1

This chapter discusses the historical and evolving terminology, constructs, and ideologies that inform the language used by those who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and same-gender loving, who may identify as queer, as well as those who are members of trans∗ communities from multiple and intersectional perspectives.

Evolving Nature of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

T.J. Jourian

In 2013 Pink Therapy, a U.K.-based counseling organization, proposed replacing the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) acronym with GSD (gender and sexual diversities; Sansalone, 2013). The group argued that LGBT and variations of it such as LGBTQQIA (to include queer, questioning, intersex, and asexual people) cannot include the multitude of identities with which people identify. In the United States, the University of Michigan's Spectrum Center has been renamed numerous times over its almost 35 years of existence (Burris, n.d.). These are but two examples of how language used to describe sexuality and gender continues to shift and in turn can influence and/or communicate the work student affairs professionals do with college students.

This chapter provides an overview of some of the ways sexual orientation and gender identity have been and are discussed in the United States, with particular attention paid to language in higher education institutions. Beginning with an historical overview, the chapter moves into current understandings of sex, gender, and sexual orientation, as contextualized within systems of oppression and privilege, and ends with the queering and constantly evolving nature of terminology relevant to sexual orientation and gender identity. For consistency the acronym LGBTQ is used throughout this chapter, unless referencing particular subpopulations, using official organizational names, or citing specific literature. This chapter is not meant to be, nor can or should it be, an exhaustive collection of definitions and terminology, but rather it serves as an opening to help situate the complex intricacies, intentions, and limitations that may inform how some students identify.

Historical Overview

The behaviors and expressions that many in the United States associate with LGBTQ identities have long existed in many preindustrial societies worldwide. However, the terms used by higher education and student affairs professionals today to describe them are recent "inventions." Here "invention" does not mean "inventing" nonheterosexual desires or gender nonconformity but rather the act of naming and categorizing those realities. These terms began to emerge in Europe in the 19th century (Foucault, 1978). The "invention" of *homosexuality* in the United States was specifically tied to race and racism with the increasing and often simultaneous policing and legislating of both racial and sexual boundaries and the emergence of their accompanied bifurcations, in other words, "Black" or "White," "heterosexual" or "homosexual" (Ferguson, 2004; Somerville, 2000). *Transgender* came into common parlance through the U.S. medical establishment in the 1960s, gaining widespread use in the early 1990s (Rawson & Williams, 2014).

LGBTQ people existed well before these times. In precolonial North America, for example, gender-variant individuals existed in hundreds of indigenous populations, including the *winkte* of the Lakota, the *nadleehe* of the Navajo, and the *lhamana* of the Zuni, to name a few (Gilley, 2006; Rifkin, 2011). Today, Two-Spirit is used to collectively express North American indigenous gender-variant people's identities. Two-Spirit is often uncritically equated with LGBTQ identities, meaning it is "translated" through a colonial and Euro-Western lens rather than understood within its own historicity and cultural context (Cameron, 2005). It is thus at the very least incomplete to responsibly and ethically review the historical evolution of these terms without a recognition that colonialism and racism have shaped that evolution and how in turn communities of color have resisted the erasure of their ways of knowing through resurrections and recreations of language.

Terms associated with LGBTQ identities that are used today in the United States did not come to be until the early to mid-20th century and thus also do not appear when specifically looking within higher education. Same-sex eroticism and partnerships prior to that time were referenced as "romantic friendships" and "crushes" (rather tritely and usually in the case of students at women's colleges; MacKay, 1993) or as abhorrent and a problem (Dilley, 2002). Terms used on college campuses also reflected language used by those who had access to higher education. For example, "butch" and "femme" have been widely used identifiers among working-class lesbian women since the 1950s (Nestle, 1981), but they do not surface in higher education discourse as access to college was almost exclusively limited to those with financial means.

