed this to be the case according to fair use under copyright law, provided that imposed limitations were adhered to.

Table 1

Overview of the conversations and participants

Nr.[i]	Name	Parent	Conversation style	Aware	Date uploaded	Length (min)	Pre-CO[ii] (min)	Found by
2	Taylor	Father	Over the phone	No	11 nov, 2014	16:39	05:01	Ole Gmelin
3	Jamaal	Father	Over the phone	No	6 nov, 2012	06:32	03:17	Ole Gmelin
4	Drew	Father	In real life	No	11 oct, 2014	13:58	00:38	Ole Gmelin
5	Daniel	Mother	In real life	No	23 feb, 2012	08:36	02:20	Bachelor students
6	Ryan	Mother	In real life	No	24 oct, 2013	11:26	02:11	Bachelor students

7	Daniel K	Mother	Over the phone	No	23 may, 2012	11:53	02:11	Ole Gmelin
8	Rodrigo	Mother	In real life	Yes	26 aug, 2019	13:03	03:43	Ole Gmelin
9	Adam	Mother	In real life	Yes	21 oct, 2013	09:12	00:35	Bachelor students
10	Mya	Mother	In real life	No	2 march, 2014	07:41	00:16	Ole Gmelin

[i] Number of conversation and video

[ii] Time passed before the coming-out moment

Data Collection and transcription

Data collection, processing and transcription were done by the lead researcher Ole Gmelin and a different group of bachelor thesis students. The video data was collected and edited by the gay sons, rather than by researchers, therefore some of the data may be missing due to the editing. The videos were downloaded to simplify the transcription, processing, and handling of the data, and stored on a secure cloud storage platform to ensure its protection/for optimal protection.

Following the video selection, the interactions were transcribed following the transcription notation method developed by Gmelin & Kunnen (2021). The data was transcribed verbatim using the transcription program InqScribe, meaning the data are not corrected for linguistic errors to maintain natural speech. To preserve the richness of context, utterances such as prolonged intonations, length of pauses, overlaps, and interruptions were transcribed following the coding scheme shown in Table 2 (Gmelin & Kunnen, 2021). Timestamps were added at every turn transition, including interruptions. Inaudible fragment parts were marked as such, as well.

Table 2

Transcription Notations

Punctuation marks	Description
[0:00:00]	A timestamp indicating a turn transition
-	Quick alteration of sentence, unusual short pause
,	Brief pause
?	Pitch rises at the end of the sentence
(.),(..),(…)	Pauses of respectively less than .5s, 1s, 1.5s
(2.)	Length of pause in seconds
wo(h)rd	Laughter in intonation
wo:rd, wo::rd	Prolonged pronunciation of phonemes, respectively 1s, 2s
[word]	Uncertain transcription due to inaudibility
word<	Speech interruption, immediate turn transition
<word	Speech interruption, followed by a turn transition
word<word>	Speech interruption, overlapping talk, followed by a turn transition
word<word	Speech interruption, not followed by a turn transition
<word>	Speech interruption, no turn transition

Note. This table is an adaptation from Gmelin & Kunnen (2021).

Data preparation, coding and analysis

This study aims to explore how parents and children position themselves and their

relationship after coming-out. The analysis of resulting transcripts from the data draws on the

Iterative Micro-Identity Content Analysis (IMICA) method (Gmelin & Kunnen, 2021). This

method views identity constructed through interactional and discursive processes and draws

on a social constructivist view, and additionally uses positioning analysis (Gmelin & Kunnen,

2021). This is consistent with the theoretical framework and research question of the current

study, on the grounds that participants are positioning themselves and their relational identity in real time as the coming-out conversation unfolds. I analyzed the transcripts according to all five steps of IMICA: familiarization with the data; identification of claims about selves; themes and domains; content and formulations of claims; and effect and function of claims (Gmelin & Kunnen, 2021).

In the first step, familiarization with the data, I read through all the transcripts and noted any personal observations to strengthen the trustworthiness of my analysis. In the second step, identification of claims about selves, coding proceeded at a turn-by-turn level, with turns being defined as a switch between speakers in the conversational floor. This meant that the two conversational partners alternated being the speaker, and therefore alternated turns being coding - depending on who was speaking at that moment. Identity related claims included in analysis were *relational identity claims* formulated by the speaker about the conversational partner or about the dyad as a whole. This resulted in four types of relational identity claims: made by speaker one about the partner; made by speaker one about the dyad; made by speaker two about the partner; and made by speaker two about the dyad. The resulting types of codes can be found in Table 3. For the purpose of this study, only claims that occurred after the CO-moment are included in analysis, because the management of the relationship, and accompanied conflict induced by the CO-moment, is subject of interest. Claims unrelated to the topic were also excluded in analysis.

