



**UNIVERSITY OF
KWAZULU-NATAL**

**INYUVESI
YAKWAZULU-NATALI**

**A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL,
TRANSGENDER AND INTERSEX (LGBTI) COMMUNITIES
AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS**

By

**SUNDAY ADESOJI DARE
212558320**

B.Sc (UAdo-Ekiti), BEd Hons, MEd (UKZN)

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD)

in

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

in the

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL

PROMOTER: PROF. DJ HLALELE

2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	THESIS COVER PAGE	I
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
	THESIS DECLARATION	Xvii
	AKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xviii
	DEDICATION	Xix
	LIST OF KEY CONCEPTS	Xx
	LIST OF ACRONYMNS AND ABBREVIATIONS	Xxi
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xxiii
	LIST OF TABLES	xxiv
	ABSTRACT	xxv
CHAPTER ONE		
OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY ON A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
1.1	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.2	PROBLEM STATEMENT	4
1.3	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	5
1.4	CRITICAL QUESTIONS	5
1.5	RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY	6
1.5.1	Self-constructed incident 1	6
1.5.2	Self-constructed incidents 2 And 3	7
1.6	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	7
1.6.1	Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory	8
1.7	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH TO THE STUDY	9
1.7.1	Selection of participants	10
1.7.2	Participatory action research as a data generating method	11
1.8	PREVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
1.9	TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE STUDY	15

1.10	ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	16
1.11	LAYOUT OF CHAPTERS	17
1.12	DELIMITATIONS	18
1.13	LIMITATIONS	18
1.14	CHAPTER SUMMARY	18
CHAPTER TWO		
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK INFORMING A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
2.1	INTRODUCTION	19
2.2	DEFINITION OF OPERATIONAL CONCEPTS	19
2.2.1	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) communities	19
2.2.2	Transformative approach	20
2.2.3	Embracing	21
2.2.4	University campus	21
2.3	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	22
2.3.1	Exploration of psychological theorists for the study	23
2.3.2	Selection of a theoretical framework for the study	25
2.3.3	Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory	25
2.3.4	Ecological systems theory and human dignity	26
2.3.5	Ecological systems theory implications	27
2.4	ONTOLOGY AND ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY	28
2.5	EPISTEMOLOGY AND ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY	28
2.6	AXIOLOGY AND ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY	30
2.7	THE RELEVANCE OF ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY TO THE CURRENT STUDY	30
2.8	THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER	31

2.9	CHAPTER SUMMARY	32
CHAPTER THREE		
REVIEW OF LITERATURE INFORMING A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
3.1	INTRODUCTION	33
3.2	A SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS INTO TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACHES FOR EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	33
3.2.1	Hostile campus climate for LGBTI communities	33
3.2.2	Tacit and subtle rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus by peers and staffs	34
3.2.3	Lack of parental/family support for LGBTI communities	34
3.2.4	Difficulties to sexual disclosure for LGBTI communities at a university campus	36
3.2.5	Heterosexuals majority dominance	37
3.2.6	LGBTI Communities' engagements and disengagement at a university campus	38
3.3	THE NEED FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	39
3.3.1	Abuses of LGBTI communities	39
3.3.2	Bullying of LGBTI communities	39
3.3.3	Harassment of LGBTI communities at a university campus	41
3.3.4	Isolation of LGBTI communities at a university campus	42
3.3.5	Labelling and stigmatisation of LGBTI communities	42
3.4	KEY ELEMENTS (TRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	43
3.4.1	Mutual engagement among LGBTI communities and heterosexuals	43

3.4.2	Mindfulness behaviour to embrace LGBTI communities	44
3.4.3	Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus	45
3.4.4	Willingness to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus	46
3.4.5	Freedom of participation for LGBTI communities at a university campus	47
3.4.6	Cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus	48
3.4.7	Empathy to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus	48
3.5	CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH CAN BE USED TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	49
3.5.1	Lecturers' attitudes towards LGBTI communities at a university campus	49
3.5.2	Changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities at a university campus	50
3.5.3	Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI communities at a university campus	51
3.5.4	Changing of prejudice about LGBTI communities at a university campus	52
3.5.5	University campus implementation of anti-bullying program to embracing LGBTI communities	54
3.5.6	Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities	54
3.5.7	Provision of improved safe university campus to embracing LGBTI communities	55
3.6	HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	57

3.6.1	Dominance of heterosexuals over LGBTI communities at a university campus	57
3.6.2	Different perspectives on embracing LGBTI communities	58
3.6.3	Insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities	59
3.6.4	Limited spaces for debate/dialogues on LGBTI communities issues	60
3.6.5	University capacity to provide necessary intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities	60
3.6.6	Absence of campaigns and rallies to embrace LGBTI communities	62
3.6.7	Religious beliefs on LGBTI communities' differences at a university campus	62
3.6.8	Inconsistencies in policies regarding LGBTI communities	64
3.7	CHAPTER SUMMARY	65
CHAPTER FOUR		
METHODOLOGY AND DATA GENERATION METHODS FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
4.1	INTRODUCTION	66
4.2	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	66
4.2.1	Qualitative approach	67
4.2.2	Sampling techniques	68
4.2.3	Selection of participants	69
4.2.4	Critical paradigm	70
4.3	DATA GENERATING METHODS	71
4.4	ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	71
4.5	PROFILES OF RESEARCH TEAM	75
4.5.1	LGBTI communities	75
4.5.2	Heterosexual students	75
4.5.3	University lecturers	75

4.5.4	University SRC	76
4.5.5	LGBTI communities from outside university	76
4.5.6	On campus faith thrusts	76
4.5.7	University students services practitioner	76
4.6	RECRUITMENT OF RESEARCH TEAM	76
4.6.1	Organizing the first meeting	76
4.6.2	Research project meetings	77
4.6.2.1	First research project meeting	79
4.6.2.2	Second research project meeting	80
4.7	CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS	83
4.9	CHAPTER SUMMARY	86
CHAPTER FIVE		
DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION ON A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
5.1	INTRODUCTION	87
5.2	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	87
5.3	THE CURRENT SITUATION REGARDING TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACHES TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	88
5.3.1	Hostile university climate for LGBTI communities	89
5.3.2	Tacit and subtle rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus by peers and staffs	90
5.3.3	Lack of parental/family supports for LGBTI communities	92
5.3.4	Difficulties to sexual disclosure for LGBTI communities	93
5.3.5	Heterosexuals majority dominance	94
5.3.6	LGBTI communities' engagement and disengagement	101
5.3.7	Negative stereotype towards LGBTI communities	103
5.4	THE NEED A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	105

5.4.1	Abuses of LGBTI communities	105
5.4.2	Bullying of LGBTI communities	107
5.4.3	Discrimination of LGBTI communities	109
5.4.4	LGBTI communities harassment	111
5.4.5	LGBTI communities' name-calling	112
5.4.6	LGBTI communities isolation	114
5.4.7	LGBTI communities state of stigmatization	116
5.4.8	Labelling and stigma of LGBTI communities	117
5.5	KEY ELEMENTS (THRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	118
5.5.1	Mutual engagement among LGBTI communities and heterosexuals	117
5.5.2	Mindfulness behaviour to embrace LGBTI communities	120
5.5.3	Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities	121
5.5.4	Love to embrace LGBTI communities	123
5.5.5	Freedom of LGBTI communities	124
5.5.6	Cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities	126
5.5.7	Friendships to embracing LGBTI communities	127
5.6	CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH CAN BE USED TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	128
5.6.1	Staffs' lack of support for LGBTI communities	128
5.6.2	Changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities	129
5.6.3	Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI communities	132
5.6.4	Changing of prejudice about LGBTI communities	134
5.6.5	University campus implementation of anti-bullying program to embracing LGBTI communities	136
5.6.6	Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities	138
5.6.7	Provision of improved safety at university campus to embracing LGBTI communities	139

5.7	HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	142
5.7.1	Dominance of heterosexuals over LGBTI communities	142
5.7.2	Different perspectives on embracing LGBTI communities	143
5.7.3	Insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities	145
5.7.4	Limited spaces for debate/dialogues on LGBTI communities Issues	148
5.7.5	Capacity to provide necessary intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus	149
5.7.6	Absence of campaigns and rallies to embrace LGBTI communities	153
5.7.7	Religious and beliefs on LGBTI communities' differences at a university campus	154
5.7.8	Inconsistency of policies regards LGBTI communities	156
5.8	CHAPTER SUMMARY	158
CHAPTER SIX		
DATA DISCUSSIONS AND ANALYSIS ON A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
6.1	INTRODUCTION	159
6.2	THE CURRENT SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS REGARDING TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACHES TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	159
6.2.1	Hostile university climate for LGBTI communities	159
6.2.2	Tacit and subtle rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus by peers and staffs	161
6.2.3	Lack of parental/family supports for LGBTI communities	163
6.2.4	Difficulties on sexual disclosure for LGBTI communities	165

6.2.5	Heterosexual majority dominance	166
6.2.6	LGBTI communities' engagement and disengagement	169
6.2.7	Negative stereotype towards LGBTI communities	170
6.3	THE NEED FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	172
6.3.1	Abuses of LGBTI communities	172
6.3.2	Bullying of LGBTI communities	174
6.3.3	Discrimination of LGBTI communities	175
6.3.4	LGBTI communities' name-calling	176
6.3.5	Stigmatization and labelling of LGBTI communities	177
6.4	KEY ELEMENTS (THRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	179
6.4.1	Mutual engagement among LGBTI communities and heterosexuals	179
6.4.2	Mindfulness behaviour to embrace LGBTI communities	180
6.4.3	Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities	181
6.4.4	Love to embrace LGBTI communities	182
6.4.5	Friendly cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities	183
6.5	CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH CAN BE USED TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	185
6.5.1	Staffs lack of support for LGBTI communities at a university campus	185
6.5.2	Changing of attitudes/prejudices towards LGBTI communities	186
6.5.3	Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI communities	188
6.5.4	University campus implementation of anti-bullying program to embracing LGBTI communities	189
6.5.5	Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities	190

6.5.6	Provision of improved safety at university campus to embracing LGBTI communities	192
6.6	HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	194
6.6.1	Dominance of heterosexuals over LGBTI communities	194
6.6.2	Different perspectives to embracing LGBTI communities	195
6.6.3	Insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities	197
6.6.4	Limited spaces for debates/dialogues on LGBTI communities Issues	199
6.6.5	Capacity to provide necessary intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities	200
6.6.6	Religious and beliefs on LGBTI communities' differences at a university	203
6.6.7	Inconsistency of policies regards LGBTI communities	204
6.7	CHAPTER SUMMARY	206
CHAPTER SEVEN		
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
7.1	INTRODUCTION	207
7.1.1	Research team demographic data	207
7.2	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON THE CURRENT SITUATION REGARDING APPROACHES TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	207
7.2.1	Present university climate on LGBTI communities	207
7.2.2	Attitudes of university community members on LGBTI communities	208
7.2.3	Low measure of peers and management supports	210

7.2.4	Fear of disclosure of sexuality based on stereotype for warm acceptance	211
7.2.5	Beliefs of heterosexual's dominance to relate with LGBTI communities	211
7.2.6	Marginal disengagement of LGBTI communities at a university campus	214
7.2.7	Direct verbal hardships imposed from heterosexual peers on differences	216
7.3	THE NEED FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MAY BE JUSTIFIED	217
7.3.1	Verbal /sexual abuse confrontation from heterosexuals	217
7.3.2	Unending arguments related to LGBTI communities on a change of personality	219
7.3.3	Scepticism of university community about LGBTI communities	221
7.3.4	Empowering inclusion of all students from classrooms	222
7.3.5	Removal of social exclusion on LGBTI communities	224
7.3.6	Educating for change around university campus	225
7.3.7	Creation of peaceful university campus	227
7.3.8	Societal non- conformity over LGBTI communities	228
7.4	SOME KEY THRUSTS OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SHOULD BE BORNE IN MIND	229
7.4.1	Collaborative engagement among LGBTI communities and university populace	229
7.4.2	Conscious understanding of LGBTI communities	231
7.4.3	Liberating individual minds about humanity values	232

7.4.4	Care application to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus	233
7.4.5	Retreat for a change of habit on diversity	234
7.4.6	Create a welcoming/friendly atmosphere	235
7.4.7	Maintain neutrality to human sexuality/gender differences	236
7.5	THERE ARE SOME CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MAY THRIVE	237
7.5.1	Managements/ staffs eagerness to support LGBTI communities	237
7.5.2	General changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities	238
7.5.3	Embracing indiscriminating association of every students	240
7.5.4	Readiness to accept transformative approach for life	242
7.5.5	University implementation constant awareness debates, rallies and campaigns of anti-abuse program to embracing LGBTI communities	244
7.5.6	Provision of secured residences/ facilities to embracing LGBTI communities	245
7.6	WE SHOULD BE CAUTIOUS REGARDING SOME HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	248
7.6.1	Heterosexual sovereignty over LGBTI communities	248
7.6.2	Uncirculated possibilities that LGBTI communities are human beings	249
7.6.3	Unsupported spaces to debate/dialogues on LGBTI communities issues	251

7.6.4	University capacity to provide prompts intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities	252
7.6.5	Religious and beliefs against LGBTI communities at a university campus	253
7.6.6	Societal indoctrination about heterosexuality/homosexuality	255
7.6.7	Schools/tertiary institutions policies exemption or neutrality on LGBTI communities	256
7.7	CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE STUDY	257
7.8	CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY: THEORETICAL, METHODOLOGICAL AS WELL AS CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRACTICE	259
7.9	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	260
7.10	RECOMMENDATIONS	261
7.11	IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	262
7.12	CHAPTER SUMMARY	262
CHAPTER EIGHT		
THE PROPOSED TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS		
8.1	INTRODUCTION	263
8.2	THE CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	263
8.2.1	Changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities	264
8.2.2	Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI communities	264
8.2.3	Changing of prejudice about LGBTI communities	264
8.2.4	University campus implementation of anti-discrimination program to embracing LGBTI communities	264
8.2.5	Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities	265
8.2.6	Provision of improved and safe university campus	265

8.3	KEY ELEMENTS (THRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	265
8.3.1	Mutual engagement among LGBTI communities and heterosexuals	265
8.3.2	Mindfulness behaviour to embrace LGBTI communities	265
8.3.3	Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities	266
8.3.4	Care to embrace LGBTI communities	266
8.3.5.	Cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities	266
8.3.6	Good friendships to embracing LGBTI communities	267
8.3.7	Managements support for LGBTI communities	267
8.4	A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS	268
8.4.1	Concepts of proposed transformative approach	268
8.5	SUMMARY OF THE STUDY	272
8.6	IMPRESSIONS FROM THE STUDY	273
8.7	CONCLUDING REMARKS	275
9	REFERENCES	276
	LIST OF APPENDICES	306
APDX 1	Ethical clearance letter	306
APDX 2	Gatekeeper permission letter	307
APDX 3	Permission to conduct study at the university campus	308
APDX 4	Turnitin report	309
APDX 5	Certificate of language editing	310
APDX 6	Informed consent to the LGBTI	311
APDX 7	Invitation to students	313
APDX 8	Informed consent to the lecturers	315
APDX 9	Informed consent to the on campus faith thrust	317

APDX 10	Informed consent to the students representative council (SRC)	319
APDX 11	Informed consent to the university students services practitioner	321
APDX 12	Informed consent to the LGBTI outside campus	323
APDX 13	Informed consent to the psychologist	325
APDX 14	Invitation to LGBTI communities	327
APDX 15	Invitation to LGBTI communities outside	328
APDX 16	Invitation to lecturers	329
APDX 17	Invitation to the on campus faith thrust	330
APDX 18	Invitation to students representative council (SRC)	331
APDX 19	Invitation to university students services practitioner	332
APDX 20	Invitation to the LGBTI outside campus	333
APDX 21	Invitation to the psychologist	334
APDX 22	Letter of re- editing	335

THESIS DECLARATION - PLAGIARISM

PhD and MED theses and dissertations should include the full declaration as follows:

DECLARATION – PLAGIARISM

I, **SUNDAY ADESOJI DARE**, declare that:

1. The research reported in this thesis, except where otherwise indicated, and is my original research.
2. This thesis has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.
3. This thesis does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.
4. This thesis does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:
 - a. Their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced
 - b. Where their exact words have been used, then their writing has been placed inside quotation marks, and referenced.
5. This thesis does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the Internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the thesis and in the References sections.