LGBTQ people progressively entered into everyday people's consciousness locally and nationally largely due to protests and movements such as

the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s through the 1940s, the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and 1960s, the 1966 Compton Cafeteria riot, the 1969 Stonewall riots, and AIDS activism of the 1980s and 1990s (D'Emilio, 2010; Schwartz, 2003; Stryker, 2008; Wolf, 2009). Language used to describe nonheterosexual desires and gender nonconformity in higher education often mirrored and was influenced by the social movements of the time. The founding of groups such as the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis in the 1950s marked the beginnings of the homophile movement, mirrored in the formation of the first campus-based organizations known as Student Homophile Leagues (SHLs) in the mid-1960s (Marine, 2011). As "homophile" began to be replaced by the use of the word "gay," such as with the Gay Liberation Front, a similar linguistic shift occurred on college campuses. For example, the SHL at Columbia changed its name to Gay People at Columbia-Barnard. Concurrently, critiques were offered of the word "gay" being used as a blanket term to reference a diversity of nonheterosexual and gender-nonconforming identities. These criticisms often came from White women, people of color across genders, and trans∗ people of various races and ethnicities, who understood "gay" to exclude anyone other than cisgender White men with same-sex desires (Wolf, 2009). On campuses these criticisms are reflected through renaming some student organizations to communicate broader inclusion, and the creations of student organizations focused on particular subsets of the population as are discussed later in this chapter.

Social movements not only played a role in the formation and naming of student organizations and centers on college campuses but also in the development of theoretical literature informing student affairs practice. Research examining sexual orientation development in the 1970s resulted in Homosexual or Gay Identity Development models (for example, Cass, 1979; Troiden, 1979). Subsequent models are referred to as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and/or Transgender Identity Development. How the models were named was often also a marker of which subpopulations were included in the research and whether the model focused on sexual orientation and/or gender identity (for example, Bilodeau, 2005; D'Augelli, 1994; Fox, 1995). Mirroring the aforementioned critiques of the word "gay" and resistance to the erasure of culturally distinct terminology, researchers also named people and identities at varying intersections of sexuality, gender, and race (for example, Manalansan, 1993; Parks, 2001; Vidal-Ortiz, 2011; Wilson, 1996). Some of these terms are explored in the next section.

Foundational Concepts: Sex, Gender, and Sexual Orientation

Higher education scholarship and practice within the last decade have used a model that distinguishes between four components of sexual identity (Lev, 2004): sex, gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation. The four components are interrelated but separate. Sex, more accurately

described as sex assigned at birth, refers to "the physiological makeup of a human being" (Lev, 2004, p. 80), meaning how one's genes, hormones, biochemistry, and internal and external anatomy combine to affect the physical body. The most common sex assignments are male and female, despite a wide range of variation in sexual development in human beings that do not neatly fit into either (Fausto-Sterling, 2000). *Intersex* or people with *Differences of Sexual Development* (DSD; Diamond, 2009) are used to describe those who physiologically deviate from the sex binary. Intersex people have a variety of gender identities, just like males and females.

Gender, which is often conflated and used interchangeably with sex, refers to the sociohistorically and culturally constructed roles and attributes given to people, often based on their assigned sex. A person's own self-conception of gender is referred to as one's gender identity, whereas the performance and enactment of gender is referred to as one's gender expression. Words that describe gender identity include woman, man, genderqueer, transgender, agender, and endless others, whereas terms such as masculine, androgynous, feminine, and many more describe gender expression. Some descriptors such as butch, femme, transfeminine, and masculine-of-center may refer to one's gender identity or gender expression or a melding of both. Within social institutions and cultures that reify essentialist and binary understandings of gender, such as U.S. higher education institutions, those assigned as males at birth are expected to be masculine men and those assigned females at birth are expected to be feminine women (Bilodeau, 2009). Fluidity and alternatives are rarely acknowledged or affirmed.

Finally, sexual orientation encompasses one's romantic, sexual, and/or emotional attractions to others. The labels people use to describe their sexual orientation, also known as sexual identity or sexuality, are vast. They include heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, queer, asexual, and same-gender loving (SGL), to name a few. SGL emerged in the early 1990s as a culturally affirming Afrocentric alternative to the terms gay and lesbian and is used primarily within the African American community. Sexuality also involves sexual behaviors, which are the actions in which one engages with oneself or others. Understanding of this aspect has been informed by the Kinsey scale (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953) and the Klein (1978) sexual orientation grid, describing sexual orientation as a nonbinary construct. These models demonstrate that people cannot all be identified as either homosexual or heterosexual exclusively. Kinsey uses a scale from 0 (exclusively heterosexual) to 6 (exclusively homosexual), with "x" used to describe asexuality. Klein's grid rates seven different variables (sexual attraction, sexual behavior, sexual fantasies, emotional preference, social preference, heterosexual/homosexual lifestyle, and self-identification) using a 1 (exclusively heterosexual) to 7 (exclusively homosexual) scale, across three different points in time: the past, the present, and the ideal. Sell (1996) measures heterosexuality and homosexuality independently from each other and not on a continuum as

Lev, Klein, and Kinsey do. Additionally, Sell distinguishes sexual attraction, sexual behavior, and sexual identity from each other, indicating that the type of person to whom one might be attracted and one's identity or behavior may not match. For example, a woman who is sexually attracted to other women and may even engage in sexual activity with women may identify as heterosexual. This may be the case if the woman in question does not wish to or cannot be open about her sexual attractions, or because she does not experience emotional attraction to other women and thus identifies as heterosexual due to her romantic inclination toward men. Another woman engaging in similar dynamics might identify herself as bisexual.

