


 Sexualities

Mapping lesbians' everyday community-making in a small city: (in)visibility, belonging and safety.

Journal:	<i>SEXUALITIES</i>
Manuscript ID	SEXU-23-0084.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	lesbian community, belonging, participatory mapping, urban, queer space
Abstract:	<p>This paper presents findings from a project exploring how lesbians make community in the 'ordinary city' of Southampton on the South coast of England. In the context of trans-exclusionary debates and the supposed demise of lesbian spaces, we sought to discover how self-identified lesbian people in Southampton conceptualised the location and boundaries of their community. The study used collaborative participatory mapping techniques, which resulted in a diffuse and multi-layered understanding of lesbian community in the city. The paper focuses on three key themes: (1) crafting 'safe' spaces; (2) terminology: naming 'lesbians' and (3) finding and creating places of community. The paper concludes that finding a space to articulate an explicitly lesbian identity can be fraught, but is deeply valued, continually becoming, and carefully negotiated both between peers and within urban space. Collaborative mapping is shown as a valuable tool in delivering more inclusive participatory research that can help foster transformative and emancipatory research into LGBTQ communities and spaces.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Abstract

This paper presents findings from a project exploring how lesbians make community in the 'ordinary city' of Southampton on the South coast of England. In the context of trans-exclusionary debates and the supposed demise of lesbian spaces, we sought to discover how self-identified lesbian people in Southampton conceptualised the location and boundaries of their community. The study used collaborative participatory mapping techniques, which resulted in a diffuse and multi-layered understanding of lesbian community in the city. The paper focuses on three key themes: (1) crafting 'safe' spaces; (2) terminology: naming 'lesbians' and (3) finding and creating places of community. The paper concludes that finding a space to articulate an explicitly lesbian identity can be fraught, but is deeply valued, continually becoming, and carefully negotiated both between peers and within urban space. Collaborative mapping is shown as a valuable tool in delivering more inclusive participatory research that can help foster transformative and emancipatory research into LGBTQ communities and spaces.

Keywords

Lesbian, community; urban; queer space; participatory mapping; belonging;

Mapping lesbians' everyday community-making in a small city: (in)visibility, belonging and safety.

Introduction

There has been wide-ranging research into LGBTQ life in large global cities but far less attention has been paid to how LGBTQ people construct communities in 'ordinary cities'. That is, cities which are not renowned for their LGBTQ scenes or regarded as a place where LGBTQ people would typically migrate to find belonging or LGBTQ community. Likewise, work on lesbian experience is still relatively scarce, with most academic work emphasising gay men's lives, or LGBTQ communities more broadly, resulting in the specificities of lesbian life, connections to space and practices of community formation being subsumed or overlooked (though the past three decades have seen the emergence of studies seeking to put lesbian lives on the map, see Browne 2021 and Valentine 2000 for an overview). Our research considers lesbian experiences of Southampton; a relatively small city on the South coast of England, home to two Universities with a student population of 43,000 (Southampton Data Observatory, 2023) and a total population of just under 250,000 (ONS, 2022). In many ways Southampton's LGBTQ scene is typical of other small cities and large towns across England, with a recently (in 2016) established Pride and a limited LGBTQ scene centred on one pub, one club, and one community performance and arts space. Census data suggests that 4.93% of the population of Southampton describe their sexuality something other than heterosexual which is higher than the proportion for England as a whole (3.17%) (ONS, 2023). Southampton's proximity and transport links to Brighton and Hove (the 'gay capital of the UK', Browne and Bakshi, 2011: 180) and London mean LGBTQ residents have access to diverse leisure and dating scenes outside the city, which could result in a reduced investment in building LGBTQ community in Southampton. Previous research on lesbian lives in small towns has found that a fragmented community and few or no lesbian-only spaces are not automatically barriers to a sense of belonging, acceptance, and perceptions of safety (Browne, 2008; Brown-Saracino, 2011; 2017). However, lesbian people remain at greater risk of isolation than straight women or gay men (Ellis, 2007; McLaren, 2009) and consistently report lower levels of

1
2
3 happiness and life satisfaction compared to their straight peers (Southampton Data Observatory,
4 2021). In the context of trans-exclusionary debates in Britain over the meaning of lesbian, the right to
5 lesbian spaces, and sensationalised stories around the demise of lesbian spaces (Foeken and Roberts,
6 2019; Held, 2015; Nash, 2011; Rossiter, 2016; Walker, 2009), we sought to discover how self-identified
7 lesbian people in Southampton conceptualised the location and boundaries of their community, what
8 their experiences of belonging (or exclusion) were, and how safety in the city was resultingly framed.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Early studies in LGBT urbanism built upon the foundational work of Weston (1995) who had
18 highlighted the migratory desires of lesbian and gay people towards the gay enclaves of large
19 metropolitan cities. Much existing UK research has focused on the construction of LGBTQ community
20 via the formation of 'gay villages' in London, Brighton and Hove and Manchester, including by people
21 drawn to these LGBTQ hubs from towns and cities around the country (Binnie and Skeggs, 2004;
22 Browne and Bakshi, 2011; Rooke, 2007; Skeggs, 1999). However, an expanded epistemological focus
23 beyond the hyper-visible gay villages of a few 'grand cities' in the global north is required in order to
24 better understand the complexities and variations of LGBTQ life. Subsequently, a rich and diverse body
25 of work has significantly advanced studies into the geographies of LGBTQ life through examinations of
26 how queer lives take place and make place in so-called 'ordinary cities' (Brown, 2008; Brown-Sarcanio
27 2015; Forstie, 2020a; Myrdahl, 2013; Stone, 2018) and in cities in the Global South (Ombagi, 2023;
28 Holland-Muter, 2019; Tucker, 2023; Khuzwayo, 2023). This work highlights how queer life emerges in
29 a multitude of sites beyond the marked 'gay village': looking at diffuse queer networks beyond the
30 metropolitan centre (Tongson, 2011). These advancements have helped challenge hierarchal
31 constructions of margins/periphery, and rigid delineations between sites of inclusion/exclusion. This
32 scholarship is particularly pertinent to studying lesbian geographies, with Podmore's (2006, 2016)
33 work on lesbian urbanisms highlighting the subtle geographic differences between the spatialities of
34 community formations of lesbians and gay men. Specifically, that the hyper-visible commodified gay
35 village may not necessarily be fully inclusive of lesbian subjectivities, and lesbian place-making may
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 take place through diffuse networks, and shifting relational geographies (see Ghaziani, 2015; Nash &
4
5 Gorman-Murray, 2015; Rothenberg, 1995).
6
7

