

Toward a Better Understanding of Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Anne-Marie Urban
Maria Jose Flor Agreda
Alejandra Ramos Moreno
Diana Ortiz

Gender and Diversity Division

TECHNICAL
NOTE N°
IDB-TN-01885

Toward a Better Understanding of Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Anne-Marie Urban
Maria Jose Flor Agreda
Alejandra Ramos Moreno
Diana Ortiz

April 2020

Cataloging-in-Publication data provided by the
Inter-American Development Bank

Felipe Herrera Library

Toward a better understanding of discrimination based on sexual orientation and
gender identity / Anne-Marie Urban, María José Flor Ágreda, Alejandra Ramos Moreno,
Diana Ortiz.

p. cm. — (IDB Technical Note ; 1885)

Includes bibliographic references.

1. Homophobia-Latin America. 2. Homophobia-Caribbean Area. 3. Transphobia-Latin
America. 4. Transphobia-Caribbean Area. 5. Sexual orientation-Latin America. 6.
Sexual orientation-Caribbean Area. 7. Gender identity-Latin America. 8. Gender
identity-Caribbean Area. I. Urban, Anne-Marie. II. Ágreda, María José Flor. III. Ramos
Moreno, Alejandra. IV. Ortiz, Diana. V. Inter-American Development Bank. Gender
and Diversity Division. VI. Series.

IDB-TN-1885

JEL codes: D63, J19.

Keywords: LGBTQ+, sexual orientation, gender identity, research, survey, interviews,
LAC, exclusion, discrimination.

<http://www.iadb.org>

Copyright © 2020 Inter-American Development Bank. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons IGO 3.0 Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC-IGO BY-NC-ND 3.0 IGO) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/igo/legalcode>) and may be reproduced with attribution to the IDB and for any non-commercial purpose. No derivative work is allowed.

Any dispute related to the use of the works of the IDB that cannot be settled amicably shall be submitted to arbitration pursuant to the UNCITRAL rules. The use of the IDB's name for any purpose other than for attribution, and the use of IDB's logo shall be subject to a separate written license agreement between the IDB and the user and is not authorized as part of this CC-IGO license.

Note that link provided above includes additional terms and conditions of the license.

The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Inter-American Development Bank, its Board of Directors, or the countries they represent.



TOWARD A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY

AUTHORS

Anne-Marie Urban, María José Flor Agreda,
Alejandra Ramos Moreno, and Diana Ortiz

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS FROM:

Verónica Frisancho and Paola Buitrago



Table of Contents

01 | Introduction
1

02 | Conceptual Framework
3

03 | Research on LGBTQ+ Populations in Latin America and the Caribbean
8

04 | Research on LGBTQ+ Populations from Other Regions of the World
18

05 | Comparison between LAC and Other International Studies
25

06 | Discussion and Recommendations
37

| Appendixes
36

| References
64

Acronyms

CADRES	Caribbean Development Research Services
CAPI	Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing
CAWI	Computer-Assisted Web Interviewing
CIPAC	Central America Research and Promotion Center (<i>Centro de Investigación y Promoción para América Central</i>)
CONAPRED	National Council to Prevent Discrimination (<i>Consejo Nacional para Prevenir la Discriminación</i>) (Mexico)
GLSEN	Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)
IDPAC	District Institute for Participation and Communal Action (<i>Instituto Distrital de la Participación y Acción Comunal</i>) (Colombia)
ILGA	International Lesbian, Gay Bisexual, Trans, and Intersex Alliance
INDEC	National Census and Statistics Institute (<i>Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos</i>) (Argentina)
INEC	National Census and Statistics Institute (<i>Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Censos</i>) (Ecuador)
INJUVE	Youth Institute (<i>Instituto de la Juventud</i>) (Spain)
IPECE	Research and Economic Strategy Institute of Ceará (<i>Instituto de Investigación y Estrategia Económica de Ceará</i>) (Brazil)
KSSO	Kaiser Survey of Sexual Orientation
LAPOP	Latin America Public Opinion Project
LGBTQ+	Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/transsexual, queer, and other persons with diverse sexual orientations and gender identities
MOVILH	Movement for Homosexual Integration and Freedom (<i>Movimiento de Integración y Liberación Homosexual</i>)
MSM	Men who have sex with men
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
ILO	International Labor Organization
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS (<i>Programa Conjunto de las Naciones Unidas sobre el HIV/SIDA</i>)
PAPI	Paper and Pencil Interviewing
RDS	Repondent Driven Sampling
SOGI	Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity
UNAM	National Autonomous University of Mexico (<i>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México</i>)
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

Toward a better understanding of discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity

Authors

Anne-Marie Urban, Alejandra Ramos Moreno, María José Flor Ágreda, and Diana Ortiz

With contributions from:

Verónica Frisancho and Paola Buitrago

Summary

In Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), there is a limited understanding regarding the size of the LGBTQ+ population (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/transsexual, queer, as well as other sexual orientations and gender identities (SOGI)), and their experiences of discrimination. This technical note analyzes existing studies on these populations, presents relevant information on their experiences with social exclusion, and identifies good practices for future research initiatives. To this end, the authors analyzed 68 studies based on surveys conducted in LAC that provided some information on the size of the population and discrimination and evidenced the gaps in information on LGBTQ+ populations in the region. In addition, the authors analyzed 25 studies and surveys that were conducted outside the LAC region, which offered good practices for collecting information about LGBTQ+ communities. Finally, based on the analysis that was performed, this technical note offers recommendations for future surveys and studies on LGBTQ+ populations, focusing on sampling design and the adequate formulation of questions on SOGI.

Keywords: LGBTQ+, sexual orientation, gender identity, research, survey, interviews, LAC, exclusion, discrimination.

Executive Summary

| Background and Objectives

Little is known about the size of the population in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) that identifies as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender/transsexual, and queer, or another sexual orientation or gender identity (LGBTQ+),¹ and about their experiences of discrimination. The limited information on these populations makes it difficult to describe the socioeconomic characteristics of each LGBTQ+ subgroup, which, in turn, makes it difficult to identify and address their specific needs. To address this challenge, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), with funding from the Dreilinden Foundation, initiated a project to contribute to improved data collection for LGBTQ+ populations in LAC. The project funded an analysis of existing data-collection initiatives for LGBTQ+ population, to identify existing best practices and make recommendations for future research projects on these populations. All of this is summarized in this technical note.

| Methodology and Findings

As a result of the analysis undertaken for this technical note, 68 quantitative studies on LGBTQ+ populations in LAC were identified. These studies are based on surveys, which were assessed using the following four criteria: (i) their objective, depending upon whether the survey sought to estimate the size of LGBTQ+ populations or characterize discrimination based on SOGI; (ii) their sampling design; (iii) the type of interview; and (iv) their representativeness (in terms of sexual and gender identity).

The review confirmed that information gaps persist with respect to LGBTQ+ populations in the region, and that existing statistical information is limited. There are some examples of studies that present data on the population size; for example, surveys conducted by Caribbean Development Research Services CADRES (2004 & 2013), show that 3% of the population in Barbados and Guyana self-identify as lesbian or gay (homosexual) and 4% as bisexual, a useful data point regarding LGB populations in the Caribbean.

Similarly, there are studies that contain data regarding discrimination toward LGBTQ+ persons. For example, a survey by the Pew Research Center (2014) showed that seven of every ten people in LAC consider homosexuality to be morally unacceptable, which indicates that strong stigmatization is still prevalent in the region. It is important to point out that this stigma, coupled with survey procedures that may not be able to guarantee privacy and confidentiality of interviewees, make data collection difficult.

This problem is exacerbated by the lack of homogeneous categories related to LGBTQ+ issues in the region to allow comparisons across studies and countries. Only seven of the 68 studies analyzed offer data on the size of LGBTQ+ populations in LAC. Only three of these studies used random samples for their surveys, while the others used samples of subpopulations, such as youth or men.

Additionally, 25 quantitative studies on LGBTQ+ populations conducted in other regions of the work were identified and analyzed. This review helped facilitate the identification of good practices in quantitative research on the subject, thereby allowing a comparison of research methodologies used globally with those used specifically in LAC and helping to detect existing information gaps in the region.

¹ Most studies that address SOGI in LAC have centered on LGBT persons and have not included other categories. Because of this, the "+" is included to recognize the diversity that exists within SOGI, and to enable the inclusion of other self-identified groups of persons in the future.

Recommendations for Future Initiatives

Based on the analysis that was carried out, this technical note presents a series of recommendations for future research including those that seek to estimate the size of LGBTQ+ populations and to understand the patterns of discrimination that they face in LAC. Specifically, the recommendations are centered around how to ask SOGI-related questions in various types of surveys, the collection of key sociodemographic information, and the importance of training and sensitizing staff conducting the surveys.



01

Introduction

1.1 Background

The Gender and Diversity Sector Framework of the IDB² includes LGBTQ+ populations among the diverse population groups in LAC that face significant inequalities and seeks to formulate policies and recommendations that promote their economic and social inclusion. Nevertheless, the institution's capacity to achieve this goal is limited due to the lack of information that exists on these populations. Because of this, a research effort was initiated with the purpose of analyzing studies that have sought to estimate the size of LGBTQ+ populations and identify patterns of discrimination due to SOGI in LAC.

1.2 Objective

Estimating the size of the LGBTQ+ population and understanding patterns of exclusion that affect them requires statistical data collection. This technical note seeks to analyze existing research initiatives that provide information on LGBTQ+ populations in LAC, with the objective of identifying existing information gaps and recommending methodological strategies for future research. At the same time, it seeks to identify best practices among studies already conducted in and outside of the LAC region that can be used as a reference point for gathering statistical data on LGBTQ+ populations in the region.

1.3 Products

As part of the compilation and analysis of existing information on LGBTQ+ populations, an inventory of studies was created to organize studies for this note. The inventory comprises a list of quantitative studies conducted in and outside of LAC and contains information about the entities that produced them. Included in the inventory are the names of the people responsible for carrying out each study/survey, the place, and year they were conducted, a summary of available results, and instructions for accessing data or results reports.

1.4 Structure

This technical note is divided into six sections, including this introduction. The second section presents the conceptual framework used for the analysis and categorization of information on LGBTQ+ populations. The third section presents information from quantitative studies conducted in LAC, followed by the fourth section on those conducted internationally. In the fifth section, a methodological comparison between studies conducted in LAC and outside the region is presented. Finally, various recommendations are offered that can be useful for future studies on LGBTQ+ populations in LAC.

² Approved by the IDB's Executive Board on March 2015.

02

Conceptual Framework

In this conceptual framework, we present the definitions of sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI), as well as the way these concepts were used in the surveys of the studies analyzed. We also propose a way to characterize the experiences of discrimination and exclusion based on SOGI and identify the contexts in which these scenarios take place.

2.1 Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity: Definition and Discussion

According to the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Intersex Association (ILGA),³ a person's **sexual orientation** refers to their capacity to feel deep affection, emotions, and sexual attraction, and to have intimate relationships with another person of the same gender, a different gender, or more than one gender⁴ (ILGA, 2015). **Sexual attraction** is defined based on the sex of a person and the sex of the people to whom they feel sexually attracted. Sexual attraction is not necessarily fixed, but rather it can vary in terms of the degree and the moment in which a person feels attracted to other people. For example, at a given moment, a person can feel sexually attracted to others of their same sex, but in another moment, they can feel attracted to persons of a different sex (ILGA, 2017). **Sexual behavior**, on the other hand, is determined based on the sex (assigned at birth⁵) of those with whom a person has had sexual experiences, independent of their sexual attraction to them (Bastos et al., 2008).

With respect to the use of definitions in surveys, the **sexual identity** approach, or how people define themselves to indicate who they are as sexual beings (Grollman, 2010), seems reasonable for data collection purposes. However, when there is discrimination and exclusion based on SOGI in the social context in which a study is undertaken, the acceptance of or openness

about one's own identity can be undermined and, as such, the use of the criterion of sexual identity in surveys would exclude those people who do not feel comfortable or safe revealing their identity. Also, it may be the case that a person's sexual identity may not correspond to their sexual behavior. Thus, there may be people who define themselves as lesbian or gay, but who have not had sexual experiences with or felt sexual attraction to people of their same sex (false positives⁶). Furthermore, there are people who self-identify as heterosexual, but who feel sexual attraction toward or have had sexual experiences with people of the same sex (false negatives⁷) (The Williams Institute, 2009).

Gender identity is distinct from sexual identity; it refers to how a person feels internally with respect to their individual experience of gender,⁸ independent of the sex they were assigned at birth and the sexual attraction they feel for other people (ILGA, 2015).

2.2 Discrimination and Exclusion Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Social stigmas result in a variety of prejudices toward certain individuals based on a diverse range of characteristics (ethnic origin, race, SOGI, among others). Often, these prejudices manifest themselves in acts of rejection, as well as unequal or unjust treatment that results in **discrimination** (ILGA, 2015). This can, in turn, lead to individuals having limited access to certain social settings and services or the inability to freely exercise their fundamental rights, consequently experiencing **exclusion** (Morales, 2012).

³ ILGA is a federation of organizations dedicated to achieving equal rights for LGBTQ+ people throughout the world. <https://ilga.org/about-us>.

⁴ This definition is also used by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2015).

⁵ Legally, one's sex assigned at birth refers to the physical characteristics of a person with respect to their sex, including the genitals, other sexual and reproductive anatomy, chromosomes, hormones, and other secondary physical characteristics that emerge in puberty (Gender Spectrum, 2019).

⁶ "False positives" exist when someone is identified as "LGBT" in a survey when it would be more appropriate to identify them as "heterosexual" (The Williams Institute, 2009).

⁷ "False negatives" exist when someone is identified as "heterosexual" in a survey, when it would be more appropriate to identify them as "LGBT" (The Williams Institute, 2009).

⁸ The gender of a person refers to their perception of and experience with masculinity and femininity based on the social constructs that make certain behaviors or roles identified as masculine or feminine. In this way, gender is linked to social expectations and the context in which a person develops, and not necessarily to their sex (ILGA, 2015, p.11).

According to the studies analyzed,

discrimination can take the form of physical violence, verbal aggression, negligence, harassment, etc.,

and it can occur in different settings, such as the family, school, workplace, and nursing homes, among others. This discrimination based on SOGI can occur with regards to access to resources and services and to overall quality of life. It is important to point out

that while access to a setting and exclusion from it are characteristically binary (i.e., a person either has access or does not), the experience of discrimination or exclusion can vary in intensity and at different periods of time.

Understanding discriminatory patterns requires an understanding of the different elements that comprise it. In Table 2.1, we present a series of basic categories for the characterization of different incidents of discrimination, including the action and method, subject, object, timing, setting, motivation, and consequences. This characterization is based on the information presented in the studies on SOGI analyzed for this technical note.⁹

Table 2.1 Categories for the characterization of studies on discrimination based on SOGI

Category	Definition	Examples
Action	Act of discrimination either perceived or experienced	Perceptions, experiences
Subject	The individual who performs the discriminatory action	Heterosexual or cisgender persons; relatives, partners, other acquaintances, strangers, etc.
Object	Person who is the target of the discriminatory act	LGBTQ+ individuals or groups of people.
Method	Way the instance of discrimination occurs	Physical violence, verbal aggression, rendering someone invisible, etc.
Setting	Environment where the act of discrimination takes place	Family, couple, school, workplace, retirement or nursing home, healthcare, housing, legal/judicial institutions.
Timing	Moment in which the act of discrimination takes place (directly tied to the setting)	Time, duration
Reason	Reason underlying the discriminatory action	Heteronormativity, collective imagination, religion
Consequences	Effects of the action on the object of discrimination	Self-discrimination, revenge, empowerment or disempowerment, costs, lower quality of services, lack of access to services

Source: Prepared by authors, based on the literature review.

⁹ It's important to emphasize that, among the studies analyzed, people who responded to the surveys could be those who perpetrated discriminatory actions or the victims of such actions.

Experiences of discrimination based on SOGI are not one-time events in people's lives, and as such, they are not limited to a specific place and time,

but rather occur in various contexts throughout a person's lifetime.

For the most part, the first setting where discrimination occurs is within their own families, followed by school, the workplace, and then, gerontological settings. Many experiences of discrimination are cumulative. This means that when an LGBTQ+ person is the object of discrimination, the consequences will have more lasting and significant when the person has been exposed to continuous forms of discrimination (Aristegui et al., 2012).

At the same time, there are spheres where discrimination tends to occur, such as in healthcare and housing, and society's collective imagination.¹⁰ This does not mean that experiences of discrimination that occur in these settings are the same across the life cycle, but rather that the discrimination is experienced repeatedly within that setting (Human Rights Watch 2014).

Finally, poverty, race and ethnicity, or positive HIV/AIDS status, are included as intersectional categories¹¹ that affect experiences of discrimination based on SOGI. This highlights the fact that diverse groups of people start off in different situations of inequality, and that while their identifying characteristics may initially be independent of their SOGI, the dynamic aspects of discrimination mean that these characteristics, together with those of SOGI, determine the magnitude of the consequences of discrimination that is experienced, and vice-versa. Among the studies analyzed, these intersectional categories appear within the sociodemographic characteristics of the interviewees who report to have experienced discrimination based on SOGI, and not as additional categories that contribute to the experience of discrimination.

2.3 Classification Criteria for Quantitative Studies

Quantitative studies (surveys) were classified based on the following criteria (see Table 2.2):

a. Objective

The studies that were analyzed had either or both of the following objectives: to determine the size (the prevalence) of LGBTQ+ populations and to describe the situation of SOGI-based discrimination.

b. Sample Design

The surveys and studies used for this technical note use either random (probabilistic) or non-random sampling. Probabilistic designs made possible obtaining information that is representative of the universe of individuals included in the sampling. Data collection from non-randomized designs is only self-representative.¹²

The studies analyzed used various random sampling methodologies. Some used stratified sampling in which the total sampling pool was divided into different strata, and the observation units were randomly selected from them. Representative conclusions were drawn from each stratum.