Viewing the four categories of sex, gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation as four interactive, fluid, and nonbinary continua allows us to discuss gender and sexuality in complex and nuanced ways that provide room for agency and self-determination. Although the distinctions between the four are useful in some ways—such as to demonstrate that a transgender woman can be a lesbian, just as much as she can be heterosexual, or any other sexual orientation—these distinctions are not necessarily cross-culturally applicable. Extremely rigid distinctions between these components often leave out communities and people that conceptualize a more integrated relationship between gender and sexuality, often in ways different from White and Western understandings of them. This includes māhū people in traditional Hawaiian culture, the fa'afafine in Samoan culture, or studs in the United States. Thus, it is important not simply to impose Eurocentric language (for example, by saying fa'afafine is Samoan for transgender) but to learn how different cultures conceptualize gender and sexuality through their histories and traditions as well as about the role of colonialism and racism in marginalizing sexual and gender diversity in communities of color. For an educational resource, see the recently released documentary, *Kumu Hina* (Hamer, Wilson, & Florez, 2014).

Situating Students Within Systems of Oppression

Often when discussing LGBTQ students and matters concerning sexual orientation and gender identity, it is important to identify and contextualize the systems of oppression that affect students' experiences on and off campuses, as well as their access to and development of identities and discourse. The systems most identifiable as affecting these student populations are *heterosexism*, *monosexism*, and *genderism/cissexism*. These systems interact with and are informed by others such as *sexism*, *racism*, *ethnocentrism*, *classism*, *ableism*, and *xenophobia*, as exemplified previously when examining historical and contemporary development of terminology and concepts. Students' multiple identities converge with each other and are informed by varying contexts and levels of salience of each of their identities to their core sense of selves. For example, let us minimally compare a lesbian cisgender woman of color who is an engineering major at a large

institution with a White lesbian trans* woman who is an elementary education major at a small liberal arts college. Although both identify as lesbians, their other identities, the types of environments with which they interact most, and how salient their racial, sexual, and gender identities are to them will likely have an impact on the ways they experience and understand heterosexism.

Heterosexism is based on the presumption that everyone is heterosexual. This presumption leads to a systemic institutionalization of attitudes and biases that privileges those who identify as heterosexual and/or are in heterosexual relationships. It posits heterosexual identities and relationships as the norm and thus superior to nonheterosexual ones. Based on the gender binary discussed previously, heterosexism relies on the notion that maleness/masculinity/men are oppositional, distinguishable from, and complementary to femaleness/femininity/women. As an example, the argument that gender-neutral housing leads to couples living together in the residence halls is based on the assumption that all students are heterosexual and thus the word "couple" implies only a man and woman pairing. *Homophobia* is a form of heterosexism that describes fear and/or hatred of nonheterosexual people and actions, language, or behavior that stem from that fear/hatred, such as the tearing down of flyers promoting a gay-identified speaker on campus.

Monosexism is based on the presumption that everyone is attracted to only one other sex or gender, meaning that one is either exclusively heterosexual or exclusively gay/lesbian. This presumption can show up, for example, when a male-identified student who had previously been in a relationship with another man starts dating a woman and is confronted by questions like, "So, are you straight now?" *Biphobia*, as a form of monosexism, is an aversion to bisexual and other non-monosexual people, such as pansexual or omnisexual, and is often based on negative stereotypes and invisibility/erasure of bisexuality (Eliason, 2000). These stereotypes include that bisexual people are indecisive and promiscuous or that bisexuality is just a phase or trendy.

