



NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

This work is published by the

**Philippine Resource Center
for Inclusive Development (Inklusibo)**

Email: info@inkluso.org
Website: www.inkluso.org

Copyright 2025 by the
Philippine Resource Center
for Inclusive Development (Inklusibo)

The views provided in this publication do not reflect nor represent the official views of any of the author's institutional affiliations. These insights are offered voluntarily by the Philippine Resource Center for Inclusive Development. Individuals may obtain a copy of this publication for free as long as it is properly cited.

Copyrights of images used belong to their respective owners, and are used for academic purposes under the Doctrine of the Fair Use provisions of the International Copyright Law. All efforts have been made to trace, clear, and credit the copyright holders of the images, and to ensure correctness of information presented. If no proper credit and acknowledgement has been made, please contact the publishers and amendments will be applied accordingly in future editions, if any.

Preferred Citation
(Chicago Manual of Style, 17th Ed.)

Bautista, Desmond Hans G. 2025. *Building towards Inclusion: Navigating the Experiences of LGBTQ+ Students in the Philippines*. Quezon City: Inklusibo.

DO NOT REMOVE THIS PAGE

Building Towards Inclusion: Navigating the Experiences of LGBTIQ+ Students in the Philippines

Desmond Hans G. Bautista¹

Introduction

Realizing inclusive education remains an arduous concern for the state, academic institutions, and civil society organizations as LGBTIQ+ individuals continue to confront discrimination and stigma from heteronormative and conservative cultures. As it lingers, household, community, and academic environments become hostile for young individuals of diverse sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sexual characteristics (SOGIESC)—putting them in a more vulnerable and disenfranchised state. While the Philippines considers itself as an LGBTIQ+ accepting country (Outright International n.d.), the LGBTIQ+ sector, particularly young individuals in schools, strongly feel the insufficiency of responses that ensure the respect, protection, and fulfillment of their rights.

Beyond the Philippines, this occurrence is also observed at the global scale. In 2016, UNESCO reported that a significant proportion of LGBTIQ+ students confront homophobic and transphobic violence causing detrimental impacts toward educational continuity, healthy mental well-being, and better socialization with peers. While significant improvement has been observed, many rights groups across the world, including the United Nations, continue to ramp its efforts to address such concerns (McBrien, Rutigliano and Sticca 2022).

While much has been published on the need for inclusive education, specific country contexts are still

limited—especially in Asia. This paper, then, aims to provide initial insight on the viewpoints and experiences of LGBTIQ+ learners in the Philippines to support programs and initiatives aimed at building inclusive and safe environments for LGBTIQ+ learners in the Philippines. By looking at available Asian country contexts, the researcher aims to compare local and multinational patterns to analyze similarities and differences among the experiences of the diverse learners. This study will also validate how discrimination and violence negatively impact the aforementioned, consequently hindering them from exercising their academic freedom and maximizing social spaces.

Odd One Out: The Case of the LGBTIQ+ in Asia

Plethora of studies show that young learners confront violent and discriminatory experiences in schools as cultural norms subscribe to heteronormative and more conservative perspectives. Beyond ideologies, patterns of violence and discrimination are normalized in communities which also affect social dynamics within academic spaces (Fulu et al. 2013; Bhatla et al. 2015). Because of these normalized practices, many LGBTIQ+ students report the toll it brings to their mental well-being and scholastic performance. Students from Sri Lanka and the Philippines,

¹ Desmond Hans G. Bautista (hans@inklusibo.org) is the convener of the Philippine Resource Center for Inclusive Development (Inklusibo) and is a development worker specializing in gender and inclusion, MELSA, and organizational development. This paper was published with the support of Babaylanes, Inc. and agencies of the United Nations.

for example, reported that isolating and verbal violence put young learners of diverse SOGIESC in a more vulnerable state given the normalized culture of exclusion towards LGBTIQ+ individuals. This ultimately affects their scholastic performance as school attendance, low scores, and lack of participation become evident effects of such discrimination (Coalition for Educational Development 2021; Human Rights Watch 2017; Truong, Zongrone and Kosciw 2020).