Other studies that used random cluster sampling, grouped elements of the population, selected a random sample from the groups, and obtained observation units randomly from each of the samples. This randomization strategy is typically more cost-efficient as it reduces the costs of survey implementation (MOVILH, 2012). The samples also adjusted for the probability of selection of each element in relation to its size (Probability Proportional to Size or PPS) or assigned to each observation a weight or expansion factor to capture a representative number of people from the population (OCDE, 2003). Finally, the random samples were carried out in various stages and in each one of these, the selection criteria for observations were different.

The use of alternatives to probabilistic sampling varied across the studies analyzed. In those that used convenience sampling, for example, subjects

¹⁰ The Collective imagination is defined a setting in which discrimination can exist because of the way the individual believes society perceives them. It determines the way that individuals perceive themselves and can have consequences such as self-discrimination.

¹¹ Intersectionality is a framework that allows us to understand how the different aspects of a person's identity can have a compounding effect on discrimination and vulnerability. Social stigmas associated with different aspects of a person's identity (e.g., SOGI, race, ethnicity) do not necessarily affect people in a one-dimensional way, but rather, can be interconnected and create compounded experiences of discrimination (Crenshaw 1995).

¹² Representative only among the sample of people interviewed.

were selected based on the ease of reaching them. In those that used voluntary sampling, subjects self-selected when they agreed to participate in the study. Snowball sampling was carried out in some studies, a strategy that is common when surveying difficult-to-access populations. In these cases, the people interviewed referred others within their friendship or acquaintance network. Other studies used Respondent Driven Sampling (RDS), which combines the chain of references from snowball sampling with corrective factors based on the size of each person's contacts network (OCDE, 2003). Although it is a non-probabilistic sampling methodology, when there are large reference chains, information on the structure of social networks allows the use of Markov chains¹³ to generate representative estimates of the population.

c. Interviews

The interviews in the studies were conducted either in-person or remotely. In-person interviews were conducted face-to-face or via questionnaires filled out directly by the people being interviewed (self-administered). The data were recorded either on

paper, on a computer, or on an electronic tablet. Other interviews were conducted by phone or via online forms.

d. Representativeness of the target population

The last classification criterion for quantitative studies is the sexual identity of the person who provided information on SOGI or SOGI-based discrimination. This information could have been obtained either by inquiring on the perceptions of the general population, or by exploring perceptions and experiences specifically of LGBTQ+ populations.

Table 2.2 Criteria for the Classification of Quantitative Studies in LAC

Category	Alternatives
Objective	Estimate of the size (or prevalence) of LGBTQ+ populations. Characterization of discrimination based on SOGI.
Sample Design	Random Not random
Survey	In-person Remote (Not in person)
Representativeness	General population LGBTQ+ populations or subpopulations

Source: Prepared by authors, based on the literature review.

¹³ A Markov chain is a stochastic process that describes a sequence of events in which the probability of each event depends solely on the preceding event.

03

Studies on LGBTQ+ Populations in Latin America and the Caribbean

3.1 General Overview of Information on LGBTQ+ Populations

Throughout the last decade, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay, and Mexico have legally recognized civil unions or marriages between same sex individuals. Nonetheless, in some Caribbean countries, like Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, the Dominican Republic, and Jamaica, there are some laws that continue to penalize sexual acts between persons of the same sex (ILGA, 2017). Given the wide recognition of LGBTQ+ rights in LAC, this section offers a panoramic overview of the region based on the findings reported in the studies analyzed.

3.2 Information on the Size of LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC

Global estimates on the size of the LGBTQ+ populations vary across countries and years. In recent years there has been a greater tendency among young people and women to self-identify as LGBTQ+. In the United States, for example, the percentage of adults who identified as LGBTQ+ increased to 4.5% in 2017, from 4.1% in 2016 and 3.5% in 2012 (Gallup, 2017; Newport, 2018). A parallel increase is observed in self-

identification among young people (millennials) (up from 5.8% in 2012 to 8.2% in 2017), and among women (up from 3.5% to 5.1%).

Statistical information on the size of LGBTQ+ populations in LAC is scarce. This is because there are few studies or surveys that inquire about sexual orientation to the general population, and fewer still that address the question of gender identity.

Many of the studies were conducted in the Southern Cone, specifically Brazil and Chile. One exception is surveys on attitudes toward homosexuals that were carried out by CADRES in Barbados (2004), Guyana (2013), and Trinidad and Tobago (2013). They found that in Barbados, 3% of people identify as homosexual, 4% as bisexual, and 9% preferred not to respond; in Guyana, 3% of people identify as homosexual, 4% as bisexual, and 15% did not respond to the question; in Trinidad and Tobago, 1.6% identify as homosexual, 1.8% as bisexual, and 6% did not respond to the question.

It is important to note that the proportion of people who did not respond to the questions on sexual orientation in the CADRES surveys is high. For this reason, it can be assumed that the percentage of people who self-identify as homosexual or bisexual does not fully reflect the percentage of the actual population.¹⁴

Table 3.1 Number of Studies Analyzed by Country¹⁵

Country	Number of Studies	Country	Number of Studies	Country	Number of Studies
Brazil	12	Nicaragua	3	Bermuda	1
Chile	12	Uruguay	3	Dominica	1
Mexico	12	Bolivia	2	French Guiana	1
Peru	9	Cuba	2	Haiti	1
Argentina	8	Guadeloupe	2	Cayman Islands	1
Costa Rica	8	Guatemala	2	Turks and Caicos Islands	1
Colombia	7	Panama	2	U.S. Virgin Islands	1
Venezuela	7	Paraguay	2	British Virgin Islands	1
El Salvador	5	Suriname	2	Martinique	1

¹⁴ An underestimation is also assumed due to the legal context in these countries where relationships between people of the same sex were still criminalized during the survey period.

¹⁵ The sum of the studies is greater than 68, as some studies were carried out in more than one country.

Country	Number of Studies	Country	Number of Studies	Country	Number of Studies
Belize	4	Anguilla	1	Puerto Rico	1
Ecuador	4	Antigua and Barbuda	1	Saba	1
Honduras	4	Aruba	1	Saint Kitts and Nevis	1
Jamaica	4	Bahamas	1	Sint Eustatius	1
Trinidad and Tobago	4	Bonaire	1	St. Martin	1
Guyana	3	Curaçao	1	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1
Dominican Republic	3	Dominica	1	St. Lucia	1
Barbados	2	Grenada	1		

In countries in the Southern Cone, the tendency not to respond to survey questions on sexual orientation is like that observed in the Caribbean. In Chile, for example, 2% of young people identified as homosexual, 1% as bisexual, and 13% preferred not to respond (Government of Chile, 2015). This suggests, again, that the estimates of lesbian, gay and bisexual people are lower than actual numbers.

In Mexico, just 0.8% of the young people surveyed did not respond when asked about their sexual identity (IMJUVE & UNAM, 2012). However, still only 1.5% of young Mexicans identified as gay, 0.7% as lesbian, and 1.4% as bisexual (Table 3.2).

Estimates tend to vary when surveys do not ask questions about sexual identity, opting instead to ask about people's sexual behavior. An example of this occurred in Guatemala, where it was found that 1.1% of sexually active men who identified as heterosexual have sex with other men (Universidad del Valle de Guatemala, 2013) (Table 3.2). Similarly, in Brazil, 0.1% of households stated that they were led by same-sex couples (IPECE, 2010), while 2.5% of sexually active people have had sexual relations with others of the same sex or of both sexes during the past five years (Bastos et al., 2008). According to the same study, 4.2% of women who had sexual relations in the past 12 months, had relations with other women.

Table 3.2 Size of LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC Countries, According to Selected Studies

Country	Main Results	Source
Barbados	3% of those surveyed identified as homosexual, 4% as bisexual, and 9% preferred not to respond.	Attitudes Towards Homosexuals (2004)
Guyana	3% of those surveyed identified as homosexual, 4% as bisexual, and 15% preferred not to respond.	Attitudes Towards Homosexuals (2013)
Trinidad and Tobago	1.6% of those surveyed identified as homosexual, 1.8% as bisexual, and 6% preferred not to respond.	Attitudes Towards Homosexuals (2013)
Chile	2% of young people identified as homosexual, 1% bisexual, and 13% preferred not to respond.	National Youth Survey (Encuesta Nacional de Juventud) (2015)
Mexico	1.5% of the young people identified as homosexual, 0.7% as lesbian, 1.4% as bisexual, and 0.8% preferred not to respond. 3% of young men identified as homosexual and 1.3% as bisexual. 1.4% of young women identified as lesbian and 1.5% as bisexual.	National Survey of Youth Values (2010)
Guatemala	Using a sample directed by interviewees (Respondent Driven Sampling), between 0.47% and 0.76% of the sexually active population of men in Guatemala City has sex with other men. Using the recapture method, the estimate increased to 1.1%.	Central American Surveillance Survey of Sexual Behavior and Prevalence of HIV and STIs (Encuesta Centroamericana de Vigilancia de Comportamiento Sexual y Prevalencia del HIV e ITS) (2013)
Brazil	0.1% of households are comprised of same-sex couples.	Demographic Census (Censo Demográfico) (2010)
Brazil	0.7% of the population's first sexual encounter was with a person of the same sex. Among sexually active people, 2.5% had had sexual relations with someone of their same sex or of both sexes in the past five years. Of the people who had sexual relations within the past 12 months, 0.9% of men and 4.2% of women had had sexual relations with people of their same sex.	Survey about Sexual Behavior and Perceptions about HIV/AIDS in Brazil (Pesquisa sobre comportamento sexual e percepções da população brasileira sobre HIV/AIDS) (2011)

Source: Prepared by authors based on the literature review.

3.3 Information on Discrimination in LAC

Among the analyzed studies, it was observed that strong stigmatization persists toward LGBTQ+ populations, thus complicating data collection on the subject. According to a Pew Research Center (2014) study,

approximately seven of every ten people in Latin America consider homosexuality to be morally unacceptable

In Argentina, 30% of people disagree with same-sex marriage, while in Brazil, four out of every 10 people are against the legalization of marriage for same-sex couples (LAPOP, 2011). On the other hand, according to a survey on sexuality in Mexico (IPSOS 2015), 54% of Mexicans believe that same-sex marriage should be legal.

According to the Costa Rican Ministry of Health (2015), 76% of Costa Ricans are uncomfortable seeing a same-sex couple kissing in public; 25% would be uncomfortable being seen in the company of a homosexual person; and 20% believe that homosexual people should not frequent the same public spaces as other people. Similarly, the National Council to Prevent Discrimination in Mexico (CONAPRED) (2010) reported that four of every 10 Mexicans would not allow homosexual individuals to live in their home, and only seven of 10 would accept a homosexual child.

These attitudes of rejection are rooted not only in prejudice but also a lack of awareness and knowledge on LGBTQ+ populations. In the survey on Attitudes Toward Homosexuals in Jamaica (Boxill et al., 2011), five out of every 10 people consider homosexuality to be something that can be changed with the help of a professional. There is profound lack of knowledge that exists when it comes to the differences among the LGBTQ+ community. For example, many consider that a transgender identity is a natural extension of homosexual identity. These conceptual gaps are reinforced by the absence of focus on sexual and gender identity in sexual education curriculum in schools and colleges. This was also shown the survey about homophobic bullying in colleges in Chile,

Guatemala, and Peru (Cáceres et al., 2013), which indicated that more than half of respondents had not received education about SOGI.

Given the limited attention given to SOGI issues in many LAC countries, it is not surprising that LGBTQ+ people feel uncomfortable talking about their sexual orientation with their family and that, as a result, self-discrimination exists. According to the survey conducted in the Caribbean by UNAIDS (2014), even though all respondents were men who have sex with men (MSM), 52% of them were not open with about their sexuality, and 55% had never interacted with an LGBTQ community center, organization, or social group. Moreover, of those who experienced discrimination based on SOGI, few sought helps; of those who did seek help, many did not find it. In Chile, for example, while the survey on discrimination against sexual minorities (MOVILH, 2011) showed that five of every ten people who identified as LGBTQ+ have been discriminated against in a direct, individual way, only 7.4% reported the abuse to authorities. Similarly, in Mexico, a survey on workplace diversity and inclusion (Robledo 2015) found that 85% of the victims of homophobic harassment decided not tell their families about it. Among those who reported the incident to Mexican authorities, 48% stated that no action was taken to investigate the incident.

3.4 Methodological Description of Quantitative Studies

This section provides a methodological description of the quantitative studies about LGBTQ+ populations in LAC. The information distinguishes between studies that had the objective of establishing the size of the LGBTI populations and those that characterize discrimination based on SOGI, as well as the few that pursue both. These studies are classified according to the criteria described in Table 2.2 and presented in Figure 3.1.

a. Studies on the Size of LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC

The 68 (quantitative) studies analyzed only provided information on the size of the LGBTQ+ populations in the region and were conducted using surveys. Of these, only three¹⁶ used random sampling to conduct face-to-face surveys that included a question about sexual orientation. However, while these surveys were conducted using a random sample of households,

only one person per household was interviewed, and that individual was asked about the sexual orientation and gender identity of all members of the household. This method, which is typical for many household surveys, can result in inaccurate estimates of LGBTQ+ populations.

None of the studies that attempted to estimate the size of LGBTQ+ populations started from a sampling frame defined by a population census. In Guatemala (Morales & Hernández, 2010) for example, an attempt was made to estimate the size of the MSM population in the country's capital by using information provided by key informants¹⁷ to map sites, days, and hours small groups of MSM gathered. From this mapping, a random survey was applied using a capture and recapture method. While the survey indicated that between 997 and 1,601 MSM lived in Guatemala City, the data recapture method estimated 4,999.

b. Studies on Discrimination toward LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC

Of the 68 quantitative studies on LGBTQ+ populations in LAC that were analyzed, 57 addressed the issue of discrimination, and of these, 28 used random sampling designs (Figure 3.1). The random studies used stratified and cluster samples, based on geographic or administrative regions as the units of stratification, with sampling frames configured by the list of physical addresses of the households. In general, these studies were carried out in person, with pencil and paper surveys, allowing the interviewer to inquire about the perception of the general population toward LGBTQ+ populations. Others, such as Latinobarómetro (LAPOP, 2011), used cards (showcards¹⁸) to ask sensitive questions.

Some implemented multiple surveys simultaneously, with the goal of arriving at a more expansive view of the situation of discrimination toward LGBTQ+ people. For example, the study conducted by Econometría Consultores in Bogotá (2010) involved two types of surveys simultaneously: (1) a survey using a random sample for in-person interviews on general perceptions

of the community toward LGBTQ+ populations, and (2) a second survey with a non-random sample using Respondent Driven Sampling (RDS)¹⁹ to understand the situation of discrimination toward LGBTQ+ people in Bogotá.

The rest of the surveys about LGBTQ+ discrimination used non-random sampling designs, either voluntary, convenience, snowball, or RDS sampling. The surveys that used voluntary sampling either in-person or online surveys. The surveys conducted online²⁰ that are most noteworthy, include those conducted by GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian, & Straight Education Network) (2015), the Todo Mejora Foundation (2012), the two surveys in Mexico on homophobia and the workforce (Robledo, 2014), and workplace diversity and inclusion (Robledo, 2015).

The surveys analyzed that used convenience samples, which were carried out in person, either targeted the general population or the LGBTQ+ populations. Examples of this approach includes the surveys on sexual education and discrimination and homophobic bullying in Chile (Todo Mejora Foundation, 2012); the survey on positive perceptions of the LGBT population in Bogotá (IDPAC 2010), and the survey about sexual orientation and the quality of life of university students in Cuba, Norway, India, and South Africa (Træen et al., 2009). Surveys, such as the one carried out during gay pride marches in Venezuela, used only LGBTQ+ populations as sources of information (Nieves & Mondragón, 2014).

Finally, there are the studies that used non-random snowball and RDS sampling. These methods are designed to obtain information on populations that are difficult to access and, as such, require in-person surveys. In snowball studies, it is common for field workers to belong to LGBTQ+ populations. Among the studies analyzed that use this type of methodology are the survey about the trans population in Argentina (INDEC, 2012); the case study on the life conditions of LGBTQ+ individuals in Ecuador (INEC, 2013); the index

¹⁶ Survey about sexual behavior in Brazil (Bastos et al., 2008); survey about family health in Belize (Belize Central Statistical Office, 1999); survey of youth in Chile (Government of Chile, 2015).

¹⁷ NGOs and institutions that had information about the study population.

¹⁸ Showcards are used during face-to-face surveys. They contain various possible responses to a question, permitting the respondent to choose the card with the correct response. The cards are used widely for questions about sensitive subjects that are perhaps best not answered aloud (LAPOP, 2017). These cards can be modified to be programmed within questions when surveys are conducted using technology like tablets or smart phones.

¹⁹ RDS combines snowball sampling with a mathematical model that weighs the sample to compensate for not being randomly selected (OECD, 2003).