In the third step, themes and domains, each conversation and code were revisited to identify recurring patterns, which were grouped into themes. Coded segments were re-evaluated to ensure the assigned codes best captured the data's meaning. Building on this, in the fourth step, the content and formulation of claims were analyzed. Their context and alignment with both the definition of relational identity claims and the found themes across conversations were assessed. During this process, some claims were reclassified to enhance

coding accuracy (e.g. non-relational identity claims initially miscoded as relational). Incomplete claim formulations, such as "Love you" instead of "I love you", were evaluated and qualified as relational identity claims although they didn't fully conform to the established criteria. In the fifth and last step, the effect and function of claims were examined by re-reading conversations with themes in mind, analyzing how relational identity claims shaped the relationship and positioned the parent and child within the conversation.

Relational identity claims

Relational identity claims made by the conversational partners were claims regarding the shared relational identity between the two partners. These claims were defined as both; 1. Statements with a grammatical structure that includes a subject "I" or "you"; a *transitive verb* and an object "you" or "me" (e.g. "I love you"; "you embarrass me"); and 2. Statements with a grammatical structure that includes the subject "we" and concern the relational identity (e.g. "We are OK"). *Transitive verbs* are verbs that are always accompanied by an object in the sentence (Verb patterns; 2025), like "respect", "love", "embarrass" and "irritate" (Whyte, 2010). Only claims suiting this definition and concerning the relational identity were included in analysis. Drawing on symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology, the relational identity claims made in and about the dyad were used to explore the relational identity between the two conversational partners.

Table 3

Different types of relational identity claims

Type of relational identity claim	Abbreviation	Example [a]
Parent Relational identity Claim to the Child	PRCC	1: "I respect you" 2: "You can tell me"
Child Relational identity Claim to the Parent	CRCP	3: "I wanted to tell you so bad"

		4: "Do you still love me?"
"We" Relational identity Claim made by Parent	WeRCP	5: "We're all different"
"We" Relational identity Claim made by Child	WeRCC	6: "Can we talk more about it later?"
		7: "We're good now"

[a] This is a made-up example and is not derived from the data.

Trustworthiness

To ensure trustworthiness and validity, two key strategies were employed: reflexivity and validation. Reflexivity was maintained by keeping research notes accompanying each transcript. I recorded both my own personal reactions and analytical observations during reading the transcripts, to increase my awareness of potential biases towards the parent, the child and their reactions to each other. This was particularly useful given that the topic of coming-out is personally significant to me due to my own sexuality, coming-out and experience with my parents. Practicing this reflexivity and keeping in mind these connections when looking at the data, I critically examined how my background might influence my interpretations. Additionally, I also discussed my impressions with my fellow thesis students to ensure a more inclusive and complete view of the data. This broadened my perspective and reduced the likelihood of a single subjective reading of the data. Illustrated by Sedgewick (1997), reflexivity strengthens trustworthiness by encouraging researchers to pause and consider alternative interpretations. My goal in this study was not to be objective, but to be transparent about my own stance and motivation behind interpretative choices, thereby making interpretative decisions more accountable (Sedgwick, 1997).

Validation was pursued through the "Next Turn Proof Procedure" (Peräkylä, 2011), which examines how a conversational turn is responded to in the immediately following turn

of talk. If a participant's response aligned with my interpretation of the preceding utterance, it was taken as support for the accuracy of my interpretation of the utterance. Conversely, a contradictory response prompted reconsideration of my interpretation. This procedure was especially useful when questions appeared in the data; for example, if I interpreted that a child was seeking love, the question "*Do you still love me?*" directed to the parent, supported that interpretation. This process provided a systematic check on my analytical conclusions, thereby enhancing the overall validity of my interpretation and findings.

Results

General findings

Across the nine coming-out conversations analyzed, 83 segments were coded using 21 relational identity codes, split into CRCP (Child Relational identity Claim to Parent), PRCC (Parent Relational identity Claim to Child) and weRC ("we" Relational identity Claim). As shown in Table 4, the most frequent claims were made by parents ($N = 43$), and were spread across all the nine conversations with a peak of 15 PRCC in conversation 6. The majority of PRCC expressed love ($N = 27$), e.g. "*I love you so much*" (dyad 6, mother to Ryan) and support ($N = 6$), e.g. "*I'm really proud of you*" (dyad 7, mother to Daniel K). The second most frequently used code was CRCP ($N = 23$). The two most used codes inside CRCP expressed desire of wanting to have told the parent ($N = 9$, e.g. "*I just had to tell you*", dyad 10, Mya to his mother) and love ($N = 7$, e.g. "*I love you too mom*", dyad 8, Rodrigo to his mother). The resulting coded claims included a range of different emotions, including craving validation and love from the parent ($N = 3$, e.g. "*Do you still love me?*", dyad 3, Jamaal to his father) and disbelief of the disclosure having happened ($N = 2$, e.g. "*I can't believe I finally told you*", dyad 9, Adam to his mother).