National policies that criminalize and disregard the legal recognition of LGBTIQ+ individuals also put LGBTIQ+ learners in a more detrimental state since schools and academic institutions have no legal basis nor any recognition of their circumstances and needs. Such lack of regard normalizes the occurrence of violence, exclusion, and discrimination of LGBTIQ+ learners. Although certain countries, such as the Philippines, have ordinances and local policies that uphold the ideals of non-discrimination and inclusion, the absence of a comprehensive national policy fails to address broader issues confronted by LGBTIQ+ individuals—such as academic discrimination and discrimination in academic institutions.

Taking Thailand and a prior study on the Philippines as an example, LGBTIQ+ students in the country reported that issues of discrimination and violence still occur when there are insufficient policies for LGBTIQ+ protection implemented (UNESCO Bangkok 2018). Since policies and political will are fundamental to protection, the lack thereof along with the conservative viewpoints also result in the limited access to knowledge and resources to capacitate academic personnel, non-academic personnel, and non-LGBTIQ+ students. The lack thereof consequently affect academic curricula as gender and development courses are excluded from fundamental or general education categories, further providing barriers to information access (Huertas-Abril and Palacios-Hidalgo 2023).

The Local Struggle for LGBTIQ+ Inclusive Education

De Leon and Ignacio (2023) reported that the Philippines' moderate acceptance towards the LGBTIQ+ surface the ambivalence of policies towards the experiences and plight of the sector. While there are no national policies enacted to ensure that LGBTIQ+ individuals are provided protection from discrimination and violence, policies on HIV and AIDS have provided substantial steps in defining key terms such as sexual orientation,

gender identity, and gender expression. The Safe Spaces Law also helps in boosting protection among LGBTIQ+ individuals as it carries accountability mechanisms in case a person identifying as LGBTIQ+ experiences discrimination.

At the local level, local government units passed anti-discrimination ordinances in lieu of a missing national policy for LGBTIQ+ protection. De Leon and Ignacio stated that as of January 2024, there are 11 provinces, 43 cities, 24 municipalities, and 4 barangays fully implementing the policy. Such limited coverage puts the majority of LGBTIQ+ individuals at risk as there are no measures and policies that protect them from any kind of discrimination.

In terms of education, state education agencies—Department of Education and Commission on Higher Education, have long promoted the implementation of inclusive pedagogies and practices in academic institutions. But as per research, there are no available policies, aside from the Anti Bullying Act of 2013, that fully respond to the LGBTIQ+ learners' need for protection in academic institutions. Such absence of a law leaves academic leadership teams and administrations to arbitrarily create and implement policies based on their own perception and understanding on the issues. The lack of any legally-binding measure guarantees the perpetuation of exclusion and discrimination of LGBTIQ+ learners since it fails to provide academic and non-academic personnel any information and understanding of the struggles of the LGBTIQ+ sector.

Objectives

This paper arises from the discussions with LGBTIQ+ and non-LGBTIQ+ university students across the Philippines, seeking to capture their concerns, circumstances, and experiences within their academic institutions. Central to this paper is the argument that inclusive education cannot be fully realized unless the Philippine government fully recognizes the struggles of the LGBTIQ+ sector and provides legally-binding protective measures for them. Furthermore, the enactment of protection of protection policies also imposes all institutions, especially academic ones, to implement policies and provide necessary resources aligned to the needs and demands of LGBTIQ+ learners.

Findings

Insights from the discussions with LGBTIQ+ and non-LGBTIQ+ learners revealed key areas of concerns on the realization of inclusive education. Experiences of LGBTIQ+ learners were compared through their visions of a safe and friendly school environment. The discussions with learners were thematically analyzed and organized into the following thematic areas: Discrimination, violence, and its effects, Physical spaces within and beyond the campus, and insufficient capacities and resources.

Envisioning a Safe and Friendly School Environment

Before diving into the thematic areas, it is imperative to understand how LGBTIQ+ learners envision a safe and friendly school environment. The author used it as a comparative tool to understand the gaps that must be fulfilled.

Generally, LGBTIQ+ students consider an academic institution as safe and friendly if they can freely express their identities and garner support and equal opportunities from peers, academic personnel, and non-academic personnel. This section will dive deeper into the considerations of the LGBTIQ+ students.

Social Spaces. Social spaces are important for LGBTIQ+ learners as it strengthens their bond with other LGBTIQ+ identifying individuals and allies within the bounds of an academic institution. They mentioned that their respective organizations serve as a safe social space for them—making their stay in the institution more worthwhile and bearable. Senga and de Torres (2022) validates this as LGBTIQ+ individuals often resort to finding like-minded peers to help them navigate through various circumstances and experiences in society.

