

Understanding Challenges and Strategies to Assist Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex+ (LGBTQI+) Workers in Latin America



Literature Scan

August 14, 2023

Prepared for:

Lauren Damme
Chief Evaluation Office, U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20210

Prepared by:

Robert Bartolotta, Ph.D. and Candice Amory, M.Ed.
The Manhattan Strategy Group LLC
4340 East-West Hwy Suite 1100
Bethesda, MD 20814



This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), Chief Evaluation Office (CEO), by Robert Bartolotta, Ph.D. and Candice Amory, M.Ed. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to DOL, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement of same by the U.S. Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Approach	1
Findings	2
Discrimination	3
Education	5
Employment	6
Promising Practices	8
Discrimination	8
Education	8
Employment	9
Conclusion.....	10
References	11

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) Chief Evaluation Office (CEO), in partnership with DOL’s Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), is interested in the fundamental labor rights,¹ working conditions, and access to employment for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI+) individuals in Latin America. In support of this interest, the CEO and ILAB directed The Manhattan Strategy Group LLC (MSG) to produce a literature scan summarizing the available information regarding (a) the data that exists about the size of the LGBTQI+ population in Latin American countries, as well as the prevalence and nature of labor and education-related² rights violations faced by the LGBTQI+ population in Latin America; (b) recent (2012–2022) program evaluations³ of LGBTQI+-focused programs related to employment or education outcomes in Latin America;⁴ and (c) evidence-based strategies to address discrimination and support labor-related outcomes among LGBTQI+ populations, including youth.⁵

APPROACH

We used Google Scholar and Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO)⁶ to identify relevant research in English, Spanish, and Brazilian Portuguese. Additional databases, such as JSTOR and EBSCO, were then used to access relevant research articles. Research and interventions developed by groups, such as the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and the International Labour Organization, as well as prominent LGBTQI+ and human rights advocacy and nonprofit groups, were also reviewed. When searching these resources, we used search strings comprised of word combinations of “rights,” “LGBT,” “economic,” “Latin,” “work,” “evaluation,” “labor,” “education,” and “school.” These initial terms were decided in collaboration with CEO and ILAB. Over the course of the research, we then identified and used cross-culturally aligned synonyms for these concepts to further the literature scan, with additional search terms to accommodate cross-cultural differences found in the terminology used for these concepts based on the initial research findings. The date parameter for the literature scan was January 2012 through December 2022.

¹ The *ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work*, adopted in 1998 and amended in 2022, describes the commitment of governments, employers, and worker organizations to uphold basic human values to support social and economic opportunity (<https://www.ilo.org/declaration/lang-en/index.htm>).

² For this engagement, interest in education-related rights violations refers to the rights of LGBTQI+ youth to complete their primary and secondary education.

³ Studies should include evaluations conducted by independent third parties that assess program implementation, performance, outcomes, or impact.

⁴ Defined as Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guiana, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela, Cuba, Dominican Republic, and Haiti.

⁵ Ages 14–24.

⁶ SciELO provides access to full-text articles covering selected scientific journals and proceedings collections from Latin America, South Africa, and other developing countries. This publication or database and the information in it is protected by copyright.

This approach may exclude seminal work in the body of English, Spanish, and Portuguese research literature since searches for material before 2012 were not a focus of the literature scan. Additionally, the original goals of the research, which were broad and not research question-driven, led to a vast range of research areas covered but not enough depth.

This report first describes general findings about the available research and international funding of LGBTQI+ education and employment broadly, and specifically in Latin America. We then describe research focusing on LGBTQI+ discrimination, education, and employment in Latin America, and follow this with promising practices to improve conditions within these three domains identified from the literature.

FINDINGS

We identified two limitations to research on LGBTQI+ topics in Latin America during the development of this literature scan. First, national surveys in Latin America rarely directly ask if a respondent is LGBTQI+ (Bustelo et al., 2020). According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2019), most population-based surveys indirectly identify the LGBTQI+ population through the sex of the respondent’s partner. This approach focuses on individuals living with a same-sex partner, a group not representative of the LGBTQI+ population due to it excluding members of this population who live alone, or whose other household members are not their partners. According to Bustelo et al. (2020), only 15 OECD countries⁷ include a question on sexual self-identification in at least one of their nationally representative surveys conducted by national statistical offices or other public institutions. Chile and Mexico are the only countries in Latin America that ask such questions in their censuses. They each report that 2%⁸ of their populations identified as LGBTQI+ in 2017 (Bustelo et al., 2020).

