

Transgender inclusivity in UK humanities and social sciences teaching: student perceptions¹

Dr Catherine Baker
University of Hull

Working Paper
June 2016

Summary

- Trans people's identities, experiences and histories are rarely integrated into humanities and social sciences teaching
- In 2015–16 I carried out exploratory research about UK students' accounts of how well their curriculum had included trans topics
- Trans identities and experiences should also be incorporated into teaching other topics
- Teaching about gender variance should include genders beyond the male/female gender binary (non-binary genders)
- Programme designers should ensure that programmes deliver foundational knowledge about gender identity beyond the gender binary, to support trans coverage in individual modules
- University libraries should be proactive in acquiring up-to-date readings on trans topics
- Poorly-informed or transphobic classroom management can undermine any 'inclusiveness' designed into the curriculum
- Universities must take decisive action against transphobic harassment by students or staff
- For inclusivity to be meaningful, universities should remove access barriers that trans students may encounter in student services and administration, and help them mitigate wider access barriers

I. Introduction

Transgender equality – ensuring that no person is directly or indirectly discriminated against because their gender identity differs from the gender they were assigned at birth – has become a matter of public interest after decades of struggle by trans activists in many countries including the UK (Whittle 2006; Stryker 2008; Connell 2012). Alongside the implications of the so-called 'transgender tipping point' (Steinmetz 2014) or sudden public visibility of trans people and trans politics for particular disciplines, which all face wider opportunities to incorporate gender variance and its cultural and material contexts into their teaching (Boucher 2011; Matthews-Jones 2015), UK universities have been under a legal duty to prevent discrimination against (some) trans people (in certain circumstances) since gender reassignment was included as a protected characteristic in the Equalities Act 2010 (applicable in England, Wales and Scotland but not Northern Ireland). This has implications for all areas of university provision – including support and welfare services,

¹ This research was originally conducted as part of Hull's Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice programme. It was approved by the UoH Faculty of Education Ethics Committee on 26 February 2015 (FoE 14/15–17).

student records, and estates – but also for the curriculum itself, as the government Equality Challenge Unit recognised when recommending that universities should, at the very least, check that curricula do not ‘rely on or reinforce stereotypical assumptions about trans people’ or ‘contain transphobic material’ (Pugh 2010: 40). This would be a minimum requirement to satisfy a legal duty.

More transformative perspectives on achieving equality through curriculum design would go further than this. They would imply actively redeveloping the curriculum in ways that positively recognise trans people and their experiences, include people who are not necessarily covered by the gender reassignment provisions of the Equalities Act (such as people with non-binary gender identities who may or may not define themselves as trans), and challenge structural transphobia and ‘cissexism’ (Serano 2007: 12–13) or ‘cishnormativity’ (Bauer et al. 2009: 356) in society.² Indeed, the ECU’s own research on LGBT staff and student experiences in higher education before the Equalities Act came into force (led by the feminist geographer Gill Valentine) showed that LGBT students valued LGBT, including trans, ‘examples or materials’ being used in teaching (Valentine, Wood and Plummer 2009: 38).

Understanding trans identities and experiences is, however, often more challenging for cisgender (non-transgender) people than understanding the diversity of sexual orientation is for straight people, because it requires unlearning the biological determinism of gender (i.e. understanding that the gender someone is assigned at birth based on genitalia does not necessarily correspond to their gender identity) as well as being able to perceive forms of structural marginalisation that they do not personally experience. These are ‘threshold concepts’ which, true to Jan Meyer and Ray Land’s definition, represent transformed ways of understanding ‘without which the learner cannot progress’ (Meyer and Land 2003: 1). For many cis students, teaching and learning about trans topics would involve a foundational rethinking of their ideas about gender and comprehension of concepts and terminology they have not encountered before.

Indeed, trans students themselves will also be at different stages of understanding gender variance: while some already are and have had to become experienced activists, others may only just be realising that something which has confused them about their own gender has also happened to other people. While educators should not assume that a trans student will always have had particular experiences or knowledge, it is prudent to assume – without trying to identify them – that there are trans/non-binary students in every class. Speaking about gender variance as if it were an abstraction rather than part of many people’s lived experience is, as responses to this research suggested, a form of ‘microaggression’ – the ‘brief and commonplace [...] verbal, behavioral or environmental indignities, whether

² Julia Serano defines cissexism as ‘the belief that transsexuals’ identified genders are inferior to, or less authentic than, those of *cissexuals* (i.e. people who are not transsexual and who have only ever experienced their subconscious and physical sexes as being aligned)’, commonly expressed through ‘attempt[ing] to deny the transsexual the basic privileges that are associated with the trans person’s self-identified gender’ – whether on a deliberately exclusionary basis or unthinkingly as a residue of structural cissexism in society (Serano 2007: 12). Greta Bauer et al. (2009: 356) define cishnormativity as ‘the expectation that all people are cissexual, that those assigned male at birth always grow up to be men and those assigned female at birth always grow up to be women. This assumption is so pervasive that it otherwise has not yet been named’. The words are formed by analogy with ‘heterosexism’ and ‘heteronormativity’. Writing that refers to ‘trans’ or ‘transgender’ rather than ‘transsexual’ people usually uses the terms ‘cis’ or ‘cisgender’ instead of ‘cissexual’ and may use ‘cisgenderism’ rather than ‘cissexism’ (e.g. Kennedy 2013).

intentional or unintentional', that marginalised people face every day (Sue et al. 2007: 271; see also Nordmarken 2014) – which add to psychological pressure on marginalised people and, in an educational context, interfere with student participation and achievement. Classrooms themselves, this research shows, can become locations of microaggressions if they are not sensitively managed. However, aspiring to integrate trans topics, experiences and scholarship into the curriculum is socially as well as pedagogically valuable in challenging the microaggression of 'erasure' (Namaste 2000; Bauer et al. 2009) – that is, the rendering invisible of trans/non-binary people and their experiences – in society. Indeed, the National Union of Students response to the Transgender Equality inquiry, noting that '[m]any trans students have expressed [...] concerns around the lack of visibility of trans identities, voices and experiences within the curriculum', suggested that '[t]his invisibility [...] may exacerbate feelings of exclusion or perceptions that [trans students] are not well supported by their institution'.³

While most research on trans students' experiences comes from the USA, a few recent UK studies have explicitly sought trans as well as LGB perspectives (Acciari 2014; Formby 2015), and post-school education is part of the social world that broader research with trans and young-binary people is likely to discuss (e.g. Gendered Intelligence n.d.). The curriculum is one among many topics in these studies, but their evidence shows a) LGBT students in general are likely to feel that LGBT experiences are not recognised in their curriculum and b) this proportion is even higher among trans students (Metro 2014: 100; Formby 2015: 32). Trans students also report significantly higher levels of transphobic bullying than LGBT students in general report for what are already high levels of bullying on the grounds of sexual orientation, and are more likely to drop out of programmes of education as a result (LGBT Youth Scotland 2012).

This study set out to complement existing research on the wider university environment by focusing specifically on perceptions of the curriculum and on trans inclusion and the inclusion of non-binary genders (rather than LGBT-wide inclusion). 'Inclusion' and 'inclusivity' are problematic terms which do not fully capture the conceptual and material unmaking and remaking that must take place in order to undo structural exclusions in the curriculum, the university and society (Ahmed 2012). Moreover, speaking of 'including' a topic can sometimes just mean tokenising it as a topic or handling its teaching so poorly that transformative learning does not occur (hooks 1994: 38–9; Beauchamp and d'Harlingue 2012). The idea is nevertheless simple to explain without requiring specific conceptual apparatus which students in some disciplines would have been more likely to obtain than others, and was therefore an appropriate survey title.

