

Erasure and Resilience: The Experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color

Asian American and Pacific Islander
LGBTQ Youth in U.S. Schools



A Report from GLSEN and
the National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance



Erasure and Resilience: The Experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color

**Asian American and Pacific Islander
LGBTQ Youth in U.S. Schools**

by Nhan L. Truong, Ph.D.
Adrian D. Zongrone, M.P.H.
Joseph G. Kosciw, Ph.D.

National Headquarters

110 William St., 30th Floor
New York, NY 10038
Ph: 212-727-0135 Fax: 212-727-0254

DC Policy Office

Make Office K Street
6th Floor, Attn: GLSEN
1015 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC, 20005
Ph: 202-347-7780 Fax: 202-347-7781

© 2020 GLSEN

ISBN 978-1-934092-30-9

glsen@glsen.org
www.glsen.org

When referencing this document, we recommend the following citation:

Truong, N. L., Zongrone, A. D., & Kosciw, J. G. (2020). *Erasure and resilience: The experiences of LGBTQ students of color, Asian American and Pacific Islander LGBTQ youth in U.S. schools*. New York: GLSEN.

GLSEN is the leading national education organization focused on ensuring safe schools for all students. Established in 1990, GLSEN envisions a world in which every child learns to respect and accept all people, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity/expression. GLSEN seeks to develop school climates where difference is valued for the positive contribution it makes to creating a more vibrant and diverse community. For more information on our educator resources, research, public policy agenda, student leadership programs, or development initiatives, visit www.glsen.org.

Graphic design: Adam Fredericks

Cover illustration: Mohammed Fayaz

Electronic versions of this report and all other GLSEN research reports are available at www.glsen.org/research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACEvii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSxi

EXECUTIVE SUMMARYxiii

 Englishxiii

 Chinese (Simplified)..... xxi

 Korean.....xxix

 Vietnamese xxxvii

 Hindi..... xlv

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODS AND SAMPLE DESCRIPTION 5

PART ONE: SAFETY AND EXPERIENCES WITH HARASSMENT AND ASSAULT 11

 Safety..... 13

 Biased Remarks..... 14

 Harassment and Assault 14

 Reporting School-Based Harassment and Assault..... 18

 Insight on Family Reporting and Intervention..... 19

 Conclusions..... 20

PART TWO: SCHOOL PRACTICES 21

 Experiences with School Discipline..... 23

 School-Based Supports and Resources for AAPI LGBTQ Students..... 25

 Insight on Club Participation and Leadership..... 28

 Insight on Inclusive Curriculum 32

 Conclusions..... 33

DISCUSSION 35

 Limitations..... 37

 Conclusions..... 37

 Recommendations 38

ENDNOTES..... 41

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table S.1	Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants.....	8
Table S.2	Characteristics of Survey Participants' Schools	9
Figure 1.1	AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Felt Unsafe at School Because of Actual or Perceived Personal Characteristics.....	13
Figure 1.2	Frequency of Hearing Anti-LGBTQ and Racist Remarks in School	14
Figure 1.3	Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Experienced Victimization Based on Personal Characteristics	15
Figure 1.4	Victimization Based on Sexual Orientation and AAPI LGBTQ Student Well-Being and Academic Outcomes	15
Figure 1.5	Victimization Based on Race/Ethnicity and AAPI LGBTQ Student Well-Being and Academic Outcomes.....	16
Figure 1.6	Differences in Level of Victimization by Trans/GNC Status.....	16
Figure 1.7	Differences in Level of Victimization by Multiple Racial/Ethnic Identities.....	17
Figure 1.8	AAPI LGBTQ Student Well-Being and Multiple Forms of Victimization Based on Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity	17
Figure 1.9	Frequency of AAPI LGBTQ Students Reporting Incidents of Harassment and Assault to School Staff	18
Insight Figure:	Frequency of Intervention by AAPI LGBTQ Students' Family Members	19
Figure 2.1	Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Experienced School Discipline.....	23
Figure 2.2	Experiences of School Discipline by Missing School Because of Feeling Unsafe	24
Figure 2.3	Experiences of School Discipline by Anti-LGBTQ Discrimination	25
Figure 2.4	Availability of GSAs and Ethnic/Cultural Clubs	26
Insight Figure:	Participation in GSAs and Ethnic/Cultural Clubs.....	28
Figure 2.5	AAPI LGBTQ Students' Reports on the Number of Teachers and Other School Staff Who are Supportive of LGBTQ Students	30
Figure 2.6	AAPI LGBTQ Students' Reports on How Supportive Their School Administration is of LGBTQ Students	30
Figure 2.7	Supportive School Staff and Well-Being and School Belonging	31
Insight Figure:	Inclusive Curriculum and Feelings of Safety, Peer Acceptance, and School Belonging among AAPI LGBTQ Students	32

Preface

Twenty years ago, GLSEN began investing in applied research capacity to build the evidence base for action on LGBTQ issues in K–12 schools, and to track the impact of efforts to improve the lives and life prospects of LGBTQ students. Now conducted under the banner of the GLSEN Research Institute, each new report in this body of work seeks to provide clarity, urgency, and renewed inspiration for the education leaders, advocates, and organizational partners dedicated to the work.

Erasure and Resilience: The Experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color is a series of four reports, each publication focusing on a different group of LGBTQ students, their lives at school, and the factors that make the biggest difference for them. The reports in this series examine the school experiences of Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI), Black, Latinx, and Native and Indigenous LGBTQ youth. Each report was conducted and is released in partnership with organizations specifically dedicated to work with the student population in question. We are so grateful for the partnership of the National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance, the National Black Justice Coalition, UnidosUS and the Hispanic Federation, and the Center for Native American Youth.

These reports arrive as the United States wrestles with two fundamental challenges to our commitment to provide a K–12 education to every child — the depth of the systemic racism undermining true educational equity in our K–12 school systems; and the rising tide of racist, anti-LGBTQ, anti-immigrant, and White Christian nationalist sentiment being expressed in the mainstream of U.S. society. The students whose lives are illuminated in these reports bear the brunt of both of these challenges. Their resilience calls on each of us to join the fight.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Eliza Byard". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Eliza" and the last name "Byard" clearly distinguishable.

Eliza Byard, Ph.D.
Executive Director
GLSEN

Dear Readers,

For almost 30 years, GLSEN has worked to defend the rights of LGBTQ youth. Despite growing awareness built by communities like GLSEN and NQAPIA, GLSEN's research shows that youth continue to face discrimination and marginalization. As the country grows to understand queer and gender expansive youth, we must remember to highlight the unique experiences Asian American and Pacific Islanders (AAPIs) face at the intersections of their identities. We must uplift the complex experiences of youth of color and recognize a need for a nuanced framework that enhances liberation of all.

NQAPIA feels deeply honored and proud to support GLSEN's *Erasure and Resilience: The Experiences of LGBTQ Students of Color, Asian American and Pacific Islander LGBTQ Youth in U.S. Schools* and their work in creating these nuanced frameworks. With research like this and resources like the, "10 Things To Know About LGBTQ AAPI Communities," created by GLSEN, NQAPIA & the NEA, we can begin to provide the life-saving and culturally relevant support for our youth that they need. This research will help us navigate how to best support our youth in their schools and communities as we continue to strive to build a world in which all AAPI LGBTQ individuals are fully accepted as they are.

We stand with GLSEN in the belief that school is and should be a safe space for all our youth. Unfortunately, racism toward youth of color and discrimination against LGBTQ youth are prevalent in secondary schools. While research has shown that AAPI students commonly experience racism in school, discussions around harassment toward AAPI youth in schools are often missing. As a result, there is a lack of visibility around these types of school experiences for AAPI students, and even more so for AAPI LGBTQ students.

This report examines the intersectional, educational experiences of AAPI LGBTQ secondary school students, and demonstrates that the majority of AAPI LGBTQ students experience safety concerns and harassment in school because of their sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity. The report also shows that AAPI LGBTQ students who experience both homophobic and racist harassment in school have the poorest academic outcomes and psychological well-being. Further, AAPI LGBTQ students who experience harassment in school are also more likely to experience school discipline.

This report is a critical tool for educators, policymakers, safe school advocates and others who want to make schools a more inclusive space for marginalized groups of students to continue to work on making accessible specific resources that support AAPI LGBTQ students. NQAPIA is proud to work with GLSEN to present this important research and we stand alongside GLSEN to do our part in ensuring safe and supportive school environments for AAPI LGBTQ students in the U.S. NQAPIA strongly encourages you to not only read the report, but translate this information into knowledge and informed care. We hope this information will lead to deeper conversations and nuanced work to enhance the lives of AAPI LGBTQ students.

Sincerely,



Khudai Tanveer
Organizing Director
National Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance

Acknowledgements

The authors first wish to thank the students who participated in our *2017 National School Climate Survey*, the data source for this report. We also wish to acknowledge the full LGBTQ Students of Color Committee for their invaluable feedback throughout the process of the report. We offer particular thanks to the members of the AAPI report subcommittee: Kevin Kumashiro, Kevin Nadal, Marcus Breed, Vinisha Rana, and Tamanna Sohal. We also thank our Research Assistant, Alicia Menard-Livingston for helping to write the Executive Summary and for proofreading the report. We are indebted to our former GLSEN Director of Research, Emily Greytak, for her guidance and support from the study's inception. Finally, much gratitude goes to Eliza Byard, GLSEN's Executive Director, for her comments and her deep commitment to GLSEN Research.

Executive Summary

Introduction

Existing research has illustrated that both Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) as well as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth often face unique issues in school related to their marginalized identities. For instance, AAPI youth are also challenged with the model minority stereotype that all AAPI students are hardworking and excel academically, which can deny, downplay, or erase racism and discrimination that AAPI students experience. Yet prior studies have shown that the incidence of racism from peers against elementary and secondary AAPI students is common. This may, in part, be why AAPI youth are often missing from policy discussions on bullying in schools. With regard to LGBTQ youth, they often face unique challenges related to their sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression. LGBTQ youth often reported experiencing victimization and discrimination, resulting in poorer educational outcomes and decreased psychological well-being. Further, they have limited or no access to in-school resources that may improve school climate and students' experiences. Although there has been a growing body of research on the experiences of AAPI youth and LGBTQ youth in schools, there has been little research examining the intersections of these identities – the experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students. Existing studies show that schools nationwide are hostile environments for LGBTQ youth of color, where they experience victimization and discrimination based on race, sexual orientation, gender identity, or all of these identities. This report is one of a series of reports that focus on LGBTQ students of different racial/ethnic identities, including Black, Latinx, and Native and Indigenous LGBTQ youth.

In this report, we examine the experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students with regard to indicators of negative school climate and their impact on academic achievement, educational aspirations, and psychological well-being:

- Feeling unsafe in school because of personal characteristics, such as sexual orientation, gender expression and race/ethnicity, and missing school because of safety reasons;
- Hearing biased remarks, including homophobic and racist remarks, in school;
- Experiencing victimization in school; and
- Experiencing school disciplinary practices.

In addition, we examine whether AAPI LGBTQ students report these experiences to school officials or their families, and how these adults address the problem.

We also examine the degree to which AAPI LGBTQ students have access to supportive resources in school, and explore the possible benefits of these resources:

- GSAs (Gay-Straight Alliances or Gender and Sexuality Alliances) or similar clubs;
- Ethnic/cultural clubs;
- Supportive school staff; and
- Curricular resources that are inclusive of LGBTQ-related topics.

Methods

Data for this report came from GLSEN's *2017 National School Climate Survey (NSCS)*. The full sample for the *2017 NSCS* was 23,001 LGBTQ middle and high school students between 13 and 21 years old. In the *NSCS*, when asked about their race and ethnicity, participants had the option to choose "Asian," and "Pacific Islander," among other racial/ethnic categories. The sample for this report consists of any

LGBTQ student in the national sample who identified as “Asian or South Asian” or “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander” (henceforth referred to as Asian American and Pacific Islander or AAPI), including those who only identified as AAPI, and those who identified as AAPI and one or more additional race/ethnic identities (multiracial AAPI). It is important to note that the sample size of Pacific Islander LGBTQ students was too small to examine their school experiences alone. Therefore, LGBTQ students who identified as Pacific Islander were combined with those who identified as Asian.

The final sample for this report was a total of 1,480 AAPI LGBTQ students. Students were from all states except for Wyoming, as well as District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Two-fifths (40.0%) identified as gay or lesbian, over half (57.7%) were cisgender, and over half (56.0%) identified with one or more racial/ethnic identities in addition to AAPI. The majority of students were born in the U.S. and nearly all learned English as their first language, or as one of their first languages. The majority of students attended high school and public schools.

Key Findings

Safety and Victimization at School

School Safety

- Over half of AAPI LGBTQ students (51.8%) felt unsafe at school because of their sexual orientation, 41.1% because of their gender expression, and 26.4% because of their race or ethnicity.
- Over a quarter of AAPI LGBTQ students (27.6%) reported missing at least one day of school in the last month because they felt unsafe or uncomfortable, and nearly one-tenth (8.4%) missed four or more days in the past month.

Biased Remarks at School

- 97.8% of AAPI LGBTQ students heard “gay” used in a negative way; almost two-thirds (61%) heard this type of language often or frequently.
- 92.4% of AAPI LGBTQ students heard other homophobic remarks; over half (51.1%) heard this type of language often or frequently.
- 89.3% of AAPI LGBTQ students heard negative gender expression remarks about not acting “masculine” enough; half (50.2%) heard these remarks often or frequently.
- 81.4 % of AAPI LGBTQ students heard remarks about not acting “feminine” enough; a third (33.9%) heard these remarks often or frequently.
- 89.3% of AAPI LGBTQ students heard racist remarks; just over half (52.7%) heard these remarks often or frequently.
- 82.3% of AAPI LGBTQ students heard negative remarks about transgender people; over a third (35.5%) heard these remarks often or frequently.

Harassment and Assault at School

- Many students experienced harassment or assault at school based on personal characteristics, including sexual orientation (60.5%), gender expression (54.7%), and race/ethnicity (53.8%).
- AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced higher levels of victimization based on sexual orientation at school:

- were more than three times as likely to skip school because they felt unsafe (57.5% vs. 16.9%);
 - were somewhat less likely to plan to graduate high school (96.1% vs. 99.3%); and
 - experienced lower levels of school belonging (22% vs 60.9%) and greater levels of depression (73.2% vs. 41.2%).
- AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced higher levels of victimization based on race/ethnicity at school:
 - were almost twice as likely to skip school because they felt unsafe (35.5% vs. 18.4%); and
 - experienced lower levels of school belonging and greater levels of depression.
 - Transgender and gender nonconforming (trans/GNC) AAPI students experienced greater levels of victimization based on sexual orientation and gender expression than LGBQ cisgender AAPI students.
 - AAPI LGBTQ students who identified with multiple racial/ethnic identities experienced greater levels of victimization based on sexual orientation and gender expression than LGBTQ students who only identified as AAPI.
 - Two-fifths of AAPI LGBTQ students (40.0%) experienced harassment or assault at school due to both their sexual orientation and their race/ethnicity. Compared to those who experienced one form of victimization or neither, AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced both forms of victimization:
 - experienced the lowest levels of school belonging;
 - had the greatest levels of depression; and
 - were the most likely to skip school because they felt unsafe.

Reporting School-based Harassment and Assault, and Intervention

A majority of AAPI LGBTQ students (56.5%) who experienced harassment or assault in the past year never reported victimization to staff, most commonly because they did not think that staff would do anything about it (67.4%).

- Less than half (42.3%) reported that staff responded effectively when students reported victimization.
- Less than half (43.5%) of AAPI LGBTQ students had told a family member about the victimization they faced at school.
- Among AAPI LGBTQ students who reported victimization experiences to a family member, half (50.5%) indicated that a family member talked to their teacher, principal or other school staff.

School Practices

Experiences with School Discipline

- Nearly a third of AAPI LGBTQ students (30.7%) experienced some form of school discipline, such as detention, out-of-school suspension, or expulsion.
- Multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students experienced greater levels discipline than those who identified only as AAPI.

- Negative school experiences were related to experiences of school discipline for AAPI LGBTQ students. Those who experienced school discipline:
 - experienced higher rates of victimization based on sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity;
 - were more likely to skip school because they felt unsafe; and
 - were more likely to experience anti-LGBTQ discriminatory school policies or practices.
- Experiences with school discipline may also negatively impact educational outcomes for AAPI LGBTQ students. Those who experienced school discipline:
 - were less likely to plan on pursuing post-secondary education; and
 - had lower grade point averages (GPAs).

School-Based Supports and Resources for AAPI LGBTQ Students

GSA

Availability and Participation

- Almost two-thirds of AAPI LGBTQ students (63.5%) reported having a GSA at their school.
- AAPI LGBTQ students who attended rural schools, schools in the South, and smaller schools, were less likely to have access to a GSA.
- The majority of AAPI LGBTQ students (57.7%) who had access to a GSA participated in the club, and 18.9% participated as an officer or a leader.

Utility

- Compared to those without a GSA, AAPI LGBTQ students with a GSA:
 - were less likely to miss school due to safety concerns (22.4% vs. 36.9%);
 - were less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation (45.6% vs. 62.3%) and gender expression (38.6% vs. 45.4%); and
 - felt greater belonging to their school community.
- AAPI LGBTQ students who participated in their GSA felt more comfortable bringing up LGBTQ issues in class and were more likely to participate in a GLSEN Day of Action or in a political rally, protest, or demonstration.

Ethnic/Cultural Clubs

Availability and Participation

- Three-quarters of AAPI LGBTQ students (74.6%) reported that their school had an ethnic or cultural club at their school.

- 12.2% of AAPI LGBTQ students with an ethnic/cultural club at school attended meetings, and 2.4% participated as an officer or leader.

Utility

- AAPI LGBTQ students who had an ethnic/cultural club at their school:
 - felt greater belonging to their school community; and
 - were less likely to feel unsafe due to their race/ethnicity.
- AAPI LGBTQ students who were born in another country were more likely to participate in ethnic/cultural clubs than those who were born in the U.S.

Supportive School Personnel

Availability

- The vast majority of AAPI LGBTQ students (97.2%) could identify at least one supportive staff member at school, but only about half (48.5%) could identify many supportive staff (11 or more).
- Only about half of AAPI LGBTQ students (49.2%) reported having somewhat or very supportive school administration.
- Multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students reported having fewer supportive staff and less supportive administrators than students who identified as AAPI only.

Utility

- AAPI LGBTQ students who had more staff who were supportive of LGBTQ students:
 - were less likely to miss school due to safety concerns;
 - were less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity;
 - had higher levels of self-esteem and lower levels of depression;
 - had greater feelings of connectedness to their school community;
 - had higher GPAs (3.5 vs. 3.2); and
 - were more likely to plan to pursue post-secondary education (97.6% vs. 93.8%).

Inclusive Curriculum

We also examined the inclusion of LGBTQ topics in school curriculum. We found that just over a quarter of AAPI LGBTQ students (27.4%) were taught positive representations of LGBTQ people, history, or events. Further, we found that AAPI LGBTQ students who had some positive LGBTQ inclusion in the curriculum at school were:

- less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation (16.8% vs. 30.2%) and gender expression (19.4% vs. 30.1%);

- more likely to have peers be accepting of LGBTQ people at school (76.4% vs. 43.7%); and
- felt more connected to their school community.

We were unable to examine other important forms of curricular inclusion, such as positive representations of people of color and their histories and communities. Nevertheless, we did find that AAPI LGBTQ students with an LGBTQ-inclusive curriculum were less likely to feel unsafe at school because of their race or ethnicity (22.5% vs. 27.8%).

Conclusions and Recommendations

AAPI LGBTQ students' have unique experiences with victimization, discriminatory school practices and access to supportive resources. Results from this report show that AAPI LGBTQ students experience institutional and interpersonal discrimination. The findings also demonstrate the ways that school supports and resources, such as GSAs and supportive school personnel can positively affect AAPI LGBTQ students' school experiences. Based on these findings, we recommend that school leaders, education policymakers, and other individuals who want to provide safe learning environments for AAPI LGBTQ students to:

- Support student clubs, such as GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs. Organizations that work with GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs should also come together to address AAPI LGBTQ students' needs related to their multiple marginalized identities, including sexual orientation, gender, and race/ethnicity.
- Provide professional development for school staff that addresses the intersections of identities and experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students.
- Increase student access to curricular resources that include diverse and positive representations of both AAPI and LGBTQ people, history, and events.
- Establish school policies and guidelines for staff in responding to anti-LGBTQ and racist behavior, and develop clear and confidential pathways for students to report victimization that they experience. Local, state, and federal education agencies should also hold schools accountable for establishing and implementing these practices and procedures.
- Work to address the inequities in funding at the local, state, and national level to increase access to institutional supports and education in general, and to provide more professional development for educators and school counselors.

Taken together, such measures can move us toward a future in which all students have the opportunity to learn and succeed in school, regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, race, or ethnicity.

执行摘要

引言

现有研究表明，亚裔美国人和太平洋岛民（AAPI）以及女同性恋、男同性恋、双性恋、跨性别者和酷儿

（LGBTQ）青少年在学校经常面临与其边缘化身份相关的独特问题。例如，AAPI 青少年还会面临模范少数族裔刻板印象带来的挑战，即所有 AAPI 学生都勤奋努力且成绩优异，这可以否决、淡化或消除 AAPI 学生经历的种族主义和歧视。然而，之前的研究表明，在小学和中学同龄人对 AAPI 学生的种族歧视是很常见的。这可能部分解释了为何在有关校园欺凌的政策讨论中经常缺少 AAPI 青少年。就 LGBTQ 青少年而言，他们往往在性倾向、性别认同和性别表达等方面面临特别的挑战。经常会有 LGBTQ 青少年遭受侵害和歧视的报道，导致教育成果较差以及心理健康状况下降。此外，他们只有很少或根本无法获得可以改善学校环境和 LGBTQ 学生体验的校内资源。虽然有越来越多针对 AAPI 青少年和 LGBTQ 青少年在学校经历的研究，但很少有研究审视这些身份的交叉性——即 AAPI LGBTQ 学生的经历。现有研究表明，全国范围内的校园环境对于有色人种 LGBTQ 的青少年来说都充满恶意的，他们在那里经历着因种族、性倾向、性别身份或所有这些身份带来的侵害和歧视。本报告是一个系列报告之一，该系列报告关注不同种族/民族身份的 LGBTQ 学生，包括黑人、拉丁裔和美国原住民 LGBTQ 青少年。

在这份报告中，我们调查了 AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体关于负面校园氛围的经历，及其对于学业成绩、教育抱负和心理健康的影响：

- 因性倾向、性别表达和种族/民族等个人特征而在学校感到不安全，并因为安全原因而缺课；
- 在学校听到带有偏见的言论，包括恐同和种族主义言论；
- 在学校遭受侵害；以及
- 遭受学校的纪律处罚。

此外，我们亦调查了 AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体是否会向学校员工或其家人报告这些经历，以及这些成年人如何解决这些问题。

我们还研究了 AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体在学校能够获得支持资源的程度，并探讨了这些资源可能会带来的益处：

- GSA（同性恋-异性恋联盟或性倾向联盟）或类似团体；
- 民族/文化社团；
- 友好支持的学校教职员工；以及
- 包括 LGBTQ 相关主题的课程资源。

方法

本报告的数据来自 GLSEN 的《2017 年全国学校氛围调查》(NSCS)。2017 NSCS 的完整样本是 23,001 名年龄在 13 到 21 岁之间的 LGBTQ 初中和高中学生群体。在 NSCS 中，当被问及他们的种族和民族时，参与者可以选择“亚裔”和“太平洋岛民”，以及其他种族/民族类别。本报告的样本包括任何

自我认同为“亚裔或南亚裔”或是“夏威夷原住民或其他太平洋岛民”的全国样本中的 LGBTQ 学生群体（此后称为亚裔美国人和太平洋岛民或 AAPI），包括那些只认同为 AAPI，以及那些认同同时具备 AAPI 和一个或多个其他种族/民族身份之人（多种族 AAPI）。值得注意的是，太平洋岛民 LGBTQ 学生群体的样本数量太少，无法单独研究其学校经历。因此，太平洋岛民的 LGBTQ 学生与亚裔 LGBTQ 学生的数据结合在一起进行分析。

这份报告的最终样本是 1480 名 AAPI LGBTQ 学生。学生来自除怀俄明州、哥伦比亚特区、波多黎各和美属维尔京群岛以外的所有州府。五分之二（40.0%）确认为同性恋，超过一半

(57.7%) 为顺性别者，超过一半 (56.0%) 确认具备 AAPI 以外的一个或多个种族/民族身份。绝大多数学生出生于美国，几乎所有人都将英语作为母语或母语之一。大多数学生都上高中和公立学校。

主要发现

在校安全与侵害

学校安全

超过一半 AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体 (51.8%) 因其性倾向感到在学校不安全，还有 41.1% 因其性别表达以及 26.4% 因其种族或民族身份感到不安全。