The second limitation is the limited international investment in LGBTQI+ employment and education action and the impact on funded research in these areas. Per the *2017–2018 Global Resources Report – Government and Philanthropic Support for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex Communities* (Global Philanthropy Project, 2020), less than 1% of international funds were dedicated to labor/employment issues for the LGBTQI+ population. The report also showed a similar percentage of funds used for education issues. Latin American and Caribbean countries received a total of \$37,984,919 in international support, per the report, with \$55,955 of this funding for labor/employment support and \$32,575 for education. The 2019–2020 edition of the report, which provides updated dollar amounts for 2017–2018, showed similar percentages (less than 1% in both years), though the dollar amount was higher for labor/employment (\$130,681). Education funding was not reported in 2019–2020, though the report does note that \$245,791 was provided for “safe schools,” a separate category from education (Global Philanthropy Project, 2022). Again, this may indicate low investment in these

⁷ These countries are Australia, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

⁸ Throughout the literature scan the authors consistently round all numbers reported to the nearest whole number.

areas by government and philanthropic organizations. U.S. investment is not reported in either report.

We identified several U.S. and internationally sponsored calls for greater research concerning discrimination, including discrimination in the education and employment domains, and human rights for LGBTQI+ populations around the world. For example, USAID, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Global Affairs Canada, the Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice, Equality Without Borders, the Williams Institute, and Franklin & Marshall College are working collaboratively through a public-private partnership called the [Multi-Donor LGBTI+ Global Human Rights Initiative](#) to leverage financial and technical capacities from multiple partners (USAID, 2022a). The World Bank (Koehler & Menzies, 2017) noted a need for quantitative data to improve the welfare of LGBTQI+ people, as this lack of data makes it difficult to know whether LGBTQI+-focused policies and programs are working. And the Inter-American Development Bank (Bustelo et al., 2020) further describes a substantial lack of information about LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin America, the challenges they face, and effective inclusionary practices.

Most of the studies and research found present descriptive findings concerning discrimination against LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin America, as well as discrimination specifically in the education and employment domains. These studies are often descriptive, which limits their ability to support causal claims. Still, the findings indicate a potential relationship between the educational and economic development conditions in Latin America and the level of discrimination experienced by LGBTQI+ individuals in the region.

Discrimination

LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin America experience various types of discrimination, including religious discrimination, workplace discrimination, school victimization, sexual identity expression, disadvantages in the presence of authorities, institutional exclusion, and denial of rights (Navarro et al., 2019; Luiggi-Hernández et al., 2015; Waaldijk, 2021). Findings indicate that LGBTQI+ discrimination appears in the forms of hate crimes, sexual harassment, physical violence, and verbal harassment (Luiggi-Hernández et al., 2015; Waaldijk, 2021). In an online survey of in-person and social media-recruited self-identified LGBTQI+ individuals (n=4,867) in Colombia, 25% of respondents reported being fired or denied a job in their lifetime (Choi et al., 2020). Additional surveys identify religiosity as a major factor in LGBTQI+ discrimination (Henry et al., 2021; Corrales & Sagarzazu, 2022), and Corrales (2015) commented that conservatism, legality, and politics are further factors limiting forms of educational and workplace training and support available to LGBTQI+ individuals, attributing this to the religious revival⁹ that occurred in Latin America in the 2000s and 2010s.

Chaux and Leon (2016) used regression models to analyze a survey of 29,962 eighth- and ninth-grade students in Chile, Columbia, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico, and Paraguay¹⁰

⁹ Corrales (2015) describes this religious revival as what the region is experiencing “with many Catholics either becoming fundamentalist Christians or turning toward more conservative wings of Catholicism” (p. 54).

¹⁰ Chile (N = 5,192); Columbia (N = 6,204); the Dominican Republic (N = 4,589); Guatemala (N = 4,002); Mexico (N = 6,576); and Paraguay (N = 3,999).

to gauge homophobic attitudes amongst the countries. The findings showed that male and non-Catholic Christian students were more likely to agree with homophobic statements than females, Catholics, nonreligious, or members of other religions. Survey responses that agreed with homophobic statements were scored higher, while survey responses that disagreed with homophobic statements were scored lower. As such, students from Guatemala and the Dominican Republic scored the highest with homophobic attitudes. They also had “the lowest levels of educational achievement and the lowest levels (with Paraguay) of gross domestic product per capita of urbanization among the six countries” (p. 1270). Findings also showed that students in Chile and Mexico scored the lowest with homophobic attitudes and had the “greatest level of urbanization, the best educational achievements results, and the greatest gross domestic product per capita among the six countries” (p. 1270). Findings showed that the variance of homophobic attitudes factor was “statistically significant for each country” (p. 1261). The contrast between homophobic attitudes demonstrates the influence of religion and economic development on attitudes toward LGBTQI+ individuals. Badgett et al. (2019) explored this dynamic further, which will be reviewed next.

