
18. LGBT* inclusion

Vincenza Priola and Saoirse C. O'Shea

INTRODUCTION

This entry explores meanings and possibilities for the work and social inclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and minority sexuality and gender people (LGBT*), and considers the role that the social and solidarity economy (SSE) may have in promoting their social, political and economic inclusion (see also entry 42, 'Work Integration'). In this entry, the SSE is viewed with reference to a wide range of non-capitalist practises and organising principles across the economic, social, political and communitarian spheres, which aim to build an economy and society that support people and the environment (see also entry 3, 'Contemporary Understandings').

Research shows that discrimination against LGBT* people is persistent and pervasive, affecting work organisations (Colgan and Rumens 2018), housing (Romero et al. 2020), quality of life, and basic human rights (Katz-Wise and Hyde 2012). LGBT* people continue to endure limitations in human, social and economic rights across the world. Homosexuality remains illegal in more than 70 countries across the world, with LGBT* people experiencing open hostility and violence. On the other hand, legal rights and social recognition have been achieved by gay, lesbian and transgender people in many nations in the Global North, where legislation exists which protects their equal rights in work and society. Despite the legal protection offered by this legislation, discrimination remains common, whilst it is more subtle and sometimes more difficult to prove. Furthermore, although the acronym used in this entry embraces many sexualities, it is important to emphasise that transgender and gender-fluid people continue to be subjected to considerably more violence and exclusion than gay or lesbian individuals, with no recent evidence of improvements to their social and economic opportunities. This discrimination often results in mental and physical health issues and social isolation, alongside estrangement from family (Potoczniak et al. 2009), as social stigma often negatively impacts upon family support and the benefits which can be derived from it (Hazel and Kleyman 2019).

This entry defines inclusion as distinct from equality and diversity. The concept of 'equality' is generally embedded in legislation designed to address harassment and discrimination, focusing on the provision of equal opportunities to all (that is, everyone is treated the same), regardless of sexuality, sexual orientation, gender, race, colour, ethnicity, disability, religion, age, and so on. On the other hand, while equality addresses equal treatment, 'diversity' acknowledges and recognises differences among people. Human rights and individual freedom are at the core of the diversity approach, with the differences that exist among people inherently respected and valued. Meanwhile, the concept of 'inclusion' focuses on outcomes, and refers to the individual's experience of the extent to which they feel valued, welcomed and able to fully participate in decision-making. It also encapsulates the availability and accessibility of development opportunities for individuals within organisations and society. The

following section considers LGBT* inclusion in more detail and explains how the SSE can contribute to LGBT* inclusion in work and society.

18.1 WHAT IS LGBT* INCLUSION?

Efforts of organisations to consider the needs of LGBT* individuals have focused on diversity and diversity management approaches, often influenced by national legislation and/or social movements. For example, in the European Union (EU), the Employment Equality Framework Directive of 2000 has established a legal agenda to be incorporated into the legislation of EU countries, making it illegal to discriminate in the workplace on the basis of sexual orientation, among other categories. The diversity management approach taken by commercial organisations has often focused on the business case, which argues that employing a diverse workforce that represents the customer/consumer base brings a competitive advantage to the firm (Otake-Ebiede et al. 2020). However, it can be argued that the business case is not sufficient to sustain the commitment to diversity, as organisations should also uphold a moral argument to support minority groups. Commercial and social enterprises, in particular, ought to take into account the moral case for social justice, which highlights an obligation to compensate for the oppression that minority groups, especially LGBT*, have endured (and continue to endure) in society. Furthermore, the diversity approach adopted by organisations generally focuses on numerical differences and similarities of employees, heavily relying on statistics and often neglecting the different needs of diverse individuals. Some scholars (e.g. Kumra and Manfredi 2012) argue that organisations should instead focus on inclusion as a means to involve, support and value employees as unique individuals so that they can be fully recognised in their identities, feeling a sense of belonging and recognition when participating and contributing to the organisation. Inclusion therefore means the involvement of individuals in the decision-making process in order to ensure that their input is integrated into the organisational actions. It is an outcome measured by the scale to which LGBT* people (and all individuals who belong to minority groups) feel that they are welcomed and supported.