The least frequently occurring claims were weRC ($N = 15$), only present in 3 conversations, with a peak in conversation 7 ($N = 10$) and one singular sighting in

conversation 5. Most weRC were expressed desire by the parent to talk to each other more about the coming-out moment and/or the sexuality of the child ($N = 9$), e.g. *"We'll have another conversation about it"*, dyad 2, father to Taylor). Overall, the most used claims in both CRCP and PRCC expressed love and support, with the most apparent difference being the question for validation of love in CRCP, which were absent in PRCC. Every interaction eventually included a PRCC expressing love, some occurred earlier in the conversation after the coming-out moment and others only just occurred at the end of the conversation, but every parent eventually told their child they loved them. This love was not consistently reciprocated by the child. The CRCP expressing love (*CRCP: "I love you (too)"*) was absent in conversations 2, 4, 5 and 10, resulting in its presence in just over half of the conversations.

Table 4

Overview of found relational identity claims used in analysis

Nr.[a]	Name	CRCP	PRCC	weRC[b]
2	Taylor	3	4	3
3	Jamaal	2	2	0
4	Drew	0	3	0
5	Daniel	0	4	1
6	Ryan	4	15	0
7	Daniel K	3	4	11
8	Rodrigo	6	4	0
9	Adam	4	5	0
10	Mya	1	2	0
Total		23	43	15

[a] Number of conversation and video.

[b] The theorized "we" Relational identity Claims made by both the child and the parent, were only found in claims made by the parent to the child, hence the code being shortened to just weRC instead of being split into weRCP and weRCC as theorized in the method.

Affection as repair

The most prominent and recurring pattern across all nine conversations is the parent sharing their love and support with the child. This happens in various degrees and situations and the talk used to express this also various across and within the conversations. In most conversations ($N = 6$) the child will receive affection without having to ask for it, but sometimes the child will seek validation and love through questions ($N = 3$), inviting the parents to directly express their affection using the same phrasing the child uses in the question. For example, *"Do you still love me?",* invites the parent to say they love their child in wording like "*Of course I do"* or "*Yes I love* you". This is not present in all conversations, mainly because the question is only asked when the love (wanted by the child) is not yet given by the parent earlier in the conversation. The details about the dynamics of these exchanges of affection vary across the conversations, but representative examples can be seen in Adam's conversation with his mother, shown in Table 5, where he both receives validation through asking for it and spontaneous.

Shortly after the CO moment, Adam wants to know if his mother still loves him because he uses a direct question to obtain this knowledge: "*So like, do you still love me?*" (Table 5). The mother immediately responds to this with "*Of course I do, Adam, (.) of course*" (Table 5). The use of the affectionate phrase occurring later in the conversation ("*I love you for you no matter*", Table 5), provides evidence of the mother using this earlier incomplete sentence ("*Of course I do, Adam, (.) of course*", Table 5), to declare her love. The mother constructs herself as loving inside the parent-child relationship using this incomplete

sentence. Potential disbelief about this from the child is contradicted by this statement from the parent.

The child asking for this affection from the parent only when it is not spontaneously given, is evidence of the need for the child to hear the words that they are loved after this disclosure. The word "still" also indicates that the relational identity between the parent and child was considered loving before the CO moment (Table 5). When Adam asks this question, it assumes that he views this CO moment as potentially risky for their earlier established secure and loving relational identity. The question poses the need for confirmation from his mother that the love she has for him, and their relationship, is not conditionally based on his sexuality. The mother positions herself as being loving multiple times throughout the conversation ("*I love you for you no matter*", "*I love you*", and "*Adam, I love you*", Table 5). The phrase "no matter" provides evidence of her love not being conditionally tied to his sexuality. In the end, he reciprocates this love by saying "*Love you too*", positioning their relational identity as loving both ways.

Relationships as a safe space to talk

Another recurring pattern throughout the conversations and across multiple conversations was the establishment of the relationship as a safe space to share vulnerable emotional moments and be open to talking to each other. From the parental view, there is expressed doubt in the beginning of the conversations about the relationship being a safe space if the child didn't disclose sooner. The relational identity is being repositioned as a safe space to talk after the parent questions this and/or by the child confirming he's happy they could share this moment ($N = 7$). The details of these exchanges vary across and within the conversations, but some representative examples can be found in Table 5, showing the positioning of the relational identity between Adam and his mother.