²⁰ Computer-Assisted Web Interviewing, or CAWI.

of stigma and discrimination in Chile (Larios Cruz, 2012); the Central American sexual behavior survey (USAID, 2010); and the study about the use of health services among MSM and transgender women in El Salvador (Measure Evaluation 2011-2012).

c. Studies on the size of and discrimination toward the LGBTQ+ population in LAC

Some of the analyzed studies sought both objectives: to estimate the size of LGBTQ+ populations and, at the same time, describe discrimination based on SOGI. Examples of this type are surveys about attitudes toward homosexuals in the Caribbean (CADRES, 2004, 2013), which contain questions about sexual identity in a questionnaire that the interviewee should self-complete. Similarly, the study about sexuality, AIDS, and drug use in Chile (MOVILH, 2005)²¹ utilized a self-administered paper questionnaire²² through which respondents' experiences victimization were collected, and they were asked about as well as their sexual orientation. For its part, the survey about values of youth in Mexico (IMJUVE & UNAM, 2012) inquired about the perception of young people with respect to the LGBTQ+ community and, at the same time, allowed the interviewees to declare their sexual orientation via face-to-face, computer-assisted interviews.²³

Regarding the sampling design and types of

interviews, the common practices observed in the quantitative studies on LGBTQ+ populations in LAC are summarized in Table 3.2.

3.5 Common practices for asking questions about SOGI in LAC

Few surveys ask questions on about gender identity to the general population. When these questions are included, they are typically formulated in two stages: first a question asks on biological sex or sex assigned at birth, followed by a question on a person's self-identification of gender identity.

In the study on LGBTQ+ populations in Ecuador (INEC, 2013), two questions were formulated although, unfortunately, the second question mixed concepts on sexual orientation and gender identity. It is worth pointing out, however, that it is one of the few surveys that includes intersex among the possible responses for the sex assigned at birth.

- According to your biological sex, you were born a:
 - Man
 - Woman
 - Intersex

Table 3.2 Common practices in quantitative studies about LGBTQ+ populations in LAC

Sample Design		Survey Method	
Random Samples	Non-random Samples	In-person interviews	Anonymized Surveys
Random, stratified, and cluster sampling	Convenience samples: Selection of respondents in socialization spaces within the LGBTQ+ community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PASI or CAPI • Do not survey substitutes or proxies • Informed consent • Ethical approval 	
Random, stratified, and cluster sampling	Snowball samples: Interviewer identifies as LGBTQ+		
Sampling frame: Physical address of the household			

Source: Authors, based on literature review.

²¹ Relatively small random study (N=315).

²² Paper and Pencil Computer Self-Interviewing (Self-administered interview using pencil and paper, assisted by computer), or PASI.

²³ Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (Personal, computer- assisted interview), or CAPI.

- According to your sexual or gender condition, you identify as:

- Gay
- Lesbian
- Bisexual
- Trans woman
- Trans man
- Transsexual
- Other

Among the surveys analyzed, it is common to find questions on sexual orientation, although presented in different forms. In some, like the National Survey of Youth in Chile (2015), questions were direct:

- What is your sexual orientation?
 - Heterosexual
 - Homosexual
 - Bisexual

In others, like the surveys by CADRES (2004, 2013) in the Caribbean, questions on sexual orientation of the interviewees were asked in a way that allowed interviewees themselves answer the following question:

- How would you describe your sexual orientation (personal)?
 - I am heterosexual
 - I am homosexual/lesbian
 - I am bisexual (man or woman)
 - I prefer not to respond

In the survey on the effects of violence and discrimination on the mental health of LGBTQ+ people in Mexico City (Ortiz-Hernández & Torres, 2005), a question on the sexual orientation of LGBTQ+ people was included with an attraction approach that is not binary, but rather focus on variations of the degree of attraction:

- To whom do you feel sexually attracted?
 - Only women
 - Mainly women, but not only women
 - Women and men, but more toward women
 - Men and women equally
 - Men and women, but more toward men

- Mainly men, but not only men
- Only men
- I'm not sure

In other surveys, such as Belize's Survey of Family Health (1999), the focus is on the current sexual behavior of people, as seen below:

- Do you have a relationship with someone of the same sex, a heterosexual relationship, both, and neither?
 - Same sex
 - Heterosexual
 - Both
 - None
 - Doesn't know/doesn't answer

Among the studies analyzed, it is noted that in LAC, and in Central America in particular, the use of the category "men who have sex with men" (MSM) is common. Nonetheless, it is a term that is used more for public health reasons related to HIV than to questions of identity.

Within the review of the studies, it was noted that, on some occasions and to obtain accurate information, surveys included a preamble to the questions on sexual orientation and gender identity. These preambles included definitions about LGBTQ+ identities. For example, in the National Survey of Values of Youth in Mexico's questionnaire (2012), the following question was asked:

[INTERVIEWER: READ THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH:]

People who PREFER to have sexual relations with someone of the opposite sex have a heterosexual orientation. People who prefer to have sexual relations with someone of their same sex are considered to have a homosexual orientation. Males are called homosexuals, while in the case of women, they are called lesbians. Those who prefer to have sexual relations with men and women are considered bisexual.

- Which do you consider to be your sexual orientation? [(READ OPTIONS 1 to 4)]
 - Heterosexual
 - Homosexual
 - Bisexual
 - Lesbian

- Other (specify)

Similarly, at the beginning of the questionnaire of the evaluation of attitudes toward LGBTQ+ people by the Costa Rican police forces (CIPAC, 2014), a section of definitions on sexual orientation and gender identity is included.

In other cases, the surveys whose objective is to describe the situation of discrimination based on SOGI contain statements that the interviewees must answer on a Likert scale²⁴, as in the following example extracted from Latinobarómetro (2011):

- Are you (1) very much in agreement, (2) in agreement, (3) in disagreement, or (4) very much in disagreement with each one of the following statements?
 - Marriage between homosexuals

Other surveys that include questions on social acceptance of LGBTQ+ people without using the Likert scale, as in the survey about sexual education and discrimination in Chile (MOVILH, 2012), directed toward adolescents:

- If your best friend tells you, they are homosexual/bisexual/transsexual. What would you do?
 - I would understand them
 - It would be hard, but I would try to understand
 - I wouldn't accept it
 - No response/doesn't know

In the survey on sexuality, reproduction, and gender inequality in Peru (IPSOS, 2011), the following question is included:

- How do you feel about people who discriminate against homosexuals? (With showcard)
 - I reject them
 - I am indifferent
 - I support them

Additionally, these surveys seek to identify the primary

settings where SOGI discrimination occurs most frequently frequency, including schools (homophobic bullying), workplaces, health settings, religious services, in situations with police involvement or other authorities, or in settings where there is an association between HIV/AIDS status and violence against LGBTQ+ populations (Todo Mejora Foundation, 2012).

It is worth noting that most surveys that address the theme of discrimination based on SOGI have ethical approval and require informed consent from the interviewees.

3.6 Information gaps on about LGBTQ+ populations in LAC

The analysis of the studies mentioned previously evidence that information gaps about LGBTQ+ populations in LAC persist for various reasons: (i) the lack of surveys on SOGI among the general population; (ii) the absence of protocols that guarantee privacy of interviewees and the handling of sensitive information; (iii) the lack of homogeneous categories that permit comparisons of evidence about discrimination across different studies; and (iv) the political sensitivity of these subjects.

Only the surveys by CADRES (2004, 2013) in the Caribbean asked questions on sexual orientation (understood as sexual identity) of the general population. In two representative surveys carried out at the national level including the survey of Chilean youth (Government of Chile, 2015) and the survey of youth in Mexico (IMJUVE & UNAM, 2010), the sexual identity question was posed to young people. Although the conclusions derived from these surveys

²⁴ The Likert scale orders the respondent's answers according to the degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements presented. In this case, the respondent identified whether they were totally in disagreement, in disagreement, in neither agreement nor disagreement, in agreement, or totally in agreement.

Table 3.3 Common Practices for Questions on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in LAC

Focus of the questions	Way to ask
Prevalence of LGBTQ+ identities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual orientation defined through identity, sexual attraction, and sexual behavior • Use of the category MSM • Absence of questions on gender identity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preamble of definitions on LGBTQ+ identities • Questions on sexual orientation in a self-complete form
Discrimination based on SOGI <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions and attitudes • Experiences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Homophobic harassment - Employment - Health and HIV - Religion - Police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likert Scale

Source: Authors, based on the literature review.

are relevant for the regions in which they were carried out, they do not allow extrapolation of the size of the LGBTQ+ populations at the national level.

The studies analyzed have other shortcomings. It is important to point out, for example, the lack of protocols to guarantee the privacy and security of those interviewed. In the survey of youth in Mexico (IMJUVE & UNAM, 2010), the identity question is posed to various members of the household through face-to-face interviews in which the interviewer fills out a form with the answers of the interviewees, without the option of using showcards that allow respondents to report on their sexual orientation without revealing it to the rest of their family. This demonstrates a lack of protocols for carrying out an interview when it is conducted in the presence of other members of the household.

With it comes to discrimination based on SOGI, the principal deficiency of the surveys analyzed in this technical note is the absence of homogeneous categories to quantify the reports of discrimination. While the survey of the case study of LGBTQ+ populations in Ecuador (INEC, 2013) asks directly whether a person has been discriminated against due to their LGBTQ+ identity; in others, such as the Survey of Youth in Chile (Government of Chile, 2015), it is investigated whether the person had been discriminated against but did not ask about the

reasons it occurred. Among the options for responding to the cause of discrimination in different settings in the national survey about discrimination in Mexico (CONAPRED, 2010), people's sexual preference appears as an option.

This lack of standardization exists because, even though it is possible to standardize responses vis-a-vis statistical analysis, there will always be a margin of error due to variety in the formulation of the questions on discrimination. Additionally, it is impossible to determine the differences between experiences of discrimination and perceptions of the concept of discrimination itself. If the experiences reported by LGBTQ+ people and those reported by the general population are captured in distinct categories, it is not possible to distinguish between discrimination that is based on SOGI and that which responds to different levels of tolerance for aggressions. As such – and in the absence of standardized measures –

it is more difficult to compare studies and to present homogeneous evidence regarding discrimination against LGBTQ+ people in the region.

04

**Studies about LGBTQ+
populations in the
international setting
(outside of LAC)**

Outside LAC, there are relevant studies that aim to determine the size of LGBTQ+ populations and the situation of social exclusion they suffer because of SOGI. The analysis of these allows for the identification of best research practices, compiling a list of international references, providing elements to compare the methodologies used, and identifying the existing information gaps in the LAC region.

For this technical note, we analyzed 25 studies that were conducted outside of the region and classified these based on the areas from which information about the LGBTQ+ populations were obtained: private sector, government, academia, and multilateral organizations. For each one of the studies, a source of information was identified (institution or lead researcher) that served as a point of departure to compile an inventory of studies (Appendix B). Each

one of the studies analyzed was classified based on the criteria mentioned in Table 2.2.

4.1 Studies on the size of LGBTQ+ populations

All the international studies conducted outside of LAC that were analyzed for this technical note were conducted using random sampling, and only seven of the 25 focused on measuring the size of LGBTQ+ populations (Table 4.1). In general, these studies were carried out using nationally representative household or health surveys that included one or two questions on gender identity and sexual orientation at the end of section on identity.

Tabla 4.1 Selected studies on the size of LGBTQ+ populations at the international level (outside of LAC)

Survey	Country	Entity responsible for conducting the survey	Objective
<i>Gallup Poll (2017)</i> (<i>Gallup Polls</i>)	Various	Gallup	Collect information on LGBTQ+ populations and include this in their measurements.
<i>Integrated Household Survey: Sexual identity, smoking prevalence and perceived general health using data from the Integrated Household Survey (2015)</i>	United Kingdom	Office of National Statistics (ONS)	Produce estimates about economic activity, education, health, identity, sexual behavior, tobacco use, and well-being.
<i>The British National Surveys of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (Natsal) (2012)</i>	United Kingdom	University College of London (UCL), London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) and NatCen Social Research (NatCen)	Provide up-to-date information on sexual and reproductive health, sexual behaviors, and risk factors of the British population.
<i>National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) (2017)</i>	United States	Centers for Disease Control (CDC)	Collect information about preventive health practices and risk behaviors.
<i>Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) (2014)</i>	United States (all states and Washington, D.C.)	Centers for Disease Control (CDC)	Compile information about preventive health practices and risk behaviors.

Survey	Country	Entity responsible for conducting the survey	Objective
<i>California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) (2016)</i>	California (United States)	UCLA Center for Health Policy Research	Provide information about physical and mental health, prevalence and management of illnesses, health coverage, and access and barriers in the use of health services.
<i>Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) (2018)</i>	Canada	Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI), Statistics Canada and Health Canada	Collect information about health, sanitation services, and determinants of health among the population.

Source: Authors, based on the literature review.

According to the methodological description of analyzed studies, the interviews for these surveys were conducted in person or not in person, which is a factor that determines the data collection instrument that was used.

The studies that used in-person interviews used interviewees' physical address as the sampling unit. In these cases, the interviewers visited the homes of people and conducted personal, computer-assisted interviews (CAPI) or self-administered with the help of a computer (Computer-Assisted Self Interviewing or CASI). On some occasions, such as in the Natsal survey in the United Kingdom (UCL, LSHTM & NatCen, 2012), both instruments were used to gather information: CASI for sensitive questions, and CAPI for generic questions.

The surveys that were not conducted in person were conducted by phone (Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing or CATI) using the list of landline phone numbers and the list of cellphone numbers as sampling frames. In these surveys, the selection of interviewees was conducted by random calls (Random Digit Dialing) and measures were implemented to correct overlap of the sampling frames.

4.2 Studies about the size of LGBTQ+ populations and discrimination outside of LAC

The surveys that aimed to determine the situation of discrimination against LGBTQ+ populations collected information through either random or non-random samples

Table 4.2 below shows that the surveys that used random samples used different methods (either in-person or not in-person interviews) and were directed to different populations (LGBTQ only, the general population, or both). Those that used non-randomized sample were directed only to the LGBTQ populations. Only those surveys with random, representative samples were able to characterize the situation of discrimination based on SOGI and, at the same time, determine the size of LGBTQ+ populations. An example of this is the Italian survey about discrimination based on SOGI (ISTAT, 2014), which collected information on the scope and types of discrimination in Italy, with special reference made to gender, sexual orientation, and ethnic origin. This survey had a random sampling design and collected information on how the general population perceives the LGBTQ+ community and how the latter feels discriminated against. To implement both questionnaires, the ISTAT questionnaire generated a random sample of households and selected at random an adult in each household to be interviewed. With the help of an interviewer and via CAPI interviews, the interviewees responded to questions about the perception with respect to certain minorities, including LGBTQ+ people. Later, the respondent completed a questionnaire module on their own, in which they reported their sexual orientation and gender identity, as well as their experiences of victimization.

4.3 Studies on discrimination outside of LAC

Most of the studies conducted outside of LAC that used random sampling with in-person CAPI interviews to collect information on how the general population

perceived LGBTQ+ people. To do this, the World Values Survey (World Values Survey Association, 2014) included two questions on the general population's perception regarding homosexual people. For its part, the Pew Research Center's (2013) global public opinion survey sought to inquire about the moral acceptance of homosexuality in society. Similarly, in its survey about discrimination, the Eurobarómetro (2016) also sought to characterize the perception of the general population toward LGBTQ+ groups in the European Union.

Among the surveys that were not conducted in person, but which sought to capture information on discrimination, both in the general population and in LGBTQ+ communities, is the Kaiser Survey of Sexual Orientation (KSSO) (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2000) in the United States, and the Social Survey of Canada (GSS, Ministry of Industry, Canada, 2013). The methodological description of the KSSO sample that collected information on the experiences of people who identified themselves as LGB and measured the attitudes of the general public toward them. The survey including questions on policies related to sexual orientation. On the other hand, the GSS, sought to understand the way in which Canadians perceive crime and justice system, as well as their experiences of victimization. Both used online (CAWI) and phone (CATI) interviews.

Some studies employed non- face-to-face random samples which used only information reported directly by LGBTQ+ people. These surveys commenced with a general population panel and were administered by the members of the panel who had identified as LGBTQ+ through previous online interviews (CAWI). An example of this type of survey is the Human Rights Campaign Foundation (2009) report which examined the workplace environment faced by LGBTI people.

Some surveys used sought to characterize the situation of discrimination in LGBTQ+ populations through non-random sampling. The majority of these used voluntary samples along with non- face-to-face surveys and collected information through online forms (CAWI). Though there are studies that cover both the general population and LGBTQ+ populations – as is the case of the Stonewall Workplace Equality Index (2018) – most of the surveys with voluntary designs are directed solely to LGBTQ+ people. This selection allows for a broader outlook where not only the degree of discrimination is characterized, but also the setting in which it is generated: daily life, the workplace, educational institutions, etc. Examples of

these surveys are: Out Now Global LGBT 2020 Study (Out Now Global, 2013); EU LGBTQ+ Survey (FRA, 2013); National Transgender Discrimination Survey (Trans Equality, 2011); First Annual LGBT Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Survey (MINGLE, 2012); and Bullying Targeting Secondary School Students Who Are Perceived to be Transgender or Same-Sex Attracted: Types, Prevalence, Impact, Motivation and Preventive Measures in Five Provinces in Thailand (UNESCO, 2014).

Studies using convenience and snowball sampling focused on LGBTQ+ populations were also identified. The study of The Williams Institute (2015) used the snowball method to capture demographic and socioeconomic information, sexual orientation and gender identity, and the experiences of discrimination of sexual and gender minorities. Given the need for the interviewer to be in the field to contact new interviewees, the data were collected through CAPI-type, face-to-face interviews in India and Nepal. Likewise, considering that the success of the surveys depends upon the ability of those responsible for recruiting respondents, local collaborators, and their position within the LGBTQ+ community were key.

4.4 Common practices for questions on the LGTBQ+ population internationally (outside of LAC)

Table 4.3 presents common practices for asking questions on sexual orientation and gender identity found in the studies conducted outside of LAC.

The questions associated with gender identity are generally formulated in two stages or “two steps,” which allow inquiry into the sex assigned at birth, and later contrasted with information on the current gender identity (The Williams Institute 2014).

