

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18764/2178-2229v33n2e27259>

Knowledge and silences: students' perceptions of sexual diversity and LGBTphobia in school

Gustavo Ferreira dos Santos

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8311-8212>

Vivianne Oliveira Gomes

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8291-8867>

Abstract: This article examines high school students' perceptions of sexual diversity and LGBTphobia within the school environment. Grounded in Foucauldian discourse analysis, the research was conducted in 2020 with 15 students from two full-time public schools in Jataí, Goiás. Online questionnaires were used to collect data. The study was developed at a time when Brazilian educational policies were experiencing significant setbacks, primarily the removal of the terms "gender" and "sexual orientation" from the National Common Curricular Base (BNCC) in 2018. The study addresses a context in which homophobia violence in schools remains structural and persistent. The results, organized into four thematic categories, revealed the following: Topics related to sexual diversity are primarily addressed in biology classes with a biologicistic focus. There is a gap in the formal curriculum regarding sex education and gender identity. This leads students to seek information through alternative means. The accounts present diverse perceptions about the acceptance of sexual diversity in schools. There are differences in how homophobia is recognized and addressed. All participants acknowledged the existence of homophobia in the school environment. They suggested possible strategies to confront it. These findings underscore the urgent necessity of educational policies that comprehensively and contextually address sexual and gender diversity issues, committed to overcoming institutionalized silencing and fostering a genuinely inclusive school environment.

Keywords: sexual diversity; LGBTphobia; school environment; sexual education; inclusion.

1 Introduction

Discrimination and prejudice against LGBTQIA+ people (Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, Transgender/Transsexuals, Queer, Intersex, Asexual individuals, and more) persist as significant problems in current Brazilian society, manifesting themselves with particular intensity in the school environment. As Campos and Urnau (2021) point out, homophobia¹ is a recurring phenomenon in educational institutions, mainly affecting students who do not conform to the dominant heteronormativity. In addition to homophobia, other specific forms of discrimination need to be recognized and

¹ In this article, "LGBTphobia" is adopted as a more encompassing term to designate discrimination directed at the LGBTQIA+ population. The term "homophobia" is retained when referring to direct quotations from students or theoretical references that originally use it.



Esta licença permite que outros distribuam, remixem, adaptem e criem a partir do seu trabalho, mesmo para fins comerciais, desde que lhe atribuem o devido crédito pela criação original.

confronted, such as lesbophobia, transphobia, and biphobia, each with its own particularities and impacts on the individuals affected.

In the context of public policies related to sexual diversity in schools, Seffner and Penna (2024) highlight that, despite normative advances in recognizing the importance of discussing gender and sexuality in the educational environment, these policies encounter significant resistance in everyday school life. The authors observe that the school is conceived as a strategic space to promote respect for diversity and equity, but it faces ideological, ethical, and political disputes that hinder the realization of a truly democratic and inclusive education.

A particular feature of the school environment tends to intensify this scenario. Unlike other social spaces, at school, both victims and aggressors are compelled to coexist daily in the same place. Outside of this context, each individual has the right to come and go and, to a large extent, is able to choose with whom they wish to interact. In the school space, however, students remain, interact, and share the same environment, even when faced with tensions or conflicts related to sexual diversity. In this context of compulsory coexistence, the absence of qualified pedagogical mediation can hardly be considered neutral. On the contrary, such a gap can pave the way for psychological or physical aggression, compromising the right of all students to a safe environment.

The magnitude of this problem in the Brazilian context is corroborated by recent empirical research. Data from the National Survey on Bullying in the Brazilian Educational Environment, conducted by the National LGBTI+ Alliance in partnership with the *Unibanco* Institute and *Plano CDE* (National LGBTI+ Alliance, 2025), indicate that 86% of LGBTI+ students say they feel unsafe at school because of some personal characteristic. Furthermore, 90% report having suffered some type of verbal aggression and 34% were victims of physical violence during 2024, a percentage that reaches 38% when it comes to trans and transvestite students. In other words, these numbers suggest that the school, instead of fully functioning as a space of protection, still tends to reproduce and, at times, intensify the violence that affects the LGBTQIA+ population in Brazilian society.

In a complementary perspective, the annual report of the *Grupo Gay da Bahia* (GGB, 2025) recorded 291 violent deaths of LGBT+ people in Brazil in 2024, averaging one death every 30 hours. Consequently, the country continues to occupy an alarming

position on the international stage regarding the incidence of crimes motivated by LGBTphobia. Taken together, these empirical data underscore the need for investigations that specifically examine students' perceptions of sexual diversity in different Brazilian educational contexts, especially in full-time schools, where daily coexistence tends to be more prolonged.

Given this complex scenario, this study seeks to answer the following questions: how do high school students perceive sexual diversity and the existence of homophobia in daily school life? What are their thoughts and behaviors regarding sexual diversity and the manifestation of homophobia in the school environment? To answer these questions, the general objective established was to analyze the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of high school students regarding sexual diversity and the existence of homophobia in the educational context. As specific objectives, the research sought to: 1) to understand the meanings students attribute to the concepts of gender, sexuality, and homophobia, as well as their perception of the approach – or lack thereof – to these themes in the school curriculum; and 2) to analyze students' discourses regarding experiences related to sexual diversity and homophobia in daily school life, considering the strategies they employ to deal with these situations.

This research is justified by the urgent need to understand how the main participants of the educational process – the students – perceive, interpret, and react to issues of sexual diversity and homophobia. This imperative becomes even more evident when considering that, even after relevant legal milestones such as the criminalization of LGBTphobia by the Supreme Federal Court in 2019, which equated it to the crime of racism through ADO 26 (*Direct Action of Unconstitutionality by Omission*) and MI 4733 (*Writ of Injunction*) (Brazil, 2019), the rates of violence against LGBTQIA+ students in the school environment persist and reveal new delineations that legal frameworks alone cannot address. The gap between normative advances and the reality experienced in schools indicates that legal changes, albeit necessary, are not enough to transform institutional cultures permeated by heteronormativity.

2 Sexual diversity, gender identity, and LGBTphobia in the educational context

The problematization of sexual diversity in the educational context is not recent in the field of Brazilian Education. Since the 1990s, researchers have produced a consistent body of literature on the articulations between gender, sexuality, and school,

mobilizing post-structuralist frameworks to question how educational institutions produce, regulate, and hierarchize identities (Louro, 2014; Junqueira, 2013). This research tradition built a specific theoretical vocabulary, centered on concepts such as heteronormativity, hidden curriculum, pedagogy of the closet, and gender performativity, which guide the reading of this study. The following frameworks are mobilized in this context as analytical tools already appropriated by the field of Education for understanding the power relations that permeate daily school life.

The sex/gender system constitutes a relevant concept for understanding sexual diversity in the educational environment. Originally formulated by Gayle Rubin (2017) in 1975, this system represents the arrangements through which societies transform biological sexuality into cultural products. Rubin (2017, p. 15) defines it as a “[...] set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied”. This conception arose as a response to the limitations of classical Marxism in the analysis of sexual oppression, seeking to establish a distinction between economic and sexual systems.