Beyond organizations, students mentioned that school-sanctioned events, organizational activities, and class discussions are considered as potential social spaces which they can use to express their identity and principles to capacitate peers, academic personnel, and non-academic personnel about their struggles. While participants affirmed that their respective universities and colleges do conduct LGBTIQ+ awareness activities, they still sense that it is tokenistic given the discriminatory treatment they still receive.

The absence of physical spaces also hinders

LGBTIQ+ learners to fully maximize socialization. Having conducive physical spaces for LGBTIQ+ students do not only strengthen socialization skills but also provide them a safe haven from any form of discrimination and exclusion.

Policies. LGBTIQ+ learners feel safe when institutional policies aimed at protecting them are implemented effectively. Given that academic policies are deemed tokenistic, non-LGBTIQ+ learners, academic personnel, and non-academic personnel are not fully held accountable for committing discriminatory acts.

At the national level, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), the state agency in charge of supervising all higher education institutions in the Philippines, has not yet developed any policy in terms of ensuring inclusive education. While multiple LGBTIQ+ rights organizations have pressured the Department of Education (DepEd) and the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) to tackle gender-based discrimination by pushing for SOGIESC-responsive policies and practices (Outrage Magazine 2022), minimal steps have been taken to resolve it. This caused academic institutions to perpetuate its arbitrary implementation of “inclusive” policies, consequently weakening their system of accountability. CHED may have pushed academic institutions to be more inclusive through series of dialogues and engagement mechanisms with students and institutional administrations, LGBTIQ+ students expressed that these aren’t enough to address the root cause of discrimination within their institutions.

Outside academic institutions, LGBTIQ+ students feel slightly safer because of the anti-discrimination ordinances in various cities. Babaylanes reported that a total of 84 anti-discrimination ordinances (ADOs) as of January 2024 where 11 are implemented in provinces and 43 implemented at the city level, 24 in municipalities, and 4 in barangays—providing a great, yet limited, coverage for inclusive spaces. LGBTIQ+ students recalled that outside their campuses, they feel relatively safe despite the people’s limited understanding of what SOGIESC is all about.

Academic Inclusivity. To ensure that LGBTIQ+ students feel safe, opportunities to discuss about SOGIESC should be provided. Participants mentioned that schools will only be a safe and friendly environment for LGBTIQ+ learners if there are avenues for academic and non-academic personnel, and students to extensively discuss about their experiences and improve their modalities and

pedagogy to foster inclusivity. This is also a mechanism for them to socialize better as it helps them expand their network and potentially gain new allies who could understand and sympathize with their struggles.

Participants report that academic personnel tend to only provide surface-level knowledge on SOGIESC due to limited learning opportunities available. Some, unfortunately, promote conservative viewpoints which perpetuates homophobia and bigotry among students. The absence of gender and development subjects in the standard higher education curriculum also poses another barrier for LGBTIQ+ students since only limited individuals are provided the benefit to learn about the mentioned topics.

Huertas-Abril and Palacios-Hidalgo (2023) validates the lack of discussion about SOGIESC since many academic personnel are not equipped to tackle and discuss gender in their classes. Further, the resistance of other academic personnel to even understand gender also increases the likelihood of perpetuating homophobia, bigotry, and other cisgender heteronormative narratives that discriminate LGBTIQ+ students.

Discrimination, Violence, and its Effects

This section focuses on the issues, challenges, and its effects towards LGBTIQ+ learners. Viewpoints provided in this section justify the trend of experiences confronted by LGBTIQ+ learners across the globe.

Double standards and discrimination. It was reported that non-LGBTIQ+ learners, non-academic personnel, and academic personnel judge LGBTIQ+ learners based on physical appearance hindering them from easily accessing offices, learning spaces, and expressing their own identities within campus grounds. There are other instances where academic personnel utter discriminatory and verbally abusive remarks towards LGBTIQ+ learners during classes. The blatant power imbalance within the learning environment affects their scholastic performance and socializing capacity, ultimately, their assurance to fair and equal academic treatment. (Coalition for Educational Development 2021; UNESCO Bangkok 2018).

One participant shared that a professor who was reported for committing discriminatory actions only received oral and written reprimand instead of a notice of suspension; manifesting weak

implementing capacity and arbitrary use of policies to justify actions of people who yield greater power and responsibility within the institution. In another instance, a participant shared that a queer learner was discouraged by a professor to perform in drag and was given a failing mark for persistently performing in drag.