- What was your assigned sex at birth?
 - Male
 - Female
- How do you describe yourself? (Choose one)
 - Man
 - Woman
 - Transgender

Table 4.2 Classification of International Studies on LGBTQ+ Populations outside of LAC

Objective	Sampling design	Interview	Representativeness	Studies
Size	Randomized	In-person	General population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Household survey: HIS (European Commission)Health survey: National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) (USA), Canadian Community Health Survey (Canada), National Surveys of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (NATSAL) (UK).
		Remote	General population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Health survey: Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) (USA), California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) (USA).Opinion survey: Gallup (USA).
Discrimination	Randomized	In-person	General population + LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Household survey: Discriminazioni Italia.
			General population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Opinion survey: World Values Survey (WVS) (worldwide), Eurobarometer (Europe), Global Attitudes (worldwide).
		Remote	General population + LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Opinion survey: Kaiser Survey of Sexual Orientation (KSSO) (USA), General Social Survey (GSS) (USA).
			LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Opinion survey: PEW LGBT Survey (USA), Degrees of Equality (USA).
			Non-randomized	
Voluntary	Remote	General population + LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Workplace: Workplace Equality Index (UK).	
		LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Quality of life: EU LGBT, National Transgender Discrimination Survey (NTDS) (USA), Supporting LGBT Lives.Workplace: Workplace India, OutNow Survey (worldwide), PSEU (USA).Education centers: Youth India, Bullying Targeting Secondary School Students who are or are perceived as transgender or same-sex attracted (Thailand).	
		Snowball	In-person	LGBTI population
Convenience	In-person	LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Quality of life: World Bank India	

Source: Authors, based on the literature review.

- I don't identify as a man, woman, or as transgender

Following The Williams Institute's guide, the National Crime Victimization Survey in the United States (2016) used this approach to obtain information on the respondents' gender:

- What sex were you assigned at birth, on your birth certificate?
 - Male
 - Female
 - I don't wish to respond
 - I don't know

- Do you currently describe yourself as a man, woman, or as transgender?

- Man
- Woman
- Transgender
- None of the above

Among the international studies analyzed, questions about gender identity and sexual orientation were formulated separately²⁵. It is for this reason that the associated question is of the type: "You describe yourself as...", "You consider yourself as...", "You identify as...", "You think of yourself as...". A common

question about sexual orientation in these surveys is, for example, like the one found in the study by Out Now Global (2013):

- How do you describe yourself?
 - Gay
 - Lesbian
 - Bisexual
 - Heterosexual
 - Other

This is consistent with best practices for questions on sexual orientation, presented by the British organization Stonewall (2016), which suggests asking the following question:

- What is your sexual orientation?
 - Bisexual
 - Gay man
 - Lesbian or gay woman
 - Heterosexual
 - I prefer not to say
 - I prefer to describe myself: _____

Among the international surveys analyzed, no preambles were presented to explain why these questions were being asked, nor were definitions of existing response options included. Nonetheless, in the studies that used face-to-face interviews, an emphasis was placed on the importance of training interviewers so that they could respond to concerns of interviewees, including on definitions of LGBTQ+ identities. Furthermore, representative surveys of the general population included questions on LGBTQ+ identities at the end of the identity module, along with other questions about ethnic or racial minorities.

When it comes to sampling design,

studies representative of the general population used stratified random sampling,

with the geographic or political-administrative region being the unit of stratification. The decision to conduct cluster randomization depended on resources available. When there were sufficient resources, randomization took place in the final sampling unit within each stratum (the household). The final sample of these studies is representative of adults older than 18 years of age and it is not likely that there is overrepresentation of any group of people.

Regarding survey implementation, a single interview was conducted per household and the interviewees were not allowed to report information on the sexual orientation or gender identity of third parties. Similarly, monetary compensation was not offered to interviewees. The selection of interviewees occurred in a random fashion (for example, selecting the person whose birthday occurred most recently). Only in the United Kingdom's household survey (Office for National Statistics, 2015), were questions on sexual orientation and gender identity asked to all household members older than 16 years. This survey also used showcards to ensure that the responses of the interviewee were not revealed to family members who were present during the interview.

It is important to underscore that information on SOGI-based discrimination can originate from two sources: the general population and LGBTQ+ groups. In the first case, the studies analyzed inquired on the perception that the population in general has toward LGBTQ+ people or about the experiences of victimization of those interviewed. In the second case, the studies included LGBTQ+ identity as a response option among the reasons associated with the discriminatory event. For example, the Eurobarómetro (European Commission, 2016) asked:

- In the last 12 months, have you felt discriminated against or harassed or one or more of the following reasons? Please mark all answers that apply.
 - Ethnic origin
 - Gender
 - Sexual orientation (for being gay, lesbian, or bisexual)
 - For being older than 55 years
 - For being younger than 30 years
 - Religion or beliefs

²⁵ The latter defined in terms of identity.

Table 4.3 Way to ask common practices for asking questions about SOGI in the international setting (outside of LAC)

Focus of the questions	Way to ask
SOGI self-identification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions on gender identity and sexual orientation are asked separately • Preambles to explain the reasoning behind SOGI questions are not used in the surveys 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions on gender identity are carried out in two phases or “two steps” compare sex assigned at birth and self identification.” • Questions about sexual orientation • Questions without preamble • Definitions about LGBTQ+ identities are not included • Trained interviewers
Discrimination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions directed to the general population or LGBTQ+ people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions that inquire about the general population’s perception of LGBTQ+ people • Inclusion of LGBTQ+ identity as a response option among the reasons associated with discrimination

Source: Authors, based on the literature review.

- Disability
- Gender identity (for being transgender or transsexual)
- For another reason

When the person reports information about discrimination based on SOGI self-identifies as LGBTQ+, the experiences of the case are the response options. For example, the survey about discrimination against transgender people in the United States (Grant et al., 2011) (Table 4.2) contains the following question:

- Given that you are transgender or gender non-conforming, please mark if you have experienced any of the following experiences in the following public spaces

In any of the cases, most of the surveys that collected information about victimization included an open question in which the interviewee could express their opinions and expand upon the information recorded in the questionnaire.

Table 4.4 Common practices in international studies (outside of LAC) about LGBTQ+ populations

Sample Design	Type of Survey	
Randomized Samples	Face-to-face Interviews	Anonymized Surveys
Random, stratified, and cluster sampling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling frame: physical address or phone number of household’s residence • Adults over the age of 18 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PASI or CAPI • One interviewee per household • No substitute or proxy surveyed • No monetary compensation 	

Source: Authors, based on the literature review

05

Comparison between LAC studies and international studies

A comparison of Tables 3.2 and 4.3 allows us to establish similarities and differences between the studies about LGBTQ+ populations. Both the LAC surveys and those conducted outside the region used random stratified samples in which the unit of stratification depended on the unit in which policy decisions were made. In both contexts an identity approach was adopted for defining sexual orientation. In no case did the methodologies permit that information about sexual orientation be disclosed by a third party: the studies did not allow surrogate or proxy surveys.

With respect to the formulation of questions about LGBTQ+ identities, while most of the surveys conducted outside the region did not include a preamble for the questions about gender identity and sexual orientation, the surveys in LAC did introduce definitions of the concepts. This is due, in part, to the fact that SOGI concepts are not entirely clear for most people in the region (Boxill et al., 2011). Nevertheless, from the point of view of quantifying stigma, not including preambles but including a measure of disinformation about SOGI issues, allows the identification and measurement of a possible cause of discrimination.

The experience in the studies conducted outside the region also differs from those in LAC with respect to the method used to collect information about LGBTQ+ identities. The use of showcards is more common in the international setting than in LAC, where information is collected through paper forms that are managed by the interviewees themselves. In the studies carried out in LAC, the protocols to guarantee privacy and security are incipient, and there is greater insistence on obtaining informed consent at the beginning of the interview.

Similarly, there are also differences in the technology used to collect information. In most of the studies conducted outside of LAC, both the interviewer and

the interviewee made use of computers, tablets, or smartphones; meanwhile, most of the interviews in LAC were conducted using printed questionnaires. This can be explained by the difference in the availability of resources and the level of technological literacy.

It is noteworthy that, among the studies conducted in LAC, experiences of discrimination based on SOGI were addressed in greater depth than those conducted outside the region. This is because studies in LAC tend to put emphasis, for example, on the role of religion in the processes of stigma and discrimination, as well as in the spaces where the LGBTQ+ population interacts with state entities, especially the police. Although the surveys conducted outside the region did not place much emphasis on these subjects, they used a greater degree of standardization of questions, which allows comparison between the studies conducted outside of LAC to be more direct. There is also a greater accumulation of knowledge, such as when they inquire about experiences of discrimination among the general population and include LGBTQ+ identities as a response option. Likewise, when they ask questions about experiences of discrimination among the LGBTQ+ community, being part of these identities and these settings where discrimination exists are response options.

It should also be noted that in LAC, there are various surveys that use samples of the Respondent Driven Sampling type (RDS) to reach difficult to access populations and to generate information that is representative of the entire target population; outside of LAC, RDS samples have had less use.

06

Discussion and Recommendations

Below, we discuss limitations and solutions that have been adopted in the surveys regarding sexual orientation and gender identity and analyzed in the report..

6.1. General Limitations

In general, the collection of statistical information regarding SOGI-based discrimination suffers from two significant limitations.

First, SOGI-based discrimination generates a bias in the responses of respondents, which affects the reporting rate; as a result, it is impossible to arrive at an exact identification of its magnitude (IACHR, 2015). Respondents cannot always respond in an honest manner, depending on the setting in which the interview is carried out, which can cause data collected about victimization, for example, to be inaccurate. In cases where a country's legislation establishes that same-sex relations are illegal, it is even more difficult to estimate the size of the population, whether because people who self-identify as LGBTQ+ do not report their identity for fear of legal repercussions (especially if the protocol and method of data collection do not ensure their confidentiality), or for fear of being discriminated against socially.

Second, the concepts related to sexual orientation and gender identity are not one-dimensional and can change over time and in context, which makes the formation of questions regarding the subjects related to SOGI not always neutral. If the survey adopts a sexual identity approach to ask about sexual orientation, the effect of SOGI-based discrimination will not be able to be estimated based on the self-acceptance of the LGBTQ+ identity of the respondents. In addition, if it uses questions about sexual behavior to address sexual orientation, it is possible to overestimate the size of LGBTQ+ populations if the frequency and duration of the sexual experiences of the respondents are not considered. Likewise, a survey that only contains questions about sexual attraction with too many young people in the sampling frame, can overestimate the size of LGBTQ+ populations since adolescence is a period of exploration (Human Rights Campaign Foundation, 2009).

6.2. Recommendations for collection of data about SOGI

Regardless of whether a survey seeks to determine the size of LGBTQ+ populations or to understand the experiences of SOGI-based discrimination, the first step for collecting statistical information is determining what one wants to measure.

A broad approach should start with questions about sex assigned at birth, followed by questions about gender identity. According to the study by The Williams Institute (2014), which highlights the best practices for asking questions to identify SOGI populations in population surveys, the most convenient practice is to ask two questions (in "two steps": first, ask one about sex assigned at birth, followed by one about gender identity). According to tests conducted by researchers, this approach should include the following questions:

- What was the sex assigned to you at birth?
 - Male
 - Female
- How do you describe yourself? (Mark one)
 - Man
 - Woman
 - Transgender
 - I don't identify as man, woman, or transgender

A good example of this practice is found in the United States Victimization Survey (2016), which has included in its questionnaire a model that conforms to the format presented in the recommendations of The Williams Institute, but with certain modifications. The questions of the victimization survey have additional response options for people who do not wish to respond to the question or who do not know which gender identity corresponds to them:

- What sex was assigned to you at birth, and is indicated on your birth certificate?
 - Male
 - Female
 - I don't want to respond
 - I don't know

- Do you currently describe yourself as a man, woman, or transgender?
 - Man
 - Woman
 - Transgender
 - None of the options

The Williams Institute also suggests another question that asks directly about gender identity:

- What is your current gender identity? (Mark all that apply).
 - Man
 - Woman
 - Trans man
 - Trans woman
 - Queer/non-conforming
 - Other identity (please identify):

Given that the response options contain “trans man” or “trans woman,” in this case, it is not necessary to ask about the sex assigned at birth. Nevertheless, The Williams Institute itself warns about the use of this question, as it has not yet been sufficiently tested and cannot be useful in contexts in which trans people do not identify as “trans men” or “trans women” and, instead of that, identify only as “men” or “women.” Even though this question is considered a best practice, the “two steps” approach is considered better.

These questions should be complemented by others about sexual orientation. A good example of how to do so can be found in the Stonewall (2016) organization’s manual about capturing data about sexual orientation and gender identity; the manual suggests the following question as a best practice:

- What is your sexual orientation?
 - Bisexual
 - Gay man
 - Lesbian or gay woman
 - Heterosexual
 - I prefer not to say
 - I prefer to describe myself: _____

This example asks directly about people’s sexual orientation, and leaves room for people to self-identify

if they do not feel represented by the response options. However, although it is a good question, it assumes a certain knowledge of SOGI concepts on the part of questionnaire respondents, which is not always the case in the context of the place where the survey is being conducted. Furthermore, the option “I am not sure” does not exist, which obligates people, in a certain way, to define their sexual orientation, even if they don’t know or are not ready to identify it.

Therefore, considering the context in which the survey is being conducted, the question about sexual orientation could be replaced or complemented by a question about sexual attraction, which is easier to understand, and which offers response options that are understood more easily. An example of this is the question about sexual attraction from the study about the effects of violence and discrimination on the mental health of LGBTQ+ people in Mexico City (Ortiz-Hernandez & Torres 2005):

- To whom do you feel sexually attracted?
 - Only to women
 - Mainly to women, but not only to them
 - To women and men, but more to women
 - To men and women equally
 - To men and women, but more to men
 - Mainly to men, but not only to them
 - Only to men
 - I am not sure
 - I prefer not to respond to the question

This question is ideal for obtaining information about the sexual attraction and sexual orientation of the respondents, as it offers specific response options without requiring that respondents self-identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual

Similarly, it is worth adding that while it is not highlighted in the examples presented about best practices for asking questions about sexual orientation, it is important to offer response options that allow differentiation between those who do not understand the question and those who are not yet clear about their identity. Given the sensitivity of the subject, it is possible that there are people who simply do not understand what they are being asked, which is why it is important to also include a response option of “I don’t understand the question,” so that respondents do not answer with a response with which they do not identify.

To minimize or reduce the size of “false negatives,” questions can also be included that seek to identify how open people are about their sexual orientation. According to the Stonewall (2016) manual, which is centered on questions about sexual orientation in workplace contexts, it is suggested that this question be asked immediately following the question about sexual orientation or attraction:

- Have you revealed your sexual orientation to...?
 - Your family
 - Your friends
 - Your colleagues at work
 - Others
 - No one

It should be emphasized that the cost of including questions about sexual orientation or gender identity in survey means that relevant questions must be asked from the beginning. It is important to keep in mind that response options should be inclusive and adapted to the local cultural context so that respondents can be identified correctly, and that questions be broad enough for the statistical information that is obtained to be informative and comparable. With respect to the issue of how to collect information about experiences of SOGI-based discrimination in adolescence, one option is to include a retrospective timeline that complements each experience of discrimination. For example, one could ask:

- In the past 12 months, have you felt discriminated against or harassed for one or more of the following reasons?

characterization of LGBTQ+ populations have certain implications, which are detailed below.

Age

Most of the national random samples are representative of the adult population (18+) or the youth population (12-29). This distinction is relevant, given that the experiences of discrimination experienced by LGBTQ+ people begin in adolescence.

The decision to establish the age of 18 or older as a criterion of respondent eligibility is costly because it impedes the ability to capture experiences of early discrimination that affect the level of acceptance that LGBTQ+ people have with respect to their sexual orientation and gender identity, negatively impacting the reporting rate of these identities.

On the other hand, the inclusion of minors in surveys imposes additional implementation costs, since these require that informed consent of parents be obtained without parents having access to information revealed by the minor.

One viable option for sampling is that of restricting the sampling frame to the social settings where the respondent has the greatest likelihood of being a victim of SOGI-based discrimination, such as the family setting, school, etc. However, this approach does not allow the capturing of the degree of discrimination suffered by LGBTQ+ communities in general, as it excludes people who have not been able to overcome barriers to educational access, given the precariousness of their life situations.

Another option is to include a subsample that has a high representation of young people. This is the strategy that was taken by the United Kingdom’s Natsal study (UCL, 2012) (Table 4.1), which complements the general sample of people between 16 and 70 years of age with a representative subsample of individuals between 16 and 34 years of age, an age range that could be expanded to incorporate a subset adolescent population. The inclusion of adolescents and adults in the same sampling design requires an adjustment of the questionnaire, as well as a revision of the ethical norms and the steps to follow to obtain valid informed consent for minors. Thus, because the prevalence of people who identify as LGBTQ+ varies by age group, the survey’s sampling frame should be representative of the general age group of the people surveyed.

6.3 Recommendations for Sample Designs

The choice of sampling design affects the type of information that can be extracted from the survey, and with it, the possibility of translating the collected data into sound policy recommendations.

Collecting statistical information about populations requires a design that defines the representativeness of the results, and along with it, the selection criteria for respondents. The adoption of certain types of sampling designs and eligibility criteria whose objectives are the

Intersectionality

Based on the qualitative evidence, it is possible to infer that the definitions of LGBTQ+ identities and the gradients of SOGI-based discrimination can be intersectional with the experiences of discrimination of other diverse and vulnerable groups.²⁶ For example, discrimination experienced by a person with transgender identity may be distinct from those of a person who identifies as transgender and Black, which are distinct from those experienced by a person who is transgender and indigenous.