Genderism or *cissexism* is rooted in the belief that there are only two genders and that gender is based on one's sex assignment at birth (Bilodeau, 2009). Genderism is institutionalized in higher education as a forced labeling process that sorts everyone into either "male" or "female," assigning privilege to those who conform to binary gender systems and punishing those who do not. Through genderism, trans* and gender-nonconforming identities are isolated, invisible, and thus not accessible. An example of genderism or cissexism that is common on college campuses is the lack of willingness or process to alter gender and sex designations in students' records or tying that process to surgical interventions, which are expensive, difficult to access, and may not be desired. *Transphobia*, as a form of genderism/cissexism, is a range of negative attitudes toward and devaluing and discriminatory treatment of trans* people. *Transmisogyny* describes

how sexism and cissexism intersect to specifically oppress trans∗women (Serano, 2007), such as through their exclusion from many women's colleges.

Dyadism is the belief that there are only two "natural" and "biological" sexes, male and female. Dyadism is at the root of the widespread practice of nonconsensual genital surgery to which intersex infants are subjected when their external anatomy does not fit a prescribed standard of normalcy (for example, by having a large clitoris or a micro-penis). This is often followed by hormone therapy at adolescence, a practice that is referred to as concealment-centered model of care. *Interphobia* is prejudice, fear, and hatred toward intersex people and the behaviors that stem from it, such as using the pronoun "it" to describe people who identify as intersex.

LGBTQ students can also internalize these isms and phobias and hold oppressive views toward other LGBTQ people or themselves. This can be aimed at identities similar to their own (for example, a gay man holding negative attitudes toward other gay men who are "too gay" or "too feminine") or different (such as a lesbian woman believing that trans men are traitors). As these systems also intersect with other systems of oppression, social hierarchies and divisions are constructed among LGBTQ students, creating a compounding effect for people with multiple marginalized identities, such as LGBTQ people who are immigrants, disabled, and/or people of color. For example, a genderqueer deaf student might not be able to attend a confidential "coming out" support group, if ze (an example of a gender-neutral pronoun) cannot locate a queer-identified American Sign Language interpreter in the area to bring to an LGBTQ-only space. Other common examples include holding an LGBTQ 101 session for international students that assumes international students do not know about or value LGBTQ people, not considering physical accessibility when planning for LGBTQ-themed/friendly housing, or holding discussions on LGBTQ faith only from a Christian perspective.

Queering Terminology

As language evolves, terms describing sexuality and gender come and go, their meanings changing over time, in different contexts, and for different people. For example, it is rare today that an individual in the United States would self-identify as "homosexual," and its use is often seen as communicating disapproval or ignorance. A word used more widely in the United States today, and which confounds many, is the word "queer." Queer defies boundaries and does not have a clear singular definition. It is also not necessarily just about sexuality or gender, although it is predominantly used in that manner. "Queer is by definition whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant . . . It is an identity without an essence" (Halperin, 1997, p. 62). Here I provide an overview of some of the ways the term is used and its different meanings.

Within academia, queer comes from queer theory or queer studies. Developed within poststructural critical theory in the early 1990s, queer theory questions the assumed normativity and stability of identities, structures, and discourse, such as dichotomous nature versus nurture debates. In and outside of academia, queer can convey a politic critical of mainstream LGBTQ approaches and priorities. Many queer activists and organizations such as Against Equality view the focus on marriage, participation in the military, and hate crimes legislation as assimilationist rather than liberatory, empowering structures that disproportionately oppress queer people of color, immigrants, and working-class people.

At an individual level, queer allows people to identify beyond gender and/or sexual binaries and name the fluidity and blurriness with which they experience those identities. For example, a student who views themselves in any way other than exclusively as a man or a woman may identify as genderqueer and may adopt gender-neutral pronouns such as "ze" (pronounced zee), "hir" (pronounced here), or the singular "they." Someone who finds themselves attracted to different genders or wishes to communicate an openness to that possibility may identify as queer, finding terms such as lesbian, gay, heterosexual, or even bisexual to be too confining. This does not imply that all bisexual people, for example, in turn define bisexuality in the same way but that the term does not work for the aforementioned student.

