

1

LGBTQ+

Annamari Vitikainen

LGBTQ+ is a common abbreviation referring to a variety of non-heterosexual sexual orientations (typically lesbian, gay, and bi) and non-conforming (non-cis) gender identities (typically trans). Q (queer) is often used as a general category that can include both non-heterosexual sexual orientations and non-conforming gender identities (trans and non-binary), while the '+' is sometimes added as an expression of inclusiveness towards other sexuality/gender-based categories that LGBTQ may not encompass. Other commonly used abbreviations include LGBT(+), LGBTI(+) (where I refers to 'intersex') and LGBTQ2(+) (where 2 refers to 'two-spirited', an expression used especially among the indigenous communities in North America). The abbreviation SOGI (sexual orientation and gender identity) is often used in legal contexts and policy documents, where, e.g., SOGI laws/policies regulate against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

In higher education contexts, LGBTQ+ persons – both students and staff alike – continue to experience various types of disadvantages ranging from outright discrimination to more subtle forms of exclusion, lack of representation, stereotyping, bias, etc. The first part of this chapter (Theories of LGBTQ+) provides a brief theoretical background to understanding the categories of LGBTQ+ and some of the main challenges and ethical issues relating to the treatment of LGBTQ+ persons in contemporary societies. The following part (LGBTQ+ in Higher Education) discusses the specific issues and concerns relating to LGBTQ+ in higher education, including discrimination, lack of knowledge, bias, and representation. The final section provides a brief summary of the main points, and some concrete suggestions for making higher education institutions more inclusive towards LGBTQ+ staff and students alike.

Theories of LGBTQ+

The relevant theoretical questions relating to LGBTQ+ fall broadly within two categories: (1) ontological or metaphysical questions about the nature of (each) category; and (2) ethical and political questions relating to the treatment of LGBTQ+ persons in society. I discuss each in turn, with a focus on some of the practical implications of each section.

How to understand sexual orientation and gender identity

When theorising about the nature of LGBTQ+, it is important to remember that LGBTQ+ is a combination of several letters, each with its own characteristics. While the first three letters (lesbian, gay, bi) refer to sexual orientation – and to persons who are only, primarily (L, G) or also (B) sexually attracted to persons of the same sex/gender as themselves – the fourth letter (trans) refers to gender identity. That is, trans persons are persons whose gender-identity is different from the one they were assigned at birth. A trans woman, for example, is a person who was assigned the male gender at birth, but who identifies as female. A cis woman, on the other hand, is a person whose gender identity matches the category they were assigned at birth. Some persons are non-binary, i.e., they do not identify as male or female and reject the binary opposition, and mutually exclusive existence, of the two categories of gender.

Importantly, one's sexual orientation and gender identity are analytically – as well as in practice – separate categories. Thus, a trans person may be gay or straight, and homosexuality (that is, same-sex sexual attraction) need not – and often does not – have anything to do with a mismatch between one's assigned and experienced gender. It is also important to note that one's ways of expressing, or performing, gender (for example, 'drag' or 'cross-dressing') are not necessarily related to any particular sexual orientation or gender identity, but can be expressions of a variety of things, including purely artistic forms of performance. In the remainder of this chapter, my focus, and examples, mostly concentrates on sexual-orientation related concerns, although many of these are also relevant for trans people.¹

As with most theories of gender, sex, and sexuality, the roots of theorising LGBTQ+ can be traced back to the classical feminist discussions on the nature of sex and gender. According to Simone de Beauvoir's classical work,² there is a clear distinction between one's biological sex and one's social gender: something that one's social surroundings – upbringing, education, cultural norms, and expectations – mould one to be. Later, queer-theoretical approaches³ critically develop this distinction by showing how one's biological sex, social gender, and object of desire stand in very complex relations to one another, and how our cultural norms have come to constrain our understandings of these relations. According to Judith Butler's influential work *Gender Trouble*,⁴ our societies are organised under heteronormative assumptions about biological sex, social gender, and heterosexual object of desire. Such heteronormative assumptions have profound effects on how we