Badgett et al. (2019) conducted a study on the relationship between LGBTQI+ inclusion and economic development with the Global Index on Legal Recognition of Homosexual Orientation using a dataset sampling 132 countries. The study included an empirical data analysis using the regression approach and found that LGBTQI+ discrimination associated with a lower gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in Latin American countries. Findings showed that the association between LGBTQI+ discrimination, as represented by the [Global Index on Legal Recognition of Homosexual Orientation](#), and GDP per capita were closely associated, with each additional point on the 8-point scale associated with an increase of approximately \$2,000 in GDP.

Badgett et al.’s (2019) review of the literature noted a growing body of research that describes associations between LGBTQI+ discrimination experiences with violence, employment discrimination, health disparities, and educational exclusion. Badgett et al. remarked that LGBTQI+ students who were discriminated against were more likely to be pressured to drop out or be denied school admission.

Countries have the power to utilize state administrative capacity to implement policy that guarantees the rights of the LGBTQI+ population, and Rave Restrepo (2020) explored this relationship in Colombia. Rave Restrepo examined the public policy administrative capacity of 12 capital cities and 11 departmental governorships (i.e., states) in Colombia to guarantee those rights. He found that the cities evaluated in this study have a higher capacity to implement such policies when compared with departments (the equivalent of U.S. states). An earlier study in 2019, the USAID-funded Colombia gender analysis and assessment, shed light on the situation of the LGBTQI+ population and underlying community conditions (Schreuel et al., 2019). Based on interviews with Arco Iris and Colombia Diversa conducted in March 2019, the authors described high levels of poverty, unemployment, and high violence rates among the LGBTQI+ population despite discrimination being underreported. The report recommended support to local organizations to integrate gender equality into local development plans. It also recommended the adoption of separate channels to report and respond to violence against the LGBTQI+

population, as well as a 2-year pilot of specialized judges and prosecutors to investigate, process, and judge cases related to gender-based violence.

Corrales (2015) noted that literature indicates that countries and localities are inclined to be more tolerant toward LGBTQI+ rights if income levels are higher, and that individuals are more tolerant if they live in urban areas and have higher levels of education. Findings support that LGBTQI+ human rights are correlated with economic development and a more inclusive and productive economy for LGBTQI+ individuals (Badgett et al., 2019; Chaux & Leon, 2016).

Education

The research on LGBTQI+ students in Latin America has shown that students identifying as LGBTQI+ have negative experiences within school, including experiencing a lack of school safety via harassment and assault, anti-LGBTQI+ remarks, and a lack of supportive school staff (Kosciw & Zongrone, 2019; Carrara et al., 2016; Valderrábano et al., 2021; Badgett et al., 2019).

The study by Kosciw and Zongrone (2019) analyzed national surveys on LGBTQI+ students in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay, which were based on the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network's (GLSEN) *National School Climate Survey*. The sample size of the study was 5,318 students between the ages of 13 and 20 who had attended a secondary school during the 2015 or 2016 academic year and who self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, a sexual orientation other than heterosexual, transgender, or a gender other than cisgender. The findings demonstrated that LGBTQI+ students experienced a range of harassment and marginalization at school. For example, students felt unsafe expressing their gender and gender identity, reported hearing homophobic remarks (58%–79%), and reported verbal and physical harassment (shoved or pushed) (22%–43%) and/or physical assault (being punched, kicked, or injured with a weapon) (9%–17%). As a result, students who experienced higher levels of victimization were more likely to miss school in the past month and reported a lower sense of school belonging, lower self-esteem, and higher levels of depression.

A second national survey on violence based on sexual orientation in Mexico showed that more than half (55%) of the 1,700 students surveyed reported having felt unsafe at school due to their sexual orientation (Baruch et al., 2017).¹¹ Two-thirds of the 912 participants reported experiencing bullying during their school years (Baruch et al., 2016).