Just after the CO moment, the mother almost immediately implicates that Adam didn't want to tell her, and she wants him to provide an explanation for that ("*And you didn't want to tell me because?*", Table 5). This shows her initial interest more in the withholding of information than the actual disclosure of his sexuality. It seems as if the relational rupture in this instance is more about the relationship not being a safe space to be vulnerable and emotional. This can also be seen in Adam's response: "*You know I was nervous and like (…) I don't know I mean I know it wouldn't be a problem but*" (Table 5). This shows him knowledgeable about the fact that he didn't tell her sooner and he is quick to give her the explanation he knew she wouldn't have a problem with his sexuality. The relationship then quickly adapts to this new information, and the mother continues asking him about his sexuality and coming-out. She is inviting him to share more with her; to not only tell her this is a safe space, but to act on it and show her he can talk to her about anything. She wants to know who he told, who knows without being told, and how he 'decided' this (assuming she's asking about his moment of 'coming-out to oneself', Floyd & Stein, 2002).

She asks repeatedly about these topics throughout the conversation (02:28.21; 03:04.06; 03:07.24; 04:30.20; 06:30.24; Table 5). This shows not only her interest in his journey and process, but also her desire for wanting to know where she stands in their relationship and why he decided to tell her at that moment, in contrast to him telling other people at different times. He understands this and shows a bit of surprise about his disclosure at around two minutes after the CO moment: "*I can't believe I finally told you*" (Table 5). This is evidence for the relationship being a safe space to share vulnerable and emotionally charged moments together. Immediately after, he invites her to also be more open about how she views him and his journey ("*have you known?*" and "*Was it like obvious?*", Table 5) to which she doesn't give him a satisfying enough answer ("*No you're still Adam*", Table 5) because he continues to ask about her previous knowledge about his sexuality before the

disclosure, possibly seeking validation of her view of his sexuality being in line with his own view about his journey and current sexual identity label. She, however, is more interested in positioning the relation identity as safe and open for him to talk to her, hence her returning to asking him about his journey. Her statement "*Never be afraid to tell me hun*" (05:45.16, Table 5), is evidence for her desire of the relational identity being safe and open.

His final confirmation for the relationship being a safe space to talk and wanting to share this vulnerable moment with her, can be found in his comment "*so I wanted to tell you that for a while*" (Table 5). This provides evidence not only for him having thought about this moment before CO, but also constructs the relationship being secure enough to share this with her. The progression of his answer to her first question "*And you didn't want to tell me because?*" (Table 5) to his own final comment about the disclosure moment, shows her initial view on the potential relational rupture being repaired with his contradiction that he did want to tell her. His explanations for the delay of his CO to her, progress from the earlier statement that he was just nervous, to his disbelief and surprise of the CO, to his relief and desire to having told her, back to his original statement that he was nervous but knew she'd be fine with it ("*Nah, I knew you'd be cool about it but like I was just nervous*", Table 5). She is satisfied with this relational repair given she stops asking about why he didn't tell her sooner and starts giving him spontaneous verbal affection.

Table 5

Overview of patterns (transcript conversation 9 Adam)

[00:02:03.18] Mother: **And you didn't want to tell me because?**
[00:02:06.02] Son: You know I was nervous and like (..) I don't know I mean I know it wouldn't be a problem but (.3) I told Hannah like (..) like Juneish (.) now that's really (..) now it's really hard.

[00:02:20.09] Mother: I mea:n (hugs son, son hugs back) (.2) Who else have you told <

[00:02:24.07] Son: < **So like, do you still love me?**

[00:02:25.17] Mother: Of course I do, Adam, (.) of course.

[00:02:28.11] Son: And you know how I talked <

[00:02:28.21] Mother: < When did you decide this?

[00:02:30.07] Son: When did I decide this?

[00:02:31.14] Mother: Or when did you <

[00:03:04.06] Mother: Have you told Mad or anyone?

[00:03:05.17] Son: Mhm.

[00:03:07.24] Mother: Has he spread it around the school though?

[00:03:10.07] Son: I mean a little bit but I don't care anymore. I used to care a lot but that's why I used to burn myself.

[00:03:16.13] Mother: Don't be doing that Adam.

[00:03:17.21] Son: I don't anymore (.) plus it kinda helped me through it.

[00:03:22.19] Mother: Aw (..) **I love you for you no matter** <

[00:03:24.23] Son: < And you know how I talk about Bradley Cooper all the all the time?

[00:03:27.18] Mother: Yes.

[00:04:01.16] Son: **I can't believe I finally told you** < I have > after like years I mean, it, was there, have you known? (..) 'cause I mean moms always know and like, I don't know. Was it like obvious?

[00:04:12.17] Mother: No you're still Adam.

[00:04:14.03] Son: No but like did you know though? (.) Like like if you think back was there anything that you think (…) stood out

(..) or any clues? Because I remember you asking me like a few times like it's okay if you like, yeah.

[00:04:30.20] Mother: I don't remember to be honest. Have you told your father?

[00:04:33.05] Son: Mm, No I don't want to tell him (.3) cause he says shit all the time. (2) Haven't told Jenna either.

[00:05:48.04] Mother: Mmh yeah and have you been with a guy?

[00:05:49.22] Son: No (.) yeah (.) so that's that.

[00:05:54.16] Mother: Never be afraid to tell me hun.