relate to others and to ourselves. As a default, we tend to presume one's gender identity as conforming to one's assigned-at-birth sex, and we also tend to assume (unless otherwise stated) that one's life partner or object of intimate interest is a person of the opposite sex/gender. The act of 'coming out of the closet', i.e., declaring one's sexuality to others, and the recurrent need to 'come out' again and again in new situations with new acquaintances,⁵ tells of the way in which one is presumed to be heterosexual, with one's homosexuality requiring public declaration. Such assumptions of people's sexuality as (by default) heterosexual may, in higher education as well as in other contexts, create exclusion, discomfort, and pressure to 'come out' or, in some cases, 'stay in' the closet. For example, if one's lectures (which can include examples or perhaps jokes aimed at lightening up the atmosphere) are filled with stories of heterosexual partnerships discussed in presumptively gendered language (e.g., husband/wife/boyfriend/girlfriend), there is a high likelihood that those who do not fit into such heteronormative presumptions will feel marginalised. Using inclusive language, and not presuming people's sexual orientations (or gender identities), is one of the first grassroots steps for LGBTQ+ inclusion also in higher education.

Ethics and politics of LGBTQ+

In addition to the ontological questions relating to LGBTQ+ issues (e.g., what is gender, sexuality; how are societies producing and constraining gender, sexuality, etc.), LGBTQ+ issues can also be approached from the perspective of ethics and politics (e.g., what are the prominent ethical questions relating to the treatment of LGBTQ+ persons; what kinds of rights should LGBTQ+ persons have). In this section, the ethics and politics of LGBTQ+ are analysed from two analytically separate, yet often intertwining, directions: *rights* and *recognition*. While many claims for rights (e.g., equal marriage) are often also claims for recognition (e.g., equal value of same-sex relationships), for the purposes of this section, these two aspects are discussed separately, with the rights-based perspective focusing mainly on the legal, and formal, elements of LGBTQ+ struggles, while the recognition-based perspective provides some of the much-needed background as to why such legal struggles, and the protection of equal rights, are needed.

From a *rights-based perspective*, the claims – as well as legal struggles – of LGBTQ+ persons have typically focused on the abolishment of LGBTQ+ discrimination and the attaining of equal rights for LGBTQ+ persons. Even in the late 20th century, many states viewed homosexuality as a crime (there are no common timelines of decriminalisation, although many western states, including the UK (1967), Canada (1968), and Norway (1972), completed the decriminalisation process in the 1960s and 1970s). As of 2020, there are still 67 countries in the world that criminalise same-sex sexual activity, and six states (or state regions) that uphold the death penalty as the maximum punishment for such crimes.⁶ While most western states have now decriminalised homosexuality, in many cases, homosexuality remained classified as a mental disorder until later; e.g., the WHO replaced its categorisation of homosexuality as a mental

illness in 1990, and the abolishment of trans or 'Gender Incongruence' as a mental disorder only came into force in 2022.⁷

In the aftermath of decriminalisation and depathologisation, LGBTQ+ movements have been able to focus on laws banning discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, and on attaining equal rights and status before the law. In 2022, many (although not all) western countries acknowledge sexual orientation as one of the protected categories in anti-discrimination law, and many public institutions, including universities and other higher education institutions, explicitly mention sexual orientation in their equal treatment policies. With respect to equal rights and the status of LGBTQ+ persons, perhaps the most prominent recent development has been the relatively wide (in western countries at least) acknowledgement of equal marriage that grants same-sex married couples the same status and rights as non-same-sex married couples.⁸