超过四分之一的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (27.6%) 表示他们上个月因为感到不安全或不自在而至少缺课一天，近十分之一 (8.4%) 的学生在上个月缺课四天或以上。

学校的偏见性言论

- 97.8% 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生听到过“同性恋”被用作贬义词；近三分之二 (61%) 的学生经常或频繁听到此类语言。
- 92.4% 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生听到过其他恐同言论；超过一半 (51.1%) 的学生经常或频繁听到此类语言。
- 89.3% 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生听到过关于性别表达不够“男性化”的负面言论；一半 (50.2%) 学生经常或频繁听到此类言论。
- 81.4% 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生听到过关于性别表达不够“女性化”的负面言论；三分之一 (33.9%) 的学生经常听到此类言论。
- 89.3% 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生听到过种族主义言论；超过一半 (52.7%) 学生经常或频繁听到此类言论。
- 82.3% 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生听到过关于跨性别的负面言论；超过三分之一 (35.5%) 的学生经常或频繁听到此类言论。

在学校受到的侵害

- 许多学生因个人特征在学校经历过骚扰或攻击，包括性倾向 (60.5%)、性别表达 (54.7%) 和种族/民族 (53.8%) 。
- 因性倾向而在学校遭受更高程度侵害的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生：
 - 因为感到不安全而逃学的可能性是其他人的三倍以上 (57.5% 比 16.9%) ；
 - 更低可能性计划高中毕业 (96.1% 比 99.3%) ；以及
 - 对学校的归属感较低 (22% 比 60.9%) ，抑郁程度则更高 (73.2% 比 41.2%) 。
- 因种族/民族而在学校遭受更高程度侵害的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生：
 - 因为感到不安全而逃学的可能性是其他人的近两倍 (35.5% 比 18.4%) ；以及
 - 对学校的归属感较低，而抑郁程度则更高。
- 跨性别(Transgender)和非性别常规者 (Gender non-conforming, GNC) AAPI 生会因性倾向和性别表达而比 LGBTQ 顺性别 AAPI 学生遭受更大程度的侵害。

- 认同具备多种族/民族身份的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生会因性倾向和性别表达而比仅确认为 AAPI 的 LGBTQ 学生遭受更大程度的侵害。
- 五分之二 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (40.0%) 会同时因其性倾向和种族/民族这两种身份而受到骚扰或攻击。与那些只经历一种或并未经历侵害的学生相比，同时经历这两种侵害的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生：
 - 对于学校的归属感最低；
 - 抑郁程度最高；以及
 - 最有可能因为感到不安全而逃学。

报告在学校遭受的骚扰和攻击，以及干预

大多数过去一年遭受过骚扰或攻击的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (56.5%) 从未向教职员报告过侵害事件，最常见的原因是他们认为教职员不会采取任何行动 (67.4%) 。

- 不到一半 (42.3%) 的学生报告教职员会在学生报告自己受到侵害时做出有效回应。
- 不到一半 (43.5%) 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生告诉了家人他们在学校遭受的侵害。
- 在向家庭成员报告自己遭受侵害的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生当中，有一半 (50.5%) 表示家庭成员与老师、校长或其他学校教职员进行了交谈。

学校措施

学校纪律惩罚经历

- 近三分之一的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (30.7%) 经历过某种形式的学校纪律惩罚，如留校、停课或开除。
- 多种族 AAPI LGBTQ 学生比那些仅具备 AAPI 身份的学生经历更高层次的惩罚。

美国学校中的亚裔美国人和太平洋岛民青少年 LGBTQ 群体

- AAPI LGBTQ 学生的负面学校经历与学校纪律惩罚经历有关。经历学校纪律惩罚的学生：
 - 曾因性倾向、性别表达和种族/民族而经历更高比例的侵害；
 - 更有可能因感到不安全而逃课；以及
 - 更有可能经历歧视 LGBTQ 学生的学校政策或措施。
- 学校惩罚经历还可能会对 AAPI LGBTQ 学生的教育结果产生负面影响。经历学校惩罚的学生：
 - 更低可能性继续接受中学后教育；以及
 - 平均绩点 (GPA) 更低。

AAPI LGBTQ 学生在校期间获得的支持与资源

GSA

可及性与参与

- 近三分之二的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (63.5%) 自己学校有 GSA。
- 在乡村学校、南方学校和规模较小学校就读的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生能接触到 GSA 的可能性较小。

- 大多数能接触到 GSA 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (57.7%) 参与到团体当中，其中有 18.9% 以干事或领导者身份参与其中。

效用

- 与无法接触到 GSA 的学生相比，能够接触到 GSA 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生：
 - 因安全顾虑而缺课的可能性较低 (22.4% 比 36.9%) ；
 - 因性倾向 (45.6% 比 62.3%) 和性别表达 (38.6% 比 45.4%) 而感到不安全的可能性较低；以及
 - 对于学校社区的归属感更强。
- 参与 GSA 的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生更愿意在课堂上提出 LGBTQ 议题，也更愿意参加 GLSEN 行动日或政治集会、抗议或示威活动。

民族/文化社团

可及性与参与

- 四分之三的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (74.6%) 报告他们的学校设有民族或文化社团。
- 学校设有民族/文化社团的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生中有 12.2% 会参加会议，有 2.4% 会以干事或领导者身份参加。

效用

- 学校设有民族/文化社团的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生：
 - 对于学校社区的归属感更强；以及
 - 因种族/民族而感到不安全的可能性较低。
- 出生于其他国家的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生比出生于美国的学生参加民族/文化社团的可能性更高。

学校支持人员

可及性

- 绝大多数 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (97.2%) 能确认学校有至少一名支持Ta们的教职员工，但只有大约一半 (48.5%) 能够确认众多支持性教职员工(11 名或以上)。
- 只有大约一半的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (49.2%) 表示学校管理能够提供一些或较多支持。
- 多种族 AAPI LGBTQ 学生表示与仅具备 AAPI 身份的学生相比，支持他们的教职员工和管理人员更少。

效用

- 拥有更多支持 LGBTQ 学生群体的教职员工的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生：
 - 因安全顾虑而缺课的可能性较低；
 - 因性倾向、性别表达和种族/民族而感到不安全的可能性较低；
 - 自尊心更强，抑郁程度更低；
 - 与其学校社区有更强的情感联结；

- 平均绩点 (GPA) 更高 (3.5 比 3.2) ; 以及
- 计划继续接受中学后教育的可能性更高 (97.6% 对 93.8%) 。

包容性课程

我们还研究了学校课程对于 LGBTQ 话题的包容性。我们发现，仅有略超过四分之一的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生 (27.4%) 获得了关于 LGBTQ 人群、历史或事件的正面教育。此外，我们发现学校课程包含 LGBTQ 正面内容的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生：

- 因性倾向 (16.8% 比 30.2%) 和性别表达 (19.4% 比 30.1%) 而感到不安全的可能性较低；以及
- 在学校有同伴能够接受 LGBTQ 人群的可能性较高 (76.4% 比 43.7%) ；以及
- 感觉与学校社区的联系更加紧密。

我们无法研究其他重要的课程包容形式，比如对有色人种及其历史和群体的正面表述。虽然如此，我们确实发现有 LGBTQ 包容性课程的 AAPI LGBTQ 学生因其种族或民族而在学校感到不安全的可能性较低 (22.5% 对 27.8%) 。

结论与建议

AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体面临与受侵害、歧视性学校措施和获得支持性资源相关的独特经历。本报告的结果显示，AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体经历了制度上和人际上的歧视。研究结果也证明了如 GSA 和支持性学校人员等学校支持和资源，能够对 AAPI LGBTQ 学生的学校经历产生积极影响。基于这些结果，我们建议学校领导、教育决策者和其他想要为 AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体提供安全学习环境的个人：

- 支持如 GSA 和民族/文化社团等学生社团。与 GSA 和民族/文化社团合作的组织也应当一起来应对 AAPI LGBTQ 学生群体关于自身多重边缘化身份 (包括性倾向、性别和种族/民族) 的需求。
- 就 AAPI LGBTQ 学生问题为学校教职员工提供职业培训。
- 增加学生接触课程资源的机会，包括对于 AAPI 和 LGBTQ 人群、历史和事件的多样化与积极表述。
- 针对反 LGBTQ 和种族主义行为制定学校政策和指导方针，并为学生建立明确保密的渠道，方便他们报告自己所遭受的侵害。当地、州府和联邦教育机构也应当督促学校负责建立和实施这些措施。
- 努力解决当地、州府和国家层面资金不平等的问题，增加获得机构支持和教育的机会，为教育工作者和学校辅导员提供更多专业培训机会。

综合起来，这些措施可以推动我们走向更美好的未来，届时，所有学生，无论其性倾向、性别身份、性别表达、种族或民族为何，都将有机会在学校求学并取得成功。

개요서

서론

기존의 연구에 따르면, 레즈비언, 게이, 양성, 성전환 및 퀴어 (LGBTQ, 성 소수자)뿐만 아니라, 아시아계 미국인과 태평양 섬 주민 (AAPI) 젊은이들은 학교에서 소외된 정체성에 관련된 독특한 문제를 종종 직면한다. 이를 테면, AAPI 젊은이들은 또한 열심히 공부하고 학교에서 성적이 좋다는 전형적인 소수 고정관념의 도전을 받는데, 이는 AAPI 학생들이 경험하는 인종 차별주의와 차별을 부정하고 과소 평가하거나 지워버릴 수가 있다. 하지만 이전의 연구에 따르면, 초등 및 중등 AAPI 학생들에 대한 또래들의 인종 차별 발생 건수는 흔하다고 한다. 부분적으로는 바로 그러한

이유 때문에 학교에서의 왕따에 대한 정책 토론에서 AAPI 젊은이들이 종종 보이지 않는다. LGBTQ 젊은이들에 관해서 말하자면, 그들은 자주 성적 성향, 성 정체성 및 성 표현에 관련된 독특한 도전에 직면한다. LGBTQ 젊은이들은 종종 피해자가 되고 차별을 경험하면서 초라한 교육적 결과를 낳고 심리적 행복이 줄어든다. 더구나, 그들은 학교 분위기나 학생들의 경험을 개선해줄지도 모르는 학교 내 자원에 대한 접근이 제한되거나 또는 전무하다. 학교 내 AAPI 젊은이와 LGBTQ 젊은이들의 경험에 대한 연구가 많이 진행되고 있지만, 이 두 정체성의 교차점, 즉 AAPI LGBTQ 학생들의 경험을 조사하는 연구는

거의 없었다. 기존의 연구에 따르면, 전국의 학교는 LGBTQ 유색 젊은이들에게 적대적인 환경이고, 그 환경에서 그들은 인종, 성적 성향, 성 정체성 혹은 그러한 모든 정체성에 근거하여 괴롭힘과 차별을 경험한다. 이 보고서는 흑인, 라틴계 및 아메리카 인디언 LGBTQ 젊은이들을 포함하여, 여러 인종/민족 정체성을 가진 LGBTQ 학생들에 집중하는 일련의 보고서 중의 하나이다.

이 보고서에서는 부정적인 학교 분위기 지표와 그 지표가 학교 성적, 교육 열망 및 심리적 복지에 미치는 영향에 관하여 AAPI LGBTQ 학생들의 경험을 조사한다:

- 개인적 특성, 이를테면 성적 성향, 성 표현 및 인종/민족 등 때문에 학교에서 불안을 느끼고, 안전 이유 때문에 학교를 빠짐;
- 학교에서 동성애를 혐오하고 인종차별주의적인 발언 등의 편향된 말을 들음;
- 학교에서 괴롭힘을 당하는 경험을 함; 그리고
- 학교 훈육 방법을 경험함.

게다가, AAPI LGBTQ 학생들이 자신의 경험을 학교 관리나 가족에게 보고하는지 그리고 어떻게 이런 어른들이 그 문제에 접근을 하는지 조사한다.

또한 AAPI LGBTQ 학생들이 학교에서 지원 자원에 대한 접근을 할 수 있는지 이런 자원의 가능한 혜택을 알아보는 정도를 조사할 것이다:

- GSA (동성애-일반 연합 혹은 성 및 성생활 연합) 혹은 비슷한 클럽;
- 민족/문화 클럽;
- 지원하는 학교 직원; 그리고
- LGBTQ 관련 토픽을 포함하는 교과과정 자원.

방법

이 보고서의 데이터는 GLSEN의 2017년 전국 학교 분위기 설문조사 (NSCS)에서 나왔다. 2017 NSCS의 전체 샘플은 23,001명의 13-21세 LGBTQ 중, 고등 학교 학생이다. NSCS에서 인종과 민족에 대한 질문을 받았을 때, 참가자들은 여러 인종/민족 범주 중에서 “아시아인” 과 “태평양 섬 주민”을 선택하는 옵션을 갖고 있었다. 이 보고서의 샘플에 속한 사람들은

전국 샘플 중에서 “아시아인 혹은 남 아시아인” 또는 “하와이 원주민 혹은 다른 태평양 섬 주민” (이하 아시아계 미국인 혹은 태평양 섬 주민, 즉 AAPI로 지칭함)으로 자신을 밝히는 LGBTQ 학생들인데, 여기에는 자신을 AAPI라고 밝힌 사람들, 자신을 AAPI라고 밝히고 하나 혹은 그 이상의 추가적인 인종/민족적 정체성 (다 인종 AAPI)을 밝힌 사람들이 포함된다. 태평양 섬 주민 LGBTQ 학생의 샘플 크기는 너무 적어서 학교 경험만을 조사할 수 없었음을 주목하는 것이 중요하다. 그러므로, 자신을 태평양 섬 주민이라고 밝힌 LGBTQ 학생들은 아시아인이라고 밝힌 학생들과 합쳐졌다.

이 보고서의 최종 샘플은 총 1,480명의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생들이었다. 학생들은 와이오밍, 콜롬비아 특별구, 푸에르토리코 및 미국 버진 아일랜드를 제외한 모든 주에서 온 학생들이다. 2/5 (40.0%)가 동성애자, 레즈비언이라고 밝혔고, 반 이상 (57.7%)이 시스젠더라고 밝혔고, 반 이상 (56.0%)이 AAPI 외에도 하나 혹은 그 이상의 인종/민족적 정체성이 있음을 밝혔다. 대부분의 학생은 고향은

미국이고, 거의 모두 영어가 모국어이거나 제1 언어 중의 하나였다. 대부분의 학생은 고등학교, 공립학교를 다녔다.

주요 결과

학교에서의 안전 및 괴롭힘

학교안전

- 반 이상의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이불안을 느낀 경우 중에서, 51.8%가 성적 성향 때문, 41.1%가 성 표현 그리고 26.4%가 인종 혹은 민족 때문이었다.
- 무려 ¼의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (27.6%)이 불안 혹은 불편하다고 느꼈기 때문에 지난 달 학교를 하루 안 나갔다고 보고했고, 거의 1/10 (8.4%)이 지난 달에 4일 이상을 빠졌다고 했다.

학교에서의 편향된 발언

- 97.8%의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이 “동성애자”라는 말이 부정적으로 사용되는 것을 들었고; 거의 2/3 (61%)가 종종 혹은 자주 이런 유형의 표현을 들었다.
- 92.4%의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이 다른 동성애 혐오 발언을 들었고; 무려 반 (51.1%) 이상이 이런 유형의 표현을 종종 혹은 자주 들었다.
- 89.3%의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이 “남자답게” 행동하지 못하는 것에 대하여 부정적인 성 표현 용어를 사용하였고; 반 (50.2%)이 그런 용어를 종종 혹은 자주 들었다.
- 81.4%의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이 “여자답게” 행동하지못하는 것에 대한 표현을 들었고; 1/3 (33.9%)이 이런 표현을 종종 혹은 자주 들었다.
- 89.3%의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이 인종 차별 주의적인 표현을 들었고; 반 이상 (52.7%)이 그런 표현을 종종 혹은 자주 들었다.
- 82.3%의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이 성 전환한 사람들에 대한 부정적인 표현을 들었고; 무려 1/3 (35.5%)이 이런 표현을 종종 혹은 자주 들었다.

학교에서의 괴롭힘

- 많은 학생이 개인적 특성에 근거한 괴롭힘 혹은 공격적인 행동을 학교에서 경험했는데, 개인적 특성에는 성적 성향 (60.5%), 성 표현 (54.7%) 및 인종/민족 (53.8%)이 포함된다.
- 학교에서 성적 성향에 근거한 높은 수준의 괴롭힘을 경험한 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은,

- 불안하다고 느끼기 때문에 학교를 빠질 가능성이 3배 이상 높았고 (57.5% 대 16.9%),
- 고등학교를 졸업할 가능성이 다소 낮았고 (96.1% 대 99.3%), 그리고
- 학교 소속감이 더 낮은(22% 대 60.9%) 경험을 하고, 더 큰 수준의 우울증 (73.2% 대 41.2%)을 경험하였다.
- 인종/민족 때문에 학교에서 높은 수준의 괴롭힘을 경험한 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은
 - 불안하다고 느끼기 때문에 학교를 빠질 가능성이 거의 두 배에 달했고 (35.5% 대 18.4%), 그리고
 - 학교 소속감 수준이 더 낮고 우울증 수준이 더 높았다.
- 성 전환한 사람과 생물학적 성에 불응하는 (트랜스//GNC) AAPI 학생은 성적 성향과 성 표현에 근거하여 LGBTQ 시스젠더 AAPI 학생들보다 더 큰 수준의 괴롭힘을 경험하였다.
- 자신이 다 인종/민족 정체성을 갖고 있다고 밝힌 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 성적 성향과 성 표현에 근거하여 AAPI라고만 밝힌 LGBTQ 학생보다 더 큰 수준의 괴롭힘을 경험하였다.
- 2/5의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (40.0%)이 성적 성향과 인종/민족 때문에 학교에서 괴롭힘이나 공격적인 행동을 경험하였다. 하나의 괴롭힘이나 괴롭힘을 경험하지 않은 학생과 비교했을 때, 두 가지의 괴롭힘을 모두 경험한 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은
 - 가장 낮은 수준의 학교 소속감을 경험했고,
 - 가장 높은 수준의 우울증을 가졌고,
 - 불안하게 느껴서 학교를 빠질 가능성이 가장 높았다.

학교에서의 괴롭힘과 공격적인 행동의 보고 및 개입

괴롭힘이나 공격적인 행동을 경험한 과반수의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (56.5%)이 그 사실을 직원에게 알리지 않았는데, 대부분의 이유는 직원이 그것에 대하여 뭘 할 수 있다고 생각하지 않았기 때문이다.

- 반 이하 (42.3%)가 괴롭힘을 보고했을 때 직원이 효과적으로 대응했다고 보고했다.
- 반 이하 (43.5%)의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생이 학교에서 직면한 괴롭힘에 대하여 가족 구성원에게 말했다.
- 가족에게 괴롭힘 경험을 보고한 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 중에서 반 (50.5%)이 가족 구성원이 교사, 교장 혹은 학교 직원에게 이야기했다고 말했다.

학교의 관행

학교 규율에 대한 경험

- AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 거의 1/3 (30.7%)이 어떤 형태의 학교 훈육, 이를테면, 방과 후 남기, 정학 혹은 추방을 경험하였다.
- 다인종 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 AAPI라고만 밝힌 학생들보다 더 큰 훈육을 경험하였다.
- 부정적인 학교 경험은 AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 학교 훈육 경험과 관련이 있었다. 학교 훈육을 경험한 학생은
 - 성적 성향, 성 표현 및 인종/민족에 근거한 괴롭힘을 경험한 비율이 더 높았고
 - 안전하지 않다고 느껴서 학교를 빠질 가능성이 더 높았고
 - LGBTQ에 반하는 차별적인 학교의 방침이나 관행을 경험할 가능성이 더 높았다.

- 학교 훈육 경험은 또한 AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 교육적 결과에 부정적으로 영향을 미칠 수가 있다 학교 훈육을 경험한 학생은
 - 고등학교 이후의 교육에 대한 계획을 세울 가능성이 덜하고
 - 평점 (GPA)도 낮았다.

AAPI LGBTQ 학생들을 위한 학교에 근거한 지원과 자원

GSA

가용성 및 참여

- 거의 2/3의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (63.5%)이 학교에서 GSA가 있다고 보고했다.
- 지방 학교, 남부 학교, 더 작은 학교 등을 다녔던 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 GSA를 접할 가능성이 더 적었다.
- GSA를 접할 수 있었던 대부분의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (57.7%)이 그 클럽에 참여하였고 18.9%가 간부 혹은 지도자로 참여하였다.

유용성

- GSA 가 없는 학생과 비교하여 GSA가 있는 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은
 - 안전 걱정 때문에 학교를 빠질 가능성이 더 적었고 (22.4% 대 36.9%),
 - 자신의 성적 성향 (45.6% 대 62.3%)과 성 표현 (38.6% 대 45.4%) 때문에 불안하다고 느낄 가능성이 더 적었고,
 - 학교 공동체에 대한 소속감이 더 크다고 느꼈다.
- GSA에 참여한 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 수업시간에 LGBTQ 문제를 꺼내는데 더 편안함을 느꼈고 GLSEN 행동의 날, 정치 집회, 항의 혹은 시위에 참여할 가능성이 더 높았다.

민족/문화 클럽

가용성 및 참여

- ¾의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (74.6%)이 자신의 학교가 민족적 혹은 문화적 클럽을 갖고 있다고 보고했다.
- 학교에 민족/문화 클럽이 있는 AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 12.2%가 회의에 참석하고 2.4%가 간부 혹은 지도자로 참여했다.

유용성

- 학교에 민족/문화 클럽이 있는 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은
 - 학교 공동체에 대한 소속감이 더 크다고 느꼈고
 - 인종/민족 때문에 불안하다고 느낄 가능성이 덜 했다.
- 다른 나라에서 태어난 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 미국에서 태어난 학생보다 민족/문화 클럽에 참여할 가능성이 더 컸다.

지원하는 학교 직원

가용성

- 압도적인 다수의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (97.2%)이 학교에서 적어도 하나 이상의 도움을 주는 직원을 알 수 있었지만, 약 반 (48.5%)만이 그런 직원을 많이 (11명 이상) 확인할 수 있었다.
- AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 약 반 (49.2%)만이 학교 행정이 다소 혹은 매우 도움을 준다고 보고했다.
- 다인종 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 AAPI라고만 밝힌 학생보다 도움을 주는 직원 수가 적었고 학교 행정관이 도움을 덜 준다고 보고했다.

유용성

- LGBTQ 학생을 도와주는 더 많은 직원을 가진 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은
 - 안전 문제로 학교를 빠질 가능성이 적었고,
 - 성적 성향, 성 표현 및 인종/민족 때문에 불안하다고 느낄 가능성이 더 적었고,
 - 더 높은 수준의 자존감과 낮은 수준의 우울증을 가졌고,
 - 학교 공동체와의 연결 느낌이 더 컸고,
 - 평점도 높았고 (3.5 대 3.2),
 - 고등학교 이후의 교육을 계획할 가능성이 더 높았다 (97.6% 대 93.8%).

포괄적인 교과과정

우리는 또한 학교 교과과정에서LGBTQ 토픽을 포함하는 지의 여부를 조사하였다. 무려 ¼의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생 (27.4%)이 LGBTQ, 역사 및 행사에 대한 긍정적인 표상을 배웠다는 것을 알았다. 게다가, 교과과정에서LGBTQ를 긍정적으로 포괄하는 학교의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은

- 성적 성향 때문에 (16.8% 대 30.2%) 그리고 성 표현 때문에(19.4% 대 30.1%) 불안을 느낄 가능성이 더 적었고,
- 학교에서 LGBTQ를 수용하는 또래를 가질 가능성이 더 컸고,
- 자신의 학교 공동체에 대한 소속감이 더 컸다.

다른 포괄적인 교과과정, 이를테면, 유색 인종과 역사 및 지역 공동체에 대한 긍정적인 표상 같은 다른 중요한 형태를 조사할 수 없었다. 그럼에도 불구하고, LGBTQ를 포괄하는 교과과정이 있는 학교의 AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 자신의 인종 및 민족 때문에 불안을 느낄 가능성이 덜 했다는 것을 발견했다 (22.5% 대 27.8%).