8 Our paper contributes to this wider body of scholarship on lesbian lives; we are interested in exploring
9
10 how lesbians make place and find community in an 'ordinary city' where there are few visible
11
12 designated or permanent lesbian spaces. While large cities may offer a degree of anonymity or
13
14 'indifference' where 'being gay is ordinary' (Rooke, 2007: 248), Southampton has no 'gay village' to
15
16 research, nor is there a geographically specific hub where LGBT life in the city might cluster. While
17
18 visitors to Brighton and Hove, London, or Manchester can pick up maps in most tourist information
19
20 venues to guide them to and through the 'gay village', Southampton's sparse community spaces, and
21
22 limited social spaces for LGBTQ people mean it is a city which has to be worked at. LGBTQ community
23
24 life is often understood through an element of visibility, of being visible to one another via the public
25
26 display of intimacy, certain aesthetics, recognition of a shared look, or the declaration of identity in a
27
28 'coming out' (Brown-Saracino, 2011; 2017; Formby, 2017; Held, 2015). These individualised acts are
29
30 imagined as the declarative ticket which opens the door to a welcoming, established and above all
31
32 concrete community of other LGBTQ people (see Homfray, 2007 for example) although much work
33
34 calls into question the utopianism of such conceptualisations (Brown and Bakshi, 2011; Weston, 1995;
35
36 Held, 2015). Yet without a visible gay village to step into, how do lesbian people in Southampton move
37
38 from 'invisible' and individualised positions to shared and 'visible' spaces with other lesbian people?
39
40
41
42
43

44 Alison Rooke has noted that sexuality is not only expressed during special outings to hubs of LGBTQ
45
46 life but is 'found in routine movement through space' (2007: 233). In our research we sought to
47
48 examine the routine movement which produces a "personalised, yet shared, matrix of attributes and
49
50 relations" (Mason, 2001: 29) that shape the experience of Southampton for lesbian people. We looked
51
52 to the ways spaces were identified by lesbian people as 'for' them, spaces in which a sense of
53
54 belonging was felt, and how these cumulatively produced a belief in a tangible community of or for
55
56 lesbians in Southampton. Noting the impossibility of specifying what constitutes a 'true' experience
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of belonging or 'authentic' lesbian space, we refer to the 'individual experiences, perceptions and
4 attachments to places' (Valentine, 1993: 114) as a way to understand the intertwined strands of space,
5 belonging, and community. We sought to identify lesbian spaces and events in expert interviews and
6 through a collaborative mapping of the city with lesbian people. In so doing, we recorded the process
7 by which lesbian spaces and communities in the city may become shared and visible.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Methodology**

16
17
18 The project took place in 2022 and engaged lesbian people living within 45 minutes travel of
19 Southampton, organisers of social groups aimed at lesbian people in the city, and business owners
20 who offer space to lesbian events, groups, or otherwise identify themselves as LGBTQ+ friendly or
21 welcoming. We hosted 3 discussion events (2 offline in city centre venues, 1 online on Zoom) with
22 between 2 and 7 self-identified lesbian people at each event (12 in total). Discussion event participants
23 were recruited through personal networks of the research team, posters placed in city centre venues
24 which were open to or welcoming of LGBTQ people, via public posts on the PI's social media accounts,
25 and in local community Facebook groups (including both LGBTQ or lesbian specific groups, and general
26 interest groups). As such, lesbian people who had not managed to identify entry points to any sort of
27 community engagement were likely not reached by this recruitment strategy and are not represented
28 in the findings which follow.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Noting the impossibility of either drawing clear lines around a definition of lesbian, the historical and
44 political contestations over the term lesbian which may exclude people who fear they are not lesbian
45 'enough' (Megarry et al, 2022; Taylor, 2007; Vaccaro, 2009; X, 2017), and the problems which can
46 come from being unable to identify what frame participants may be drawing on when identifying
47 themselves as lesbian (Weston, 2009), we offered a description of lesbian which clarified who was
48 being invited to participate. Drawn from Campbell X's 'lesbian nation' (2017) it includes all women,
49 trans and cis, who describe themselves as lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, queer or otherwise non-
50 heterosexual, and trans and/or non-binary, genderqueer, or genderfluid people who describe
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 themselves as lesbian. During recruitment for the project, a small number of people responded to the
4
5 PI's social media posts complaining that the definition of lesbian offered was 'meaningless' or
6
7 'offensive'. In the current climate, this response was not unexpected. It is likely that people who
8
9 subscribe to a biological essentialist view of womanhood, or a trans-exclusionary definition of lesbian,
10
11 were alienated by this framing and chose not to participate in the study.
12
13

14
15 Concurrently with running discussion events, we invited business owners and community organisers
16
17 to participate in one-to-one semi-structured interviews. We identified potential respondents for these
18
19 interviews through a combination of systematic exploration of businesses and groups advertised in
20
21 and around Southampton as for (or welcoming of) lesbian people and contacting venues identified by
22
23 participants. In total, we identified 13 potential venues or groups and contacted them in-person and
24
25 via email. We secured 5 expert interviews; 2 interviews were with individuals who organised 2
26
27 different lesbian social groups in the city, and 3 interviews were with owners or representatives of
28
29 businesses in the city (a book shop, a performance and art space, and a coffee shop). There are two
30
31 explicitly LGBTQ-focused venues in the city (a club and a pub) but neither responded to our invitations
32
33 to participate. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim.
34
35
36
37

38 Following ethical approval from our institution's ethics board, all participants and respondents were
39
40 given information sheets and invited to ask questions before being asked to sign consent forms.
41
42 Discussion event participants were then invited to complete a short survey on their age, gender,
43
44 ethnicity, sexuality, caring responsibilities, employment status, relationship status, where they lived,
45
46 as well as which venues in the city they had visited in the last 3 years. A brief overview of discussion
47
48 group participant demographics is presented in table 1. We asked participants to select all answers
49
50 which applied. For some this meant overlapping answers describing their situation (e.g. not in a
51
52 relationship, looking for a relationship) while others chose to give us single checked options for
53
54 questions (living with partner, but no information on whether this was a long or short term
55
56 relationship)
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **[insert table 1 about here]**
4
5