The idea is that a survey will be able to identify and statistically compare such differences, so it may be necessary to over represent people from diverse backgrounds to gain a better idea of their experiences of discrimination as these intersect with LGBTQ+ identities..

6.4. Recommendations for in-person interviews

A sound method for collecting data in person is to achieve the greatest number of observations per visit with the greatest reliability possible. When surveys include questions about sensitive topics, as in the case of sexual orientation and gender identity, there is a trade-off between both goals.

On the one hand, it is ideal to collect information from all eligible household members in the simplest way possible; on the other hand, the results obtained are only reliable if the implementation of the survey guarantees the privacy and the comfort of those surveyed, as well as the confidentiality of the information obtained. This is critical, especially because, to collect the best data possible, it is necessary for each household member to respond to questions about SOGI.

A first alternative in face-to-face interviews is to interview all household members and to ask questions on sexual orientation and gender identity using showcards that are personalized to each respondent. The process is as follows: in each interview, the interviewer presents a showcard to the respondent that contains the questions and the possible responses. After reviewing the content, the respondent only needs to respond with the number that corresponds to the response on the card that fits their selected answer.

Through this methodology, the interviewer registers the response on the form without reading the selected response aloud. Similarly, if the order of the responses to the question about sexual orientation and gender identity is varied by each respondent in the household, the use of cards prevents the family members from guessing the question on the card and inferring the interviewee's LGBTQ+ identity based on the order of the questions. Interview showcards can also be used to collect information from a single respondent in each household, with the goal of guaranteeing their security, although this measure decreases the number of observations that can be obtained successfully from in-person interviewing.

A second alternative is to combine general questions entered by the interviewer with a questionnaire to be completed by the respondent that includes the most sensitive questions such as those on sexual orientation and gender identity, which reduces the bias generated by the presence of the interviewer. However, the absence of an interviewer who has been trained in conducting the survey increases the probability of errors in measurement. Likewise, the separation of questions about sexual orientation and gender identity from the rest of the questionnaire can induce bias in the responses because this signals that the subject is taboo. Finally, relegating questions about experiences of discrimination to a self-administered form limits the capacity of the interviewers to orient victims of discrimination and people in vulnerable situations, a relevant consideration for obtaining ethical review board approval.

Not all populations are appropriate for collecting information via self-administered questionnaires, as their use assumes literacy levels that do not necessarily exist in communities with a low level of schooling. Because these situations mean that face-to-face interviews are the only methodology for viable data collection, it is key to train interviewers about the definitions for SOGI categories used in the questionnaire, the means for reducing biases, and the ways in which orientation and support can be offered to those who find themselves in vulnerable situations.

²⁶ See the synthesis of qualitative studies by Microrainbow (2014) and Human Rights Watch (2014), found in Appendix A, as an example of the interaction between LGBTQ+ identities and situations of poverty. Within the international context, we suggest the example of the Stonewall (2012) study.

6.5. Summary of Recommendations (Table 6.1)

With this Technical Note, we sought to identify, compile, and analyze studies that contained information about LGBTQ+ populations in LAC, with the objective of proposing recommendations directed at carrying out research in the future that leads to the estimation of the size of these populations and identifies the patterns of exclusion and discrimination based on SOGI

Recommendation for survey framework

In general terms, it is recommended to implement a survey about discrimination with a sampling design and a data collection methodology that are like those of the Italian gender, sexual orientation, and ethnic discrimination survey (ISTAT, 2014) (Appendix C, Table C2). To adapt this survey to the LAC context, it is suggested to use questions like those included in the questionnaire in the survey of Chilean youth (Government of Chile, 2015) (Appendix B, Table B1, South America). As a complement, the implementation of a Respondent Driven Sampling (RDS) type of design is recommended for the transgender population, like the survey of health service utilization among MSM and transgender women (Andrinopoulous & Hembling, 2013) (Appendix B, Table B1, Central America).

Specific recommendations

a. Sampling design (who to ask)

- It is recommended that the sampling design be of a random nature, stratified by geographical or administrative entity where the policy decisions about social inclusion are made. The sampling frame should be constructed based on the physical address of the household. Within each household, it is recommended that interviews be conducted with each member of the household, given that the best means of obtaining information about SOGI is by asking each person, instead of asking only the head of the family. This is also important for guaranteeing maximum confidentiality and security of the respondent.
- The sample should be representative of adults older than 18, in the national setting, and should include subsamples that over represent other groups to better understand how experiences of intersectional discrimination occur. For example, if you wish to capture information about homophobic harassment,

it is recommended to over represent young students in high school. To reflect the situation of poverty of LGBTQ+ people, it is suggested to over represent the population of low-income individuals. When there are geographical areas recognized as LGBTQ+ spaces or enclaves of spatial segregation, it is recommended to include a subsample that is over representative of households located in these zones.

- If resources allow, it is suggested that the sample be complemented with a Respondent Driven Sampling (RDS) design directed at the transgender population, for the following reasons: (i) because of SOGI-based discrimination and the level of marginalization that victimizes them – even within LGBTQ+ groups themselves – the transgender population is difficult to access and has rarely been included in random samples that are representative at a national level; and (ii) although RDS samples are more costly than snowball samples, the need to form policies and recommendations that promote the inclusion of LGBTQ+ people requires having statistics that are representative of the totality of that population, and not just a subsample of respondents.
- It is important to note that, to obtain precise data about the size of LGBTQ+ populations in any country, it is necessary that questions about sexual orientation and gender identity be included in population censuses. Otherwise, although other surveys can be representative of certain populations or in certain contexts, they will not be representative at the national level.

b. Formulation of questions

- The formulation of questions about gender identity should be conducted in two phases (“two steps”). Information about sex assigned at birth should be collected at the beginning of the interview, along with other demographic information. The question about the gender with which one identifies should be relegated to the section in which the question about sexual orientation appears. The two questions about LGBTQ+ identities should be included in the questionnaire, along with other questions about identity.

- To capture information about the sexual orientation of the respondents, it is suggested to use questions about gender identity as a point of departure. It is not recommended to include preambles that explain the objective of the survey nor definitions of LGBTQ+ identities since, aside from allowing an estimation of the level of lack of awareness about SOGI in the population, this can generate a certain resistance to continuing with the interview if the respondent perceives that it is designed exclusively for LGBTQ+ populations. To mitigate this, it is suggested that heterosexuality should be included as the first response option. To differentiate between those who are not clear about their sexual identity and those who do not understand the question, both should be offered as possible responses.
- To achieve a broad approach to sexual orientation, it is recommended that the question about sexual identity be complemented with others about attraction (with degrees of intensity) and sexual behavior (with variables of duration). The suggested timeline for questions about sexual behavior is five years at most, as the correlation between behavior and sexual identity decreases from that moment on (Gates, 2012). In questions about sexual attraction, variations of intensity allow us to go beyond the traditional framework: toward people of the same sex, people of the opposite sex, or both. It is also recommended to collect information about spaces of social interaction where the respondent has revealed their LGBTQ+ identity, to generate markers of the main settings of SOGI-based exclusion and discrimination.
- It is recommended that the questions referring to SOGI-based discrimination be included in the survey module about victimization or discrimination. In this way, being part of LGBTQ+ populations appear as a response option and not in the formulation of the questions. When characterizing a record of discrimination and delving into its motives, being LGBTQ+ can be an underlying cause, but not the only one. For this reason, these types of questions should be formulated to consider the different contexts and actors who part of the act of discrimination are. For

example, because religious discourse is used to justify SOGI-based discrimination, it is important that the questions referring to SOGI appear before the section about religion, if this is included.

- It is also recommended to include sociodemographic questions that allow identification of those populations that are particularly vulnerable to discrimination, as well as leaving an additional blank space where the respondent can complement questionnaire information.

c. Interview process (how to conduct fieldwork and register responses)

- The sociodemographic, economic, workforce participation, and health system access information (among others) should be collected via CAPI interviews where the interviewer records the responses of the interviewee on a tablet or smartphone.
- Information about gender identity, sexual attraction and behavior, and SOGI-based discrimination and other forms of victimization should be collected via PASI interviews on a paper form to be filled out by each member of the household. If the conditions of the household permit, it is recommended that interviews, and the self-administered questionnaire, be conducted in a separate room that allows privacy. It is ideal if the interviewer does not intervene in the filling out of the questionnaire, although it is recommended that their assistance be permitted when the respondent requests it.
- It is recommended that interviewers be trained in the definitions of LGBTQ+ identities so that they can respond appropriately to any questions of respondents, without biasing their responses. SOGI-based discrimination also exists among fieldwork staff, which is why it is recommended that sensitivity assignments be part of the training process. It is also recommended that LGBTQ+ interviewers be included, with the goal of facilitating and accelerating the process of acceptance of identities other than cisgender among the interviewers themselves.
- It is important to offer fieldwork staff guidelines follow in case they recognize experiences

of victimization that could threaten the integrity of the respondent. By means of verification, it is suggested that a report of the conditions in which interviews were carried out be included indicating whether the respondents were alone or not.

Table 6.1 Summary of Recommendations

Who to ask?

- Adopt a representative random sample at the national level, stratified by administrative settings where policy decisions about social inclusion are made.
- Utilize household's physical addresses as the sampling frame.
- Interview all members of the household to obtain the self-reported data of each person.
- The sample should be representative of adults.
- Include subsamples for the representation of intersectional groups.
- If there are enclaves spatially segregated by SOGI, include a subsample that over represents the households located in these areas.
- Complement a random sample with a RDS-type sample for people who identify as transgender.

What to ask?

- Inquire about the spaces of social interaction where the respondent has revealed their LGBTQ+ identity.
- Collect information on discrimination through the experiences of the victims, using LGBTQ+ identities as a response option to different discrimination scenarios.
- Include an additional blank space where the respondent can add information to the questionnaire.
- Include questions about sociodemographic aspects.

How to ask?

- Formulate the questions on sexual orientation and gender identity separately.
- To capture sexual orientation, begin with questions on sexual identity and complement these with questions in sexual attraction and behavior.
- Formulate the question on gender identity in two stages: first as about sex assigned at birth followed by a question on current gender identity.
- Omit preambles to questions about sexual orientation and gender identity.
- If definitions for the response options are not included, include options such as "I don't know" and "I don't understand the question."

In which part of the questionnaire to ask?

- Include questions on LGBTQ+ identity alongside others on identity, and before questions on religion.
- Include questions about SOGI-based discrimination in a victimization section, alongside questions on other types of discrimination

How to record responses?

- Collect sociodemographic information via CAPI interviews.
- Collect information on LGBTQ+ identity and SOGI-based discrimination via PASI interviews.
- Allow the interviewer to support the respondent fill out the self-completed questionnaire.

How to conduct fieldwork?

- Train interviewers on LGBTQ+ definitions and identities.
- Include interviewers who identify as LGBTQ+.
- When possible, conduct the entire interview in a room that is separate from the shared household.
- Include questions for the interviewer to report on the conditions in which the interview was conducted.
- Define the steps to take if a situation occurs that puts the integrity of the respondent at risk.



Appendixes

Appendix A. List of studies about LGBTQ+ populations in LAC considered for this Technical Note

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
The Caribbean		
The Caribbean Men's Internet Survey (CARIMIS) (2014)	Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bermuda, Bonaire, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cuba, Curaçao, Dominica, Dominican Republic, French Guiana, Grenada, Guyana, Guadeloupe, Haiti, Jamaica, Martinique, Saba, St. Bart's, Sint Eustatius, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Martin, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands	Evaluate the risks of behavior between men who have sex with men (MSM) in the Caribbean, as well as the potential use of the internet to recruit those MSM who aren't reached through traditional sampling methods.
Attitudes Towards Homosexuals (2004)	Barbados Guyana Trinidad and Tobago	Learn the opinion of respondents about homosexuals, homosexuality, and concomitant problems.
Attitudes Towards Homosexuals in Barbados 2004 (2004)	Barbados	Learn the opinion of respondents about homosexuals, homosexuality, and concomitant problems.
Family Health Survey (1999)	Belize	National survey of fertility, contraception, and child-maternal health

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
A MANDATE TO ACT. Findings from a Poll on Public Attitudes to Sexual and Reproductive Health, Abuse, Violence and Discrimination (2013)	Belize Trinidad and Tobago	Examine public attitudes about sexual and reproductive health, child abuse, domestic violence, and stigma and discrimination as they relate to HIV and homophobia.
Sexual Orientation and Quality of Life Among University Students from Cuba, Norway, India, and South Africa (Orientación sexual y calidad de vida entre estudiantes universitarios de Cuba, Noruega, India y Sudáfrica) (2009)	Cuba (Havana)	Examine the differences in the quality of life of heterosexual people and LGB people.
National Survey of Attitudes and Perceptions of Jamaicans Towards Same Sex Relationships (2011)	Jamaica	Identify the population's perception of homosexuality and identify the factors that can affect said perceptions and attitudes.
Central America		
National Sexual and Reproductive Health Survey (2015)	Costa Rica	Survey about sexual and reproductive health.
Evaluation of attitudes toward LGBTQ+ people on the part of police forces in Costa Rica (2014)	Costa Rica	Develop a baseline about the knowledge, attitudes, and predispositions of police personnel with respect to LGBTQ+ populations.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Diagnostic, with a gender focus, about the situation of stigma, discrimination, and homophobia in Costa Rica (2007)	Costa Rica	Learn about the attitudes and thoughts of university students toward the gay and lesbian population.
Evaluation of the discriminatory attitudes and prejudices toward diverse populations, with university students in the Greater San José Metropolitan Area, Costa Rica (2008)	Costa Rica (Greater San José Metropolitan Area)	Research study to measure the discriminatory attitudes and prejudices associated with different sectors of the population.
Suicide in the Costa Rican homosexual population (2000)	Costa Rica (San José)	Exploratory research about suicide in the male and female homosexual population in San José, Costa Rica.
Attitudes and stereotypes of EBAIS* staff toward sexual diversity in Costa Rica (2009) * Basic Comprehensive Healthcare Teams	Costa Rica (Central Valley of Costa Rica)	Inquire about the attitudes about the morality, legality, familiarity, and social interactions with, and right to work for homosexual people, and with respect to the stereotypes associated with their sexual orientations.
National Survey about LGBTQ+ Realities in El Salvador (2012)	El Salvador	Provide statistics about the reality of LGBTQ+ people to guide government efforts to eradicate stigma and discrimination.
Utilization of health services among men who have sex with men and transgender women, San Salvador, 2011-2012: Results of a cross-sectional study with respondent-driven sampling (2013)	El Salvador (San Salvador)	Determine the degree of social exclusion and marginalization faced by populations of men who have sex with men and transsexual women, and the way in which these affect their need and willingness to seek out health services, their perceptions about available services, and their experiences searching for those services.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Index of stigma and discrimination toward people with HIV (2013)	Nicaragua	Obtain information from the general population about perceptions and opinions that can manifest in stigmatizing and discriminatory attitudes and practices associated with populations with HIV and at greater risk of HIV.
Estimate of the size of populations at greater risk and vulnerability with respect to HIV: Men who have sex with men and sex workers in six cities in Guatemala (2010)	Guatemala (Guatemala City, Quetzaltenango, Escuintla, Mazatenango, Puerto Barrios and Cobán)	To estimate the size of populations of men who have sex with men and sex workers.
1st Survey about Homophobia in the Workplace in Mexico (2014)	México	Not available
National survey of values among youth (2012)	México	Learn the characteristics of the values and cultural practices of young people.
National survey on political culture and citizens' practices (2008)	México	Public opinion study, with the goal of disseminating democratic culture, promoting citizen participation, and learning the level of political socialization, information, and knowledge about political citizenship.
National survey about discrimination in Mexico (2010)	México	Record perceptions about discrimination by exploring the opinions of people in dual roles of being discriminated against or discriminating.
First national survey about sex (2004)	México	Not available

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
First national survey about homophobic bullying(2012)	México	To understand the state of violence toward LGBTQ+ people during their school years and propose actions to eradicate homophobic bullying.
Second survey about diversity and workplace inclusion (2015)	México	To learn the perceptions of employees of companies that have strategies in place to promote workplace inclusion of LGBTQ+ people, regarding the results of such strategies.
Effects of violence and discrimination on the mental health of bisexuals, lesbians, and homosexuals in Mexico City (2005)	Mexico (Mexico Federal District)	Estimate the prevalence of suicide attempts, mental suffering, and alcoholism among the LGB population in Mexico City, and to analyze their possible relationship with violence and discrimination.
Central American surveillance survey of sexual behavior and prevalence of HIV and STIs in vulnerable populations in Nicaragua, men who have sex with men, sex workers, and people with HIV (2011)	Nicaragua (Managua and Chinandega) Honduras (Tegucigalpa, San Pedro Sula, Comayagua, La Ceiba)	Obtain information about sexual behavior and the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases (STIs) and HIV in sex workers and in men who have sex with men, as well as the risk behaviors of people with HIV.
South America		
Index of stigma in people who live with HIV, Argentina (2011)	Argentina	Understand external and internal stigma and the discriminatory situations experienced by people with HIV in different social settings: What are the different forms of stigma in Argentina; How do they manifest at the individual, family, institutional, and public policy levels; What has been the response on the part of relevant political and social stakeholders?