결론 및 권장 사항

AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 괴롭힘, 학교의 차별적인 관행 및 지원 자원에 대한 차별적인 접근 같은 독특한 경험을 갖고 있다. 이 보고서의 결과에 따르면, AAPI LGBTQ 학생은 제도적이고 대인관계적인 차별을 경험한다고 한다. 이 결과는 또한 학교 지원과 자원, 이를테면 GSA와 학교 지원 직원 등이 AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 학교 경험에 긍정적인 영향을 줄 수 있는 방법을 보여준다. 이런 결과에 근거하여, 우리는 학교 지도자, 교육 정책 입안자 및 AAPI LGBTQ 학생에 대한 안전한 학습 환경을 제공하고 싶어하는 다른 사람들이

- GSA와 민족/문화 클럽을 지원할 것을 권장한다. GSA와 민족/문화 클럽과 협력하는 조직은, 성적 성향, 성 및 인종/민족 등을 포함하여 다종의 소외된 정체성과 관련된 AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 요구사항을 함께 다루어야 한다.
- AAPI LGBTQ 학생의 문제에 대하여 학교 직원의 전문적 발달을 제공한다.
- AAPI LGBTQ, 역사 및 행사를 다양하고 긍정적으로 대표해주는 교과과정 자원에 대한 학생의 접근을 높인다.
- 반 LGBTQ 행동 및 인종 차별 행동에 대한 반응으로 직원에 대한 학교 방침과 가이드라인을 확립하고 학생들이 경험하는 괴롭힘을 보고할 수 있는 분명하고도 비밀을 보장하는 경로를 개발한다.
- 지역, 주 및 연방 교육 기관은 또한 학교가 이러한 관행과 절차를 확립하고 수행하도록 해야 한다.
- 지역, 주 및 연방 수준에서의 자금 지원 불평등 문제를 다루어서 기관의 지원 및 교육 일반에 대한 접근을 더 가능하게 하고, 교육자와 학교 상담사에게 더 많은 전문적인 개발을 제공하도록 힘쓴다.

종합하면, 그러한 조치는 성적 성향, 성 정체성, 성 표현, 인종 및 민족에 관계없이 모든 학생이 학교에서 배우고 성공할 기회를 갖는 그런 미래로 우리를 이끌어 줄 수 있다.

Tóm tắt dự án

Giới thiệu

Nghiên cứu hiện nay đã cho thấy rằng cả các bạn trẻ người Mỹ gốc Á và Quần đảo Thái Bình Dương (AAPI) cũng như các bạn trẻ đồng tính nữ, đồng tính nam, lưỡng tính, chuyển giới và lệch lạc giới tính (LGBTQ) thường phải đối mặt với các vấn đề của riêng mình tại trường liên quan đến các bản sắc bên lề của mình. Ví dụ, các bạn trẻ AAPI cũng bị thách thức với định kiến về nhóm thiểu số gương mẫu, bị cho rằng tất cả học sinh AAPI đều chăm chỉ và xuất sắc trong học tập, có thể từ chối, xem thường hoặc xóa bỏ hành vi phân biệt chủng tộc và phân biệt đối xử mà học sinh AAPI gặp phải. Tuy nhiên, các nghiên cứu trước đây đã cho thấy mức độ phổ biến của hành vi phân biệt chủng tộc từ các bạn học đối với các học sinh AAPI tiểu học và trung học. Điều này có thể là một phần lý do

vì sao các bạn trẻ AAPI thường không có mặt trong các buổi thảo luận về chính sách đối với nạn bắt nạt học đường. Về các bạn trẻ LGBTQ, các bạn thường phải đối mặt với những thách thức của riêng mình liên quan đến xu hướng tính dục, bản dạng giới tính và thể hiện giới. Các bạn trẻ LGBTQ hay báo việc mình bị ngược đãi và bị phân biệt đối xử, dẫn đến kết quả học tập kém hơn và sức khỏe tinh thần bị sa sút. Ngoài ra, các bạn cũng bị hạn chế hay không được tiếp cận các nguồn tài nguyên học tập tại trường để có thể cải thiện môi trường học đường và những trải nghiệm của học sinh. Mặc dù đã có một tổ chức đang phát triển nghiên cứu về các trải nghiệm của các bạn trẻ AAPI và các bạn trẻ LGBTQ tại các trường, nhưng vẫn có rất ít nghiên cứu xem xét sự giao thoa của những bản dạng này - những trải nghiệm của các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI. Các nghiên cứu hiện nay cho thấy các trường học trên toàn quốc là môi trường không thân thiện đối với các bạn trẻ LGBTQ da màu, là nơi các bạn bị ngược đãi hay bị phân biệt đối xử về chủng tộc, xu hướng tính dục, bản dạng giới tính hoặc tất cả các bản sắc này. Báo cáo này là một trong chuỗi các báo cáo tập trung vào các học sinh LGBTQ thuộc chủng tộc/ dân tộc khác nhau, bao gồm các bạn trẻ LGBTQ da đen, Latinh và người Mỹ bản địa.

Trong báo cáo này, chúng tôi xem xét các trải nghiệm của các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI khi xét về yếu tố về môi trường học đường tiêu cực và tác động của chúng đến thành tích học tập, nguyện vọng học tập và sức khỏe tâm lý:

- Cảm thấy không an toàn ở trường vì các đặc điểm cá nhân, ví dụ như xu hướng tính dục, thể hiện giới tính và chủng tộc/ dân tộc, và nghỉ học vì lý do an toàn;
- Nghe nhận xét thiên vị tại trường học, bao gồm nhận xét đồng tính và phân biệt chủng tộc;
- Bị ngược đãi tại trường; và
- Bị kỷ luật;

Ngoài ra, chúng tôi có xét đến việc các học sinh LGBTQ AAPI có báo cáo những trải nghiệm này cho các cán bộ nhà trường hoặc gia đình của mình hay không và cách thức những người trưởng thành này giải quyết vấn đề.

Chúng tôi cũng xét đến mức độ học sinh LGBTQ AAPI được truy cập vào các tài nguyên hỗ trợ học tập tại trường, và khám phá những lợi ích có thể có được từ các tài nguyên này:

- Các câu lạc bộ GSAs (Liên minh Người đồng tính nam – Người dị tính hay Liên minh Giới tính và Xu hướng tính dục) hay các câu lạc bộ tương tự;
- Các câu lạc bộ dân tộc / văn hóa;
- Nhân viên nhà trường hỗ trợ; và
- Nguồn tài nguyên học tập ngoại khóa bao gồm các chủ đề liên quan đến LGBTQ.

Các phương pháp

Dữ liệu cho báo cáo này được lấy từ bài Khảo sát Môi trường Học đường Toàn quốc 2017 (NSCS) của GLSEN. Toàn bộ mẫu đối tượng khảo sát cho 2017 NSCS là 23.001 học sinh LGBTQ tại trường trung học cơ sở và trung học phổ thông từ 13 đến 21 tuổi. Trong NSCS, khi được hỏi về chủng tộc và dân tộc của mình, những người tham gia khảo sát có quyền tùy chọn “Người Châu Á”, “Người Quần đảo Thái Bình Dương”, trong số các chủng tộc và dân tộc khác. Mẫu đối tượng khảo sát của báo cáo này bao gồm bất kỳ

học sinh LGBTQ trong mẫu đối tượng toàn quốc, những người đã xác định là “Người Châu Á hoặc Nam Á”, hoặc “Người Hawaii bản xứ hay Người Quần đảo Thái Bình Dương khác” (nay gọi là Người Mỹ gốc Á và Quần đảo Thái Bình Dương hoặc AAPI), bao gồm cả những người chỉ xác định là người AAPI và những người xác định như người AAPI và một hoặc nhiều chủng tộc/ dân tộc khác (AAPI đa chủng tộc). Điều quan trọng cần lưu ý là kích thước mẫu đối tượng học sinh LGBTQ Quần đảo Thái Bình Dương quá nhỏ đến nỗi không thể xem xét riêng những trải nghiệm của các bạn tại trường. Do đó, các bạn học sinh LGBTQ, những người xác định là Người Quần đảo Thái Bình Dương đã được kết hợp với những người xác định là người châu Á.

Mẫu đối tượng cuối cùng của báo cáo này có tổng cộng 1.480 học sinh LGBTQ AAPI. Học sinh đến từ tất cả các tiểu bang, trừ bang Utah, cũng như Quận Columbia, Puerto Rico và Quần đảo Virgin thuộc Hoa Kỳ. Hai phần năm (40,0%) đã xác định là đồng tính nam hoặc đồng tính nữ, hơn một nửa (57,7%) là người có bản dạng giới tính đúng với giới tính sinh học và hơn một nửa (56,0%) đã xác định thuộc một hoặc nhiều chủng tộc/ dân tộc ngoài AAPI. Phần lớn các học sinh được sinh tại

Hoa Kỳ và hầu hết tất cả học sinh đều đã học tiếng Anh là ngôn ngữ đầu tiên của mình, hoặc là một trong những ngôn ngữ đầu tiên của mình. Phần lớn là các học sinh học trường trung học và công lập.

Các nhận định chính

Sự an toàn và ngược đãi tại trường

Sự an toàn tại trường

- Hơn một nửa số học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (51,8%) cảm thấy không an toàn ở trường vì xu hướng tính dục của mình, 41,1% vì thể hiện giới tính của mình và 26,4% vì chủng tộc hoặc dân tộc của mình.
- Hơn một phần tư học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (27,6%) đã được báo là nghỉ học ít nhất một ngày trong tháng trước vì cảm thấy không an toàn hoặc không thoải mái, và gần một phần mười (8,4%) nghỉ học từ bốn ngày trở lên trong tháng vừa qua.

Những nhận xét thiên vị ở trường

- 97,8% học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã nghe nói từ “đồng tính nam” một cách tiêu cực; gần hai phần ba (61%) hay hoặc thường xuyên nghe loại ngôn từ này.
- 92,4% học sinh LGBTQ AAPI nghe những nhận xét đồng tính khác; hơn một nửa (51,1%) hay hoặc thường xuyên nghe loại ngôn từ này.
- 89,3% học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã nghe nhận xét tiêu cực về thể hiện giới tính đối với việc chưa ứng xử đủ mức “nam tính”; một nửa (50,2%) hay hoặc thường xuyên nghe những nhận xét này.

- 81,4% học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã nghe nhận xét tiêu cực đối với việc chưa ứng xử đủ mức “nữ tính”; một phần ba (33,9%) hay hoặc thường xuyên nghe những nhận xét này.
- 89,3% học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã nghe những nhận xét phân biệt chủng tộc; chỉ hơn một nửa (52,7%) hay hoặc thường xuyên nghe những nhận xét này.
- 82,3% học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã nghe những nhận xét tiêu cực về người chuyển giới; hơn một phần ba (35,5%) hay hoặc thường xuyên nghe những nhận xét này.

Việc ngược đãi tại trường

- Nhiều học sinh đã bị quấy rối hoặc bạo hành tại trường do các đặc điểm cá nhân, bao gồm xu hướng tính dục (60,5%), thể hiện giới tính (54,7%) và chủng tộc/ dân tộc (53,8%).
- Học sinh LGBTQ AAPI bị ngược đãi nhiều hơn tại trường do xu hướng tính dục:
 - có nhiều khả năng bỏ học gấp ba lần vì cảm thấy không an toàn (57,5% so với 16,9%);
 - ít có khả năng dự định tốt nghiệp trung học (96,1% so với 99,3%); và
 - cảm nhận là thành viên trường được tôn trọng ở mức độ thấp (22% so với 60,9%) và mức độ trầm cảm cao hơn (73,2% so với 41,2%).
- Học sinh LGBTQ AAPI bị ngược đãi nhiều hơn tại trường do chủng tộc/ dân tộc:
 - gần như có gấp đôi khả năng bỏ học vì cảm thấy không an toàn (35,5% so với 18,4%); và
 - cảm nhận là thành viên trường được tôn trọng ở mức độ thấp và mức độ trầm cảm cao hơn.
- So với các bạn học sinh AAPI có giới tính phù hợp với giới tính sinh học LGBTQ, các bạn học sinh AAPI là người chuyển giới và người không theo chuẩn giới nào (trans / GNC) bị ngược đãi nhiều hơn tại trường do xu hướng tính dục và thể hiện giới tính.
- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI, những người xác định thuộc nhiều chủng tộc/ dân tộc bị ngược đãi nhiều hơn do xu hướng tính dục và thể hiện giới tính so với các bạn học sinh LGBTQ chỉ xác định là AAPI.
- Hai phần năm học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (40,0%) bị quấy rối hoặc bạo hành ở trường do cả xu hướng tính dục và chủng tộc / dân tộc của mình. So với những bạn từng hay chưa từng bị ngược đãi, các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã bị ngược đãi dưới hai hình thức sau:
 - cảm nhận là thành viên trường được tôn trọng ở mức độ thấp;
 - có mức độ trầm cảm nhiều hơn; và
 - gần như có gấp đôi khả năng bỏ học vì cảm thấy không an toàn;

Báo cáo quấy rối và bạo hành ở trường, và Sự can thiệp

Phần lớn các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (56,5%) từng bị quấy rối hoặc bạo hành trong năm qua chưa bao giờ báo cho cán bộ nhà trường việc mình bị ngược đãi, chủ yếu vì các bạn không cho rằng cán bộ nhà trường sẽ làm điều gì đó để giải quyết vấn đề (67,4%).

- Chưa đến một nửa (42,3%) đã báo rằng cán bộ nhà trường đã giải quyết một cách hiệu quả khi các bạn học sinh báo việc ngược đãi.
- Chưa đến một nửa (43,5%) số học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã nói với thành viên gia đình về việc mình bị ngược đãi ở trường.

- Trong số các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã báo cho thành viên gia đình việc mình bị ngược đãi, một nửa (50,5%) trong số các bạn đã xác nhận việc thành viên trong gia đình đã nói chuyện với giáo viên, hiệu trưởng hoặc cán bộ khác tại trường.

Các quy định thực hành tại trường

Bị kỷ luật tại trường

- Gần một phần ba các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (30,7%) đã bị phạt một số hình thức kỷ luật tại trường, như phạt ở lại, đình chỉ việc học, hoặc cho thôi học.
- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đa chủng tộc bị kỷ luật nặng hơn so với các bạn học sinh chỉ xác định là AAPI.
- Những trải nghiệm tiêu cực tại trường liên quan đến việc bị kỷ luật tại trường đối với các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI Các bạn học sinh từng bị kỷ luật tại trường:
 - bị ngược đãi nhiều hơn do xu hướng tình dục, thể hiện giới tính, và chủng tộc/ dân tộc;
 - có nhiều khả năng bỏ học do cảm thấy không an toàn; và
 - có nhiều khả năng trải nghiệm các chính sách hoặc thực tiễn phân biệt đối xử chống lại cộng đồng LGBTQ.
 - Việc bị kỷ luật tại trường có thể ảnh hưởng tiêu cực đến kết quả học tập đối với các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI . Các bạn học sinh từng bị kỷ luật tại trường:
- ít có khả năng lên kế hoạch theo học chương trình giáo dục sau trung học; và
- có điểm trung bình (ĐTB) thấp hơn (GPAs).

Sự hỗ trợ và Các nguồn tài nguyên học tập tại trường dành cho các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI

GSA (Các Câu lạc bộ Liên minh Người đồng tính nam – Người dị tính)

Tình trạng hoạt động và sự tham gia

- Gần hai phần ba các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (63,5%) đã báo cáo có GSA tại trường của mình.
- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI học tại các trường ở nông thôn, các trường ở miền Nam và các trường nhỏ hơn, ít có khả năng tiếp cận với GSA
- Phần lớn các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (57,7%) có quyền tiếp cận GSA đã tham gia câu lạc bộ, và 18,9% đã tham gia giữ chức vụ hay làm người chỉ dẫn;

Lợi ích

- So với các bạn học sinh không có GSA, các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI có GSA:
 - ít có khả năng nghỉ học do vấn đề an toàn (22,4% so với 36,9%);
 - ít có khả năng cảm thấy không an toàn vì xu hướng tình dục của mình (45,6% so với 62,3%) và thể hiện giới tính (38,6% so với 45,4%); và
 - cảm thấy là thành viên được tôn trọng hơn trong cộng đồng học đường.

- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI tham gia GSA cảm thấy thoải mái hơn khi đưa ra các vấn đề về LGBTQ trong lớp và có nhiều khả năng tham gia Ngày hành động vì cộng đồng GLSEN hoặc biểu tình, bảo vệ, biểu dương chính trị.

Các câu lạc bộ Văn hoá/ Dân tộc

Tình trạng hoạt động và sự tham gia

- Ba phần tư học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (74,6%) báo cáo rằng trường của họ có một câu lạc bộ Văn hóa hoặc Dân tộc tại trường của mình.
- 12,2% các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI với một câu lạc bộ văn hóa / dân tộc tại trường đã tham dự các cuộc họp và 2,4% các bạn học sinh này đã tham gia giữ chức vụ hay làm người chỉ dẫn;

Lợi ích

- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI có câu lạc bộ văn hóa / dân tộc tại trường của mình:
- cảm thấy là thành viên được tôn trọng hơn trong cộng đồng học đường; và
- ít có khả năng cảm thấy không an toàn vì chủng tộc/ dân tộc
- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI sinh ra tại một quốc gia khác có nhiều khả năng tham gia các câu lạc bộ văn hóa/ dân tộc hơn so với những bạn sinh ra ở Hoa Kỳ.

Bộ phận Nhân sự Hỗ trợ của Nhà trường

Tình trạng hoạt động

- Đa đa các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (97,2%) có thể xác định ít nhất một thành viên là cán bộ hỗ trợ tại trường, nhưng chỉ khoảng một nửa (48,5%) trong số các bạn có thể xác định nhiều cán bộ hỗ trợ (11 cán bộ hỗ trợ trở lên).
- Chỉ có khoảng một nửa trong số các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (49,2%) đã báo cáo có bộ phận hành chính nhà trường đã rất hỗ trợ hay giải quyết phần nào vấn đề.
- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI thuộc đa chủng tộc đã báo cáo việc có ít cán bộ nhà trường hỗ trợ và ít cán bộ hành chính hỗ trợ hơn so với các bạn học sinh chỉ xác định là AAPI.

Lợi ích

- Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI có nhiều cán bộ hỗ trợ hơn cho các bạn học sinh LGBTQ:
 - ít có khả năng nghỉ học do vấn đề an toàn;
 - ít có khả năng cảm thấy không an toàn vì xu hướng tình dục, thể hiện giới tính, dân tộc và chủng tộc;
 - có mức độ tự trọng cao hơn và mức độ trầm cảm thấp hơn;
 - cảm thấy kết nối tốt hơn với cộng đồng học đường;
 - có ĐTB học tập cao hơn (3,5 so với 3,2); và
 - có nhiều khả năng lên kế hoạch theo học chương trình sau trung học hơn (97,6% so với 93,8%).

Chương trình giảng dạy được lồng ghép

Chúng tôi cũng đã xem xét việc lồng ghép các chủ đề LGBTQ vào chương trình giảng dạy tại

trường. Chúng tôi thấy rằng chỉ hơn một phần tư các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI (27,4%) được giảng dạy với nội dung trình bày tích cực về con người, lịch sử, hay các sự kiện LGBTQ. Ngoài ra, chúng tôi cũng nhận thấy rằng các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI tham dự chương trình giảng dạy có lồng ghép tích cực nội dung về LGBTQ:

- ít có khả năng cảm thấy không an toàn vì xu hướng tính dục của mình (16,8% so với 30,2%) và thể hiện giới tính (19,4% so với 30,1%);
- có nhiều khả năng được các bạn học chấp nhận là người LGBTQ tại trường (76,4% so với 43,7%); và
- cảm thấy kết nối nhiều hơn với cộng đồng học đường;

Chúng tôi không thể xem xét các hình thức lồng ghép nội dung quan trọng khác trong chương trình giảng dạy, như trình bày nội dung tích cực về người da màu và lịch sử cũng như cộng đồng của họ. Tuy nhiên, chúng tôi đã nhận thấy rằng các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI trong chương trình giảng dạy được lồng ghép chủ đề LGBTQ ít có khả năng cảm thấy không an toàn ở trường vì chủng tộc hoặc dân tộc của mình (22,5% so với 27,8%).

Kết luận và Kiến nghị

Các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI có những trải nghiệm của riêng mình về các quy định thực hành tại trường đối với việc phân biệt đối xử, ngược đãi, và truy cập các nguồn hỗ trợ. Kết quả từ báo cáo này cho thấy các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI đã trải nghiệm trường hợp phân biệt đối xử giữa các cá nhân và tổ chức. Các phát hiện cũng cho thấy cách thức nhà trường hỗ trợ và các nguồn hỗ trợ, như GSA và bộ phận nhân sự hỗ trợ của nhà trường, có thể ảnh hưởng tích cực đến trải nghiệm của các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI tại trường. Dựa trên những phát hiện này, chúng tôi kiến nghị các nội dung sau đến ban giám hiệu nhà trường, các nhà hoạch định chính sách giáo dục và các cá nhân khác muốn cung cấp môi trường học tập an toàn cho các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI :

- Các câu lạc bộ hỗ trợ học sinh, như GSA và các câu lạc bộ văn hoá/ dân tộc; Các tổ chức làm việc với GSA và các câu lạc bộ văn hóa / dân tộc cũng nên hợp tác để đáp ứng nhu cầu của các bạn học sinh LGBTQ AAPI , liên quan đến nhiều bản sắc bên lề, bao gồm các bản sắc xu hướng tính dục, giới tính và chủng tộc/ dân tộc.
- Mang đến sự phát triển chuyên môn cho các cán bộ nhà trường liên quan đến các vấn đề của học sinh LGBTQ AAPI.
- Tăng khả năng tiếp cận của học sinh đối với các nguồn tài nguyên học tập bao gồm các nội dung trình bày đa dạng và tích cực về con người, lịch sử và sự kiện AAPI và LGBTQ.
- Lập các nội dung chính sách và hướng dẫn của trường dành cho các cán bộ xử lý hành vi phân biệt chủng tộc và chống đối cộng đồng LGBTQ, đồng thời phát triển các quy trình bảo mật rõ ràng để học sinh báo vấn đề bị ngược đãi của mình.
- Các cơ quan quản lý giáo dục tại địa phương, tiểu bang và liên bang cũng nên yêu cầu nhà trường chịu trách nhiệm cho việc lập và thực hiện các quy định thực hành và thủ tục này.
- Làm việc để giải quyết sự bất bình đẳng trong hoạt động tài trợ ở cấp địa phương, tiểu bang và quốc gia để tăng khả năng tiếp cận các hoạt động giáo dục và hỗ trợ từ các tổ chức nói chung, và mang đến sự phát triển chuyên nghiệp hơn cho các nhà giáo dục và cán bộ tư vấn học đường.

Khi được kết hợp lại với nhau, các biện pháp này có thể đưa chúng ta đến một tương lai mà các bạn học sinh có cơ hội học tập và đạt kết quả tốt tại trường, bất kể mọi xu hướng tính dục, bản dạng giới tính, thể hiện giới tính, chủng tộc hay dân tộc.