Providing a trans/non-binary-inclusive curriculum matters both instrumentally and, for tutors informed by critical/feminist pedagogy, politically. In an admissions environment where student satisfaction affects university league-table performance and student places are no longer centrally capped, it is all the more important for universities to provide a curriculum that students perceive as up-to-date and that will appeal to the full range of potential students – the so-called 'business case' for diversity (Shaw et al. 2007; David 2009). Even in 2015, research suggested universities were not meeting demand in this area (Formby 2015: 42–3). Yet an inclusive curriculum can and, this paper suggests, should, be viewed as more

³ Written evidence TRA0187 (National Union of Students), 21 August 2015. <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/women-and-equalities-committee/transgender-equality/written/19608.html> (accessed 27 June 2016).

than an instrument to increase student recruitment and satisfaction, or even as a mechanism for meeting a legislative anti-discrimination duty. A critical pedagogy, following bell hooks (1994: 83–4), acknowledges ‘that students from marginalized groups enter classrooms within institutions where their voices have been neither heard nor welcomed’ and seeks to ‘affirm their presence, their right to speak, in multiple ways on diverse topics’ as part of involving all students in a transformative education. Achieving this transformation requires much more than just *including* marginalised identities and experiences, but also, as Toby Beauchamp and Benjamin d’Harlingue (2012: 26–7) argue in a study of learning resources for introductions to gender/women’s studies, integrating ‘transgender bodies and subjects’ throughout the discipline’s curriculum, rather than just ‘greater inclusion of transgender subjects under the sign of women or man’.

2. Participants

This report is based on the narratives of 18 participants who had studied humanities and/or social sciences in the UK since 2005, collected online using the methodology described in Appendix 1. The narratives, elicited through a series of prompt questions (about the curriculum participants remembered, classroom experiences, and other relevant factors in the higher education environment) within a Bristol Online Survey questionnaire and hand-coded by the researcher. A small number of comments by internet users (along the lines that trans and non-binary identities and experiences had been so invisible in their curriculum that it was not even worth completing a survey about it) which reached me when the survey was publicised on social media are not included in the study but suggest broader perceptions among (ex-)students aware of trans and non-binary issues that university curricula do not cover these well.⁴

Respondents stated their gender and ethnic/racial background using free-text fields (rather than ticking boxes to align themselves with Higher Education Statistics Agency categories) and in another field could add any other information they considered important in contextualising their response. 13 respondents (72.2%) identified as white in some way (8 as White British), including 3 (16.7%) who also mentioned Jewish heritage. I defined themselves as ‘British’, 1 ‘Southeast European’, 1 ‘Mixed Asian and European’ and 1 as an ‘international student’. The sample’s gender balance was 44.4% female, 27.7% male and 22.2% non-binary, with 1 (5.6%) not stating any gender. The numbers of trans/non-binary and cis participants were equal (6 (33.3%) each), among participants who stated a gender identity. As additional background, 2 participants referred to disability and chronic illness, 2 to poverty and class, 1 to being a non-UK/EU citizen and 2 to close personal ties with trans partners or relatives. 10 participants (55.5%) had completed their studies and 8 (44%) were still studying. 8 (44.4%) had begun studying after 2010 (thus after the latest Equalities Act) and another 7 (38.9%) had study dates spanning the pre-2010 and post-2010 periods; only 3 (16.7%) had completed all their studies before 2010. However, the narratives of pre-2010 and post-2010 students were not sufficiently divergent to require sustained differential comparison (though if more pre-2010 students had participated maybe more differences would have emerged).

⁴ The survey contained no responses arguing that trans inclusion was irrelevant, unnecessary or misguided. People holding these views were probably less likely to respond to an open-ended survey than people who shared the assumptions of the research.

While participants' background information is tabulated in Appendix 2, a few remarks are important for contextualising the responses. The sample lacked participants older than the 35–44 age group and any participants who identified themselves as Black (2 did not state any ethnic or racial background), suggesting that an expanded study would need to identify specific routes for recruiting current/former mature students and Black students to participate (such as contacting Black students' officers about the survey), as well as contacting the full range of HEIs in the UK as Valentine, Wood and Plummer (2009) had done. Directly including a question inviting participants to narrate the intersecting effects of cissexism and racial oppression/Islamophobia on their experiences of learning, as 2 respondents recommended, would also have been important, and I regret that I did not include one in the research.

The wide remit for participants – who did not have to identify their subject of study, nor state whether they were cis or trans – obstructs some forms of comparison but was intended to reassure participants that they could not be identified if their department/programme had been small. This was particularly important in fulfilling ethical responsibilities towards participants who were trans, for whom being identifiably 'outed' is a serious safety concern (Grossman and D'augelli 2006: 123). All but 2 respondents did choose to identify a subject area and all but 5 did explain their gender identity during the response.⁵ There was not enough evidence to suggest certain subject areas systematically performed worse than others in students' perceptions of inclusivity; rather, most observations were repeated across subjects. A repeated study with a larger sample might reveal finer-grained differences. One important contrast did emerge when comparing narratives by respondents who identified themselves as trans and those who did not: trans respondents generally commented in more detail on the personal as well as intellectual consequences of failed inclusion and on extra-curricular factors which in their view prevented universities offering trans students an inclusive environment. This, as the research will show, has implications for how universities should approach student participation in curriculum design.

2.1 Curriculum design

When asked when (if at all) they remembered trans and non-binary issues being covered in their curriculum, no respondents who had had all their higher education in the UK reported more than a limited amount of inclusivity. 12 gave responses amounting to 'never' or 'not at all' (6 of these were embedded in longer narratives about problematic teaching). A History and Politics student who began studying in 2008 recalled no coverage until he started his Gender History MA. One social sciences postgraduate using the pseudonym '123', studying in 2008–12, recalled several modules covering trans issues (in medical anthropology, anthropology of reproduction, state borders, cultural boundaries), potentially the best-integrated UK instance in the sample – as long as the content was up to date – and a similar range of topics to those suggested by Michel Boucher (2011: 73) as areas of Gender Studies where trans issues should be systematically integrated; yet even she characterised this as 'the little that was offered' in her course. 3 respondents (respectively studying in 2012–13,

⁵ 'Gender identity' here refers to the relationship between a person's gender and the gender they were assigned at birth after inspection of their genitalia ('trans' or 'transgender' if these do not match, 'cis' or 'cisgender' if they do). It is distinct from 'gender' as in what gender(s) someone is (e.g. understanding themselves as male, female, a gender outside the male/female binary, genderqueer or genderfluid, bigender, or agender).

2008–11 and 2011–present) recalled one single reading or lecture on trans or non-binary topics in the course of their whole curriculum ('a single article on queer IR [International Relations] which appeared as non necessary reading in my ir theory class'; 'a third-year discussion of Judith Butler's "Gender Trouble"; 'one [Psychology] lecture, concerning theories of gender identity formation').

2 of these 3 respondents considered that even this content had been covered in a limited way. For instance, Daisy, a 'closeted non-binary/male-presenting' Film and Literature student between 2008 and 2011, recalled the Butler discussion 'mostly focussed on the idea of drag performance, not day-to-day life as trans or anything else'. This stage of Butler's work on gender (Butler 1990) was foundational in Gender Studies but severely criticised by trans scholars for instrumentalising trans people in theoretical exercises that did not contribute to emancipating trans people (Prosser 1998: 21–60; Currah 2001: 180–2; Connell 2012) and especially trans women (Namaste 2009) – an argument that would be pedagogically valuable to incorporate.⁶

The most positive report of trans inclusivity in the curriculum came from Tuesday, who began undergraduate studies in the USA in 2010 and subsequently became a postgraduate in Scotland:

The [US] department had an openly trans lecturer [...] She taught mostly intro level women's studies classes in a lecture format, so we read various thinking about the trans experience and it was covered in lectures (circa 2008/9). [...] I recall reading about trans identity in more advanced modules as well as introductory modules (often through discussions of intersectionality, e.g. experiences [of] black trans women). I took a module called Queer Lit which covered some of this as well!