When institutional policies are not implemented effectively, non-academic personnel also take advantage of power by arbitrarily judging an LGBTIQ+ learner and discriminate against them based on how they present themselves in public. Multiple students mentioned instances of discrimination from maintenance and security personnel hindering them to use restrooms that affirm their gender identity and ultimately get inside the school premises. Learners also shared that transmen and transwomen confront greater difficulty in expressing their gender identity, especially during graduation ceremonies. Few participants mentioned instances where photographs of transgender people were omitted from the presentation of graduates. Worse, were barred from accepting their degree on stage.

Effects of discrimination. Such cases of discrimination result in negative effects on LGBTIQ+ learners' mental well-being and their genuine pursuit of academic freedom. They mentioned that whenever they receive discriminatory remarks, it takes a toll on their mental health causing them to disassociate from the situation or, worse, pull-out from the institution. Interestingly, LGBTIQ+ learners often let go of discriminatory experiences which potentially causes the perpetuation of such practices. Despite building resilience, students mentioned how it is emotionally laborious for them as they are expected to give conservative individuals the benefit of the doubt. LGBTIQ+ students often have to put their best foot forward just to ensure that they get opportunities to engage with cisgender heterosexual non-allies which waters down opportunities to change viewpoints and perspectives about the sector. Truong, Zongrone and Kosciw (2020) affirms this in their study among Asian American and Pacific Islander LGBTIQ+ learners in the United States.

Formal and informal networks also help LGBTIQ+ students create informed decisions on addressing cases. As some push for justice through reporting mechanisms, most LGBTIQ+ learners choose to forego painful experiences out of fear of retaliation. LGBTIQ+ learners mentioned that acquiring feedback from upper class individuals regarding professors to pick, subjects to take, and areas

where they can hang out and socialize are crucial as it helps them navigate through spaces that are inherently exclusive of LGBTIQ+ individuals. Senga and de Torres (2022) share similar insights as to how peer groups influence an individual's perception of justice and accountability. While not explicitly written, providing recommendations to younger learners contribute to the likelihood of these students to encounter discriminatory practices among non-LGBTIQ+ individuals within the campus.

Physical Spaces Within and Beyond the Campus

LGBTIQ+ students mentioned that spaces within the campus are deemed inclusive, yet academic and non-academic personnel's arbitrary judgment hinder them from fully maximizing it. One LGBTIQ+ student shared that gender-affirming restrooms are only accessible to faculty and staff, manifesting exclusive treatment rather than an inclusive one. The blatant exclusion of LGBTIQ+ students in using their desired restroom, for example, causes more harm than good as it gives non-LGBTIQ+ students the power to judge their identity based on heteronormative standards.

Beyond the campus, LGBTIQ+ students offered mixed feedback regarding inclusivity of spaces. Some mentioned that many of the establishments they frequent are inclusive enough, especially because they have formed social bonds with its owners or workers. This gave them an advantage to freely express their identity. Anti-discrimination ordinances also helped them as establishments are legally required to ensure inclusivity. One participant mentioned that the dining establishment they frequently go to has been accommodating, making them feel safe. Larger establishments such as malls, however, are a different case since mall personnel provide arbitrary judgment towards LGBTIQ+ individuals.

Public transportation was also reported as a potential discriminatory space for LGBTIQ+ students. This begs them to ask how transport workers and other communities within and beyond the campus could be more mindful towards LGBTIQ+ individuals as they are also considered by these individuals as community stakeholders as well. Lodging and housing beyond the campus also share the same potential as public transportation. A participant mentioned that a transgender student was prohibited to lodge because of their identity alone. This specific finding affirms with UNESCO Bangkok's 2018 study which reported that individuals in Vietnam and Philippines are more prone to being

homeless because of the violence and discrimination they experience.

Insufficient Capacities and Resources

Participants identified that substantial improvement of the academic curriculum, non-academic opportunities, and social accountability mechanisms must be done to foster inclusion within their campuses.