The attainment of both protection against discrimination and equal status have resulted in largely positive – yet not always realised – implications for LGBTQ+ persons in higher education institutions. While the anti-discrimination policies provide formal protections to LGBTQ+ persons in higher education, the actual procedures for reporting and dealing with LGBTQ+ discrimination may not be adequate or sufficiently accessible. The formal anti-discrimination policies may also fail to tackle many of the more subtle forms of disadvantage, such as the effects of implicit bias,⁹ lack of representation, or simple insensitivity to the kinds of struggles (bullying, jokes, fear of coming out, etc.) that LGBTQ+ persons may be subjected to, not only in higher education, but also in life in general. Despite substantive advancements in LGBTQ+ inclusion, alarmingly high numbers of LGBTQ+ staff and students continue to experience various forms of discrimination, harassment, and a 'chilly climate' in higher education institutions.¹⁰

With respect to equal status (e.g., equal marriage), this provides both students and staff with a number of associated benefits, such as housing, visas for LGBTQ+ spouses and family members, family insurance, and other social security benefits. In the internationalised student and job market, these benefits may not, however, be equally distributed. For example, families of LGBTQ+ staff and students from countries that do not recognise equal marriage (or adoption rights) may not be able to accompany their partners to their new place of work or study. These challenges often intersect with other global inequalities (e.g., differentiated visa requirements) and are exacerbated by other forms of both explicit and structural discrimination and disadvantage (e.g., ethnicity, gender, age). Moreover, LGBTQ+ staff and students hoping to work or study abroad (whether more permanently or via institutionalised international mobility programmes) may face a number of difficulties finding the support they need in other countries and institutions. In order to cater to equal treatment and opportunities for LGBTQ+ persons, it is essential that the higher education institutions take these challenges into account and provide information and support for LGBTQ+ persons and their families, not only within the framework of the home institution, but also in relation to broader public services, international exchange programmes, work practices, etc.

From a *recognition-based perspective*, it has sometimes been argued that it is not enough – for the equal treatment of historically disadvantaged groups – that they are given formal equal rights and opportunities, but that their distinctive contributions and worth *as members of these groups* must also be publicly, and positively, recognised.¹¹ Many historically disadvantaged groups – including women, ethnic minorities, and LGBTQ+ persons – have long been belittled and marginalised, including in higher education institutions that have, traditionally, been dominated by white, middle-class, able-bodied, and (at least presumptively) heterosexual men. In order to counter this dominance, and in order to provide positive role-models for other LGBTQ+ persons, it is essential that LGBTQ+ persons and their achievements are recognised,¹² and that the diversity of sexual orientations is put forth in a positive light. This may happen, for example, via an institution taking part in national LGBTQ+ Pride activities; however, it may also – and should – happen in the every-day organisation, curriculum development, and hiring decisions of higher education institutions. For example, LGBTQ+ issues and perspectives can, in many cases, be incorporated as inherent parts of the ordinary curriculum. The works of LGBTQ+ authors can be represented in reading lists, and the hiring processes can include moderate prioritisation of LGBTQ+ persons (along with other under-represented groups, such as women, indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, disabled persons, etc.). Some resources already exist for the diversification of one’s curriculum.¹³ Moreover, in many countries, LGBTQ+ organisations also provide materials and training for LGBTQ+ inclusion in educational institutions (contact your national/local LGBTQ+ organisation for more information and materials for inclusion).

LGBTQ+ in higher education

Higher education institutions and their approaches to LGBTQ+ issues often follow (albeit not necessarily linearly) the general legal frameworks and attitudes of the surrounding society. Around the world, there is thus a vast variety of approaches to LGBTQ+ issues within higher education, ranging from the non-existent or explicitly hostile¹⁴ to explicit policies of non-discrimination and active inclusion. My main focus here is on the challenges of LGBTQ+ persons in formally equal higher education environments – that is, in environments that are, or at least are claiming to be, non-discriminatory. My focus is also on state-sponsored public higher education institutions as opposed to privately funded institutions, while recognising that LGBTQ+ persons face many of the same, although also slightly different, challenges in different types of institutions. (In some cases, for example, in some strongly religious private institutions, the challenges of LGBTQ+ persons may be exacerbated due to the explicitly discriminatory practices, although my intention here is not to address such explicitly discriminatory institutions, nor to discuss the extent to which such institutions may, or may not, be permitted to uphold them.) I divide the challenges, and the discussed examples, into four categories: *LGBTQ+ discrimination, lack of knowledge, bias, and representation*. These categories are not