From Rubin’s perspective, “gender is a socially imposed division of the sexes” (2017, p. 17), resulting from the social relations of sexuality. The author argues that the division by sex functions as a mechanism that creates mutually exclusive categories, exacerbating biological differences and socially constructing gender.

Joan Scott radicalizes this perspective by shifting the debate from the Marxist to the historiographical field, clarifying that the term gender emerged among American feminists as a rejection of biological determinism. For Scott (1995, p. 75), “[...] gender is a socially imposed category on a sexed body”, distinguishing sexual practices from socially assigned roles. This definition establishes an important basis for questioning traditional gender roles and paves the way for more fluid understandings of identity.

Starting from this questioning of normative gender roles, the queer movement emerged in the 1990s, representing an advancement in both theorization and activism related to sexual diversity. According to Louro (2001), societies construct a relationship considered normal between sex, gender, and sexuality, in which social norms seek to align the identification of a body as male or female with a specific gender (masculine or feminine) and a form of desire directed exclusively towards the opposite sex/gender.

Queer theory emerges as a critique of this imposed linearity, challenging and deconstructing such rigid and binary norms.

Queer theory, with Judith Butler (2002) as its main exponent, arises from feminist, post-structuralist, and psychoanalytic theories. Butler (2002, p. 57, our translation) argues that gender varies according to historical and cultural contexts, and that “[...] recognition is not conferred upon the subject, but rather this recognition constitutes the subject”, revealing how pre-existing discourses build subjectivities. Butler (2003) develops the concept of gender performativity, a category that is not to be confused with “performance” in the sense of conscious action, but designates the reiterative and coercive character of the acts by which gender is produced and stabilized. Gender, in this perspective, is not something one is or does voluntarily, but the effect of a compulsory repetition of norms that precede and exceed the subject. In the field of Education, Louro (2014) articulates this concept to the daily school life, demonstrating how the school operates as a fundamental instance of production and reiteration of heteronormativity, precisely because it organizes bodies, practices, curricula and relationships according to the binary and heterosexual matrix that Butler (2003) problematizes.

These discussions about gender and queer theory are intrinsically linked to the understanding of sexuality as a social and historical construct, a perspective developed by Michel Foucault (2011). In Foucault’s view, sexuality is not merely a natural given, but a historical device that emerged in the mid-18th century, consisting of “[...] a network interwoven by a set of practices, discourses and techniques for stimulating bodies, intensifying pleasures and forming knowledge” (Foucault, 2011, p. 100). For Foucault (2011, p. 101), the apparatus of sexuality aims not only at reproduction, but also at “[...] proliferating, innovating, annexing, inventing, penetrating bodies in an increasingly detailed way and controlling populations in an increasingly global manner”.

This Foucauldian conceptualization of discourse as a practice that systematically shapes the objects it speaks of (Foucault, 2007) offers essential methodological tools for the present study. In the educational context, it allows us to examine how school institutions produce, regulate, and circulate certain knowledge about sexuality while silencing others, revealing the power relations that permeate

daily school life and how students negotiate, resist, or reproduce dominant discourses on sexual diversity (Louro, 2014).

The intersection between gender theories, queer theory, and Foucault's analysis of sexuality as a power device allows for an integrated comprehension of sexual diversity. As Louro (2001, p. 542) observes, "Today, so-called sexual 'minorities' are much more visible and, consequently, the struggle between them and conservative groups becomes more explicit and intense". This growing visibility of non-normative identities highlights the power mechanisms that seek to regulate and control sexuality.

As Foucault (2017) argues, the apparatus of sexuality is not primarily configured as a mechanism of repression, but as a complex and productive web of discourses, institutions, knowledge, and practices that traverse social life. It is an articulated set of strategies that organize, classify, and manage bodies and populations, guiding ways of living and understanding sexuality. From this perspective, power does not act solely through prohibition or silencing, since it also produces subjectivities, delineating which experiences are recognized as legitimate and which occupy the margins of the norm. Thus, certain expressions of sexuality are not simply suppressed, but kept under constant surveillance and regulation, contributing to the maintenance of power relations that sustain the social order.

This integrated theoretical framework allows us to understand how discourses, practices, and power relations operate in the school environment. Understanding these dynamics is essential for developing educational actions that not only tolerate but actively affirm sexual diversity in daily school routine.

In the specific context of Brazilian youth, recent research indicates that LGBTQIA+ youth develop resistance strategies in the school environment, creating informal support networks and seeking allies among teachers open to sexual diversity. Cassiavillani and Albrecht (2023) demonstrate that the absence of a systematic approach in the formal curriculum is the main factor that leads these students to seek information through alternative means, without qualified pedagogical mediation. As Freitas, Bermúdez, and Mércan-Hamann (2021) observe, these young people develop subtle tactics for negotiating with school norms, alternating between visibility and concealment, appropriating heteronormative spaces and re-signifying pedagogical practices to include their experiences.

Santos, Rocha, and Medeiros (2024), in an integrative review on teacher training in gender and sexuality in basic education published between 2012 and 2022, point out that continuing training is an essential condition for promoting more inclusive educational practices, but that structural resistance to addressing these issues in schools remains significant. Ferrari, Gomes, and Berto (2020) confirm this persistence within schools, revealing that teachers of all genders, even when they demonstrate openness to gender and sexuality issues, feel insecure about intervening pedagogically in situations of discrimination.

Homophobia in the school environment manifests itself as a reflection of a long tradition of repression of sexuality in Western pedagogy. Since the 17th century, according to Foucault (2017), this repression has been constructed through the suppression of free discourse and the establishment of fear of expression, resulting in censorship and silencing about sexuality, affecting students, educators, and the school community as a whole. Such repression establishes an intrinsic relationship between sex and power, in which dominant discourses control expressions of sexuality and limit the understanding of what it means to be socially and sexually free.

Understanding homophobia in all its complexity requires going beyond the most visible manifestations of hatred and violence. Borrillo (2010) proposes a comprehensive conception of the phenomenon, which contemplates both its cognitive dimension, expressed in the disqualification of non-heterosexual identities, and its affective dimension, manifested in fear, repulsion, and discomfort in the face of sexual diversity. According to the author, homophobia operates on different levels: individual, when it is expressed in discriminatory attitudes and behaviors; cultural; and institutional, when it is inscribed in norms, practices, and structures that naturalize heterosexuality as the only legitimate model of existence. It is precisely this institutional dimension that makes the school environment a privileged space for the production and reproduction of homophobia, regardless of the intentions of its actors.

In the educational environment, its manifestations often occur through the labeling of children and adolescents based on stereotypes, exposing them to discrimination and psychological confrontations even before they fully understand their own sexuality. Campos and Urnau (2021) demonstrate that this phenomenon significantly affects students who do not conform to heteronormative standards, extending beyond the school environment and impacting other aspects of life.