एक्ज़ीक्यूटिवि सारांश

परिचय

मौजूदा शोध में बताया गया है कि स्कूल में एशियाई अमेरिकी और प्रशांत द्वीप वासी (AAPI), दोनों के लेस्बियन, गे, बाईसेक्सुअल, ट्रांसजेंडर, और होमोसेक्सुअल (LGBTQ) युवा अक्सर अपनी अधिकारहीन पहचान से संबंधित खास समस्याओं का सामना करते हैं। उदाहरण के लिए, AAPI के युवाओं को मॉडल माइनॉरिटी स्टीरियोटाइप (आदर्श अल्पसंख्यक रूढ़िबद्ध धारणा) के साथ चुनौती भी दी जाती है कि AAPI के सभी वदियार्थी शैक्षणिक रूप से मेहनती और वशिष्ट हैं, इससे उस जातविवाद और भेदभाव का खंडन किया जा सकता है, उसके महत्व को कम किया जा सकता है, या खत्म किया जा सकता है जिससे AAPI के वदियार्थी अनुभव करते हैं। इससे पहले के अध्ययनों में देखा गया है कि AAPI के प्राथमिक और माध्यमिक वदियार्थियों के वरिद्ध सहपाठियों द्वारा जातविवाद की घटना सामान्य है। ऐसा आंशिक रूप से इसलिए हो सकता है

क्योंकि AAPI के युवा अक्सर स्कूलों में धमकी पर होने वाली नीतित्म चर्चा में शामिल नहीं होते। LGBTQ युवा होने के कारण, वे अक्सर अपने लैंगिक-रुझान, लिंग पहचान और लिंग अभिव्यक्ति से संबंधित खास चुनौतियों का सामना करते हैं। LGBTQ युवाओं ने कई बार उत्पीड़न और भेदभाव की रिपोर्ट की है जिसके कारण शैक्षणिक परिणाम अच्छे नहीं रहे और मनोवैज्ञानिक हित में कमी आई। इसके अलावा, उनके पास स्कूल में मौजूद उन संसाधनों तक सीमा तक पहुंच है या कोई पहुंच नहीं है जिससे स्कूल के परविश और वदियार्थियों के अनुभव को बेहतर बनाया जा सके। हालांकि, यहां स्कूलों में AAPI के युवाओं और LGBTQ युवाओं के अनुभवों पर काफी शोध किया जा रहा है, इन पहचानों के प्रतच्छेदन की जांच में बहुत कम शोध हुए हैं – AAPI LGBTQ

वदियार्थियों के अनुभव. मौजूदा अध्ययनों से पता चलता है कि सार्वजनिक स्कूलों में LGBTQ युवाओं के रंग को लेकर द्वेषपूर्ण परविश है जहां वे जात, लैंगिक-रुझान, लिंग पहचान, या इन सभी पहचानों के आधार पर उत्पीड़न और भेदभाव का अनुभव करते हैं। यह रिपोर्ट उन रिपोर्टों की एक श्रृंखला है जिसमें ब्लैक, लेटनिकस और मूल अमेरिकी LGBTQ युवाओं सहित अलग-अलग जातीय/संजातीय पहचान वाले LGBTQ वदियार्थियों पर फोकस किया गया है।

इस रिपोर्ट में, हम स्कूल में नकारात्मक परविश के संकेतकों, और शैक्षणिक उपलब्धि, शैक्षणिक आकांक्षाओं, और मनोवैज्ञानिक हित पर उनके प्रभाव के संबंध में AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों के अनुभव की जांच कर रहे हैं:

- व्यक्तिगत वशिष्टताओं, जैसे कि लैंगिक-रुझान, लिंग अभिव्यक्ति और जात/संजातीयता, के कारण स्कूल में असुरक्षित महसूस करना, और सुरक्षा कारणों के कारण स्कूल न आना;
- स्कूल में पक्षपातपूर्ण टिप्पणियां सुनना जिसमें समलैंगिकता और जातीयता से संबंधित टिप्पणियां शामिल हैं;
- स्कूल में उत्पीड़न का अनुभव करना; और
- स्कूल की अनुशासनात्मक कार्यप्रणालियों का अनुभव करना।

इसके अलावा, हम इसकी जांच रहे हैं कि AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी इन अनुभवों के बारे में स्कूल के अधिकारियों या अपने परिजनों को बताते हैं या नहीं, और ये लोग समस्या पर कैसे कार्य करते हैं।

हम उस स्थिति की भी जांच कर रहे हैं जिसके लिए AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों के पास स्कूल के सहायक संसाधनों तक पहुंच है, और इन संसाधनों के संभावित लाभों का पता लगाते हैं:

- GSA (गे-स्ट्रेट एलायंस या जेंडर ऐंड सेक्सुअलिटी एलायंस) या इससे मिलते-जुलते संघ;
- जातीय/सांस्कृतिक संघ;
- सहायक स्कूल कर्मचारी; और
- पाठ्यचर्या संबंधी संसाधन जिनमें LGBTQ से संबंधित विषयों में शामिल किया जाता है।

तरीके

इस रिपोर्ट का डेटा GLSEN के 2017 नेशनल स्कूल क्लाइमेट सर्वे (NSCS) से प्राप्त किया गया है। 2017 NSCS के पूरे सैपल में 23,001 LGBTQ वदियार्थियों को शामिल किया गया था जो मडिलि और हाई स्कूल के थे और उनकी आयु 13 से लेकर 21 वर्ष के बीच थी। NSCS में, जब उनसे उनकी जात और संजातीयता के बारे में पूछा गया, तो प्रतभागियों के पास अन्य जात/संजातीयता श्रेणियों के बीच “एशियाई,” और “प्रशांत द्वीप वासी” चुनने का विकल्प था। इस रिपोर्ट के सैपल में नेशनल सैपल के ऐसे

किसी भी LGBTQ वदियार्थी को शामिल किया जाता है जो “एशियाई या दक्षिण एशियाई” या “मूल हवाई या अन्य प्रशांत द्वीप वासी” (इसलिए, उन्हें एशियाई अमेरिकी और प्रशांत द्वीप वासी या AAPI के रूप में संदर्भित किया जाता है) के रूप में पहचाने जाते हैं, इनमें वे लोग भी शामिल हैं जो केवल AAPI के रूप में पहचाने जाते हैं, और जो AAPI और एक या एक से अधिक अतिरिक्त जातीय/संजातीय पहचानों (बहुजातीय AAPI) के रूप में पहचाने जाते हैं। यह ध्यान रखना ज़रूरी है कि प्रशांत द्वीप वासी LGBTQ वदियार्थियों का सैपल साइज़ स्कूल में केवल उनके अनुभवों की जांच करने के लिए बहुत कम था। इसलिए, प्रशांत द्वीप वासी के रूप में पहचाने गए LGBTQ वदियार्थियों को उन वदियार्थियों के साथ संयुक्त किया गया जिन्हें एशियाई के रूप में पहचाना गया।

इस रर्पोर्ट के आखिरी सैपल में कुल 1,480 AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी थे। वयोमगि, डिस्ट्रिक्ट ऑफ़ कोलंबिया, प्यूरटो रिको और यूएस वर्जनि आइलैंड को छोड़कर सभी राज्यों के वदियार्थी इसमें थे। दो बटा पांच (40.0%) को गे या लेस्बियन के रूप में पहचाना गया, आधे से अधिक (57.7%) ससिजेंडर थे, और AAPI के अलावा एक या एक से अधिक जातीय/संजातीय पहचान के साथ आधे से अधिक (56.0%) को पहचाना गया। अमेरिका में अधिकांश वदियार्थियों के लिए

पाया गया कलिगभग सभी ने अपनी पहली भाषा के रूप में, या अपनी पहली भाषाओं में से एक के रूप में अंग्रेजी का अध्ययन किया। अधिकांश वदियार्थी हाई स्कूल और पब्लिक स्कूलों में उपस्थिति हुए।

मुख्य नषिकर्ष

स्कूल में सुरक्षा और उत्पीडन

स्कूल सुरक्षा

- आधे से अधिक AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (51.8%) ने अपने लैंगिक-रुझान के कारण, 41.1% ने अपनी लगी अभवियक्ती के कारण, और 26.4% ने अपनी जातीय या संजातीयता के कारण स्कूल में असुरक्षति महसूस किया।
- एक चौथाई से अधिक AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (27.6%) को पछिले महीने स्कूल में कम से कम एक दनि अनुपस्थति इस कारण पाया गया क्योंकि उन्होंने असुरक्षति या असहज होने का अनुभव किया, और पछिले महीने में लगभग एक बट्टा दस (8.4%) वदियार्थी चार या इससे अधिक दनि अनुपस्थति रहे।

स्कूल में पक्षपातपूर्ण टपिपणियां

- 97.8% AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने “गे” शब्द का उपयोग नकारात्मक तरीके से करते हुए सुना; लगभग दो-तहिई वदियार्थियों (61%) ने कई बार या बार-बार इस तरह के शब्दों को सुना।
- 92.4% AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने समलैंगिकता संबंधी अन्य टपिपणियों को सुना; आधे से अधिक वदियार्थियों (51.1%) ने कई बार या बार-बार इस तरह के शब्दों को सुना।
- 89.3% AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने अपर्याप्त “पुरुष” से संबंधित नकारात्मक लैंगिक अभवियक्ती की टपिपणियां सुनी; आधे वदियार्थियों (50.2%) ने इन टपिपणियों को कई बार या बार-बार सुना।
- 81.4 % AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने अपर्याप्त “स्त्री” से संबंधित टपिपणियां सुनी; एक तहिई वदियार्थियों (33.9%) ने इन टपिपणियों को कई बार या बार-बार सुना।
- 89.3% AAPI LGBTQ के वदियार्थियों ने जातीय टपिपणियां सुनी; आधे से अधिक वदियार्थियों (52.7%) इन टपिपणियों को कई बार या बार-बार सुना।
- 82.3% AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने ट्रांसजेंडर होने के संबंध में नकारात्मक टपिपणियां सुनी; एक तहिई से अधिक वदियार्थियों (35.5%) इन टपिपणियों को कई बार या बार-बार सुना।

स्कूल में उत्पीडन

- कई वदियार्थियों ने स्कूल में नजी वशिषताओं पर आधारित उत्पीडन या अवैध भाषा का अनुभव किया जिसमें लैंगिक-रुझान (60.5%), लगी अभवियक्ती (54.7%), और जातीय/संजातीयता (53.8%) शामिल हैं।
- AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी जिन्होंने स्कूल में लैंगिक-रुझान के आधार पर उच्च उत्पीडन स्तर का अनुभव किया:

- स्कूल छोड़ने की संभावना तीन गुना से अधिक इस कारण थी क्योंकि वे असुरक्षित महसूस करते थे (57.5% बनाम 16.9%);
- हाईस्कूल पूरा करने की योजना संभावित रूप से काफ़ी हद तक कम थी (96.1% बनाम 99.3%); और
- संबंधित स्कूल में नमिन स्तर (22% बनाम 60.9%), और डिप्रेशन के उच्च स्तर का अनुभव किया (73.2% बनाम 41.2%)।
- AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी जन्हींने स्कूल में जात/सिंजातीयता के आधार पर उच्च उत्पीड़न स्तर का अनुभव किया:
 - स्कूल छोड़ने की संभावना लगभग दो गुना इस कारण थी क्योंकि वे असुरक्षित महसूस करते थे (35.5% बनाम 18.4%);
 - संबंधित स्कूल में नमिन स्तर और डिप्रेशन के उच्च स्तर का अनुभव किया।
- ट्रांसजेंडर और जेंडर नॉनफॉर्मिगि (trans/GNC) AAPI वदियार्थियों ने लैंगकि-रुझान और लिंग अभिव्यक्ति के आधार पर उच्च स्तर वाले उत्पीड़न का अनुभव LGBQ ससिजेंडर AAPI वदियार्थियों से अधिक किया।
- एक से अधिक जात/सिंजातीय पहचानों वाले AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने लैंगकि-रुझान और लिंग अभिव्यक्ति के आधार पर उच्च स्तर वाले उत्पीड़न का अनुभव उन LGBTQ वदियार्थियों से अधिक किया जो केवल AAPI वदियार्थी के रूप में पहचाने गए।
- दो बट्टा पांच AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (40.0%) ने अपने लैंगकि-रुझान और अपनी जात/सिंजातीयता, दोनों के कारण स्कूल में उत्पीड़न या अवैध भाषा का अनुभव किया। उत्पीड़न के एक रूप का अनुभव या उत्पीड़न का अनुभव नहीं करने वाले AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों की तुलना में, उत्पीड़न के दोनों रूपों का अनुभव करने वाले AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने:
 - संबंधित स्कूल में नमिन स्तरों का अनुभव किया;
 - डिप्रेशन के उच्चतर स्तरों का अनुभव किया; और
 - स्कूल छोड़ने की सबसे अधिक संभावना इसलिए जताई क्योंकि वे असुरक्षित महसूस करते थे।

स्कूल आधारित उत्पीड़न और अवैध भाषा की रिपोर्टिंग, और बीच-बचाव

पछिले वर्ष उत्पीड़न या अवैध भाषा का अनुभव करने वाले अधिकांश AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (56.5%) ने उत्पीड़न की रिपोर्ट कर्मचारियों को कभी नहीं की, सबसे आम कारण यह था कि उन्हें ऐसा नहीं लगा कि कर्मचारी इस संबंध में कुछ भी करेंगे (67.4%)।

- आधे से भी कम वदियार्थियों (42.3%) ने बताया कि वदियार्थियों द्वारा उत्पीड़न की रिपोर्ट किए जाने पर कर्मचारियों ने प्रभावी ढंग से कार्रवाई की।
- आधे से भी कम AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (43.5%) ने स्कूल में उनके द्वारा सामना किए जा रहे उत्पीड़न के बारे में परजिनों को बताया।
- जनि AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने परजिनों को उत्पीड़न के अनुभव की सूचना दी, उनमें से आधे (50.5%) ने बताया कि परजिनों ने उनके शिक्षक, प्रसिपिल या स्कूल के अन्य कर्मचारी से इस संबंध में बात की।

स्कूल की कार्यप्रणाली

स्कूल व्यवस्था के साथ अनुभव

- लगभग एक तहाई AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (30.7%) ने स्कूल व्यवस्था के कुछ कार्यों का अनुभव किया, जैसे कि अवरोधन, स्कूल से नलिंबन, या नषिकासन।
- बहुजातीय AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने उन वदियार्थियों की तुलना में उच्च स्तरीय व्यवस्था का अनुभव किया जनिहें केवल AAPI के रूप में पहचाना गया।
- स्कूल के नकारात्मक अनुभव, AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों के लिए स्कूल व्यवस्था के अनुभवों से संबंधित थे। स्कूल व्यवस्था का अनुभव करने वाले वदियार्थियों ने:

- लैंगिक-रुझान, लिंग अभिव्यक्ति, और जात/संजातीयता के आधार पर उच्च उत्पीड़न दर का अनुभव किया;
- स्कूल छोड़ने की अधिक संभावना इसलिए जताई क्योंकि उन्होंने असुरक्षित महसूस किया; और
- स्कूल में LGBTQ पक्षपाती वरिधी नीतियों या कार्यप्रणालियों का अनुभव करने की अधिक संभावना जताई।
- स्कूल व्यवस्था वाले अनुभव भी AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों के शैक्षिक परणामों पर नकारात्मक प्रभाव डाल सकते हैं। स्कूल व्यवस्था का अनुभव करने वाले वदियार्थियों ने:
 - माध्यमिक शिक्षा के बाद आगे की शिक्षा के लिए योजना बनाने की कम संभावना जताई; और
 - नमिन ग्रेड पॉइंट एवरेज (GPA) का प्रदर्शन किया।

AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों के लिए स्कूल द्वारा दी जाने वाली सहायता और संसाधन

GSA

उपलब्धता और भागीदारी

- लगभग दो-तर्हिई AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (63.5%) ने अपने स्कूल में GSA होने की सूचना दी।
- ग्रामीण स्कूलों, दक्षिण के स्कूलों, और छोटे स्कूलों के AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने GSA तक पहुंच होने की कम संभावना जताई।
- GSA तक पहुंच वाले अधिकांश AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (57.7%) ने संघ में भाग लिया, और 18.9% वदियार्थियों ने अधिकारी या नेता के रूप में भाग लिया।

उपयोगिता

- बनिा GSA वाले AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों की तुलना में GSA वाले AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने:
 - सुरक्षा चिंताओं के कारण स्कूल छोड़ने की कम संभावना जताई (22.4% बनाम 36.9%);
 - अपने लैंगिक-रुझान (45.6% बनाम 62.3%) और लिंग अभिव्यक्ति (38.6% बनाम 45.4%) के कारण असुरक्षित होने का अनुभव करने में कम संभावना जताई; और
 - अपने संबंधित स्कूल समुदाय में अधिक बेहतर होने का अनुभव किया।
- GSA में भाग लेने वाले AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने कक्षा में LGBTQ की समस्याओं को सामने लाने में अधिक सहज होने का अनुभव किया, और GLSEN डे ऑफ़ एक्शन में, या राजनीतिक रैली, वरिध प्रदर्शन या प्रदर्शन में भाग लेने की अधिक संभावना जताई।

जातीय/सांस्कृतिक संघ;

उपलब्धता और भागीदारी

- तीन-चौथाई AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (74.6%) ने बताया कि उनके स्कूल में एक जातीय या सांस्कृतिक संघ था।
- स्कूल के जातीय/सांस्कृतिक संघ वाले 12.2% AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने बैठकों में भाग लिया, और 2.4% वदियार्थियों ने अधिकारी या नेता के रूप में भाग लिया।

उपयोगिता

- अपने स्कूल के जातीय/सांस्कृतिक संघ से जुड़े AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने:
 - अपने संबंधित स्कूल समुदाय में अधिक बेहतर होने का अनुभव किया; और
 - अपनी जात/संजातीयता के कारण असुरक्षित होने की कम संभावना जताई।

- किसी अन्य देश के AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने अमेरिकी AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों की तुलना में जातीय/सांस्कृतिक संघों में भाग लेने की अधिक संभावना जताई।

सहायक स्कूल कर्मचारी

उपलब्धता

- अधिकांश AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी (97.2%) स्कूल के कम से कम एक सहायक कर्मचारी की पहचान कर पा रहे थे, लेकिन केवल लगभग आधे वदियार्थी (48.5%) ही कई सहायक कर्मचारियों (11 या इससे अधिक) की पहचान कर पा रहे थे।
- केवल लगभग आधे AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (49.2%) ने कुछ हद तक या बहुत अधिक सहायक स्कूल प्रशासन होने की सूचना दी।
- बहुजातीय AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों ने, केवल AAPI के रूप में पहचाने गए वदियार्थियों की तुलना में कम सहायक कर्मचारी और कम सहायक प्रशासन होने की सूचना दी।

उपयोगिता

- वे AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी जन्होंने LGBTQ वदियार्थियों की सहायता करने वाले अधिक कर्मचारियों की सूचना दी, उन्होंने:
 - सुरक्षा चिंताओं के कारण स्कूल छोड़ने की कम संभावना जताई;
 - अपने लैंगिक-रुझान, लिंग अभिव्यक्ति, और जाति/संजातीयता के कारण असुरक्षित होने की कम संभावना जताई;
 - उच्च स्तरीय आत्म-सम्मान और नम्र स्तरीय डिप्रेशन का प्रदर्शन किया;
 - अपने स्कूल समुदाय से जुड़ाव की अधिक भावना का प्रदर्शन किया;
 - उच्च GPA (3.5 बनाम 3.2) का प्रदर्शन किया; और
 - माध्यमिक शिक्षा के बाद आगे की शिक्षा के लिए योजना बनाने की अधिक संभावना जताई (97.6% बनाम 93.8%)।

समावेशी पाठ्यक्रम

हमने स्कूल के पाठ्यक्रम में LGBTQ वषियों को शामिल करने की भी जांच की। हमने पाया कि केवल एक चौथाई AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों (27.4%) को LGBTQ लोगों, इतिहास, या कार्यक्रमों के सकारात्मक प्रतरूप के बारे में बताया गया था। इसके अलावा, हमने यह भी पाया कि जिन AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों को स्कूल के पाठ्यक्रम में LGBTQ समुदाय से जुड़े कुछ सकारात्मक पहलुओं को बताया गया था, उन्होंने:

- अपने लैंगिक-रुझान (16.8% बनाम 30.2%) और लिंग अभिव्यक्ति (19.4% बनाम 30.1%) के कारण असुरक्षित होने का अनुभव करने में कम संभावना जताई;
- स्कूल में सहपाठियों द्वारा LGBTQ लोगों को स्वीकार करने की अधिक संभावना जताई (76.4% बनाम 43.7%); और
- अपने स्कूल समुदाय में अधिक जुड़ाव का अनुभव किया।

हम पाठ्यक्रम समावेश के अन्य महत्वपूर्ण रूपों की जांच नहीं कर पाएँ, जैसे कि अलग-अलग रंग वाले लोगों, और उनके इतिहास और समुदायों का सकारात्मक प्रतरूप। इसके बावजूद, हमने पाया कि LGBTQ-समावेशी पाठ्यक्रम में शामिल वाले AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों में अपनी जाति/संजातीयता के कारण स्कूल में असुरक्षित होने का अनुभव करने की संभावना कम थी (22.5% बनाम 27.8%)।

नषिकर्ष और सुझाव

AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों में उत्पीड़न, स्कूल की पक्षपाती कार्यप्रणालियों, और सहायक संसाधनों तक पहुंच से संबंधित अद्वितीय अनुभव हैं। इस रिपोर्ट के परिणाम बताते हैं कि AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी संस्थागत और

पारस्परिक भेदभाव का अनुभव करते हैं। नषिकर्ष में स्कूल द्वारा दी जाने वाली सहायता और संसाधन जैसे तरीके भी सामने आए हैं, जैसे कि GSA और सहायक स्कूल कर्मचारी, AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों के स्कूल के अनुभवों पर सकारात्मक रूप से असर डाल सकते हैं। इन नषिकर्षों के आधार पर, हम सुझाव देते हैं कि स्कूल लीडर, शिक्षा नीति निर्माता, और AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों को सुरक्षित शिक्षण परविश देने की चाह रखने वाले अन्य व्यक्ति:

- GSA और जातीय/सांस्कृतिक संघ जैसे वदियार्थी संघों का समर्थन करें। GSA और जातीय/सांस्कृतिक संघों के साथ कार्य करने वाले संगठन को AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थियों की उन आवश्यकताओं को पूरा करने के लिए काम करना चाहिए जो लैंगिक-रुझान, लिंग, और जाति/संजातीयता सहित उनकी कई अधिकारहीन पहचानों से संबंधित हैं।
- AAPI LGBTQ वदियार्थी की समस्याओं के बारे में स्कूल के कर्मचारियों को पेशेवर सुधार की जानकारी दें।
- उन पाठ्यक्रम संसाधनों तक वदियार्थी की पहुंच को बढ़ाएं जिनमें AAPI और LGBTQ, दोनों के लोगों, इतिहास और कार्यक्रमों के विधि और सकारात्मक प्रतिरूप शामिल हों।
- LGBTQ और जातीय वरिधी व्यवहार के संबंध में कर्मचारियों के लिए स्कूल नीतियों और दशानरिदेशों को स्थापित करें, और वदियार्थियों द्वारा उस उत्पीड़न की रिपोर्ट करने के लिए स्पष्ट और गोपनीय तरीके बनाएं जिनका वे अनुभव करते हैं।
- स्थानीय, राज्य और संघीय शिक्षा एजेंसियों द्वारा भी इन कार्यप्रणालियों और प्रक्रियाओं को स्थापित करने और लागू करने के लिए स्कूलों को जवाबदेह बनाया जाना चाहिए।
- सामान्य रूप से संस्थागत समर्थन और शिक्षा तक पहुंच बढ़ाने के लिए स्थानीय, राज्य और राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर वृत्त पोषण में असमानताओं को संबोधित करने का कार्य करें, और शिक्षकों और स्कूल के परामर्शदाताओं के लिए अधिक पेशेवर विकास प्रदान करें।

ऐसे उपाय एक साथ मिलाकर करने से हम ऐसे भवषिय की ओर जा सकते हैं जसिमें लैंगिक-रुझान, लिंग पहचान, लिंग अभव्यक्ति, जाति, या संजातीयता को नज़रअंदाज़ करते हुए सभी वदियार्थियों को स्कूल में पढ़ने और सफल होने का अवसर मलिता है।

Introduction

Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI)¹ elementary and secondary school students represent 5% of the U.S. population, yet they are often missing from policy discussions on bullying in schools.² In fact, national data on school victimization for AAPI are often missing or unavailable.³ It may be that smaller racial/ethnic student populations, such as AAPI and Native American youth, are often overlooked because of population size. However, AAPI students may also be left out of school bullying conversations, in part, because of the model minority myth that AAPI students are innately intelligent and hardworking, and excel academically.⁴ These stereotypes perpetuate fallacies, create social pressures for high achievement, and deny, downplay, or erase the racism and discrimination that AAPI students experience, and as a result, can be damaging to the student.⁵ Prior studies, in fact, show that the incidence of racism from peers against AAPI elementary and secondary school students is common.⁶ Another consequence of the model minority myth may be the false assumption that all AAPI youth are driven to excel academically and, thus, are somehow able to avoid experiences of bullying and harassment at school. This may lead educators and administrators to believe that, by focusing on their studies, AAPI youth are able to avoid situations that lead to bullying, and thus, they do not experience bullying in school.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) youth often face unique challenges related to their sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression, challenges which most of their non-LGBTQ peers do not face. GLSEN's *2017 National School Climate Survey* found that schools are often unsafe places for LGBTQ students.⁷ LGBTQ youth often reported experiencing harassment, discrimination, and other troubling events in school, often specifically related to their sexual orientation, gender identity and/or how they express their gender,⁸ including high levels of verbal and physical harassment and assault, sexual harassment, social exclusion and isolation, and other interpersonal problems with peers. In addition, many LGBTQ students did not have access to in-school resources that may improve school climate and students' experiences, such as Gender and Sexuality Alliances (GSAs), supportive educators, and supportive and inclusive school policies.

Although a growing body of research has focused on examining AAPI youth's school experiences

and LGBTQ youth's school experiences separately or uniquely, much less research has examined the school experiences of LGBTQ AAPI students. Research on LGBTQ youth of color in general has shown that schools nationwide are hostile environments for LGBTQ youth of color, where they experience victimization and discrimination based on race, sexual orientation, and gender identity, or all of the above simultaneously.⁹ Because LGBTQ youth are not a monolithic population, some research has examined racial/ethnic group differences in school climate indicating that AAPI LGBTQ students tended to fare better than other groups, including lower levels anti-LGBTQ victimization, and school disciplinary action.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it was still a common occurrence that AAPI LGBTQ students experience a hostile school climate. Therefore, it is important to highlight the experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students, and how school climate is related to their educational experiences and psychological well-being. In this report, we explore more deeply the school experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students.