The participants of the second national survey were 13 to 20 years old and were required to study in secondary school or high school in Mexico during the 2015–2016 school year and identify as LGBTQI+. For the second national survey, at least 32% of the self-identified LGBTQI+ participants indicated having missed a class due to feeling unsafe at school. Over 20% of the LGBTQI+ students reported physical intimidation regularly or frequently, while most never reported the episodes to school officials. The analysis showed that students who reported a higher frequency of bullying missed more school days, reported lower self-esteem, and had higher rates of depression (Baruch et al., 2017).

The investigation by Cornejo (2014) on homophobic bullying in Chilean schools utilized primary and secondary research from complaints of discrimination registered by the Ministry of

¹¹ The first national survey was conducted in 2012 and surveyed individuals identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender.

Education of Chile (between 2009 to 2013), interviews with school staff and students, and press reports from 2000 to current day. The findings showed a decline over time in physical violence due to students' sexual orientation, especially in larger cities. The author speculated that these changes followed violence prevention campaigns and new laws in Chile, [Law 20.536](#) and [Law 20.609](#), respectively passed in 2011 and 2012, that targeted school-based violence and discrimination in various forms, including sexual orientation, identity, and gender expression.

Studies also frequently show that some teachers do not know how to respond to reported incidents, which results in inaction and a lack of student support (Carrara et al., 2016; Kosciw & Zongrone, 2019). A Brazilian initiative ([Diversity in School](#)) offered an e-learning course to equip teachers and school administrators with knowledge of sexism, racism, homophobia in the school environment, sexual orientation, and gender identity (Carrara et al., 2016). An evaluation of the curriculum was conducted between 2012 and 2014 with teachers who had participated in the course between 2008 and 2011. Eighteen focus groups were conducted with 189 public school teachers, and an additional 749 teachers participated in an online survey. Qualitative data described the teachers positively reacting to the curriculum and experiencing changes on a personal and professional level (Carrara et al., 2016). Quantitative data from the survey was not provided.

LGBTQI+ rights in Brazil have been evolving since the creation of the Constitution of Brazil of 1988 and the 2011 Supreme Federal Court decision in favor of granting same-sex couples the same legal rights as married heterosexual couples (Caulfeld, 2011). The evaluation by Horst (2016) on the Brazilian federal government's launched initiative "Brazil without Homophobia" assessed the effects of the initiative on Brazil's LGBTQI+ population. The initiative's goals were to strengthen state capacity to improve gay rights, build professional capacity building for individuals working in defense of human rights, disseminate information about rights and gay self-esteem, and incentivize complaints for rights violations. It created 15 national centers providing legal support and psychological and social services and an additional 30 centers across state capitals in Brazil (Horst, 2016). In addition, the initiative included efforts to promote nondiscrimination in education and at work, including professional training for educators and students (Figueiredo Lazáro et al., 2004).

Semi-structured interviews focusing on the implementation of the initiative in Pernambuco, a state in Brazil with a high incidence of violence against the LGBTQI+ population, described the local center serving many people despite challenges such as limited funding and staffing (Feitosa, 2019). In addition, the capacity-building efforts faced resistance among key training recipients. Feitosa anecdotally described the negative reaction from police officers receiving the training, and Vianna (2015) similarly highlighted the resistance of schoolteachers to the training received in Sao Paulo. Vianna also described how opposition from religious groups led to vetoing the use of the [School without Homophobia](#) toolkit with school communities across Brazil.

Employment

The quality of an individual's educational experience often influences their job resources (income, job autonomy, and job variety) (Solomon et al., 2022). Unfortunately, the research on the employment of LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin America is limited. Despite this, available

research does show a positive relationship between legal protections and inclusive policies and positive economic outcomes for LGBTQI+ individuals in select Latin American countries. For example, as introduced earlier, Badgett et al. (2019) found a positive association between the expansion of human rights for LGBTQI+ individuals and overall economic development, with greater access to rights and more access to higher wages found in countries with greater legal acceptance. According to Bagdett et al. (2019), examples of this in Latin America included Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay.

A second study, using census information on heads of household and their partners in Chile and Uruguay, showed that gay men in these two countries were 5% less likely to participate in the workforce than married, heterosexual men. At the same time, lesbians were 33% more likely to participate in the labor force than married, heterosexual women (Brown et al., 2019).