The inclusion of sex education in Brazilian school curricula has a controversial history that's marked by debates. The incorporation of sexual orientation as a cross-cutting theme in the Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais (PCN – National Curriculum Parameters) in 1998, represented a milestone in the institutionalization of the topic in the school environment. Even so, Seffner and Penna (2024) argue that curricular policies focused on gender and sexuality issues in Brazil have been traversed by political and moral disputes that frequently restrict the debate to biomedical and preventive approaches, placing broader discussions about sexual diversity, gender identity, and human rights in the background. The Parâmetros Curriculares Nacionais (PCN) were later replaced by the Base Nacional Comum Curricular (BNCC – National Common Curriculum Base) in 2018, representing a new stage in the organization of the Brazilian curriculum.

The implementation of the BNCC faced significant challenges regarding the approach to gender and sexuality issues. As Silva, Brancaloni and Oliveira (2019) point out, the absence of explicit references to these issues in the final document reveals the political and ideological tensions that characterize the contemporary Brazilian educational debate. This omission has generated insecurity among educators about how to approach these issues in a systematic and well-founded manner, especially in a context of increasing social polarization.

Araújo (2022) deepens this analysis by demonstrating that the suppression of these terms was not a technical mistake, but the result of systematic pressure from conservative groups on the document's drafting process, placing teachers in front of a deliberately constructed curricular void, forcing them to navigate institutional loopholes to include sexual diversity in their pedagogical practices. Silva (2020), in turn, shows that this regression manifests itself in a particularly serious way in the early years of elementary school, where the exclusion of the theme of sexuality from the curricular guidelines deepens the biological focus that the data from this research also identified in high school.

From the 1980s onwards, Brazil has witnessed a significant growth in the struggles for the rights of homosexual people, followed by increasingly broader segments of what is now designated as the LGBTQIA+ population, an acronym that emerged progressively throughout the 1990s and 2000s. The Brazilian Homosexual Movement, founded in 1978, constitutes the inaugural milestone of this process of

political organization, which, over the decades, incorporated new identities and demands until culminating in 2004 with the creation of the *Brasil Sem Homofobia* (Brazil Without Homophobia) program. This program, implemented during the government of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, represented an important landmark in policies related to sexual diversity. Initiatives such as the *Escola Sem Homofobia* (School Without Homophobia) program, however, faced strong resistance from conservative sectors, which distorted its educational purpose, pejoratively labeling the teaching materials and claiming that sex education should be the exclusive responsibility of the family.

In the specific context of the state of Goiás, educational policies related to sexual diversity have faced significant challenges. A regional investigation carried out by Santos (2024) with undergraduate courses in Pedagogy at public universities in the Midwest of Brazil shows that this problem persists structurally: of the 15 courses analyzed in eight institutions, less than half address gender and/or sexuality in a regular and mandatory way in the curriculum. When they occur, these themes appear in a fragmented way, a fact that is particularly relevant to the context of this research, located in Jataí, Goiás, and which directly dialogues with teacher training in the region.

This curricular void is not, however, an exclusively Brazilian phenomenon. Voss and Krakhecke (2023) analyze how a neoconservative avalanche has been reorienting discourses on sexuality in Latin American educational policies, systematically combating sociological, anthropological, and philosophical interpretations of the body, sex, and gender. The authors point out that these groups, in addition to sustaining high rates of gender inequality and violence, also curtail scientific production and pedagogical actions related to sexual diversity, producing silences that especially affect the most vulnerable subjects.

This resistance is strongly manifested in the discourse on the so-called “Gender Ideology”, a term created by conservative groups to disqualify gender studies and policies. As demonstrated by Vergara Rodrigues and Seffner (2024), this discourse is articulated with an anti-gender agenda that has consolidated itself in the field of Brazilian educational policies, resulting in deliberate changes in the versions of the BNCC for high school and in the systematic persecution of teachers who address gender and sexuality in their pedagogical practices, in a context of democratic crisis and alliance between the far right wing and moral conservatism.

Biroli, Vaggione, and Machado (2020) broaden this perspective by demonstrating that this phenomenon is not exclusively Brazilian, but part of a neoconservative offensive articulated on a Latin American scale, in which religious, political, and media actors actively dispute the meanings of education, family, and sexuality, instrumentalizing the school space as a cultural battleground. This transnational dimension of neoconservatism helps to understand why setbacks in Brazilian educational policies, such as the exclusion of gender from the BNCC (National Common Core Curriculum), are not isolated events, but local expressions of a broader political project.

Santos and Pereira (2024) demonstrate that the articulation between neoliberalism and neoconservatism in Brazilian educational policies is not fortuitous, but constitutes a coherent project that instrumentalizes discourses on family and religious values to restrict the debate on gender and sexuality in schools, simultaneously deepening control over teaching work and emptying the public and democratic meaning of education. Fundamentalist religious groups actively contribute to this process, inhibiting schools, researchers, and social movements that seek to promote a more inclusive education.

The challenges for the effective inclusion of sexual diversity in the school curriculum remain significant in the face of ultraconservative sectors that, by employing discourses based on religious beliefs and non-scientific knowledge, create barriers to a truly inclusive education. Such resistance has serious consequences, contributing to the maintenance of high levels of social inequality and violence against LGBTQIA+ people in Brazil. Overcoming these obstacles requires a commitment to education based on scientific evidence and respect for fundamental human rights, recognizing the school as an essential space for building a more just and inclusive society.

3 Formal curriculum and student knowledge: methodology and initial approaches to sexual diversity

This research adopted a qualitative approach, based on Foucault's discourse analysis, which allowed us to examine the power relations and the effects of meaning existing in the discourses produced on sexual diversity and homophobia in the school environment. The choice of this methodological perspective is justified by its ability to

clarify how discourses describe and construct social realities, especially regarding sensitive topics such as sexuality.

The research was carried out in public schools in the city of Jataí, state of Goiás, selected based on three main criteria: institutions that adopted the full-time education model; that offered high school education; and that had a larger number of students to ensure a reasonable number of participants. Two schools that met these criteria were selected, being the only institutions in the municipality that offered full-time high school education during the data collection period. This choice is justified by the greater interaction between teachers and students in this model, which could provide greater engagement in issues related to sexual diversity and homophobia. Both institutions are located in peripheral areas of the city and serve students in situations of social vulnerability, characteristics considered relevant to the objectives of the research.

Participants were selected based on characteristics common to both institutions: high school students, aged between 14 and 18 years, with no distinction regarding sex, gender, color or race. The sample consisted of 15 students, 10 from School A (5 female and 5 male) and 5 from School B (3 female and 2 male). To guarantee the anonymity of the participants, each one was identified only by letters and numbers, referring to the school and the chronological order of response to the questionnaire. The students from school A were designated from (A-1) to (A-10), while those from school B were identified from (B-1) to (B-5).