Adopting the term may also signal attempts to reclaim power from its use as a derogatory term. This does not mean that it can no longer be used as an insult, and in fact it still is. Queer has multiple meanings and interpretations, with some in the LGBT(Q) community not having an appreciation for the word. This can be due to generational, regional, and/or cultural reasons. Younger generations tend to be more comfortable with its use than older generations who have predominantly experienced it used negatively. The use of queer may be more contentious in the South than other parts of the United States. As a former program coordinator for a campus LGBTQI office in Tennessee, I found that the inclusion of Queer in the office's name puzzled and even angered people so much that explaining its many meanings was something I had to do at almost every tabling and training event. I did not experience this quite to that extent working at campuses in other regions of the country. Some people of color also perceive queer to be yet another White-centric term, with its connections to academia and lack of historic presence in communities of color. Other people of color do prefer queer as a descriptor or the intersectional terms QPOC (Queer People/Person of Color, pronounced Q-Pock) or QTPOC (Queer and Trans∗ People/Person of Color, pronounced Cutie-Pock) instead of LGBT people of color for many of the reasons already discussed in this section.

When naming gender and sexuality, agency and self-determination are crucial aspects of one's ability to describe one's own identity. Terms ought not to be imposed on individuals based solely on our own limited

knowledge or our own interpretations of others' behaviors and expressions. In fact, discovering and even creating language for oneself can be an empowering experience for students, when they are affirmed in their process and afforded room to try different words without judgment ("I don't think that's a real identity, you shouldn't use it if you want people to understand you"), expectations ("You're queer, why are you wearing a suit and tie; that's so heteronormative"), or conditions ("You can't be queer and only like other women"). For student affairs professionals, using language (including pronouns) that an individual student identifies with in a given context at a given time is an important part of creating affirming, respectful, and safe spaces on campus.

Evolving Conversations and Complexities

In this section I focus on some current (and for some not-so-current) discussions and shifts in terminology. The intention is to provide additional examples at individual, communal, institutional, and societal levels of continued evolutions of language and in no part does it seek to be a comprehensive list. This would be both impossible and undesirable as the gender and sexual diversity within our communities cannot be fully captured in such a concise way. Additionally, the evolving and contextual natures of language require flexibility and a commitment to openness on our parts as educators and practitioners to new and sometimes challenging conversations and terminology.

Much of this evolution has to do with individuals and communities rejecting binary thinking. For some, this rejection directly relates to their own identities, prompting the search for and creation of language that better describes their identities more accurately. Non-monosexual identities are a clear example of rejecting a gay/lesbian or heterosexual binary. Individual people rarely self-identify as non-monosexual, rather using terms such as bisexual, pansexual, omnisexual, ambisexual, polysexual, and others. These labels help individuals express varying relationships to how gender factors into their own sexuality. Others seeking to communicate an openness in their monosexual identities might use terms such as heteroflexible (meaning primarily heterosexual, but open to the possibility of same-sex attraction) or homoflexible (the converse of heteroflexible).

In addition to sexuality, different terms used to describe one's gender identity may also communicate a nonbinary experience. Some of these terms include genderqueer, agender, bigender, gender nonconforming, intergender, gender fluid, neutrois, pangender, and many others. The asterisk at the end of the prefix trans is used to signal broad inclusivity of multiple gender identities beyond just trans men (also referred to as female-to-male or transgender men) or trans women (also referred to as male-to-female or transgender women), such as nonbinary individuals, as well as crossdressers and even gender performers like drag kings and

queens (Tompkins, 2014). This does not mean that all trans∗ people identify outside of the gender binary. In fact many individuals, some of whom may not use any trans∗-related descriptors and prefer to be described simply as women or men, see themselves as very much aligned with one gender at all times. Some crossdressers and many gender performers also do not see themselves as part of the trans∗ community.

Terms are usually created to describe those perceived to be outside the norm, thus deciding who is considered normal and who is not. To resist this, trans∗ activist discourses in the 1990s began to use the term *cisgender* to describe those whose sex assignment at birth and gender identity aligned with each other in socially prescribed ways (Aultman, 2014). Cisgender is meant to replace terms such as normatively gendered or biologically gendered that by extension position trans∗ people as not normal or biological. The prefix *cis-* in Latin means "on the same side as," whereas the prefix *trans-* translates to "on the other side of," "beyond," or "across." By using "cis man" or "cis woman" instead of just "man" or "woman" when only discussing cisgender individuals resists the idea that a trans∗ person is not a man or a woman.

Terminology may also be created to identify gaps and commonalities within and across groups, both to form community and to enact social change. The coining of the term *masculine of center* (MoC) to describe "lesbian/queer womyn and gender-nonconforming/trans people who tilt towards the masculine side of the gender spectrum" (as cited in Bailey, 2014) allows individuals across genders and sexualities to build community with each other, as well as come together to form healthy masculinities. Relatedly, the term *brown boi* is used to describe MoC individuals, who are people of color. The Brown Boi Project (n.d.) is an organization that harnesses the leadership of brown bois toward intersectional gender justice.