18.2 THE SSE AND THE WORK AND SOCIAL INCLUSION OF LGBT* PEOPLE

Whilst there have been few empirical studies that have considered economic development in relation to LGBT* people (Badgett et al. 2019), research shows that positive changes in LGBT* rights and inclusion lead to improved economic development (Badgett et al. 2014). The inclusion and acceptance of LGBT* people 'is an indicator of an underlying culture that's open and conducive to creativity' (Florida and Tinagli 2004, 25) and can contribute to a country's economic development. Badgett et al. (2019) estimated the relationship between per capita gross domestic product (GDP) and LGBT* legal rights (as measured by the Global Index on Legal Recognition of Homosexual Orientation – GILRHO) across a large range of countries between 1966 and 2011. They reported that the inclusion of LGBT* people is linked to a stronger economy, with one additional legal right in the GILRHO index (out of eight legal rights in total) associated with US\$2065 more in per capita GDP.

LGBT* people are widely discriminated against in many countries, experiencing: violence; workplace, health and educational discrimination, resulting in loss of productivity; economic deprivation; social and familial marginalisation and exclusion; and lowered life expectancy (Badgett et al. 2019; Badgett 2014). A United Nations (UN) source (UN Human Rights 2015) cites that the costs of homophobia and transphobia to the economy is US\$32 billion a year, an amount equal in size to India's economy. In the case of transgender people, discrimination and marginalisation result in increased rates of under- and unemployment, poverty, homelessness, substance misuse, suicidal ideation and suicide, and criminalisation (Grant et al. 2011). LGBT* people commonly present as forced migrants and refugees, as a consequence of fleeing repressive regimes, persecution and torture (Forced Migration Review 2013; Jordan 2011), or further, fleeing exploitation and victimisation by, for example, sex traffickers. There is therefore an economic, social and ethical necessity to consider how LGBT* people may be best included in work organisations that recognise and value their contribution. Due to their commitment to supporting people and society, SSE organisations and enterprises (SSEOs) represent a key channel for the work and social inclusion of LGBT* people.

Priola et al. (2014, 2018) conducted a study with social cooperatives based in Italy which were founded to support the employment of people who are disadvantaged in the labour market, such as disabled individuals, drug addicts and ex-convicts, among others. The authors of the study analysed the inclusion practises of these cooperatives to assess whether, and how, such organisations extended their core aim of inclusion to other groups, such as LGBT*, who are not formally considered disadvantaged, but are often ostracised and discriminated against at work and in society. In view of the fact that such organisations are part of the SSE and work 'against normativity' in supporting people who do not fit within the normative standards of the 'typical worker', they were expected to show a culture of inclusion extending to a diverse workforce in general. However, the authors found that the efforts of these social cooperatives to 'include' their employees remained grounded on heteronormativity, which is defined as 'the expectations, demands and constraints produced when heterosexuality is taken as normative within a society and thus when biological gender roles fit with sexuality' (Priola et al. 2014, 489). In these social cooperatives, interventions to support the inclusion of socially disadvantaged groups were clearly based on individual psychological support and group-based actions aimed at developing individual resilience. However, alongside their supportive ethos, the authors found that these cooperatives were characterised by a heterosexist culture, revealed in discriminatory practices such as silence, gossip and derogatory comments that were generally accepted and justified as banter. The importance of considering sexual orientation in the workplace was neglected by these social cooperatives on the basis of the fact that sexuality and sexual orientation belonged to the private sphere of life rather than to the work environment. LGBT* individuals were 'included' as long as they did not flaunt their diversity. Most lesbian and gay workers remained in the closet. As an example, transgender employees felt excluded because they visibly did not conform to normative conventions associated with the fit between gender and sex. They reported that they had been asked to move from a customer-facing position to a 'hidden' role, and that colleagues often avoided conversations beyond mundane daily exchanges, preventing them from establishing friendships. Priola et al. (2018) suggest that the organisational practises observed reproduce cultural discourses present at the national level, characterising the Italian society and reinforcing the view that LGBT* sexualities should remain confined to the private aspect of life, and excluded from work organisations. The authors of the study reconnect these aspects to the importance that Italian society places on the

institution of the family in its traditional form, which is embedded in the historical legacies of fascism and the influence of the Catholic church.

While this study shows how these specific social cooperatives have missed the opportunity to be fully inclusive, we argue that SSE organisations of all types have a great potential to be inclusive of LGBT* individuals. We now turn our attention to consider specific SSE LGBT* organisations.

18.3 SSE ORGANISATIONS SUPPORTING LGBT* PEOPLES

LGBT* organisations vary in size, who they represent and how, and the issues that they cover. They include large national organisations such as Stonewall in the United Kingdom (UK), Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD) in the United States of America (USA) and Arcigay in Italy, which campaign on all issues that are of importance to their national LGBT* communities. As well as these LGBT* national organisations there are single-issue organisations and/or those that focus on a specific group within the LGBT* community, such as transgender people. Examples of these organisations include Mermaids in the UK (a charity focused on supporting transgender children) and the Sylvia Rivera Law Project in the USA (focused on the legal rights and protections of transgender people in the USA), and other regional and local, self-organised groups. Some organisations support the economic development of the LGBT* community, for example, by listing LGBT* businesses in specific areas. Among these, Pink Spots, the LGBT directory in San Francisco (USA), lists LGBTQ owned and friendly businesses in the area (divided across many categories), as well as events and LGBTQ news.