Signed:



Date: 23rd July, 2019.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My gratitude goes to the following personalities who supported and encouraged me to the complete this research:

- ✚ My promoter, Professor Dipane Joseph Hlalele, for his positive attitude, inspiration, untiring support and directives from the study's inception to the end;
- ✚ Sincere thanks also goes out to the LGBTI communities, and entire research teams, who participated in this study;
- ✚ I am grateful to the Churches I attend; Ayegun Baptist Church, Ogbomoso, Oyo State Nigeria and Winners Chapel International Durban South Africa for their continued support. Ebun Olorun society, Ayegun Ogbomoso; VPAN Ogbomoso. Oke-Alapata Landlord Association; Peaceway Professional Photos Ode-Abese Ogbomoso. Thanks to Daddy Joseph Oladipo, for the mentorship as I was trained under his establishment. Gratitudes to Rev. Dr. and Mrs Olutayo/Olusayo Oladejo, Rev. Dr. and Mrs Paul Olaleye, Pastor and Mrs Kayode Akindeji, Rev. & Mrs G.O Olasehinde and many others who encouraged me, My children, **Esther Olakristi**, **Cornelious Ayokristi** and **Huldah Siphosetu Ifekristi Dare**, my step-mother, Mrs Dorcas Dare;
- ✚ My appreciation goes to the teachers/lecturers who taught me at Ayegun Baptist School 1 & 2, Ogbomoso Baptist High School and Gbede Community High School, Gbede, Ogbomoso, the University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria and the University of KwaZulu-Natal South Africa for their academic investment which fueled me this far in education and actualize my dream in life; Pa. Joseph Oyelade and Pa. Oladosu Ogundeji, thank you so much. My friends; Mr. Adegbola Ogundeji, Mrs Ruth Abiola, Mrs Olalekan Akintara, Mrs Janet Adepoju, Bro John Afolabi, Mr Adekunle Aderinto, Rev. Olufemi Onifade. Also Mr & Mrs Victor Nandozie and Mr. Abraham Edokpolor for their supports. I acknowledge Mr. Mukesh Kemrajlr who is the Subject Librarian for his support. My brothers and sister-in-law, Alhaj Olalekan Adegbite, Mrs Fadesere Asafa, Mr Adeniyi Adegbite, Mr Adeyemi Adegbite and Mr Dauda Adegbite. I am grateful to the University of KwaZulu-Natal's Edgewood Campus for the support in order to make this research a success and also to the Dean's conference local funding and strategic funding, which were privileges that I enjoyed during the course of this study. I also appreciate Pastor Olusegun Ajani for his ever relenting prayer and supplication through the difficult times. to Dr. Joseph Edimo, Mr. Simeon Owolabi, Pastor Emmanuel Igben, Pastor Kayode Akindeji and Dn. David Ogunmola; thanks to Caitlin Martins, Lynn Sibanda, and Denise Wodak for editing my work;
- ✚ Finally, I am eternally grateful to my creator, The Almighty God, who provided me with all required resources to complete this study.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to:

My wife, **Folasade Monilola Dare**, for her tireless sacrifices, support and reinforcement during this study;

My father, **Pa. David Adebayo Dare**, my mother, **Ma. Alice Faramade Dare**, for their part of life that has brought me thus far. For being my sources of power though they passed on but their efforts remain infallible and their zeal they gave me to persevere in order to accomplish any given task is still relevant;

My mother-in-law, **Alhaja Ralibat Adegbite** who prayerfully motivated me to study towards the completion of this degree despite the hard times experienced during the study period; she stood by me with words of encouragement and helped me to the end of this course.

LIST OF KEY CONCEPTS

Embracing
LGBTI communities
Transformative
University campus

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
APA	American Psychological Association
BED	Bachelor of Education
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
CW	Chat on WhatsApp
DBE	Department of Basic Education
DoE	Department of Education
DUT	Durban University of Technology
ECD	Early Childhood Development
FET	Foundation Educational Training
Gi	Government
GLSEN	Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network
KJV	King James Version
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HREC	Higher Research and Ethics Committee
LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex
LGBTIOC	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex outside Campus
LGBTI Co	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex communities
LGBTQ	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer
LGBTQIA	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex and Allies
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
ODE	Online Dictionary of Education
OCFT	On Campus Faith Thrust
PAR	Participatory Action Research

PGCE Postgraduate Certificate in Education

PHD Doctor of Philosophy

PTA Parent Teacher Association

UGA University of Georgia

UL University Lecturer

UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNISA University of South Africa

USA United State of America

USSP University Students Services Practitioner

RMS Resourced Management Services

RSA Republic of South Africa

SH Student Heterosexuals

SRC Students Representative Council

STU Student

TP Teaching Practice

TV Television

WHO World Health Organization

WFPF White Paper on Foreign Policy

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Ethical clearance letter	306
APPENDIX 2: Gatekeeper permission letter	307
APPENDIX 3: Permission to conduct study at the university campus	308
APPENDIX 4: Turnitin report	309
APPENDIX 5: Certificate of language editing	310
APPENDIX 6: Informed consent to the LGBTI	311
APPENDIX 7: Invitation to students	313
APPENDIX 8: Informed consent to the lecturers	315
APPENDIX 9: Informed consent to the on campus faith thrust	317
APPENDIX 10: Informed consent to the student representative council (SRC)	319
APPENDIX 11: Informed consent to the university students services practitioner	321
APPENDIX 12: Informed consent to the LGBTI outside campus	323
APPENDIX 13: Informed consent to the psychologist	325
APPENDIX 14: Invitation to LGBTI communities	327
APPENDIX 15: Invitation to LGBTI communities outside	328
APPENDIX 16: Invitation to Lecturers	329
APPENDIX 17: Invitation to the on campus faith thrust	330
APPENDIX 18: Invitation to students representative council (SRC)	331
APPENDIX 19: Invitation to university students services practitioner	332
APPENDIX 20: Invitation to the LGBTI outside campus	333
APPENDIX 21: Invitation to the psychologist	334
APPENDIX 22: Letter of re-editing	335

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1	Research team demographic data	74
Table 4.2	Research plans	80
Table 4.3	Participant's reflexive essay	81
Table 8.4.1	Concepts of proposed transformative approach	268

ABSTRACT

The current issues of homophobic and discriminating acts by heterosexuals against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex communities has necessitated critiques to constructively drive to gain a transformative approach in order to embrace the LGBTI communities. The objective of this study is to propose a transformative approach that could embracing LGBTI communities at a university. The recruitment of a research team was done through a purposive method. The study's sample size was reduced from 17 to 15 as two participants declined to participate in the study. The critical paradigm was used for data generation and PAR was used as an approach coached "Bronfrenbrenner ecological systems" theory. The "Ecological systems" theory in this study draws collective perspectives in order to allow responsive action towards maintained values, respect and morality for humanity by giving relative acceptance. The literature review was used, Ethical consideration sought from the university; gatekeepers and informed consents sent to the participants and the ethical clearance released by the higher degree ethics office. Data generation was obtained from meetings; focus group discussions, conversations, deliberate dialogues as well as free attitudes interviews/scripts/writings. Data was audiotaped and transcribed verbatim and it addressed each objective accordingly. Findings were from data generated, and the trustworthiness of this study was triangulated by the reflexive essay and the researcher's field notes and reflections through the participants' body language. Firstly, transcriptions were done by an expert and the researcher in order to maintain congruence and accuracy of data management. Data findings were further analyzed accordingly. Therefore, findings from this study showed that despite the awareness, campaigns and talk shows about the LGBTI communities, the majority of the heterosexual students as well as the management also need orientation to support LGBTI communities to be an active part of the University. This study discovered that more research needs to be done to embrace the LGBTI communities at a university campus. The limitations to this study were; 1). The religious practitioners such as pastors, imams, traditionalists, Hindus and other faith based groups could be part of this study. 2). The timeframe had a great influence on the efficiency of this study 3).

Keywords: Transformative approach, embracing, LGBTI communities, university campus

CHAPTER ONE

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY ON A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

This chapter presented the overview study of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. It presented problem statement, aims and objectives of the study, theoretical framework, research methodology and approach to study, preview of literature review, trustworthiness of the study and rigour, ethical consideration and layout of chapters, delimitation, limitations and chapter summary. The next discussed introduction and background to the study.

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUD TO THE STUDY

This study intends to explore a transformative approach to embracing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) communities at a university campus. Globally, LGBTI communities have arisen from point of debate, such that countries like USA, Australia, Canada and Europe have been taking some measures into consideration to ensure a level of acceptance by formulating policies within the system which invariably annul discrimination or violence against LGBTI groups at homes, schools, universities and workplaces (The Council for Global Equality, 2012). The restrictions and policies, in countries like Russia, Uganda, Zimbabwe and Nigeria do not support LGBTI in any form. However, South Africa has been passively learning to attend to the urgency of the human rights violations especially on LGBTI communities like in her counterparts in the world, which called for an intense education to pave way, rather than to be more practical in inclusivity in the attention to unaware/alarming issues at the school and university levels.

In Uganda, a study reveals that heterosexist continues to be deeply shaped by notions of the patriarchal system that promotes heteronormativity (Boyd, 2013:704). In the midst of the struggle and despite the death of many of the country's LGBTI youth, the Ugandan government has taken strides to further criminalize homosexuality (Rusnak, 2014:09). The circumstances has posed unpredictable occurrences on the LGBTI communities. As Nyanzi (2013) articulates that the rhetoric of Uganda's Anti-Homosexuality Bill reveals something of the paternalistic and myopic protectionism of

homogenised, static and illusory African culture characterized by an imagination of a certain cherished traditional heterosexual family. However, in United Kingdom, Sonja (2008) survey study unveils the experiences of LGBTI students has been worrisome on the mainstream idea of diversity for inclusivity among the university students. O'Higgins-Norman (2009) exploration of homosexuality and the tense homophobia in secondary schools of Ireland demands conscious measure to alleviate education standard for all students. Nonetheless, another study at Washington DC by Graham, Bradford, de Vries and Garofalo (2011), emphasized on the importance of LGBTI communities' health and social wellbeing state along their academic engagements at a diversify school environment.

Research has found that despite advocacy for equity, and the non-discriminating rights of all to education, a vacuum remains unattended to, and there is a need to redress (Msibi, 2012; Bhana, 2012; Francis and Msibi, 2011; Brikkels 2014). The core urgency of inclusive education implementation as stated on Department of Basic Education (DBE, 2013), which have not been seeing and responding to discriminative precedencies against the rights of all students to equal education. This contributes to the type of experiences and stigma that LGBTI students encounter at schools and universities. Gokcek and Baki. (2013) support that Teachers were challenged to develop an accommodative insight from the existing curriculum to address individual needs of students by adopting from a hidden curriculum to support socially marginalized students for effective participation in teaching and learning activities.

The Stonewall International (2014) noted the needs for inclusive education, and an urgency to provide a worthwhile intervention through initiatives which aim to eradicate poverty and inequality before 2030. One of the vital issues mentioned in the "No One Left Behind Project", was the need to include LGBTI communities in education which challenged authorities to support all students equally. This initiative may be useful as a supporting tool in developing a transformative approach designed to empower and effect as desired change for LGBTI communities – particularly to achieve the sustainable development goals and LGBTI inclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2011). As that initiative continues, this study provides a transformative approach to alleviate stigmatisation, which may hinder effective participation of LGBTI individuals and communities at a university campus.

Studies by Msibi (2012), Bhana (2012), Brikkels (2014) and Dare (2015) emphasise that the comprehensive education system should accommodate all students, irrespective of their gender, sexuality, status, race and ethnicity, in order to build a reliable nation. To promote a non-discriminating and non-stigmatising university environment that could accommodate all students and enhance their rights to participate in school activities, without fear of any threat, which enhances cooperative engagement at all times. This research may contribute to new knowledge to strengthen those LGBTI communities that might be struggling to accept themselves and their rights to education, by escaping from daily negative experiences of the past which have been influencing them on a daily basis. The researcher found this study that it is imperative, to identify the need for transformative urgency that might cater to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus on the assumption that continuous exposition make rapid changes of behaviours to the reality.

The purpose of this study is to explore and explain how we can, through a transformative approach, embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. According to Hornby (2013), defined LGBTI as a lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) community through the act of dating within the “same sexual sexes; gay is a male who sexually attracted to his fellow male; lesbian is a female who sexually attracted her same sex, while bisexuals refer to be sexually attracted to both opposite and same sexes alternatively, transgender is a person who chooses to be either male or female, through makeup of appearance to suite their gender identity. Intersex is a human born with both male and female organs that make one confused of his/her identify to make his/ her preferred choice of gender and vice versa” (Hornby, 2013). Msibi, 2012, p. 516) stated that heterosexual dominance has been silencing LGBTI students due to an unclear statement of the school’s constitutional policy on education. Subject Educators seem to feel less or no concern about any discrimination reports from LGBTI students (Msibi, 2012, p. 522). For this research, the researcher attended a meeting on LGBTI issues and the turnout was impressive – the first dialogue had 12 representatives of LGBTI communities at a university campus. According to LGBTI campus representatives;

...there is a stigma going on underneath at university campuses in which our members are subjected to name calling and all sorts of verbal abuses all over

campuses. In addition, it seems as if we are alone in a cold room, because if we report any case against our members, it took time to respond, and at times we took steps by ourselves by reporting the incidences before university intervened. We are being judged as everyday experiences, why? Life is a choice and university is for all...we would be happy if there is any input to make our voices heard to improve the climatic environment we are in.