6 The PI's personal experience as an attendee of lesbian social events in the city, and the city's wider
7 demographics suggest this sample has some clear omissions: most particularly of lesbians who were
8 older, unemployed, and Black, Asian, mixed or from other ethnic groups. While Southampton is a
9 predominately white city (81%, ONS, 2022) the PIs personal experience points to a more racially
10 diverse lesbian scene than this sample reflects. This does not mean racist exclusions and
11 marginalisation do not exist on this scene, rather large cities such as London and Brighton have venue
12 capacity and LGBTQ population density to offer exclusive spaces for Black, Asian or mixed lesbians,
13 something Southampton lacks. The PI used their regular attendance at in-person lesbian social events
14 as an opportunity to share the call for participants. During one of these events, the PIs mention of the
15 study prompted an extended discussion amongst a group of older lesbians on lost lesbian spaces
16 across the South and historic experiences of discrimination. Yet these generational experiences of
17 exclusion and changing orientations to the city were simply not replicated in the discussion events and
18 this is a notable limitation in the findings which follow. The demographics of the research team (all
19 white and under 50) and the project being identified as a university research project (rather than one
20 emerging from peer-led community organisations) are likely factors in this underrepresentation. The
21 short timeframe of funded data collection (3 months) also impacted on accessing people who had
22 restricted availability or irregular working hours. We note, below, the implications this has for
23 understanding these data.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Mapping was selected for this project following the format of the 'safety map' by Kate Shields (2016):
47 following Mason (2001), this installation 'crowdsourced' knowledge and captured previously
48 unreported experiences of hate crime in Brighton and Hove. In our discussion events, participants
49 were presented with a map of Southampton and invited to annotate it using coloured post-it notes,
50 stickers, pens and highlighters. For Zoom events the map was presented via Jamboard, and in hard
51 format (on an A1 sheet) for the in-person events. Focusing on more than just experiences of hate
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 crime, we arranged prompt cards around tables (or displayed on an image shared to all participants
4 in the Zoom) which asked participants to reflect on: safety; activities; access; lesbians (or your
5 community); pandemic; and anything else. These written prompts were developed from the core
6 debates we identified in the literature (above) regarding the production of community, belonging,
7 safety and shared space, and were supplemented with verbal prompts and encouragement from the
8 group facilitators as participants began to add material to the maps. We found that in in-person events
9 participants were initially hesitant to write down or 'fix' their comments on the maps, uncertain as to
10 what type of responses were welcome. Providing written prompts allowed time for silence, reflection
11 and thinking, while the physical interaction with pens and stickers provided objects with which
12 participants could engage while they felt out the expectations of the event and translated personal
13 experience to a written note or verbal comment. This time also supported the building of rapport and
14 comfort in the discussion event venue as participants were free to eat and drink, sit apart from others,
15 or ask facilitators questions before engaging with the map, or other participants. This transition from
16 quiet reflection to group discussion was more challenging on Zoom. One particular issue was that
17 speaking and questioning was automatically an engagement with everyone in the group as it was
18 broadcast through Zoom: this inhibited how conversation flowed and produced a sometimes
19 facilitator-dominated discussion. Participants seemed to look to us to invite specific people to respond
20 and to determine in what order people should speak, without being able to rely on the implicit social
21 cues possible in-person (a common issue when conducting any sort of online discussion event). In
22 addition to the annotated maps, data was collected through field notes made by facilitators which
23 noted elements of discussion which stood out and their impressions of what participants wanted to
24 emphasise. Maps and mapping have a long and varied history which includes violent domination, the
25 imposition of concrete boundaries, imaginative shaping of space, and the production of guide maps
26 which sit outside of stable geographic contexts (Anderson, 2006: 164, 171, 185; Rooke, 2007: 233).
27 Our methodology was inspired by work around participatory collaborative mapping and counter-
28 cartographies, which seek to centre the voices of marginalized communities in order to disrupt and
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 queer dominant maps, borders and boundaries (Ferreira & Salvador, 2014). The collaborative mapping
4 provided space for participants to chart their complex relationships to urban space and lesbian
5 community formation, opening-up the study into a variety of complex and diffuse sites across the city.
6
7
8
9
10 Our methodology responds to Rooke's call to imagine cities in ways which encompass "the lived,
11 perceived and conceived urban spaces and spatiality of queer lives" (2007: 233). Rooke notes the gay
12 village is "a visible and material expression of lesbian and gay cultures" but that alongside these clearly
13 demarcated areas, another gay city exists, one that through everyday interaction, movements and
14 norms, shapes how "lesbian and gay individuals comport themselves in...social and cultural spaces"
15 (2007: 233). Interaction with the map acted as a proxy for movement around the city; we could
16 observe the processes by which individuals share their everyday movements and collaboratively
17 produce public spaces as 'lesbian' from the undifferentiated heterosexual space of the city. The
18 method also made visible the 'safety mapping' of social and physical environments which lesbian and
19 gay people continually undertake in public space (Mason, 2001: 32): we witnessed the sometimes-
20 difficult collaborative and negotiated process of finding and defining community and of determining
21 and agreeing the characteristics of a 'safe' space. Our expert interviews focused on uncovering the
22 way organisers and owners of clearly demarcated lesbian events or LGBTQ-friendly venues regarded
23 their role in the shaping or support of lesbian community, and who they understood as participants in
24 such a community. Jointly, this data allowed us insight into how respondents and participants imagine
25 – or map – the lesbian city and the community which [may] emerge in and through it. We do not claim
26 that the maps produced in this study represent a stable, coherent or authoritative version of lesbian
27 life in the city, rather they retain the valuable subjective, affective and evolving experience of a group
28 of lesbian people collaboratively recounting the city. In particular, we note that the lack of Black, Asian
29 and mixed-race participants in the study risks re-embedding the racialised exclusions which so many
30 queer spaces still uphold (c.f. Held, 2015 and McCormich and Barthelemy, 2021).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To analyse and synthesise the data produced from discussion events and interviews, the research
4 team used an inductive approach. Beginning with discussion and reflection on the elements of the
5 data which stood out to each of us, we talked through our interpretations of specific elements and
6 overarching impressions of the data as a whole. We paid particular attention to the multi-layered and
7 contested meanings of city spaces and lesbian belonging by examining the contributions made by
8 discussion participants against the intentions and beliefs about events, spaces and community
9 membership reported by the interview respondents who curated them.

10
11 Reflecting on the city through maps was a collaborative process between participants and facilitators,
12 driven by the recounting of affective relations to the city spaces. The synthesis of data produced in
13 discussion events and interviews continued this interpretative and iterative co-production of
14 knowledge about space, belonging, and community. We built a thematic map from the material we
15 identified as significant. Here we report the findings from three key themes: (1) crafting 'safe' spaces;
16 (2) terminology: naming 'lesbians'; and (3) finding and creating places of community. These findings
17 represent our ongoing participation in a process of collaborative imagining, and making visible, of the
18 city as a site of community and locus of belonging, as it exists for [some] lesbian people.