LGBT* people are diverse and have multiple needs, which may reflect the local realities of indigenous people. Such individuals have been marginalised both by their country and by the concerns of a Global North which focuses on economic development (Budhiraja et al. 2010). In this sense, sexual and gender identities may have a cultural context rather than a simple, uniform one (Altman 2004; Katyal 2005). For example, many countries and cultures have, for centuries, included diverse gender identities, such as *muxe* people in Mexico, *kinnar* people in the Indian subcontinent, *kathoey*s people in Thailand and third-gender indigenous American people in the United States. The term ‘transgender’, as a 20th century Anglo-American term, reflects neither these histories nor the difference between these peoples. On this account, local SSEOs may have a better understanding and ability than a multinational non-governmental organisation (NGO) to appeal to, represent and aid fragmented and disparate communities. Doan (2010) argues that there is a need to: (1) undermine social control mechanisms, through personal and local acts that question normative assumptions of ‘correct’ sex and gender behaviour and presentation; (2) mitigate social control through international conditions by building international coalitions that question repression, such as the Sisterhood Is Global Institute (SIGI) and Women Living Under Muslim Laws (WLWML) in the Middle East, both of which resist Islamic fundamentalism through regional and international coalition building; and (3) strengthen local coalitions: whilst international NGOs can help, local groups must lead local action.

In addition to specific LGBT* organisations, other SSEOs can support the inclusion of LGBT* individuals in the economy and society due to their mission of prioritising the welfare of people over profit and business imperatives. In a 2021 document, the International Labour

Organization (ILO) advocates the cooperative advantage for the transgender community, suggesting that it:

- helps to create employment and improve income;
- supports the transition from the informal to the formal community;
- provides access to services such as finance, housing and care;
- generates resources and bargaining power;
- promotes education and training, and supports economic democracy; and
- lobbies for workers' rights and inclusion.

It provides a few examples of LGBT* cooperatives, such as:

- *Estilo Diversa*: the textile cooperative in Argentina, formed in 2010 by a LGBT* collective that specialises in producing theatre costumes and fashion wear for the LGBT* community. After the first cooperative was formed in Buenos Aires, other LGBT* cooperatives were formed in Bahía Blanca, Comodoro Rivadavia and Córdoba.
- *Trans Welfare Cooperative Society*: formed in 2018 in Kerala, India, by the Left Democratic Front government to provide financial assistance facilitating hospitality business ventures, the creation of temporary shelters for homeless transgender people, and the creation of pension schemes for transgender people over 60.
- *LGBT Place of Refuge Multipurpose Cooperative* in the Philippines, formed in 2010 by a LGBT* collective to provide a wide range of opportunities including business credit, capacity development, health and accident insurance, and other benefits.

18.4 EXAMPLES OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS SUPPORTING LGBT* PEOPLE ACROSS THE WORLD

Many international organisations supporting LGBT* individuals share SSE principles or have SSE organisations as their members. Among the international associations and organisations supporting LGBT* people are:

- The International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association (ILGA) World. It brings together more than 1600 organisations from over 150 countries and campaigns for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex human rights.
- The International Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Trans, and Intersex Law Association (ILGLaw). It specifically provides legal information and policy support.
- The International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Intersex (LGBTQI) Youth and Student Organisation (IGLYO). It is the largest LGBT* youth and student network in the world, operating in more than 40 countries.
- Global Action for Trans Equality (GATE), an international advocacy organisation supporting justice and equality for transgender, gender-diverse and intersex communities. It works with global partners to provide knowledge, resources and access to UN mechanisms and bodies.
- Global Respect in Education (GRIN), a transatlantic non-profit organisation and advocacy group which campaigns primarily for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer/questioning (LGBTQ) people's social and political equality in education. It seeks to end

discrimination, harassment and bullying based on sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression in all educational institutes. It is run by students.

- Kaleidoscope Trust. It works to uphold the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT+) people in countries around the world where they are discriminated against or marginalised due to their sexual orientation, gender identity and/or gender expression.