A third study in Colombia, using a sample of 4,875 LGBTQI+ individuals recruited for an online survey using social media, showed that 25% of the respondents reported being fired or denied a job in their lifetime (Choi et al., 2020). Seventy-six percent of the respondents were between 18 and 29 years of age, with the remainder being 30 or older. Twenty percent of the lesbian, gay, and bisexual respondents also reported verbal abuse from the police or state officials, with 11% reporting physical abuse. Transgender respondents reported higher abuse from police or state officials, with 29% reporting verbal abuse and 24% reporting physical abuse. The study posited that there was a statistical significance of transgender respondents that were verbally and physically abused by police.

U.S. and European-focused research shows that anti-discriminatory laws focused on sexual orientation and gender identity enhance innovation and contribute to employer performance. For example, Hossain et al. (2020), using data from the Human Rights Campaign Foundation's (HRC Foundation) Corporate Equality Index of 398 U.S. firms between 2011 and 2014, showed a positive relationship between the Corporate Equality Index and firm innovation (e.g., patents, trademarks, copyrights, research and development, research and development per sales) at the 10% or better level of significance. The HRC Foundation's Corporate Equality Index program has expanded to Argentina (2022), Brazil (2022), Chile (2021), and Mexico (2016) (HRC Foundation, 2023), allowing the opportunity for study replication to occur in these countries.

Rivero-Díaz et al. (2021) adapted and validated the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Climate Inventory to evaluate the workplace climate for support and/or hostility toward 587 LGBTQI+ workers in Spain. The researchers, citing several instruments, validated it against several previously assessed scales, including the Job Insecurity Scale (Pienaar et al., 2013; validated version in Spanish: Llosa et al., 2017), the Person-Organization Fit scale (Saks & Ashforth, 1997; translated ad hoc for this study with the blind back-translation procedure), the Person-Job Fit scale (Saks & Ashforth, 1997; translated ad hoc for this study with the blind back-translation procedure), the Turnover Intention scale (Wayne et al., 1997; Spanish version: S'anchez-Vidal et al., 2011), the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985; validated Spanish version: Atienza et al., 2000), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire-Short Form (Weiss et al., 1977; Spanish version: Short Form 3), to develop a methodologically acceptable version of the instrument for use in Spain. Though Rivero-Díaz et al. (2021) did not conduct this study in Latin America, it could be replicated there after further adaptation and validation for use in additional Spanish-speaking countries or Brazil.

Though several instruments and research methods described have been successfully used in Latin America, it is important to recognize that there may be additional challenges to their use. First, each Latin American country possesses its own unique culture and linguistic nuance. Translation of an instrument into Spanish, or Brazilian Portuguese, is a good first step, though translation into additional languages, such as Quechua and Guarani, may also be necessary to reach additional subpopulations. The instruments should also be validated within each country to ensure that items adequately address the linguistic and cultural differences within each individual country. The use of online survey tools also may not adequately reach a representative sample of LGBTQI+ individuals within a country. Use of such tools requires access to a web-enabled tool, such as a cellphone or computer, and sufficient independent literacy skills to complete a survey.

PROMISING PRACTICES

As indicated earlier, research, particularly research leading to quantitative findings concerning effective LGBTQI+-focused interventions in Latin America, is limited (Koehler & Menzies, 2017). For this reason, it is best to describe most strategies available to improve the educational and employment outcomes of LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin America as “promising” rather than evidence-based at this time.

Discrimination

NORC at the University of Chicago (2018) used document reviews, key informant interviews with participants at all levels (donor, implementing partner, grantee organization/civil society organization partner, and end beneficiaries), and the identification of beneficiary impact stories to help understand the effectiveness of the LGBTQI+ Global Development Partnership and its impact on beneficiaries during its qualitative evaluation of the initiative. NORC reported that sponsored training (i.e., media/communication/technology trainings, democratic participation trainings) strengthened the capacities and abilities of LGBTQI+ people and organizations to advocate for their own human rights and improve their lives. Examples of reported successes include six openly LGBTQI+ leaders being elected in Colombia in 2015, with three of them previously receiving training through the Global Development Partnership, and another receiving support through their campaign and subsequent training for elected officials.

Education

We identified few evidence-based strategies tested in Latin America focusing on LGBTQI+ youth. USAID (2022b) has developed a series of best practices for LGBTQI+ inclusion in education that focus on promoting the concepts of diversity, inclusion, and respect; addressing school-based violence and harassment; teaching preferred and inclusionary terminology; promoting anti-discrimination laws or policies in the curriculum; and providing inclusion-focused professional development for teachers. The Brazilian initiative, [Diversity in School](#), aligns with these practices and demonstrated strategies to provide teachers and school administrators with an opportunity to become informed on inclusivity, gender, and sexuality (Carrara et al., 2016).