Tuesday could remember at least four modules with trans content and authors, and considered the content had been 'very cutting edge'. She praised the curriculum's ability to make students:

conscious of the fact the world wasn't just binary (M/F) and that queer identity is a thing and it matters! I'm sure it was very eye opening for some if not many students (we lived in and were by & large from) a very rural area. I remember being really impressed that we were talking about complex trans & nonbinary identities – felt very contemporary.

Tuesday had benefited from a knowledgeable instructor and from a programme structure (common in North America but rarer in the UK) that enabled students of other subjects to participate in gender/women's studies classes.

Other respondents commonly considered that their curriculum had missed opportunities for trans and non-binary inclusion. As Daisy commented: 'Given that gender – representations of femininity, masculinity, etc – was a frequent theme under study on my course, there would definitely have been opportunity for trans voices and experiences to be included'. This recurred across subject areas. Connor, a genderqueer student who began

⁶ Butler did later, however, commit herself to a politics of trans liberation and gender self-determination (Williams 2014).

studying Politics, Philosophy and Economics in 2013, identified political theory modules (which covered feminism) and political sociology modules (which discussed ‘the way gender, race, nationality, etc. affects political behaviour’) as sites where ‘transgender issues and authors’ could and should have been included but were ‘completely ignored’. Jade, a cis Psychology student in 2009–12, felt that social psychology and evolutionary psychology modules could have deconstructed, rather than essentialised, differences between ‘men’ and ‘women’, and that introductory modules could have ‘explain[ed] that many studies are based on white, cisgendered and middle class people, and [...] consider[ed] how demographics are represented’. Laura, an Archaeology student who studied in 2010–14, wanted her curriculum to have ‘[a]cknowledge[d] the many presentations of gender identity in archaeology as the norm, rather than binary concepts and [presenting] archaeology as a study of “mankind”’ (suggesting that trans inclusivity would go hand in hand with undoing sexism in the curriculum). E, a History and English student in 2006–9, considered her curriculum had presented a binaristic and cisnormative concept of gender throughout:

even in Gender History the material covered was mainly about the experiences of cis women, and in fact there was a lot more about biological sex than about gender identity. [...] identities were seen as either ‘male’ or ‘female’ - the narrative of women being oppressed collapsed women into a single category and assumed that all women – and indeed all those oppressed by gender stereotypes – had female genitalia.⁷ [...] The issue of gender only ever came up in terms of women's equality with men, so most discussions were actually built around a binary of gender (rather than, eg. cis men’s privilege, which would have allowed for a wider range of categories).

[...] In the literature half of my degree there was also not very much on LGBTQ+ people in general and certainly nothing on trans issues. [...] [T]hinking about the trans or non-binary authors I know of, none were assigned unless as part of a ‘special’ topic – ie. LGBTQ+ literature was segregated from ‘standard’ literature. So Victorian literature included cis women and men, but no nonbinary figures – for example.

E considered that her curriculum could have been improved:

By having some trans people in it, first of all. But also more focus on gender as a social construct, and less focus on biology as a tool of oppression – or at least on cis woman's experience of biology as a tool of oppression.

Metis, a genderfluid student who began their Psychology BSc in 2011 and was now studying an MSc, also felt trans topics were tokenised within the curriculum – an endemic problem in the design of learning about social marginalisation (hooks 1994: 38–9). The knowledge presented in their one lecture on gender identity had not informed the curriculum’s coverage of survey design, or even of microaggressions, which were limited to gender and race. They and the other Psychology student in the study both felt that the cisnormativity of

⁷ The shortcomings of generalisations about a single category of womanhood have already been broken down in women’s and gender history by Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham and other historians of black women, who show that ‘factors of class and race make any generalization regarding womanhood’s common oppression impossible’ (Higginbotham 1989: 63). Although racism and cissexism are distinct forms of oppression, this literature offers a well-established example of gender historians recognising other oppressions intersecting with the category of ‘woman’ to produce very different experiences within the category.

their research methods training had left them underequipped for conducting research in their discipline. Metis considered that students learning questionnaire design ought to be taught how to ask about gender in ways that enabled trans and non-binary people to take part (guidance that Jade would also have appreciated in the preparation for her third-year research project). They also commented that all example datasets used in their teaching contained 'strictly binary data on gender', reflecting the structural cisnormativity of survey instruments in social research: 'At the time, multidimensional scales for gender identity assessment hadn't been developed, but now that one has (Joel et al. 2014),⁸ they could also talk about that.' Jade similarly noted that introductory modules could have equipped students to understand structural inequalities in the production of psychological knowledge by 'explaining that many studies are based on white, cisgendered and middle class people'.

Specifically non-binary inclusivity was also seen as lacking by many respondents (Hypothesis 3). 9 respondents did not remember 'identities and experiences outside the male–female gender binary' (my phrasing) being covered at all, with one (Metis, who began university in 2011) adding 'I got more coverage of non-binary identities at A-level than I did in my degree!'), and another (Jay, who had studied 2003–13) that '[q]uite frankly it struggled to cover much beyond white men (usually also dead)'. Another 2 said '[h]ardly' or '[v]ery seldom'. 2 remembered only one reading covering non-binary identities/experiences (*Gender Trouble* in one case; in another, Don Kulick's ethnography of Brazilian *travesti* sex workers (Kulick 1998)). 2 others felt that teaching had tried to interrogate the gender binary but in fact 'reached fairly stereotypical and normative conclusions' (Dominic) or 'simply reinforced traditional gender roles' (J, a Politics student in 2006–14). Tuesday was the most positive, and even her praise – 'Not super well, but I was grateful to have it be introduced as a concept we should know about' – was qualified. This in any case referred to her studies in the US. Non-binary gender was thus invisible in almost all the UK teaching that respondents recalled.

4 respondents discussing UK courses recalled readings by trans authors being available, including work by the sociologist of masculinities Raewyn Connell, the political scientist Sabrina Ramet (the only reading by a trans author not on trans-specific topics that any respondent remembered⁹), the historian Susan Stryker, the gender theorist Jack Halberstam, and a historical figure whose writing had been used as a primary source in a History class, Catalina/Antonio/Alonso de Erauso. Incorporating trans authors into the curriculum is important in demonstrating to students that trans people are producers, not just subjects, of expertise, and in countering legacies of abstraction and medicalisation of knowledge about trans people (Spade 2012: 59). 2 respondents, in contrast, recalled trans/non-binary topics being covered only through readings that described trans people as abnormal or (uncritically-presented) openly transphobic readings. With a wide range of scholarly literature now available that challenges such perspectives, it is inappropriate and indeed harmful for such readings to provide the only coverage of trans/non-binary topics in an entire curriculum.

2.2 Independent learning

⁸ Metis provided this as a URL in their survey response.

⁹ Not all trans or non-binary scholars are out professionally, especially in subject areas outside Gender Studies; teachers can nevertheless strive to include trans authors of whom they are aware.

Independent study unexpectedly (from the viewpoint of the survey design, which had not asked about it) emerged as a much more important source of education on trans issues than reading assigned in the curriculum. This testifies to the significance of the university and in particular its library as a site for self-directed education supplementary or incidental to students' programmes of study. It especially suggests the importance of university libraries developing inclusive collections that allow students to navigate them as sites of discovery beyond their assigned reading lists (Sadler and Bourg 2015). Jay 'was definitely reading Raewyn Connell's work by the first year of [her] PhD' but could not remember if she had been assigned it or picked it up herself. Dominic 'had found such readings myself' during his PhD in Health. '123' remembered being assigned Ramet in an area studies module but no trans-specific readings in a 'kinship, gender, sexuality and class' module apart from Kulick's 1998 book (this at some point between 2008 and 2012!); however, she listed six readings on gender non-conformity and the social construction of sex that she had 'enjoyed' though not having been assigned them.