18.5 EXAMPLES OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL ORGANISATIONS SUPPORTING LGBT* PEOPLE

While listing national SSE organisations that support LGBT* people is a challenging task, in this section we want to give a few examples from countries in the Global South. We have chosen to focus on the Global South in this section because there is often a tendency to consider the Global North as more egalitarian than the Global South. Puar (2007) discusses homonationalism as a process by which the claims of the LGBT* social movement are used by some groups, such as far-right parties, to justify racism and xenophobic positions, particularly against Muslim people and migrants from countries considered homophobic. Far-right parties in the Global North often use LGBT* rights and sexual diversity to sustain their political stance against migration. Alexander (2005) argues that scholars in the Global North generally view the degree of development of LGBT* movements and rights by Global North standards and neoliberal ideologies, and presuppose that the Global North has the answers to the Global South's problems. However, as Puar (2007) argues, the use of LGBT* social movements by certain groups generally focuses on the rhetoric of equality, and neglects to acknowledge the homophobia and discrimination that LGBT* people still experience in Western societies. The exceptionality of the simplistic homonationalistic accounts used by some groups in the Global North is questioned by LGBT* communities in many countries in the Global South. Rights such as same-sex marriage reflect heteronormativity, but do not always correspond to full equality or equal treatment. The remainder of this section lists a few organisations supporting LGBT* people.

In Bolivia, *Mujeres Creando* is a feminist collective that participates in actions tackling homophobia, anti-poverty and racism via participatory methods such as street theatre, workshops and also via publishing and TV programmes. *Familia Galan*, another Bolivian organisation, formed in 2001 by a group of transgender artists and activists, challenges the machismo that dominates Bolivia's public and political lives. It produces a TV show, and a magazine, using street theatre and performance to question repression and oppression. This local organising through the arts is important as it can involve people across classes, ages, races, and so on. It also brings the LGBT* community and its issues into the spotlight.

In India, *Creating Resources for Empowerment in Action (CREA)* works with structurally excluded women; individuals of diverse sexualities, genders and sex characteristics; disabled individuals; and sex workers to advocate their broader inclusion and solidarity. It organises a range of programmes and events, develops resources to advance human rights, builds feminist leadership, and expands sexual and reproductive freedoms.

In Turkey, *Lambda Istanbul* is an LGBT* organisation that reports human rights violations and runs campaigns to amend the Constitution of Turkey to include sexual orientation and sexual identity among the categories protected by the discrimination legislation. *Lambda*

Istanbul organises panel discussions, LGBT* film screenings, symposia and a variety of LGBT* solidarity activities.

Helem was established in Beirut, Lebanon, in 2001 to support the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of LGBT* people and any non-conforming sexualities or gender identities in Lebanon, and the South West Asia and North Africa regions. It works with young LGBT* leaders to empower local actions through education and community building, and creates initiatives and spaces to build community power and mobilise changes in legislation, policies and practices to improve the quality of life of the LGBT* communities.

In the Dominican Republic, Amigos Siempre Amigos (ASA) is a social advocacy organisation that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention and fights for the rights of LGBT* people in the Dominican Republic, which currently has no legislation protecting LGBT* people from discrimination.

In South Africa, the Forum for the Empowerment of Women (FEW) is an organisation raising issues of violence affecting black lesbians and the wider LGBT* community. It works to build alliances with the state and creates networks across the regions.

In Namibia, The Rainbow Project (TRP) and Sister Namibia are two SSE organisations that oppose the South West Africa People's Organisation's (SWAPO Party) 'homosexuality is un-African' message and its subsequent hostility against the LGBT* community, including threats and penalties for sodomy. As highlighted by Currier (2011), state leaders in some African nations position LGBT* as a colonial import, arguing that LGBT* sexualities did not exist within pre-colonial African societies (hence the SWAPO argument that homosexuality is 'un-African').

CONCLUSIONS

Limited research has explored LGBT* inclusion and the SSE. This entry has discussed some of the issues that LGBT* people face in society and in the workplace, and argued that SSEOs have the potential to support the economic and social inclusion of LGBT* people. SSEOs are diverse, operating through a variety of models, and according to different aims, by providing services and goods to meet the needs of specific groups. In relation to LGBT* inclusion, they can have an important role that extends beyond their immediate aims and can generate awareness of the oppression that LGBT* people experience, as well as a willingness to change on a much wider scale. The entry has provided examples of organisations that operate internationally and nationally in the Global South, to support the needs of LGBT* people.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, M. Jacqui (2005) *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory and the Sacred*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Altman, Dennis. 2004. 'Sexuality and Globalization.' *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 1 (1): 63–8. <https://doi.org/10.1525/srsp.2004.1.1.63>.
- Badgett, M.V.L. 2014. *The Economic Cost of Stigma and the Exclusion of LGBT People: A Case Study of India*. World Bank. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/527261468035379692/pdf/940400WP0Box380usion0of0LGBT0People.pdf>.