Diversity in School is an e-learning course that equips teachers and school administrators with awareness of sexism, racism, homophobia in the school environment, sexual orientation, and

gender identity (Carrara et al., 2016). The course includes 200 hours of in-person and e-learning activities, and by 2016 the course was offered at 38 universities in Brazil. Teacher feedback described the course as promoting positive changes due to teachers providing gender-neutral classroom activities, relinquishing sexist ideals regarding household responsibilities, and demonstrating awareness of biases. Additionally, there were reports of students and administrations organizing to support causes surrounding gender identity and sexual orientation after completing the Diversity in School course (Carrara et al., 2016). Based on this initiative, similar courses could be useful in influencing school culture by creating a more inclusive and equitable environment that contributes to the safety and support of all LGBTQI+ students and staff.

Employment

During this literature scan, we did not identify evidence-based strategies to reduce discrimination against LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin American workplaces, though promising practices were found. As previously described by Badgett et al. (2019), evidence shows parallels, though not a causal link, between economic development and the expansion of human rights for LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin America. This expansion is occurring, with Farrell (2021) of the Wilson Center noting that three Latin American countries—Bolivia, Cuba, and Ecuador—prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in their constitutions. The *State-Sponsored Homophobia 2020: Global Legislation Overview Update* (Ramón Mendos et al., 2020) also reported that as of 2020, 11 Latin American countries have approved broad protections against discrimination based on sexual orientation, including Brazil, Colombia, Honduras, and Mexico. The International Labour Organization (2022), in its *Inclusion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex and Queer (LGBTIQ+) Persons in the World of Work: A Learning Guide*, provided additional policy recommendations, such as national policy and labor law reviews, consultation and partnership with LGBTQI+ employer and worker organizations, and dedicated employer diversity initiatives.

The [Multi-Donor LGBTQI+ Global Human Rights Initiative](#), of which USAID is a partner, is an ongoing initiative to provide technical assistance to promote entrepreneurship and small and medium-sized enterprise growth in developing countries and regions, including Latin America (USAID, 2022a). According to a study conducted by NORC at the University of Chicago (2018), the initiative promotes economic development by providing LGBTQI+ individuals with enhanced networks, skills, and resources to advance economically despite societal discrimination. An example of this in Colombia and Mexico is “[Talento Diverso](#),” an initiative by the National LGBT Chamber of Commerce in those countries designed to combat labor market discrimination, build employment skills, and develop a database of LGBTQI+ workers to use as a hiring pool (Burns, 2020). The LGBT Chamber of Commerce in Colombia also developed a “Friendly Biz” certification program to provide training to employers interested in improving their inclusivity. Additionally, NORC described political leaders in the Dominican Republic as in conversation with their local LGBT Chamber of Commerce to identify ways to improve social and economic empowerment within their intersex community.

A U.S.-based study by Steiger and Henry (2020) hypothesized that companies are recognized and awarded for protected-class diversity policies. This study further postulated that companies

that have a greater percentage of women and racial/ethnic minorities on their boards of directors would have more progressive LGBTQI+ policies. Using a sample of 360 Fortune 500 companies, the authors examined protected-class diversity awards and the percentage of women and racial/ethnic minorities on boards of directors as predictors of LGBTQI+-related policies. They found that protected-class diversity awards and the percentage of women on company boards of directors were associated with progressive LGBTQI+ policies. Based on this finding, a focus on the gender and ethnic diversity of boards of directors by Latin American employers may contribute to more inclusive and supportive LGBTQI+ employment policies.

CONCLUSION

During the course of this literature scan, we determined that there is currently limited research and evaluation in the area of LGBTQI+ discrimination in Latin America, particularly in the areas of education and employment. The available research shows that discrimination against LGBTQI+ individuals in Latin America has been associated with economic development, though it is important to be clear that a causal relationship has not been established. Interventions, including the development of LGBTQI+-inclusive curricula and federal and employer policies, are promising and may indicate opportunities for capacity building technical assistance while greater capacity for research is being developed.