This finding is in keeping with the insight that self-directed learning can form part of a critical pedagogy by empowering students to redress structural exclusions in their curriculum (Brookfield 1993). Indeed, I have observed this in my own teaching where some students taking a module which contains an independent research essay tell me they chose it or enjoy it because it permits them to write about topics such as feminism or LGBT history which they do not consider to be covered well enough in our History curriculum. This reparative strategy for managing perceived deficiencies in the curriculum does however require tutors and supervisors to have sufficient expertise and sensitivity to support students' independent learning. Where they do not, the experience is discouraging, as Jon (a trans man who reported transphobic harassment inside and outside class during his Law and Philosophy studies in 2006–10) recalled: 'I chose to write my dissertation on the GRA [Gender Recognition Act 2004]. My supervisor's understanding of it was extremely flawed!'

Students in this situation risk being assessed according to a flawed understanding of a topic where they may have more expertise than their tutor, and/or missing out on the quality of supervision and feedback they would have received if supervisors had been better prepared, so that independent research assignments do not fulfil their pedagogical potential. Indeed, without a good level of supervisory knowledge, even the resources that a library might supply can end up not being used: Jon also commented that '[w]e had access to accurate case law and legislation [on trans rights and gender recognition] but it was never raised.' Dominic's current PhD, on the other hand, demonstrated that a shared base of knowledge and experience could produce effective supervision: 'I think the best experiences have been from my PhD – but I'm trans and so is my supervisor, so it's more a case of us having good conversations rather than specific teaching.' Self-directed learning required knowledgeable, up-to-date support from libraries and supervisors. It was also insufficient in creating a curriculum where students such as Tuesday and her classmates would encounter the threshold concepts of cisnormativity and the social construction of sex and gender *for the first time*.

Students who did possess and gain expertise on trans issues through lived experience and/or self-directed learning often found themselves in the position of educating other students (and tutors) in the classroom. Metis, for instance, recalled:

From my Master's so far (one semester), there hasn't been much about trans people that wasn't brought up by me. I've mentioned trans issues as examples

(e.g. when a lecturer asked us to think of examples of health inequalities) and have often been praised by lecturers for bringing them up, and received a pretty positive response to a project I did on trans sexual health, but trans people haven't really been directly mentioned in the curriculum at all as far as I can remember. [...] This kind of thing is really important going forward – my cis classmates would often turn to me when I'd brought up trans issues in an example and say things like 'I would never have thought of that!'. And of course, they won't, unless trans people are brought into their awareness in the context of their course.

Connor, similarly, could 'think of only two times trans issues were raised in a tutorial (both by me)', during classes on feminism (where fellow students seemed 'largely uncomfortable' but the tutor was 'warm and engaging') and Marxism (where the tutor had been eager to learn). Sophie, an arts student in 2001–9, recognised the potential of her discipline's pedagogy to create space for trans inclusivity but did not think this had happened in practice:

I have no recollection of trans or non-binary issues being explicitly covered in any of the institutions I attended, though the frame of art practice and study is very much student led, and therefore allowed for students to bring this issues into the room. I don't remember this happening, beyond the most surface references to Frida Kahlo's non-binary identification, or, worse, discriminatory references to trans or non-binary students. I'm not convinced the staff were well versed in gender politics.

Achieving trans coverage through student intervention might have been effective in a particular student's seminar group, but could not be described as a component of an inclusive *curriculum*; instead, it left students substituting for an institutional lack of knowledge, resources and planning. In such cases, whether and how trans issues were discussed was contingent on knowledgeable students being both present and willing to contribute (in a setting where they may often have been unsure of how students and tutors would respond). This left them facing what hooks (1994: 43–4) terms (in discussing teaching about race) 'unfair responsibility' as an objectified 'native informant', where this burden should instead be carried by the *designer* of teaching and learning. The pedagogical effect of student interventions would moreover depend on how tutors legitimised the contribution; if the tutor dismissed it or shut it down, other students might not treat the knowledge as valid and the impact on the student-contributor could also be distressing. This was the case for another respondent who described all but one of his tutors looking annoyed when he brought trans issues up in class. It had had an even greater effect on Dominic, whose account of a confrontation with his tutor over the history of Catalina/Alonso Erauso (below) demonstrates that classroom microaggressions could compromise attempts to include gender non-conformity in the curriculum (Hypothesis 2) with repercussions that could extend far beyond the immediate learning activity.

2.3 *The classroom environment*

Hypothesis 2, that classroom 'microaggressions' would be likely to compromise efforts towards trans-inclusive curricula that have been made, is borne out for at least some students. The risk of covering trans issues when instructors are poorly prepared or, worse, personally indisposed to covering them sensitively (that is, actively transphobic) is that trans

students may be left distressed by microaggressions and erasure and that cis students will gain incomplete or flawed understanding. 3 students, all trans, reported particularly negative classroom experiences. Jon, when asked what the classroom experience had been like, wrote: 'It was only raised as a joke. A male tutor asked a cis girl in front of the class if she had a penis. Such jokes were made by staff despite knowing they had at least two transsexual students.' Another student, at university since 2013 (well after the Equalities Act 2010 came into force and universities should have been expected to address this), felt that one of his tutors had gone out of his way to be pejorative towards trans people even when discussing unrelated topics, that he had been unfairly assessed when tutors knew that he was trans, and that his department had not acted on transphobic behaviour by staff even after students had reported it on module evaluations. He also reported that his friends' lecturers had described trans people as deceptive of their sexual partners, used slurs against intersex people and refused to be corrected, and misgendered a supervisee. The longest account came from Dominic, for whom an incident of trans erasure during an undergraduate class had potentially affected his attitude to studying LGBT topics even as a postgraduate:

I did an undergraduate module in a history degree [...] which featured the case of Catalina/Alonso de Erauso (a seventeenth century person assigned female at birth, but who appears to have voluntarily lived most of their life as male, and was eventually granted papal permission to live in male clothes). However, my lecturer started talking about Erauso 'really' being a woman. I challenged the assumption that Erauso was really a woman, given that it seems clear his preference was to live as male. The lecturer assumed I hadn't understood the story properly and dismissed my point.

[...] When I attempted to correct my lecturer on her statement that Erauso was 'really' a woman, I was in the rather uncomfortable situation where she did not know I was trans (I don't think) but several of my fellow students did, although I had never discussed it with them. So although no-one said anything, I personally felt quite embarrassed and that other students might think I was being over-sensitive as a trans person (although this is absolutely me projecting). I think the lecturer saw it as so self-evidently true that Erauso was 'really' a woman that she did not understand my point and assumed I hadn't read the text properly, so dismissed me. This would have been in around 2006, but I can still remember the experience as humiliating.

[...] My Management Studies PG diploma featured very little on LGBT issues in general. To be honest, I tended to avoid modules where LGBT issues might have come up (e.g. the HR module), because I didn't expect they would be covered well and I didn't want to have to argue with the lecturer.

When asked how well his curriculum had covered non-binary identities and experiences, Dominic again referred to the problematic History module:

My undergraduate history course attempted to raise them [...] but in fact reached fairly stereotypical and normative conclusions. There certainly wasn't any clear attempt to apply gender or queer theories to the stories, nor even to approach them from the perspective of the teller. I don't think it had occurred

to the lecturer that any of the students might have current trans or non-binary experiences.

Nothing of this was included in Management Studies. I am including it within the PhD.

The problem of making '[b]iological sex [...] the fountain of truth' (Boyd 1999: 77) about the identities of gender-non-conforming subjects in the recuperative project of lesbian/women's history (and automatically labelling people like de Erauso as lesbians or gender-non-conforming women) is well-known to historians of sexuality and gender (Boyd 1999; Reis 2004: 170–1; Halberstam 2005), who were discussing it well before 2006. An up-to-date gender history curriculum would have benefited from exploring this question, not shutting it down – as long as it was handled in a sensitive way.¹⁰ Dominic's suggestions for what would have made his History curriculum more inclusive pointed to the risks of cisnormatively covering these topics as intellectual 'curiosities' without expecting any trans or non-binary students to be in the room:

I think if lecturers are going to make an effort to raise gender non-normative stories from the past, they need to register that these may be issues which affect current students, and to have a look at some of the up-to-date gender and queer and trans theories, rather than treating them as historical curiosities.