[00:05:56.25] Son: Well I know like. (.) Oh my god I still can't get my legs to stop moving. (h)

[00:05:59.17] Mother: (h)

[00:06:01.17] Son: Yeah (.) **so I wanted to tell you that for a while** (.) like I don't know and like some of you guys wanna like officially kinda know and <

[00:06:08.29] Mother: < It's kind of young though.

[00:06:10.13] Son: I don't know, I know it's like, I don't know but like some of the girls, when I like officially knew (.) well I officially not like yeah at least I thought I was like bi or something (…) but, no, I'm sorry like girls are fine, just what they have is kind of gross. (.) So I feel it's like the second to know. (.) Now you're like the 30th (chuckles) (.2) because people told people but whatever.

[00:06:30.24] Mother: And you are okay with all that?

[00:06:32.04] Son: I don't really care.

[00:06:33.13] Mother: You're not gonna be cutting yourself into your arms <

```
[00:06:35.04] Son: < No I stopped that in August. The first time I
ever did any of that was in 7th grade when they wrote fag over my
arm.
[00:06:42.16] Mother: You know I love you (hugs his son)  (..) you
are my life (..) still (.) go to school, still jump, still do what
you want.
[00:06:51.00] Son: Yeah so is everything cool?
[00:06:52.23] Mother: Yeah.
[00:06:54.09] Son: And pity smiley face?
[00:06:55.29] Mother: (chuckles, hugs son)
[00:07:00.10] Son: Nah, I knew you'd be cool about it but like I
was just nervous.
```

```
[00:08:59.22] Son: Alright.
[00:09:00.12] Mother: Adam, I love you.
[00:09:01.09] Son: Love you too. (..) (holds his head with both
hands) Oh my God. I can't believe this. Okay. Surpri::se.
```

Note. Relational identity claims regarding the pattern 'affection as repair' are highlighted in bold and colored in orange and relational identity claims regarding the pattern 'relationships as a safe space to talk' are highlighted in bold and colored in blue.

Note. Claims within tables that are not directly adjacent are displayed in rows separated by dotted lines. The timestamps indicate the time gap between these segments.

Discussion

This study examined how parents and adolescents negotiate their relational identity after the vulnerable moment of coming-out (CO). Relational identity was constructed through talk (Agne, 2025), which is studied in real time CO conversations, drawing on discursive psychology and symbolic interactionism (Francis & Adams, 2018; Wetherell & Edley, 2014).

The CO moment induced potential relational repair and growth or relational strain (Koepke &
Denissen, 2012; Schachter & Ventura, 2008; Tylor & Abetz, 2020). This study looked at the
relational identity claims by parents and children and how they positioned themselves in their
conversation after the CO moment, to examine how the relationship was managed. Using the
method of IMICA (Gmelin & Kunnen, 2021), the research question 'How do parents and
adolescents construct relational identity claims to manage the parent-child relationship after
disclosing the child's sexuality?' was studied. The data and analysis showed how relational
identity claims made by both parent and child were used to manage the relationship after CO.
The findings show the relationship being managed through verbal affection in relational
identity claims and the relationship being positioned as a safe and open space to talk, for the
disclosure and other subjects regarding the autonomy of the child.

Findings

The data show that coming-out (CO) is an emotionally charged moment for both
parents and children and that the impact on their relationship varies from dyad to dyad. This
is in line with literature about the effect of CO to a parent, for example, Mills and colleagues
talk about the process of CO as being unique for everyone and the scope of parental reactions
from negative to neutral to positive (2018). This can also be seen in the number of claims
found and analyzed. Overall, the most used relational identity claims were made by parents
(PRCC; $N = 43$, Table 4), while CRCPs only occurred in seven of the nine conversations (N -
$= 23$, Table 4). This is not entirely in line with the research of Tyler, who theorized relational
strain needing repair from both the parent and the child (2015). Relational identity claims
were constructed by both the parent and child to manage the relationship, however, children
seemed to construct less claims than the parent and both partners wanted something different
from the other to repair this relational strain.

Children were concerned about themselves not being loveable anymore and needed this confirmation from the parent. In all nine conversations, the parents managed this using verbal affection in relational identity claims, spontaneously or after being asked by the child. This can be seen as an extension from the assumption parents now see their real authentic child and the disclosure having a positive effect on the closeness of their relationship (Pistella et al., 2024). The need for affection, asked by the child when not received spontaneously, is in line with parents participating in their child's identity as 'loved' (Schachter & Ventura, 2008). The parents in turn, were concerned with the relationship not being as secure and safe for their child to talk to them and wanted the child to explain this and reassure them of the relationship being secure. This can be explained through earlier studies showing the parents' fear of losing connection with their child after CO (Saltzburg, 2004). In sum, parents constructed verbal affection in relational identity to manage the parent-child relationship and children positioned the relationship as secure and safe to talk to their parent.