Academic curriculum improvement. Students mentioned that subjects about gender and topics about sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, and sexual characteristics are taught in a generic and surface-level manner, hindering students with slight understanding to thoroughly understand and apply inclusive and non-discriminatory practices. While they welcome having it as a subject, many academic personnel have limited information on how to discuss and substantiate the topics mentioned. Many of them mentioned that there are merits to having gender subjects in their curriculum. One non-LGBTIQ+ learner mentioned that without the course on gender, they would not have been able to fully grasp the concept of SOGIESC and the plight of LGBTIQ+ individuals.

Schools also arbitrarily include gender and development subjects as it is not included in the general academic curriculum, leaving only few colleges or units to have the benefit of enrolling in gender and development courses. This directly causes the lack of capacity to confidently discuss and understand concepts and realities of LGBTIQ+ individuals (Huertas-Abril and Palacios-Hidalgo 2023).

Diversified Non-Academic Pursuits. Students mentioned that organizations serve as their lifeline within the university as it provides them a space to freely express their identity. But to be recognized by the academic administration, these organizations must undergo standard assessments and maintain credibility through finances, membership growth, and more. Interestingly, many of the participants mentioned that despite being recognized by the administration, support towards them is still minimal. They reported that funding for organizations remain bleak, leaving students to raise money for their activities and initiatives. In Visayas and Mindanao, students confront challenges in keeping their membership afloat as social stigma continue to dominate narratives and perceptions of the broader student population and academic and non-academic personnel.

Fortunately, for some participants in Luzon and NCR, few academic offices advocate for them. But the broader bureaucracy hinders them to fully penetrate conversations and engagements with the school administration in terms of changing policies and strengthening inclusion in the campus. Learners mentioned that while they feel represented by council representatives, these are insufficient to register their concerns as learners.

Counseling services are also limited within the campuses, causing LGBTIQ+ students to cope by sharing with peers. This also substantiates a study where LGBTIQ+ individuals would rather discuss with individuals who understand their struggle rather than use social accountability mechanisms as it may further disenfranchise them through potential retaliation (Senga and de Torres 2022).

Strengthened social accountability mechanisms.

To ensure inclusion in the campuses, students raised that feedback and engagement mechanisms must be effective to ensure that concerns of LGBTIQ+ students will be thoroughly discussed. However, given the weak implementation of policies and the limited capacities of offices to act upon reports of gender-related discrimination, LGBTIQ+ students often feel excluded and unheard inside their campuses.

One participant raised that their academic administration only considers something as urgent if numerous students are affected by a certain phenomenon. Consideration towards LGBTIQ+ students is often overlooked because the administration always seeks for information and evidence regarding the matter. It is important to note that while evidence is important, victims often find the difficulty to process their emotions and trauma. Thus, it is important for academic institutions to provide comprehensive support (e.g., psychosocial first aid and counselling) to help students to fully provide context on what they experienced.

Students also mentioned that there are insufficient avenues for them to raise concerns, causing them to question the legitimacy and capacity of offices to genuinely confront issues and hold perpetrators accountable for their actions. They would often cite that policies created by the administration are often done without prior consultation with the student population, making the whole implementation incoherent to the needs and aspirations of LGBTIQ+ students inside the campus.

The Learners' Demands

LGBTIQ+ learners possess such promising potential as they continue to develop and conduct wide-scale initiatives such as pride celebrations, learning fora, advocacy campaigns, and mobilizations. They also possess so much grit as they are actively involved in various student governance engagement mechanisms, dialogues, and conversations with the administration to raise certain issues and circumstances that need to be resolved. Their character contributed greatly in making LGBTIQ+ learners more heard, protected, and included in all school endeavors.

While they have taken great strides in making their campuses more inclusive, many of them still feel that efforts remain insufficient. The best way for them to push the fight further is to garner more support in terms of accessing funding, capacity building, leadership sustainability, organizational development at the school level. At the national level, learners asserted that the SOGIE Equality Bill must be enacted to ensure that there are clear accountability measures and safeguards from any form of discrimination and violence.

Learning institutions were built to uphold the dignity and rights of every student, regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity or expression. In this context, the struggle is not only about protection—it is about transformation. To move forward, we must recognize schools as critical sites for change. This means pushing beyond symbolic inclusion to implement concrete policies, practices, and pedagogies that affirm LGBTIQ+ learners. It means building communities of care where educators, administrators, and peers are equipped to disrupt violence, uphold accountability, and foster solidarity. It means making the government adhere to the needs and demands of LGBTIQ+ individuals. The voices of LGBTIQ+ students are not just testimonies of exclusion—they are blueprints for reimagining what education can and should be: liberating, affirming, and just. •

References

Asia Pacific Coalition on Male Sexual Health (APCOM). 2024. Organizational Diagnostic: Babaylanes Inc. Philippines. APCOM: Thailand.