The tutor of Dominic's module might have thought she was approaching gender history in an innovative, radical, even emancipatory way by incorporating the narrative of a gender non-conforming person (in her eyes, a woman breaking gender norms) into the curriculum. Her shutting down of Dominic's challenge, however, had the opposite of an emancipatory effect. Not only was he left uncomfortable with the History class, but he avoided LGBT topics in some of his later studies because of his expectations that he would have to 'argue with the lecturer' and that Management 'would only ever have treated it as a potential 'diversity' issue to manage – and frankly I think I'd have cringed at being the only trans student in the room while people who didn't know that much about it discussed it, even if it came from a wellmeaning place'. This would not have been caused solely by the de Erauso incident but it had been important enough for him to mention in four separate responses during the survey. Doctoral research, with one-to-one teaching and learning through supervision, on the other hand represented an environment where Dominic could apply his independent initiative to the full.

Other trans and non-binary students reported more mixed experiences but concurred on the effects of having to out themselves in order to make a point in class (especially since they might not have been able to update student records to show their correct name and gender), and the uncertainty about whether tutors and students would accept their gender. Sahra described her classroom environment as '[t]ypical cis-ignorance'. Connor, 'as a fairly androgynous AFAB [assigned female at birth] person who uses he/him pronouns', often had

¹⁰ Two contrasting approaches to writing about de Erauso, for instance, appear in a 2007 *Gender and History* article that calls de Erauso 'she' throughout, except in two paragraphs about his military career in South America (Aresti 2007), and a 2015 article in *Colonial Latin American Review* which does not seek to determine de Erauso's gender from the historical sources at all but is interested in how Spanish officials and others in the sources produced knowledge about de Erauso's gender, class and social status (Goldmark 2015).

to correct staff who addressed him as 'she'. While '[m]ultiple tutors have [...] been very polite and accommodating when I corrected them':

One tutor actively refused to use he/him, and made a point to use she/her and to refer to me as a girl.

Additionally, several tutors, whether they assumed I was a girl originally or not, when I asserted I was a boy, assumed I was a cis boy. Upon finding out I was trans, they are often ask uncomfortable, invasive questions or offered unsolicited opinions on trans people (e.g.: 'it's just a fad for confused teens').

While I have also had some positive experiences, primarily from younger tutor and lecturers and from other students, many staff members are actively hostile to transgender people.

Zahra, who began a Languages degree in 2014, had also had to deal with classmates who were confused about their gender:

I identify as non binary/gender fluid and go from presenting as 'femme' to masculine frequently. It has led to my classmates asking me if I'm 'gay or something' loads of times. I'm most comfortable presenting as both and neither bothers me but people don't like not knowing what gender someone is.

[...] I was in a humanities class for beginners last year where the lecturer and some of the classmates talked about how they found it ridiculous that there were more than two gender options. One classmate told me that there was no such thing as agenderness even though I tried to explain to him that there are people that are non binary that do exist and it doesn't make them defiant of some sort. It fell to deaf ears.

While Zahra did not describe this as causing them particular distress, it was a level of non-recognition that cisgender students would not have to negotiate.

When the curriculum lacked trans content, there might from one point of view be less likelihood of classroom microaggressions because trans topics would not even be being discussed. The lack of curriculum content would itself, however, constitute an institutional micro (verging on macro) aggression – signalling an environment where trans students' experiences are not validated and cis students do not receive the education they may need to transform their own understandings of gender identity. E was among the respondents for whom '[t]rans issues and experiences [were] seldom discussed in classroom'. She attributed this partly to 'a tradition of old white male teachers, many of whom went to my university at 18 and stayed there, who think trans issues are "nonsense"', but also to:

in general – a lack of willingness to discuss trans issues. If someone trans had been in the classroom and wanted to discuss trans/nonbinary issues, they would have had to bring it up as a new subject, which they might (justifiably) have found intimidating.

Designing more inclusive curricula would have helped to overcome this situation, which burdened students with needing to interject a new topic of knowledge into a course of

study which had already been set out as authoritative, at risk of potential or expected hostility from students or staff.

Several respondents recommended that, as 'Mr' (a queer gender-non-conforming cissexual man studying History and Politics since 2008) put it, 'even basic classroom dynamics could have been considerably more trans inclusive, let alone the course content.' 'Mr' was among 6 respondents who commented that students and staff needed to learn not to assume someone's gender based on their appearance, the gender they had been assigned at birth or the gender on their student records. Opinions were divided over whether staff should invite all students to state what gender pronouns they used as part of their classroom management. Two genderqueer/genderfluid students would have welcomed this, though, as 'Mr' pointed out, this could also 'potentially [be] forcing someone to come out to a room full of strangers' and removing their agency over who they disclosed their gender identity to. Tuesday, who was now involved in teaching, tried to use non-gender-specific language rather than pronouns when managing her class.

Tuesday had also had the most positive environment for discussing trans issues, during her US undergraduate degree. This had begun in her first-year Introduction to Women's Studies class and continued into an upper-level Queer Literature module, which had benefited from a self-selecting student body:

The Queer Lit course was exceptional, I thought. It was an elective course, so students who wanted to take it would [take it], skewing very much towards the various LGBTQ+ faces on campus, so it was a very careful space for discussion.

In many other cases, discussing trans and non-binary issues in particular modules was impeded because students had not yet acquired the foundational, transformative knowledge about gender identity beyond the gender binary (or what trans writers, adopting the naming conventions of US first-year undergraduate modules, often call 'Trans 101'). This suggests that achieving trans and non-binary inclusivity cannot be fully achieved at module level, however committed a particular teacher is to challenging cisnormativity and transphobia; it is instead a *programme*-level matter. Zahra implied this when explaining how they had felt silenced from talking about non-binary gender in class, in a way that they felt could have been avoided if cis students had been better prepared outside the module:

It was uncomfortable for me to sit still and not say a word as I was uncomfortable outing myself to people who viewed people outside of the binary as being PC. As not normal. It would be great if lecturers or even the students had to do a workshop at the start of the year [to] understand that there are people that see themselves as gender queer or are agender or bigender and so on.

Zahra felt this would have made them more able to participate in classes about matters that affected them. Jay, who had studied social sciences in 2003–13 and was now an early-career academic, shared this view when answering the question about how her curriculum's trans inclusivity could have been improved:

It would have needed to start with a much more nuanced and developed account of gender, and once that was in place then the trans inclusivity would have naturally followed. I think a lot of failures in this area are packaged up with

a failure to teach gender well. You can't just rock up and say 'today we're going to be discussing nonbinary gender experiences': undergraduates especially struggle with the idea that gender is not a fixed, biological, determined 'thing'. The binary is so self-evident to them that it becomes invisible. So the issue is much bigger.

Expecting one optional module to do all the transformative work in changing students' understanding of a threshold concept is an extremely difficult task. It also overlooks the level of what knowledge *teachers* need in order to teach transformatively about gender; as hooks (1994: 36) notes, 'the fears teachers have when asked to shift their paradigms' are real, and need to be alleviated through 'transformative pedagogy' themselves.

2.4 Relative importance of curriculum and other areas of HE

Respondents identified a range of issues outside the curriculum that needed to be addressed in order for higher education to be a trans-inclusive environment (Table 7) – chiefly: safe access to toilets (including gender-neutral toilet provision and respecting all students' right to choose the appropriate toilet for their gender); accommodation and housing provision; smooth and consistent procedures for implementing students' name and pronoun changes; accommodating trans students in Mitigating Circumstances procedures; use of inclusive language; and avoiding the misgendering or outing of students through university paperwork and IDs. These findings suggest that, as the NUS survey of LGBT students in 2014 also found, 'the multiple barriers that [trans] people face as students' need to be addressed 'simultaneously' (Acciari 2014: 19) for students to be able to participate in teaching and learning.