meant to be exhaustive nor, as will become clear, are the lines between different categories clearly fixed. On the contrary, many LGBTQ+-related issues in higher education can be characterised as including elements of several of the above categories, although some of the LGBTQ+ issues may be hidden, or incorporated into the broader rubrics of diversity and inclusion, and the different categories of discrimination, lack of knowledge, bias, and representation are also clearly intersectional.¹⁵ This thus points towards the need to develop more complex, as well as context sensitive, solutions that address issues across these different categories.

LGBTQ+ discrimination

Even in institutions that do not uphold policies that would be explicitly discriminatory against LGBTQ+ persons, some policies, as well as *de facto* practices, may have discriminatory effects, some of which may be clearly identifiable with others continuing to be hidden.¹⁶ Some apparently neutral policies – such as, for example, reserving family accommodation for married couples – may in fact treat people differently, based on their sexual orientation or gender identity.¹⁷ Sometimes the simple offering (or non-offering) of information may be unbalanced. For example, if the student/staff health services have information readily available on contraception and sexual health tailored to those engaging in heterosexual sexual activities, it should also have adequate, and specific, information on sexual health for those engaging in homosexual sexual activities. Furthermore, the anti-discrimination and anti-sexual-harassment policies and procedures – typically designed to counter discrimination and harassment against women¹⁸ – should also be expanded and adjusted to incorporate measures that counter the often rampant and underreported¹⁹ discrimination and sexual harassment of LGBTQ+ persons.

Furthermore, while an institution may not be explicitly discriminatory, and may even have strict anti-discrimination policies to protect LGBTQ+ persons, this does not mean that all members of the institution (staff or students) will automatically follow these rules. Thus, a singular teacher's prejudice against LGBTQ+ persons may lead to unfair course assessments, or unequal treatment in the classroom, interviewing, or hiring processes. In order to counter such cases, clear procedures for both flagging and addressing such behaviour must be in place, and information about how to report such cases – without fear of retaliation, stigmatisation, or of being unwillingly 'outed' – should be readily available.

Lack of knowledge

As should be clear from the above, not all cases of LGBTQ+ discrimination necessarily have a discriminatory intent. In many cases, the institutional policies or procedures may simply be underdeveloped, or insensitive to the specific needs of LGBTQ+ persons, due to the lack of adequate knowledge on what these specific needs are or how to address them. The individual teachers, administrators, and student support services may struggle to identify, and address, the specific challenges of

LGBTQ+ persons in higher education, as they have not been accustomed, or trained, to recognise and address such challenges. Heteronormative assumptions (see Theories of LGBTQ+ above) play a large role in the underdevelopment of institutional policies, the lack of knowledge, and the often accompanying insensitivity towards LGBTQ+ issues by both individual staff and students. Heteronormative language, LGBTQ+ jokes, or addressing LGBTQ+ issues in common yet clumsy and stereotypical ways may all be well-intentioned – and nevertheless fail to provide an inclusive environment for LGBTQ+ persons. In order to address such a lack of knowledge, or an inability to respond to such knowledge, it is important that the higher education institutions do their part in including LGBTQ+ issues in their diversity training programmes. Many LGBTQ+ organisations already provide both materials and training in educational institutions,²⁰ and the consultation of LGBTQ+ organisations, including LGBTQ+ student organisations, should be standard during institutional policy development. While it is clear that LGBTQ+ inclusive diversity training can do much in countering the lack of knowledge on LGBTQ+ issues, it is also clear that knowledge of LGBTQ+ issues cannot be left solely to such training programmes. Thus, LGBTQ+ issues and perspectives should also be included in the core curriculum, and the existence of sexual and gender diversity should be recognised as part of everyday life in all areas of higher education.