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Pride and sexual diversity march survey (2010)	Argentina (Buenos Aires, Córdoba) Colombia (Bogotá) Chile (Santiago de Chile) Brazil (Pernambuco, São Paulo)	To map the patterns of violence and discrimination faced by gays, lesbians, transvestites, transsexuals, and bisexuals.
Quantitative Study Report: Marriage between people of the same sex (2010)	Argentina (City of Buenos Aires, Greater Buenos Aires, Greater Córdoba, Greater Rosario, Greater Mendoza, and Greater Tucumán)	Public opinion survey.
First survey about the trans population 2012 (2012)	Argentina (Municipality of La Matanza)	Describe the sociodemographic characteristics and the life conditions of transgender people, inquire about their experiences of discrimination, their knowledge about laws and norms that protect them from discrimination, and access to justice
The 2015 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Youth in our Nation's Schools (Encuesta Nacional del Ámbito Escolar 2015: Las experiencias de jóvenes lesbianas, gays, bisexuales, transgénero y queer en las escuelas de nuestra nación) (2015)	Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru Uruguay, United States	Collect experiences of LGBTQ+ students in educational institutions.
Brazilian Demographic Census (2010)	Brazil	Census
Sexual diversity and homophobia in Brazil (2011)	Brazil	Survey about sexual diversity and homophobia, through which it was sought to generate objective indicators about the discriminatory practices based on sexual orientation, as well as perceptions about the phenomenon.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Survey about knowledge, attitudes, and practices in the Brazilian population (Pesquisa de conhecimentos, atitudes e práticas na população brasileira) (2011)	Brazil	Collect data that allowed the formulation of indicators to monitor the epidemics of STIs and AIDS.
National public opinion survey (Pesquisa de opinião pública nacional) (2017)	Brazil	Public opinion survey.
Survey about sexual behavior and perceptions about HIV/AIDS in Brazil (Pesquisa sobre comportamento sexual e percepções da população brasileira sobre HIV/Aids Brasil) (2008)	Brazil	Identify the sexual behaviors, attitudes, and practices of the population and their awareness of and knowledge about HIV/AIDS.
Brazilian social survey (Pesquisa social brasileira) (2002)	Brazil	Survey of attitudes and values related to “the Brazilian way”, violence and delinquency related to race relations, sexuality, and views about the State’s intervention in the economy.
Profile of LGBT Parade participants (Perfil dos participantes da Parada GLBT) (2005)	Brazil (São Paulo)	To sketch a profile of the homosexual, bisexual, and transsexual participants of the LGBTQ+ parade in São Paulo. To collect information about their sexual behavior and opinions about homosexuality, civil unions between people of the same sex, the adoption of children by same-sex couples, and politics, among other subjects.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC

Study	Place	Objectives
8th National youth survey (2015)	Chile	To generate representative, up-to-date information about Chilean youth, with the objective of identifying their needs and allotting resources for the design and implementation of public policies directed at this population.
First National Survey: Sexual diversity, human rights, and the anti-discrimination law (2013)	Chile	Learn about the reach and perceptions of discrimination, as well as evaluate and learn more about the social sector's knowledge about the Zamudio Law. * *The Zamudio Law (Law 20609) is a law that established anti-discrimination measures
Weekly public opinion poll. (2017)	Chile	Public opinion survey.
Index of stigma and discrimination against homosexual men, other MSM, and transgender women in Chile (2012)	Chile (Arica, Valparaíso, and Santiago)	Measure stigma and discrimination directed at gay men, other men who have sex with men, and transgender women in Chile, and to devise a baseline measure in three regions: Arica Parinacota, Valparaíso, and the Metropolitan region.
Survey of homophobic bullying (2012)	Chile (Centro Politécnico Carlos Condell, Liceo Polivalente Paul Harris, Colegio San Francisco de Sales and Colegio Altamira)	To understand how the phenomenon of homophobic bullying is constructed in school cultures, to characterize this phenomenon from the perspective of adolescents, and to describe their prevalence from an ecological perspective.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Diagnostic study about sexuality, AIDS, and drug use in the Lo Prado commune (2005)	Chile (Comuna Lo Prado)	Systematize and analyze knowledge and basic facts that make possible an investigation about the behavior and perceptions related to sexuality.
Survey about discrimination toward sexual minorities (2011)	Chile (Santiago Metropolitan Region)	The study proposed to explore and describe the processes and the experience of discrimination directed at sexual minorities.
Survey about sexual education and discrimination(2012)	Chile (Santiago Metropolitan Region)	Learn whether classes about sexuality (with a focus on sexual minorities) are given in schools; inquire whether practices or guidelines exist that discriminate against students based on their gender identity or sexual orientation; detect eventual prejudices of students about sexual practices of lesbians, gays, bisexuals, or transsexuals; and establish the levels of acceptance or rejection among students with respect to the rights of sexual minorities, specifically with respect to gay marriage and social relationships.
Project to reinforce positive images of the LGBT population in the 18 Rafael Uribe area (2010)	Colombia (18 Rafael Uribe area, Bogotá)	Determine the level of discrimination toward the LGBTQ+ population in area 18, knowledge about their personal lifestyles, and the knowledge surveyed people have about mechanisms of attention to discrimination and violence.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Perceptions about sexual diversity in school-aged adolescents in the city of Cuenca (2011)	Ecuador (Cuenca)	Attitudes toward sexual diversity.
Case study about life circumstances, social inclusion, and compliance with human rights in the LGBTQ+ population in Ecuador (2013)	Ecuador (urban zones of Quito, Guayaquil, Portoviejo, Machala, Babahoyo, Ibarra, Santa Elena, Salinas, Libertad and Manta.)	Describe LGBTQ+ populations in Ecuador.
Survey of national urban opinion (2007)	Peru	Public opinion survey.
Opinion survey about family and gender roles (2012)	Peru	Address attitudes and values related to marriage, cohabitation, and alternative families, gender roles, the distribution of work within the home, and public policies related to families.
Survey to measure the perception of the Peruvian population toward human rights (2013)	Peru	To learn about the perceptions of the Peruvian population with respect to human rights, with the goal of establishing a baseline reference to determine policies, plans, and programs directed at their protection and promotion.
Survey about sexual and reproductive rights in Peru (2015)	Peru (Lima, Arequipa, Pucallpa, Puerto Maldonado, Iquitos)	Learn about public opinion regarding themes related to sexual and reproductive rights, as well as concepts about gender and identity.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Sexuality, reproduction, and gender inequality (2011)	Peru (Lima, Ayacucho, Pucallpa, Puria)	Learn about public opinion regarding themes related to themes related to individuals' sexuality.
Sexuality and public opinion in Lima: Perceptions and opinions about sexuality, health, and sexual and reproductive rights (2015)	Peru (Lima)	Learn about the opinions and perceptions of the population of Lima regarding subjects related to sexual and reproductive rights, specifically regarding gender and sexism; sexual diversity and homophobia; abortion and contraception; sexual education and harassment.
Report about homophobia, violence, and impunity toward the lesbian, gay, transsexual, and bisexual community in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. (2008)	Venezuela	To detect perceptions and experiences of the LGBTQ+ community with the police, other security forces, and public authorities and their entities with respect to human rights.
Discrimination and impunity are not equal before the law: Situation of Human Rights of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, Trans, and Intersex People in Venezuela (2015)	Venezuela	To collect information about verbal, physical, school and university, and workplace violence, as well as action plans for affected communities.
Sexual diversity: Rights, discrimination, and violence. Venezuelan Pride Parade Survey, 2013. Caracas, Valencia, and Maracaibo. (2014)	Venezuela (Caracas, Valencia and Maracaibo)	To learn the opinions of the LGBTQ+ community about their experiences of discrimination and violence, as well as citizen participation related to sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression.

Studies about LGBTQ+ Populations in LAC		
Study	Place	Objectives
Study about the legislative, institutional, and social conditions for the recognition, protection, and exercise of rights and sexual and reproductive health in Venezuela.(2015)	Venezuela (Maracay, Barquisimeto, Maracaibo, Mérida and Greater Caracas)	To show the legislative, institutional, and social conditions for the recognition, protection, and exercise of sexual and reproductive rights, adolescent pregnancy, maternal mortality, violence against women, discrimination based on sexual diversity, and HIV/AIDS.
Latin America and the Caribbean in General		
Ipsos (2012)	Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, and United States	Public opinion survey.
American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP) Survey (El barómetro de las Américas) (2017)	Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.	Public opinion survey.
Religion in Latin America: Widespread Change in a Historically Catholic Region (2014)	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Puerto Rico, Uruguay and Venezuela.	To examine religious affiliations, beliefs, and practices.

Clasificación de los estudios sobre poblaciones LGBTQ+ en ALC

Objective	Sampling design	Interview	Representativeness	Studies
Size	Randomized	In-person	General population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encuesta Nacional de Juventud (Chile). • Encuesta ENDESA (Costa Rica). • Family Health Survey (Belize). • Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP). • População Brasileira Sobre HIV/AIDS (Brazil). • Pesquisa sobre Comportamento Sexual e Percepções da População Brasileira Sobre HIV/AIDS (Brazil).
	Randomized + non-randomized			
	Randomized + capture-recapture model	In-person	LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Estimación del tamaño de poblaciones en mayor riesgo y vulnerabilidad al VIH: hombres que tienen sexo con hombres y trabajadoras sexuales en seis ciudades de Guatemala.</i>
Size + discrimination	Randomized	In-person	General population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitudes Towards Homosexuals in Barbados, Guyana, y Trinidad and Tobago. • Estudio diagnóstico sobre sexualidad, SIDA y consumo de drogas en jóvenes de la comuna de Lo Prado (Chile).
			General population + LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encuesta Nacional de Valores en Juventud (Mexico).
Discrimination	Randomized	In-person + remote	General population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly track of public opinion (survey) (Chile).
			LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Primera Encuesta Nacional Diversidad Sexual, Derechos Humanos y Ley contra la Discriminación (Chile).</i>

Objective	Sampling design	Interview	Representativeness	Studies
		In-person	General Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Religion in Latin America (LAC). • A Mandate to act. Findings from a Poll on Public Attitudes to Sexual and Reproductive Health, Abuse, Violence and Discrimination (Belize, Trinity and Tobago). • Actitudes y Estereotipos del Personal de los EBAIS hacia la Diversidad Sexual en Costa Rica. • Diversidade Sexual e Homofobia no Brasil. • Encuesta de Opinión Nacional Urbana (Peru). • Encuesta de Opinión sobre Familia y Roles de Género (Peru) • Encuesta Nacional de Salud Sexual y Reproductiva (Costa Rica). • Encuesta Nacional sobre Cultura Política y Prácticas Ciudadanas. • Encuesta Nacional sobre Discriminación en México. • Encuesta para Medir la Percepción de la Población Peruana en Relación a los Derechos Humanos (Peru). • Estigma y Discriminación asociados al VIH (Guatemala). • Estudio sobre las condiciones legislativas, institucionales y sociales para el reconocimiento, protección y ejercicio de los Derechos y la Salud Sexual y Reproductiva de Venezuela. • Evaluación de las Actitudes discriminativas y Prejuicios hacia poblaciones diversas, con Estudiantes de Universitarios de la Gran Área Metropolitana de San José, Costa Rica. • Evaluación de las actitudes hacia las personas LGBTI por parte de las fuerzas policiales en Costa Rica. • Latinobarómetro (ALC). • Percepción de estudiantes universitarios sobre la homo/ lesbofobia en Costa Rica. • Percepciones sobre la Diversidad Sexual en Adolescentes Escolarizados en la Ciudad de Cuenca (Ecuador). • Pesquisa Social Brasileira (Brazil). • Primera Encuesta Nacional Sobre Sexo (Mexico). • Sexualidad y opinión pública en Lima: Percepciones y opiniones acerca de la sexualidad, la salud y los derechos sexuales y reproductivos (Peru). • Sexualidad, Reproducción y Desigualdades de Género (Peru).
			General population + LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullying Homofóbico en Instituciones Educativas Públicas de Chile, Guatemala y Perú
		Remote	General population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ipsos Public Affairs (worldwide). • Matrimonio entre personas del mismo sexo (Argentina).
	Non-randomized			

Objective	Sampling design	Interview	Representativeness	Studies
	Randomized + RDS	In-person + remote	General population + LGBTI population	Construcción de la Línea De Base de la Política Pública para la Garantía Plena de Derechos de los Sectores Lesbianas, Gays, Bisexuales Y Transgeneristas LGBT de Bogotá. Situación de Derechos de Lesbianas, Gays, Bisexuales Y Transgeneristas en Bogotá.
	Non-randomized			
	Voluntary	In person	LGBTI population	• Encuesta sobre Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos en Perú.
			LGBTI population	• Barreras de acceso a servicios de salud de las personas lesbianas, gay, bisexuales y transgénero de Bogotá D.C (Colombia)
		Remote	General population + LGBTI population	• Homophobic Bullying in Schools in Latin America.
			LGBTI population	• 1ra Encuesta Sobre Homofobia y el Mundo Laboral en México. • 1ra. Encuesta Nacional sobre Bullying Homofóbico (Mexico). • 2da. Encuesta sobre Diversidad e Inclusión Laboral (Mexico). • School Climate Survey (USA). • The Caribbean Men's Internet Survey (Caribbean countries).
	Convenience	In-person	General population	• Encuesta sobre educación Sexual y Discriminación (Chile).
			General population + LGBTI population	• Encuesta de Bullying Homofóbico (Chile). • Proyecto de Reforzamiento de Imaginarios Positivos de la Población LBGT de la Localidad 18 Rafael Uribe Uribe (Colombia). • Sexual Orientation and Quality of Life Among University Students from Cuba, Norway, India, and South Africa.
		In-person	LGBTI population	• Diversidad sexual: Derechos, discriminación y violencia. Encuesta Marcha del Orgullo (Venezuela). • Encuesta Marcha del Orgullo y la Diversidad Sexual (Venezuela). • Encuesta Sobre Discriminación y Minorías Sexuales (Chile). • Informe sobre Homofobia, Violencia e Impunidad contra la Comunidad Lesbiana, Gay, Transexual y Bisexual en la República Bolivariana de Venezuela. • Perfil dos participantes da Parada GLBT (Brazil). • Suicidio en la población homosexual costarricense (Costa Rica).

Objective	Sampling design	Interview	Representativeness	Studies
		In-person + remote	LGBTI population	Efectos de la violencia y la discriminación en la salud mental de bisexuales, lesbianas y homosexuales de la Ciudad de México
	Convenience + snowball	In person	Población LGBTI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consulta Nacional sobre realidades LGBTI en El Salvador. • Índice de estigma en personas que viven con VIH Argentina.
	Snowball	In person	Población LGBTI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encuesta sobre Población Trans (Uruguay). • Estudio de caso sobre condiciones de vida, inclusión social y cumplimiento de derechos humanos de la población LGBTI en el Ecuador. • Índice Compuesto de Estigma y Discriminación hacia Hombres Homosexuales, otros HSH y Mujeres Transgénero en Chile.
	RDS	In person	LGBTI population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encuesta Centroamericana de Vigilancia de Comportamiento Sexual y Prevalencia del VIH/ITS en Poblaciones Vulnerables (Nicaragua and Honduras). • Utilización de los servicios de salud entre los hombres que tienen sexo con hombres y

Appendix B Selection of international studies conducted outside LAC

Twenty-six international studies conducted outside LAC were analyzed. To select these, four actors were identified to supply information about LGBTQ+ populations, and within each sector, a primary source was selected to act as a starting point for composing the inventory.

Sources of primary information for the selection of international studies outside of LAC

Sector	Source (Institution/Lead Researcher)	Resource
Academia	The Williams Institute on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Law and Public Policy	<i>How Many People are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender?</i>
Government	Office for National Statistics of the United Kingdom (ONS - UK)	<i>Sexual Identity Project (SIP)</i>
Non-profit entities	Dr. Randall Sell	www.LGBTQ+data.com
Multilateral organizations	Gender and Diversity Division of the IDB	Important documents for consulting the LGBTQ initiatives databank

Source: Authors, based on the literature review.

The Williams Institute is a public policy research center focused on sexual orientation and gender identity. Even though it is seated within the UCLA Law School, it is financed with private resources and has become an international reference point in research about LGBTQ+ populations. In 2011, The Williams Institute produced a report titled, *How Many People Are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender?* This report identified some of the main international sources that provided an estimate of the size of LGBTQ+ populations.

The United Kingdom is a leading country in the production of statistical information about public health. Its Office of National Statistics (ONS) was one of the first to consider the inclusion of questions about gender identity and sexual orientation in the census, for which it developed the Sexual Identity Project (SIP). Within SIP's documentation, there is categorization of statistical evidence about the size of LGBTQ+ populations in the United States and Canada.

Randall Sell, Ph.D., is a Doctor of Health Science

Policies at the Harvard School of Public Health and associate professor at the Dornsife School of Public Health at Drexel University. His research has centered on defining and measuring sexual orientation, as well as on sampling methods of sexual minorities. On his website, www.LGBTQ+data.com, Sell makes available to the public a summary and classification of a compendium of studies collected over the course of his research about LGBTQ+ populations in the United States.

The Gender and Diversity Division of the IDB (SCL/GDI) promotes gender equality and supports social integration in LAC via public policies and strategic orientation. For this Technical Note, said division prepared a document entitled, "Important documents for the LGBTQ+ Initiatives Database," in which some of the quantitative studies about LGBTQ+ populations that were identified previously by the division are summarized.

The studies reviewed in the preceding documents

were identified and those whose surveys satisfied two criteria were selected: (i) the sampling design or data collection methodology had not been described previously in other studies, and (ii) the sample size of the LGBTI population is larger than 100. If two surveys with the same sampling design and data collection methodology were discovered, two additional selection criteria were added: (i) choose the survey that had been implemented the greatest number of times, and (ii) select the survey whose results demonstrated the greatest representativeness.

Afterward, an online search was conducted of studies centered on LGBTQ+ populations in Africa, Asia, and Europe. In this phase, studies were excluded that were not compatible with the required objectives of characterizing the size of the population and SOGI-based discrimination, as well as those studies whose methodology had already been described in the previously selected studies.