Drucilla, and Muvangua (2011) contend that social adaptation embraces diversity among people and encourages respect to live with love and harmony within a systems ecology. Msibi, 2012; Bhana, 2012; Hlalele, 2012; Göransson and Nilholm, 2014; echoed on advocacy for inclusive education opportunities at schools, to accommodate differences within the schools and universities levels to provide equal access for all.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

The university campus is a wider space of learning that seeks to accommodate all students irrespective of their background, religion, ethnicity, status and identity. Current cultural contexts and audiences indirectly contest this importance of acceptance. The researcher was privileged to teach students at a university and witness the reactions of the majority of the class to a gay student. Also, informed by his interest to maintain a peaceful atmosphere in his faith to show love to all without condemning nor judge anyone with their personalities. The researcher noticed that despite the initiative to support LGBTI communities, the gap between homosexuals and heterosexuals is large, and the non-tolerance of LGBTI communities at a university campus is becoming alarming. Based on fairness to humanity, the research considered if there could be a transformative approach that could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Main objective: To explore a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Objectives:

- To explore the current situation regarding approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.
- To examine the need for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.
- To explain key elements (thrusts) of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus
- To examine circumstances/conditions under which a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus may be successfully implemented.
- To identify hindrances/barriers to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and suggest how these may be circumvented.
- To propose a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

1.4 CRITICAL QUESTIONS

The main critical question is: 'How can we, through a transformative approach embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus?'

Secondary critical questions include:

- Are there any current understanding of approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Why do we need a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Under which circumstances/conditions would a transformative approach be implemented successfully to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can there be some key elements (thrusts) to embrace LGBTI communities at a

university campus?

- What are the hindrances/barriers against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how can these be circumvented?
- In which ways a transformative approach can succeed to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus?

1.5 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

This topic was inspired by stigma experienced by gay and lesbian students at a university. The intensity of marginalisation noted by Dare (2015) indicated the need for further study; the study investigated the experiences of gay and lesbian learners in a high school within the Durban metropolis of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The study used social learning theory of Bandura (1997), which did not fully capture experiences encountered by gay/lesbian learners. This study left a gap, as it was limited to high school learners and suggestions on interventions were limited. In addition, the study was limited to only two of the LGBTI communities: gays and lesbians. Therefore, the researcher hopes that considering different theories into actions will make a difference and find a solution to negative school and university campus experiences for LGBTI students. To find a way out of societal stereotyping against LGBTI communities and bring about social justice, social inclusion and identity equality drove the focus on a transformative approaches to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

1.5.1 Self-constructed incident 1

As a tutor, (2012-2017), the researcher witnessed an example of prejudice and discrimination at a university while teaching. A student answered a diversity-related question during class to define 'who I am'. The student stated that he was gay, and other students responded loudly and began to yell at this student. The researcher intervened by cautioning them, telling them of the importance of the activity, as there can be no hate of any sexual orientation or gender, status, religion, race and other identification and that no students should be discriminated against Department of Basic Education (DBE, 2013). This step taken supported the student in this situation but provided little intervention to alleviate stigmatisation and victimisation against

LGBTI communities on campus overall. The researcher noticed that particular students still felt their peers did not tolerate them. With the sensitive nature of their group, the researcher saw a need to address homophobia and related prejudices among university students.

1.5.2 Self-constructed incidents 2 and 3

Another incident was a case of a lesbian student who was name-called by peers due to her sexual orientation thus subjecting her to loneliness. She indicated that she was thinking of dropping out for the semester. Another scenario was a gay student who revealed that his partner was being bullied by another student at the university residence. He was thinking of killing himself because of his experiences and felt powerless. He was not comfortable talking about the whole story and left the discussion. This proves that LGBTI communities are being neglected and untold stories make these students vulnerable to any form of abuse within the university environment. These influences and experiences can lead to gay students lacking concentration in the academic environment and may end up cultivating bad habits. Sadly, instead of LGBTI communities finding a confidant who can give them counselling or formulate coping strategies, they remain secretive for fear of harassment. It seems a difficult issue to address, yet it is affecting LGBTI communities at a university campus where students' lives are in danger and affected by everyday life experiences (Barber, 2012). In order to combat the status quo, there should be a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. This will help to control the unusual threat that may contest a good university climate for all students, especially LGBTI communities.

1.6 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theory is a crucial tool that upholds the phenomenon under study to work effectively with the help of literature review, which serves to prevent the researcher from being grounded (Dunne, 2011, p. 117). The researcher explored psychological theorists such as; Bandura (1997) social theory, Bronnefrenbrener (1989) ecological systems theory and Metz (2012, 2014), Ubuntu theory, the chosen theory may help to navigate the inter-related on the research objectives and questions within a framework to

achieve a credible study. However, Bronfenbrenner ecological system theory originated from psychological school of thought shared similar ideas with Ubuntu theory, only that Ubuntu gained its root from humanistic philosophy, therefore researcher decided to apply psychological theory alternatively by chosen Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory for this study.

The literature (Msibi, 2012; Bhana, 2012; Hlalele, 2012; Göransson and Nilholm, 2014) indicated that despite the efforts of few scholars on advocacy for inclusive education opportunities at schools, to accommodate differences within the schools and universities levels to provide equal access for all. On this account, Futhwa (2011), Elechi, Morris and Schauer (2010), ecological system theory seek to address this imbalances occurrences along the circular flow of friction related to differences and execute equity through substantive concepts that could help individual students, managements and university on the approach to accept all against stigma place on certain group of peoples. These peoples are; HIV/AIDS and LGBTI communities as heterosexuals behaves indirectly or indirectly disengaging these groups of people from their expected involvement on their daily school activities. The theory has provided findings to could bring normative insights to maintain uniformity against discrimination and stigma which has create classism on LGBTI communities to their groups differently (Drucilla & Muvangua, 2011). As such, ecological systems theory try to inculcate circular flow of communication not minding status/barriers to learning thus restore unity among students irrespective of any identification thus create safe university campus for all students according to inclusive education. The next is the Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory.

1.6.1 Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory

A relationship of belonging evolves by forming our relational bonds within ecological system (Ahmed, 2006). Ubuntu comes in different languages of the world for the appreciation of cultural values (Idang, 2015). McNulty (2013) affirms that ecological systems theory strengthens human personalities that help people to embrace themselves, understand and show love for one another.

Ecological systems theory offers a framework that foster community psychologists to examine individuals' relationships within communities and their wider society which they lived (Bronfrenbrenner, 2005). This theory identifies five environmental systems components through which an individual interacts for development.

The researcher found that Bronfrenbrenner ecological systems theory would be able to go beyond expressions of ecological components but assimilating advocacy for individual social transformation which centred on collectivism, unity and love for a normative communication intervention (Selhub, 2009). The researcher considers that learning of difference would be applicable to LGBTI students because oppression encounter and stigmatization at the university is not limited to others but from heterosexual peers. The theory appeared to strengthen collectivism and idealism in order to implement social justice and change some oppressive measures against humanity. By considering relational factor which coupled by world views and beliefs, as well as opinions and how they can be interpreted and studied (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). The researcher used the component on learning and adaptivity medium to design a transformative approach in order to embrace the LGBTI communities at a university campus with the hopes that address the related issues in order to ensure inclusivity and humanity.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH TO THE STUDY

For this study, the researcher employed a selection of research teams (participants) as the study will be trying to propose a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus by contacting those who this study may be helpful to. Patton (2015) suggests that in research, participants/respondents should be selected in accordance to the significance of their involvement on the study. This study employed participatory action research which deals with the participants' collective suggestions to formulate an approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus (Ratsoy, 2013).

1.7.1 Selection of participants

The study took place in one of the tertiary institutions in South Africa. In this study, the selection of participants involved those at the university and outside. Therefore, the selection of participants for this study was anchored on Bertram and Christiansen (2014) who emphasise research data selection procedures for sampling methods by acknowledge purposive and convenience sampling techniques in qualitative research. The researcher recruited participants for this study through purposive sampling in order to get individuals from the LGBTI communities as well as heterosexual participants. The total number of participants was 17. There were (5) participants from the LGBTI communities within the university; (3) Lecturers, (5) heterosexual students, one (1) SRC member, (1) LGBTI representative from outside the university, one (1) student Counsellor and development practitioner, as well as one on campus faith-based community representative. Only those who were willing and available were part of the study. The selected (17) participants were based on the assumption that they would add value in terms of their input to this study because the LGBTI communities' issues are not in isolation but involve others around them.

To gain participants' attention, the researcher firstly placed an advertisement on the notice boards over the campus on the nature of the study, stating that anyone who is interested to participate is free to contact them through email or phone. Through the advert, the researcher got a student, who through snowball sampling led him to four other members from the LGBTI community who were willing to participate in the study. In support to the participants' recruitment process and in line with Krista and Mark (2010), who argue that a participant serves a prominent role as they can recruit other participants in a sensitive type of study such that participants were difficult to find. The researcher identified one member of LGBTI communities to help getting other members for this study (Krista & Mark, 2010). Other participants were selected based on the assumption of either they would add value to this study.

The researcher decided to allow only those who agreed to cooperate and adhere with the terms to participate in the study, as recommended by Palys and Atchison (2008). The tools used to gather information include focus group discussions, collages, dialogues, conversations and meetings. The researcher audiotaped the meetings,

conversations and dialogues in order to generate rich data. The study participants were gathered through snowball sampling and convenience techniques, meaning that the results of this research can be applicable to the same population size. However, transferability of the results is possible for similar groups or contexts. The researcher found that with Bertram and Christiansen (2014) that a good qualitative research possess basic rigors which include transferability, confirmability, dependability and credibility. On the importance by Silverman (2013) that states that research can be verified through triangulating evidences on the process of qualitative data process and management. It therefore imperative to ensure that the coordination of the study follows the authentic process of qualitative research, as a researcher must maintain a subjective participation role.

1.7.2 Participatory Action Research as a data generating method

The researcher sees this study as participatory, because it is qualitative research that appreciates the input of the collective view of participants towards developing a transformative approach that will seek to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. In support to my approach, Punch (2009) defines a paradigm as an essential set of philosophies or viewpoints, which guides action or serves to direct the research. Individuals' different perspectives on something influence their construction of realities around of a particular issue, place or thing. Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011) also defined paradigms as ways of looking at reality, or frames of reference used to organise observations and reasoning.

The Participatory Action Research (PAR) paradigm is suitable for this study because it involves diverse views and opinions of people on how to develop a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. Moreover, the study is an action research study that will involve different representation of groups as stated to draw an approach that is transformative in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through the 'Bronfrenbenner's ecological systems' theory. Participatory action research is an, approach with flexibility influence to accommodate participant's involvement on the research (Kumar, 2012). PAR is a democratic, equitable, liberating, and life-enhancing qualitative inquiry that remains distinct from other qualitative methodologies (Kach and Kralik, 2006). In this research, the research

team were allowed to produce knowledge on their own, which was then shared with the researcher.

In addition, PAR works within a timeframe, and knowledge of the participants', sensitivity to the topics covered is vital, and it is also important for the researcher to acknowledge participants' intentions of doing the study (Young, 2006). Consensus around social issues, such as LGBTI intolerance and the timeframe anticipated for the change might be difficult (McNiff and Whitehead, 2006). PAR encourages a small number of individuals in a focus group to facilitate a relaxed atmosphere for participants, thus enabling useful data generation. During a focus group, it is the researcher's duty to create a supportive environment in which discussion, conversation and differing points of view are strengthened (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). Therefore, PAR empowers triangulation of findings since there are different kinds of data generation procedures.

1.8 PREVIEW OF LITERATURE REVIEW

Clarke (2012) defines a transformative approach as a drastic improvement of the present situation of events/experiences in a different paradigm. The author argues that change must be applied in a systems way in order to better a current situation. The White Paper on Foreign Policy (2011) supports that tolerance should be maintained by making education free for everyone and avoid discrimination by encouraging love, empathy, equity and unity to promote nation development. This research used a transformative approach of social change, through 'ecological systems', to empower the targeted LGBTI communities at university campus.

Taylor (2008) defines the transformative approach as a process of constructing and appropriating new and revised interpretations of the meaning of an experience in the world. This indicates a bringing in of innovation that allow social change and empowerment. Dirkx (2006) proposes that the transformative approach helps LGBTI communities to learn with heterosexual students and to use the contexts of their lives experiences to construct and reconstruct personal meaning for future empowerment. Bajaj (2011) argues that the transformative approach is a paradigm shift from

transitivity to a transformative state that enables all students to consider changes as necessary tools to appreciate unity in diversity among all students at a university.

Illeris (2014) states that transformation creates opportunities for students to enjoy a peaceful university environment with their peers without fear of any threat that could inflict danger on their relationships with others. This approach cultivates inclusive attitudes to recognition of the value for others, in order to reinforce good behaviour and mould our society in a more positive way. The transformative approach is a lens through which changes occur in a systematic way towards democratic engagement between LGBTI communities and heterosexual students at a university campus (Wals, 2010). The transformative approach may provide LGBTI communities with a model with the values, knowledge and skills needed for creating a sustainable university campus environment (Burns 2009). Wyandotte and Huh (2012) assert that the transformative approach will serve as an intervention to promote emotional wellbeing, psychological competence and promote intellectual development of LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Ainscow, Booth and Dyson (2010) argue that the transformative approach be understood as a new paradigm which bypasses the medical approach and the concept of academic deficiency, in order to promote inclusive environments that embrace diversity. In the case of LGBTI communities at a university, there is no recorded transformational approach to challenge these issues which are occurring on a daily basis. In addition, Adamczyk and Pitt (2009) suggest that changing of attitudes of the majority of the community, in regard to their behaviour to LGBTI communities in a schools and universities environment, involves the process of embracing diversity.

The Department of Education, White Paper 6 in 2001 (DoE, 2008), states that the main objective of any education system in a democratic society is to provide quality education for all learners so that they will be able to achieve their lives' objectives. One of the main objectives of a teacher is to provide adequate interventions to support learners experiencing barriers to reading and learning (p.53). The document ensures promotion of home/school/community partnerships of all in education. The Education White Paper 6 on Inclusive Education (2001) describes the intention of the Department of Education to implement inclusive education at all levels in the system by 2020. Such

an inclusive system will facilitate the inclusion for vulnerable learners and reduce the barriers to learning, through targeted support structures and mechanisms that will improve their participation and retention levels of learners in the education system, particularly learners who are prone to dropping out. The document ensures all learner inclusions but failed to specify the categories of learners, whereby LGBTI communities could be taken care of (DBE, 2011, p. 21).

Carter and Goldfried's (2006) study attempted to address the issue regarding individuals who have difficulty coming out as being part of LGBTI communities, are often diagnosed with borderline personality disorder. LGBTI communities find it difficult to connect with heterosexual peers at university due to the fear of hate and harassment because they are not sure of the climate they are in at a university. Kosciw et al. (2010) stated that LGBTI communities were experiencing challenging times at schools and universities where homophobic attacks are unavoidable. Research has shown that LGBTI students who are more open about their sexual orientation are more likely to be bullied by their peers, and bullying may lead to severe psychological distress. Swearer, Turner, Givens and Pollack (2008) support this view saying that LGBTI students who are repeatedly called 'gay', 'queer' or 'istabane' tend to develop a greater psychological distress, which can result in low grades, substance abuse, and depression.