Given that the majority of research on this population has examined AAPI youth and LGBTQ youth separately, we approach this report with an intersectional framework.¹¹ Where possible, we examine the school experiences of AAPI LGBTQ student's multiple intersecting marginalized identities (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation) in relation to multiple interlocking systems of oppression (e.g., racism, transphobia, homophobia). For instance, the homophobic bias that an AAPI LGBTQ individual may experience is tied to their experiences of racism as an AAPI individual. Our focal point is on the school experiences of AAPI LGBTQ youth as a whole, with attention to also examining differences within AAPI LGBTQ youth. This report will not compare AAPI LGBTQ youth to other racial/ethnic LGBTQ groups.

This report is one of a series of reports on LGBTQ students of color, including Black, Latinx, and Native and Indigenous LGBTQ youth. In this report, we examine the experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students with regard to indicators of negative school climate, as well as supports and resources. In *Part One: Safety and Victimization at School*, we begin with examining AAPI LGBTQ students' feelings of safety at school due to their personal characteristics (race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender identity/expression), experiences of racist and anti-LGBTQ victimization from

peers, as well as reporting racist and anti-LGBTQ victimization to school staff and staff responses to these reports, and family reporting and intervention as an additional form that impacts their school experiences. In *Part Two: School Practices*, we shift to AAPI LGBTQ students' experiences with

school staff and practices, including experiences of school disciplinary action and its relation to anti-LGBTQ discriminatory school policies and practices, as well as school resources and supports for AAPI LGBTQ students, and club participation and leadership.

Methods and Sample Description

Methods

Data for this report came from GLSEN's *2017 National School Climate Survey (NSCS)*, a biennial survey of U.S. secondary school students who identify as LGBTQ. Participants completed an online survey about their experiences in school during the 2016-2017 school year, including hearing biased remarks, feelings of safety, experiencing harassment and assault, feeling comfortable at school, and experiencing anti-LGBTQ discriminatory school policies and practices. They were also asked about their academic achievement, attitudes about school, school involvement, and availability and impact of supportive school resources. Eligibility for participation in the survey included being at least 13 years of age, attending a K-12 school in the United States during the 2016-2017 school year, and identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, or a sexual orientation other than heterosexual (e.g., pansexual, questioning) or being transgender or as having a gender identity that is not cisgender (e.g., genderqueer, nonbinary). For a full discussion of methods, refer to GLSEN's *2017 NSCS* report.¹²

The full sample for the *2017 NSCS* was 23,001 LGBTQ middle and high school students between 13 and 21 years old. In the survey, participants were asked how they identified their race/ethnicity, including "Asian or South Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander". Participants could check all that apply. The sample for this report consisted of any LGBTQ student in the national sample who identified as "Asian or South Asian" or "Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander" (henceforth referred to as Asian American and Pacific Islander), including those who only identified as AAPI, and those who identified as AAPI and one or more additional racial/ethnic identities (multiracial AAPI). It is important to note that the sample size of Pacific Islander LGBTQ

students was too small to examine their school experiences alone. Therefore, LGBTQ students who identified as Pacific Islander were combined with those who identified as Asian. The final sample for this report was a total of 1,480 AAPI LGBTQ students.

Sample Description

As seen in Table S.1, two-fifths (40.0%) of AAPI LGBTQ students in the sample identified as gay or lesbian, with just over a quarter (28.9%) identifying as bisexual and nearly one-fifth (19.8%) identifying as pansexual. Just over half (57.7%) identified as cisgender, nearly a quarter (22.1%) identified as transgender, and the remainder identified with another gender identity or were unsure of their gender identity. Among students who only identified as only AAPI, 91.7% identified as Asian or South Asian, and 13.7% identified as Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian (see Table S.1). Just over half of the AAPI LGBTQ students in this report (56.0%) identified with one or more racial/ethnic identities in addition to AAPI, as described in Table S.1. For example, nearly half of respondents (45.9%) also identified as White. The majority of respondents were born in the U.S. (86.9%) and nearly all learned English as their first language, or as one of their first languages (91.1%). Additionally, just over half (54.5%) identified with no religion.

Students attended schools in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands. As seen in Table S.2, the majority of students attended high school (67.0%), the vast majority attended public school (87.7%), and just over half attended majority-White schools (56.5%).

Table S.1. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants

Sexual Orientation ¹³ (n = 1474)		Gender ¹⁹ (n = 1425)	
Gay or Lesbian	40.0%	Cisgender	57.7%
Bisexual	28.9%	Female	37.3%
Pansexual ¹⁴	19.8%	Male	17.3%
Queer	4.0%	Unspecified	3.1%
Asexual ¹⁵	2.7%	Transgender	22.1%
Another Sexual Orientation (e.g., fluid, heterosexual)	3.9%	Female	1.8%
Questioning or Unsure	3.3%	Male	13.9%
		Nonbinary (i.e., not identifying as male or female, or identifying as both male and female)	5.1%
Race and Ethnicity ¹⁶ (n = 1480)		Unspecified	1.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander Only	44.0%	Genderqueer	11.2%
Asian or South Asian	91.7%	Another Nonbinary Identity (e.g., agender, genderfluid)	7.3%
Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	13.7%	Questioning or Unsure	1.8%
Multiple Racial/Ethnic Identities ¹⁷	56.0%		
White	45.9%	Religious Affiliation (n = 1475)	
Native American, American Indian, or Alaska Native	7.8%	Christian (non-denominational)	13.5%
Black or African American	8.4%	Catholic	10.6%
Hispanic or Latino/Latina/Latinx	12.8%	Protestant	1.4%
Middle Eastern or Arab American	2.9%	Jewish	1.2%
		Buddhist	6.2%
Immigration Status (n = 1478)		Muslim	1.3%
U.S. Citizen	96.8%	Another Religion (e.g., Unitarian Universalist, Wiccan)	11.3%
Born in the U.S. or a U.S. territory	86.9%	No Religion, Atheist, or Agnostic (and not affiliated with a religion listed above)	54.5%
Born in another country ¹⁸	9.9%		
U.S. Non-citizen	3.1%	Received Educational Accommodations ²⁰ (n = 1466)	23.6%
Documented	2.8%		
Undocumented	0.3%		
English Learned as First Language (n = 1462)	91.1%		
Average Age (n = 1480) = 15.5 years			
Grade in School (n = 1449)			
6th	1.2%		
7th	7.5%		
8th	14.4%		
9th	20.2%		
10th	23.4%		
11th	21.7%		
12th	11.5%		

Table S.2. Characteristics of Survey Participants' Schools

Grade Level (n = 1474)		School Type (n = 1453)	
K through 12 School	7.7%	Public School	87.7%
Lower School (elementary and middle grades)	1.8%	Charter	5.3%
Middle School	15.3%	Magnet	11.2%
Upper School (middle and high grades)	8.2%	Religious-Affiliated School	4.6%
High School	67.0%	Other Independent or Private School	7.7%
Region ²¹ (n = 1472)		Single-Sex School (n = 1474)	
Northeast	17.1%		1.9%
South	24.2%	School Locale (n = 1452)	
Midwest	15.3%	Urban	27.7%
West	41.2%	Suburban	54.2%
U.S. Territories	2.2%	Rural or Small Town	18.1%
School Racial Composition (n = 1316)			
Majority AAPI	13.1%		
Majority White	56.5%		
Majority Other Race	18.6%		
No Majority Race	11.8%		


Part One: Safety and Victimization at School

For AAPI LGBTQ youth, school can be an unsafe place. Our previous research indicates that the majority of LGBTQ students regularly hear biased language at school, and most experience some form of identity-based harassment or assault. These experiences may negatively impact students' academic outcomes, as well as their psychological well-being. Thus, we explored the reasons AAPI LGBTQ students feel unsafe at school, the types of biased language they hear, and both the extent and effects of in-school harassment and assault. Because school staff have a responsibility to intervene on such incidents of bias, we also examined AAPI LGBTQ students' rates of reporting their victimization to staff, and how school staff responded.

Safety

We asked students if they ever felt unsafe at school due to any personal characteristics. As shown in Figure 1.1, the most common reason for AAPI LGBTQ students to feel unsafe was due to their actual or perceived sexual orientation (51.8%), followed by the way they express their gender, or how traditionally “masculine” or “feminine” they were in appearance or behavior (41.1%).²² Additionally, just over a quarter of students (26.4%) felt unsafe due to their race or ethnicity. For some, feeling unsafe at school may even result in avoiding school altogether. When asked about absenteeism, over a quarter of AAPI LGBTQ students (27.6%) reported missing at least one day of school in the last month because they felt

Figure 1.1 AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Felt Unsafe at School Because of Actual or Perceived Personal Characteristics



unsafe or uncomfortable, and nearly one-tenth (8.4%) missed four or more days in the last month.

Biased Remarks

AAPI LGBTQ students may feel unsafe at school, in part, because of homophobic, racist, or other types of biased language that they hear from their peers in classrooms or hallways. We asked students how often they heard anti-LGBTQ language from other students, including: the word “gay” being used in a negative way (such as “that’s so gay” being used to call something “stupid” or “worthless”), other homophobic remarks (such as “faggot” and “dyke”), comments about students not acting “masculine” enough, comments about students not acting “feminine” enough, and negative remarks about transgender people (such as “tranny” or “he/she”). We also asked students how often they heard racist language from other students at school. As shown in Figure 1.2, the most common form of biased language was “gay” used in a negative way, followed by racist remarks. Nearly two-thirds of AAPI LGBTQ students heard “gay” used in a negative way often or frequently (61.9%), and just over half heard racist remarks often or frequently (52.7%). The next most common forms of biased remarks heard by AAPI LGBTQ students were other homophobic remarks and comments about not acting “masculine” enough (see also Figure 1.2).²³

Harassment and Assault


In addition to hearing biased language in hallways or classrooms, many students

experience victimization at school, including verbal harassment (e.g., being called names or threatened), physical harassment (e.g., being shoved or pushed), and physical assault (e.g., being punched, kicked, or injured with a weapon). LGBTQ students who experience harassment or assault may feel excluded and disconnected from their school community, and may respond by avoiding school. This victimization may also have a negative impact on students’ psychological well-being and academic success.²⁴ Therefore, we examined how often AAPI LGBTQ students experienced victimization in the past year based on their actual or perceived sexual orientation, the way they express their gender, and their actual or perceived race/ethnicity. We also examined whether victimization based on sexual orientation or based on race/ethnicity was associated with academic outcomes as well as key indicators of student well-being, including: educational aspirations, skipping school due to feeling unsafe, school belonging, and depression.

Extent and effects of harassment and assault based on personal characteristics. As shown in Figure 1.3, the majority of AAPI LGBTQ students experienced harassment and assault based on their race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender expression. Victimization based on their sexual orientation was most common, followed by victimization because of gender expression (see also Figure 1.3).²⁵

We examined whether victimization at school due to sexual orientation and victimization due to race or ethnicity were associated with AAPI LGBTQ students’ psychological well-being and

Figure 1.2 Frequency of Hearing Anti-LGBTQ and Racist Remarks in School



educational outcomes. We found that victimization based on sexual orientation was related to skipping school due to feeling unsafe, lower educational aspirations, lower levels of school belonging, and greater levels of depression.²⁶ For example, as seen in Figure 1.4, students were more than three times as likely to skip school because they felt unsafe if they experienced higher than average levels of victimization based on sexual orientation (57.5% vs. 16.9%). Similarly, we found that victimization based on race/ethnicity was related to skipping school due to feeling unsafe, lower levels of school belonging, and greater levels of depression (see Figure 1.5).²⁷ We did not, however, observe a relationship between victimization based on race/ethnicity and educational aspirations.

Differences in victimization by transgender status. Previous research, from GLSEN, as well as other scholars, has demonstrated that transgender and other gender nonconforming (trans/GNC) students experience greater levels of anti-LGBTQ victimization and harassment than cisgender LGBTQ students.²⁸ We found this to be true for AAPI LGBTQ students as well. Specifically, we found that trans/GNC AAPI students experienced greater levels of victimization based on sexual orientation and gender expression than their cisgender LGBTQ AAPI peers (see Figure 1.6), but they did not differ on victimization based on race/ethnicity (see also Figure 1.6).²⁹ Given that the general population tends to hold less favorable views of transgender people than of gay and lesbian people,³⁰ trans/GNC AAPI students may be greater targets for anti-LGBTQ victimization.

Differences in victimization by multiple racial/ethnic identities. For multiracial students, their own racial/ethnic identification or how they are identified by their peers in terms of their race/ethnicity may vary based on context.³¹ Because they do not belong to any single racial/ethnic group, these students may face greater levels of social exclusion that may result in increased risks for peer victimization.³² Thus, we examined whether AAPI LGBTQ students who endorsed multiple racial/ethnic identities differed from those who identified only as AAPI with regard to their experiences of victimization. We found that multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students experienced greater levels of victimization based on sexual

Figure 1.3 Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Experienced Victimization Based on Personal Characteristics





Figure 1.4 Victimization Based on Sexual Orientation and AAPI LGBTQ Student Well-Being and Academic Outcomes



orientation and based on gender expression than LGBTQ students who identified only as AAPI (see Figure 1.7).³³

We did not find that multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students, overall, experienced different levels of race-based harassment than those who only identified as AAPI. However, we did find differences when we considered the racial composition of the school. In majority AAPI schools, multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students experienced a higher severity of racist victimization than LGBTQ students who only identified as AAPI. However in all other school compositions — majority White, majority other non-White race, and no majority race schools — LGBTQ students who only identified as AAPI experienced higher

severity of racist victimization than multiracial AAPI students.³⁴ It is possible that multiracial AAPI students are more likely to be targeted for victimization in AAPI majority schools because of their other racial/ethnic identities, whereas students who only identify as AAPI may be more targeted for victimization in schools where they are not a racial majority. Further research is warranted to explore other possible connections between multiracial/multiethnic identity and different forms of victimization among students of color.

Experiencing multiple forms of victimization. Thus far in this section, we have discussed AAPI LGBTQ students' in-school experiences of victimization based on sexual orientation, on gender expression, and on race/ethnicity independently. However,

Figure 1.5 Victimization Based on Race/Ethnicity and AAPI LGBTQ Student Well-Being and Academic Outcomes





Figure 1.6 Differences in Level of Victimization by Trans/GNC Status
(Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Experiencing Higher than Average Levels of Victimization)



many AAPI LGBTQ students experience victimization that targets both their LGBTQ and their racial/ethnic identities. In fact, two-fifths of AAPI LGBTQ students in our study (40.0%) experienced harassment or assault based on both their sexual orientation and their race/ethnicity.³⁵ Previously in this report, we reported that both

types of victimization separately were related to skipping school due to feeling unsafe, lower school belonging, and greater levels of depression. However, it is important to understand how these outcomes are associated with experiencing multiple forms of harassment. Therefore, we examined the combined effects of race-based

Figure 1.7 Differences in Level of Victimization by Multiple Racial/Ethnic Identities
(Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Experiencing Higher than Average Levels of Victimization)





Figure 1.8 AAPI LGBTQ Student Well-Being and Multiple Forms of Victimization Based on Sexual Orientation and Race/Ethnicity



and homophobic victimization on missing school, school belonging, and depression. We found that students who experienced both homophobic and racist victimization were the most likely to skip school due to feeling unsafe,³⁶ experienced the lowest levels of school belonging,³⁷ and experienced the highest levels of depression,³⁸ as compared to those who experienced only one form of victimization or neither (see Figure 1.8).

In that AAPI LGBTQ students likely have a longer history with experiencing victimization based on their race/ethnicity than their LGBTQ identity, it is possible that these experiences of race-based victimization may equip AAPI LGBTQ students with skills to navigate other types of victimization, such as anti-LGBTQ victimization, and provide a buffer against the psychological harms of these additional forms of victimization.³⁹ Thus, we also examined how the experience of racist victimization might alter the effect of homophobic victimization on school outcomes and well-being. We found that the effects of victimization on school belonging and depression were more pronounced if students only experienced one form of victimization.⁴⁰ For example, the negative effect of homophobic victimization on depression was strongest among AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced higher levels of homophobic victimization and lower levels of racist victimization. Thus, the findings suggest that an AAPI LGBTQ student who has early and possibly ongoing experiences of racist victimization may be better equipped to respond to subsequent victimization, including harassment based on their sexual orientation.⁴¹ We did not find this same effect with regard to missing school, however. More investigation is warranted to further understand the impacts of multiple forms of victimization, although it remains clear that experiencing additional forms of victimization means experiencing additional harm, and AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced victimization targeting both their race/ethnicity and sexual orientation experienced the poorest outcomes.

Reporting School-Based Harassment and Assault


GLSEN advocates for clear guidelines for school staff on anti-bullying and harassment incidents, and for staff to be trained in effectively responding to victimization incidents. We asked AAPI LGBTQ students who had experienced harassment or

assault in the past school year how often they had reported the incidents to school staff, and found that the majority of students (56.5%) never reported victimization to staff (see Figure 1.9). Less than 1 in 5 students (17.1%) reported victimization to staff “most of time” or “always.”

AAPI LGBTQ students who indicated that they had not always told school personnel about their experiences with harassment or assault were asked why they did not always do so. The most common reason for not reporting victimization to staff was that they did not think that staff would do anything about it (67.4%).

We asked LGBTQ students who had reported incidents to school staff about the actions that staff had taken in response to the reported incident. The most common staff responses to students’ reports of harassment and assault was talking to the perpetrator/telling the perpetrator to stop (42.3%), followed by telling the student to ignore it (40.8%), and doing nothing/taking no action (34.3%). Thus, AAPI LGBTQ students may be justified in thinking that staff may not address the victimization they experience. Furthermore, nearly half of students (44.9%) reported that staff responded ineffectively to their reports of victimization. We also found that the only common response that could be considered appropriate or effective was talking to the perpetrator/telling the perpetrator to stop.⁴²

Figure 1.9 Frequency of AAPI LGBTQ Students Reporting Incidents of Harassment and Assault to School Staff (n=687)



Insight on Family Reporting and Intervention

Family support has been shown to improve educational opportunities and academic success for marginalized groups, such as students with disabilities and students of color.⁴³ However, little is known about factors that contribute to family support, particularly for AAPI LGBTQ students. Prior studies have focused on AAPI parents' involvement in their children's academic achievement.⁴⁴ In part, this may be because education research regarding parental involvement in general, regardless of the students' race/ethnicity, has typically examined the relationship between parental involvement and academic achievement.⁴⁵ Therefore, relatively less attention has been paid to non-educational outcomes in the school lives of AAPI youth, including family support for AAPI students with regard to bullying. In this section, we examined family intervention in response to their child's victimization at school, and conditions that promote family intervention for AAPI LGBTQ students.


Reporting Victimization to Family. Given that family members may be able to intervene when incidents of victimization occur, we asked students in our survey if they reported harassment or assault to a family member. Less than half of AAPI LGBTQ students (43.5%) said that they had ever told a family member about the victimization they faced at school. When LGBTQ students experience victimization at school, they may be hesitant to tell family members if they are not out to them. We found that students who were out as LGBTQ to at least one family member were more likely to tell their families about the victimization they were experiencing at school, but it remained only slightly more than half (52.3% of those out to family vs. 32.0% of those not out).⁴⁶

Family Intervention. Among AAPI LGBTQ students who reported victimization experiences to a family member, half (50.5%) reported that a family member talked to their teacher, principal or other school staff about the harassment or assault they experienced (see Figure).

Certain factors may increase the likelihood that family members intervene on behalf of the student with the school. Family members may be more likely to intervene when the student experiences a high severity of victimization. Further, family members of students with disabilities or educational accommodations may be more likely to be involved in the student's general school life and thus, more likely to intervene when that student is victimized in school. In fact, we found that family members of AAPI LGBTQ students were more likely to talk to staff about victimization when the student had experienced higher levels of victimization based on gender expression (54.5% vs. 45.2%).⁴⁷ However, victimization based on sexual orientation and victimization based on race/ethnicity were not related to family members talking to staff about victimization. We also found that AAPI LGBTQ students who had a disability were more likely to report that their family members talked to staff about their victimization, compared to AAPI LGBTQ students who did not have a disability (54.4% vs. 44.6%).⁴⁸ Receiving educational accommodation services was not related to family members talking to staff about victimization.

Conclusions. We found that many AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced victimization in school reported victimization to their family members and many family members talked to staff about victimization experiences. Certain conditions at school make it more likely for family members of AAPI LGBTQ students to intervene, such as when there is a more hostile school climate and when their child has a disability. It is interesting to note that family members of AAPI LGBTQ students were more likely to intervene when the student experienced higher levels of victimization based on gender expression, but this was not the case for victimization based on sexual orientation and victimization based on race/ethnicity. Further research is warranted to explore connections between different forms of victimization and family intervention among AAPI LGBTQ students. Finally, findings from our data show whether family members intervene, but not how effective their interventions are. Thus, it is critical for research to assess the effectiveness of family intervention efforts in improving school climate.

Frequency of Intervention by AAPI LGBTQ Students' Family Members (n = 687)



Conclusions

The majority of AAPI LGBTQ students experienced anti-LGBTQ and racist victimization, and these forms of victimization may result in poorer academic outcomes and student well-being. In fact, those who experienced both of these forms of victimization had the most adverse outcomes with regard to skipping school due to feeling unsafe, school belonging, and depression. Thus, it is important that educators be particularly attentive to the needs of students who lie at the intersection of multiple forms of bias. Unfortunately, we also found that the majority of AAPI LGBTQ students

who experienced victimization at school never reported these experiences to staff. Further, for those who did report their victimization to staff, the second most common staff response was telling the student to ignore the incident. Thus, it is critical that schools implement clear and confidential pathways for students to report incidents of bias that they experience, and that educators and other school staff receive training to understand how to intervene effectively on both anti-LGBTQ and racist victimization.


Part Two: School Practices

Schools have a responsibility to promote positive learning for all students, including AAPI LGBTQ students. The availability of resources and supports in school for AAPI LGBTQ students is another important dimension of school climate. There are several key resources that may help to promote a safer climate and more positive school experiences for students: student clubs that address issues for LGBTQ students; school personnel who are supportive of LGBTQ students; and LGBTQ-inclusive curricular materials. However, our previous research has found that many LGBTQ students do not have such supports available in their schools.⁴⁹ In addition, schools also often have disciplinary practices that contribute to a hostile school climate. Thus, in this section, we examined school practices, and their impact on the educational outcomes and well-being of AAPI LGBTQ students. Specifically, we examined AAPI LGBTQ students' experiences of school disciplinary action, as well as the availability and utility of specific supports and resources that may uniquely impact AAPI LGBTQ students in ways that differ from the general LGBTQ student population, including student clubs that address LGBTQ and ethnic/cultural issues, school personnel, and LGBTQ-inclusive curriculum.

Experiences with School Discipline

The use of harsh and exclusionary discipline, such as zero tolerance policies, has contributed to higher dropout rates as well as reliance on alternative educational settings, where educational supports and opportunities may be less available.⁵⁰ Prior research shows that school disciplinary policies and practices disproportionately targets LGBTQ students,⁵¹ and may have serious academic consequences for these students. School discipline can also be directly connected to greater time out of school and even a greater likelihood in juvenile justice system involvement. We examined three categories of school disciplinary action: in-school discipline (including referral to the principal, detention, and in-school suspension), out-of-school discipline (including out-of-school suspension and expulsion), and having had contact with the criminal justice or juvenile justice system as a result of school discipline, such as being arrested and serving time in a detention facility. As shown in Figure 2.1, nearly a third of AAPI LGBTQ students (30.7%) reported having ever been disciplined at school. Students most commonly reported in-school discipline, and fewer students received out-of-school suspension and expulsion.

Figure 2.1 Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Experienced School Discipline



A small percentage of students (1.4%) had had contact with the criminal justice or juvenile justice system.

Impact of victimization and safety on school discipline. Several factors may be associated with LGBTQ students' school disciplinary experiences, including those stemming from unsafe or discriminatory school environments. As we found in GLSEN's *2017 National School Climate Survey*, LGBTQ students are often disciplined when they are, in fact, the victim of harassment or assault. We found that AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced greater levels of victimization based on sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity were more likely to experience all three forms of school discipline (in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, and contact with law enforcement).⁵²


LGBTQ students who are victimized at school may also miss school because they feel unsafe, and thus, face potential disciplinary consequences for truancy. We found that AAPI LGBTQ students who missed more days of school were more likely to experience all three forms of discipline (in-school, out-of-school, and contact with law enforcement).⁵³ For instance, as shown in Figure 2.2, just over two-fifths of AAPI LGBTQ students (42.8%) who missed school in the past month because they felt unsafe experienced some form of in-school discipline, compared to a quarter of students (24.5%) who did not miss school.

Impact of discriminatory school policies and practices on school discipline. Schools often employ anti-LGBTQ discriminatory practices, which may lead to more disciplinary action against LGBTQ students. In our survey, we asked LGBTQ students about a number of specific LGBTQ-related discriminatory school policies and practices at their school that they may have personally experienced, such as being disciplined for expressing public displays of affection, prevented from starting a GSA, and gender-related discrimination (e.g., prevented from using the bathroom or locker room that aligns with their gender, prevented from using their chosen name or pronouns). Half of AAPI LGBTQ students (50.0%) experienced discriminatory school policies and practices.