Bias

Bias is often understood in terms of negative associations with a particular group of people (in this case, LGBTQ+) that have a detrimental impact on our initial assessments and responses to members of such groups. Biases can be both explicit²¹ and implicit²² – that is, often unconscious sets of attitudes that have small, yet non-negligible, effects on our responses to others. Again, the existence of such biases, and their effects on LGBTQ+ persons, may not indicate any malicious will from those holding such biases; they may simply be the products of long-lasting social conditioning, internalising of the (historically negative) stereotypes of LGBTQ+ persons, and the general effects of heteronormativity²³ in our society. For example, while an individual teacher, administrator, or student support worker may hold – explicitly – a view of LGBTQ+ persons as being of equal moral worth, equally as capable and deserving of equal rights and treatment as their non-LGBTQ+ counterparts, an implicit bias may nevertheless affect their behaviour and responses to LGBTQ+ persons in negative ways. They may, for example, not be equally prone to advise LGBTQ+ persons towards certain professions or educational careers; they may expect more from LGBTQ+ persons when judging their qualifications; or – and this applies especially to LGBTQ+ persons themselves – they may have skewed expectations and self-perceptions of themselves that affect their behaviour in educational settings. The implicit biases and stereotype threats for LGBTQ+ persons often go hand in hand, much in the same way as the bias and stereotype threat for women.²⁴

Representation

As with most marginalised groups in society, LGBTQ+ persons have been, and still are, underrepresented in higher education. LGBTQ+ students have statistically higher drop-out rates, and while the number of openly LGBTQ+ researchers and teachers is increasing, the numbers are still relatively low. Unlike many other underrepresented groups – e.g., women and ethnic minorities – LGBTQ+ persons are not a necessarily visible minority. There are thus many LGBTQ+ persons (at least those who are white male LGBTQ+) who have occupied positions in higher education throughout history. This does not, however, mean that LGBTQ+ persons would have occupied these positions *as* LGBTQ+, and a visible presence of openly LGBTQ+ researchers, teachers, administrators, and students alike is a relatively new phenomenon.²⁵

As with any marginalised group, the representation of LGBTQ+ persons in higher education matters. It matters for example for the normalisation of non-heterosexual and non-cis identities, for the providing of role models for other LGBTQ+ persons, and for a balanced representation of different perspectives and viewpoints in higher education. LGBTQ+ representation can be increased via various platforms and means. The work of LGBTQ+ scholars can be included in curriculums and reading lists; LGBTQ+ persons can be moderately prioritised in admission and hiring procedures (alongside other marginalised groups); LGBTQ+ staff and students can – *if they so wish* – flag their status as LGBTQ+, although it should be emphasised that no-one should be required to disclose their sexuality, nor should anyone be ‘outed’ by others against their will. Institutions can also develop policies that include LGBTQ+ representation in different committees and decision-making organs, although they should do so in ways that avoids the usage and negative effects of ‘tokenism’: that is, the appointing of ‘token LGBTQ+ persons’ in committees, etc., which tends to both undermine the actual competences of LGBTQ+ persons as well as create an increased administrative load for the few LGBTQ+ persons who may now need to operate as the token LGBTQ+ person in a number of committees, etc. However, while a carefully implemented inclusion of LGBTQ+ persons in committees, decision-making organs, etc., may increase the general diversity in such positions, it may not be enough to address the deeper issues of underrepresentation, bias, lack of knowledge, or discrimination of LGBTQ+ persons in higher education. Firstly, it should be clear that, while LGBTQ+ persons have certain knowledge of LGBTQ+ issues simply by virtue of being LGBTQ+, the experiences of LGBTQ+ persons vary tremendously, and one’s status as LGBTQ+ does not in itself make one an overall expert on LGBTQ+ challenges, or possible solutions to these challenges. Secondly, LGBTQ+ persons are not in higher education institutions simply to address LGBTQ+ issues – typically, they are there to teach, study, and work – and requiring LGBTQ+ persons to be representatives, advocates, and knowledge providers on all LGBTQ+-related issues puts an undue burden on LGBTQ+ persons in the work and study environment. It is thus of immense importance that the inclusion of LGBTQ+ issues, and the addressing of

LGBTQ+ challenges in higher education institutions, is not left to the individual LGBTQ+ persons working or studying in these institutions but is a collaborative effort by everyone.