- Badgett, M.V.L., S. Nezhad, C. Waaldijk and Y. van der Meulen Rodgers. 2014. *The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies*. Los Angeles, CA: US Agency For International Development (USAID) and Williams Institute (UCLA).
- Badgett, M.V.L., Kees Waaldijk and Yana van der Meulen Rodgers. 2019. 'The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: Macro-Level Evidence.' *World Development* 120: 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.03.011>.
- Budhiraja, S., S.T. Fried and A. Teixeira. 2010. 'From Alphabet Soup to Sexual Rights and Gender Justice.' In *Development, Sexual Rights and Global Governance*, edited by Amy Lind. London, UK and New York, USA: Routledge 131–44.
- Colgan, Fiona and Nick Rumens, eds. 2018. *Sexual Orientation at Work: Contemporary Issues and Perspectives*. New York, USA and London, UK: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Currier, A. 2011. 'Decolonising the Law: LGBT Organising in Namibia and South Africa.' In *Social Movements/Legal Possibilities: Special Issue*, edited by Austin Sarat. Bingley: Emerald 17–44.
- Doan, P. 2010. 'Disrupting Gender Normativity in the Middle East: Supporting Gender Transgression as a Development Strategy.' In *Development, Sexual Rights and Global Governance*, edited by Amy Lind. London, UK and New York, USA: Routledge 145–54.
- Florida, Richard and Irene Tinagli. 2004. *Europe in the Creative Age*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon Software Industry Center.
- Forced Migration Review. 2013. 'Special Issue – Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity and the Protection of Forced Migrants.' *Forced Migration Review* 42: 1–64.
- Grant, J.M., L.A. Mottet and J. Tanis. 2011. *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. Washington, DC: National Center For Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
- Hazel, Kelly L. and Kerry S. Kleymann. 2019. 'Gender and Sex Inequalities: Implications and Resistance.' *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community* 48 (4): 281–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2019.1627079>.
- ILO. 2021. 'Why Cooperatives for Transgender Community? An ILO Perspective.' https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/cooperatives/news/WCMS_776103/lang--en/index.htm.
- Jordan, Sharalyn R. 2011. 'Un/Convention(A)l Refugees: Contextualizing the Accounts of Refugees Facing Homophobic or Transphobic Persecution.' *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees* 26 (2): 165–82. <https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.32086>.
- Katyal, S.K. 2005. 'Sexuality and Sovereignty: The Global Limits and Possibilities of Lawrence.' *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 14: 1429–92.
- Katz-Wise, Sabra L. and Janet S. Hyde. 2012. 'Victimization Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Individuals: A Meta-Analysis.' *Journal of Sex Research* 49 (2–3): 142–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.637247>.
- Kumra, Savita and Simonetta Manfredi. 2012. *Managing Equality and Diversity: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Otaye-Ebede, Lilian, Samah Shaffakat and Scott Foster. 2020. 'A Multilevel Model Examining the Relationships between Workplace Spirituality, Ethical Climate and Outcomes: A Social Cognitive Theory Perspective.' *Journal of Business Ethics* 166 (3): 611–26.
- Potoczniak, Daniel, Margaret Crosbie-Burnett and Nikki Saltzburg. 2009. 'Experiences Regarding Coming out to Parents among African American, Hispanic, and White Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning Adolescents.' *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services* 21 (2–3): 189–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720902772063>.
- Priola, Vincenza, Diego Lasio, Francesco Serri and Silvia De Simone. 2018. 'The Organisation of Sexuality and the Sexuality of Organisation: A Genealogical Analysis of Sexual "Inclusive Exclusion" at Work.' *Organization* 25 (6): 732–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508418790140>.
- Priola, Vincenza, Diego Lasio, Silvia De Simone and Francesco Serri. 2014. 'The Sound of Silence. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Discrimination in "Inclusive Organizations".' *British Journal of Management* 25 (3): 488–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12043>.
- Puar, Jasbir K. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Romero, A.P, S.K. Goldberg and L.A. Vasquez. 2020. *LGBT People and Housing Affordability, Discrimination, and Homelessness*. Los Angeles, CA: Williams Institute (UCLA).
- UN Human Rights. 2015. 'UN Free & Equal – the Price of Exclusion.' YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/embed/DvSxLHpyFOk>.