We examined how anti-LGBTQ discriminatory school policies and practices were associated with school disciplinary action. As illustrated in Figure 2.3, we found that AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced discrimination in school were more likely to experience both in-school and out-of-school-discipline than AAPI LGBTQ students who did not experience discrimination, but did not find any differences with regard to contact with law enforcement.⁵⁴

Differences in school discipline by transgender status. Previous research from GLSEN has demonstrated that, in general, transgender and other gender nonconforming (trans/GNC) students experience higher rates of in-school discipline and

Figure 2.2 Experiences of School Discipline by Missing School Because of Feeling Unsafe
(Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Experienced School Discipline)



out-of-school discipline, compared to cisgender LGBTQ students.⁵⁵ We also found this to be true for AAPI LGBTQ students. Trans/GNC AAPI students were more likely to experience in-school discipline and out-of-school discipline than cisgender LGBTQ AAPI students.⁵⁶ However, trans/GNC AAPI students did not differ with regard to contact with law enforcement.

Given our previous finding that trans/GNC AAPI students experienced greater levels of anti-LGBTQ victimization and that they are more likely to experience in-school and out-of-school discipline than cisgender LGBTQ AAPI students, we examined whether anti-LGBTQ victimization played a role on the relationships between trans/GNC status and in-school and out-of-school discipline. We found that trans/GNC AAPI students experienced greater levels of anti-LGBTQ victimization than their cisgender LGBTQ AAPI peers, and in turn, they were more likely to experience in-school and out-of-school discipline.⁵⁷

Differences in school discipline by multiple racial/ethnic identities. Prior research has found that among secondary school students, students who identify as two or more racial/ethnic identities are at greater risk for school disciplinary action than other racial/ethnic groups.⁵⁸ Thus, we examined whether AAPI LGBTQ students who endorsed multiple racial/ethnic identities differed from those who only identified as AAPI with regard to their experiences with school disciplinary action. We found that multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students were more likely to experience all three forms of


school discipline, including in-school discipline (34.6% vs. 23.0%), out-of-school discipline (5.9% vs. 3.1%), and contact with law enforcement (2.2% vs. 0.3%), than AAPI LGBTQ students who identified only as AAPI.⁵⁹ Further research is warranted to explore the possible connections between multiracial/multiethnic identity and school discipline among students of color.

Impact of school discipline on educational outcomes. School disciplinary action may impinge on a student's educational success. Exclusionary school disciplinary practices, those that remove students from the classroom, may lead to poorer grades and a diminished desire to continue on with school. In fact, we found that AAPI LGBTQ students' experiences with in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, and contact with law enforcement were related to lower likelihood to plan on pursuing post-secondary education,⁶⁰ and lower grade point average (GPA)⁶¹ than those who did not experience in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline and contact with law enforcement.

School-Based Supports and Resources for AAPI LGBTQ Students

In our *2017 National School Climate Survey* report, we demonstrated the positive impact of LGBTQ-related school resources and supports on educational outcomes and well-being for LGBTQ secondary school students in general. Unfortunately, we also found that many LGBTQ


Figure 2.3 Experiences of School Discipline by Anti LGBTQ Discrimination
(Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Experienced School Discipline)



students did not have access to these types of resources in school. Thus, in this section, we examined the availability and utility of school supports, including LGBTQ-related school supports as well as student-led ethnic/cultural clubs, for AAPI LGBTQ students. It is important to note that for institutional supports, including the presence of GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs, school characteristics may be related to their availability, such as region, locale, school racial composition, and school size. Other school supports, such as having educators and administrators who are supportive of LGBTQ students, may differ based on the identities of AAPI LGBTQ students. For example, a student's AAPI or LGBTQ identities may not be related to whether they have a GSA or an ethnic/cultural club, but they may be related to how supportive their teachers are. Yet, one's racial/ethnic identities may be related to the types of schools one attends or has access to (e.g., school racial composition, region, locale), and schools then vary in the availability of LGBTQ-related institutional supports (see GLSEN's *2017 National School Climate Survey* report for full discussion of school characteristics and the availability of supports). Therefore, we also examined how the availability of these supports may be related to various demographic and school characteristics, such as school location and student body racial composition.

GSAs. GSAs, often known as Gay-Straight Alliances or Gender and Sexuality Alliances, are student-led clubs that address LGBTQ student issues and can be supportive spaces for LGBTQ students.

Figure 2.4 Availability of GSAs and Ethnic/Cultural Clubs
(Percentage of AAPI LGBTQ Students Who Reported Having Club at Their School)



The presence of GSAs, regardless of participation in them, can provide LGBTQ students with a safe and affirming space within a school environment that may be hostile. Nearly two-thirds of AAPI LGBTQ students (63.5%) reported having a GSA at their school (see Figure 2.4). While our findings show that just over a third of AAPI LGBTQ students (36.5%) do not have access to a GSA, the percentage of AAPI LGBTQ students who have access to a GSA is still higher than the national percentage for LGBTQ students, based on the *2017 National School Climate Survey*.⁶² Further research is warranted to explore possible school-level characteristics that may contribute to differences in access to GSAs for AAPI LGBTQ students, compared to LGBTQ students nationally.

We also examined whether school characteristics, including school racial composition, locale (urban, suburban, rural), region (Northwest, South, Midwest, West), and school size were related to the availability of GSAs. With regard to locale, AAPI LGBTQ students in suburban schools were most likely and rural schools were least likely to have a GSA at their school.⁶³ Regarding region, AAPI LGBTQ students who attended schools in the South were the least likely to have a GSA, and those attending schools in the West were more likely to have a GSA than those in the Midwest.⁶⁴ Finally, regarding size of the school population, AAPI LGBTQ students who attended larger schools were more likely to have a GSA at their school.⁶⁵ School racial composition was not related to GSA availability.⁶⁶

GSAs and other similar student clubs can provide a safe and inclusive school environment for LGBTQ students and their allies to meet, socialize, and advocate for change in their school communities.⁶⁷ Thus, students who have a GSA may feel more connected to school and may be less likely to miss school because they have supportive groups for LGBTQ students. Also, in that GSAs can often effect change in schools for a safer environment for LGBTQ students, LGBTQ students with a GSA may be less likely to feel unsafe at school and feel a greater sense of belonging to the school community. AAPI LGBTQ students with a GSA at their school were less likely to miss school due to safety concerns (22.4% vs. 36.9%), and felt more connected to their school community than those who did not have a GSA.⁶⁸ AAPI LGBTQ students who had a GSA at their school were also less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation

(45.6% vs. 62.3%) and gender expression (38.6% vs. 45.4%).⁶⁹ There was, however, no relationship with feeling unsafe because of race/ethnicity.

Ethnic/cultural clubs. Ethnic/cultural clubs that bring together students of a particular racial, ethnic, and/or cultural background can offer a supportive space in school for those students. As such, the presence of these clubs, regardless of participation in them, may offer AAPI LGBTQ youth a network of peer support with other AAPI youth that may be more difficult to find in the general student population. Three-quarters of AAPI LGBTQ students (74.6%) reported that their school had an ethnic or cultural club at their school (see Figure 2.4). We also found that certain school characteristics were related to the availability of ethnic/cultural clubs.

Regarding school racial composition, the availability of ethnic/cultural clubs was greater in majority-AAPI schools than in majority-White schools.⁷⁰ Given that the AAPI population is ethnically and culturally diverse, AAPI LGBTQ students in majority-AAPI schools may be more likely to have ethnic/cultural clubs than AAPI LGBTQ students in majority-White schools because majority-AAPI schools have a larger pool of AAPI ethnic subgroups.

Regarding region, AAPI LGBTQ students who attended schools in the West were more likely to have an ethnic/cultural club than those who attended schools in the South and Northeast.⁷¹ This may be, in part, because majority-AAPI schools were more likely to be in the West than in other regions.⁷²

Regarding locale, AAPI LGBTQ students who attended rural schools were less likely to have an ethnic/cultural club than those who attended urban and suburban schools.⁷³ Regarding size of the school population, AAPI LGBTQ students who attended larger schools were more likely to have an ethnic/cultural club at their school.⁷⁴

Schools with ethnic/cultural clubs may afford AAPI LGBTQ students the opportunity to network with other AAPI students. Further, similar to GSAs, regardless of participation, ethnic/cultural clubs may indicate to the LGBTQ AAPI student that the school is a welcoming and supportive place for them. We, in fact, found that AAPI LGBTQ students who had an ethnic/cultural club at their school felt safer due to their race/ethnicity, and had greater feelings of school belonging.⁷⁵

Insight on Club Participation and Leadership


As discussed in this report, having a GSA or ethnic/cultural club at school is associated with several benefits for AAPI LGBTQ students, regardless of whether one participates in these clubs. However, it is also important to examine participation in these types of clubs and the possible benefits of participating for AAPI LGBTQ students. Prior research has demonstrated that participation in GSAs may mitigate some of the harmful effects of anti-LGBTQ victimization.⁷⁶ However, some research on AAPI gay cis male youth indicates that these youth may have negative perceptions of GSA participation, including a fear of being targeted for discrimination.⁷⁷ There is also evidence that ethnic/cultural clubs may provide a means of cultural validation for students of color.⁷⁸ However, there has been little research on the benefits of participation in these clubs for LGBTQ students of color. Thus, we examined the effects of participation on student well-being. Also, given that GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs may encourage students to work toward social and political change,⁷⁹ we examined the relationship between club participation and civic engagement.

GSA Participation. As previously noted, nearly two-thirds of AAPI LGBTQ students (63.5%) had a GSA or similar club at their school. As shown in the figure, the majority of AAPI LGBTQ students with a GSA participated in the club (57.7%). Given the prior research indicating that AAPI LGBTQ youth may be hesitant to participate in GSAs, it is possible that certain school characteristics may be related to their participation in GSAs, such as school racial composition. However, no differences in GSA participation were found by racial composition of the school that AAPI LGBTQ students attend.⁸⁰ Participation in GSAs may also differ by demographic characteristics of AAPI LGBTQ students, specifically race/ethnicity (multiracial vs. AAPI only) and immigration status, but we found no significant differences in this regard.⁸¹

Given that GSAs may offer AAPI LGBTQ youth a network of support at school, we examined whether GSA members felt an increased sense of school belonging, but did not observe a significant relationship.⁸² However, we did find that GSAs may offer students opportunities and build skills to work towards more LGBTQ-inclusive schools and communities. For example, we found that AAPI LGBTQ students who led their GSAs and other GSA members felt more comfortable bringing up LGBTQ issues in class than those who were not part of their GSA.⁸³ We also found that GSA members were more likely than those who did not attend meetings to participate in a GLSEN Day of Action (such as Day of Silence)⁸⁴ or in a rally, protest, or demonstration for a cause, with GSA leaders being most likely to take part in either of these activities.⁸⁵ Moreover, GSA leaders were also more likely than those not involved in their GSA, to participate in a boycott against a company, and contact politicians, governments, or authorities about issues that are important to them.⁸⁶ Finally, we found that GSA members were more likely than those who did not attend meetings to participate in an event where people express their political views (such as a poetry slam or youth forum), volunteer to campaign for a political cause or candidate, and express views about politics or social issues on social media, with no differences between leader and non-leader GSA members.⁸⁷

AAPI LGBTQ students who participate in GSAs may also face challenges at school regarding their LGBTQ identity. We found that GSA leaders experienced greater levels of victimization due to sexual orientation and gender expression than GSA non-leaders and those not involved in their GSA.⁸⁸ However, there were no differences between GSA non-leader members and those not involved in their GSA. It could be that greater levels of anti-LGBTQ harassment compel AAPI LGBTQ students to lead their school's GSA and take action toward making school safer for themselves and for other LGBTQ students. It may also be that GSA leaders are more visible as LGBTQ and, thus, more likely to be targeted for anti-LGBTQ victimization than GSA non-leaders and those not involved in their GSA.

Ethnic/Cultural Club Participation. As previously noted, a majority of AAPI LGBTQ students (74.8%) had an ethnic/cultural club at their school; however, only 16.4% of those with such a club attended meetings, with 3.2% who participated as an officer or a leader (see Figure). Although the percentage of those



participating in these clubs may seem low, it is important to note that some may have an ethnic/cultural club at their school for an ethnic or cultural community with which they do not identify.

Given that we previously found that AAPI LGBTQ students had more access to ethnic/cultural clubs in majority AAPI schools than in majority White schools, the racial composition of the school that AAPI LGBTQ students attend may also play a role in their participation in these clubs. However, we did not find differences in ethnic/cultural club participation by school racial composition.⁸⁹

We did find demographic differences in ethnic/cultural club attendance and leadership, specifically with immigration status. AAPI LGBTQ students who were born in another country were more likely to participate as leaders in ethnic/cultural clubs than those who were born in the US.⁹⁰ However, multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students and those who only identify as AAPI did not differ on ethnic/cultural club attendance and leadership.⁹¹

Ethnic/cultural clubs may create a space for students of a particular racial, ethnic, or cultural background to meet, offering a network of peer support with other AAPI LGBTQ youth at school. However, we found no differences in sense of school belonging between those who had and had not attended ethnic/cultural clubs.⁹² One possible explanation is that participation in ethnic/cultural clubs may foster a greater sense of school belonging for AAPI LGBTQ students when they attend AAPI majority schools compared to non-AAPI majority schools. However, we did not find any differences in school belonging by ethnic club participation when we considered the racial composition of the school.⁹³

We found that involvement in the school's ethnic/cultural club was related to engagement in the various forms of activism discussed above with regard to GSA involvement. AAPI LGBTQ students who attended meetings at their ethnic/cultural club were more likely to participate in all forms of activism than those who did not attend meetings, except for a GLSEN Day of Action.⁹⁴ However, ethnic/cultural club leaders did not differ from non-leaders in these activities. This suggests that ethnic/cultural club membership itself may be associated with greater civic engagement, regardless of the level of club participation.

It is possible that AAPI LGBTQ students are more likely to participate in an ethnic/cultural club when they experience more racial victimization at school and have a greater need for support. However, we found that AAPI LGBTQ students who attended an ethnic/cultural club did not differ from those who did not attend meetings on experiencing race-based victimization.⁹⁵

Conclusions. GSA and ethnic/cultural club participation were both associated with positive outcomes for AAPI LGBTQ students. For instance, participation in GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs were both associated with greater levels of civic engagement. Future research is warranted regarding GSA and ethnic/cultural club activities that may promote political action and advocacy efforts among club members.

Our findings also suggest that having an ethnic/cultural club may be especially important for AAPI LGBTQ students who were born in another country, given their higher rates of ethnic/cultural club participation. It may be that AAPI LGBTQ students who were born in another country are more interested in participating in ethnic/cultural clubs because these students may already feel more connected to their cultural heritage, and participating in these clubs may be a way for them to maintain these ties.

It is interesting to note that GSA and ethnic/cultural club participation were not related to feelings of school belonging, but having access to them were, as discussed elsewhere in this report. This suggests that for AAPI LGBTQ students in general, it may simply be the presence of a GSA and ethnic/cultural club at their school that signals to these students that their school is a supportive place for them.

Finally, we found that AAPI LGBTQ students who led their GSAs experienced greater levels of anti-LGBTQ victimization, although ethnic/cultural club participation was not related to racist victimization. It may be that attending a GSA brings visibility to one's actual or perceived LGBTQ status, whereas the same would not be true for attending an ethnic/cultural club. However, it is unclear whether heightened visibility among students who lead their GSA leads to greater levels of victimization, or whether greater levels of victimization lead students to lead their GSAs. Further research is needed to examine the nature of this relationship, the reasons that compel LGBTQ students to participate in GSAs, and the impact of GSA leadership.

Supportive school personnel. Previous research has established that for LGBTQ students in general, having supportive teachers, principals, and other school staff and administration has benefits for educational and psychological outcomes. However, educators who are supportive of LGBTQ students may vary in their ability to respond to the needs of youth of color.⁹⁶ For AAPI LGBTQ students, having such supports may be especially beneficial because they may experience victimization or discrimination that targets their multiple identities, and because they may receive less support in general because of both their race/ethnicity and LGBTQ identity. In our survey, we asked about how many school staff are supportive of LGBTQ students, and how supportive administrators are of LGBTQ students. Similar to our findings on LGBTQ students in general from the *2017 National School Climate Survey* report, the vast majority of AAPI LGBTQ students (97.2%) could identify at least one supportive staff member at school. However, only about half (48.5%) reported having 11 or more supportive staff (see Figure 2.5). Furthermore, only about half of AAPI LGBTQ students (49.2%) reported having somewhat or very supportive school administration (see Figure 2.6). It is possible that multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students may be treated differently by educators and administrators than those who only identify as AAPI. In fact, we found that multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students reported having fewer supportive staff and a lower level of support from administrators than students who identified only as AAPI.⁹⁷ This may be due to differences in educator and administrator attitudes toward various racial/ethnic groups.

Given that AAPI LGBTQ students often feel unsafe and unwelcome in school, as discussed earlier in this report, having access to supportive school personnel may be critical for creating better learning environments for AAPI LGBTQ students. Therefore, we examined the relationships between the presence of staff who are supportive of LGBTQ students and several indicators of school climate, including: absenteeism, feeling unsafe because of personal characteristics, psychological well-being, feelings of school belonging, academic achievement, and educational aspirations.

As illustrated in Figure 2.7, AAPI LGBTQ students who had more staff who were supportive of LGBTQ students:

- had increased feelings of connectedness to their school community;
- had higher levels of self-esteem; and
- had lower levels of depression.⁹⁸

In addition, AAPI LGBTQ students who had more staff who were supportive of LGBTQ students:

- were less likely to miss school due to safety concerns (e.g., 15.3% with 11 or more supportive staff reported missing at least one day of school in the past month vs. 41.5% with no supportive staff);
- were less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation (e.g., 40.6% with 11 or more supportive staff reported feeling unsafe

Figure 2.5 AAPI LGBTQ Students' Reports on the Number of Teachers and Other School Staff Who are Supportive of LGBTQ Students





Figure 2.6 AAPI LGBTQ Students' Reports on How Supportive Their School Administration is of LGBTQ Students




because of their sexual orientation vs. 70.7% with no supportive staff);

- were less likely to feel unsafe because of their gender expression (e.g., 33.9% with 11 or more supportive staff reported feeling unsafe because of their gender expression vs. 43.9% with no supportive staff);
- were less likely to feel unsafe because of their race/ethnicity (e.g., 20.8% with 11 or more supportive staff reported feeling unsafe because of their race/ethnicity vs. 29.3% with no supportive staff);

- had higher GPAs (e.g., average GPA of 3.5 with 11 or more supportive staff vs. 3.2 with no supportive staff);⁹⁹ and

- had greater educational aspirations (e.g., 97.6% with 11 or more supportive staff planning to pursue post-secondary education vs. 93.8% with no supportive staff).¹⁰⁰

Figure 2.7 Supportive School Staff and Well-Being and School Belonging



Insight on Inclusive Curriculum


Findings from GLSEN's *2017 National School Climate Survey* show that having an LGBTQ inclusive curriculum, such as learning about LGBTQ history and positive roles models, can positively shape the school experiences of LGBTQ students in general. With regard to LGBTQ curricular inclusion, we found that just over a quarter of AAPI LGBTQ students (27.4%) were taught positive representations of LGBTQ people, history, or events, which is similar to the percentage of the full sample of LGBTQ students.

Teaching students about LGBTQ people, history, and events in a positive manner may help AAPI LGBTQ students feel more valued at school, and it may also promote positive feelings toward LGBTQ students from peers. Thus, we examined the relationship between having an inclusive curriculum and feeling unsafe because of personal characteristics, peer acceptance of LGBTQ people, and school belonging. As shown in the figure, compared to AAPI LGBTQ students who did not have an inclusive curriculum at their school, those who had an inclusive curriculum:

- were less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation and gender expression;¹⁰¹
- were more likely to have peers at school be accepting of LGBTQ people;¹⁰² and
- felt more connected to their school community.¹⁰³

Interestingly, AAPI LGBTQ students who had an LGBTQ inclusive curriculum were also less likely to feel unsafe because of their race/ethnicity than those who did not have an LGBTQ inclusive curriculum (22.5% vs. 27.8%).¹⁰⁴ It may be that teaching students positive representations of LGBTQ people, history, and events not only makes peers more accepting of LGBTQ students, but perhaps also more accepting of diversity in general, including racial/ethnic diversity. It is also possible that schools or school districts that include positive representations of LGBTQ topics may also be more likely to have positive inclusion about race/ethnicity in their curriculum, policies and practices.

Inclusive Curriculum and Feelings of Safety, Peer Acceptance, and School Belonging among AAPI LGBTQ Students



It is important to note that we did not ask questions about other types of curricular inclusion, such as content about AAPI people, history or events. Previous research has shown that for students of color, positive representations of people of color, history and events can help to dissolve stereotypical mainstream representations.¹⁰⁵ This would also benefit the learning experience and well-being of AAPI LGBTQ youth, and could also work in concert with LGBTQ inclusion to greater benefit this population of students.

Conclusions. A school curriculum that is inclusive of diverse identities may help to instill beliefs in the intrinsic value of all individuals. We found that AAPI LGBTQ students who were taught positive representations about LGBTQ people, history, and events at school felt more connected to their school community and felt safer at school, not only with regard to their LGBTQ identity, but also with their racial/ethnic identity. Therefore, having an LGBTQ curriculum may mitigate anti-LGBTQ victimization, as well as racist victimization for AAPI LGBTQ students. However, such an inclusive curriculum was unavailable for the majority of AAPI LGBTQ youth. Thus, it is imperative that educators are provided with both training and resources to deliver school lessons and activities that reflect the diverse identities and communities present in their classrooms.

Conclusions

In this section, we examined AAPI LGBTQ students' experiences with school practices, particularly school disciplinary action and school resources and supports. AAPI LGBTQ students experienced somewhat high rates of school discipline, with the most common form being in-school discipline. We also found that AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced institutional discrimination were more likely to experience both in-school and out-of-school discipline. Research and policy initiatives that attempt to address school disciplinary action and juvenile justice must be inclusive of, and respond to the experiences of AAPI LGBTQ youth. In order to ensure that schools are welcoming and affirming to all students, schools should eliminate policies and practices that discriminate against AAPI LGBTQ students. Moreover, administrators, policymakers, and teachers should advocate for disciplinary policies that are restorative instead of punitive.

Overall, having access to school supports and resources helped to improve the school safety and educational outcomes for AAPI LGBTQ students. We found that having more LGBTQ-supportive staff was associated with greater feelings of school

belonging and school safety, greater educational outcomes, and improved psychological well-being. Similarly, having an LGBTQ-inclusive curriculum was related to greater feelings of school belonging and school safety. Further, not only are the availability of and participation in GSAs beneficial for AAPI LGBTQ students, but ethnic/cultural clubs are as well. However, as our findings indicate, many AAPI LGBTQ students do not have access to these supportive resources. It is important to note that we did not explore any other resources regarding race/ethnicity, and so we do not have information on racial/ethnic specific resources. For instance, we do not know whether AAPI LGBTQ students are exposed to positive representations of AAPI history, people, and events or how such representations may be beneficial for their educational experience. Further, we were able to examine the benefits of having school personnel who are supportive of LGBTQ students, but were not able to examine school personnel who are supportive of AAPI students in general. Given that the experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students lie at the intersection of multiple forms of bias, future research should examine resources that support and affirm these students' multiple marginalized identities.

Discussion

Limitations

The findings presented in this report provide new information and valuable insights on the school experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students. However, there are some limitations to our study. The participants in this study were only representative of those who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer, and have some connection to the LGBTQ community either through local organizations or online, and LGBTQ youth who were not comfortable identifying their sexual orientation in this manner may not have learned about the survey. Therefore, AAPI LGBTQ youth who self-identified as LGBTQ but had no connection to the LGBTQ community may be underrepresented in this sample. The participants in this study also did not include students who have a sexual attraction to the same gender or multiple genders, but do not identify themselves as LGBTQ.

In the survey, there were several instances where we asked about sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression as it pertained to the unique school experiences of LGBTQ youth of color, but we did not ask similar questions regarding race/ethnicity. For instance, we did not ask about peer or educator support related to race/ethnicity, which would have provided a more comprehensive understanding on the school experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students.

In the survey, we only included two ethnic categories for AAPI when we asked students about their race/ethnicity: “Asian or South Asian” (Asian) and “Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander” (Pacific Islander). Therefore, we could not examine school experiences within and across Asian LGBTQ students (e.g., Southeast Asian, South Asian, East Asian). Also, as noted in the Methods section of this report, the sample size of Pacific Islander LGBTQ students was too small to examine their school experiences alone; therefore, students who identified as Pacific Islander were combined with those who identified as Asian. Examining feelings of safety, victimization experiences, school discipline, and supports and resources among Asian ethnic groups and among Pacific Islanders, as well as differences across these ethnic groups, could provide more insight into the unique school experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students.