Theoretical implication

Relational identity claims are used to study underlying processes of relational dynamics unfolding in coming-out (CO) conversations. Relational identity-work, Symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology are used to derive relational meaning through talk and interaction, like establishing relational identity (Agne, 2025; Francis & Adams, 2018; Wetherell & Edley, 2014). Based on my findings, relational identity is constructed and can be negotiated through talk and interaction. However, this data also shows claims outside defined relational identity. Relational identity claims itself are just a small portion of all claims regarding conflict management. The total scope of how the relationship is managed can be looked at using more claims included in analyses, using discursive psychology more optimally (Wetherell & Edley, 2014). The relational dynamics concerning conflict

management after sensitive disclosures can be studied using frameworks concerning language and interaction, when used extensively.

The findings imply disclosures in general as an emotional moment shared between two people, where relational strain can happen, which needs to be resolved for the relationship to continue healthy development (Tucker et al., 2003; Lichtwarck-Aschoff et al., 2010; Hall, 1987; Wolcott & Weston, 1994). This can be done using relational identity claims as defined in this study, or with other claims regarding the relationship. These claims not only repair potential strain to further foster healthy development of the relationship but are also used in conversations to construct and renegotiate the relationship and what it is built on. This type of conflict management as seen in CO disclosures in parent-child relationships can also be applicable to other sensitive disclosures or other relationships, using symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology.

Strengths, limitations and future research

One of this study's strengths was the opportunity to bridge the research gap of the impact of CO on parent-child relationships studied retrospectively but never as an unfolding process (Taylor, 2015). The accessibility to authentic CO conversations enabled this, as replicating a CO moment in a lab is challenging due to issues like obtaining video consent, informed consent, and potential parental bias in reaction to the CO from suspicion of the purpose of the study. Thus, making the CO moment harder to study. This study used a natural setting where the parents were unaware of what was happening yet still could be observed through video footage. Another strength lies in the freedom that was given to the researchers, enabling them to study what was of personal greatest interest inside the data being offered. This allowed the researcher to fully engage with the data and was a great motivation to completely emerge themselves in this project. The combination of this freedom and the accessibility to pre-transcribed, real-time interactions, adds to the strengths of this study.

Nonetheless, there are also some limitations to this study, for example the amount of found and analyzed claims. The theorized relational claims (CRCPs and PRCCs) on average only occurred between two and five times per conversation (Table 4) and the "We" Relational identity Claims (Table 3) only occurred in three conversations (Table 4) and were hardly ever found in the way theorized, to the extent that the WeRCCs ("We" Relational identity Claim made by Child) were completely absent and the abbreviation for "We" Relational identity Claim made by Parent (WeRCP) was changed to simply WeRC. These theorized claims don't follow the fluid nature of everyday language: partial sentences or single words, for example "*Why?*" instead of "*Why are you gay?*", can function as complete communicative acts when understood in context (Sacks et al., 1974); interruptions occur (Table 5, Sacks et al., 2974); and subjects are left out (e.g. "*love you*" instead of "*I love you*") because the implied "I" is understood in context.

However, using discourse, relational meaning can be derived even from minimal expressions (Wetherell & Edley, 2014), which was done when qualifying "*love you*" as a relational identity claim. For future research, discourse can be used more fully by an experienced researcher, or a broader framework can be adapted to ensure a more complete inclusion of claims used in analysis. For example, drawing on grounded theory to inductively discover patterns emerging from the data without being restricted in only using language and predefined claims (Willig & Rogers, 2017). Another possibility for future research is the unraveling of conversations regarding similar disclosures that induce possible relational strain and repair, to discover how these conflicts are similar or different. The finding that relational rupture is parent-child relationships after disclosure is mostly about the breaking of trust, questioning the amount of affection and withholding of information that positions the relationship as unsecure, might be transferable to different conflicts. This can be studied by

using a broad framework like grounded theory to see if these patterns also emerge from other data with disclosures in parent-child or other relationships.

Conclusion

This study examines the management of the parent-child relationship after coming-out, through relational identity claims. Coming-out is a vulnerable moment inducing potential relational strain and repair and both parent and child question the security of the relationship after this disclosure. The child doubts the presence of unconditional love inside the relationship when the parent doesn't position themselves inside the relationship as loving towards the child. The parent in turn, questions the nature of the relationship as safe to share and be vulnerable in. Both parents and children respond to these doubts; the parent manages the relationship through verbal affection to the child and the child positions the relationship as a safe space to talk to their parent. This study used IMICA and drew on symbolic interactionism and discursive psychology, both groundwork for relational identity-work. These frameworks are useful in the study of relational identity being constructed and managed through talk in everyday interaction. Using these frameworks, the data studied shows the parent-child relationship being managed through affection and constructing the relationship as safe and secure. This confirms previous research about the importance of the parent-child relationship in coming-out conversations and adds to the understanding how relational dynamics unfold in real-time conflict management.