Many of these barriers related to university systems forcing students to reveal their trans status and/or a previous name, or not communicating name/pronoun changes effectively. Jon, for instance, pointed out that universities needed to '[a]llow students to use chosen names and titles – my old name flashed up on a screen whenever I took out books'. He had also had severe difficulties obtaining degree certificates in his correct name, and had experienced directly transphobic jokes by tutors in class. As with the inclusivity of the curriculum, therefore, even an administrative system that followed best practice in ensuring trans/non-binary people's privacy and autonomy would still fail to achieve its objectives if staff continued to behave in transphobic ways. Indeed, NUS research in 2014 found that (although 6 out of 10 trans respondents believed their lecturers would intervene if they witnessed transphobic behaviour in the classroom¹¹) '[t]he great majority' of trans respondents had been 'repeatedly misnamed and mis-gendered by their tutors' in terms that amounted to harassment (Acciari 2014: 22, 39). The psychological stakes of misgendering are illustrated by the testimony of a young trans man who summarised his university experience in written evidence to the parliamentary Transgender Equality inquiry:

I [...] studied Psychology for two of three terms, eventually suspending and then ceasing study all together before I'd finished the year due to many reasons. Most of the reason was my own disability, but it was exacerbated by bullying from other students, and ignorance by lecturers. Frequently I was misgendered (mistaken for

¹¹ This figure is significantly lower than the 7.9 in 10 of heterosexual students, and the 7.2 in 10 of LGB students, who believed this (Acciari 2014: 39) – suggesting that those respondents who themselves felt the effects of transphobia were the least confident that lecturers would intervene.

female, in my case, such as the wrong pronouns or title being used) by teachers as my voice hadn't yet been lowered by testosterone hormone replacement therapy, a mistake, but one which could've been avoided if they'd just looked at my name on the register – XXXX. I went through effort and expense, correcting every part of my documentation to avoid those issues, but one word, one pronoun, invalidates all of that in those moments.¹²

Young people suffering transphobic, biphobic or homophobic harassment inside and outside class, as an LGBT Youth Scotland study of young people's experiences in education stated, 'are more than likely diverting their energy from learning to protecting themselves from physical, mental or emotional harm. Until they are protected from such discrimination, their wellbeing is not ensured' (LGBT Youth Scotland 2012: 12).

The impact of wider university structures on students' capacity to participate in learning and teaching suggested by this survey is therefore consistent with the findings of larger-scale quantitative research. A noticeable finding which was made possible because participants' responses were based on free text, however – and a finding that would not have been picked up in surveys conducted among trans students only – is that when asked about issues outside the curriculum, trans and non-binary respondents highlighted more matters than cis respondents, highlighted many matters that cis respondents did not, and generally provided more detail about the implications of the matters they discussed.

Major issues reflected in ECU guidance, university trans equality policies and staff diversity training were mentioned both by cis and trans/non-binary respondents, though trans/non-binary respondents mentioned them more often. Many matters to do with everyday interaction with university systems and services were, however, raised only by trans/non-binary respondents. These included the need to design processes that prevented forced disclosure of a student's trans status or (if they had changed it) birth name; trans and non-binary inclusion in student societies (including trans inclusion in LGBT societies, and non-binary students needing reassurance they would not be perceived as 'not trans enough'); trans awareness in university medical services, including gender-neutral access to condoms and pregnancy tests; the problem of gender non-conformity being treated as an intellectual curiosity not a lived experience; and, perhaps most seriously, transphobic harassment by students and also by staff. No cis respondents questioned why universities needed to ask about gender on forms, but this was the single most common point trans/non-binary respondents made.

The divergence between issues raised by trans/non-binary participants and cis participants in response to this question demonstrates that trans students have perspectives that cis students and staff, even if well-informed, are much less likely to perceive. The implication for universities' duties under the Equalities Act, and also for curriculum development, is that meaningful consultation with trans students is essential in order to ensure that new procedures and curriculum content will actually meet their needs.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

¹² Written evidence TRA0082 (Anonymised), 19 August 2015. <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/women-and-equalities-committee/transgender-equality/written/19362.html> (accessed 27 June 2016).

These findings suggest that, at least in terms of student perceptions, there has not been any significant improvement in trans/non-binary inclusivity since 2010, even though gender reassignment at that time became a protected characteristic under UK equalities legislation. This is contrary to the first hypothesis behind the study, which expected greater improvement might have been perceived. The second and third hypotheses – that participants would not perceive the curriculum as inclusive in practice if instructors teaching trans-inclusive material had caused or failed to challenge transphobic ‘microaggressions’ (McKinney 2005: 68), and that participants would still not perceive non-binary gender identities to have been included in teaching – were both supported, though the baseline level of perceptions about inclusivity in general did not give the third hypothesis much to improve on.

As an exploratory study, this research had several limitations which need to be acknowledged. The study had a small number of participants and was not designed to be statistically significant, nor to demonstrate how important a trans/non-binary-inclusive curriculum would be perceived as being among the UK student body as a whole. In collecting responses from across the humanities and social sciences, it did not specifically ask about aspects of disciplinary pedagogy that would require specific attention in these subject areas in order to ensure trans/non-binary-inclusive provision: for instance, the one Archaeology student (Laura) was the only respondent to mention support for trans students during residential fieldwork at remote archaeological sites with communal and gender-segregated accommodation, but this would be a significant consideration for all Archaeology departments/programmes and a potential barrier to trans/non-binary students succeeding in (or even choosing) Archaeology or other subjects (such as Geography) with organised residential fieldwork elements. Similarly, while no Languages/Area Studies respondents mentioned the solo year/semester abroad, this could cause similar (indeed greater) difficulties for trans/non-binary students, especially those who would need to travel with hormones, who would face additional risks in international travel because their identity documents did not match their gender presentation (see Beauchamp 2009) or who could not obtain accurate ID so could not travel. Subject associations in consultation with current/former trans/non-binary students of their subject could assist university departments here by publishing best practice guidelines geared to their disciplines’ distinctive teaching methods and learning environments.

The accounts collected in the survey suggest that several recommendations can still be made:

- Curricula should, at the very least, incorporate trans identities and experiences as an integral part of the subject rather than segregating them as a specialised or optional topic.
- They should not, however, be presented in an intellectualised or abstract way, or without awareness that there are likely to be trans or non-binary students among the class.
- Opportunities for independent learning which enable students to pursue trans/non-binary topics should be created,
- and should be *actively resourced* through up-to-date library provision,
- but tutors and departments should not depend on trans students to be the trans curriculum by educating classmates and staff through seminars.
- The diversity of gender identities and embodied experiences of gender should instead be recognised as a threshold concept that needs to be addressed at

programme level, potentially university-wide level, to ensure that more specific teaching in individual modules can be effective.

- At the same time, it is essential to provide *functioning* mechanisms for reporting transphobic harassment by students and staff so that trans students are able to fully participate in learning about these topics and all others.
- Finally, universities should remove barriers to trans students' learning and participation that they can solve themselves (such as problems negotiating university administration) and support them through obstacles that are larger than the university (such as barriers to accessing housing and health care, and intersections of gender-identity-based marginalisation with factors such as disability and race).

This study therefore supports scholars in History and other disciplines who have called for greater integration of trans/non-binary topics into the curriculum (Reis 2004; Boucher 2011; Matthews-Jones 2015) by suggesting that students continue to perceive this need as unmet. Investigating and improving trans/non-binary inclusivity in the curriculum, however, depends on and exposes an understanding of the politics of curriculum construction and where agency can be exerted within it. Early career staff may only be able to influence the curriculum at module level, and the most casualised staff may only be able to influence it at the level of planning seminar activities or supplying supplementary reading to accompany a fixed syllabus; learning design is both facilitated and constrained by what resources libraries can or might purchase; when students are not equipped to think beyond biologically determinist concepts of gender at programme level, as they generally are not, the task of teaching trans/non-binary topics at module level is much more difficult across the curriculum. There are nevertheless many opportunities to address these matters in ways that show how they intersect with oppressions based on race, class, nationality and disability (Boucher 2011). Designing an inclusive curriculum will not in itself undo the structural barriers to trans/non-binary students' participation and achievement at university, but can tackle the in-class obstacles to their learning – and equip all graduates to perceive and challenge wider structures of cissexism and transphobia in their private and professional lives.