It is also important to note that our survey only reflects the experiences of LGBTQ students who were in school during the 2016-2017 school year. Thus, findings from this survey may not necessarily reflect the experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students who had already dropped out of school, whose experiences may be different from students who remained in school.

Conclusions

Findings presented in this report highlight the unique experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students at the intersection of their various identities, including race, gender, and sexual orientation. The majority of AAPI LGBTQ students experienced harassment in school in the past year because of their sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity. Experiences of anti-LGBTQ victimization were particularly severe for both trans/GNC AAPI students as well as multiracial AAPI students, which may be related to greater levels of social exclusion faced by these groups at school. We also found that racist victimization was particularly severe for multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students who attended majority AAPI schools. It may be that AAPI LGBTQ students who attend majority AAPI schools experience greater levels of social exclusion based on their multiracial status. Further, we also found that AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced both homophobic and racist victimization experienced the poorest academic outcomes and psychological well-being. AAPI LGBTQ youth who experienced sexual orientation-based victimization, gender expression-based victimization, or race-based victimization were also more likely to experience exclusionary school discipline, such as detention, suspension, or expulsion. Such disciplinary actions may increase their likelihood of involvement with the criminal and juvenile justice system.

The findings in this report help to provide a deeper understanding of the experiences of AAPI students by examining the school-related experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students. Much of the general literature on AAPI students has focused on achievement, perhaps in order to challenge

the model minority myth that all AAPI youth are academically successful. The myth may also promote the notion that they avoid or are exempt from experiencing victimization at school. Further, it may also lead educators and administrators to believe that focusing on their studies prevents AAPI youth from being placed in situations that can lead to experiencing victimization. Yet our findings clearly demonstrate that many AAPI LGBTQ students experience challenges in school and need greater support. Trans/GNC and multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students may especially need support from school educators and administrators — not only do these students face greater victimization due to their trans/GNC and multiracial status, but they may also be overlooked due to their AAPI status.

We did identify critical resources that were beneficial for AAPI LGBTQ youth. For example, having an LGBTQ-inclusive curriculum and having LGBTQ-supportive educators at school were both associated with AAPI LGBTQ students feeling more connected to their school community and feeling less unsafe regarding their sexual orientation, gender expression, and even their race/ethnicity. Supportive student clubs such as GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs were also associated with greater feelings of safety, and those who attended these clubs were more likely to engage in activism in their schools and communities. However, we found that many AAPI LGBTQ students did not have access to these supportive school resources. We also found that LGBTQ students who only identified as AAPI had more supportive school educators and higher level of support from administrators than multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students. This may be due to differences in attitudes toward various racial/ethnic groups. In this vein, staff and administrators may apply the model minority stereotype to students who only identify as AAPI, and less so to multiracial AAPI students, and therefore treat those who only identify as AAPI more favorably than multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students.

Recommendations

As educators, advocates, and others concerned with issues of educational equity and access continue to address the myriad forms of oppression found in and out of school, such as racism, heterosexism, homophobia and transphobia, they must also account for the intersections of

these forms of oppression. Therefore, addressing the concerns of AAPI LGBTQ students requires a nuanced approach to combating racism, homophobia, and transphobia. Further, it is important to have a greater understanding of the experiences, needs and concerns of AAPI LGBTQ students through specific and focused efforts.

Given the paucity of data on challenges faced by AAPI youth in school and on discussions that involve bullying in schools in this population, information that is critical in policymaking and advocacy for AAPI LGBTQ youth may not always be available. Education researchers must work to obtain diverse and robust samples so that they can explore smaller racial/ethnic populations such as AAPI. This report continues to fill this gap in knowledge, so that educators, policymakers, safe school advocates, and others working to make schools a more inclusive space can continue to seek to understand the multifaceted experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students, particularly with regard to how we can render accessible specific resources that support these students at school and in larger communities outside of school. This report demonstrates the ways in which the availability of supportive student clubs, supportive educators, and other school-based resources for AAPI LGBTQ students can positively affect their school experiences. We recommend school leaders, education policymakers, and other individuals who want to provide safe learning environments for AAPI LGBTQ students to:

- Support student clubs, such as GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs. Organizations that work with GSAs and ethnic/cultural clubs should also come together to address AAPI LGBTQ students' needs related to their multiple marginalized identities, including sexual orientation, gender, and race/ethnicity.
- Provide professional development for school staff that addresses the intersections of identities and experiences of AAPI LGBTQ students.
- Increase student access to curricular resources that include diverse and positive representations of both AAPI and LGBTQ people, history, and events.
- Establish school policies and guidelines for staff in responding to anti-LGBTQ and racist

behavior, and develop clear and confidential pathways for students to report victimization that they experience. Local, state, and federal education agencies should also hold schools accountable for establishing and implementing these practices and procedures.

- Work to address the inequities in funding at the local, state, and national level to increase access to institutional supports and education

in general, and to provide more professional development for educators and school counselors.

Taken together, such measures can move us toward a future in which all students have the opportunity to learn and succeed in school, regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, race, or ethnicity.

Endnotes

- 1 The term Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) is the current term used within the AAPI communities to include persons having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent, as well as Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islands people within and outside of the United States jurisdictions. Prior to this, Asian Pacific Americans (APA) was the term commonly used in the 1990s. For more about the use of “Asian American” and “AAPI,” refer to:

Agbayani, A., & Ching, D. (2017). Scholarship, policy, and praxis recommendations for institutional change. In S. D. Museus, A. Agbayani, & D. M. Ching (Eds.), *Focusing on the underserved: Immigrant, refugee, and indigenous Asian American and Pacific Islanders in Higher Education* (pp. 241–253). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.

Kandil, C. Y. (2018). After 50 years of ‘Asian American,’ advocates say the term is ‘more essential than ever’. NBC News. <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/after-50-years-asian-american-advocates-say-term-more-essential-n875601>

U.S. Census Bureau. Asian-American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month: May 2019. <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2019/asian-american-pacific-islander.html>
- 2 Ocampo, A. C., & Soodjinda, D. (2016). Invisible Asian Americans: the intersection of sexuality, race, and education among gay Asian Americans. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(3), 480–499.

Only recently was there a report from the AAPI Bullying Prevention Task Force, specifically about bullying against AAPI students. See: AAPI Task Force. (2016). AAPI Bullying Prevention Task Force Report, 2014–2016. <https://sites.ed.gov/aapi/files/2015/02/AAPI-Bullying-Prevention-Task-Force-Report-2014-2016.pdf>
- 3 Tran, N., & Okazaki, S. (2012). Bullying & victimization and Asian American students. Asian American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/pi/oema/resources/ethnicity-health/asian-american/bullying-and-victimization.pdf>
- 4 Yi, V. & Museus, S. D. (2016). Model minority myth. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalism*. John Wiley & Sons.
- 5 Kian, L., Huynh, V. W., Cheah, C. S. L., Wang, Y, & Yoshikawa, H. (2017). Moving beyond the model minority. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*, 8(1), 1–6.
- 6 Rosenbloom, S. R. & Way, N. (2006). Experiences of discrimination among African American, Asian American, and Latino adolescents in an urban high school. *Youth and Society*, 35(4), 420–451.
- 7 Siu, S-F. (1996). Asian American students at risk: A literature review. *Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CESPAR)*. pp. 1–90.
- 8 Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Zongrone, A. D., Clark, C. M., & Truong, N. L. (2018). *The 2017 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation’s schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- 9 Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Zongrone, A. D., Clark, C. M., & Truong, N. L. (2018). *The 2017 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation’s schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- 10 GSA Network. (2018). LGBTQ youth of color: Discipline disparities, school push-out, and the school-to-prison pipeline. https://gsanetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/LGBTQ_brief_FINAL.pdf
- 11 Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Zongrone, A. D., Clark, C. M., & Truong, N. L. (2018). *The 2017 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation’s schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- 12 Bowleg, L. (2012). The problem with the phrase women and minorities: Intersectionality—an important theoretical framework for public health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(7), 1267–1273.
- 13 Crenshaw, K. (1990). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299.
- 14 For a full discussion of the Methods, refer to page 7 of GLSEN’s 2017 *National School Climate Survey* report.
- 15 Sexual orientation was assessed with a multi-check question item (i.e., gay, lesbian, straight/heterosexual, bisexual, pansexual, questioning, queer, and asexual) with an optional write-in item for sexual orientations not listed. Students in the categories Queer, Another Sexual Orientation, and Questioning/Unsure did not also indicate that they were gay/lesbian, bisexual, or pansexual.
- 16 Pansexual identity is commonly defined as experiencing attraction to some people, regardless of their gender identity. This identity may be distinct from a Bisexual identity, which is commonly described as either experiencing attraction to some male-identified people and some female-identified people or as experiencing attraction to some people of the same gender and some people of different genders.
- 17 Students who indicated that they were asexual and another sexual orientation were categorized as another sexual orientation. Additionally, students who indicated that their only sexual orientation was asexual and also indicated that they were cisgender were not included in the final study sample. Therefore, all students included in the Asexual category also are not cisgender (i.e., are transgender, genderqueer, another nonbinary identity, or questioning their gender).
- 18 Race/ethnicity was assessed with a single multi-check question item (i.e., African American or Black; Asian or South Asian; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; Native American, American Indian, or Alaska Native; White or Caucasian; Hispanic or Latino/a; and Middle Eastern or Arab American) with an optional write-in item for race/ethnicities not listed. All participants included in this report identified as “Asian or South Asian” or “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander”. Percentages are listed for students who selected other racial/ethnic identities in addition to “Asian or South Asian” or “Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander”.
- 19 The racial/ethnic groups reported here are not mutually exclusive categories. Students who identified with more than one racial/ethnic group in addition to identifying as “Asian or South Asian” or “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander” are counted in each of the relevant categories.
- 20 It is important to note that we do not know the immigration status of the parents/guardians of students in our survey. Therefore, it is possible that students in the survey who were born outside the U.S. and its territories have U.S. citizenship because one of their parents/guardians does, and would not technically be immigrants to the U.S. Therefore, U.S. citizens born outside the U.S. may include both immigrants and non-immigrants.
- 21 Gender was assessed via three items: an item assessing sex assigned at birth (i.e., male or female), an item assessing gender identity (i.e., male, female, nonbinary, and an additional write-in option), and a multiple response item assessing sex/gender status (i.e., cisgender, transgender, genderqueer, intersex, and an additional write-in option). Based on responses to these three items, students’ gender was categorized as: Cisgender Male, Cisgender Female, Cisgender Unspecified (those who did not provide any assigned sex or gender identity information), Transgender Male, Transgender Female, Transgender Nonbinary, Transgender Unspecified (those who did not provide any gender identity information), Genderqueer, Another Nonbinary Identity (i.e., those who indicated a nonbinary identity but did not indicate that they were transgender or genderqueer, including those who wrote in identities such as “gender fluid” or “demi gender”), or Questioning/Unsure.
- 22 Receiving educational accommodations was assessed with a question that asked students if they received any educational support services at school, including special education classes, extra time on tests, resource classes, or other accommodations.
- 23 Students were placed into region based on which state the last school they attended was located in – Northeast: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, DC; South: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia; Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; West: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming; U.S.

- Territories: American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands.
- 22 Mean differences in reasons for feeling unsafe were examined using a repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The multivariate effect was significant: Pillai's trace = .57, $F(10, 1470) = 190.87, p < .001$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Significant differences were found between all reasons with the exception of: gender and body size/weight were not different from each other, and; actual or perceived disability and actual or perceived religion were not different from each other. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 23 Mean differences in rates of hearing biased language were examined using a repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The multivariate effect was significant: Pillai's trace = .37, $F(5, 1467) = 171.07, p < .001$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Significant differences were found between all forms of biased language with the exception of: other homophobic remarks and not acting "masculine" enough were not different from each other, and; other homophobic remarks and racist remarks were not different from each other. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 24 Gruber, J. E. & Fineran, S. (2008). Comparing the impact of bullying and sexual harassment victimization on the mental and physical health of adolescents. *Sex Roles, 59*(1-2), 1-13.
- Hammig, B. & Jozkowski, K. (2013). Academic achievement, violent victimization, and bullying among U.S. high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(7), 1424-1436.
- Hase, C. N., Goldberg, S. B., & Smith, D. (2015). Impacts of traditional bullying and cyberbullying on the mental health of middle school and high school students. *Psychology in Schools, 52*(6), 607-617.
- Holt, M. K., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Polanin, J. R., Holland, K. M., DeGue, S., Matjasko, J. L., Wolfe, M., & Reid, G. (2015). Bullying and suicidal ideation and behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics, 135*(2), 496-509.
- Strom, I. F., Thoresen, S., Wentzel-Larsen, T., & Dyb, G. (2013). Violence, bullying and academic achievement: A study of 15-year-old adolescents and their school environment. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 37*(4), 243-251.
- 25 Mean differences in rates of experiencing different forms of victimization were examined using a repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The multivariate effect was significant: Pillai's trace = .06, $F(2, 1436) = 41.42, p < .001$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Significant differences were found between all forms of victimization with exception of victimization based on sexual orientation and victimization based on gender expression. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 26 The relationships between missing school, school belonging, and depression and severity of victimization due to sexual orientation were examined through Pearson correlations. Missing school: $r(1468) = .46, p < .001$; school belonging: $r(1465) = -.45, p < .001$; depression: $r(1446) = .38, p < .001$.
- The relationship between educational aspirations and severity of sexual orientation-based victimization was examined using an analysis of variance (ANOVA), with victimization based on sexual orientation as the dependent variable and educational aspirations as the independent variable. The effect was significant: $F(5, 1448) = 6.21, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .02$. Post hoc comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Those not planning to graduate high school or unsure of their high school graduation plans experienced greater levels of victimization than all others, except for vocational school. There were no other observable differences. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 27 The relationship between missing school, school belonging, and depression and severity of victimization due to race/ethnicity was examined through Pearson correlations. Missing school: $r(1473) = .27, p < .001$; school belonging: $r(1471) = -.32, p < .001$; depression: $r(1452) = .31, p < .001$.
- The relationship between educational aspirations and severity of race-based victimization was examined using an analysis of variance (ANOVA), with victimization based on race/ethnicity as the dependent variable and educational aspirations as the independent variable. The effect was not significant. There were no observable differences.
- 28 Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., Card, N. A., & Russell, S. T. (2013). Gender-nonconforming lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth: School victimization and young adult psychosocial adjustment. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 1*(S), 71-80.
- 29 To test differences in severity of victimization by trans/GNC identity, a series of t-tests were conducted, with trans/GNC identity as the independent variable, and severity of victimization as the dependent variable. The effect was significant for victimization based on sexual orientation and victimization based on gender expression. Victimization based on sexual orientation: $t(984.48) = 6.13, p < .001$; victimization based on gender expression: $t(889.00) = 10.62, p < .001$. Trans/GNC AAPI students and cisgender LGBQ AAPI students did not differ on victimization based on race/ethnicity. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 30 Lewis, D. C., Flores, A. R., Haider-Markel, D. P., Miller, P. R., Tadlock, B. L., & Taylor, J. K. (2017). Degrees of acceptance: Variation in public attitudes toward segments of the LGBT community. *Political Research Quarterly, 70*(4), 861-875.
- 31 Herman, M. (2004). Forced to choose: Some determinants of racial identification in multiracial adolescents. *Society for Research in Child Development, 75*(3), 730-748.
- 32 Renn, K. A. (2000). Patterns of situational identity among biracial and multiracial college students. *The Review of Higher Education, 23*(4), 399-420.
- 33 To test differences in severity of victimization by multiracial/multiethnic status, a series of t-tests were conducted, with multiracial/multiethnic status as the independent variable, and severity of victimization as the dependent variable. The effect was significant for victimization based on sexual orientation and gender expression. Sexual orientation: $t(1462.33) = -4.17, p < .001$; gender expression: $t(1368.63) = -2.32, p < .05$. LGBTQ students who only identified as AAPI did not differ from multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students on experiences of victimization based on race/ethnicity. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 34 To examine whether school racial composition moderated the relationship between multiracial/multiethnic status and race-based victimization, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted, with multiracial/multiethnic status and school racial composition as the independent variables, multiracial/multiethnic status X school racial composition as the interaction term, and severity of race-based victimization as the dependent variable. The univariate effect was significant: $F(7, 1302) = 5.14, p < .001$. School racial composition was significantly associated with severity of race-based victimization: $F(3, 1302) = 3.97, p < .01$. Multiracial/multiethnic status X school racial composition interaction was significantly associated with severity of race-based victimization: $F(3, 1302) = 4.68, p < .01$. No differences were found between multiracial/multiethnic status and race-based victimization.
- A similar analysis was conducted to examine whether school racial composition moderated the relationship between multiracial/multiethnic status and anti-LGBTQ victimization. A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted, with multiracial/multiethnic status and school racial composition as the independent variables, multiracial/multiethnic status X school racial composition as the interaction term, and severity of victimization based on sexual orientation and based on gender expression as the dependent variables. No interaction effects were found for both victimization based on sexual orientation and based on gender expression.
- 35 The full percentage breakdowns are as follows – did not experience victimization due to sexual orientation or race/ethnicity: 25.3%; experienced victimization due sexual orientation, but not race/ethnicity: 21.0%; experienced victimization due to race/ethnicity, but not sexual orientation: 14.2%; experienced victimization due to both sexual orientation and race/ethnicity: 39.5%.
- 36 To examine differences in number of school days missed, a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted, with experiences of sexual orientation-based victimization, race-based victimization, or both as the independent variable, and number of school days missed due to feeling unsafe as the dependent variable, while controlling for school racial composition and racial identification (only AAPI vs. multiracial AAPI). The main effect was significant: $F(3, 1464) = 43.95, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .08$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$: students who experienced both forms of victimization missed more days than all others; students who

- experienced neither form of victimization missed fewer days than those who only experienced victimization based on sexual orientation and both forms of victimization. All other comparisons were not significant. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 37 To examine differences in levels of school belonging, a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted, with experiences of sexual orientation-based victimization, race-based victimization, or both as the independent variable, and school belonging as the dependent variable, while controlling for school racial composition and racial identification (only AAPI vs. multiracial AAPI). The main effect was significant: $F(3, 1462) = 70.93, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .13$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$: students who experienced both forms of victimization had lower levels of belonging than all others; students who experienced neither form of victimization had the highest levels of belonging. All other comparisons were not significant. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 38 To examine differences in levels of depression, a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted, with experiences of sexual orientation-based victimization, race-based victimization, or both as the independent variable, and depression as the dependent variable, while controlling for school racial composition and racial identification (only AAPI vs. multiracial AAPI). The main effect was significant: $F(3, 1443) = 58.84, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .11$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$: students who experienced both forms of victimization had higher levels of depression than all others; students who experienced neither form of victimization had the lowest levels of depression. All other comparisons were not significant. Percentages are shown for illustrative purposes.
- 39 Niwa, E. Y., Way, N., Qin, D. B., & Okazaki, S. (2011). Hostile hallways: Asian American adolescents' experiences of peer discrimination in school. In F. T. Leong, L. Juan, D. B. Qin, & H. E. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Asian American and Pacific Islander Children and Mental Health* (pp. 193–217). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- 40 To examine the interaction between victimization based on sexual orientation and victimization based on race/ethnicity on level of school belonging, a three-step hierarchical regression model was conducted. In the first step, level of school belonging was regressed onto the independent variable, severity of victimization based on sexual orientation. The model accounted for a significant portion of the variance (19.8%) and the model was significant: $F(1, 1461) = 361.21, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .198, p < .001$. Victimization based on sexual orientation was a significant predictor: $\beta = -.07, p < .001$. For step two, the moderator, victimization based on race/ethnicity was added. Victimization based on race/ethnicity accounted for an additional 3.0% above and beyond the variance accounted from victimization based on sexual orientation, and the model was significant: $F(2, 1460) = 216.73, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .228, p < .001$. Victimization based on race/ethnicity was a significant predictor: $\beta = -.10, p < .001$. For step three, the interaction term between the independent and moderator variables was introduced. The interaction term accounted for an additional 0.5% above and beyond the variance accounted from the independent and moderator variables, and the model was significant: $F(3, 1459) = 149.25, p < .001$; $\text{Adj. } \Delta R^2 = .233, p < .001$. Both forms of victimization remained significant predictors. The interaction was also significant: $\beta = .01, p < .001$, indicating that the negative effect of homophobic victimization on school belonging was strongest among AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced higher levels of homophobic victimization and lower levels of racist victimization.
- To examine the interaction between victimization based on sexual orientation and victimization based on race/ethnicity on level of depression, a three-step hierarchical regression model was conducted. In the first step, level of depression was regressed onto the independent variable, severity of victimization based on sexual orientation. The model accounted for a significant portion of the variance (14.3%) and the model was significant: $F(1, 1430) = 239.39, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .143, p < .001$. Victimization based on sexual orientation was a significant predictor: $\beta = .07, p < .001$. For step two, the moderator, victimization based on race/ethnicity was added. Victimization based on race/ethnicity accounted for an additional 3.2% above and beyond the variance accounted from victimization based on sexual orientation, and the model was significant: $F(2, 1429) = 152.58, \text{Adj. } R^2 = .175, p < .001$. Victimization based on race/ethnicity was a significant predictor: $\beta = .13, p < .001$. For step three, the interaction term between the independent and moderator variables was introduced. The interaction term accounted for an additional 0.5% above and beyond the variance accounted from the independent and moderator variables, and the model was significant: $F(3, 1428) = 105.59, p < .001$; $\text{Adj. } \Delta R^2 = .180, p < .001$. Both forms of victimization remained significant predictors. The interaction was also significant: $\beta = -.01, p < .01$, indicating that the negative effect of homophobic victimization on depression was strongest among AAPI LGBTQ students who experienced higher levels of homophobic victimization and lower levels of racist victimization.
- A similar three-step hierarchical regression model was conducted to examine the interaction between victimization based on sexual orientation and victimization based on race/ethnicity on missing school due to safety concerns. In the first step, missing school was regressed onto the independent variable, severity of victimization based on sexual orientation. For step two, the moderator, victimization based on race/ethnicity was added. For step three, the interaction between the independent and moderator variables was introduced. The sexual orientation-based victimization X race-based victimization interaction was not related to missing school.
- 41 It is also relevant to consider the racial socialization that AAPI LGBTQ students may receive from parents, guardians, and other family members in the form of explicit and/or implicit messages about how to operate as an AAPI individual in the U.S. These messages may prepare young people for experiences with racial injustice, and could also possibly be helpful in preparing youth for experiences with other forms of injustice, such as anti-LGBTQ victimization. Read more:
- Neblett, E. W. J., White, R. L., Ford, K. R., Philip, C. L., Nguyễn, H. X., & Sellers, R. M. (2008). Patterns of racial socialization and psychological adjustment: Can parental communications about race reduce the impact of racial discrimination? *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 18*(3), 477–515.
- 42 Chi-square tests were performed examining the common types of school staff response by whether it was perceived to be effective or ineffective (a dichotomous variable was created for effectiveness: effective = "very effective" or "somewhat effective"; ineffective = "not at all effective" or "somewhat ineffective"). The only common response perceived to be effective was talking to the perpetrator/telling the perpetrator to stop: $\chi^2(1) = 38.21, p < .001, \phi = -.318$. The other two common responses were perceived to be ineffective: telling the student to ignore it: $\chi^2(1) = 92.76, p < .001, \phi = -.495$; did nothing/did not take action: $\chi^2(1) = 86.99, p < .001, \phi = -.480$.
- 43 Bacon, J. K. & Causton-Theoharis, J. (2012). 'It should be teamwork': A critical investigation of school practices and parent advocacy in special education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 17*(7), 682–699.
- Behnke, A. O., & Kelly, C. (2011). Creating programs to help Latino youth thrive at school: The influence of Latino parent involvement programs. *Journal of Extension, 49*(1), 1–11.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). The effects of parental involvement on the academic achievement of African American youth. *The Journal of Negro Education, 74*(3), 260–274.
- Nguyen, J. T., You, S., & Ho, H. Z. (2009). The process of Asian American parental involvement and its relationship to students' academic achievement. In C. C. Park, R. Endo, & X. L. Rong (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Asian American Parents, Students, and Teacher Recruitment* (pp. 25–49). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
- 44 Fu, A. S. & Markus, H. R. (2014). My mother and me: Why tiger mothers motivate Asian Americans but not European Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology, 40*(6), 739–749.
- Jaiswal, S. K. & Choudhuri, R. (2017). A review of the relationship between parental involvement and students' academic performance. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology, 4*(3), 110–123.
- Okasaki, S. & Lim, N. E. (2011). Academic and educational achievement among Asian American children and youth. In F. T. L., Leon, L., Juang, D. B. Qin, & H. E. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Asian American and Pacific Islander children and mental health* (pp. 143–167). Santa Barbara, California: Praeger.
- 45 Hill, N. E. & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(3), 740–763.