Below is a list of the international studies conducted outside LAC that were considered for this Technical Note.

International studies about LGBTQ+ populations outside of LAC

Study	Location	Objectives
Global		
World Values Survey (2014)	90 countries	Study changes in social values and their impact on political and social life.
The Global Divide on Homosexuality: Greater Acceptance in More Secular and Affluent Countries (2013)	39 countries	Public opinion survey with the objective of understanding attitudes about homosexual people in different parts of the world.
Out Now Global LGBTQ+ 2020 Study (2013)	24 countries	Provides data with respect to the daily difficulties faced by LGBT communities.
North America		
National Health Interview Survey (2017)	United States	Monitor the health of the population by collecting and analyzing data about various health-related subjects. Improve the health, security, and well-being of LGB people.

Study	Location	Objectives
Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (2014)	United States	Collect uniform and specific data from each state about preventive health practices and risk behaviors associated with chronic illnesses, wounds, and infectious illnesses that affect the adult population.
California Health Interview Survey (2016)	United States	Offer information about the health of adults and children in California. Include information related to physical and mental health, prevalence and management of chronic illnesses, nutrition, exercise, tobacco use, sun exposure, health insurance coverage, access to preventive health services, and barriers to use of health services.
Gallup Poll (2017)	United States	Measure Americans' opinions and perceptions with respect to the most urgent political and economic issues, and about current events that affect the United States and the world.
PEW Survey of LGBTQ+ Americans (2013)	United States	Explore attitudes about the sexual orientation and identity of Americans.
Kaiser Survey of Sexual Orientation (2000)	United States	Collect information about experiences of people who self-identify as LGB and measure the general public's attitudes about these populations, as well as their point of view about political matters related to sexual orientation.

Study	Location	Objectives
Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey (2011)	United States	Characterize and explain the reach of discrimination against transgender and gender non-conforming individuals.
Degrees of Equality: A National Study Examining Workplace Climate for LGBTQ+ Employees (2009)	United States	Examine the workplace setting for LGBT populations and identify key elements of the workplace setting.
Canadian Community Health Survey (2018)	Canada	Collect information about health, sanitation services, and health determinants of the Canadian population. Support sanitation surveillance programs by supplying data.
Canadian General Social Survey (2013)	Canada	Understand the way in which Canadians perceive crime and the justice system, as well as their experiences of victimization.
Europe		
The British National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (2012)	Great Britain	Supply updated information about sexual and reproductive health, sexual behaviors, and risk factors of the British populations, and about trends over time.

Study	Location	Objectives
Integrated Household Survey: Sexual identity, smoking prevalence and perceived general health using data from the Integrated Household Survey (2015)	United Kingdom	Produce more precise estimates within a more reduced geographic setting about economic activity, education, health, identity, sexual behavior, tobacco use, and well-being.
Stonewall Workplace Equality Index (2018)	United Kingdom	Not available
Public Service Executive Union Survey [PSEU] of LGBTQ+ Members	Ireland	Learn about the actions the PSEU could undertake to address concerns of members of the LGBTQ+ community.
Supporting LGBT Lives: A Study of the Mental Health and Well-Being of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People (2009)	Ireland	Identify and respond to the problem of suicide within LGBT populations, with a special emphasis on young people. Identify risk and resilience factors for the mental health of LGBT populations.
EU LGBTQ+ Survey (2013)	European Union and Croatia	Offer a broad, panoramic view of the life experiences of LGBTI people in the European Union and Croatia, with the goal of supporting those responsible for policy formation in the introduction and application of measures that promote respect and safeguard the fundamental rights of LGBTQ+ people.

Study	Location	Objectives
Eurobarometer Survey on Discrimination (2016)	European Union	Improve knowledge about discrimination, support intermediary stakeholders in bettering their capacity to fight against the same, and to support the development of equality policies.
Discrimination based on gender, sexual orientation, and ethnicity (2014)	Italy	Collect information about the reach and forms of discrimination in Italy: with special reference to gender, sexual orientation, and ethnic origin. Detect the propagation of stereotypes and discriminatory attitudes toward the categories that are the object of interest. Estimate the number of people who have suffered discriminatory experiences
Asia		
Youth and Campus Survey 2011: A Study examining LGBTQ+ issues in Indian College & University Campuses (2011)	India	Evaluate the environmental, psychological, and educational factors that affect LGBTQ+ youth, their family, and heterosexual friends.
A Six State Survey of Sexual Minorities in India	India	Understand the experiences of discrimination and violence motivated by SOGI in six states in India, as well as their impact on socioeconomic status.
First Annual LGBTQ+ Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Survey (2012)	India	Measure the work setting of homosexual workers in the corporate world.

Study	Location	Objectives
An Inclusive Approach to Surveys of Sexual and Gender Minorities (2015)	Nepal	Collect demographic data, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, and gender identity relevant to sexual and gender minorities in Nepal, as well as experiences of discrimination and access to HIV services. Develop best practices for data collection and for developing a model for questions.
Bullying Targeting Secondary School Students who or are Perceived to be Transgender or Same-Sex Attracted: Types, Prevalence, Impact, Motivation and Preventive Measures in Five Provinces in Thailand (2014)	Thailand	Collect evidence in five Thai provinces about the nature, scale, and impact of harassment against those students who feel attracted to people of the same sex, transgender students, or those whose peers perceive them to be in one of the preceding categories.

Anexo C. Other International Studies from outside of LAC, not included in the analysis

Below is a list of international studies on LGBTQ+ populations that were identified during the study but that were not included in the analysis, with the reasons for their exclusion.

Study	Other objectives	Methodology included previously
<i>American Community Survey (ACS)</i>		X
<i>Australian Longitudinal Study of Health and Relationships</i>		X
<i>Being the Gay One: Experiences of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People Working in the Health and Social Care Sector</i>		X
<i>Buck Consultants' LGBT+LGBTQ+ Self-Identification in the Workplace Survey</i>	X	
<i>Community Marketing and Insights African American / Black LGBT Community Survey</i>	X	
<i>Community Marketing and Insights Canadian LGBT Community Survey</i>	X	
<i>Community Marketing and Insights Chinese LGBT Community Survey</i>	X	
<i>Community Marketing and Insights LGBT Community Survey</i>	X	
<i>Count Me In! Violence Against Disabled, Lesbian and Sex-working Women in Bangladesh, India and Nepal (Count Me In!)</i>	X	
<i>Domestic Abuse: Stonewall Health Briefing Diversity & Inclusion in Asia Creating Inclusive Workplaces for LGBT Employees in China</i>		X

Study	Other objectives	Methodology included previously
<i>Gay and Bisexual Men's Health Survey Domestic Abuse: Stonewall Health Briefing Creating Inclusive Workplaces for LGBT Employees in India</i>		X
<i>Gay in Britain: Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual People's Experiences and Expectations of Discrimination Gay and Bisexual Men's Health Survey Discrimination on Grounds of Sexual Orientation and Gender Minority in Health Care, Education, Employment and Social Security in the Russian Federation</i>		X
<i>General Social Survey Gay in Britain: Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual People's Experiences and Expectations of Discrimination Diversity & Inclusion in Asia</i>		X
<i>Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual in Later Life General Social Survey Domestic Abuse: Stonewall Health Briefing</i>		X
<i>Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) People in Sport: Understanding LGB sports participation in Wales Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual in Later Life Gay and Bisexual Men's Health Survey</i>		X
<i>Love Thy Neighbour: What people of Faith Really Think about Homosexuality Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) People in Sport: Understanding LGB sports participation in Wales Gay in Britain: Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual People's Experiences and Expectations of Discrimination</i>		X
<i>National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions Love Thy Neighbour: What people of Faith Really Think about Homosexuality General Social Survey</i>		X

Study	Other objectives	Methodology included previously
<i>National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual in Later Life</i>		X
<i>National Survey of Family Growth National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) People in Sport: Understanding LGB sports participation in Wales</i>		X
<i>National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) National Survey of Family Growth Love Thy Neighbour: What people of Faith Really Think about Homosexuality</i>		X
<i>National Survey of Sexual and Health Behavior National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions</i>		X
<i>Norwegian Living Conditions Survey National Survey of Sexual and Health Behavior National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES)</i>		X
<i>One Minority at a Time: Being Black and Gay Norwegian Living Conditions Survey National Survey of Family Growth</i>		X
<i>Peak Performance: Gay people and productivity One Minority at a Time: Being Black and Gay National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG)</i>		X
<i>Prescription for Change: Lesbian and Bisexual Women's Health Check 2008 Peak Performance: Gay people and productivity National Survey of Sexual and Health Behavior</i>		X

Study	Other objectives	Methodology included previously
<i>Public Attitudes Towards LGBT in South Korea Prescription for Change: Lesbian and Bisexual Women's Health Check 2008 Norwegian Living Conditions Survey</i>		X
<i>Serves You Right: Lesbian and Gay People's Expectations of Discrimination Public Attitudes Towards LGBT in South Korea One Minority at a Time: Being Black and Gay</i>		X
<i>Understanding Prejudice: Attitudes towards minorities Serves You Right: Lesbian and Gay People's Expectations of Discrimination Peak Performance: Gay people and productivity</i>		X
<i>Violence: Through the Lens of Lesbians, Bisexual Women and Trans People in Asia Understanding Prejudice: Attitudes towards minorities Prescription for Change: Lesbian and Bisexual Women's Health Check 2008</i>		X
<i>Serves You Right: Lesbian and Gay People's Expectations of Discrimination Public Attitudes Towards LGBT in South Korea</i>		X
<i>Understanding Prejudice: Attitudes towards minorities Serves You Right: Lesbian and Gay People's Expectations of Discrimination</i>		X
<i>Violence: Through the Lens of Lesbians, Bisexual Women and Trans People in Asia Understanding Prejudice: Attitudes towards minorities</i>		X

References

- American Psychological Association (APA). (2015). Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Transgender and Gender Nonconforming People. *American Psychologist*, 70(9), 832-864.
- ANALOGÍAS. (2010). Informe de estudio cuantitativo: Matrimonio entre personas del mismo sexo. Analogías, Investigación y Estrategia.
- Andrinopoulos, K., & Hembling, J. (2013). Utilización de los servicios de salud entre los hombres que tienen sexo con hombres y mujeres transgénero, San Salvador 2011-2012: Resultados de un estudio transversal con muestreo dirigido por los entrevistados. Accessed at https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/tr-13-92-es/at_download/document
- Barrientos, J., Díaz, J., and Muñoz, M. (2012). Derechos, Política, Violencia y Diversidad Sexual: Segunda Encuesta Marcha de la Diversidad Sexual Santiago de Chile 2011. Universidad Católica del Norte, Centro Latinoamericano en Sexualidad y Derechos Humanos, y Movimiento por la Diversidad Sexual. Accessed at: <http://www.clam.org.br/uploads/archivo/Derechos,%20politica,%20violencia%20y%20diversidad%20-%20segunda%20encuesta%20Santiago.pdf>
- Bastos, F., Barradas, R., Aquino, E., & Latorre, M. (2008). Pesquisa sobre Comportamento sexual e percepções sobre HIV/Aids no Brasil. *Revista de Saúde Pública*, p. 1-2. Accessed at: <https://repositorio.ufba.br/ri/bitstream/ri/1872/1/nacionais%202008.24.pdf>
- Belize Central Statistical Office. (1999). Belize Family Health Survey. Belmopan, Belize: Belize Central Statistical Office.
- Boxill, I., Martin, J., Russel, R., Waller, L., Meikle, T., & Mitchell, R. (2011). National survey of attitudes and perceptions of Jamaicans towards same sex relationships. Kingston, Jamaica: Department of Sociology, Psychology and Social Work, University of the West Indies, Mona Campus.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016). National Crime Victimization Survey – NCVS. Accessed at: <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=245>
- Cáceres, C., & Salazar, X. (2013). El bullying Homofóbico en Instituciones Educativas Públicas de Chile, Guatemala y Perú. IESSDEH, UPCH, PNUD, UNESCO. Accessed at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000229323>
- Cáceres, C., Salazar, X., Motta, A., Núñez-Curto, A., Encisco, J., Valdivia, F., Lugo, E., Silva-Santisteban, A., & Romero, L. (2015). Sexualidad y opinión pública en Lima: Percepciones y opiniones acerca de la sexualidad, la salud y los derechos sexuales y reproductivos. Accessed at: http://iessdeh.org/usuario/ftp2/sexualidad_y_opinion_publica.pdf
- CADEM. (2017). Track de Opinión Pública Semanal Plaza Pública CADEM. Accessed at: <https://plazapublica.cl/wp-content/uploads/archivos/Track-PP179-Junio-S3-VF.pdf>
- CADRES. (2004). Attitudes Toward Homosexuals in Barbados (Actitudes hacia homosexuales en Barbados). CADRES: Barbados. Accessed at <http://ufdcimages.uflib.ufl.edu/IR/00/00/02/87/00001/Attitudes%20Toward%20Homosexuals%20in%20Barbados.pdf>
- CADRES. (2013) Attitudes Toward Homosexuals in Trinidad and Tobago. CADRES: Trinidad and Tobago. <https://gspottt.files.wordpress.com/2013/05/tt-poll-data-media-release.pdf>
- CADRES. (2013). Attitudes Toward Homosexuals in Guyana. CADRES: Guyana. Accessed at: http://ufdcimages.uflib.ufl.edu/AA/00/01/61/51/00001/Attitudes_Toward_Homosexuals_in_Guyana.pdf
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2014). Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) (Sistema de vigilancia de factores de riesgo de comportamiento). Accessed at: <https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/index.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2017). National Health Interview Survey (Encuesta Nacional de Salud). National Center for Health Statistics in collaboration with the U.S. Census Bureau's Social, Economic, and Housing Statistics Division. Accessed at: <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhis/earlyrelease/>

- NCHS_CPS_Comparison092018.pdf
- CESOP. (2002). Pesquisa social brasileira (Encuesta Social Brasileña). Accessed at: https://www.cesop.unicamp.br/vw/1JQ6VyjAO_MDA_c2bb7_/quest_01864.pdf
- CIPAC. (2014). Evaluación de Actitudes hacia las Personas LGBTI por parte de las Fuerzas Policiales de Costa Rica. CIPAC. Accessed at: https://www.cipacdh.org/pdf/INFORME_COSTA_RICA.pdf
- CIPAC. (2000). Suicidio en la población homosexual costarricense. Accessed at: http://www.cipacdh.org/cipac_articulo_completo.php?art=66
- CIPAC. (2008). Evaluación de las actitudes discriminativas y prejuicios hacia diversas poblaciones, con estudiantes universitarios de la Gran Área Metropolitana de San José, Costa Rica. Accessed at: <https://www.google.com/>
- CIPAC. (2009). Actitudes y Estereotipos del Personal de los EBAIS hacia la Diversidad Sexual en Costa Rica. CIPAC. Accessed at: https://www.cipacdh.org/pdf/Actitudes_y_estereotipos_del_personal_de_salud.pdf
- Cochela, R., & Machuca, M. (2014). Diagnóstico de la situación de personas lesbianas, gays, bisexuales, transgénero, intersexuales y queer en Lima metropolitana. No tengo Miedo. Accessed at: <http://descarga.notengomiedo.pe/archivo/No%20Tengo%20Miedo%20-%20Estado%20de%20Violencia.pdf>
- CLAM. (2010). Encuesta marcha del orgullo y la diversidad sexual.
- Colombia Diversa (2016). Encuesta de Clima Escolar LGBT en Colombia 2016. Mi voz cuenta: Experiencias de adolescentes y jóvenes lesbianas, gays, bisexuales y trans en el ámbito escolar. Bogotá, Colombia. Accessed at: <https://colombiadiversa.org/colombiadiversa2016/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/IAE-Colombia-Web-FINAL-2.pdf>
- CONAPRED. (2010). Encuesta Nacional sobre Discriminación en México (ENADIS). Consejo Nacional para Prevenir la Discriminación. Accessed at: <https://www.conapred.org.mx/userfiles/files/Enadis-2010-RG-Accss-002.pdf>
- Consulta Mitofsky. (2004). Primera Encuesta Nacional Sobre Sexo: Estudio de Opinión en Vivienda. Accessed at: <http://www.sociologia.uson.mx/lecturas/encuestasobresexoenmexico.pdf>
- Crenshaw, K. (1995). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. In *Critical race theory: The key writings that informed the movement*. ed. K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas, 357-83. New York: New Press.
- European Commission. (2016). The Standard Eurobarometer (Eurobarómetro Estándar). <http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm>
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). (2013). European Union lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Survey. Accessed at: <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/eu-lgbtsurvey-european-union-lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender-survey-results>
- Fundación Huésped. (2011). Índice de estigma en personas que viven con HIV en Argentina. Fundación Huésped y Red de Personas Viviendo con HIV/sida de Mar del Plata. Accessed at: <https://www.huesped.org.ar/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Indice-de-Estigma-y-Discriminacion.pdf>
- Fundación Todo Mejora. (2012). 1ra Encuesta Nacional Sobre Bullying Homofóbico. Youth Coalition, COJESS, Foro ENETTACHE, and Comisión Nacional de los Derechos Humanos de México.
- Gallup Poll. (2017). The Gallup Poll. <https://www.gallup.com/home.aspx>
- Gates, G. (2012). LGBT Identity: A Demographer's Perspective, 45 *Loy. L.A. L. Rev.* 693.
- Gender Spectrum (2019). Principles of Gender-Inclusive Puberty and Health Education (Principios de la pubertad con inclusión de género y educación sexual). Accessed at: https://www.genderspectrum.org/staging/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/GenderSpectrum_2019_report_WEB_final.pdf