Msibi's (2012) study exposes the dominant attitudes of the heterosexual majority at schools and universities as unfair treatment towards LGBTI communities. He challenges the role of educators, to be transformative agents instead of silent bystanders, and to support students' diversity within their domain. At university campuses, management follows a lengthy process, delaying the attempts of students to lay cases of assaults against students, especially LGBTI communities. Identity and sexual differences should not deprive students of their rights to learn in a safer university campus environment. Furthermore, Msibi (2012) argues that the teacher, being the agent of change, needs to change their discourse influencing heterosexual dominance that creates a non-homophobic environment that endangers LGBTI communities at schools and universities. Pianata (1999) states that teachers do not contribute directly to creating a hostile environment for students who identify as part

of LGBTI communities and argues that oppressive relations among students at schools and universities rather contribute to intolerant behaviours.

Gainor (2000) contends that LGBTI communities have been a source of concern for young people, especially those at schools and universities. Gainor (2000) asserts that negative attitudes towards LGBTI communities create a climate of violence and hostility and symbol of unacceptance of diversity, which in turn exposes minority LGBTI communities to the risk of victimisation. For instance, there has been a heated debate on including gay and lesbian issues in diversity education in elementary and secondary schools; as a result there have been the development of student clubs such as the “gay straight alliance” and the emergence of a national organisation known as the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN, 2012). This gives recognition to LGBTI communities’ right to be safe at schools and universities with no fear of abuse from their fellow heterosexual students.

1.9 TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE STUDY

This study used inductive analysis, which is a process of synthesising and obtaining meaning from specific data, in order to develop general categories and patterns (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Generated data should be transcribed, coded, themed, categorised and thereafter interpreted, to provide explanations for the researched questions (Bernard, Russell & Ryan; Gery, 2010). The researcher carefully transcribed the collected data into a written form, coded and categorised the emerging themes for interpretation in order to ensure the confidentiality of the participants. This ensured the originality and the authenticity of the study (Franzese, 2007). According to the researcher, originality and authenticity are the structuring of a study in a totally different way, using a framework that no researcher has ever used for this kind of study.

McMillan and Schumacher (2006) state that validity refers to the degree of congruence between the explanations of the phenomena and the realities of the world; for the issue of trustworthiness, they argued that continuous refinement of the selection and data generation techniques throughout the data generation processes, increases the trustworthiness. Hence, Kumar (2012) opines that strategies to ensure rigor in a qualitative study should be carried out during the research process. The authors

outlined the strategies to include, ensuring methodological coherence, enabling researcher responsiveness, ensuring appropriateness of the sample and active analytical stance, in order to achieve rigour. Similarly, McMillan and Schumacher (2010) describe trustworthiness in qualitative research as the extent to which interpretations of data have the same meaning to the researcher and participants. Qualitative research techniques are used to ensure dependability, credibility, transferability and conformability for a transformative approach.

Yin (2012) asserts that the findings should maintain their internal validity; this implies that data should remain credible, transferable and confirmable during the triangulation processes in order to make the study's findings worthwhile. Therefore, these concepts are very important in a research study. Locke, Silverman and Spriduso (2010) maintain that the words 'reliability' and 'validity' must be replaced with the term trustworthiness, when conducting a qualitative research. The truthful experiences of the participants under study are required in order to ensure validity and reliability of the findings, this implies that the participants are required to be sincere in their responses. Therefore, data cannot be influenced in any way or changed to suit the objectives of the study. According to Creswell (2009), trustworthiness is an element that ensures coherence by maintaining credibility, dependability transferability and the conformability of the study. The researcher ensured that the generated data met the required criteria and that the triangulation process ensured the study's originality and authenticity

1.10 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Concerning ethical issues, the researcher is aware of the need to respect the human rights, dignity and the privacy of participants during and after the course of this research in order to protect the participants. McCarron (2013) confirms that the absolute right of the participants must be safeguarded and on no account should they be forced into participating in the study. In addition, Wiles (2012) confirms the necessity of following ethical guidelines while doing qualitative research. The researcher gave out the forms requesting all participants' consent and permission to participate in the study. All the participants of this study were 18-60 years old, so there was no parental/guardians' permission required. In addition, Murphy and Dingwall (2007) confirm that participants need be informed and reassured by the researcher

that confidentiality will be maintained and they need to know that their names will not be used anywhere in the study, instead pseudonyms will be used, in order to protect their privacy and identity.

It is very important to seek permission from the appropriate organization involved such as the school or the ministry involved. Miller, Mauthner and Jessop (2012) proposed guiding steps to ensure good research that includes informed consent from the gatekeepers. A detailed letter asking permission to conduct a research study at the university was developed, listing the aims and objectives of the study and it was sent to the University for Approval before the commencement of the study. The Ethical Clearance was sought and it was granted (**HSS/0920/017D**). The researcher got permission from the university to conduct a study there. After the generation of data from the participants, the researcher gave the transcripts to the participants in order to ensure that the data was accurate.

1.11 LAYOUT OF CHAPTERS

Chapter one commences with the introduction and background to the study, the problem statement and research questions, rationale to the study, aims and objectives of the study, and Chapter two presents the theoretical framework framing the study. Chapter three traverses the literature on a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Chapter four handles methodology and data generation, while Chapter five deals with the presentation, and interpretation of the data. Chapter six focuses on discussions and data analysis. Chapter seven dealt with summary of findings, conclusions and implications, the limitations for the study, contribution of the study, and the suggestions for further research and chapter summary. Chapter eight presents the proposed transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus, the summary of the study and overall impressions from the study.

1.12 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The current study is located within the field of Educational Psychology. It further concerns itself with what happens at higher education institutions. It explores how we may embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. Participants included both students and staff at on South African university campus.

1.13 LIMITATIONS

In this research study, the researcher draws the limitations based on personal instinct that participants for this study may not be enough to make the generalisation possible to the wider population sample. The researcher considers the sensitivity of this study less friendly which may further requires renegotiation of confidentiality to the respective research team from the inception to the completion of this study. Motivational resources are not fully available since the researcher is still a student with no funds to adequately finance this project. Participants determined the uncertain instruments for data collection. The theory and methodology used is subject to future critiques to further research. herefore, this study is limited to the theory and methods used, this connotes that alternative theoretical and methods could make a total difference out of the like nature type of this study.

1.14 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has provided; the introduction and background to the study; problem statement and critical research questions; rationale to the study; aims and objectives of the study; theoretical framework; research methodology and approach to study; review of literature; validity, reliability and rigor; ethical consideration; delimitations; limitations; definitions of key concepts; layout of the chapters as well as the chapter summary. The next chapter provides theoretical framework informing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

CHAPTER TWO
**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK INFORMING A TRANSFORMATIVE
APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY
CAMPUS**

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the current study is to explore a transformative approach to embrace the LGBTI communities at a university campus. In Chapter one, the researcher presented the background and overview of the study. This chapter discusses the theoretical framework couching the study. Theoretical frameworks provide a sense of structure and guide to the research study. The theoretical framework chosen for guiding this study is 'Ecological systems theory'. This chapter begins with a discussion of the operational concepts that would help to gain an in-depth understanding of the theory considered for this study.

2.2 DEFINITION OF OPERATIONAL CONCEPTS

This section introduces the concepts and definitions used in this study. The operational definitions of these concepts are discussed below.

2.2.1 Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) communities

According the literature, LGBTI means lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (American Psychological Association, 2012; Netshandama, Mavhandu, Medusa & Matshidze, 2017, p. 307; Nduna & Kiguwa. 2017, p. 168). According to Dare (2015, p. 24), gay and lesbian people in LGBTI communities are people who by attraction, identity and feelings desire same sex relationships. The American Psychological Association (APA, 2012), define LGBTI thus: Lesbian as a female attracted to female sexually; Gay as a male attracted to male sexually; Bisexual as sexually attracted to both female and male sex, while Transgender define as changing of either male sexual organ or female organ to align with a choice gender. Intersex is a formation of two opposite organs on a single body as a malfunction of chromosomes. Likewise, the World Health Organization (WHO, 2012) describes intersex as people

born with any of the variations in sex characteristics, which include chromosomes, gonads, sex hormones, or genitals. It further clarifies that intersex people are people who neither fit the definition of male nor female bodies. The next subheading will discuss the concept of transformative approach concept.

2.2.2 Transformative approach

The transformative approach is a design that seek to improve a particular standard, treatment or attention given to a particular thing, group or place (Beemyn and Rankin, 2011). Taylor (2008) defines transformative approach as a process of constructing and appropriating new and revised interpretations of experiences in the world—an application of innovation that allows social change and transformation. Dirkx (2006) contends that a transformative approach can help LGBTI communities to learn along with heterosexual students and use the contexts of their experiences to construct and reconstruct personal engagement for future empowerment. Bajaj (2011) argues that the transformative approach enables all students to consider changes as a necessary tools to appreciate unity in diversity among all students at a university. In this study, a transformative approach is conceptualised as a way to address a particular issue of LGBTI communities at a university campus. It is an approach conceptualized to imply ways of acceptance and tolerance of LGBTI communities.

According to Illeris (2014) maintains that the transformative approach enable students to gain secure access to teaching and learning environment void of discriminating behaviour against individual differences. In line with this view, the transformative approach is explained as a lens through which changes can occur in the ways LGBTI communities and their heterosexual student counterparts freely engage and express themselves without prejudice and or bias from each other (Wals, 2010). Similarly, Burns (2009) argues that change of approach might provides LGBTI communities access to values, knowledge and skills needed to create comfort zones safe at their university campus environment. Wyandotte and Huh (2012) assert that the transformative approach provides interventions which might promote emotional wellbeing, psychological competences, and higher academic performance of LGBTI communities at a university.

2.2.3 Embracing

Embracing as a term means an act of welcoming and tolerating one another with their differences without any complaints of such differences. It involves showing kindness or love with an open heart to others who seems to have different characters or values. Online Thesaurus dictionary (2017), gives synonyms for 'embrace' as: welcome, accept, receive enthusiastically, receive wholeheartedly, take up, take to one's heart, receive with open arms, welcome with open arms, adopt, support, and be in favour of, back, champion. According to Newton (2011), embracing is an art of making others fit in a space of acceptance. Ward (2011) confirms that embracing is taking welcoming someone without making comparisons to the differences, and respecting and accepting them. Newton's (2011) asserts that embracing others is an art that balances differences with tolerance and respect for others. A transformative approach as an operational definition means to rethink, reconstruct and propose new intervention in this case it would be to embrace LGBTI communities, to be welcome at a university campus.

2.2.4 University campus

The university is defined as a high-level educational institution in which students study for degrees and academic research is done. Shen (2012, p. 64) defined a "university as a campus that integrates cultural construction into the whole process of knowledge, gaining access through enriched courses from different field such as sciences, humanities and social sciences, and liberal education is combined with scientific education". This implies an environment that accommodates a diverse population of students. A campus is the site where a college or university and related institutional buildings are situated (ODE, 2016). Usually a university campus comprises the libraries, lecture theatres, residences, student centers or dining halls, cafeterias and park-like settings (Oxford Dictionary, 2012). The university campus represents the institutional authority, which govern large numbers of both students and staff. In other words, the university campus operates and harbors teaching staff, non-teaching staff and students. The university is an environment that holds diverse people, different beliefs and cultures; it mostly consists of heterosexual individuals.

2.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A theoretical framework is a lens through which a researcher aims to examine his/her study (Trafford & Leshem, 2008). Lacey (2009, p. 23) defines theoretical framework “as any empirical or quasi-empirical theory of social and psychological processes”. According to Hornby (2010, p. 594), maintains that framework is a set of beliefs, ideas, or rules used to make decisions and drawing of conclusion. A framework provides a structure, overview, guiding routine, and the system, or a plan that enables exploration of a phenomenon, which consists of various descriptive categories, such as concepts, constructs or variables, and the presumed relationships (Hornby, 2010). Nilsen argues that “frameworks form no explanations; rather describe empirical variables which allow categorization (2015, p. 2). Nilsen (2015), Svinicki (2010) and Hornby (2010) imply that framework is a basis or a structure for understanding of a phenomenon.

Udo-Akang (2012) argues that “theory entail alignment in a research for its authenticity and credence which ensure theoretical underpines for a functioning methodology” (p. 89). Imenda (2014, p. 186) conforms that theory is a principle that coordinates a research. Kitchel and Ball (2014) assert that “theories are purposely explain and predict phenomena through a lens of approach on phenomenon” (p. 188). Furthermore, Imenda (2014) states that “a theory is a blueprint, which forms a guiding principle to follow as an interrelationship between each element, that make theory distinct the concepts from relation of concepts to one another” (p.186). Drawing from Impend (2014), a theoretical framework is a body of structure that couches a particular research study. Kitchel and Ball (2014) maintain that the terms ‘theory’ and ‘theoretical framework’ are used interchangeable because both are “defined as a statement or complex argument [to] explain and/or predict phenomena” (p. 190). Imenda (2014) states that a “theoretical framework refers to the theory application by researcher in in the process of research work” (p. 189).

Therefore, based on the discussions of Imenda (2014, p. 186-187), Kitchel and Ball (2014, p. 188) and Udo-Akang (2012, p. 89), a theory is a principle that governs a particular subject, with which the views of the phenomena is explained. In addition, Udo-Akang (2012, p. 91), affirms that theory has a central role to play in a research. As such, this study is guided by a theory in order to grapple with and understand the phenomenon. Kitchen and Ball (2014, p. 188) assert that “theory guides inquiry and

interpretation, and ensures academic rigor to scholarly work”. Tavallaei and Abu Talib (2010, p. 573) state that theory is “defined in a variety of ways, depending on the field of study, the ground of science and even the era it was recognised to be a vital device in the process of knowledge throughout history”. Udo-Akang (2012, p.91) states that “although theory should ideally guide research, theory and research are interrelated and regarded as dependent variables over one another to make sense of a phenomenon”. Braun et al. (2013, p. 2) and Udo-Akang (2012, p. 91) imply that practice is informed by theory, and theory is equally informed by what is done in practice.

Imenda (2014) identifies the three main significant features of a theory:

1. It is a set of interrelated propositions, concepts and definitions that presents a systematic point of view;
2. It specifies relationships between/among concepts;
3. It explains and/or makes predictions about the occurrence of events, based on the specified relationships.

Nilsen (2015) explains that, “a good theory provides a clear explanation of how and why specific relationships lead to specific events” (p.2). In line with Nilsen’s (2015) position, this study uses the operational definition of a theoretical framework as the theoretical lens with which to guide and provide a clear explanation of how and why specific relationships lead to specific events.

2.3.1 Exploration of psychological theorists for the study

Based on theoretical insights among psychological theorists were; Bandura (1992; 1997) social learning theory believed that individual can learn by observing the behavior is of others and the outcomes of those behaviors. Vygotsky (1978; 1987), developed the sociocultural theory of cognitive development which tried to compliment Bandura's social theory which addressed the link between social-cultural context emphasized on child’s zonal proximal development (ZPD), that an individual child is capable through environment as influence to express their thoughts and experiences the way of occurrences base on their reasoning skills to give meanings constructively. One major critique of Bandura theory is that learning can occur without a change of

behavior. However, Vygotsky's critique was that some behaviors at the time might not be construed by expression, a series of questions emerge on why then should we learn if no change occurs. That equates to a waste of resources since it does not make a significant difference. Also, based on construction of expression and behavioral occurrences, and to counsel for acceptance or repulsion.