- Shute, V. J., Hansen, E. G., Underwood, J. S., & Razzouk, R., (2011). A review of the relationship between parental involvement and secondary school students' academic achievement. *Educational Research International*, 1–10.
- Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17, 125–146.
- Wilder, S. (2014). Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement: A meta-synthesis. *Educational Review*, 66(3), 377–397.
- Yan, W. & Lin, Q. (2005). Parent involvement and mathematics achievement: Contrast across racial and ethnic groups. *The Journal of Education Research*, 99(2), 116–127.
- 46 To test differences in frequency of reporting victimization to family members by outness to family members while controlling for respondent's age and gender (cisgender vs. trans/GNC), we conducted an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), where reporting to family was the dependent variable, outness to family members was the independent variable, and age and gender were covariates. After controlling for age and gender, the main effect for outness to family was significant: $F(1, 809) = 29.82, p < .001$.
- 47 The relationship between family members talking to school staff about the AAPI LGBTQ student's experiences with victimization, and experiences of anti-LGBTQ victimization (victimization based on sexual orientation, victimization based on gender expression), and race-based victimization, while controlling for reporting victimization to family members, outness to parents, and age were examined through partial correlations. The following relationship was significant: gender expression-based victimization: $r(344) = .17, p < .01$. Experiences with sexual orientation-based victimization, and race-based victimization were not related to a family members talking to school staff.
- 48 The relationship between family members talking to school staff about their AAPI LGBTQ child's experiences with victimization, and disability status and educational accommodation services, while controlling for reporting victimization to family members, outness to parents, and age were examined through partial correlations. The following relationship was significant: Disability status: $r(344) = .12, p < .05$. Receiving education accommodation services was not related to a family members talking to school staff.
- 49 Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Zongrone, A. D., Clark, C. M., & Truong, N. L. (2018). *The 2017 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- 50 Cholewa, B., Hull, M. F., Babcock, C. R., & Smith, A. D. (2018). Predictors and academic outcomes associated with in-school suspension. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 33(2), 191–199.
- Johnson, M., & Naughton, J. (2019). Just another school?: The need to strengthen legal protections for students facing disciplinary transfers. *Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy*, 33(1), 1–40.
- 51 Greytak, E. A., Kosciw, J. G., Villenas, C., & Giga, N. M. (2016). *From Teasing to Torment: School Climate Revisited, A Survey of U.S. Secondary School Students and Teachers*. New York: GLSEN.
- Poteat, V. P., Scheer, J. R., & Chong, E. S. K. (2015). Sexual orientation-based disparities in school and juvenile discipline: A multiple group comparison of contributing factors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 108(2).
- Snapp, S., Hoenig, J., Fields, A., & Russell, S. T. (2015). Messy, butch, and queer: LGBTQ youth and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 30, 57–82.
- 52 The relationship between experiences with victimization (based on sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity) and school disciplinary action, while controlling for race/ethnicity (AAPI only vs. multiracial AAPI), outness to students, and outness to staff, were examined through partial correlations. For in-school discipline, all correlations were significant: Sexual orientation-based victimization: $r(1388) = .26, p < .001$; Gender expression-based victimization: $r(1388) = .23, p < .001$; Race-based victimization: $r(1388) = .15, p < .001$. All correlations were also significant for out-of-school victimization: Sexual orientation-based victimization: $r(1388) = .22, p < .001$; Gender expression-based victimization: $r(1388) = .18, p < .001$; Race-based victimization: $r(1388) = .10, p < .001$. All correlations were also significant for contact with law enforcement: Sexual orientation-based victimization: $r(1388) = .10, p < .001$; Gender expression-based victimization: $r(1388) = .10, p < .001$; Race-based victimization: $r(1388) = .08, p < .01$.
- 53 The relationship between missing school and school discipline (in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, contact with law enforcement), while controlling for race/ethnicity (AAPI only vs. multiracial AAPI) was examined through partial correlations – In-school discipline: $r(1456) = .19, p < .001$; out-of-school discipline: $r(1456) = .18, p < .001$; contact with law enforcement: $r(1456) = .07, p < .01$.
- 54 The relationship between experiencing any anti-LGBTQ discriminatory policies and practices, and school discipline (in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, contact with law enforcement), while controlling for race/ethnicity (AAPI only vs. multiracial AAPI), was examined through partial correlations – In-school discipline: $r(1444) = .17, p < .001$; out-of-school discipline: $r(1444) = .12, p < .001$. Experiences with any anti-LGBTQ discrimination was not related to contact with law enforcement.
- 55 Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Zongrone, A. D., Clark, C. M., & Truong, N. L. (2018). *The 2017 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- 56 Chi-square tests were performed looking at experiences with school discipline (in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, and contact with law enforcement) by gender (trans/GNC vs. cisgender LGBQ). In-school discipline: $\chi^2(1) = 6.55, p < .05, \phi = -.07$; out-of-school discipline: $\chi^2(1) = 7.36, p < .01, \phi = -.07$. There were no differences in contact with law enforcement between trans/GNC and cisgender LGBQ AAPI students.
- 57 To test for whether anti-LGBTQ victimization mediated the relationship between trans/gnc status and in-school and out-of-school discipline, six separate regression analyses were conducted, three for in-school discipline and three for out-of-school discipline. All three sets regression analyses must be significant for mediation to occur for each type of school discipline. For both in-school and out-of-school discipline, sexual orientation and gender expression based victimization were significant mediators. Regression analyses between trans/gnc status and victimization: sexual orientation-based victimization: $\beta = -1.38, p < .001$; sexual orientation-based victimization: $\beta = -2.47, p < .001$. Logistic regression analyses between victimization and discipline: sexual orientation-based victimization and in-school discipline: odds ratio (OR) = 1.16, $p < .001$; gender expression-based victimization and in-school discipline: OR = 1.12, $p < .001$; sexual orientation-based victimization and out-of-school discipline: OR = 1.15, $p < .001$; gender expression-based victimization and out-of-school discipline: OR = 1.13, $p < .001$. Regression analyses between trans/gnc status and discipline: in-school discipline: $\beta = 0.74, p < .05$; out-of-school discipline: $\beta = 0.50, p < .01$. The Sobel test for mediation was significant for sexual orientation as mediator: in-school discipline: $z = -6.53, p < .001$; out-of-school discipline: $z = -4.79, p < .001$. The Sobel test for mediation was significant for gender expression-based victimization as mediator: in-school discipline: $z = -7.86, p < .001$; out-of-school discipline: $z = -5.29, p < .001$.
- The Sobel test was calculated using the Sobel test online interactive calculation tool: <http://quantpsy.org/sobel/sobel.htm>
- 58 Ksinan, A. J., Vazsonyi, A. T., Jiskrova, G. K., & Peugh, J. L. (2019). National ethnic and racial disparities in disciplinary practices: A contextual analysis in American secondary schools. *Journal of School Psychology*, 74, 106–125.
- Silverman, T. (2019). School discipline disparities: How we can do better. <https://www.iyi.org/school-discipline-disparities-how-we-can-do-better/>
- 59 Chi-square tests were performed looking at experiences with school discipline (in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, and contact with law enforcement) by race/ethnicity (AAPI only vs. multiracial AAPI). Multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students were more likely to experience all three types of school discipline than those who only identified as AAPI: In-school discipline: $\chi^2(1) = 23.51, p < .001, \phi = .13$; Out-of-school discipline: $\chi^2(1) = 6.03, p < .05, \phi = .06$; Contact with law enforcement: $\chi^2(1) = 9.43, p < .01, \phi = .08$.
- 60 Chi-square tests were performed looking at educational aspirations by in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, and contact with law enforcement. Students were less likely to plan on pursuing post-secondary education when they experienced: In-school

- discipline: $\chi^2(5) = 11.23, p < .05$, Cramer's $V = .09$; Out-of-school discipline: $\chi^2(5) = 14.43, p < .05$, Cramer's $V = .10$, and; Contact with law enforcement: $\chi^2(5) = 36.72, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .16$.
- 61 To test differences in GPA by in-school discipline, out-of-school discipline, and contact with law enforcement, while controlling for race/ethnicity (AAPI only vs. multiracial AAPI), partial correlations were conducted. All three types of school discipline were related to lower GPA: In-school discipline: $r(1457) = -.22, p < .001$; Out-of-school discipline: $r(1457) = -.16, p < .001$; Contact with law enforcement: $r(1457) = -.16, p < .001$.
- 62 Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Zongrone, A. D., Clark, C. M., & Truong, N. L. (2018). *The 2017 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- 63 A chi-square test was performed looking at locale on the availability of GSAs at school: $\chi^2(2) = 78.50, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .23$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. AAPI LGBTQ students in suburban schools were more likely to have a GSA than students in urban and rural schools. Students in urban schools were more likely to have a GSA than students in rural schools.
- 64 A chi-square test was performed looking at region on the availability of GSAs at school: $\chi^2(3) = 80.96, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .24$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Students in the Northeast were more likely to have a GSA than students in the South to have a GSA. Students in the West were more likely to have a GSA than students in the Midwest and South. Students in the Midwest were more likely to have a GSA than students in the South. Students in the Northeast did not differ from students in the Midwest and West on having a GSA at their school.
- 65 The relationship between school size and the availability of a GSA was examined through a Pearson correlation: $r(1464) = .34, p < .001$. AAPI LGBTQ students who attended larger schools were more likely to have a GSA at their school.
- 66 A chi-square test was performed looking at school racial composition on the availability of a GSA at their school. No differences were found on the availability of a GSA by school racial composition.
- 67 Porta, C. M., Singer, E., Mehus, C. J., Gower, A. L., Saewyc, E., Fredkove, W., & Eisenberg, M. E. (2017). LGBTQ youth's views on gay-straight alliances: Building community, providing gateways, and representing safety and support. *Journal of School Health, 87*(7), 489–497.
- Toomey, R. B. & Russell, S. T. (2013). Gay-straight alliances, social justice involvement, and school victimization of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer youth: Implications for school well-being and plans to vote. *Youth & Society, 45*(4), 500–522.
- 68 To test differences in missing school and feelings of school belonging by the availability of a GSA at their school, independent t-tests were conducted, with GSAs as the independent variable, and missing school and feelings of school belonging as the dependent variables. Students who had a GSA at their school were less likely to miss school in the past month: $t(952.66) = 5.30, p < .001$. Students who had a GSA at their school also felt a greater sense of connection to their school community: $t(1052.47) = -8.81, p < .001$.
- 69 Chi-square tests were performed looking at feelings of safety (due to their sexual orientation, gender expression and race/ethnicity) and the availability of a GSA at their school. Students who had a GSA at their school were: less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation: $\chi^2(1) = 38.17, p < .001, \phi = -.16$, and; less likely to feel unsafe because of their gender expression: $\chi^2(1) = 6.42, p = .01, \phi = -.07$. Having a GSA at their school did not affect feelings of safety due to their race/ethnicity.
- 70 A chi-square test was performed looking at school racial composition and the availability of an ethnic/cultural club at their school: $\chi^2(3) = 14.62, p < .01$, Cramer's $V = .11$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Students in majority-White schools were less likely to have an ethnic/cultural club than students in majority-AAPI schools. No other differences were observed.
- 71 A chi-square test was performed looking at region (Northeast, South, Midwest, West) and the availability of an ethnic/cultural club at their school: $\chi^2(3) = 15.94, p < .01$, Cramer's $V = .11$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Students who attended schools in the West were more likely to have an ethnic/cultural club than students in the Northeast and South. Students in the Northeast, Midwest, and South did not differ from each other.
- 72 A chi-square test was performed looking at school racial composition (majority AAPI, majority White, majority other non-White race, no majority race) and region (Northeast, South, Midwest, and West): $\chi^2(9) = 152.85, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .20$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Students who attended majority-AAPI schools were more likely to be in the West than students in the Northeast, South, and Midwest: Students who attended majority-White schools were: more likely to be in the Midwest than students in the West and South, more likely to be in the Northeast than in the West, and more likely to be in the South than in the West. Students who attended majority other non-White schools were more likely to be in the South than students in the Midwest. No other differences were found.
- 73 A chi-square test was performed looking at locale (urban, suburban, rural) and the availability of an ethnic/cultural club at their school: $\chi^2(2) = 48.71, p < .001$, Cramer's $V = .18$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Students who attended rural schools were less likely to have an ethnic/cultural club than students in urban and suburban schools. No other differences were found.
- 74 The relationship between school size and availability of an ethnic/cultural club was examined through a Pearson correlation. AAPI LGBTQ students who attended larger schools were more likely to have an ethnic/cultural club: $r(1454) = .38, p < .001$.
- 75 A chi-square test was performed looking at feelings of safety due to race/ethnicity and the availability of an ethnic/cultural club at their school. Students who had an ethnic cultural club at their school felt safer due to their race/ethnicity: $\chi^2(1) = 11.87, p < .001, \phi = -.09$
- To test differences in school belonging by presence of an ethnic/cultural club, an independent t-test was conducted, with availability of an ethnic/cultural club as the independent variable, and feelings of school belonging as the dependent variable. Students who had an ethnic/cultural club at their school had greater feelings of school belonging: $t(1463) = -4.03, p < .001$.
- 76 Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., & Russell, S. T. (2011). High school Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs) and young adult well-being: An examination of GSA presence, participation, and perceived effectiveness. *Applied Developmental Science, 15*(4), 175–185.
- 77 Ocampo, A. C. & Soodjinda, D. (2016). Invisible Asian Americans: the intersection of sexuality, race, and education among gay Asian Americans. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 19*(3), 480–499.
- 78 Museus, S. (2008). The role of ethnic student organizations in fostering African American and Asian American students' cultural adjustment and membership at predominantly White institutions. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(6), 568–586.
- 79 Bowman, N. A., Park, J. J., & Denson, N. (2015). Student involvement in ethnic student organizations: Examining civic outcomes 6 years after graduation. *Research in Higher Education, 56*(2), 127–145.
- Poteat, V. P., Calzo, J. P., & Yoshikawa, Y. (2018). Gay-straight alliance involvement and youths' participation in civic engagement, advocacy, and awareness-raising. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 56*, 13–20.
- Toomey, R. B. & Russell, S. T. (2013). Gay-straight alliances, social justice involvement, and school victimization of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer youth: Implications for school well-being and plans to vote. *Youth & Society, 45*(4), 500–522.
- 80 A chi-square test was performed looking at school racial composition and GSA participation. GSA participation was not related to school racial composition.
- 81 Chi-square tests were performed looking at demographic characteristics (multiracial AAPI vs. AAPI only, and immigration status) and GSA participation. GSA participation was not related to multiracial status and immigration status.
- 82 To examine differences in school belonging by GSA participation, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with level of GSA participation as the independent variable, and feelings of school belonging as the dependent variable. No significant differences were observed.
- 83 To examine differences in comfort bringing up LGBTQ issues in class by GSA participation, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was

- conducted with level of GSA participation as the independent variable, and comfort bringing up LGBTQ issues in class as the dependent variable. The univariate effect was significant: $F(2, 932) = 12.02, p < .001, \eta^2 = .03$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Students who did not attend GSA meetings were less likely to bring up LGBTQ issues in class than those who attended GSA meetings as non-leaders and as leaders. GSA leaders and non-leaders did not differ on comfort with bringing up LGBTQ issues in class.
- 84 GLSEN Days of Action (including Ally Week, No Name-Calling Week, and Day of Silence) are national student-led events of school-based LGBTQ advocacy, coordinated by GLSEN. The Day of Silence occurs each year in the spring, and is designed to draw attention to anti-LGBTQ name-calling, bullying, and harassment in schools. Visit www.dayofsilence.org for more information.
- 85 To examine differences in rates of participation by level of GSA participation, two chi-square tests were conducted: participating in GLSEN Day of Action, and participating in a rally, protest, or demonstration for a cause. The effects for both were significant. GLSEN Day of Action: $\chi^2(2) = 132.02, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .38$; rally, protest, or demonstration: $\chi^2(2) = 30.43, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .18$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. For both activities, GSA members, both leaders and non-leaders, were more likely to participate than students who were not GSA members; and GSA leaders were more likely than GSA non-leaders to participate.
- 86 To examine differences in rates of participation by level of GSA participation, two chi-square tests were conducted: participating in a boycott against a company, and contacting politicians, governments, or authorities about issues that are important to them. The effects for both were significant. Participating in a boycott against a company: $\chi^2(2) = 132.02, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .38$; contacting politicians, governments, or authorities: $\chi^2(2) = 132.02, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .38$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. For both activities, GSA leaders were more likely to participate than non-members. No differences were found between GSA leaders and GSA non-leaders, and no differences were found between GSA non-leaders and non-members.
- 87 To examine differences in rates of participation by level of GSA participation, three chi-square tests were conducted: participating in an event where people express their political views, volunteering to campaign for a political cause or candidate, and expressing political views about politics or social issues on social media. The effects for all three were significant. Events for expressing views: $\chi^2(2) = 49.83, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .23$; volunteering to campaign: $\chi^2(2) = 20.32, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .15$; expressing political views: $\chi^2(2) = 11.66, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .11$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. For all three activities, GSA members, both leaders and non-leaders, were more likely to participate than students who were not GSA members; and no differences were found between GSA non-leaders and leaders on participation.
- 88 To examine differences in anti-LGBTQ victimization by GSA participation, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted with level of GSA participation as the independent variable, and two dependent variables: severity of victimization due to sexual orientation, and severity of victimization due to gender expression. The multivariate effect was significant: Pillai's Trace = .03, $F(4, 1780) = 7.52$. The univariate effects for victimization due to sexual orientation and gender expression were both significant. Sexual orientation: $F(2, 890) = 13.67, p < .001$. Gender expression: $F(2, 890) = 12.07, p < .001$. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Sexual orientation: students attending as a leader/officer experienced greater levels of victimization than those who did not attend and those attending as a non-leader; there was no difference between those not attending and those attending as a non-leader. Gender expression: students attending as a leader/officer experienced greater levels of victimization than those who did not attend and those attending as a non-leader; there was no difference between those not attending and those attending as a non-leader.
- 89 A chi-square test was conducted looking at school racial composition and ethnic/cultural club participation. School racial composition was not related to ethnic/cultural club participation.
- 90 A chi-square test was conducted looking at immigrant status and ethnic/cultural club participation: $\chi^2(2) = 7.57, p < .05, \phi = .08$. Comparisons showed the following significant differences at $p < .05$: U.S. born students were less likely to participate than those born outside the U.S.; U.S. born students were less likely to participate as a leader. U.S. born students did not differ from those born outside the U.S. on participating as a non-leader.
- 91 A chi-square test was conducted looking at racial identification (multiracial AAPI vs. AAPI only) and ethnic/cultural club participation. Multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students did not differ from those who only identify as AAPI on ethnic/cultural club participation.
- 92 To examine differences in school belonging by ethnic/cultural club participation, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with level of ethnic/cultural club participation as the independent variable, and feelings of school belonging as the dependent variable. No significant differences were observed.
- 93 To examine whether school belonging was related to ethnic/cultural club participation by school racial composition, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with ethnic/cultural club participation X school racial composition as the interaction term, and school belonging as the dependent variable. The univariate effect was not significant. No differences were found between participation in ethnic/cultural clubs and school belonging, and no differences were found between the participation in ethnic/cultural clubs X school racial composition interaction and school belonging.
- 94 We examined differences in rates of participation in the following activities: participating in an event where people express their political views (such as a poetry slam or youth forum); volunteering to campaign for a political cause or candidate; participating in a boycott against a company; expressing views about politics or social issues on social media; participating in a rally, protest, or demonstration for a cause; participating in a GLSEN Day of Action; and contacting politicians, governments, or authorities about issues that are important to the student.
- To examine differences in rates of participation by level of ethnic/cultural club participation, a series of chi-square tests were conducted for each form of activism. The effect was significant for the following forms of activism: Event to express political views: $\chi^2(2) = 43.27, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .20$; volunteering: $\chi^2(2) = 33.74, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .18$; boycott: $\chi^2(2) = 19.35, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .13$; social media: $\chi^2(2) = 18.47, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .13$; rally: $\chi^2(2) = 24.39, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .15$; contacting politicians: $\chi^2(2) = 32.77, p < .001, \text{Cramer's } V = .17$. No differences were found for participating in a GLSEN Day of Action. Pairwise comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. For participating in a boycott, non-leader club members were more likely to participate than students who did not attend club meetings; no differences were found between ethnic/cultural club leaders, and non-leaders and those who did not attend meetings on participation in boycotts. For participating in an event to express political views, volunteering to campaign, expressing views on social media, participating in a rally, and contacting politicians, club leaders were more likely than those who did not attend meetings to: club leaders and non-leaders were more likely to participate in these activities than those who did not attend club meetings; no differences were found between club leaders and non-leaders on participating in these activities.
- 95 To examine differences in racist victimization by ethnic/cultural club participation, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted, with frequency of racist victimization as the dependent variable, and level of ethnic/cultural club participation as the independent variable. The effect was not significant. A similar analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted, controlling for school racial composition. The results did not change.
- 96 Shelton, S. A. & Barnes, M. E. (2016). "Racism just isn't an issue anymore": Preservice teachers' resistances to the intersections of sexuality and race. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 55*, 165–174.
- 97 To test differences in race/ethnicity and supportive school personnel, two separate independent t-tests were conducted, with race/ethnicity (AAPI only vs. multiracial AAPI) as the independent variable, and supportive staff and supportive administrators as the dependent variables. LGBTQ students who only identified as AAPI were more likely to have supportive staff and administrators than multiracial AAPI LGBTQ students: $t(1456) = 2.97, p < .01$; supportive administrators: $t(1459) = 2.49, p < .05$.
- 98 The relationship between number of supportive educators, and feelings of school belonging and psychological well-being (self-esteem, depression) were examined through Pearson correlations.

- Students who have more supportive staff had greater levels of school belonging, higher levels of self-esteem, and lower levels of depression: Feelings of school belonging: $r(1456) = .49, p < .001$; Self-esteem: $r(1439) = .26, p < .001$; Depression: $r(1438) = -.28, p < .001$
- 99 The relationship between number of supportive educators and missing school, feeling unsafe (due to sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity), and GPA were examined through Pearson correlations. Students who had more supportive staff: were less likely to miss school; were less likely to feel unsafe due to sexual orientation, gender expression, and race/ethnicity; and had higher GPAs. Missing school: $r(1457) = -.28, p < .001$; feeling unsafe due to sexual orientation: $r(1458) = -.25, p < .001$; feeling unsafe due to gender expression: $r(1458) = -.15, p < .001$; feeling unsafe due to race/ethnicity: $r(1458) = -.13, p < .001$; GPA: $r(1458) = .15, p < .001$.
- 100 To examine differences in educational aspirations by number of supportive educators, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with educational aspirations as the independent variable, and number of supportive educators as the dependent variable. The effect was significant: $F(5, 1440) = 43.38, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .03$. Post hoc comparisons were considered at $p < .05$. Students who have more supportive staff were more likely to plan to pursue post-secondary education.
- 101 Chi-square tests were performed looking at feelings of safety due to sexual orientation and gender expression and the availability of inclusive curriculum at their school. Students who had an inclusive curriculum at their school were less likely to feel unsafe due to their sexual orientation: $\chi^2(1) = 43.48, p < .001, \phi = -.17$, and; less likely to feel unsafe because of their gender expression: $\chi^2(1) = 17.84, p < .001, \phi = -.11$.
- 102 To test differences in peer acceptance and having an inclusive curriculum at school, an independent t-test was conducted, with inclusive curriculum as the independent variable, and peer acceptance as the dependent variable. Students who had an inclusive curriculum at their school had greater peer acceptance: $t(881.74) = -15.13, p < .001$.
- 103 To test differences in feelings of school belonging and having an inclusive curriculum at school, an independent t-test was conducted, with inclusive curriculum as the independent variable, and school belonging as the dependent variable. Students who had an inclusive curriculum at their school had greater feelings of school belonging: $t(790.61) = -13.84, p < .001$.
- 104 A chi-square test was performed looking at feelings of safety due to race/ethnicity and the availability of inclusive curriculum at their school. Students who had an inclusive curriculum at their school were less likely to feel unsafe due to their race/ethnicity: $\chi^2(1) = 4.22, p < .05, \phi = -.05$.
- 105 Givens, J. R., Nasir, N., Ross, K., & McKinney de Royston, M. (2016). Modeling manhood: Reimagining Black male identities in school. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 47*(2), 167–185.

GLSEN[®]

GLSEN
110 William Street, 30th Floor
New York, NY 10038
www.glsen.org

\$15.00
ISBN 978-1-934092-30-9
5 1500 >



9 781934 092309