Data collection took place in 2020, using online questionnaires as the main instrument for obtaining the *corpus* of analysis. Google Forms was used, and the key questions included: “Do you receive sex education or any information on the topic of sexuality at the school you attend?”; “Have you ever heard of sexual orientation and gender identity?”; “At your school, do you believe that LGBTQIA+ students are open about their sexual orientation with their colleagues and teachers?”; “What do you understand by homophobia?”; “Do you believe that LGBTQIA+ students suffer discrimination because of their sexual orientation?”; and “What do you suggest to combat homophobia at school?”.

In the data analysis, French-style Discourse Analysis was used, following the methodological principles of discourse analysis (Orlandi, 2009). The analytical process was developed in three stages: 1) floating reading of all responses to identify

regularities and discursive dispersions; 2) the construction of the discursive *corpus* through the selection of representative discursive sequences; and 3) the analysis itself, examining the conditions of production, discursive formations, and the effects of meaning present in the student statements. Throughout this process, contradictions, silences, and repetitions that revealed the power relations underlying the discourses on sexual diversity were sought. Based on the discursive regularities identified in the analysis, the statements were grouped into four thematic paths that emerged from the *corpus* itself.

The first thematic path, “Presence or absence of sexual orientation, sexuality, and sexual diversity in the school curriculum”, seeks to understand how students perceive the treatment of these themes in their school education. The analysis of students’ perceptions about the presence of sexual orientation, sexuality, and sexual diversity in the school curriculum indicated significant divergences. When asked whether they received sex education or any information on topics related to sexuality, there was no unanimity in the responses. At school A, eight out of ten participants said yes, while at school B, three out of five responded negatively, with one abstention.

By deepening the investigation into which teachers addressed these themes and in which subjects, a strong concentration was found in the subject of Biology. Students reported that the subject was primarily covered during the study of human reproduction, with explanations about contraceptive methods and other aspects related to sex education. This approach tends to be predominantly biologicistic and reproductivist, focused on the prevention of Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs), while neglecting the social, cultural, and identity dimensions of human sexuality.

Regarding the specific topics discussed in the school environment, participants were able to select from categories such as gender, sexual rights, and reproductive rights. The gender category was selected seven times (five in school A and two in school B); sexual rights was cited eight times (five in school A and three in school B); and reproductive rights was also mentioned eight times (six in school A and two in school B).

Concerning pedagogical resources on sexuality or sex education, there was a significant lack of specific materials. Most reported not having received materials on the subject, with information being transmitted mainly through videos, documentaries,

or explanations from teachers during classes: “no physical materials, but I’ve been in an elective and we watched several YouTube videos and some documentaries” (A8).

Responses regarding LGBTQIA+ discussions at school revealed diverse perspectives and significant limitations. One student stated that “it was only addressed a few times, just in class assignments where it was necessary to mention them, never for the whole school to hear. I think it’s not discussed because most people have prejudices, even though they don’t admit it” (A-2). This response indicates not only the rarity of these discussions but also points to prejudice as a barrier to broader and more open approaches.

Another student presented a critique of the curriculum:

No, in my point of view the content is shaped by the sexual parameters of ancient society, so it only transmits the sexual relationship between men and women, and does not present content from other genders, considering our current society this content must be worked on because the varieties of sexual genders have increased, and if people do not know about sex education, the rates of STDs, among other diseases, will only increase (A-3).

This perspective points to an outdated curriculum in the face of contemporary sexual diversity. The student highlights practical consequences of this gap, such as the potential increase in sexually transmitted infections. Their critique points to the need to update educational content to reflect current social reality and promote a more comprehensive and effective sex education.

In contrast, one participant stated that these topics are “widely discussed, mainly among students, due to the extensive diversity of the student body” (A-6), suggesting that discussions occur more often among the students themselves than in formal teaching contexts. Cassiavillani and Albrecht (2023) had already identified this displacement as a direct consequence of the absence of a systematic curricular approach: without pedagogical mediation, the topic circulates, but outside the reach and control of the school institution.

Institutional and personal barriers were also mentioned: “no, I think that because of the closed minds that many still have, unfortunately teachers cannot have the freedom to comment on this subject because of some students or even because they (teachers) have closed minds” (B-1). This response points to a double obstacle: resistance from both students and teachers themselves in addressing these topics. Complementarily, another student observed: “no, because it is a very delicate and

controversial subject, it tends to be avoided to prevent conflicts between teachers and students, that's what I think" (B-2), highlighting how the perception of potential conflicts leads to the avoidance of topics considered controversial.

Some students mentioned participating in elective courses that addressed topics related to sexuality. Although such initiatives are important, it is observed that they do not reach all students, as they depend on individual interest in the topic. Consequently, students who potentially exhibit discriminatory behaviors may not be reached by these activities, limiting the intended educational impact.

Such curricular omission is not pedagogically neutral, since denying access to qualified information on sexuality, affective relationships, and reproductive rights constitutes, in itself, a form of institutional violence, insofar as the absence of pedagogical mediation can leave students vulnerable to situations of abuse, discrimination, and exploitation, making it difficult for them to identify and confront them. In this sense, it is understood that school sex education does not refer to precocity, but to the right of children and young people to know their own bodies, limits, and rights.

The analysis of this thematic trajectory indicates that, despite some advances in the inclusion of topics related to sexuality and diversity in the school environment, significant gaps and restrictions still persist. The insufficiency of specific teaching materials and the limitations identified reinforce the need for a more systematic and grounded approach to sex education, which overcomes biologism and recognizes the social and identity dimensions of sexuality in the school context.

The second thematic path, "Sexual diversity and gender identity: knowledge and attitudes", explores the participants' knowledge and attitudes about sexual diversity and gender identity. Initially, the study sought to identify perceptions about the presence of sexual diversity in schools. Regarding the number of gay or lesbian students in their institution, the responses varied: one student considered the number small, two classified it as reasonable, and two others were unable to say. These responses reveal that students recognize the existence of classmates with diverse sexual orientations in their school environment.

When investigating the understanding of the concepts of sexual orientation (SO) and gender identity (GI), it was found that everyone stated that they had already

heard about these topics. Most demonstrated an adequate understanding of the concepts, with some particularly elaborate responses:

Sexual orientation is an indicator of the feelings and (romantic) attraction that an individual has towards the opposite sex, the same sex, both, all, or none. Gender identity, on the other hand, is how a person sees themselves, where they understand they fit in, which can be as: woman, man, *transvestite*, or non-binary (A-4).

Sexual orientation is a related term used to describe the different forms of affective and sexual attraction. But people don't choose their orientation; many develop it over the years. Gender identity is related to the feelings a person has about themselves, regardless of their anatomy (B-3).