Brown boi is one of many terms individuals and communities use to describe their identities intersectionally and not merely as additive. Earlier QPOC and QTPOC were introduced along with their pronunciations. The way the words are said is important as they phonetically communicate a merged racial, sexual, and gender identification that sounds different than saying LGBTQ people of color. Other intersectional terms, some of which may be appropriately used only as in-group terminology (meaning, by those who identify with these terms), include *gaysian* (merging gay and Asian) and *SDQ* (sick and disabled queers). Intersectional language may communicate one's resistance to having to pick between identities and express a more holistic self-conception and set of experiences. The growing number of QPOC/QTPOC student organizations and conferences around the country signals a need for spaces and movements that honor students' lives at the intersections of their many identities.

On college campuses, departments that serve students across diverse sexual and gender identities continue to contend with what to call themselves in order to best capture both this evolving terminology and ultimately

whom they serve. In addition to the more ubiquitous LGBT or LGBTQ (with the letters in different orders at times), the current discussions on the inclusion or exclusion of two additional letters, I and A, reflect broader conversations on whether intersex and asexual people are part of the LGBTQ community. Intersex and asexual people themselves have diverse perspectives and experiences and thus do not hold a consensus on their positionalities. Some see themselves as part of the queer community, and others do not. As discussed previously, intersex people can hold a variety of gender identities, as well as may themselves identify as something other than heterosexual. Media representations of intersex people are extremely limited even today, with the MTV series *Faking It* (Nugiel, Goldman, Covington, Williams, & Leder, 2014) making history in 2014 by introducing the first main intersex character on a TV show.

Asexuality is often confused for abstinence, which describes a choice in behavior rather than a sexual orientation. People who practice abstinence do experience sexual attractions but have made the decision to not act on them for a period of time. Asexual is both an identity for people who do not experience sexual attraction to anyone and an umbrella term. Some asexual people do engage in purely romantic relationships and may find enjoyment in nonsexual physical activities such as cuddling. Various terms exist to describe asexual people's romantic inclinations, such as aromantic (do not experience romantic attractions), heteroromantic (romantically inclined toward people of a different sex/gender), homoromantic, biromantic, panromantic, and so on. Additionally, some may experience nonconsistent or occasional romantic and/or sexual attractions and may use terms such as gray-A (gray asexual), demiromantic, demisexual, and so on. These terms in turn communicate varying relationships with sexuality and romanticism. For example, demisexual people experience sexual attraction only when a stable emotional connection has been established. In a society where the existence of sexuality is a given, with phrases like "everyone has sex" seeming innocuous, asexual people may indeed feel queer themselves, meaning different from the given norm.

Students are often among the first to respond to changing terminology either by adopting them themselves when finding words to better describe who they are or by advocating for organizational name changes. Often less constrained by bureaucratic processes and institutional resistance that mire departmental-level changes, student organizations can quickly adapt to ensure inclusion and comfort. An example is when students at Vanderbilt University's Lambda GSA altered the acronym in their name to stand for Gender and Sexuality Alliance instead of Gay and Straight Alliance.

Names, labels, and language communicate a great deal about our knowledge, assumptions, intentions, and interpretations of particular topics and experiences. Practitioners and scholars have an ethical responsibility to cultivate an openness within themselves and campus-wide to shifting and contextually based terminology and to adopt practices that

promote individual and community meaning making. This may merely be one part of creating equitable and inclusive campus communities for all students, but it is a crucial aspect.

References

Aultman, B. (2014). Cisgender. *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, *1*(1–2), 61–63.

Bailey, V. (2014). Brown bois. *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, *1*(1–2), 45–47.

Bilodeau, B. (2005). Beyond the gender binary: A case study of transgender college student development at a Midwestern university. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Issues in Education*, *3*(1), 29–44.

Bilodeau, B. L. (2009). *Genderism: Transgender students, binary systems and higher education*. Germany: VDM Verlag.

Brown Boi Project. (n.d.) [Website]. Retrieved from http://www.brownboiproject.org.

Burris, N. (n.d.). Our history. *Spectrum Center*. Retrieved from http://spectrumcenter.umich.edu/article/58.

Cameron, M. (2005). Two-spirited aboriginal people: Continuing cultural appropriation by non-aboriginal society. *Canadian Woman Studies*, *24*(2), 123–127.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *4*, 219–235.