- GLSEN, Kosciw, J., Greytak, E., Giga, N., Villenas, C., & Danischewski, D. (2015). The 2015 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Youth in our Nation's Schools. GLSEN. Accessed at: https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2015%20National%20GLSEN%202015%20National%20School%20Climate%20Survey%20%28NSCS%29%20-%20Full%20Report_0.pdf
- Gobierno de Chile, Ministerio de Desarrollo Social. (2015). Encuesta Nacional de Juventud (8va). Instituto Nacional de la Juventud. Accessed at: http://www.injuv.gob.cl/storage/docs/Libro_Octava_Encuesta_Nacional_de_Juventud.pdf
- Grant, J., Mottet, L., Tanis, J., Herman, J., & Keisling, M. (2011). Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey (Injusticia en cada momento: Un reporte de la Encuesta Nacional de Discriminación a personas Transgénero). National Center for Transgender Equality, National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. Accessed at: https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/resources/NTDS_Report.pdf
- Grollman, E. (2010). What Is "Sexual Identity"? Is It the Same as Sexual Orientation? What is sexual identity? How is it related to sexual orientation, and how is it different from it? It is quite complex, multidimensional, and fluid. Kinsey Confidential. Accessed at: <https://kinseyconfidential.org/sexual-identity-sexual-orientation/>
- Guasp, A., & Kibridge, H. (2012). One Minority at a Time: Being Black and Gay. Stonewall. Accessed at: https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/One_Minority_At_A_Time__2012_.pdf
- Hart-Brinson, P. (2016). The Social Imagination of Homosexuality and the Rise of Same-sex Marriage in the United States Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World, 2, 237802311663055.
- Herz, M. (2015). The Normativity of the Concept of Heteronormativity. Journal of Homosexuality, 62:8 1009-1020.
- Human Rights Campaign Foundation. (2009). Degrees of Equality: A National Study Examining Workplace Climate for LGBT Employees. Accessed at: https://assets2.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/DegreesOfEquality_2009.pdf?_ga=2.263588364.164600372.1539596932-47066033.1539596932
- Human Rights Watch. (2014). Not Safe at Home: Violence and Discrimination against LGBT people in Jamaica. Accessed at: https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/jamaica1014_ForUpload_1.pdf
- IDPAC. (2010). Proyecto de Reforzamiento de Imaginarios Positivos de la Población LBGT de la Localidad 18 Rafael Uribe. Accessed at: <https://www.slideshare.net/PROSURGIR/informe-final-encuesta-sobre-discriminacion-localidad-18-ruu>
- ILGA. (2015). ILGA-EUROPE Glossary. International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, and Intersex Association: Geneva. Accessed at: https://www.ilga-europe.org/sites/default/files/glossary_october_2015_edition.pdf
- ILGA. (2017). State Sponsored Homophobia, A World Survey of Sexual Orientation Laws: Criminalization, Protection and Recognition. 12 ed. Accessed at: https://ilga.org/downloads/2017/ILGA_State_Sponsored_Homophobia_2017_WEB.pdf
- IMJUVE and UNAM. (2012). Encuesta Nacional de Valores en Juventud. Mexico.
- INDEC. (2012). Primera Encuesta sobre Población Trans: Travestis, Transexuales, Transgéneros y Hombres Trans. Informe técnico de la prueba Piloto Municipio de La Matanza 18 al 29 de junio 2012. Accessed at: <https://fpabramo.org.br/publicacoes/wpcontent/uploads/sites/5/2017/05/Diversidade-Sexual-Web.pdf>
- INEC Ecuador. (2013). Estudio de caso sobre condiciones de vida, inclusión social y cumplimiento de derechos humanos de la población LGBTI en Ecuador. Accessed at: http://www.ecuadorencifras.gob.ec/documentos/web-inec/Estadisticas_Sociales/LGBTI/Analisis_situacion_LGBTI.pdf
- INEGI. (2008). Encuesta Nacional sobre Cultura Política y Prácticas Ciudadanas (ENCUP). Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía. Accessed at: <http://www.beta.inegi.org.mx/proyectos/enchogares/historicas/encup/>
- IPECE, Brasil. (2010). Resultados do Censo Demográfico 2010: População, Renda e Condição de Domicílios. Accessed at: http://www.ipece.ce.gov.br/informe/apresentacao_informe_6.pdf

- IPSOS. (2011). Sexualidad, Reproducción y Desigualdades de Género. Accessed at: https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/publication/2011-10/Presentacion_Sexualidad.pdf
- ISTAT. (2014). Discriminazioni in base al genere, all'orientamento sessuale e all'appartenenza étnica (Discriminación por género, orientación sexual y etnia). Accessed at: <https://www.istat.it/it/files//2011/06/Questionario.pdf>
- Kaiser Family Foundation. (2000). Kaiser Survey of Sexual Orientation (Encuesta de Orientación Sexual de Kaiser). Accessed at: http://www.lgbt-lgbtdata.com/uploads/1/0/8/8/10884149/ds020_kssr_report.pdf
- LAPOP. (2017). The Americas Barometer by the Latin American Public Opinion Project (LAPOP): www.LapopSurveys.org.
- Larios Cruz, M. (2013). Índice de estigma y discriminación a personas con HIV – Nicaragua. Accessed at: http://www.stigmaindex.org/sites/default/files/reports/NicaraguaEstudio%20Final_ED_.pdf
- León, M. (2015). Estudio sobre las condiciones legislativas, institucionales y sociales para el reconocimiento, protección y ejercicio de los derechos y la salud sexual y reproductiva en Venezuela, Tomo 1: Reconocimiento de los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos. AVEAS, ACCSI,
- Aliadas en Cadena. Accessed at: https://issuu.com/nodiscriminesHIV/docs/dssr_en_venezuela__tomo_1._reconoci
- Mayock, O., Bryan, A., Carr, N., & Kitching, K. (2009). Supporting LGBT Lives: A Study of the Mental Health and Well-Being of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People. Gay and Lesbian Equality Network (GLEN) and Belong to Youth Service. Accessed at: <https://www.hse.ie/eng/services/publications/mentalhealth/suporting-lgbt-lives.pdf>
- Measure Evaluation. (2011-2012). Utilización de los servicios de salud entre los hombres que tienen sexo con hombres y mujeres transgénero, San Salvador 2011-2012. Accessed at: <https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/publications/tr-13-92-es>
- MINGLE – Mission for Indian gay and lesbian Empowerment. (2011). Youth and Campus Survey 2011: A Study examining LGBT issues in Indian College & University. Accessed at: <https://mingle.org.in/pdf/Youth-Campus-Survey-2011-Mingle.pdf>
- MINGLE – Mission for Indian gay and lesbian Empowerment. (2012). First Annual LGBT Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Survey. Accessed at: <https://mingle.org.in/pdf/LGBT-Workplace-Survey-2012-MINGLE.pdf>
- Ministério da Saúde, Brasil. (2011). Pesquisa de Conhecimentos, Atitudes e Práticas na População Brasileira (Encuesta de Conocimientos, Actitudes y Prácticas en la Población Brasileña). Sistema Unico de Saúde. Accessed at: http://bvsms.saude.gov.br/bvs/publicacoes/pesquisa_conhecimentos_atitudes_praticas_populacao_brasileira.pdf
- Ministerio de Desarrollo Social e Instituto Mexicano de Juventud. (2010). Encuesta Nacional de Juventud 2010. Accessed at: http://www.imjuventud.gob.mx/imgs/uploads/Presentacion_ENJ_2010_Dr_Tuiran_V4am.pdf
- Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos. (2013). Encuesta para Medir la Percepción de la Población Peruana en relación con los Derechos Humanos. Dirección General de Derechos Humanos, Dirección de Políticas y Gestión en Derechos Humanos. Accessed at: <http://www.yonodiscrimino.gob.pe/images/EncuestaDH.pdf>
- Ministerio de Salud, Costa Rica. (2015). Encuesta Nacional de Salud Sexual y Reproductiva, Costa Rica 2015. Accessed at: <https://ccp.ucr.ac.cr/documentos/portal/Informe-2daEncuesta-2015.pdf>
- Ministry of Industry, Canada. (2013). General Social Survey. Accessed at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/89f0115x/89f0115x2013001-eng.pdf?st=w6RnfCQH>
- Morales, M. (2012). Índice Compuesto de Estigma y Discriminación hacia Hombres Homosexuales, otros MSM y Mujeres Transgénero en Chile. Accessed at: <http://www.onu.cl/onu/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/ESTUDIO-ESTIGMA-Y-DISCRIMINACION-MSM-Y-MUJERES-TRANS.-CHILE-dic-2012.pdf>

- Morales, S., Paz, B., & Hernández, B. (2010). Estimación del tamaño de poblaciones en mayor riesgo y vulnerabilidad al HIV: Hombres que tienen sexo con hombres y trabajadoras sexuales en seis ciudades de Guatemala. UNAIDS. Accessed at: http://www.pasca.org/sites/default/files/estimacion_tamano_pob_pemar_g_MSM_ts_2010.pdf
- MOVILH. (2005). Estudio diagnóstico sobre sexualidad, sida y consumo de drogas en jóvenes de la comuna de Lo Prado. Accessed at: <http://www.movilh.cl/documentacion/diagnosticoloprado.pdf>
- MOVILH. (2011). Encuesta Sobre Discriminación de las Minorías Sexuales. Fundación Progres. Accessed at: <http://www.movilh.cl/documentacion/encuestas/Encuesta-Movilh-Progres-2011.pdf>
- MOVILH. (2012). Encuesta sobre Educación Sexual y Discriminación. Accessed at: <http://www.movilh.cl/documentacion/Encuesta-sobre-educacion-sexual-y-discriminacion.pdf>
- MOVILH. (2013). Primera Encuesta Nacional: diversidad Sexual, Derechos Humanos y Ley contra la Discriminación. Accessed at: <http://www.movilh.cl/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Encuesta-Nacional-Diversidad-Sexual.pdf>
- Newport, F. (2018). In U.S., Estimate of LGBT Rises to 4.5%. Gallup, Politics. Accessed at: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/234863/estimate-lgbt-population-rises.aspx>
- Nieves, A., & Mondragón, A. (2014). Diversidad Sexual: Derechos, discriminación y violencia: Encuesta Marcha del Orgullo Venezuela 2013, Caracas, Valencia y Maracaibo. Accessed at: <https://www.slideshare.net/qfranco/diversidad-sexual-derechos-discriminacin-y-violencia-encuesta-marcha-del-orgullo>
- Nieves, A., & Quiteria, F. (2015). La discriminación y la impunidad no son iguales ante la ley: Situación de los Derechos Humanos de las Lesbianas, Gays, Bisexuales, Trans e Intersexuales en Venezuela. Accessed at: <http://www.derechos.org/ve/pw/wp-content/uploads/Informe-situacion-de-los-DDHH-de-personas-LGBTI-en-Venezuela-CIDH-marzo-2015.pdf>
- Ochoa, M., & Gorriñ, C. (2008). Informe sobre Homofobia, Violencia e Impunidad contra la Comunidad Lesbiana, Gay, Transexual y Bisexual en la República Bolivariana de Venezuela. UNAIDS and PNUD. Accessed at: https://hivhealthclearinghouse.unesco.org/sites/default/files/resources/santiago_so-0040s.pdf
- OCDE (2003). Glossary of Statistical Terms. OCDE, Paris: Francia.
- Office for National Statistics. (2015). Integrated Household Survey: Sexual identity, smoking prevalence and perceived general health using data from the Integrated Household Survey. Accessed at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/integratedhouseholdsurvey/2015-10-01>
- ONU SIDA. (2013). A Mandate to Act: Findings from a poll on Public Attitudes to Sexual and Reproductive Health, Abuse, Violence and Discrimination. Accessed at: <http://unaids-caribbean.org/sites/default/files/field/image/UNAIDS%20TT%202013%20POLL%20FINAL.pdf>
- UNAIDS. (2014). The Caribbean men's Internet Survey (CARIMIS). Accessed at: <http://sigmaresearch.org.uk/files/report2014d.pdf>
- Ortiz-Hernández, L., & Torres, M. I. (2005). Efectos de la violencia y la discriminación en la salud mental de bisexuales, lesbianas y homosexuales de la Ciudad de México. Cuadernos De Saúde Pública, 21(3), 913-925.
- Out Now Global. (2013). Out Now Global LGBT 2020 Study. Accessed at: <https://www.outnowconsulting.com/media/1332/idaho-discrimination-report-global-v7.pdf>
- Paraná Pesquisas. (2017). Pesquisa de opinião pública nacional. Accessed at: http://www.paranapesquisas.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/BR_Mai18-M%C3%ADdia2.pdf
- Pew Research Center. (2013). A Survey of LGBT Americans (Encuesta de personas LGBT americanas). Accessed at: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/06/13/a-survey-of-lgbtamericans/>
- Pew Research Center. (2013). The Global Divide on Homosexuality: Greater Acceptance in More Secular and Affluent countries. Accessed at: <http://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/05/Pew->

- Global-Attitudes-Homosexuality-Report-REVISED-MAY-27-2014.pdf
- Pew Research Center. (2014). Religion in Latin America: Widespread Change in a Historically Catholic Region. Accessed at: <http://www.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2014/11/Religion-in-Latin-America-11-12-PM-full-PDF.pdf>
- Pinos-Vélez, V., Pinos, G., & Palacios, M. (2011). Percepciones sobre la diversidad sexual en adolescentes escolarizados de la ciudad de Cuenca. Universidad de Cuenca. Accessed at: <https://publicaciones.ucuenca.edu.ec/ojs/index.php/maskana/article/view/382/328>
- Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Instituto de Opinión Pública. (2007). Encuesta de opinión Nacional Urbana. Accessed at: <http://repositorio.pucp.edu.pe/index/handle/123456789/15416?show=full>
- PROMSEX. (2015). Encuesta sobre derechos sexuales y reproductivos en Perú.
- PUCP. (2012). Encuesta de Opinión sobre Familia y Roles de Género. Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, Instituto de Opinión Pública.
- Robledo, F. (2014). 1ra Encuesta Sobre Homofobia y el Mundo Laboral en México. Accessed at: <http://www.adilmexico.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Resultados-Encuesta-2014.pdf>
- Robledo, F. (2015). 2da. Encuesta sobre Diversidad e Inclusión Laboral. Accessed at: <http://www.adilmexico.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2daEncuestaADIL2015superlow.pdf>
- Secretaría de Inclusión Social. (2012). Consulta Nacional sobre realidades LGBTQ+ en El Salvador. Accessed at: <http://amate.org.sv/doc/Consulta%20Nacional%20sobre%20realidades%20LGBTI%20en%20El%20Salvador.PDF>
- Statistics Canada. (2013). Canadian General Social Survey. General Social Survey, an overview, 2013. Social and Aboriginal Statistics Division. Accessed at: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/89f0115x/89f0115x2013001-eng.pdf?st=n8fLFTkS>
- Statistics Canada. (2018). Canadian Community Health Survey. <https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/survey/household/3226>
- Stonewall. (2016). Do Ask, Do Tell, Capturing data on sexual orientation and gender identity. Accessed at: https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/do_ask_do_tell_guide_2016.pdf
- Stonewall. (2018). Stonewall Workplace Equality Index. London, United Kingdom. <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/workplace-equality-index>
- Suárez Rehaag, D., & Madrigal Ballesteros, F. (2007). Diagnóstico, con enfoque de género, sobre la situación del estigma, la discriminación y la homofobia en Costa Rica. CIPAC. Accessed at: https://www.cipacdh.org/pdf/diagnostico_costa_rica.pdf
- The Williams Institute. (2009). Best Practices for Asking Questions about Sexual Orientation on Surveys. Sexual Minority Assessment Research Team (SMART). UCLA School of Law. Accessed at: <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/SMART-FINAL-Nov-2009.pdf>
- The Williams Institute. (2011). How Many People Are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender? The Williams Institute, UCLA Law School. Accessed at: <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-How-Many-People-LGBT-Apr-2011.pdf>
- The Williams Institute. (2015). An Inclusive Approach to Surveys of Sexual and Gender Minorities. The Williams Institute: UCLA Law School. Accessed at: <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Inclusive-Approach-to-Surveys-of-Sexual-and-Gender-Minorities-Nepal-March-2015.pdf>
- Træen, B., Martinussen, M., Vitters, J., & Saini, S. (2009). Sexual Orientation and Quality of Life Among University Students from Cuba, Norway, India, and South Africa. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 56(5), 655-669.
- UCL, LSHTM, NatCen. (2012). The British National Surveys of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (Natsal). Accessed

- at: <http://www.natsal.ac.uk/media/2078/b1-capi-and-casi-questionnaire.pdf>
- UCLA. (2016). California Health Interview Survey. UCLA Center for Health Policy Research and the UCLA Fielding School of Public Health. <http://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/chis/Pages/default.aspx>
- UNESCO. (2014). Bullying Targeting Secondary School Students who or are Perceived to be Transgender or Same-Sex Attracted: Types, Prevalence, Impact, Motivation and Preventive Measures in 5 Provinces in Thailand. Accessed at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002275/227518e.pdf>
- USAID. (2010). Encuesta Centroamericana de Vigilancia de Comportamiento Sexual y Prevalencia del HIV/ITS en Poblaciones Vulnerables: Hombres que tienen relaciones sexuales con hombres.
- Venturi, G., & Bokary, V. (2011). Diversidade Sexual e Homofobia no Brasil. Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo. Accessed at: http://www.trabajo.gov.ar/downloads/diversidadsexual/Argentina_Primer_Encuesta_sobre_Poblacion_Trans_2012.pdf
- World Values Survey Association. (2014). World Values Survey. Accessed at: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSEventsShow>.