At this juncture, the researcher found few similarities with Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1989), who stated in his human ecological systems theory that a factor of relationships exist/co-exist between individuals and their environment. The theoretical construction of Jeronimus, Riese, Sanderman and Ormel (2014), stated that systems interactions which determine each roles, norms and rules which shape human psychological development. Bronfenbrenner's (1979), propounded "*Ecology of Human Development*" maintained a widespread influence on psychodynamics and others approaches for human study and their environments. Therefore, through his trailblazing discovery on "human ecology", differentiates environments from the family economic and political structures which are considered as a part of life course from childhood through adulthood (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2010). Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1989), has identified five systems models that explained human ecological development. These were influenced by environmental factors from behavioral engagements to development of social ecology. The researcher evaluated both theories to be purposive and explorative ideology though differences, and might not be applied simultaneously.

Meanwhile, Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1989, 2005), emphasized on the interconnectivity that influence child's development through his analytical human ecological model as explained in five modes; microsystem, macrosystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and chronosystem relationships on development. The researcher explored ecological systems theory of Bronfenbrenner (1979) to compliment Ubuntu theory of Metz (2012, 2014), since child's identity was explained on child interaction with his/her environment was much focused by ecological model. The next is theoretical selection for the study.

2.3.2 Selection of a theoretical framework for the study

To arrive at theoretical selection, the researcher explores theories from humanistic understanding from Metz (2012, 2014), Ubuntu theory of respect and morality of others to be inherent to create an accommodative environment for student's interaction and involvement at a university campus. This asserts that learner's development is associated with the rapport he/she share with peers at schools. Yet, Bronfenbrenner (1989, p. 227) explains that in order to underline the possible insight for development through personal qualities, it is significant that cooperative relationships thus emerge with people of their immediate environment. Therefore, researcher found that some personal qualities of embracement wanting of Bronfenbrenner's (1979, 1989) as articulated by Metz's (2012, 2014), here stated of the frame "Ubuntu theory" to embracing diversity, with some basic behavioural concepts like tolerance, respect and acceptance could be alternatively traced to ecological systems theory. As such, since Bronfenbrenner (2005) conforms that the level of human accommodation throughout life span varies based on expressions and valued expectation to life situations, the researcher decided to use Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory for the relevance of this study. Ecological systems theory offers a framework through which community psychologists examine individuals' relationships within communities and the wider society. The theory is also commonly referred to as the ecological/systems framework. It identifies five environmental systems with which an individual interacts.

2.3.3 Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory

Bronfenbrenner (1989) defines ecological systems theory as an approach to the study of human development that consists of the 'scientific' study of the progressive, mutual accommodation, throughout the life course. However, Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1989) maintained between the active stages of human growth and the changing around properties of the immediate settings that evolves human lives, as this process is affected by the relations between these settings, and by the larger contexts in which the settings are embedded.

Grange (2011) affirms that philosophical ideas and Themane and Mamabolo (2011), educational transformation empower to manage past hardships experiences thus changing global world through restorative appeals, rejuvenation and reimagining of the traditional values against apartheid. According to the Department of Education (2013), the concept of systems ecological theory influenced through transformation struggles of the South African education system in 1994. The policies that were formulated to govern the educational system were intensified through the humanness features that appeared on the curriculum policy as practise in order to safeguard the equal access of all to education (p.12).

2.3.4 Ecological systems theory and human dignity

The Constitution of South African places emphasis on the importance of national reconciliation and respect for human dignity. There is also a strong emphasis on human dignity which is an obvious reaction to the pre 27 April 1994 constitution which ensures the fight for human rights and therefore incubated respect for human dignity.

According to the Department of Education (2013), the concept requires that everyone must be treated with dignity and respect, irrespective of person's gender, sexuality, religion, race and ethnicity. This affirms that everyone should be treated with respect. Despite this, Mavhandu-Mudzusi, and Ganga-Limando (2014) affirm that LGBTI communities have been alienated by people because of sexual differences. The ecological theory maintain that individual should relate freely to encourage the inclusivity without racial disparities.

Elechi, Morris and Schauer (2009), Bobo et al. (2014) pointed that main ecological factor is inherent on tolerance of spirit among people of the same community. This implies that humanness is a vital part to addressing some of the moral and ethical challenges that face modern African societies. The researcher perceived that within the context of socialization, factors such as differences are inherent while considers 'ecological theory' useful to explore issues regards to LGBTI communities perhaps may provide a platform for problems solving, awareness raising and provision of accessible moral guidance (Malunga 2011). McClintock (2010) and Mawere (2012) portrayed that belief systems often impact how people react to others for changes of actions and behaviour for co-existence against exclusion of others. Malunga (2011)

argues on appropriate solutions to perceived internal differences on social imbalances that skewed against the LGBTI communities.

Galaty (2014) promotes the campaign for human, social and political transformation while Graham and Jahnukainen (2011) support that inclusive education for social change and academic development. In contrast, Hlalele (2012, p.111) concedes that difference is an inherent, inevitable and indispensable feature of social existence and education, and argues that rural education needs to embrace difference, shape demands and model social benefits in accordance with the realities of a particular rural setting. As viewed by Mbeki (2015) that Africans should accommodate difference as a pathway to social development. Wilson and Wilson (2013) maintain that oneness and team spirit propel communal living.

2.3.5 Ecological systems theory implications

Gordon (2014) reaffirms that Praeg (2014) reports on social justice and the authors underscore the limits of the post-apartheid constitution but they believe that it stands as a marker of both a historical violence that suffocates other political claims, as well as the current loss that haunts feelings about the rescue of democracy after the end of the official apartheid period. On this note, Chabal (2009) emphasizes traumatic experiences inculcated to people from the apartheid era which make ecological paramount to promote collective ideology create space that would accommodate all with regards to social justice. Nonetheless, Praeg et al. (2014) argue that the strength of the constitution highlights that relational fairness pilots a consistent constitutional justice negotiation. Metz and Gaie (2010) maintain that ethics primarily condone transformative approaches where inequalities obviously noted against a group of people who are liberated from prejudice hence lead to creation of anti-LGBTI campaigns at the university campus.

Drucilla and Muvangua (2011) assert that social influences strengthen the law of equity on humanness, However, Lewis (2014) disagrees, based on the dichotomy of Praeg (2014), and the possibilities that 'ecological systems' possessed within the human constitutional rights, in contrast to the people's perspectives. Meanwhile, Bowler (2014) infers that study of other in an ecosystem and Western tradition

contradictions should not be treated as disparate philosophies but rather as ideologies. The researcher covets that the practices and logics of sovereignty hide on the diversity that promotes the students' acceptability. Ama (2014) contends that religious beliefs are a contradiction to relational constitutional values on the societal concept for human lives. Bowler (2014) contributes that interactive activities affirms a transformative approach to accommodate everyone at a university campus (Rakotsoane & van Niekerk, 2017), to secure self-worth returns to individual's behaviour.

2.4 ONTOLOGY AND ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY

Pinet, Roussey, Brun and Vigier (2009), define ontology as a system of belief systems that interpret an individual assertion through the exploration of knowledge. Guarino, Oberle and Staab (2009) state that ontology is regarded a set of concepts such as things, events, and relations that are specific in some way, in order to create an agreed-upon exchange of information. Simons (2012) states that ontology is the assumptions made about the kind and nature of reality and what exists. The researcher agrees with van Inwagen (2012), who suggests that ontology is made up of categories which depend on the assumptions on the nature of the world and its inter-subjectivity. As a researcher, one needs to inquire how things happen in real life and to determine the necessary tools find hidden truths. Bryman (2008) states that the concept 'social ontology' is a philosophical consideration in research which concerns the nature of social entities that exist independently from social action and is made up of social constructions built up from the perceptions, actions and interpretations of the individuals in society.

2.5 EPISTEMOLOGY AND ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY

Epistemology is concerned with the general assumptions that are made about the nature of knowledge (Hosseini, 2010; Lewis, 2014). Whitworth and Friedman (2009) maintain that epistemology is the study of knowledge concerned with the creation and spreading of knowledge and how knowledge is acquired and justified. Epistemology assumes that knowledge is the hidden truth held by the participants, and not the assumption of the truth by the researcher. Crotty (2008) states that epistemology is a

paradigm of the world and making sense of it. Additionally, Creswell (2013) states that epistemology deals with the 'nature' of knowledge, its possibility (what knowledge is possible and what is not), its scope and legitimacy. Bryman (2008, p.13) defines epistemology as an issue concerned with the question of what is (or should be) regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline.

Furthermore, Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007, p.7) agree that epistemology is about the assumptions which one makes about "the construction of knowledge – its nature and form, how it can be acquired and communicated to other human beings". Greener (2011) stresses that epistemological assumptions about knowledge can profoundly affect how we go about uncovering knowledge of social behavior.

Block (2008) asserts that ecological provision possesses relational potentials to motivate people towards embracing differences. Bronfenbrenner ecological systems theory opens that individuals need each other to develop physically and mentally in order to encourage moderate co-existence among people living within an ecosystem. Alaga (2011) argues that collectivism of ideology presents the dialogical viewpoints of the past nationalists, who made critical engagements and arguments that dismissed unpersuasive and irrational arguments.

Ncube (2010) suggests that the philosophy embraces human relations and moral practices which are rooted exclusively on the advancement of human well-being, thus recognising the importance of dignity, respect and contentment with others, the self as well as the community. Letseka (2012, p.180), posits from oneness comprises of moral norms and virtues such as kindness, generosity, compassion, benevolence and courtesy. This indicates that respect and concern for others have an influence on the growth of interpersonal relationships and cooperative skills. This supports an adage in Nigeria, in the Yoruba language which goes '...ise ni igba pada' (which means respect is earned in return). The interdependency between an individual and others is epitomised by expressions such as '*umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*' (Xhosa and Zulu), meaning, 'I am because we are' or '*motho ke motho ka batho ba bang'*' (Sotho), meaning 'A person is a person through other persons' (More, 2004, p.157).

2.6 AXIOLOGY AND ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY

According to the Webster Dictionary (2013), axiology involves the values and judgements according to ethics. Axiology involves the nature of philosophical knowledge that theory will use, in this case, the theory of 'Bronfrenbrenner ecological systems' in relation to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Therefore, it is imperative for the researcher to engage with the ethical principles involved in the study.

Bronfrenbrenner ecological systems theory is characterised by values that include unity, acceptance and kindness towards people, irrespective of their races, backgrounds, religions, status and ethnicity as interactional medium of diversity within the functional system. Letseka (2012) states that its values include warmth, kindness and love for others. Bronfrenbrenner ecological systems theory underpins that ecosystem does not formed an ally of no other factors like microsystem, macrosystem, exosystem and chronosystem; this requires that all people's beliefs, cultures and attitudes of people within a community should be respected. The researcher concur with Letseka (2012) that provides ethics of practice for embracing humanity, particularly in the LGBTI communities. A focus on these values and principles is relevant in this study because this is what is lacking in the treatment of LGBTI communities by their peers at a university campus.

2.7 THE RELEVANCE OF ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS THEORY TO THE CURRENT STUDY

Ecological systems theory is a philosophical theory that allows individuals to learn and be conscious of their environment to understand human actions towards one another, to maintain connectedness; as study ecology would instil a sense of belonging that evolves by our relational bonds within a community (Hosseini, 2010). McNulty (2013) affirms that through learning from others, people could associate, embrace and show love for one another. The education curriculum seeks to create a lifelong learner who is confident and independent, literate, numerate, multi-skilled, compassionate, with respect for the environment and the ability to participate in society as a critical and active citizen (DoE, 2008). The significance of ecological systems theory imply that

communalism should be given a priority to play a vital role in designing educational curriculum and in the overall attitude at schools and universities.

The Bill of Rights therefore seen as an attempt to give expression to the values associated with circular flow of interest to accommodate diversity within the educational system to develop all citizens mentally and physically. Historically, in the 1990s, 'ubuntu' received recognition as circumference of ecological approach from the Interim Constitution and the preamble to the South African Acts (1996) Constitution, as mentioned by the DoE (2008):

The adoption of this constitution lays the secure foundation for the people of South Africa and enables them to transcend the divisions and strife of the past, which generated gross violations of human rights, the transgression of humanitarian principles into violent conflicts and a legacy of hatred, fear, guilt and revenge.

In the postscript to the constitution for example, the consideration is given towards addressing ecological issues of individualistic relational factors explicitly mentioned as being the source of the underlying values of the new South Africa. In this document, ecological systems is aligned with positive values of understanding and preparation, and is contrasted with vengeance, retaliation, and victimization. The inclusion of conditionalities that could be practically help citizens to relate accurately with other as equal individuals of a country. This aligns with Bronfrenbrenner (1989) that individual have influence on their environment as determinants of circumstances for their development.

2.8 THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

Punch (2005), Cross (2009) and Creswell (2013), affirm that the researcher should manoeuvre himself/herself from an outsider point, by gaining access to become an intimate member of the group. The researcher, tried to position himself as team member due to the participatory nature of this study. Such a positioning also makes the researcher an active member of the study. Good participation is built on an open relationship with the research which enables the participants to actively contribute to the study.

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), the researcher is considered as an instrument of data generation. This means that data is generated and mediated through a human instrument rather than through inventories, questionnaires or machines, unlike in quantitative research. Ponterotto (2010) argues that a good qualitative researcher should adhere to probing questions, then listen, think and ask more probing questions in order to access a deeper level of conversation. The researcher inserts himself into the study for reassurance to research teams on their participatory significance and ethical issues as contained in the consents given. The qualitative researcher needs to describe the relevant aspects of self, biases, assumptions, expectations and experiences throughout the research (Lyons, Bike, Johnson & Bethea, 2012). While recognising the bias of the researcher on the study, Creswell (2009) states that the neutrality of a researcher gives more credibility to the study.

2.9 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has provided the overview of the key operational concepts of this study; it stated clearly the theoretical framework used. Its relevance and how to apply this meaningfully to address the study objectives. In addition, this chapter discussed ontology as well as the axiology and epistemology of 'ecological systems theory', theoretical justification for the study, the relevance of ecological theory, the role of researcher and chapter summary. The next chapter is the literature review that informs the transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

CHAPTER THREE

REVIEW OF LITERATURE INFORMING A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, the theoretical framework and the operational concepts were discussed. In this section, literature related to this study was discussed according to the research objectives. This chapter will also address the research questions by explaining the transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities and how this can be implemented successfully. The next section will discuss situational analysis into transformative approaches for embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

3.2 A SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS INTO TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACHES FOR EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

This section includes a situational description and analysis of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

3.2.1 Hostile campus climate for LGBTI communities

Over the past three decades, scholars have increasingly recognized the importance of school climate (particularly violence and the threat of violence) on students who identify as part of LGBTI communities (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). Kosciw, Palmer, Kull and Greytak (2013), in recent research on LGBTI students, have demonstrated the negative impacts of peer victimisation, which includes psychological problems and poorer academic results.