Regarding the sexual orientations and gender identities they were familiar with, the students demonstrated familiarity with various possibilities, mentioning orientations such as heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality, pansexuality, and asexuality, and identities such as transsexuality, *travestilidade*, cisgenderity, non-binary, genderfluid, and neutral gender. This diverse knowledge, which indicates a search for information through alternative means in the face of curricular gaps, finds support in Louro (2014), who argues that young people develop knowledge about sexuality and gender not only through formal education, but also through networks of sociability and their own youth cultures, which can question the heteronormative norms prevalent in the school environment.

When asked at what point students define their sexual orientation, the answers varied between those who associated this moment with puberty: "it usually happens in adolescence when you start to learn more about yourself" (A-9), and those who emphasized the individuality of the process: "when they feel comfortable defining or discovering themselves, I don't think it's something that we're going to discover overnight upon reaching a predefined age" (B-2). One response stands out, revealing an understanding of the fluidity and complexity of this process:

I strongly believe that there are [no] defined ages for a person to identify themselves. Just as there are individuals who grow up disliking the stereotype: blue/toy cars for boys and pink/dolls for girls, there are people who live many years under the pre-established regime at birth, that of heterosexuality, and only after various experiences they do understand themselves in another way. In other words, there is no right age for the blossoming of self-knowledge, acceptance, and desires to come to light (A-4).

These student perceptions resonate with Butler's concept of gender performativity (Butler, 2003): if gender is not something one is intrinsically, but the effect

of a repetition of norms that can be displaced and reconfigured, then the fluidity expressed in the reports – the rejection of “right ages”, the openness to the process of self-discovery – does not constitute naivety, but discursive resistance to the heteronormative matrix that imposes fixed trajectories. In this sense, the school’s daily life emerges as a space of tension between the compulsory reiteration of gender norms and the possibilities of subversion that the students themselves articulate.

4 LGBTQIA+ student experiences and institutional strategies for confronting homophobia

Based on the understanding of how sexual diversity manifests itself in the formal curriculum and the students’ knowledge and attitudes regarding sexual diversity and gender identity, it becomes essential to analyze the students’ broader perceptions of these topics. The analysis of the two remaining thematic paths revealed central dimensions of student experiences, such as the specific experiences of LGBTQIA+ students in the school environment and the role of the school in tackling homophobia.

The third thematic path, “LGBTQIA+: facing challenges and school response”, explores issues related to “coming out” and institutional responses to these situations. In addition, it examines the challenges faced by these students in their daily school routines and how educational institutions respond to these demands.

Regarding whether LGBTQIA+ students disclose their sexual orientations to colleagues and teachers, the responses indicated significant differences between the schools investigated. In school A, positive reports predominated about a welcoming environment, such as “yes, because in my school it is a very welcoming environment in which no type of discrimination is accepted, and so these LGBT students feel more comfortable coming out” (A-1); “yes, because all the LGBT students I know openly state their sexual orientation, I think one of the reasons is the unity of our group” (A-3).

At school B, the responses were more cautious, suggesting a less welcoming environment, such as “I don’t think so, because there are many people who judge” (B-5). One student presented another perspective:

A bit of both, those who come out I think it’s because that’s who they are and they’re willing to show society what they really are and are tired of pretending to be what they’re not, while those who don’t come out are afraid of being oppressed by society and afraid of rejection from family and friends (B-2).

This variation in students' experiences reflects what Junqueira (2013) calls "pedagogy of the closet", a set of practices, power relations, and subjectivation processes that operate to reify heteronormativity in school, creating unequal conditions of expression and recognition for LGBTQIA+ students. The author argues that the "closet" is not just a metaphor for silencing, but rather a "pedagogy" that teaches all students about the limits of social acceptability.

Regarding the teachers' stance when they discover or suspect that a student is homosexual or bisexual, students from school A predominantly reported welcoming attitudes: "they are as welcoming as possible (own experience)" (A-5). In school B, however, the responses were more vague: "I don't know, I haven't witnessed anything like that" (B-1); "to be honest, I have no idea, but I imagine that the teachers have a conversation with the student and with the student's parents" (B-2).

When asked whether the school should inform families about students' sexual orientation, twelve of them were against this practice. This majority position indicates a clear understanding of the risks involved. Data from the National LGBTI+ Alliance (2025) reveal that the home environment is among the spaces of greatest vulnerability for LGBTQIA+ youth, which makes the unsolicited disclosure of a student's sexual orientation by the school a potential violation of rights capable of significantly aggravating their situation of vulnerability. B-2's account shows that the silencing has roots that go beyond the school and deepen in domestic relationships, a dimension that no isolated school policy is capable of resolving.

Regarding the difficulties faced by LGBTQIA+ students in the school environment, the accounts pointed to several challenges:

For lesbians, gays, and bisexuals, it's just about lame jokes, disrespect, and things like that. For a transgender person, it's much more complicated, as many people don't take it well and are very prejudiced. They might deprive the person of using the correct bathroom for them, or say something hurtful (A-2).

This differentiation pointed out by that student is corroborated by Xavier and Vianna (2023), who demonstrate that the processes of exclusion of trans students are not sporadic, but structural. Discrimination manifests itself in the daily school routine in concrete and recurring ways: the denial of basic rights, such as access to bathrooms and changing rooms compatible with gender identity, is among the main causes of

study interruption. In this sense, the school not only fails to welcome trans students; it actively produces their exclusion.

This active production of cisgenderity as a school norm is supported by the national data already presented (National LGBTI+ Alliance, 2025) in which the 38% of physical assaults recorded among transvestite and transsexual students are not episodic, but an expression of an exclusion structurally produced by the school. A-2's account, produced in 2020, accurately anticipates what subsequent national surveys have confirmed.

Other challenges mentioned by the students included various forms of discrimination in the school environment. "Prejudice and homophobia, and I think in my reality a good example would be when choosing a partner to do work, many students can be excluded just for having a different sexual orientation/identity" (B-2). These experiences illustrate how discrimination can affect fundamental aspects of the educational process, from interpersonal relationships to the development of collaborative academic activities.

The naturalization of these everyday forms of violence in the school environment brings to light what Louro (2014) identifies as the operation of a hidden curriculum that teaches and reinforces gender and sexuality norms through everyday practices, often not recognized as pedagogical. The author argues that, through this hidden curriculum, the school transmits knowledge and produces subjects, social identities, and power relations.

The definitions of homophobia offered by the students show an understanding that goes beyond common sense, articulating violence, ignorance, and social structure. This can be seen in the following accounts: "it is violence, cruelty. It is the lack of empathy due to lack of information and ignorance" (A5); "I think it is the discrimination of people who have any other sexual orientation that is not heterosexual, judging that these people are worse than others" (A9). This unanimous recognition of homophobia as a form of violence contrasts with the normalization and invisibility that often characterize this phenomenon in the school context. The statements produced suggest that, even in schools where the environment is described as relatively welcoming, LGBTQIA+ students still face significant barriers to full participation and expression.