19 Findings

20 *Creating 'Safe' Spaces: External Threats and Homophobia*

21
22 One of the topics that was repeated across our discussion groups and interviews was the need for
23 lesbian spaces that felt 'safe'. The process of evaluation and categorisation which produces spaces as
24 safe is common to minoritized and victimised groups. Participants in our study readily labelled
25 particular venues and general areas of the city as 'safe' or 'unsafe' indicating this as their primary
26 orientation to space. Participants mapped personally significant places on the map – including 'my
27 house' – as locations which provided safety and space for intimacy and stability. Homes offer private,
28 sustaining spaces which hold transformative potential, as well as being sites of everyday, ordinary
29 existence and belonging (Blunt and Dowling, 2006; Gorman-Murray, 2017; Pilkey, 2014). Facilitators

1
2
3 then directed participants to discussion of their feelings around public space, and the movement
4
5 outwards to shared space. For our participants, stepping outside of the boundaries of home was a
6
7 sometimes a stark transition to 'unsafe' public space. Participants spoke about a sense of hyper-
8
9 visibility and vulnerability when walking along roads in their suburban neighbourhoods whilst holding
10
11 hands with a same-sex partner. Fearing homophobic recriminations could follow them home to their
12
13 front door, they preferred to travel into the city centre before relaxing into public displays of affection.
14
15 These accounts point to a "sense of difference" in participants' everyday lives where decisions about
16
17 practices of intimacy are carefully regulated according to the geographical space (Formby, 2017:71).
18
19 The anonymity of the city centre produced this space as 'safe'. Through experience and repetition, it
20
21 was identified as the [only] public place in which community can reliably be 'done' (Formby, 2017: 72,
22
23 80)
24
25
26

27
28 However, the divisions of safe and unsafe space were not simply patterned across anonymity and
29
30 visibility; when making evaluations about which public venues were safe participants often sought to
31
32 identify who owned or operated spaces around the city. in common with Skeggs' (1999) work on
33
34 Manchester's gay village, safety and belonging were determined following scrutiny of the operators
35
36 and uses of a space, rather than a simple designation of a space as 'for' LGBTQ people. While
37
38 anonymity offered safety in some locations, identifiable venue owners and event organisers who
39
40 could be relied upon to act to protect known (lesbian) patrons from homophobic threats and
41
42 heterosexualised aggression were actively sought out and celebrated by participants for ensuring
43
44 spaces *remained* safe. Safe space was therefore seen as something that had to be worked at and
45
46 constantly reproduced. As already noted, participants were exclusively white; Held (2017) and Gibson
47
48 and MacLeod (2012) amongst others have written about the exclusion and vulnerability resulting from
49
50 refusal of recognition for Black, Asian and mixed-race lesbians owing to a norm of whiteness
51
52 characterising what a lesbian 'looks like'. Recognising other patrons, and venue and event owners as
53
54 'like us' and/or explicitly LGBTQ-identified draws on implicit markers of sameness judged through
55
56 appearance and, in some cases, politics (see following section). Furthermore, spatial imaginaries of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 safe/unsafe areas are often framed via racist constructions of white safety and Black/brown danger
4
5 (see Holland-Muter, 2023 for a discussion of how this is resisted by Black lesbians in Cape Town). In
6
7 discussion events, no participants explicitly spoke of race and racism: these silences point to how
8
9 safety was evaluated solely through a personal lens, without reflection on the intrinsic protections
10
11 whiteness may offer in navigating these spaces.
12
13

14
15 As Browne (2008) has argued, urban environments have been oversimplified as universally safe(er)
16
17 for queers, but strategies of safety, including being known by LGBTQ people in a specific location and
18
19 sustaining intimate community, remain constant across urban and rural environments.
20
21 Southampton's small size (precluding the possibility of finding a venue which would, for example,
22
23 allow for anonymity) and limited range of venues seemed to be a factor in prompting people to engage
24
25 with spaces they felt were not consistently 'safe'. For example, as more venues were mapped,
26
27 conversation began to centre on the city's gay-owned LGBTQ pub and club, sites which all participants
28
29 were aware of, and most had visited. A handful of participants described them as attracting
30
31 heterosexual stag and hen parties resulting in what they termed an 'aggressive' and 'violent'
32
33 atmosphere and acting as a lightning rod for people wishing to target LGBTQ people for violence and
34
35 harassment. This is in common with research on other UK cities with small gay scenes, such as
36
37 Newcastle, where queered sites are 'reduced and compromised' by incursions from heterosexual
38
39 patrons, resulting in compromised feelings of safety for lesbian people (Casey, 2004: 457). Other
40
41 research has similarly found that branding of gay bars and clubs as 'for all' and offering consumption
42
43 of a cosmopolitan sexual otherness compromises safety and security of non-heterosexual people and
44
45 undermines a sense of community (Binnie and Skeggs, 2004; Branton and Compton, 2021). Economic
46
47 pressures of operating a gay-only venue in a city with a small LGBTQ population would point to
48
49 possible reasons for choosing to brand these venues, as the club puts it on their social media pages,
50
51 as for 'the gay community & their friends', rather than enforcing an exclusive door policy. In the
52
53 intersection between maintaining a LGBTQ-only space which can enable non-heterosexual community
54
55 ties in a space of safety from homophobic violence, and door policies needed to ensure financial
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 viability of a venue, lesbian people in Southampton face a contracted choice of social space.
4
5 Participants' continued patronage of these spaces despite misgivings about safety and experiences of
6
7 hostility can be understood as asserting a claim to Southampton as an everyday space of belonging
8
9 for lesbian people, and a divestment from an 'urban utopia' (Browne, 2008: 30) of anonymous queer
10
11 life which might be accessed in nearby Brighton and Hove. Ultimately, this was a decision made by
12
13 weighing the risks and benefits of engaging with imperfect spaces; further research is needed to
14
15 understand the manner in which Black, Asian and mixed-race lesbian people navigate these spaces
16
17 given the ways in which many queer spaces continue to uphold racialised hierarchies.
18
19

20
21 In discussion groups, subjective experiences of fear, discomfort and marginalisation in ostensibly
22
23 LGBTQ-friendly venues became the dominant account of what these spaces meant, with participants
24
25 who had previously had positive experiences there deferring to the emotive accounts of those who
26
27 had had negative experiences, asking where the injured parties would instead recommend going to
28
29 socialise. We also heard, in expert interviews, how organisers' similarly negative personal experiences
30
31 of such venues prompted them to seek out and negotiate protected access to venues in the city which
32
33 had not historically hosted or identified themselves as LGBTQ friendly. In one case, organisers of a
34
35 lesbian social group reported negotiating a change in staffing and door policies with a bar venue's
36
37 management in order to provide reassurance to attendees of their safety. In discussion groups, a
38
39 number of participants placed stickers on the map flagging this venue and identifying it as 'safe' or
40
41 'friendly'. Eleanor Formby (2020: 7) argues that space and intimacy are intertwined: repeated
42
43 practices of intimacy produce spaces as safe, while belief in a space as 'safe' creates the conditions
44
45 necessary for sexual minority people to engage in practices of intimacy. This seemed to hold true for
46
47 the discussions and processes of evaluating spaces which we captured in this project; despite explicit
48
49 statements from participants that their choices of venue were informed by pre-existing conditions of
50
51 safety or a sense of belonging, the above example demonstrates the degree to which the choice of
52
53 venues and designation of them as 'safe' or 'community focused' by participants was primarily a
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consequence of the knowledge shared about them and subjective experience of repeated belonging
4 and community intimacies, rather than any objective material conditions of these locations.
5
6
7