A study conducted by Tetreault, Fette, Meidlinger and Hope (2013) at a tertiary institution in New York, United State of America (USA), investigated the perceptions of a campus environment in relation to sexual minorities. The study indicated that the university campus was a hostile climate for LGBTI communities as observed through

unfair and prejudiced treatment by their peers on their sexual orientation, gender identity and status.-

3.2.2 Tacit and subtle rejection of LGBTI communities at campus by peers and staffs

McCormack's (2012) research has demonstrated that LGBTI students tend to have negative experiences at schools and universities, suffer social marginalisation and discrimination. Toomey and Russell (2013), found out that the majority of educators contributed to the situation by deliberately remaining silent on gender orientation differences and sexuality-related reports. LGBTI communities report that staffs and teachers often did not intervene, even when they witnessed harassment physically from heterosexual students (Nakamoto & Schwartz, 2010; Pendragon, 2010). Such findings show the discrimination experienced by LGBTI students and the lack of support they receive at school and university. Reygan (2012), affirms that lack of support from educators is a further challenge for LGBTI communities as they struggle against bullying from peers.

Ringrose and Renold (2010) argue that staffs' input have a significant influence on ensuring equal access of students to human rights. Remaining silent to LGBTI communities' voices on abuse from peers might cause students to internalise their feelings and experience emotional problems. Lozier and Beckman (2012), argue that LGBTI communities who face discrimination by their peers, struggle to co-exist among them, as well as struggle to achieve their goals. Llera and Katsirebas (2010, p.29) confirm that LGBTI communities cohabit among other students at a university campus and engage in love relationships in order to facilitate their visibility at a university environment.

3.2.3 Lack of Parental/Family support for LGBTI communities

LGBTI communities often tend to lack supportive family, peers and teachers (Williams et al., 2005; Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011), which cause those who identify as LGBTI to undergo more victimisation and isolation within their families (Garofalo, Wolf, Wssow, Woods & Goodman, 1999). LGBTI communities often report that educators and

teachers most of the time did not intervene, even when they witnessed harassment physically from heterosexual students (Nakamoto & Schwartz, 2010; Pendragon, 2010). This apathy behaviour has indicated that parental and ethic of student-teacher relationships is denied meant that educators failed to play parental role as required at the university to challenge the wrong acts against students or victims.

Needham and Austin (2010), state that non-disclosure of sexuality arise home which occur from parental intolerance behaviour which could contribute to peer victimization against LGBTI communities. The parental indulgence against support to build confidence into LGBTI identified has negative impact to make them powerless to challenge the situations they find themselves in at the university campus. The researcher supports that family acceptance suggested by Ryan and Diaz (2009), support that parental role might be beneficial to embracing these LGBTI communities from home and lengthen to university campuses in line with Ryan, Huebner, Diaz and Sanchez (2009), support that family enlightenment helps the family not to reject their own children based on sexuality and gender orientation differences. Additionally, on the importance that educators serve as second parents as the schools and universities play second homes, Swank and Raiz (2010) assert that LGBTI communities' unacceptance originates from early childhood behaviours into non attachment to parental care and this disallow free relative interaction thus contribute to some educators failure to address cases of abuse reported by students on sexuality related issues. In contrast, Munson and Stelboun (2013), claim that parental responsibilities play a vital role to embracing LGBTI communities' for their improvement on psychological and physiological development.

Despite several discourses on homosexuality and interventions, LGBTI communities at a university campus still experience challenges. According to the body of evidence, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (2012), define homophobic and transphobic bullying as a global problem phenomenon that violates on students' rights and perhaps which might impede on educational achievement for LGBTI communities. (Cornu, 2016; UNESCO, 2012; Coleyshaw, 2010; Salmivalli, 2010). However, Cornu (2016) study compared that LGBTI student's communities in United State and Israel, results found that homosexuality has encountered homophobic attacks from heterosexuals.

3.2.4 Difficulties of sexuality disclosure for LGBTI communities at a university campus

Wang and Eccles (2012), confirm that sexual orientation disclosure among LGBTI communities exposes them to assaults, verbal abuse and rape attempts from their peers at schools and university campuses. Tetreault et al. (2013) found that anti-LGBTI sentiments caused some students to pretend to be heterosexual and hide their sexual identity from other students and staff due to fear of stigmatisation and victimisation.

The difficulties of sexual orientation and gender conformity do not fully allow LGBTI communities to share equal position with heterosexuals based on their gender non-conformity could extend hostile environments that might result in internalizing problems. Haney (2008), affirms that rejection and isolation happen to LGBTI communities once disclosing their identity, and this deprived them of their full participation with heterosexual peers, and thus subjects them to consequent disengagement and loneliness which might occur, and to lead them to develop low self-esteem in their academics and fail to achieve as expected.

Pile (2010), disagrees that reactivity of human behaviors forces active responses on change to stimulus in the university environment. This supports people's consciousness to adapt socially for interpersonal relationships. Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees and Skinner (2011), argue that emotional problems occur for LGBTI communities' to achieve their relationships from the community. Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008), maintain that strong aspiration helps to accelerate differences that sexuality places on LGBTI communities against people's perceptions on love and forgiveness for humanity. The researcher found with Wyandotte and Huh (2012) that equality serves to maximize ecological system theory against negativity based on gender identity and to corroborate a functional relationship amongst all students at a university campus and thus ensure social transformation. This endorses that consideration of campus democratic policy should encourage all students to build a team spirit whereby they can compete for a common goal and do work collaboratively so that everyone will be fully embraced.

Patrick, Knee, Canevello and Lonsbany (2007), contended that relationships importance represent an outright framework that beneficial to individual sexuality

disclosure among with heterosexual students at a University campus. These relationships are importance to provide assistance for LGBTI communities to develop a sense of self-worth at a university campus. Munson and Stelboum (2013) averted that relational self-worth ensure an individualistic self-concept that could be used to sustain positive attitudes and beliefs towards mutual interactions with others. In respect to sexual identities disclosure, studies conducted; Gay (2010), Munson and Stelboum (2013), have shown that exposure of gender identity/sexuality has implied someone's preference to significant other on self-beliefs, change of one's perception about self, compare to another who does not appreciate their significant other. Cislighi (2013) disagrees that coming out set barriers to community beliefs on LGBTI communities but enjoins others to move beyond simple tolerance to embracing and celebrate rich dimensions of diversity contained within each individual.

3.2.5 Heterosexual dominance at university

Societal norms have positioned heterosexuals to be in a position of dominance that allows them to oppress other groups (Regan, 2009) – in this case LGBTI communities do not have a solid backing to stand on their feet as the university is a diverse population. Molden and Finkel (2010), support that submission occurs to different degrees; like how some employees may decide follow their boss' orders without questioning, whereas others might disobey orders but later concede by pressurisation. Unlike majority domination, Alatalo (2012) argues that heterosexual individuals do often oppress LGBTI communities.

The researcher concurs that heterosexual students see oppressing LGBTI communities as a way of showing that they are agents in terms of power relation and indicate that their rival LGBTIs were powerless and so base on perceived domination abuse privildges. However, Holt (2011), confirms that dominace power relation should be controlled in collaboration to the understanding of building a social trust to understand and respect individual at the university campus. This will ensure that LGBTI communities share their own perspectives with their classmates without fear or threat of intimidation by heterosexual dominance.

3.2.6 LGBTI communities' engagement and disengagement at a university campus

Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo & Gabriel (2011), suggest that students' engagement helps to actualise academic success at university. Meanwhile, the love role shared among students emphasized with Goldberg (2014) that family belongingness actualizes their interpersonal relationships while familiar with individual differences from heterosexual peers. Bajaj (2014) states that provision of educational rights be implemented and monitored in accordance to inclusivity principles as contained in DoE (2008), to cater for the initial difficulties, and that all students might enjoy support to overcome these difficulties. Dehart et al. (2011), promoted sense belongings for LGBTI communities at a university campus in study especially at the face of adversity and discrimination to improve self-dependency. This self-dependency propels diversity among students.

Göransson and Nilholm (2014) claim that way to develop a self-confidence through communicating experiences which are similar to others' belongingness; expressions like, you belong here, I know you can succeed." As such, these inspirational tips might boost morale standards to motivate and believe that each LGBTI community can win over the challenges of life. Chopik, Edelstein and Fraley (2013) suggest that negative views to LGBTI students leads to a struggle to be visible or to participate fully at a university. Unconscious disengagement of LGBTI students may result in a lack of concentration and depression, and a failure to achieve their life goals. Fisher, Poirier and Blau (2012), concurred that discrimination has a negative influence on LGBTI communities which might create mental stress, which will not allow them to survive at a university campus. Additionally, emotional problems which emanate from disengagement such as severe mental stress can pose a threat to human health.

3.3 THE NEED FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

3.3.1 Abuses of LGBTI communities

Kosciw, Greytak and Diaz (2009), Pendragon (2010) and Swearer et al. (2008) all draw attention to the assaults and abuse, such as name-calling, ridicule, teasing, discrimination, and stigmatisation experienced by members of the LGBTI community. Bhana (2012), in support of this discusses the experiences of lesbians in South African schools who experience prejudice and oppression. Research by Espelage, Aragon, Birkett and Koenig (2008); Kosciw et al. (2009); Llera and Katsireba (2010) and Russell et al. (2011), confirmed that secondary schools are the most hostile location for violence against LGBTI youth. Swarr (2012) adds that men sometime rape lesbians, as a punitive, corrective or curative measure of their homosexuality. Badgett, Lee, Nezhad, Waaldijk and Van der Meulen (2014) stated that in 2017, Chicago 52 people identifying as LGBTI experience violence as a result of their sexuality – some of them were killed.

Payne (2007), supports that labelling of sexual orientation is considered against acceptable school's culture as it would cause to be excluded, disconnected and isolated from the entire groups. The researcher disagrees with Trafford and Leshem (2008) but agrees that the inner ability to thrive on friendly inclusivity among students but follow part of Bajaj (2011) that confirms the authenticity of creating knowledge as light for all students empowerment; no one left out policy against year 2020 from emancipation of diversity. The researcher concurs with Swarr (2012) who indicates that the intense exclusion and isolation of LGBTI communities might deprive them of having better relationships with their heterosexual peers thus influencing them negatively even on their academic performance.

3.3.2 Bullying of LGBTI communities

Bullying is one of the serious challenges experienced by learners/students from primary education to university education. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2012), defined homophobic and transphobic bullying as a global problem that is a violation of students' rights which impedes the educational

success of the LGBTI communities (Cornu, 2016; UNESCO, 2012). Stewart (2010) points out those LGBTI students are more likely to be victims of discrimination from their heterosexual counterparts.

Meland, Rydning, Lobben, Breidablik and Ekeland (2010) studied the internalised impacts of bullying on the student; they argue that bullying may lead to psychological breakdown and very low self-esteem even at university. LGBTI students have high rates of unreported bullying and harassment. Toomey and Russell (2013) indicate that up to 86 LGBTI communities have experienced some forms of bullying at school, as well as university. This might result in inadequate academic performance, truancy, and dropping out of school. In addition, Wang, Iannotti and Luk, (2011) assert that bullying results in an internalising of fear and insecurity amongst LGBTI communities resulting in absenteeism and later dropping out. Blondal and Sigrun (2009) state that perpetual insecurity experienced in LGBTI communities at a university from verbal abuse/harassment, can result in dropping out from university.

Literature shows that educational environments for LGBTIs are generally negative in nature (Swarr, 2012; Kotch, 2014). In a study carried out in New York (USA) by the Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network (2010) results showed that most LGBTI scholars perceived that schools are unsafe because of their sexual orientation, and over one-third felt insecure because of their gender identity.

On coping strategies for bullied students, research has presented some impacts of stress and coping strategies (Skinner & Zimmer-Gombak, 2007; Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees & Skinner, 2011; Birditt, Antonucci & Tighe, 2012) have found that LGBTI communities are faced with challenges that reduce their ability to respond effectively to stressful situations, resulting in an increase of symptoms of psychosocial influences (Graber & Sontag, 2008). Birditt et al. (2012) by examining moderate effects to cope and the association between poverty and psychopathology, then found that student's coping strategies serve as mediation to liberate the mind. Although, these findings, and other studies suggest that coping strategies during childhood and adolescence may be context-dependent and susceptible to direct influence from the stressor, (Erath & Tu, 2014; Birditt et al., 2012) none of these studies have focused exclusively on social stressors that may be most salient to LGBTI communities based on stigmatization challenges at a university campus. Tolerance stand as a key to help

LGBTI communities' students to develop confidence against bullying and improve on their life challenges among themselves.

3.3.3 Harassment of LGBTI communities at a university campus

Lozier and Beckman (2012) found that harassment and intimidation encountered by LGBTI individuals in schools creates an unsafe and unsupportive environment for academic and social achievement. A study was conducted by a research group at the University of Georgia (USA) in 2002, with LGBTI students at their university campus, and data was collected from 82 students who self-identified as LGBTI. The study found out that 90% of the participants reported to have heard anti-gay remarks or jokes while 75% of participants knew someone who had been verbally harassed because of their sexual orientation (Lozier & Beckman, 2012). The study findings revealed that almost half of the participants have experienced some form of prejudice on campus.

Swearer, Turner, Givens and Pollack (2008) assert that name-calling of students imposes psychological stress on students which can result in a lack of coping during classroom activities, a reduction to learning, low grades, substance use, and depression. Kapeleris and Paivio (2011, p. 626) concur that LGBTI students experience bullying, abuse, are picked on and are called names. Dare (2015), study found that heterosexual students point fingers at those in the LGBTI community and call them names such as 'susi', 'tomboy' and 'faggot' to make them feel uncomfortable among their friends at schools and universities.

Ashley-Smith (2013) says that the act of name-calling is a signal to others which leads to major stigmatisation of LGBTI communities. Dehart et al. (2011) state that the actual 'coming out' of individuals at a young age exposes them as more visible and they are subjected to labelling, teasing, name-calling and harassment from other students (Wang et al., 2011). Therefore, harassment experiences could cause internalization of problems for LGBTI communities which might, lead to depression, anxiety and substance abuse (Nakamoto & Schwartz, 2010). All this can be catered for through a transformative approach for embracing LGBTI communities among heterosexual students against harassment at a university campus.

3.3.4 Isolation of LGBTI communities at a university campus

Another issue experienced by LGBTI individuals is the social and emotional isolation on campus, which extends the risk of both physical and mental health problems (Butler, 2008). McCormack (2011) states that fewer LGBTI individuals make it to higher education due to the difficulties encountered at high school from their peers and hindered academic success, as they felt unsafe and unprotected. Robinson (2010) reveals that LGBTI learners find it difficult to concentrate in the class because of a preoccupation with negative events that have occurred and a fear of reoccurrence. Research by Grossman et al. (2009) reveals that American LGBTI communities do not feel safe or have sense of belonging at their school environment due to powerlessness, exclusion and marginalization which leaves them no control over how they are being treated.

3.3.5 Labelling and stigmatisation of LGBTI communities

To understand the influence that stigmatization has on sexuality differentiation at a university campus, Erath and Tu (2014) opine that higher levels of stress may occur during challenges encountered and put LGBTI communities on a greater risk of emotional and behavioural problems. It has been well established in literature that how individuals cope with stress is often a strong indicator of psychosocial well-being.