References

Adams, G. R., & Marshall, S. K., (1996). A developmental social psychology of identity: understanding the person-in-context. *Journal of Adolescence,* 19, 429-442.

Agne, R. R. (2025). The discourse of managing attempted levity in a serious situation: Relational identity-work in the Waco Standoff negotiations. *Western Journal of Communication*, *89*(1), 26–45. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1080/10570314.2023.2254943

Ali, S., & Barden, S. (2015). Considering the Cycle of Coming out: Sexual Minority Identity Development. *The professional counselor,* 5(4), 501-515. DOI: 10.15241/sa.5.4.501

Arnett, J. J. (2015). Identity Development from Adolescence to Emerging Adulthood: What We Know and (Especially) Don't Know. *The Oxford Handbook of Identity Development*, Oxford Library of Psychology. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199936564.013.009

Bosma, H. A., & Kunnen, E. S. (2001). Determinant of Mechanisms in Ego Identity Development: A Review and Synthesis. *Developmental Review,* 21, 39-66. Doi:10.1006/drev.2000.0514

Branje, S., (2022). Adolescent Identity Development in Context. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 45,* 101286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.11.006

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual Identity Formation: A Theoretical Model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *4*(3), 219–235. DOI: 10.1300/J082v04n03_01

Cronin, M. A., & Weingart, L. R.., (2005). Conflict in Diverse Teams: The Problem of Representational Gaps And the Solution of Cognitive and Affective Integration. *Tepper School of Business*, *544.*

Ellis, M. (2022, 28th July). *Linking Verbs: Definition and Examples*. Grammarly. From: https://www.grammarly.com/blog/parts-of-speech/linking-verbs/ on March 17th, 2025.

Erikson, E. H., (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis.* Norton.

Floyd, F. J., & Stein, T. S., (2002). Sexual Orientation Identity Formation among Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Youths: Multiple Patterns of Milestone Experiences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12(2), 167-191.

Francis, L. E., & Adams, R. E., (2018). Two Faces of Self and Emotion in Symbolic
Interactionism: From Process to Structure and Culture – And Back. *Symbolic
Interaction,* 42(2), 250-277. DOI: 10.1002/SYMB.383

Gedro, J.A., & Rocco, T.S. (Eds.). (2024). *The Routledge Handbook of LGBTQ
Identity in Organizations and Society*, (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi-
org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.4324/9781003128151

Gmelin, J. H., & Kunnen, E. S., (2021). Iterative Micro-Identity Content Analysis:
Studying Identity Development within and across Real-Time Interactions.
Journal of Identity, 21(4), 324-340. DOI: 10.1080/15283488.2021.1973474

Green, J. L., Brock, C., Baker, W. D., & Harris, P. (2020). Positioning theory and
discourse analysis: An explanatory theory and analytic lens. In *Handbook of
the cultural foundations of learning.* (pp. 119–140). https://doi-org.proxy-
ub.rug.nl/10.4324/9780203774977-9

Hall, J. A., (1987). Parent-adolescent conflict: an empirical review. *Adolescence,
22(88).*

Horowitz, J. L., & Newcomb, M. D. (2001). A multidimensional approach to
homosexual identity. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42,* 1-19.
http://dx.doi.org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1300/J082v42n02_01

Kerrick, M. R., & Thorne, A., (2014). "So it's like, do you like Jeff a lot or, I
mean…": How Women Friends Interactionally Position Personal Identity
While Conversing About desire. *Emerging Adulthood, 2(4),* 294-303. DOI:
10.1177/2167696814549803

Kinnish, K. K., Strassberg, D. S., & Turner, C. (2005). Sex Differences in the
Flexibility of Sexual Orientation: A Multidimensional Retrospective
Assessment. *Archives of Sexual Behavior,* 34(2), 173-183. DOI:
10.1007/s10508-005-1795-9

Koepke, S., & Denissen, J. A. (2012). Dynamics of identity development and
separation-individuation in parent-child relationships during adolescence and
emerging adulthood – a conceptual integration. *Developmental review,* 32, 67-
88.

Korobov, N., (2010). A discursive psychological approach to positioning. *Qualitative
Research in Psychology, 7,* 263-277. doi:10.1080/ 14780880902822321

Li, Y. (2022, August 15). Coming Out in Interpersonal and Relational Perspectives. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication.* https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.1357

Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Kunnen, S., & van Geert, P. (2010). Adolescent Girls' Perceptions of Daily Conflicts With Their Mothers: Within-Conflict Sequences and Their Relationship to Autonomy. *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 25(4), 527-556. DOI: 10.1177/0743558410367953

Maltempi, H., Yu, Y. J., & Bruna, S. (2024). LGBTQ+ Stigma and Health Effects: A Systematic Review of the Global Literature. *Global Journal of Health Science, 16(5)*. DOI:10.5539/gjhs.v16n6p.