REFERENCES

- Badgett, M. V. L., Waaldijk, K., & van der Meulen Rodgers, Y. (2019). The relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development: Macro-level evidence. *World Development*, 120, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.03.011>
- Baruch-Dominguez, R., Infante-Xibille, C., & Saloma-Zuñiga, C. E. (2016). Homophobic bullying in Mexico: Results of a national survey. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 13(1–2), 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2015.1099498>
- Baruch, R., Pérez, R., Valencia, J., & Rojas, R. (2017). *Segunda encuesta nacional sobre violencia escolar basada en la orientación sexual, identidad y expresión de género hacia estudiantes LGBTQ en México*. Fundación Arcoiris-El Closet de Sor Juana-Inspira-COJESS-Espolea.
- Brown, C., Contreras, D., & Schmidt, L. (2019). Sexual orientation and labor force participation: Findings from Chile and Uruguay. *Feminist Economics*, 25(2), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2018.1554905>
- Burns, K. (2020). *Best practices guide on economic empowerment for LGBTI communities*. COC Netherlands. https://international.coc.nl/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Best-Practices-Guide_English_201020final.pdf
- Bustelo, M., Frisancho, V., & Viollaz, M. (2020). *Información confiable como herramienta para cerrar las brechas de diversidad*. <https://doi.org/10.18235/0002806>
- Carrara, S., Nascimento, M., Duque, A., & Tramontano, L. (2016). Diversity in school: A Brazilian educational policy against homophobia. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 13(1–2), 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2016.1160269>
- Caulfeld, S. (2011). The recent supreme court ruling on same-sex unions in Brazil: A historical perspective. *International Institute Journal*, 1(1). <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/p/pod/dod-idx/recent-supreme-court-ruling-on-same-sex-unions-in-brazil.pdf?c=ijj;idno=11645653.0001.103;format=pdf>
- Chaux, E., & León, M. (2016). Homophobic attitudes and associated factors among adolescents: A comparison of six Latin American countries. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 63(9), 1253–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1151697>
- Choi, S., Divsalar, S., Flórez-Donado, J., Kittle, K., Lin, A., Meyer, I. H., & Torres-Salazar, P. (2020). *Stress, health, and well-being of LGBT people in Colombia: Results from a national survey*. UCLA: The Williams Institute. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9tr2s9hs>
- Cornejo, J. (2014). Bullying homofóbico en Chile: Trayectoria histórica. Límite. *Revista Interdisciplinaria de Filosofía y Psicología*, 9(30), 61–70. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/836/83642583007.pdf>
- Corrales, J. (2015). The politics of LGBT rights in Latin America and the Caribbean: Research agendas. *Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y Del Caribe. European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 100, 53. <https://doi.org/10.18352/erlacs.10126>

- Corrales, J., & Sagarzazu, I. (2022). Not all ‘sins’ are rejected equally: Resistance to lgbt rights across religions in Colombia. *Politics and Religion Journal*, 13(2), 351–377. <https://doi.org/10.54561/prj1302351c>
- Farrell, G. (2021, June 25). The state of lgbtq+ rights in Latin America. *Weekly Asado*. Wilson Center. <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/state-lgbtq-rights-latin-america-0>
- Feitosa, C. (2019). Políticas públicas LGBT no Brasil: um estudo sobre o Centro Estadual de Combate à Homofobia de Pernambuco. *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad: Revista Latinoamericana*, (32), 90–118. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-6487.sess.2019.32.06.a>
- Figueiredo Lazáro, A. L., Silva, C. N., dos Santos, I. A. A., da Saúde, B. M., & Conselho Nacional de Combate à Discriminação (Brazil). (2004). *Brasil sem homofobia: programa de combate à violência e à discriminação contra GLTB e de promoção da cidadania homossexual*. <https://books.google.com/books?id=8wVHAAAAYAAJ>
- Global Philanthropy Project. (2020). *Funding for international lgbti issues. 2017-2018 global resources report – government and philanthropic support for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex communities*. https://globalresourcesreport.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/InternationalFunding_GRR_2017-2018_Color-4.pdf
- Global Philanthropy Project. (2022). *Global resources report government and philanthropic support for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex communities*. https://globalresourcesreport.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/GRR_2019-2020_EN_colour_double-page.pdf
- Henry, R. S., Hoetger, C., Rabinovitch, A. E., Aguayo Arelis, A., Rabago Barajas, B. V., & Perrin, P. B. (2021). Discrimination, mental health, and suicidal ideation among sexual minority adults in Latin America: Considering the roles of social support and religiosity. *Trauma Care*, 1(3), 143–161. <https://doi.org/10.3390/traumacare1030013>
- Horst, C. H. M. (2016). Avaliando o programa brasil sem homofobia. *Anais of the 4th International Meeting and 11th National Meeting on Social Policy*, 1(1). <https://periodicos.ufes.br/einps/article/view/12858>
- Hossain, M., Atif, M., Ahmed, A., & Mia, L. (2020). Do LGBT workplace diversity policies create value for firms? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167(4), 775–791. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04158-z>
- Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2023) *HRC Equidad MX: Global workplace quality program*. Retrieved March 3, 2023, from <https://www.hrc.org/resources/hrc-equidad-mx-global-workplace-equality-program>
- Ramón Mendos, L., Botha, K., Carrano Lelis, R., López de la Peña, E., Savelev, I., & Daron Tan, D. (2020). *State-sponsored homophobia 2020: Global legislation overview update*. ILGA World. https://ilga.org/downloads/ILGA_World_State_Sponsored_Homophobia_report_global_1_egislation_overview_update_December_2020.pdf
- International Labour Organization. (2022). *Inclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and queer (LGBTIQ+) persons in the world of work: A learning guide*.