Summary

LGBTQ+ is a commonly used umbrella term for a variety of non-heterosexual sexual orientations and non-conforming (non-cis) gender identities. Despite many recent developments for LGBTQ+ equal rights, status, and recognition, LGBTQ+ persons continue to be underrepresented and face a variety of challenges and disadvantages *qua being LGBTQ+* in higher education. In order to improve the situation of LGBTQ+ persons in higher education, some general suggestions are provided. These suggestions, it should be emphasised, are not intended as conclusive, nor all-encompassing, but as relatively broad frameworks within which some avenues for LGBTQ+ inclusion could be made.

- The anti-discrimination (and anti-sexual harassment) policies and procedures should be extended to include LGBTQ+-based discrimination and sexual harassment, and also take the specifics of such discrimination and harassment into account (e.g., by providing avenues to report sexual harassment without the fear of being 'outed' in the work/study environment).
- General information and support for LGBTQ+ rights and equal treatment should be readily available. This also includes information and support for persons travelling from or to countries that do not have extensive LGBTQ+ protections. Such country-specific contexts, and support for LGBTQ+ persons, is also relevant for different staff and student exchange programmes.
- In order to counter bias, lack of knowledge and unintentional marginalisation (e.g., heteronormativity), information materials and diversity training should be provided. Many LGBTQ+ organisations already provide such materials and training and can be consulted – including in general policy/decision making.
- LGBTQ+ issues and perspectives can be more readily included in the curriculum, and the works of LGBTQ+ scholars can be sought for. (This, it should be emphasised, is not simply because it is the work by LGBTQ+ scholars, but rather because the work of marginalised groups is often – for a variety of reasons, such as implicit bias – not given equal attention.)
- LGBTQ+ persons can be given moderate prioritisation in admission and hiring processes (along with other underrepresented groups).
- LGBTQ+ persons should be included in different committees and decision-making organs – although such inclusion should not be used to 'outsource' the responsibility of LGBTQ+ inclusion to the LGBTQ+ persons themselves.
- The higher education institution, and its members, can also engage in a variety of acts of recognition (both symbolic and practical). For example, the institution can take part in LGBTQ+ Pride celebrations, recognise the contributions of LGBTQ+ staff and students, and promote awareness of the diversity of sexual

orientations and gender identities. Importantly, the institution, and its members, should include LGBTQ+ persons, and issues pertaining to the diversity of sexual orientations and gender identities, as inherent parts of the everyday life of the higher education institution.

Questions for discussion

- LGBTQ+ is an umbrella term for a variety of non-heterosexual sexual orientations and non-conforming (non-cis) gender identities. After reminding oneself of the meaning of each letter, critically discuss to what extent the ethical issues and challenges encountered by persons under each individual letter (L, G, B, T, Q) can be addressed jointly, and to what extent the different letters require different responses.²⁶
- What does heteronormativity mean and in which ways is it manifested in higher education institutions? How can one counter heteronormativity – in everyday life, or in higher education policies and practices?
- Discuss some of the ways in which apparently non-discriminatory policies may nevertheless have discriminatory effects to LGBTQ+ persons.
- ‘Underrepresentation’ and ‘tokenism’ can be seen as two sides of a phenomenon that LGBTQ+ persons (along with other minorities) are often faced with in higher education. What do these two issues refer to, and how could one ensure a simultaneous increase of representation while avoiding the dangers of tokenism?
- How can I, as a leader/administrator/teacher/researcher, make sure that my actions (or policies, etc., that I am designing/implementing) cater to LGBTQ+ inclusion, or – at the very minimum – do not contribute to the marginalisation of LGBTQ+ persons in higher education?

