

**Article**

'Won't somebody please think of the gays!'  
Investigating the Experiences of LGBTQ+ Students in British Schools

**Author**

Naomi Hoodless, Department of Education

---

**Review 1**

**Reviewer:** Anonymous

**Institution:** University of Oxford

Does the title reflect the subject matter of the article?	Yes.
The article is clearly written	Strongly agree
The article is well structured	Strongly agree
The article makes a strong contribution to the discussion in its field	Strongly agree
The references are relevant and satisfactory	Strongly agree
The article appropriately uses figures, tables, and appendices	N/A
The contributor is confident about their evaluation	Strongly agree
The subject matter of the article is suitable for an interdisciplinary audience	Strongly agree
Recommendation	Accept - with slight alteration to the last para on page 3 which while I see what it means, is not entirely clear grammatically. Additionally the last sentence in that paragraph needs a citation.
Additional comments	n/a

Review 2

Reviewer: Prof Jonathan Glazzard

Institution: Edge Hill University

<b>Does the title reflect the subject matter of the article?</b>	Yes.
<b>The article is clearly written</b>	Agree. There are some errors with citations e.g. use of author initials in the text
<b>The article is well structured</b>	Disagree. The structure jumps about a bit . It could be clearer. For example I would start with historical context, then examine current context, then examine the school.
<b>The article makes a strong contribution to the discussion in its field</b>	Agree. Do not put references in the abstract. Check terminology e.g. why use transgender and not trans which is more inclusive? Naming Oxfordshire is a bit worrying- the trainees is an MFL trainee. It could be easy to identify the school or for the school to identify the trainees. There is no discussion of research methods. This is a case study. It used observations, interviews and document scrutiny but these methods are not clearly states. The section on current legislation do not address the Equality Act 2010.
<b>The references are relevant and satisfactory</b>	Agree. I would like to see more recent refs.
<b>The article appropriately uses figures, tables, and appendices</b>	N/A
<b>The contributor is confident about their evaluation</b>	Agree.
<b>The subject matter of the article is suitable for an interdisciplinary audience</b>	Disagree. This article is about the UK but comparisons could be made to other countries.
<b>Recommendation</b>	It is a good article but i have suggested improvements.
<b>Additional comments</b>	

### Review 3

**Reviewer:** Prof Richard Harris

**Institution:** University of Reading

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper, which I enjoyed reading. It is well written and addresses an important issues, as highlighted by the personal experience of the author.

The following comments are designed to help refine and improve the paper, so hope they are taken in the spirit of critical review.

P4 – RQs could be refined/clarified – it is not clear if the RQs are to be answered using the findings from the school or drawing on findings in the wider literature.

RQ1 do you want to include some of the more recent issues affecting the trans community, in particular the implications of the Bell vs Tavistock?

RQ2 is about lived experiences of LGBT youngsters but the participants in the study are adults in the school, so is the RQ is more about the adult perception of these young people, or is the RQ being answered using the wider literature?

RQ3 is this being answered from the wider literature?

Page 4-6 - I feel there should be reference to the Equalities Act of 2010 as this is a major piece of legislation affecting the LGBT community and schools are affected by this legislation  
In the discussion on pages 7-8 the following article might be useful:

Rawlings, V. (2019). 'It's not bullying', 'It's just a joke': teacher and student discursive manoeuvres around gendered violence. *British Educational Research Journal*, 45(4), 698-716.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3521>

Rawlings (and others) draw an important distinction between school culture and school climate which would be helpful in the article.

P10 – it might be worth noting there is a dispute in the literature about how schools are addressing the needs of LGBT youngsters.

For example the following papers present a positive experience:

Morris, M., McCormack, M., & Anderson, E. (2014). The changing experiences of bisexual male adolescents. *Gender and Education*, 26(4), 397-413.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2014.927834>

White, A. J., Magrath, R., & Thomas, B. (2018). The experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual students and staff at a Further Education college in South East England. *British Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 480-495. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3443>

It is not a view that is totally accepted but might be worth highlighting.

Recommendations could be more nuanced. Having a support group can be helpful but only for those who are openly out at school – for some it means having to be out and this can cause immense distress. The argument is that schools should focus on making the school a safe space rather than creating a safe space within the school for LGBT youngsters. There are also issues that schools could address around the use of gendered spaces such as toilets and changing rooms – these are problematic for trans students in particular, but can cause issues for LGB students in terms of bullying and other abuse.

Review 4

Reviewer: Anonymous

Institution: Leeds Beckett University

<p><b>Does the title reflect the subject matter of the article?</b></p>	<p>To some extent. In articles addressing sexuality and gender identity I would expect to see some discussion re: terminology and why the author has chosen to use the term LGBT (rather than, for example, LGBTQ+). In addition, I would expect justification for the adoption of the term transgender rather than trans, as use of the term transgender can exclude some with minority identities who do not associate with transgender (but do with trans).</p>
<p><b>The article is clearly written</b></p>	<p>Disagree. The article is accessible but needs to be framed with explicit reference to and critique of terminology (see above).</p>
<p><b>The article is well structured</b></p>	<p>Agree. The article explores the interplay between policy and legislation in a way that is coherent and logical.</p>
<p><b>The article makes a strong contribution to the discussion in its field</b></p>	<p>Agree. There must be critique of terminology as well as assumptions, generalisability and representation in relation to identity and sexuality.</p>
<p><b>The references are relevant and satisfactory</b></p>	<p>Agree. Accurate and presented consistently.</p>
<p><b>The article appropriately uses figures, tables, and appendices</b></p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>The contributor is confident about their evaluation</b></p>	<p>Disagree. A thorough evaluation must address the critiques highlighted previously.</p>
<p><b>The subject matter of the article is suitable for an interdisciplinary audience</b></p>	<p>Disagree. This focuses on sexuality and gender identity and is not interdisciplinary.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>Publication upon receipt of an introductory paragraph setting out the author's approach to representation of identity and sexuality (and the terms used within)</p>
<p><b>Additional comments</b></p>	<p>This article outlines the context of inclusion within schools in relation to sexuality and gender identity. When using acronyms (e.g. LGBT), it would be helpful to justify as well as critique the use of these in relation to whether communities can be represented and whether the author's experiences provide insight that is transferable or representative of the community.</p>