Notably, Seelman et al. (2012) state that positive support and intervention for these LGBTI communities can be fuelled by the input of a university counsellor, lecturers and social workers towards attainment of excellence at the university. Koswic et al. (2014) further suggested that promotion of gay-straight alliances be conducted at the universities, which will contribute to the improvement of social, emotional, physical and academic state of LGBTI communities at a university campus. Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Netshandam (2013) investigated the experience of LGBTI students at a rural institution in South Africa. Findings from the study recommend structured programmes on social behaviour, focus on advocacy for a change to educate and support should be implemented at the institution. It was suggested that this would help empower them in dealing with stigma and discrimination.

In terms of the labelling and stigmatisation LGBTI communities, Swearer et.al. (2008) explain that LGBTI students at the university may find it difficult to interact freely with their heterosexual peers due to fear of labelling and stereotyping. LGBTI individuals often hide their identity for fear of rejection (Romero-Canyas, Downey, Berenson, Ayduk & Kang, 2010). As stated, constant stigmatisation may marginalise LGBTI students at the university, thereby causing depression and emotional instability which might result in suicidal thoughts and suicide attempts (Fafchamps & Shilpi, 2008; Fine & Spencer, 2009; Hawkley & Cacioppo, 2010; World Health Organization, 2012).

3.4 KEY ELEMENTS (TRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

Some key elements thrusts of a transformative approach discussed that could be used for embracing LGBTI communities includes:

3.4.1 Mutual engagement among LGBTI communities and heterosexuals

Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) suggest that student engagement helps to actualise academic success for LGBTI communities by ensuring security of their future at a university campus. Hughes, Harold and Boyer (2011) concur that relationships within the LGBTI community can help satisfy the need for connection while students negotiate the differences from their peers. The researcher reinforces the fact that academic success is possible irrespective of challenges that LGBTI communities might encounter at a university campus. Dehart et al. (2011) suggest that sense of belonging apportions confidence to LGBTI communities at a university campus.

The self-reinforcement chain among homosexual people to cohabit with their environment however positively reclaims power for individuals to accept differences and reinforce stereotypes while disrupting negative behaviour (Li, Dobinson & Ross, 2012). Destructive behaviour does not come physically at the schools but flows through institutionalized ideas to internalize oppression on LGBTI communities by showing empathy and help to protect them against been victimized. Chopik, Edelstein and Fraley (2013), suggest life for life adaptation to develop a transformative

approach that might cater for systematic problems problem solving through a change of attitudes towards embracing diversity. This approach seeks to strengthen friendly connections that require all students, irrespective of gender and sexual differences, to encourage democracy and promote friendly relationships in a progressive manner (Chopik et al., 2013).

According to Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco (2011), communal living across different groups improves the emotional and physical state in order to have balanced development. This indicates that living together of all, in an enabling environment serves as a therapy to the wellness of transformation and change of individual perceptions of LGBTI communities. Coleyshaw (2010) emphasises that harmonious relationships maintain psychological health through sustenance activities which provide embracing capacity to a healthy lifestyle of individuals. Gabb (2011) confirms the power of relationships between both LGBTI communities and heterosexual students and the importance of this mental and physical connection for human development.

3.4.2 Mindfulness behaviour to embrace LGBTI communities

This is a key element that can help both LGBTI communities and heterosexual communities to create a collaborative platform to enjoy a shared university campus. Hofmann, Sawyer, Witt and Oh (2010) in their quantitative study found that mindfulness-based therapy has a functional effect to treat depression and low self-esteem. The emergence of this study showed that LGBTI communities have embraced a view of what transformative approach could do to support their acceptance and strengthen learning capacity as they compete with their peers at university campus. Guasp (2011) states the importance of support provided through healthcare services to provide a sustainable therapy for LGBTI communities to improve on their experiences of threat which might infuse unstable life conditions under these circumstances.

Erath and Tu (2014) infer that mindfulness is a therapeutic practice that encourages one to stay in the present moment of unpleasantness in order to be neutral and to control behavioural indifferences with maturity. The researcher found the point raised

by Hawkey and Cacioppo (2010) that social exclusion might stimulate disconnection and isolation of LGBTI communities among their peers and deprive them of the privilege of equally to share favorable environments to prepare them for future responsibilities. Epstein (2009) confirms that individual development relies on the nature of relational supports gained by reconciliation and acceptance of the value of appreciating uniqueness in diversity.

3.4.3 Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus

Feeney and Thrush (2010) assert that LGBTI communities discover avenues to learn from the possibilities to maintain temperate attitudes to ensure their heterosexual counterparts allow social integration among all at a university campus is empowering. The exploration of interactive influences on LGBTI communities at a university campus appeals to a transformative approach to embracing them based on the fact that lives connect together (Fine & Spencer, 2009).

Fitzsimons and Fishbach (2010), suggest that the application of free attitudes should be used as alternatives to promote LGBTI communities' life goal to improve their academic participation at a university campus. Therefore, LGBTI communities' efforts to improve their academic participation by manoeuvring and connecting socially, and to engage actively in love relationships to improve their involvement at a university campus to improve on academic performance is validated (Fafchanps & Shilpi, 2008). This indicates that proper engagement/participation with love, creates emotional stability for LGBTI communities to cope positively with their heterosexual peers at a university campus.

Helliker (2012, p.38) acceptability of human values on a sustenance of human rights is in accordance with societal interference. Napolis (2015) maintains, to avoid violation or conflict of interest may hamper transformation (Hlalele, 2014, p.102; Hlalele, 2012, p.111) embrace diversity. Kirkpatrick (2010), and Fernande (2010) suggested that opinions of people which provide quick feedbacks on LGBTI communities' issues through social change and transformation have value. Positive relationships help LGBTI communities to achieve academic excellence, particularly to secure a remarkable future for themselves (Santrock, 2008). Berlart (2012) states that

interpersonal relationships are dynamic systems in nature, which might change continuously during a lifetime as students develop psychosocially at university. This might help to stimulate LGBTI communities among peers at a university campus. As such, a measure of complementing each other affords appropriate security and emotional stability.

Collectivism and tolerance is strengthening for a change towards action against discrimination. There is a limitation of the Bandura (1997) social theory which explained that human interactions have a significant influence around its ecology. He maintained that human behaviour revolves within the following model; microsystem, macrosystem, exosystem and chronosystem. However, Bandura failed to identify key concepts that could influence change of behaviors. The researcher identified a gap for the emergence of the 'Bronfrenbrenner ecological systems' theory which conceptualizes significant concepts for positive change, which could afford a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

3.4.4 Willingness to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus

According to Alatalo (2012), love helps one to appreciate diversity. With this, he meant that good love relationships provide unity and life adaptations to the difficult circumstances of LGBTI communities among their peers. Harrison and Shorthall (2011) affirm that love aligns with feelings of connection and caring that individuals have to experience to get relationship satisfaction.

This supports that adaptation among students is apprehended by closeness and to display emotional feelings that individuals desire to get as stated by Seelman, Walls, Hazel and Wisneski (2012). Love relationships prepare individual students to cultivate good emotions towards their lives' goals and achievements. There is evidence which indicates that progress can either increase or decrease by a student's motivational drive to achieve life endeavor (Fitzsimons & Fishbach, 2010). Progressive measures "provide an active role to re-prioritise individual goals to shape the nature of feelings that LGBTI communities have through personal self-regulation development" (Fitzsimons & Fishbach, 2010, p. 546). The researcher suggests that people's feelings and emotions be constant and work towards embracing one another, feeling

respected, adored and appreciated. The researcher believes that if this is achieved, it will promote an outstanding healthy lifestyle since life is socially constructed for human development.

3.4.5 Freedom of participation for LGBTI communities at a university campus

Kelmer, Rhoades, Stanley and Markman (2013) stated that key elements to support the LGBTI communities could not cope with their peers for the fear of discrimination, and thereby struggle for freedom to participate. Peradventure, Graber and Sontag (2008) believe that LGBTI communities coming out of challenges might influence their behaviour positively to engage in daily social life participation. However, Bortolin, Adam and Jaime McCauley (2013) suggest that, repeated routine on stigmatization interferes with LGBTI communities at a university campus, where no embracing approaches which are necessary for life transitions are made.

Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) concur that psychological cooperation attempts to propose a transformative approach engenders LGBTI communities to maximize their potential in all round activities and to further complement effort to actualize their live goals. Selhub (2009) confirms that intimacy of LGBTI communities' students, with agreement of heterosexuals, might create a welcoming atmosphere for their needs and interests to promote quality of love relationships for a lifelong adventure. However, Ashley-Smith (2013) suggests that equity evolves by sharing of different opinions and views together, to engage common interests through developing a transformative approach that could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. This may provide intervention strategies for the whole university's students as a backup measure. Korosteleva (2012), and McCandless (2011) support a struggle for equity and fairness of others through non-relenting efforts leads to emancipation of students at various Schools and universities in democratic freedom. The researcher concurs with Futhwa (2011) that the marginalized position of LGBTI communities among their peers at the university campuses remains invisible.

3.4.6 Cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities at a University campus

Boylan (2008) states that love power mechanisms that relate the university students together, depend on the assumptions that LGBTI communities show respect to themselves. Sherwood (2006) affirms that social, emotional, psychological, physical, spiritual and academic responsibilities are required in life. As mentioned, some needs that make a direct influence to transformative approach might launch an indiscriminating effort to embrace LGBTI communities. Boylan (2008) supports that good cooperation helps to follow a pathway towards accomplishment of human existence on the world of actualization. This supports that cooperation plays a significant role to mediate the gap between the LGBTI communities and heterosexuals, as they co-exist within the same praxis of university campus.

3.4.7 Empathy to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus

Demir, Ozen, Dogan, Bilgk and Tyrell (2011), study reveals that happiness ensures quality relationships, which is based on peoples' responsiveness among individuals to mediate relationship indifferences between friendship and happiness function among university students to care for friends in hard situations. This confirms that loneliness might deprive LGBTI communities of companionship to to stay happy through connectivity with their heterosexual peers (Riggle, Whitman, Olson, Rostosky & Strong, 2008). The mediation however, intensifies a theoretical lens to understand how friendships relate to happiness. Some explanations suggest that establishing and maintaining healthy friendships might contribute to happiness that brings unity in diversity (Demir & Weitekamp, 2007; Lyubomirsky, 2008). The researcher found that warmth and care helps to make LGBTI communities experience their happiness through the medium of support received from their friends and families in times of need. This constitutes the experience of love within the friendship sphere that potentially influences social well-being (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008; Lyubomirsky, 2008). The researcher is of the opinion that good interrelationships between heterosexual and LGBTI students might promote happiness and improve their lives on a university campus.

3.5 CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH CAN BE USED TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

This section of discussion considers circumstances/conditions under which a transformative approach can be used to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

3.5.1 Lecturers' attitudes towards LGBTI communities at a university campus

This part addresses staffs' attitudes to LGBTI communities or sexuality-related issues at the university campus. Francis (2012) states that there is a need to create more intensive awareness and teaching around sexuality that cater for the social, emotional, health and educational well-being of all learners and support diversity on teaching and learning in South African schools. The goal is to remove homophobia and discrimination, which commonly deprives LGBTI communities of their participation in academic performance (Neto & Pinto, 2015).

Francis (2013) states that LGBTI communities' find it very difficult to socialize among their heterosexual peers and perform adequately in team activities or presentations. They also struggle to enjoy tolerance from fellow students, which may have negative influence on their academic performance. Thomas (2011) asserts that human lifestyle depends on the quality of interaction from students around them to militate against their enjoyment. It confirms that good relationships make happier engagements among student communities to provide a transformative approach that allows sound mental health. This supports that more LGBTI communities gain embracing love from heterosexual's peers, which medically averts depression, anger, mania and other psychological problems.

Taylor and Snowdon (2014) agree that LGBTI communities' students could be intensively motivated to achieve greater success in their lives whenever life seems like fun and play. Swank and Raiz (2010) affirm that heterosexuals have different interpretations of LGBTI communities based on their home background, understanding of sexuality and gender differences. More so, their ability to adapt to the new university campus environment in which they find themselves, seems difficult

(Langbein & Yost, 2009). Notwithstanding, circumstances may create its opportunities that embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

3.5.2 Changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities at a university campus

Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald, (2009) argue that poor sexual education orientation of teachers in high schools may lead to students internalising these negative perceptions and perpetuate them as homophobia in higher education institutions. Chopik, Edelstein and Fraley (2013) advocate life for life adaptation to develop a transformative approach that caters for systematic problems through changing of attitudes to accommodate diversity, and LGBTI communities that are struggling to participate at the university campus activities. The change of attitudes will seek to strengthen connections required among students (Hall, Evans & Nixon, 2013). Lemay and Clark (2008) assert that social connectivity keeps students socializing, facilitating LGBTI communities to maintain a continuation of friendly association with their high school peers up to the university.

Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2014) contend that attachment has a stronger effect in building a transformative approach to relationships which embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. When both LGBTI communities and heterosexual students understand each other, it helps them to connect mentally and spiritually, thus benefiting the pervasive culture.

In some cases, people perceive being homosexual or being gender non-conforming as un-African (Brouard & Pieterse, 2012), which perpetuates homophobic attitudes among people. A good number of studies have investigated the causes and characteristics of homophobia, but have not provided adequately for how those practices/behaviours can be challenged and minimised (Rispel et al., 2012; Müller, 2013). The challenges are mostly experienced in communities where heteronormativity is stressed, such as in communities and this extends to rural universities. Collins (2009) suggests that heteronormativity promotes heterosexuality as the only 'normal' sexual orientation. The word 'heteronormativity' refers to a set of institutional practices that systematically legitimise and establish heterosexuality as the norm for sexual and

broader social relations (Taylor & Snowden, 2014) and rejecting others sexual orientations.

Studies conducted, and media reports, indicate that there is intolerance of any sexual orientation that is different from heterosexuality, and to any gender roles other than traditional gender roles, which indicates the extent of stigma and discrimination around LGBTI individuals (DeBarros, 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2014). Furthermore, Reygan (2013) states that there is a need for schools to be teaching anti-oppressive pedagogies which are inclusive of sexual and gender minorities.

Beitz (2009) states that socialisation processes, and social expectations create ways to interact with other people. Consciousness on sexuality differences needs to be applied by educating students to accept each other. Johnson (2014) asserts that the behavioural lifestyle of LGBTI towards heterosexuals is considered as aberrant when judged by societal norms, and thought of socializing individuals to embrace LGBTI without violating their civil rights. Francis (2012), Francis and DePalma (2014) emphasise that students should be equipped with skills to challenge inequality and discrimination in their study environment. Johnson (2014) affirms that the concept of diversity includes recognition for individual sexuality and encompasses individual differences.

3.5.3 Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI Communities at a University campus

Barnes, Brown, Krusemark, Campbell and Rogge (2007) suggest that higher levels of positive self esteem are normative precautions. This can sustain higher academic performance as student-teacher relationships are more effective, thereby the satisfaction for individual students is encouraged. LGBTI communities thus partake in the work activities with peers to boost their morale for adequate transformation in education. The researcher contends that practicing mindfulness to relate with students might serve to inform educators and practitioners to focus on promoting healthy relationships that will improve student's low self-esteem.

Birditt, Antonucci and Tighe (2012) maintain that good satisfaction emerges from effective participation among students in competitive activities to ensure that equal

treatment is given to all, and to lower emotional stress through non-violent discussions to promote a competitive spirit by maintaining fairness. The researcher maintains that the transformative approach could be helpful to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus, as mindfulness will help both heterosexual and LGBTI communities to secure good self-esteem with any interruption to cooperation.