- International Labour Organization. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---gender/documents/publication/wcms_846108.pdf
- Koehler, D., & Menzies, N. (2017). *Surveys, big data, and experiments: How can we best learn about LGBTI development outcomes?* Policy Research Working Paper No. 8154. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/27963/WPS8154.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Kosciw, J. G., & Zongrone, A. D. (2019). *A global school climate crisis: Insights on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender & queer students in Latin America*. GLSEN Research Institute. https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/Global-School-Climate-Crisis-Latin-America-English-2019_0.pdf
- Luiggi-Hernández, J. G., Torres, G. E. L., Domínguez, J. G., Sánchez, G. M. C., Meléndez, M. P., Medina, D. M. C., & Rentas, C. D. G. (2015). Outing the discrimination towards LGBT people during the hiring process: What about their well-being? *Revista Puertorriqueña de Psicología*, 26(2), 194–213. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2016-04263-004>
- Navarro, M. C., Barrientos, J., Gómez, F., & Bahamondes, J. (2019). Tolerance of homosexuality in south American countries: A multilevel analysis of related individual and sociocultural factors. *International Journal of Sexual Health: Official Journal of the World Association for Sexual Health*, 31(3), 257–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2019.1625843>
- NORC at the University of Chicago. (2018). *Evaluation lgbt global development partnership*. United States Agency for International Development. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00T7TW.pdf
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Society at a glance 2019 OECD social indicators*. <https://www.oecd.org/social/society-at-a-glance-19991290.htm>
- Rave Restrepo, J. C. (2020). Índice de capacidad administrativa de política pública. Un análisis de políticas LGBT en Colombia. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 65(239). <https://doi.org/10.22201/fcpys.2448492xe.2020.239.67249>
- Rivero-Díaz, M. L., Agulló-Tomás, E., & Llosa, J. A. (2021). Adaptation and validation of the LGBTCI to the Spanish LGBT working population. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 29(3), 422–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072720982339>
- Schreuel, I., Rodriguez, E.M., Gomez, E., & Kolundzija, A. (2019). *USAID/Colombia gender analysis and assessment final report*. United States Agency for International Development. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00TPD8.pdf
- Solomon, B. C., Nikolaev, B. N., & Shepherd, D. A. (2022). Does educational attainment promote job satisfaction? The bittersweet trade-offs between job resources, demands, and stress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(7), 1227–1241. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000904>

- Steiger, R. L., & Henry, P. J. (2020). LGBT workplace protections as an extension of the protected class framework. *Law and Human Behavior*, 44(4), 251–265.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000418>
- U.S. Agency for International Development. (2022a). *The multi-donor lgbt global human rights initiative*. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/Final_Multi_Donor_LGBTI_Global_Human_Rights_Initiative_Overview_PARTNER_LOGOS.pdf
- U.S. Agency for International Development. (2022b). *Integrating lgbtqi+ considerations into education programming*. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/External_Draft_Integrating_LGBTQI_Considerations_In_Education_Programming_210601-508.pdf
- Valderrábano, J. H., Thomas, C., & Freeman, C. (2021). A path is emerging: Steps towards an LGBT+ inclusive education for Mexican students. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 29(147). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.29.6157>
- Vianna, C. P. (2015). O movimento LGBT e as políticas de educação de gênero e diversidade sexual: perdas, ganhos e desafios. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 41(3), 791–806.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/s1517-97022015031914>
- Waldijk, K. (2021). The strong global trend of prohibiting employment discrimination based on sexual orientation. *Tijdschrift voor genderstudies*, 24(3/4), 388–400.
<https://doi.org/10.5117/tvgn.2021.3/4.011.waal>