Bhatla, Nandita, Pranita Achyut, Nizamuddin Khan, Sunayana Walia, and Alessandra Tranquilli. 2015. Promoting Equality and Safety in Schools: Are Schools Safe and Equal Places for Girls and Boys in Asia? Summary Report. Bangkok: Plan International and International Center for Research on Women (ICRW). https://plan-international.org/uploads/2022/01/2015_are_schools_safe

Coalition for Educational Development. 2021. Marginalized Youth Voice in Asia Pacific: Shaping the Future of Education – Youth Consultation on Identifying Challenges in Education and Future Education Expectations in LGBTIQ Youth Community in Sri Lanka. Rajagiriya, Sri Lanka: CED. <https://cedsrilanka.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/9-FoE-Report.pdf>.

De Leon, Claire, and Ignacio, Jap Paul Jann. 2023. Pride and Protection: An Audit of Protective Philippine Laws and Policies against SOGIESC-Based Violence, Harassment, Stigma, and Discrimination. Quezon City: Babaylanes.

Fulu, Emma, Xian Warner, Stephanie Miedema, Rachel Jewkes, Tim Roselli, and James Lang. 2013. Why Do Some Men Use Violence Against Women and How Can We Prevent It? Quantitative Findings from the United Nations Multi-Country Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific. Bangkok: UNDP, UNFPA, UN Women, and UNV. <https://www.partners4prevention.org/about-prevention/research/men-and-violence-study/regional-findings>.

Hren, Urška. 2022. “Queering Humanitas: LGBTQ+ Narratives and Cultural Memory.” *Ars Humanitas* 17 (1): 45–62. <https://journals.uni-lj.si/arshumanitas/article/view/8001>(<https://journals.uni-lj.si/arshumanitas/article/view/8001>).

Human Rights Watch. 2017. “Just Let Us Be”: Discrimination Against LGBT Students in the Philippines. New York: Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/report/2017/06/22/just-let-us-be/discrimination-against-lgbt-students-philippines>.

Huertas-Abril, Cristina A., and Francisco Javier Palacios-Hidalgo. 2023. “LGBTIQ+ Education for Making Teaching Inclusive? Voices of Teachers from All Around the World.” *Environment and Social Psychology* 8(1): 1550. <https://doi.org/10.18063/esp.v8.i1.1550>.

McBrien, Jody, Alexandre Rutigliano, and Adam Sticca. 2022. “The Inclusion of LGBTQI+ students across education systems: An overview”. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361584093> (<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361584093>).

Outrage Magazine. 2024. “PH LGBTQIA+ Organizations Call for DepEd, CHED to Tackle Gender-Based Discrimination in Schools.” Outrage Magazine. <https://outragemag.com/ph-lgbtqia-organizations-call-for-deped-ched-to-tackle-gender-based-discrimination-in-schools/>.

Soudien, Crain, and Aslam Fataar. 2017. “Education, Social Cohesion, and the Future.” *South African Journal of Higher Education* 31 (4): 15–32. <https://journals.co.za/doi/epdf/10.20853/31-4-890>.

Senga, Bryon Neil A., and De Torres, Kristine Kyla M. 2021. “Expressions of justice and accountability in dealing with SOGIESC-based discrimination”. *Review of Women Studies* 31(2), 29–58. <https://rainbowresearchhub.up.edu.ph/resources/expressions-of-justice-and-accountability-in-dealing-with-sogiesc-based-discrimination/>

Truong, Nhan L., Adrian D. Zongrone, and Joseph G. Kosciw. 2020. Erasure and Resilience: The Experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color—Asian American and Pacific Islander LGBTQ Youth in U.S. Schools. New York: GLSEN. <https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2020-06/Erasure-and-Resilience-AAPI-2020.pdf>.

UNESCO. 2016. Out in the Open: Education Sector Responses to Violence Based on Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity/Expression: Summary Report. ED.2016/WS/12 (Rev. in Spa). Paris: UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000244652>.

—. 2018. School-Related Violence and Bullying on the Basis of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity or Expression (SOGIE): Synthesis Report on China, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. Paris and Bangkok: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000366434>