Resources

Equality Challenge Unit: <http://www.ecu.ac.uk/guidance-resources/inclusive-environment/providing-support/trans-people/>

Gendered Intelligence (provides support for young trans people and training for staff working with trans youth, including universities):

<http://genderedintelligence.co.uk/professionals/education>

Gender Identity Research and Education Society (advises organisations and individuals):

<http://www.gires.org.uk/whatwedo#Support%20for%20Educators>

National Trans Youth Network (connects UK trans youth organisations): <http://ntyn.org.uk>

National Union of Students LGBT Campaign: <http://www.nus.org.uk/en/who-we-are/how-we-work/lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-trans/> (NUS voted in April 2016 to establish a specific Trans Campaign)

Scottish Transgender Alliance: <http://www.scottishtrans.org/resources/>

Transgender Northern Ireland: <https://transgenderni.com/>

UK Trans Info resources for schools and universities: <http://uktrans.info/transition/39-resources-for-schools>

References

- Acciari, Louise (2014) *Education beyond the straight and narrow: LGBT students' experience in higher education*. London: NUS. Available online: <http://web.archive.org/web/20140516152759/http://www.nus.org.uk/Global/lgbt-research.pdf> [accessed 27/11/2015].
- Ahmed, Sara (2012) *On being included: racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Aresti, Nerea (2007) 'The gendered identities of the "Lieutenant Nun": rethinking the story of a female warrior in early modern Spain'. *Gender and History* 19 (3): 401–18.
- Bauer, Greta R., Hammond, Rebecca, Travers, Robb, Kaay, Matthias, Hohenadel, Karin M., & Boyce, Michelle (2009) 'I don't think this is theoretical; this is our lives': how erasure impacts health care for transgender people. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*, 20(5), 348–61.
- Beauchamp, Toby (2009) Artful concealment and strategic visibility: transgender bodies and U.S. state surveillance after 9/11. *Surveillance and Society*, 6(4), 356–66.
- Beauchamp, Toby, & d'Harlingue, Benjamin (2012) Beyond additions and exceptions: the category of transgender and new pedagogical approaches for women's studies. *Feminist Formations*, 24(2), 25–51.
- Boucher, Michel J. (2011) Teaching 'trans issues': an intersectional and systems-based approach. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 125, 65–75.
- Boyd, Nan Alamilla (1999) The materiality of gender: looking for lesbian bodies in transgender history. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 3(3), 73–81.
- Brookfield, Stephen (1993) Self-directed learning, political clarity, and the critical practice of adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 43(4), 227–42.
- Butler, Judith (1990) *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cleaver, Elizabeth, Lintern, Maxine, & McLinden, Mike (2014) *Teaching and learning in higher education: disciplinary approaches to educational enquiry*. London: Sage.
- Connell, Raewyn (2012) Transsexual women and feminist thought: toward new understanding and new politics. *Signs*, 37(4), 857–81.
- Currah, Paisley (2001) Queer theory, lesbian and gay rights, and transsexual marriages. In Blasius, Mark (ed), *Sexual identities, queer politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 178–99.
- David, Maxine E. (2009) Social diversity and democracy in higher education in the 21st century: towards a feminist critique. *Higher Education Policy*, 22(1), 61–79.
- Ellis, Sonja J. (2009) Diversity and inclusivity at university: a survey of the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) students in the UK. *Higher Education*, 57(6), 723–39.
- Formby, Eleanor (2015) *#FreshersToFinals: from freshers' week to finals: understanding LGBT+ perspectives on, and experiences of, higher education*. Sheffield: Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, Sheffield Hallam University. Available online: <http://www.shu.ac.uk/assets/pdf/freshers-to-finals-end-report.pdf> [accessed 27/11/2015].
- Gendered Intelligence (n.d.) *Capturing journeys... and setting goals*. London: Gendered Intelligence.
- Goldmark, Matthew (2015) 'Reading habits: Catalina de Erauso and the subjects of early modern Spanish gender and sexuality'. *Colonial Latin American Review* 24 (2): 215–35.
- Grossman, Arnold H., and D'augelli, Anthony R. (2006) Transgender youth: invisible and vulnerable. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(1), 111–28.
- Halberstam, Judith (2005) *In a Queer Time and Place*. New York: New York University Press.
- Higginbotham, Evelyn Brooks (1989) 'Beyond the sound of silence: Afro-American women in history'. *Gender and History* 1 (1): 50–67.

hooks, bell (1994) *Teaching to transgress: education as the practice of freedom*. London and New York: Routledge.

James, Nalita, & Busher, Hugh (2009) *Online interviewing*. London: Sage.

Joel, Daphna, Tarrasch, Ricardo, Berman, Zohar, Mukamel, Maya, & Ziv, Effi (2014) Queering gender: studying gender identity in 'normative' individuals, *Psychology and Sexuality*, 5(4), 291–321.

Kennedy, Natacha (2013) Cultural cisgenderism: consequences of the imperceptible. *Psychology of Women Section Review*, 15(2), 1–7.

Kulick, Don (1998) *Travesti: sex, gender, and culture among Brazilian transgendered prostitutes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

LGBT Youth Scotland (2012) *Life in Scotland for LGBT young people: education report*. Edinburgh: LGBT Youth Scotland.
https://www.lgbtyouth.org.uk/files/documents/Life_in_Scotland_for_LGBT_Young_People_-_Education_Report_NEW.pdf [accessed: 27/6/2016].

Matthews-Jones, Lucinda (2015) Teaching women's and gender history: introducing our past, present and future. *Women's History*, 2(3), 4–7.

McKinney, Jeffrey S. (2005) On the margins: a study of the experiences of transgender college students. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*, 3(1), 63–76.

Metro (2014) *Youth chances survey of 16–25 year olds: first reference report*. London: Metro. Available online: http://www.youthchances.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/YouthChancesSurvey-16-25yearOlds_FirstReferenceReport.pdf [accessed: 28/11/2015].

Meyer, Jan, & Land, Ray (2003) Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines. In Rust, Chris (ed) *Improving student learning: ten years on*. Oxford: OCSLD, 1–16.

Namaste, Viviane (2000) *Invisible lives: the erasure of transsexual and transgendered people*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Namaste, Viviane (2009) Undoing theory: the 'transgender question' and the epistemic violence of Anglo-American feminist theory. *Hypatia*, 24(3), 11–32.

Nordmarken, Sonny (2014) Microaggressions. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 1(1–2), 129–34.

O'Connor, Henrietta, Madge, Claire, Shaw, Robert, & Wellens, Jane (2007) Internet-based interviewing. In Fielding, Nigel, Lee, Raymond M., & Blank, Grant (ed), *The Sage handbook of online research methods*. London: Sage, 271–90.

Prosser, Jay (1998) *Second skins: the body narratives of transsexuality*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pugh, Ellen (2010) *Trans staff and students in higher education*. London: Equality Challenge Unit. Available online: <http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/external/trans-staff-and-students-in-he-revised-2010.pdf> [accessed 27/11/2015].

Reis, Elizabeth (2004) Teaching transgender history, identity, and politics. *Radical History Review*, 88, 166–77.

Sadler, Bess, & Bourg, Chris (2015) Feminism and the future of library discovery, *Code4Lib Journal*, 28. Available online: <http://journal.code4lib.org/articles/10425> [Accessed 26/11/2015].

Serano, Julia (2007) *Whipping girl: a transsexual woman on sexism and the scapegoating of femininity*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.