The analysis of this thematic path shows the complexity of the experiences of LGBTQIA+ students in the school environment, demonstrating how institutional and interpersonal factors intertwine to create more or less welcoming environments. The differences observed between schools A and B lead to the understanding that specific pedagogical practices and school cultures can significantly influence the experiences of these students, creating possibilities for interventions that seek to build more inclusive educational environments.

The fourth thematic path, “The discourse and the role of the school: homophobia on the blackboard”, explores students’ perceptions of homophobia in the school environment, its manifestations, causes, consequences, and possible coping strategies. Regarding whether they had heard about homophobia at school, twelve of the fifteen participating students answered affirmatively, indicating that the topic, although in a limited way, circulates in the school environment.

Regarding the perception of discrimination existing against LGBTQIA+ students due to their sexual orientation, all fifteen participants acknowledged the occurrence of this type of discrimination, as shown in the following excerpts: “I never witnessed violence, but I know there was discrimination” (A-2); “certainly. If not physical violence, verbal violence” (A-6). This unanimous perception of discrimination in the school environment is significant and aligns with what Junqueira (2015) identifies as the systemic nature of homophobia in educational institutions, which often operates subtly and naturally, not always being visible or identifiable as explicit violence.

Regarding the causes of these violent and discriminatory manifestations, the students mainly pointed to sociocultural and religious factors: “because people are ignorant and don’t know that love is love, regardless of who it’s with, they are people who haven’t evolved” (A-1); “due to the society in which we grow up, where we are taught that not being heterosexual is wrong” (A-7). Some specified the role of religion in this context: “People simply prefer to live in the social bubble they have created, despising anyone who is different from what they believe is ‘right’. They claim that such religion says it is a sin, but it’s just an excuse” (A-2).

This analysis by the students on the roots of homophobia finds support in the reflections of Borrillo (2010), who argues that homophobia is a complex phenomenon that articulates different dimensions, including the psychological, cultural, religious and political, manifesting itself from simple discomfort to explicit violence. The author

highlights that religious discourse often functions as a legitimizer of homophobic practices, providing moral justifications for discrimination. Currently, this dynamic is particularly evident in the actions of the evangelical caucus in the National Congress, which systematically opposes bills that seek to expand the rights of the LGBTQIA+ population and promotes initiatives that reinforce traditional family and sexuality values, using religious arguments to legitimize political positions that, in practice, contribute to the maintenance of discriminatory structures.

Another participant identified broader structural causes:

I think the main reason is that we haven't been able to completely break with normative patterns ethically based on the patriarchal system. Which, unfortunately, creates an opening for people to perpetuate sexist, homophobic and transphobic thinking (A-4).

Louro (2014) argues that heteronormativity and homophobia are structurally articulated with other systems of oppression, such as patriarchy and sexism. According to the author, these elements form a complex set of norms and practices that regulate not only sexuality, but also gender and social relations more broadly. This intersectional perspective allows us to understand how different forms of discrimination intertwine and reinforce each other in the school context.

Regarding which groups within the LGBTQIA+ community suffer the most violence, students primarily identified gay men (mentioned by seven of them) and transgender people (mentioned by eight students). This perception is supported by statistics on violence against the LGBTQIA+ population in Brazil, which indicate higher rates of physical violence against gay men and transgender people, especially transgender women (Benevides, 2025).

The consequences of homophobia, in the students' view, range from self-esteem problems to suicide, including various psychological and social impacts.

A person who suffers from homophobia is closed off, psychologically and emotionally, they are repressed, excluded, and violated in areas that should be supportive, such as the family, which leaves them vulnerable, repressed, and with physical and psychological consequences (the development of illnesses, for example). Without space for growth, they are segregated and socially oppressed (academically, professionally, and socially) (A-4).

This account accurately describes what the mental health literature recognizes as the effects of a hostile school environment on LGBTQIA+ students: isolation, repression, physical and psychological sequelae, and exclusion in multiple areas of

life. Freitas, Bermúdez, and Mércan-Hamann (2021), in a national survey of LGBTQIA+ school-aged youth, confirm that these impacts manifest themselves in an especially intense way during adolescence, when the need for belonging and recognition is more acute and exposure to school LGBTphobia is more frequent.

Another aspect highlighted by a student was the apparent impunity or lack of consequences for perpetrators of homophobia: “for those who are being prejudiced or homophobic, there are no consequences, but for those who are suffering homophobia, it causes various conflicts within themselves in their own heads” (A-9). National data confirm this perception, as in 90% of cases involving verbal violence against LGBTQIA+ students that was no pedagogical or institutional intervention (National LGBTI+ Alliance, 2025). Impunity is therefore not a subjective impression; it is a structural fact of school reality. Coelho, Desidério and Rocha (2023) argue that this lack of institutional response is, in itself, a form of LGBTphobia: by not naming, not intervening and not punishing, the school naturalizes what it should confront.

Regarding whether homophobia should be combated in the school environment, all students answered affirmatively, offering justifications ranging from the impact on the quality of life of LGBTQIA+ people to considerations about human and constitutional rights:

Yes, homophobia must be combated because it affects the quality of life of thousands of people; it is responsible for alarming statistics of sexual violence, assaults (verbal and physical), and exclusion in various spheres (family, student, professional, and social) (A-4).

Clearly. Because it is not coherent. No type of violence is acceptable. Because it infringes on everyone’s right to come and go. The right to their freedom and the right to freedom of expression reinforced in sections IV and IX of the current federal constitution (A-6).

Finally, students offered suggestions for combating homophobia in the school environment, including awareness programs, lectures, debates, seminars, and the creation of extracurricular subjects. One of them suggested:

I think that awareness programs about “difference” could be an alternative, in addition to anti-violence discourse and respect for others, starting from upper elementary school, with children who already know and understand what is “right and wrong” socially, and where habits are commonly formed. A network of psychological support for students who suffer such homophobia and for the “aggressor” students, so that the root of the issue can be found and resolved in a healthy way for both parties (A-4).

The proposals presented converge with what Soares et al. (2024) identify as a condition for effectively confronting LGBTphobia in schools: it is not enough to include the topic in a punctual or disciplinary way; it is necessary for the school to actively question the heteronormative assumptions that organize its curricula, practices, and institutional cultures. Suggestion of the student A-4, which proposes intervention from elementary school onwards and includes both victims and aggressors, anticipates a pedagogical perspective that recent literature has progressively defended.

One student highlighted the need to start combating homophobia within the family, but recognized the complementary role of the school: “it should be initiated by those responsible, but the school should also guide students and implement sex education” (A-8). This response indicates a sophisticated understanding of the problem, which is not limited to the school environment but crosses different social spheres, which the literature on LGBTphobia has named an intersectoral challenge: the school cannot replace the family, but neither can it remain silent under the argument that sex education is the exclusive responsibility of the domestic sphere, an argument that, as described earlier, has been historically mobilized by conservative sectors to undermine inclusive educational policies.