8 ***Naming 'lesbians': Exclusion, Not Belonging and Division***

9

10
11 Participants gave accounts of stepping into unknown places without knowing if they would be
12 welcome, with people they did not know if they could trust, in the hope of fulfilling a deeply felt
13 longing for connection and belonging. While anxiety of exclusion was particularly stark for participants
14 who identified themselves as gender non-conforming or non-binary, women in the research also
15 expressed fears of lacking legitimacy in lesbian space. Language emerged as a key point of orientation
16 in navigating this vulnerability: participants reported using 'lesbian' as a way to find where they might
17 fit but also expressed considerable anxiety about their legitimacy to claim membership in such spaces.
18 The reasons cited for this anxiety were wide ranging and included having recently come out, not
19 having lesbian friends, or feeling uncertain about the social expectations of lesbian events or venues.
20 Some participants discussed their feeling that limited LGBTQ venues in the city only offered space for
21 young people, people who drank, and people who were happy to be in mixed (variously: not women
22 only, not lesbian only, or not LGBTQ only) spaces. Other participants were concerned they would not
23 be welcome at lesbian events having only recently identified themselves in that way or anticipating
24 that other attendees would already know one another. Discussion group participants spoke about
25 looking for cultural cues – and clues – to evaluate who was the intended or expected patron of an
26 event or venue marked as 'for' lesbian people, in the hope of confirming they would be welcomed to
27 the space or event. At the heart of this, there was an apparent awareness of the polysemic nature of
28 'lesbian'. As one participant reflected: 'lesbian may not mean the same thing to me as to you'. Indeed,
29 the demographic data we gathered confirmed the heterogeneity of a group who might otherwise
30 appear homogenous; all but one participant used the word lesbian to describe their sexuality, but
31 additional terms were significant and indicate the additive, rather than exclusive, nature of identity or
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sexuality labelsⁱ. Similarly, 11 out of 12 participants used 'woman' to describe their gender, but again
4
5 additional terms (including genderqueer and non-binary) had salience.
6
7

8 Language in this project is and was slippery. During data collection there were some moments of
9
10 discomfort and difficulty as people identified language with which they felt comfortable or
11
12 uncomfortable. Participants discussed the meanings of words including queer, dyke, and lesbian;
13
14 there was no consensus on the meaning or value of these and an enormous amount of social, political
15
16 and personal weight accompanied all the reflections we heard. One participant suggested their
17
18 previous use of 'queer' rather than 'lesbian' as a descriptor for themselves was 'cowardly' because
19
20 they sought to sidestep what they perceived as negative associations with the word lesbian rather
21
22 than confronting and rejecting them. Participants generally agreed that 'lesbian' was a word which
23
24 had been used to attack or shame them with connotations of, as one participant summarised it: being
25
26 'fat, ugly, man hating'. Despite this, they retained a clear affiliation with it. In expert interviews, we
27
28 heard how carefully 'lesbian' had been considered by event organisers and what they hoped this
29
30 would convey about who was welcome. One lesbian social event organiser spoke about attempting to
31
32 make their criteria explicit without inadvertently gatekeeping or excluding people they have not met
33
34 or imagined: 'my idea of what they are could be quite different, so...it's for you to answer...it's for you
35
36 to feel like it's your space'. In another expert interview, respondents lamented this lack of specificity
37
38 saying: 'it wasn't clear if it was trans or queer inclusive, it was very much 'this is for lesbians, this is for
39
40 women, this is for women who are lesbians''. In response, they chose the word 'sapphic' as their
41
42 group's descriptor. They explained their decision thusly:
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 we wanted to make it very clear that it was open because the last thing you wanna do when
50
51 you're nervous about going and joining a group is having to go 'excuse me am I allowed to
52
53 come and join the group?' so we wanted to make it as easy to understand as possible and as
54
55 open as possible.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Despite the best intentions of these organisers, for many of our participants the term 'sapphic' did not
4 deliver the clarity which 'lesbian' was alleged to lack. In discussion groups, two people labelled the
5 location of the sapphic group's meet ups and were met with extensive queries on what this meant,
6 who it was for, and why 'sapphic' was different than lesbian. In their response, these participants
7 placed emphasis on the inclusion of people with diverse gender identities. From here discussion
8 continued as some participants expressed a lack of knowledge on trans and non-binary identities and
9 how this relates to lesbian and LGBTQ spaces more generally. We witnessed sometimes tense but
10 typically careful, open conversation between participants who appeared to work hard to create space
11 for understanding, reflecting as they did on how varied the people gathered under the term 'lesbian'
12 might be.
13
14

15
16 Current media and political discourse around lesbian identity and women-only spaces is characterised
17 by sensationalised debates over trans women's legitimacy and access to spaces (Hines, 2020; Rossiter,
18 2016; Walker, 2009) and dichotomous framings of 'lesbian women' versus 'queer people' (Megarry et
19 al 2022), with a narrative that lesbian space is under threat. Following some hostile responses to
20 project recruitment online, we anticipated the possibility of a repeat of such claims to authority over
21 the meaning of lesbian; in discussion events however, this did *not* materialise. Rather, participants
22 seemed to be tentatively seeking confirmation of their own legitimacy inside 'lesbian' and identifying
23 who was claiming that space alongside them. Thus, while some research – and discourse – claims that
24 it is the demise of the term 'lesbian' which is driving the loss of lesbian space (Forstie, 2020b; Megarry
25 et al 2022), the findings of this project do not support this. While some participants identified beyond
26 'lesbian' as a primary term or used other terms in addition, the word lesbian *was* central in their
27 orientations to community and identifying spaces which might be safe and welcoming. The
28 participants in our study rejected understandings of lesbian as something with hard boundaries. It is
29 beyond the scope of the project to understand whether the heightened online discourse regarding
30 women's spaces, definitions of lesbian, and trans lives, is not reflective of everyday, co-present
31 interactions but, in the discussions we observed, the everyday experience of identity and belonging
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was more fluid and open to reworking and contestation. However, discussions on the inclusivity of
4
5 'lesbian' or 'sapphic' pointed to the impossibility of labelling a space or event in a way which does not
6
7 appear to, or is not felt to, fix participation to a particular group or exclude others. Although this
8
9 finding is likely informed by the definition offered in our recruitment material and the participants we
10
11 then attracted, it is worth noting that this framing appeared to resonate with the participants and
12
13 respondents who articulated a wish to retain the word lesbian as a descriptor of identity *and* allow it
14
15 to be a broad umbrella under which people could find the community and affiliation. The discussions
16
17 we witnessed, and the care and anxiety expressed by participants to understand meanings of lesbian
18
19 as they were felt by others, suggest that the question of what lesbian means is far from settled. Lesbian
20
21 community was thus characterised by tentative belonging, contested authority, and competing
22
23 discourses of legitimacy which participants were largely uncertain of their right to claim. Despite this
24
25 uncertainty, a desire for belonging drove a continued investment in and orientation to the category
26
27 of lesbian and we saw this during discussion events in the process of reflection on the term.
28
29
30
31
32