Matthews, C. H., & Salazar, C. F., (2012). An Integrative, Empowerment Model for Helping Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth Negotiate the Coming-Out Process. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 6(2), 96-117. DOI: 10.1080/15538605.2012.678176

McLean, K. C., & Syed, M. U. (2015). *The Oxford handbook of identity development*. Oxford University Press. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199936564.013.016.

Mills, K. W. R., Rehder, P. D., & McCurdy, A. L. (2018). The significance of parenting and parent–child relationships for sexual and gender minority adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *28*(3), 637–649. https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1111/jora.12404

Morris, J. F., Waldo, C. R. & Rothblum, E. D., (2001). A Model of Predictors and Outcomes of Outness Among Lesbian and Bisexual Women. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 71, 61-71. DOI: 10.1037/0002-9432.71.1.61

Noller, P., & Callan, C., (1991). *The adolescent in the family*. Routledge.

Nordquist, R. (2019, 7th september). *What Is a Copular Verb?* ThoughtCo. From: https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-copula-copular-verb-1689934 on March 17th, 2025.

Peräkylä, A. (2011). Validity in Research on Naturally Occurring Social Interaction. In D Silverman (ed.), *Qualitative Research. Third Edition*. (3rd ed.). Sage.

Pistella. J., Salvati, M., Ioverno, S., Laghi, F., Baiocco, R. (2016). Coming-Out to Family Members and Internalized Sexual Stigma in Bisexual, lesbian and Gay People. *Journal of Child & Family Studies,* 25, 3694-3701. DOI: 10.1007/s10826-016-0528-0

Rosario, M., Hunter, J., Maguen, S., Gwadz, M., & Smith, R., (2001). The Coming-Out Process and Its Adaptational and Health-Related Associations Among Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Youths: Stipulation and Exploration of a Model. *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 29(1), 133–160. DOI:10.1023/a:1005205630978.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language,* 50(4), 696-735. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Saltzburg, S., (2004). Learning that an adolescent child is gay or lesbian: the parent experience. *Social work, 49(1),* 109-118.

Savin-Williams, R. C., (2011). Identity Development Among Sexual-Minority Youth. *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research,* 1&2, 671-689. Springer Science + Business Media. http://dx.doi.org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_28

Savin-Williams, R. C., & Dubé, E. M. (1998). Parental Reactions to Their Child's Disclosure of a Gay/Lesbian Identity. *Family Relations,* 47(1), 7-13.

Schachter, E. P., & Ventura, J. J. (2008). Identity agents: Parents as active and reflective participants in their children's identity formation. *Journal of Research on Adolescence,* 18(3), 449–476. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2008.00567.x

Sedgwick, E. K. (1997). Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading; or, You're So Paranoid, You Probably Think This Introduction is About You. *Duke University Press.* https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822382478-001

Tessitore, M., (2023). Factors involved in the decision to disclose one's sexual minority identity to parents: a qualitative study. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The sciences and Engineering,* 84(1-B).

Tucker, C., J., McHale, S., M., & Crouter, A., C. (2003). Conflict Resolution. Links With Adolescents' Family Relationships and Individual Well-being. *Journal of family issues*, 24(6), 715-736. DOI: 10.1177/0192513X03251181

Tyler, T. R., (2015). Our story: The Parent and LGBTQ Child Relational Process. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services,* 27, 17-45. DOI: 10.1080/10538720.2015.988313

Tyler, T. R., & Abetz, J. S. (2020). Relational turning points in the parent and LGBTQ child coming out process. *Journal of Family Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2020.1761863

Vaughan, M. D., & Waehler, C. A. (2010). Coming out growth: Conceptualizing and measuring stress-related growth associated with coming out to others as a sexual minority. *Journal of Adult Development*, 17, 94–109. DOI:10.1007/s10804-009-9084-9

Verb patterns: with and without objects. (2025). In *Cambridge Grammar*. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/verb-patterns-with-and-without-objects

Vogelzang, L. N., Euwema,M. C., & Nauta, A. (1997). You, We and I - Relationships Between Verbal Expressions of Communality and Dyadic Conflict Behavior. *Journal of language and social psychology, 16(4)*, 456-463.

Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (2014). A Discursive Psychological Framework for Analyzing Men and Masculinities. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity,* 15(4), 355-364.

Whyte, R. (2010). *Transitive and Intransitive Verbs*. https://www.eslwriting.org/wp-content/esl-transitive-verbs.pdf

Willig, C., & Rogers, W. (2017). The SAGE Handbook of qualitative research in psychology. (Vols. 1-0). SAGE Publications Ltd, https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526405555

Wolcott, I., & Weston, R., (1994). Keeping the peace: resolving conflict between parents and adolescents. *Family and conciliation courts review, 32(2),* 208-229.