Shaw, Jenny, Brain, Kevin, Bridger, Kath, Foreman, Judith, & Reid, Ivan (2007) *Embedding widening participation and promoting student diversity: what can be learned from a business case approach?*. York: Higher Education Academy. Available online:

https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/resources/embedding_wp_business_case_approach_july07.pdf [Accessed 28/11/2015].

Spade, Dean (2012) Some very basic tips for making higher education more accessible to trans students and rethinking how we talk about gendered bodies. *The Radical Teacher*, 92, 57–62.

Steinmetz, Katy (2014) The transgender tipping point. *Time*, 29 May. Available online: <http://time.com/135480/transgender-tipping-point/> [Accessed 27/11/2015].

Stryker, Susan (2008) *Transgender history*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.

Stryker, Susan, and Whittle, Stephen (ed) (2006) *The transgender studies reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sue, Derald Wing, Capodilupo, Christina M., Torino, Gina C., Bucceri, Jennifer M., Holder, Aisha M. B., Nadal, Kevin L., & Esquilin, Marta (2007) Racial microaggressions in everyday life: implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271–86.

Sue, Valerie M., & Ritter, Lois A. (2007) *Conducting online surveys*. London: Sage.

UK Trans Info (2015) *Results of terminology survey*. UK Trans Info. Available online: <http://uktrans.info/attachments/article/377/terminology-survey-results.pdf> [accessed 28/11/2015].

Valentine, Gill, Wood, Nichola, and Plummer, Paul (2009). *The experience of lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans staff and students in higher education*. London: Equality Challenge Unit. Available online: <http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/external/Experiences-of-lgbt-staff-and-students-in-he.doc> [accessed 27/11/2015].

Williams, Cristan (2014) Gender performance: *The Transadvocate* interviews Judith Butler. *The Transadvocate*, 1 May. Available online: http://www.transadvocate.com/gender-performance-the-transadvocate-interviews-judith-butler_n_13652.htm [accessed 28/11/2015].

Appendix I: Hypotheses and methodology

As a qualitative online study, this survey's methodology adapted the open-response elements of the research design used by Sonja Ellis (2009) in studying UK LGBT students' perceptions of harassment and discrimination. Unlike Ellis, however, it did not attempt to draw quantitative conclusions and did not utilise Likert scales; it instead aimed to elicit narratives about teaching and learning using a series of prompts asking respondents about their curriculum content, classroom dynamics and institutional environment. While open-ended questions are known to attract lower response rates than closed questions in online survey research, they do not restrict respondents to the categories designed by the researcher and thus, as evidence about perceptions, generate more accurate data (Sue and Ritter 2007: 43–4). They also permit participants to draw complex conceptual connections as they respond, making them an important complement to larger-scale qualitative surveys.

This research was an asynchronous process where knowledge and narration were mediated through textual representation (James and Busher 2009: 10–11). While narratives could not be as directly co-produced as in a face-to-face interview, it permitted respondents to consider their responses in their own time without the pressure of being in front of an interviewer (O'Connor et al. 2007: 272–3), and it enabled me to widen the participant population outside my own university (thus reducing, though not eliminating, the power differential between myself and participants (see Cleaver, Lintern and McLinden 2014: 66–7)) without the need for travel. It did however restrict participation to those with access to an internet connection and time to respond.

The study had three hypotheses and five research questions. Hypothesis 1, prompted by the extension of diversity policy into (some areas of) transgender equality as a result of the

Equalities Act, was that current students and very recent (post-2013) graduates would report slightly more positively (compared to less recent graduates) on trans inclusivity or, at least, would report less exposure to directly transphobic content (Hypothesis 1); their perceptions of what inclusivity actually constituted would also be important to discern. The others qualified Hypothesis 1 by hypothesising that students would not perceive the curriculum as inclusive in practice if instructors had been teaching trans-inclusive material but not been challenging – or had themselves been perpetrating (McKinney 2005: 68) – microaggressions (Hypothesis 2), and that respondents would not perceive non-binary identities to have been incorporated well into the curriculum even in very recent teaching and learning (Hypothesis 3). The five research questions were therefore:

- How trans-inclusive have respondents perceived their curricula as being, and is there any evidence this has improved since 2010? (Hypothesis 1)
- What examples of good practice in the planning and implementation of curriculum trans inclusivity have students remembered? (Hypothesis 1)
- In students’ perceptions, how seriously do classroom ‘microaggressions’ compromise efforts towards trans-inclusive curricula which have been made? (Hypothesis 2)
- To what extent do students perceive efforts towards trans-inclusive curricula to have accommodated non-binary as well as binary trans identities? (Hypothesis 3)

Relative to other factors that impact the accessibility of higher education to trans students, how important do students perceive an inclusive curriculum to be? (Hypothesis 1)

Appendix 2: Data

Table 1: Respondents’ disciplines

Subject	UG	PG	Number ¹³
Archaeology		1	1
Economics	1		1
Film	1		1
Fine Arts	1	1	1
Health and Social Care		1	1
History	3	1	4
Humanities	1		1
Languages	1		1
Law	1	1	2
Literature/English	2	1	3
Management		1	1
Philosophy	1	1	2
Politics/International Relations	3	5	5
Psychology	2	1	2
Social Sciences		2	2

Table 2: Dates of study

Periods of study	Number
------------------	--------

¹³ Due to joint degrees and multiple degrees, this column totals higher than the total of respondents. Rows may total lower than component columns if a respondent studied one subject at both levels.

All before 2010	3
Before 2010 and after 2010	7
After 2010 only	8
Completed studies	10
Still studying	8

Table 3: Ages of respondents

Age	Number
18–21	1
22–25	7
26–34	7
35–44	3

Table 4: Genders of respondents

Gender	Number
Female	8
Male	5
Non-binary, genderfluid or genderqueer ¹⁴	4
Not stated/Prefer not to say	1

Table 5: Pronouns respondents asked me to use

Pronoun	Number
She/her	9 ¹⁵
Him/his	5
They/them/their	2
Multiple preferences	1
Not stated ¹⁶	1

Table 6: Gender identity

Gender identity	Number
Cis	6
Trans	5
Non-binary (did not describe as trans)	1
Not stated	6

Table 8: Important matters other than curriculum for trans and non-binary inclusion in higher education, per gender identity of respondents

¹⁴ These non-binary gender identities are amalgamated in the table because some respondents used more than one term in describing their gender identity.

¹⁵ Including one request for 'She/her/Your Fierceness'.

¹⁶ This respondent had answered the pilot, which had a free-text field for gender but not a separate one for pronouns. The main survey included one, on his recommendation. He subsequently asked for his response to be included in the main survey results so that he would not have to fill it in again.

Topic	Gender identity			Number
	Cis	Trans/NB	Not given	
Toilets	1	3	2	6
Documentation and paperwork	1	3	1	5
Name changes	1	3		4
Data collection about gender		4		4
Language use	2	1	1	4
<i>Genders other than male and female</i>	1		1	2
<i>Including genderfluidity</i>	1			1
<i>Challenging slurs</i>		1		1
Student progress	2	2		4
<i>Mitigating circumstances procedures</i>	1	1		2
<i>Impact of trans health care needs</i>	1	1		2
Accommodation and housing	2	2		4
<i>Accommodation (university halls)</i>	1	2		3
<i>Accommodation (cost of living)</i>	1			1
Sports facilities and teams	1	2		3
Atmosphere in general	1	2		3
Support staff and services	1	1		3
Training for students outside modules	1		1	3
Social inequalities in general	1	1		3
Student societies		3		3
<i>Trans inclusion</i>		2		2
<i>Non-binary inclusion</i>		1		1
Avoiding forced disclosure		3		3
Training for staff	2	1		3
University medical services		2		2
Harassment by students		2		2
Harassment by staff		2		2
Residential activities		1	1	2
Not treating trans/non-binary as curiosity		2		2
Careers advice	1			1
Harassment reporting mechanisms		1		1
Employment of trans staff	1			1
Awareness of how students respond	1			1
Library provision	1			1
Engaging with trans/NB-inclusive institutions	1			1