33 ***Finding Places of Community: Lesbian In-Jokes and Shared Knowledge***

34
35
36 In light of the changes to socialising and normalisation of online event attendance brought about by
37
38 COVID-19 lockdowns in the UK during 2020 and 2021, we included prompts in discussion groups aimed
39
40 at understanding how online resources and spaces contributed to a sense of community. The hesitant
41
42 and uneven flow of discussion in our online events was consistent with the lower preference all
43
44 participants indicated for online socialising and event attendance. Expert interview respondents
45
46 corroborated this impression with respondents reporting a significant drop-off in engagement with
47
48 online platforms including Facebook groups, Discord and online-streamed events during 2022
49
50 compared to a 2020 peak. With the exception of one participant, all discussion group participants
51
52 identified offline spaces as the primary location for their social and cultural lives. While online spaces
53
54 and groups were used by all our participants to varying degrees during the pandemic to maintain a
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sometimes thread-like connection to self-identified community, they were generally discarded once
4
5 restrictions on face-to-face meeting were lifted.
6
7

8 We questioned participants on why in-person interaction was more desirable than online interactions.
9
10 Participants repeatedly spoke about pursuing friendships, seeking opportunities to engage in varied
11
12 activities with other lesbians, having opportunities to engage in unstructured conversation, seeing
13
14 other lesbians and being seen by them, and sharing cultural knowledge - such as which barbers could
15
16 be relied upon to be welcoming of people who do not present as men or which pubs had a 'queer'
17
18 clientele. The value placed on this intra-cultural knowledge was clear in the data collection process.
19
20 Interview respondents questioned us on what we had learnt so far and made emphatic requests to
21
22 receive our findings at the end of the project. In discussion events, participants switched from labelling
23
24 the maps with spaces personally significant to them, to questioning one another on the venues they
25
26 identified and exchanging tips on where lesbian community might be found. The conversation here
27
28 moved to sharing of acknowledged intimate, subjective experiences of space and a flexible sub-
29
30 cultural knowledge accrued across lifetimes. This was exemplified in the first discussion event where
31
32 one participant labelled Ikea on the map, providing no further detail (see fig 1); other participants
33
34 queried its significance to lesbian community and experience in the city. The participant explained
35
36 that shortly after moving to Southampton she and her partner went to shop for furniture for their
37
38 shared home and argued over interior design choices. This was, participants jokingly agreed, a rite of
39
40 passage for any serious relationship and part of a lesbian habitus encompassing domestic concerns
41
42 and publicly visible relationships. Ikea became a cultural touchstone for the rest of the event; a shared
43
44 in-joke acting as shorthand for the trajectory of lesbian relationships, intimacy, practicality, and
45
46 oftentimes the wished for 'achievement' of lesbian community: a committed intimate relationship
47
48 which could withstand a quarrel in a furniture store. Another participant took stickers and placed
49
50 hearts on the map in places they had first met and first kissed their partner. There was no suggestion
51
52 these places had significance beyond their personal relationship story, but they offered something of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the texture of the city as a multi-layered space of experience, individual biography, and intimacy.

4
5 **[insert figure 1 around here]**
6
7

8 At the end of the in-person discussion groups, participants drifted slowly away from the tables we had
9 laid out the maps on but continued talking, swapping contact details, and using map apps on their
10 phones to record specific places which had been talked about. They referred back to discussion of
11 Ikea, joking they would see each other there later, or even suggesting they might swing by that
12 afternoon to see if they could meet some lesbians. In-person, this process spilled readily beyond the
13 bounds of the discussion event, but the clear 'end' of the Zoom discussion curtailed possibilities for
14 participants to continue conversations or follow up with questions about specific events or venues.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In the course of this project, it seemed that it was in the back and forth between lesbian-identified
25 people, through the sharing experience, and certainly through laughter anchored on in-jokes that a
26 sense of community and feeling of belonging emerged. We found this was an organic, boisterous and
27 sometimes starkly vulnerable process (as participants shared stories of fear and violence) which was
28 less available via digital technologies because of the more tightly controlled temporal boundaries of
29 communication and the material conditions of video conferencing. Specifically, its attendant missing
30 social cues and additional cognitive demand (resulting in what is colloquially referred to as Zoom
31 fatigue; Ramachandran, 2021) which make unstructured conversation more challenging to achieve.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
Temporary online spaces of the sort created by Zoom events obstructed ongoing conversations,
reduced opportunities for mutual recognition, and failed to designate a distinct space as a place in
which lesbians could be found in future. This may point to one of many inequalities in access to
belonging and community given financial, temporal and health resources all contribute to the
accessibility of physical spaces and events held therein.

The architecture of online spaces did not appear to facilitate the same opportunities for intimacy or
mutual recognition which participant responses identified as the central function of community. What
digital technologies did offer, was a way to resource access to events and scope out spaces before

1
2
3 physically visiting them. Apps and online platforms were spoken about as a means to an end, tools
4 such as Facebook events and Google maps were used to orientate participants to in-person spaces
5
6 such as Facebook events and Google maps were used to orientate participants to in-person spaces
7
8 and events which allowed for the building of emotional, social, lasting bonds which were imagined to
9
10 cover all areas of life. While online interactions were deemed valuable – including the wider
11
12 accessibility of events or performances when they are live streamed – they represented ways to ‘keep
13
14 in touch’ and maintain continuity of contact, rather than the goal or primary location of community
15
16 belonging.

17 18 19 **Conclusions**

20
21
22 This study set out to explore how lesbians make community in an ‘ordinary city’: a city without a gay
23
24 village, and few fixed spaces that are designated as lesbian. Our use of participatory collaborative
25
26 mapping helped produce a diffuse and multi-layered understanding of lesbian community in
27
28 Southampton. Rather than begin our study with a focus on a specific site (a bar, a club), we instead let
29
30 participants guide us through *their* city. Interaction with the map allowed us to observe the process
31
32 by which individuals share their everyday movements and memories, and collaboratively produce
33
34 public spaces as lesbian from the undifferentiated heterosexual space of the city. As such, the study
35
36 managed to capture the ‘everydayness of sexuality as lived practice’ (Rooke, 2007: 233); where the
37
38 site of a first kiss became a site of belonging, marked on the map. Participatory collaborative mapping
39
40 helped us uncover places that would not make it onto an official map of LGBTQ life in the city, it took
41
42 us to places we had not anticipated, to places unlikely to be recommended as a location to visit in
43
44 search of lesbian social contact, but nonetheless central in the subjective lived experience of being
45
46 lesbian in the city and of achieving a sense of place.