Suggestions for further reading

Useful resources and examples of LGBTQ+ inclusion guides available online:

- Higher Education Today (2017) ‘LGBTQ Students on Campus: Issues and Opportunities for Higher Education Leaders’, www.higheredtoday.org/2017/04/10/lgbtq-students-higher-education/
- Stonewall (2017) ‘Studying Abroad: A Guide to Supporting LGBT Students in Higher Education’, www.stonewall.org.uk/resources/studying-abroad
- Stonewall (2019) ‘Delivering LGBT Inclusive Higher Education: Academic Provision, Accommodation, Catering, Facilities, Induction, Recruitment, Registry, Societies, Sports and Student Services’, www.ucl.ac.uk/womens-health/sites/womens-health/files/delivering_lgbt_inclusive_higher_education-2019.pdf
- University of Birmingham (2017) ‘LGBTQ-Inclusivity in the Higher Education Curriculum: A Best Practise Guide’, <https://intranet.birmingham.ac.uk/staff/teaching-academy/documents/public/lgbt-best-practice-guide.PDF>

Notes

- 1 For specifically trans-related issues, see Sagdahl in this volume
- 2 de Beauvoir 2015 [1949]
- 3 E.g., Butler 1999 [1990]; Halberstam 1998
- 4 Butler's 1999 [1990]
- 5 Cf. Sedgwick 1990
- 6 ILGA World 2020
- 7 For a historical overview, see, e.g., Belmonte 2020
- 8 For country specific details, see ILGA World 2020
- 9 See Rasmussen, this volume
- 10 Rankin et al. 2010
- 11 See e.g., Taylor 1994; Appiah 2005
- 12 See Tanyi, this volume
- 13 See e.g., Diversifying Syllabi (<https://diversifyingsyllabi.weebly.com/>); APA Diversity and Inclusiveness Syllabus Collection (www.apaonline.org/members/group_content_view.asp?group=110430&id=380970)
- 14 See also ILGA World 2020 on LGBTQ+ criminalisation around the world
- 15 See Losleben & Musubika, this volume
- 16 See Lippert-Rasmussen, this volume
- 17 See also the section on the ethics and politics of LGBTQ+, this chapter
- 18 See Antonsen, this volume
- 19 E.g., TUC 2019
- 20 E.g., FRI Norge: Rosa kompetanse (www.foreningenfri.no/rosa-kompetanse)
- 21 See the section on prejudice and discrimination, this chapter
- 22 See Rasmussen, this volume
- 23 See the section on the understanding of sexual orientation and gender identity, this chapter
- 24 See Finholt, this volume
- 25 Bazarsky & Sanlo 2011
- 26 See also Sagdahl, this volume

References

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2005) *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bazarsky, Debbie, and Sanlo, Ronni (2011) 'LGBT Students, Faculty, and Staff: Past, Present, and Future Directions', in Stulberg, Lisa M. and Weinberg, Sharon L. (eds.) *Diversity in American Higher Education: Toward a More Comprehensive Approach*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Belmonte, Laura A. (2020) *The International LGBT Rights Movement: A History*. London, New York, Oxford, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Butler, Judith (1999 [1990]) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.
- de Beauvoir, Simone (2015 [1949]) *The Second Sex [Le Deuxième Sexe]*. London: Vintage Classics.
- Halberstam, J. (1998) *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- ILGA World (2020) *State-Sponsored Homophobia 2020: Global Legislation Overview Update*. Geneva: ILGA.
- Rankin, Susan, Weber, Genevieve, Blumenfeld, Warren, and Frazen, Somjen (2010) *State of Higher Education for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender People*. Charlotte, NC: Campus Pride.

- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky (1990) *The Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Taylor, Charles (1994) 'The Politics of Recognition', in Gutmann, Amy (ed.) *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- TUC (2019) *Sexual Harassment of LGBT people in the workplace*. London: Trades Unions Congress.