D'Augelli, A. R. (1994). Identity development and sexual orientation: Toward a model of lesbian, gay, and bisexual development. In E. J. Trickett, R. J. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity: Perspectives of people in context* (pp. 312–333). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

D'Emilio, J. (2010). *Lost prophet: The life and times of Bayard Rustin*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Diamond, M. (2009). Human intersexuality: Difference or disorder? *Sexual Behavior*, *38*(2), 72.

Dilley, P. (2002). *Queer man on campus: A history of non-heterosexual college men, 1945–2000*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Eliason, M. (2000). Bi-negativity: The stigma facing bisexual men. *Journal of Bisexuality*, *1*(2–3), 137–154.

Fausto-Sterling, A. (2000). The five sexes, revisited. *Sciences*, *40*(4), 18–23.

Ferguson, R. A. (2004). *Aberrations in black: Toward a queer of color critique*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Vol. 1. An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Vantage Books. (Originally published in 1976).

Fox, R. (1995). Bisexual identities. In A. D'Augelli & C. Patterson (Eds.), *Lesbian, gay and bisexual identities over the lifespan* (pp. 48–86). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gilley, B. J. (2006). *Becoming two-spirit: Gay identity and social acceptance in Indian country*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Halperin, D. (1997). *Saint Foucault: Towards a gay hagiography*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hamer, D., Wilson, J., & Florez, C. M. (2014). *Kumu hina* [Documentary].United States.: ITVS.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Klein, F. (1978). *The bisexual option*. Philadelphia, PA: Haworth Press.

Lev, A. I. (2004). *Transgender emergence: Therapeutic guidelines for working with gender-variant people and their families*. New York: Routledge.

MacKay, A. (Ed.). (1993). *Wolf girls at Vassar: Lesbian and gay experiences*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Manalansan, M. (1993). (Re)locating the gay Filipino: Resistance, postcolonialism, and identity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *26*(2/3), 53–73.

Marine, S. B. (2011). Stonewall's legacy: Bisexual, gay, lesbian, and transgender students in higher education. [*ASHE Higher Education Report*, 37(4)]. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nestle, J. (1981). Butch-femme relationships: Sexual courage in the 1950s. *Heresies No. 12*, *3*(4), 21–24

Nugiel, N., Goldman, W., Covington, C., Williams, B., & Leder, S. (2014). *Faking it* [Television series]. Glendora, CA: MTV.

Parks, C. W. (2001). African American same-gender-loving youths and families in urban schools. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, *13*(3), 41–56.

Rawson, K. J., & Williams, C. (2014). Transgender∗: The rhetorical landscape of a term. *Present Tense: A Journal of Rhetoric in Society*, *3*(2). Retrieved from http://www.presenttensejournal.org/volume-3/transgender-the-rhetorical-landscape-of-a-term/.

Rifkin, M. (2011). *When did Indians become straight? Kinship, the history of sexuality, and native sovereignty*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sansalone, D. (2013, February 25). Organisation proposes replacing the "limiting" term LGBT with "more inclusive" GSD. *Pink News*. Retrieved from http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2013/02/25/organisation-proposes-replacing-the-limiting-term-lgbt-with-more-inclusive-gsd/.

Schwartz, A. B. C. (2003). *Gay voices in the Harlem Renaissance*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Sell, R. L. (1996). The Sell assessment of sexual orientation: Background and scoring. *Journal of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Identity*, *1*(4), 295–310.

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

Somerville, S. B. (2000). *Queering the color line: Race and the invention of homosexuality in American culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

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

Tompkins, A. (2014). Asterisk. *Transgender Studies Quarterly*, *1*(1–2), 26–27.

Troiden, R. R. (1979). Becoming homosexual: A model of gay identity acquisition. *Psychiatry*, *42*, 362–373.

Vidal-Ortiz, S. (2011). "Maricon," "Parjaro," and "Loca": Cuban and Puerto Rican linguistic practices, and sexual minority participation, in U.S. Santeria. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *58*(6–7), 901–918.

Wilson, A. (1996). How we find ourselves: Identity development in two-spirit people. *Harvard Educational Review*, *66*(2), 303–317.

Wolf, S. (2009). *Sexuality and socialism: History, politics, and theory of LGBT liberation*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

T.J. Jourian is a PhD candidate in higher education at Loyola University Chicago.