47
48
49 As participants layered notes on the map, they read one another’s contributions and questioned each
50
51 other on the significance of a location or experience. As people recounted their experiences, we
52
53 listened to a series of interlinked conversations, shared jokes, and sometimes heated debates which
54
55 paralleled the experience of lesbians searching for spaces and shared community in the city. Through
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 these interactions, it became apparent that finding a space to articulate an explicitly lesbian identity
4
5 in Southampton can be fraught, but it was something that participants valued immensely and were
6
7 willing to invest time and emotional energy in. We witnessed participants actively seeking connection
8
9 as they talked about and carved physical, virtual and imaginative spaces of belonging in a mapping
10
11 process that was drawn and redrawn in a collaborative process of community creation.
12
13

14
15 The collaborative mapping was more than just a tool for data collection; it facilitated conversations
16
17 that participants continued after the conclusion of discussion events, sharing recommendations,
18
19 stories about lesbian spaces, and swapping phone numbers. These organic moments of community
20
21 emerged in the margins of our official fieldwork. By creating a safe[r] space for lesbians in
22
23 Southampton to share their experiences of the city we created possibilities for these connections to
24
25 be forged and continued. A key implication of this project is how collaborative mapping can offer a
26
27 tool for delivering more inclusive *participatory* research that can help foster transformative and
28
29 emancipatory research into LGBTQ communities and spaces.
30
31

32
33 We make no claim that the maps produced represent a coherent and fixed lesbian community. Rather,
34
35 the maps produced are always partial, always fragmented, and always in a process of becoming—
36
37 much like processes of community formation itself. The homogeneity of our research sample in terms
38
39 of age and race has clear limits on the conclusions we can draw. Yet participatory collaborative
40
41 mapping is a method that has much to add to existing scholarship on sexuality and space and queer
42
43 urbanisms, with counter-cartography offering ways to trace the contours of a multitude of queer lives
44
45 in the city. Future work may benefit from using participatory collaborative mapping to produce a
46
47 nuanced, local picture of queer life. Cumulatively, we suggest work engaging different generations,
48
49 participants from different class positions, and Black and Asian queer people will offer an important
50
51 tapestry of knowledge on LGBTQ communities across (and within) spaces.
52
53

54
55 In times of social change and crisis, networks of connection and community become particularly
56
57 important for lesbian and gay people (Ellis, 2007). The precarity of a sustained period of fiscal austerity
58
59
60

1
2
3 and reductions to social welfare, have been compounded by the pandemic and subsequent cost of
4 living crisis in the UK, which is accelerating most acutely in queer capitals such as London, Manchester
5 and Brighton and Hove. These conditions are constricting the choices of economically precarious and
6 working-class LGBTQ people regarding where they choose to settle, and their opportunity to travel to
7 queer scenes in large[r] cities. As such, the granulated experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and
8 queer people in small cities is essential to understanding contemporary queer life in Britain. Our
9 research points to need for more work looking at a variety of cities and towns, in order to grasp the
10 multitudinous experiences, demographic differences, unique histories, and varied spaces, which
11 produce, as we have shown, distinct relational geographies of urban life.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

This is in contrast to findings of Megarry et al (2022: 66) who found lesbian women felt it necessary to select one label in opposition to broader terms such as queer

References

- Anderson B (2006) *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Binnie J and Skeggs B (2004) Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and consumption of sexualized space: Manchester's gay village. *The Sociological Review* 52(1): 39–61.
- Blunt A and Dowling R (2006) *Home*. London: Routledge
- Branton SE and Compton CA (2021) There's no such thing as a gay bar: Co-sexuality and the neoliberal branding of queer spaces. *Management Communication Quarterly* 35(1): 69–95.
- Brown G (2008) Urban (homo) sexualities: Ordinary cities and ordinary sexualities. *Geography Compass* 2(4): 1215-1231.
- Browne K and Bakshi L (2011) We are here to party? Lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans leisurescapes beyond commercial gay scenes. *Leisure Studies* 30(2): 179-196
- Browne K (2008) Imagining cities, living the other: Between the gay urban idyll and rural lesbian lives. *The Open Geography Journal* 1: 25-32
- Browne K (2021) Geographies of sexuality: Making room for lesbianism. *Progress in Human Geography* 45(2): 362-370.
- Brown-Saracino J (2011) From the lesbian ghetto to ambient community: The perceived costs and benefits of integration for the community. *Social Problems* 58(3): 361-388
- Brown-Saracino J (2015). How places shape identity: The origins of distinctive LBQ identities in four small US cities. *American Journal of Sociology* 121(1): 1–63
- Brown-Saracino J (2017) *How Places Make Us: Novel LBQ Identities in Four Small Cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Casey M (2004) De-dyking Queer Space(s): Heterosexual Female Visibility in Gay and Lesbian Spaces. *Sexualities* 7(4): 446–461.
- Ellis SJ (2007) Community in the 21st Century: Issues arising from a study of British lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy* 11(1-2): 111-126
- Ferreira E and Salvador R. (2015) Lesbian collaborative web mapping: disrupting heteronormativity in Portugal. *Gender, Place & Culture* 22(7): 954-970.
- Foeken E and Roberts S (2019) Reifying difference: Examining the negotiation of internal diversity on a (post-)lesbian subreddit. *Sexualities* 22(7–8): 1268–1287.
- Formby E (2020) LGBT 'Communities' and the (self-)regulation and shaping of intimacy. *Sociological Research Online* (December 2020): 1-19
- Forstie C (2020a) Theory making from the middle: Researching LGBTQ communities in small cities. *City & Community* 19(1): 153-168.
- Forstie C (2020b) Disappearing Dykes? Post-Lesbian Discourse and Shifting Identities and Communities. *Journal of Homosexuality* 67(12): 1760–1778.
- Ghaziani A (2015) Lesbian geographies. *Contexts* 14(1): 62-64.