5 Final considerations

This study analyzed the perceptions, attitudes, and practices of high school students regarding sexual diversity and LGBTphobia in the school environment. The research, conducted in 2020 with 15 students from two full-time public schools in Jataí, Goiás, through online questionnaires, highlighted the absence of specific pedagogical materials and curricular approaches on sexuality and gender identity, with the topic being addressed mainly in the Biology discipline, a local expression of a curricular void deliberately constructed by the suppression of the terms gender and sexual orientation, in the 2018 BNCC (National Common Curriculum Base).

The main findings reveal a contemporary educational paradox: while the formal curriculum presents significant gaps in the approach to sexual diversity and gender identity, students demonstrate sophisticated knowledge about these topics, obtained through alternative sources, such as social media and their own youth cultures. A contrast was identified between the experiences of LGBTQIA+ students in

the investigated schools. While one institution was reported as more welcoming, the other showed greater resistance to the expression of sexual diversity, pointing to the influence of specific school cultures.

All participants acknowledged the existence of homophobia in the school environment, indicating its sociocultural, religious, and structural causes, as well as its consequences, ranging from self-esteem issues to extreme cases of suicide. The students demonstrated a critical understanding of the systemic roots of discrimination, identifying connections between homophobia, patriarchy, and other systems of oppression. Furthermore, they suggested measures to combat the problem, such as awareness programs focused on recognizing sexual and gender differences, lectures, and the creation of specific subjects, demonstrating a commitment to promoting a more inclusive environment.

The implications of this study point to the urgent need for structural transformations in educational policies and practices related to sexual diversity. First, the cross-curricular integration of themes on sexual diversity and gender identity into the curriculum proves to be fundamental, overcoming the biologicistic restriction and contemplating historical, social, cultural, and political dimensions of sexuality. Second, both initial and continuing teacher training emerge as a decisive factor for the effective implementation of inclusive educational practices, through the development of training programs that promote critical reflection on educators' own conceptions and prejudices. Third, educational institutions must develop specific policies to combat discrimination and promote diversity, establishing clear protocols for addressing situations of LGBTphobia.

The limitations of this study include the restriction to two schools in a single city, the relatively small sample size, and the methodological adaptations required by the pandemic context. The use of online questionnaires limited the perception of discursive nuances that could have been captured through face-to-face interviews. Furthermore, the research was limited to the students' perspective, not including the voices of teachers, administrators, and families.

Future studies could broaden the geographic and institutional scope, including schools of different types and regions of the country. It would be particularly relevant to investigate the perspectives of various educational stakeholders to understand the complex dynamics that influence the construction of inclusive or exclusionary

educational environments. Longitudinal studies could follow the trajectories of LGBTQIA+ students throughout their school experience, allowing for a deeper understanding of the impacts of different educational practices.

The urgency of these transformations is justified by ethical imperatives related to human rights and dignity, as well as by scientific evidence on the negative impacts of hostile educational environments on the integral development of all students. Inclusive school environments not only benefit LGBTQIA+ students, they also contribute to the formation of more critical, empathetic citizens, better prepared to live in democratic and plural societies. The challenge facing educators, administrators, and policymakers is to translate this youthful potential into concrete transformations that promote social justice and equality within the educational context, contributing to the construction of a more just and inclusive society for all people, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

REFERENCES

- ALIANÇA NACIONAL LGBTI+. **Pesquisa nacional sobre o bullying no ambiente educacional brasileiro 2024**. Curitiba: IBSEX, 2025. Available at: <https://observatoriodeeducacao.institutounibanco.org.br/cedoc/detalhe/pesquisa-nacional-sobre-o-bullying-no-ambiente-educacional-brasileiro-2024.0de31c89-3774-4470-a84a-1bf49caab276>. Accessed: mar. 8, 2026.
- ARAÚJO, Luiz Carlos Marinho de. Gênero e sexualidade na BNCC: possibilidades para implementação da disciplina educação para sexualidade na educação básica. **Revista Interinstitucional Artes de Educar**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 8, n. 1, p. 263-286, 2022. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.12957/riae.2022.65331>. Accessed: feb. 23, 2026.
- BENEVIDES, Bruna G. **Dossiê: assassinatos e violências contra travestis e transexuais brasileiras em 2024**. Brasília, DF: Distrito Drag; ANTRA, 2025. Available at: <https://antrabrasil.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/dossie-antra-2025.pdf>. Accessed: mar. 8, 2026.
- BIROLI, Flávia; VAGGIONE, Juan Marco; MACHADO, Maria das Dores Campos. **Gênero, neoconservadorismo e democracia: disputas e retrocessos na América Latina**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2020.
- BORRILLO, Daniel. **Homofobia: história e crítica de um preconceito**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2010.
- BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**. Brasília, DF: MEC, 2018. Available at: <http://basenacionalcomum.mec.gov.br/>. Accessed: mar. 20, 2025.
- BRASIL. Supremo Tribunal Federal. **ADO 26 e MI 4733: criminalização da homofobia e transfobia por equiparação à Lei nº 7.716/1989 (Lei do Racismo)**. Brasília, DF: STF, 13 jun. 2019. Available at: <https://portal.stf.jus.br/noticias/verNoticiaDetalhe.asp?idConteudo=414010>. Accessed: feb. 25, 2026.
- BUTLER, Judith. Críticamente subversiva. In: JIMÉNEZ, Rafael M. Mérida (ed.). **Sexualidades transgressoras: una antología de estudios queer**. Barcelona: Icària editorial, 2002. p. 55-81.
- BUTLER, Judith. **Problemas de gênero: feminismo e subversão da identidade**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2003.
- CAMPOS, Denise Carvalho; URNAU, Lílian Caroline. Exploração sexual de crianças e adolescentes: reflexão sobre o papel da escola. **Psicologia Escolar e Educacional**, Maringá, v. 25, e221612, 2021. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2175-35392021221612>. Accessed: jul. 5, 2024.

CASSIAVILLANI, Thiene Pelosi; ALBRECHT, Mirian Silva Pacheco. Educação sexual: uma análise sobre legislação e documentos oficiais brasileiros em diferentes contextos políticos. **Educação em Revista**, Belo Horizonte, v. 39, e39794, 2023. Available at: <https://periodicos.ufmg.br/index.php/edrevista/article/view/39794>. Accessed: mar. 6, 2026.

COELHO, Gilson Gomes; DESIDÉRIO, Plábio Marcos Martins; ROCHA, Luisa Pereira. Afinal, o que é a LGBTfobia? **Revista Brasileira de Sexualidade Humana**, São Paulo, v. 34, e1115, 2023. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.35919/rbsh.v34.1115>. Accessed: feb. 26, 2026.

FERRARI, Anderson; GOMES, Claudete Imaculada de Souza; BERTO, Cláudio Magno Gomes. A prática docente e as relações de gênero e sexualidades: conversando com professoras e professores. **Espaço Pedagógico**, Passo Fundo, v. 27, n. 1, p. 223-243, 2020. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5335/rep.v27i1.10583>. Accessed: mar. 3, 2026.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **A arqueologia do saber**. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2007.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **O nascimento da clínica**. 7. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2011.