- 1
2
3 Gibson A and Macleod C (2012) (Dis)allowances of lesbians' sexual identities: Lesbian identity
4 construction in racialised, classed, familial, and institutional spaces. *Feminism & Psychology*
5 22(4): 462-481.
6
7 Gorman-Murray A (2017) 'Que(e)rying homonormativity: The everyday politics of lesbian and gay
8 homemaking' In: Pilkey B, Scicluna R, Campkin B, and Penner B (eds.). *Sexuality and Gender*
9 *at Home: Experience, Politics, Transgression* (1st ed.). London: Routledge, pp.149-162.
10
11 Held, N. (2015) Comfortable and Safe Spaces? Gender, Sexuality and 'race' in night-time leisure
12 spaces. *Emotion Space and Society* 14(February): 33-42
13
14 Hines S (2020) Sex wars and (trans) gender panics: Identity and body politics in contemporary UK
15 feminism. *The Sociological Review* 68(4): 699–717.
16
17 Holland-Muter S (2019) Making place, making home: lesbian queer world-making in Cape Town.
18 *Revista Estudos Feministas* 27: e67311. DOI: 10.1590/1806-9584-2019v27n367311
19
20 Holland-Muter, S. (2023). The Politics of Safety Talk and Practices: Lesbians Constructing Belonging
21 and Queer World-Making in Cape Town. In: Camminga B and Matebeni z (eds.) *Beyond the*
22 *Mountain: Queer Life in 'Africa's Gay Capital'*. London: Routledge, pp.77-90.
23
24 Homfray M (2007) *Provincial Queens: the gay and lesbian community in the north-west of England*
25 Oxford: Peter Lang
26
27 Khuzwayo Z (2023) Navigating Urban Spaces as Queer Women in South Africa. *Urban Forum* 34(2):
28 191-200.
29
30 Mason G (2001) Body Maps: Envisaging Homophobia, Violence and Safety. *Social & Legal Studies*
31 10(1): 23–44.
32
33 McCormick M and Barthelemy RS (2021) Excluded from "inclusive" communities: LGBTQ youths'
34 perception of "their" community, *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 33:1: 103-122
35
36 McLaren S (2009) Sense of belonging to the gender and lesbian communities as predictors of
37 depression amongst lesbians. *Journal of Homosexuality* 56(1): 1-13
38
39 Megarry J, Orian Weiss C, Tyler M and Farhall K. (2022) Women who prefer 'lesbian' to 'queer':
40 generational continuity and discontinuity. *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 26(1): 53-72
41
42 Myrdahl TM (2013) Ordinary (small) cities and LGBTQ lives. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical*
43 *Geographies* 12(2): 279-304.
44
45 Nash CJ (2011) Trans experiences in lesbian and queer space. *The Canadian Geographer* 55: 192-
46 207.
47
48 Nash C and Gorman-Murray A (2015) Lesbians in the city: Mobilities and relational geographies.
49 *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 19(2): 173-191.
50
51 Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2022) Dataset: Population and household estimates, England and
52 Wales: Census 2021. Available at:
53 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationandhouseholdestimatesenglandandwalescensus2021>
54
55 (Accessed 13th April 2023)
56
57
58
59
60

- Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2023) Sexual orientation, England and Wales: Census 2021. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/sexualorientationenglandandwales/census2021> (Accessed 13th April 2023)
- Ombagi E (2023) Nairobi Queer Visibilities/Invisibilities and Forms of Queer Ambivalence. In *Urban Forum* 34: 169-177.
- Pilkey B (2014) Queering heteronormativity at home: Older gay Londoners and the negotiation of domestic materiality. *Gender, Place and Culture* 21(9): 1142-57
- Podmore JA (2006) Gone 'underground'? Lesbian visibility and the consolidation of queer space in Montréal. *Social & Cultural Geography* 7(4): 595-625.
- Podmore JA (2016) Disaggregating sexual metronormativities: Looking back at 'lesbian' urbanisms. In Brown G and Browne K (eds.) *The Routledge Research Companion to geographies of sex and sexualities*. London: Routledge, pp.21-28.
- Ramachandran V (2021) Stanford researchers identify four causes for 'Zoom fatigue' and their simple fixes. Available at: <https://news.stanford.edu/2021/02/23/four-causes-zoom-fatigue-solutions/> (Accessed 13th April 2023)
- Rooke A (2007) Navigating embodied lesbian cultural space: Toward a lesbian habitus. *Space and Culture* 10(2): 231-252.
- Rossiter H (2016) She's always a woman: Butch lesbian trans women in the lesbian community. *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 20(1): 87-96.
- Rothenberg T (1995) 'And she told two friends': lesbians creating urban social space. In Bell D and Valentine G (eds.) *Mapping Desire: Geography Sexuality*. London: Routledge, pp. 150-165.
- Shields K (2016) *The Safety Map* [Installation] Trans Pride, Brighton Description available at: https://brightondome.org/event/10099/the_safety_map/ (Viewed 23 July 2016)
- Skeggs B (1999) Matter out of place: visibility and sexualities in leisure spaces. *Leisure Studies* 18(3): 213-232
- Southampton Data Observatory (2021) Southampton City Survey 2020: Full Results Summary. Available at: https://data.southampton.gov.uk/images/southampton-city-survey-2020-final-results-summary-jan-2021-no2_tcm71-440419.pdf (Accessed 13th April 2023)
- Southampton Data Observatory (2023) Population Size and Structure. Available at: <https://data.southampton.gov.uk/population/pop-structure/> (Accessed 13th April 2023)
- Stone AL (2018) The geography of research on LGBTQ life: Why sociologists should study the south, rural queers, and ordinary cities. *Sociology Compass* 12(11): e12638.
- Taylor Y (2007) 'If your face doesn't fit...' the misrecognition of working-class lesbians in scene space. *Leisure Studies* 26(2): 161-178
- Tongson K (2011) *Relocations: Queer Suburban Imaginaries*. New York: New York University Press.
- Tucker A (2023) Geographies of gender and sexuality I: Engaging the shift towards Southern urbanism. *Progress in Human Geography* 47(3): 460-469.

- 1
2
3 Vaccaro A (2009) Intergenerational perceptions, similarities and differences: A comparative analysis
4 of lesbian, gay, and bisexual millennial youth with Generation X and Baby Boomers. *Journal*
5 *of LGBT Youth* 6(2-3): 113-134
6
7 Valentine G (1993) Desperately Seeking Susan: A Geography of Lesbian Friendships. *Area* 25(2): 109–
8 116.
9
10 Valentine G (2000) Introduction: From nowhere to everywhere: Lesbian geographies. *Journal of*
11 *Lesbian Studies* 4(1): 1-9.
12
13 Walker B (2009) Imagining the future of lesbian community: The case of online lesbian communities
14 and the issue of trans. *Continuum* 23(6): 921-935.
15
16 Weston K (1995) Get thee to a big city: Sexual imaginary and the great gay migration. *GLQ* 2(3): 253–
17 277.
18
19 Weston K (2009) The lady vanishes: on never knowing, quite, who is a lesbian. *Journal of lesbian*
20 *Studies* 13(2): 136–148.
21
22 X, C. (2017) 'A Trans Inclusive Lesbian Nation' *Lesbian Lives conference: Lesbian Love/s*. University of
23 Brighton. 24-25 February.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table

Table 1

Words used to describe sexuality: Lesbian (11); Bisexual (1); Gay (3); Pansexual (1); Queer (4).

Words used to describe gender: Woman (11); Genderqueer (2); Non-binary (1); In another way (1)

Gender same as assigned at birth: Yes (10); No (1); Yes and No (1)

Age: 22-58 years (mean: 35)

Relationship: Not currently in relationship (5); Looking for a relationship (3); Living with partner (3); in a short-term relationship (under 3 months) (2); in a longer-term relationship (over 3 months) (1)

Race and ethnicity: White: English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish, British (8) White: Irish, European, any other white background (4)

Caring responsibilities: None (11); For a child under the age of 18, living with them full time (1)

Employment status: Full time employed (10); Student (2); Zero hours/casual contract worker (1); Part time employed (1)

Living within city of Southampton (7); Living within 45mins travel of Southampton city centre (5)

Figures

Figure 1