FOUCAULT, Michel. **História da sexualidade I: a vontade de saber**. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2017.

FREITAS, Sandra; BERMÚDEZ, Ximena Pamela Díaz; MÉRCHAN-HAMANN, Edgar. Sentidos atribuídos por jovens escolares LGBT à afetividade e à vivência da sexualidade. **Saúde e Sociedade**, São Paulo, v. 30, n. 2, e190351, 2021. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-12902021190351>. Accessed: jan. 3, 2022.

GRUPO GAY DA BAHIA (GGB). **Observatório de mortes violentas de LGBT+ no Brasil - 2024**. Salvador, BA: GGB, 2025. Available at: <https://grupogaydabahia.com.br/mortes-violentas-de-lgbt-no-brasil-2024/>. Accessed: mar. 7, 2026.

JUNQUEIRA, Rogério Diniz. Pedagogia do armário: a normatividade em ação. **Retratos da Escola**, Brasília, DF, v. 7, n. 13, p. 481-498, jul./dez. 2013. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22420/rde.v7i13.320>. Accessed: aug. 15, 2019.

JUNQUEIRA, Rogério Diniz. Homofobia nas escolas: um problema de todos. *In*: JUNQUEIRA, Rogério Diniz (org.). **Diversidade sexual na educação: problematizações sobre a homofobia nas escolas**. Brasília: MEC: SECAD: UNESCO, 2015. p. 13-51.

LOURO, Guacira Lopes. Teoria queer: uma política pós-identitária para a educação. **Estudos Feministas**, Florianópolis, v. 9, n. 2, p. 541-553, 2001. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-026X2001000200012>. Accessed: jan. 12, 2019.

LOURO, Guacira Lopes. **Gênero, sexualidade e educação**: uma perspectiva pós-estruturalista. 16. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2014.

ORLANDI, Eni Puccinelli. **Análise de discurso**: princípios & procedimentos. 8. ed. Campinas: Pontes, 2009.

RUBIN, Gayle. O tráfico de mulheres: notas sobre a “economia política” do sexo. *In*: RUBIN, Gayle. **Políticas do sexo**. Translation: Jamille Pinheiro Dias. São Paulo: Ubu Editora, 2017. p. 8-21.

SANTOS, Catarina Cerqueira de Freitas; PEREIRA, Rodrigo da Silva. Neoliberalismo e neoconservadorismo nas políticas educacionais brasileiras. **Retratos da Escola**, Brasília, DF, v. 18, n. 42, p. 815-831, 2024. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22420/rde.v18i42.2229>. Accessed: mar. 3, 2026.

SANTOS, Maria Tarcília Alves dos. **Gênero na formação inicial de docentes**: estudo em universidades federais da região Centro-Oeste. 2024. Dissertation (Master's in Education) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Federal de Jataí, Jataí, 2024.

SANTOS, Tiago Zeferino dos; ROCHA, Luciano Daudt da; MEDEIROS, Natanael de. Formação de professores em gênero e sexualidade na educação básica: uma revisão integrativa. **Momento - Diálogos em Educação**, Rio Grande, v. 33, n. 2, p. 315-336, 2024. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.14295/momento.v33i2.16437>. Accessed: mar. 6, 2026.

SCOTT, Joan. Gênero, uma categoria útil de análise histórica. **Educação & Realidade**, Porto Alegre, v. 20, n. 2, p. 71-99, 1995. Available at: <https://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/educacaoerealidade/article/view/71721>. Accessed: may 22, 2020.

SEFFNER, Fernando; PENNA, Fernando. Educação democrática e equidade de gênero: disputas na cultura escolar. **Retratos da Escola**, Brasília, DF, v. 18, n. 40, p. 39-57, 2024. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.22420/rde.v18i40.1879>. Accessed: feb. 28, 2026.

SILVA, Caio Samuel Franciscati da; BRANCALEONI, Ana Paula Leivar; OLIVEIRA, Rosemary Rodrigues de. Base Nacional Comum Curricular e diversidade sexual e de gênero: (des)caracterizações. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 14, n. 2, p. 1538-1555, 2019. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v14iesp.2.12051>. Accessed: jul. 5, 2021.

SILVA, Ricardo Desidério da. A exclusão da temática sexualidade nos anos iniciais do ensino fundamental na BNCC e seus reflexos para o ensino de ciências. **Horizontes - Revista de Educação**, [s. l.], v. 8, n. 15, p. 98-112, 2020. Available at: <https://ojs.ufgd.edu.br/horizontes/article/view/12282>. Accessed: feb. 23, 2026.

SOARES, Ana Paula dos Santos; COSTA NETO, Aluizio Torres; LIMA, Stefany Machado de; AMORIM, Elisangela Santos de. Reprodução da LGBTfobia na educação: causas e enfrentamentos. **Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales**, [s. l.], v. 17, n. 6, e7325, 2024. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.55905/revconv.17n.6-071>. Accessed: mar. 2, 2026.

VERGARA RODRIGUES, Carolina; SEFFNER, Fernando. Neoconservadorismo e agenda antigênero em políticas de educação no Brasil: uma análise com foco na BNCC do ensino médio. **Revista Ponto de Vista**, [s. l.], v. 13, n. 2, p. 1-20, 2024. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.47328/rpv.v13i2.16829>. Accessed: mar. 8, 2026.

VOSS, Dulce Mari da Silva; KRAKHECKE, Eliada Mayara Alves. A produção do dispositivo sexualidade em tempos de avalanche neoconservadora na educação: discursividades científicas latino-americanas. **Práxis Educativa**, Ponta Grossa, v. 18, e21384, 2023. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5212/PraxEduc.v.18.21384.036>. Accessed: mar. 7, 2026.

XAVIER, Thais Pimentel de Oliveira; VIANNA, Cláudia. A educação de pessoas trans*: relatos de exclusão, abjeção e luta. **Educação & Realidade**, Porto Alegre, v. 48, e124022, 2023. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-6236124022vs01>. Accessed: mar. 6, 2026.

Received in september 2025 | Approved in january 2025

MINI BIOGRAPHY

Gustavo Ferreira dos Santos

Master's degree in Education from the Graduate Program in Education (PPGE-UFJ), funded by CAPES. Bachelor's degree in Physical Education from the Federal University of Goiás (UFG). Conducts research in the areas of sexuality, homophobia, and education.

Vivianne Oliveira Gomes

PhD in Sports Sciences from the Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha (Spain) and Postdoctoral researcher in Psychology from the University of Beira Interior (Portugal). Associate Professor III in the Physical Education undergraduate program and in the Graduate Programs in Education and Psychology at UFJ. Leader of the Research Group GESEFE – Gender, Sexualities, Education, and Physical Education (CNPq/IFES).

Translated by **Jeanne Gomes de Lima**