Neff (2011) confirms that good self-esteem confronts any wrong perception that students might have on diverse involvement, and promotes respect and compassion for one another. This goes beyond the limit self-criticism and ensures that negative effects are avoided and leaves no hindrances which prevent LGBTI communities to achieve their highest goal potential towards a more contented and a fulfilled life. In addition, Erath and Tu (2014) emphasise that arguments on sexuality with negative confrontations might create a threat for the LGBTI communities. He further states that to continue with good self-esteem comes through character development which internalizes self-worth against challenges on emotional, physical, social and educational features, and to develop a more positive mind that establishes possibilities.

3.5.4 Changing of prejudice about LGBTI communities at a university campus

Brikkels (2014) confirms that prejudice and behaviour of the majority of heterosexual individuals in regard to relationships with the same sex as abnormal and against the norms and values of their society. LGBTI communities often suffer discrimination in silence. Swank and Raiz (2010) concur that the changing of attitudes serves a prominent role to transform the society from 'the outside the world', through forgiveness to accommodate members of the community. This shows that education needs to enlighten the majority to their responsibility for others. Notably, Seelman et al. (2012) state that positive support and intervention for these LGBTI communities can be fuelled by the input of a university counsellor, lecturers and social workers towards the attainment of excellence at the university. Koswic et al. (2014) further suggested that promotion of gay-straight alliances be conducted at the universities which will contribute to the improvement of social, emotional, physical and academic states of LGBTI communities at a university campus. Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Netshandam (2013) investigated the experience of LGBTI students at a rural institution

in South Africa. Findings from the study recommend that structured programmes on social behaviour, which should focus on advocacy for a change to educate and support should be implemented at the institution. It was suggested that this would help empower them in dealing with stigma and discrimination at a university campus.

On sexuality and related issues it is prudent to prepare the universities and society to share common knowledge that embraces diversity. Needham and Austin (2010) confirm that sexual orientation needs to be handled with caution by parents, thereby encouraging acceptance and acknowledgement of LGBTI communities' identity.

A constant engagement among students affords LGBTI communities to appreciate support that will allow them to explore social opportunities which provides efficiency that accelerates the social performance (Blondal & Sigrun, 2009). Berlant (2012) suggests that a change of attitudes from LGBTI communities to embrace their people in love to ensure equity and maintain fairness to gain momentum of their life challenges is needed. Alatalo (2012) emphasises the importance of equality for humanity, which should not be negotiable, and confirms that love is paramount. As such, LGBTI communities were included in universities and therefore share equal access to their freedom on sexuality and education through genuine love. Ashley-Smith (2013) notes that prejudice extends risk against compassion and states that it is important to embrace all students according to the inclusive education policy and create a tolerable university campus environment, irrespective of status and sexuality.

Fisher, Porrier and Blau (2012) suggest that students' belongingness tends to overcome loneliness and isolation through peer support to handle their challenges among themselves at the university. The researcher envisages that this study could support LGBTI communities to gain more confidence over challenges in their lives and win over emotional problems such as; depression, anxiety and suicidal thought. Block (2008) agrees that community acceptance provides safety for shy students in LGBTI communities by helping them to have the ability to cope, both socially and emotionally with their peers.

3.5.5 University campus implementation of anti-bullying program to embracing LGBTI communities

This aspect is the key medium to support students who might be marginalised or bullied by other students or peers. The aim is to reduce such occurrences at schools and university campuses. On this note of importance, Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, and Bartkiewicz, (2010) concur on the need to implement school-wide anti-bullying policies to reduce or eliminate victimisation for the benefit of LGBTI learners in the schools. This indicates that social prejudice from the homes of some LGBTI communities internalise their experiences of harassment, stigmatization and rejection by their peers which sometimes contributes to vulnerability and suicidal thought (Aragon, Poteat & Espelage, 2014; Aspendliedder, Buchanan, McDougall & Sippola, 2009). This shows that disassociation might contribute to endanger a victim of abuse and trigger their minds to wrong thoughts, which can lead them to suicidal ideation which may result in actual suicide.

Van Aswegen (2008) suggests that identity differences among students classified individual students at the university environments. Moreover, psychosocial support enhanced social wellbeing of individual students to display competencies and capacities to deal with their lives' circumstances and manage their love relationships as they understand their environment (Halderman, 2012).

Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) reveal that students' psychosocial well-being covers other aspects of their lives, such as appropriate emotions, relevant thoughts or cognitions, mental health, develop morality, enhance positive relationships with family, peers and teachers. Bortlin, Adam and Jaime McCauley (2013) support that students' psychosocial wellbeing affects every aspect of their lives and this might reflect on their ability to learn, health, play and to relate adequately well with other people as they grow.

3.5.6 Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities

Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) reveal that students' psychosocial well-being covers other aspects of their lives, such as appropriate emotions, relevant thoughts or cognitions, mental health, the development of good morality, and enhances positive

relationships with family, peers and teachers. Bortlin, Adam and Jaime McCauley (2013) support that students' psychosocial wellbeing affects every aspect of their lives and this might reflect on their ability to learn, health, play and relate well with other people as they grow.

Pyykkönen (2012) concurs that there is a need to support LGBTI communities at university to enhance their wellbeing. Psychosocial support is described as a continuum of care and momentum which aims towards ensuring social, emotional and psychological wellbeing of students at the university campus (Gabb, 2011). The provision of psychosocial support services aims to enhance physical wellness and emotional wellbeing of LGBTI communities' students who are vulnerable to abuse and experience insecurity at a university campus for disclosing their sexuality to other students (Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011). Psychosocial involves the combining of different social activities' competence which is difficult to differentiate from the physical and biological aspect of life (Boden, Fischer & Neihuis, 2010). Carlson and Sperry (2010) emphasise that LGBTI communities' psychosocial impact is to maintain interpersonal relations with the broader family and to enhance community networks to promote human lives through relating with other people of the same environment.

3.5.7 Provision of an improved, safe university campus to embrace LGBTI communities

The university campus in this context is an environment that seeks to accommodate the populace of students for educational development in general. University campuses often formed sites of victimisation for LGBTI communities (D'Augelli, Grossman & Starks, 2006; South African Human Rights Commission, 2007). LGBTI communities been found to encounter vulnerability at university campuses because of their sexuality identification. This occurs because of their sexual orientation and the way they express their gender identity (Aspenlieder, Buchanan, McDougall, & Sippola, 2009; Tetreault, Fette, Meidlinger & Hope, 2013; Renn, 2010; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, Card & Russell, 2010). Labelling and disassociation of LGBTI communities on a daily basis by heterosexual's students can prevent them from achieving academic success and engaging fully in campus endeavours. As a result of opposition towards them, it becomes difficult for LGBTI communities to perform well academically, because there

is no enabling academic environment that allows them to attend lectures without fear of their safety and emotional wellbeing (Fisher, Poirier & Blau, 2012).

Sadly, students who attend unsecured university campuses are more likely to alienate themselves from these homophobic environments by being absent or dropping out (Aragon, Poteat, & Espelage, 2014; Lozier & Beckman, 2012). The researcher noticed that fewer students did not find it easy to share their social life problems with anyone for fear of more bad encounters; they rather take leave from school or withdraw from the semester. On this note, Lamanna and Reidmann (2009) maintain that performance of students' needs follow-up to encroach transformative ideas to enable a university campus to be more adaptable for LGBTI communities to enjoy a supportive atmosphere to maximize their potential like their heterosexual peers across the high schools, colleges and universities.

Birditt, Antonucci and Tighe (2012) state that some problems which heterosexual students usually impose on LGBTI communities include: loneliness, insecurity, depression and isolation which often results in internalizing any problems. Lyubomirsky (2008) confirms that internalized emotions have no distinctive ends for LGBTI communities, and only support to handle their challenges results in faster recovery. Gaine and Guardia (2009) contend that perspectives for unequal gender differences be addressed to normalize the competition that persists between the wider heterosexual and LGBTI communities at the same university campus. To this end, there is a need for dialogues and awareness to provide a support service to LGBTI communities who may be marginalized due to sexual orientation, and thus suffer unequal measure of relationships that embrace the democratic state of students.

3.6 HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

There are some barriers/hindrances of transformative approach as discussed below.

3.6.1 Dominance of heterosexuals over LGBTI communities at a university campus

Lamanna and Reidmann (2009) concur that human life is imbalanced through difficulties encountered from environmental influences which in turn discourage individuals' effort to act on future achievement as uncertain circumstances determine LGBTI communities' achievement at schools. Noticeable heterosexual dominance engenders marginalization of the LGBTI communities which impacts negatively on their academic performance and lives. Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowics, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) maintained that monitoring of involvement in activities participation are normative to transformation, that might allow a University campus to be more attractive for LGBTI communities to enjoy a supportive atmosphere to maximize their potential, like their heterosexual peers across high schools, colleges and universities.

Notwithstanding, LGBTI communities require constant follow up on their interest to actively participate in activities without negative trespass against academic performance at a university campus. Birditt, Antonucci and Tighe (2012) state that some problems, which heterosexual students usually place on LGBTI communities include: loneliness, insecurity, depression and isolation resulting in internalization of problems. Gaine and Guardia (2009) contend that perspectives for unequal gender differences need to be addressed to normalize the competition that may arrive between the wider heterosexual population and LGBTI communities that are located at the same university campus. This can lead to no end to disagreements about the diversity controversy that excludes LGBTI communities.

Le, Dove, Agnew, Korn and Mutso (2010) affirmed that embracing value, and not accrue sides' perspective, but as a whole system to provide a transformative approach that will help LGBTI communities to find their safety at a university campus where they are admitted is needed. However, the risk of aggressive behavior over dominance incidences of vulnerable LGBTI communities thus gaining security over isolation, tends to be inaccurate. Peradventure, Beyer (2012) support that transformative

approaches are not adequately measured and equally creates a transfer of aggression, hatred and lack of concentration among students. However, Burns (2009) affirms that negative behavioral attitudes come out of unfair treatment and to bargain education for increase in participation and general commitment to love benefits against negative influences on their academic performance.

3.6.2 Different perspectives on embracing LGBTI communities

Simon, Aikins and Prinstein (2008)'s study found that socialization factors align with differences, which enclose adjustment of similarities among LGBTI communities, but it is difficult to provide security for their consciousness to collective belongingness. This study addressed interactive behaviour of students to understand how easy they can relate with LGBTI communities and help to maintain respect and show care against depressive factor of rejection of noticed sexuality. Bierman (2004) opens that depressive behavior symptoms emanate from peer rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus, and launch relational aggression and emergent victimization significantly causes changes to their concentration levels, over time.

Moreover, Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) noted that LGBTI communities experience difficulties socializing by having friends who could probably offer them total acceptance on their daily interactions at the university campus. Guasp (2011) asserts that absence of welcome of LGBTI communities acquires difficulty from interpersonal relationships, which masked the stereotype and prejudice among people in their environments. Stereotypes and prejudice pose unresolved problems for LGBTI communities to advance through social stress experiences (Graber & Sontag, 2008). Social stress emerges from interactions and relationships with others. Sometimes you feel like it's 'not you' but 'everyone else' and that is pretty much the definition of social stress. Savage (2010) affirms that social stress experiences by LGBTI communities' sexuality deprives them of friendly relationships with peers and accrue to social rejection. Romero-Canyas, Downey, Berenson, Ayduk and Kang (2010) revealed that social rejection pushes LGBTI communities out of acceptance of love from counterparts whose familiarity with them shield them from uncaring heterosexual peers against their security.

3.6.3 Insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities

Barker (2012) affirms that knowledge acquisition promotes management of the issues of sexuality-related discrimination, and provides intervention options through means of counselling for the victims to overcome such times of difficulty. Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012), contend that staffs should help students through inclusive education. They would gain knowledge by allocating time to listen to grievances on the sensitive nature of their experiences, leading to a moderation of attitudes of all students at a university campus. To ensure moderate attitudes, sufficient knowledge is needed to avoid mishaps and misunderstandings between LGBTI communities and heterosexuals, Molden and Finkel (2010) and Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) stated that balances made possible through moderate attitudes and to activate forgiveness of past wrongs and embracing a collective insight to propose a transformative approach could be beneficial to LGBTI communities while heterosexuals moderate their attitudes and characters. This means total acceptance that caters for equal treatment of all students for better future, freedom, peace, and to equip LGBTI communities against future challenges.

Haldeman (2012) shows that peer rejection and victimization due to insufficient knowledge deprives LGBTI communities of equal access of choice on their sexuality, thus perpetuating their low self-esteem. Robinson (2011) asserts that not enough knowledge is given to heterosexual students about LGBTI communities to provide them with flexible access to happiness against wrong perception of attitudes and behaviors. Barker (2012) affirms that knowledge acquisition promotes situational management on sexuality issues and thus provides intervention strategies to counsel the victims in times of difficulties. This assumes that lecturers and educators be available to share their expertise to support all students to have the courage in readiness for future challenges. LGBTI communities are inclusive in a transformative way of embracement at a university campus.

3.6.4 Limited spaces for debates/dialogues on LGBTI communities issues

At university campuses, there are not enough spaces that are available to encourage engagement with students that need to be educated, especially on sexuality education (Clark, 2012). Goransson and Nilholm (2014) unveil that varieties of activities were holistically structured to accommodate all students, while helpful for diversity awareness for all students without marginalization of any group to participate. DoE (2013) confirmed that there is the need for dialogues and debates that will accentuate the importance of inclusion of diversity.

Hall, Evans and Nixon (2013) suggest that dialogue and debate spaces be made available for interactions that promote peaceful co-existence among students. Diversity dialogues and debates that involve LGBTI communities' issues at a University campus should occur to improve awareness (Litvin, 2006). Booysen, Kelly, Nkomo and Steyn (2007) suggested that special attention be given to meetings related to inclusive education programmes to enlighten the entire university on the significance of embracing learning of individual's exploration through ecological systems insight on equal acceptance of individuals and to promote unity among all students.

3.6.5 University capacity to provide necessary intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities

To gain an indepth understanding of intervention preventive measures by the university could be taken seriously for a conducive teaching and learning environment for all. In other ways, Payne (2007) supports that in accordance with school rules, based on, if someone who is labelled as different sexual orientation, against acceptability within school's culture be excluded, disconnected and isolated from entire groups. Pyykonen (2012) further opines that, exclusion and isolation of LGBTI students is exacerbated by their inability to form close friendships with heterosexual counterparts and peers due to conflict of interest. Based on intolerance, according to Msibi (2012), he argues that teachers who impose invalid fear of homosexuals in their learners create such action that promotes LGBTI exclusion and isolation thus make it

difficult for these students to make friends with their heterosexual peers at schools and universities.

Bhana (2012) and Reygan (2013) concur that fear of homophobic abuse prevents heterosexual students from associating or socializing with LGBTI students on campus. This may intensify social exclusion for the LGBTI communities in a University campus. Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012) disagree, that teachers should mitigate students' exclusion leading to isolation among their peers despite the application of strategies within reach to embrace diversity in the classroom. The researcher agrees with Msibi (2012) that educators at times contribute indirectly to student's stigma especially LGBTI cases, and thus internalise their relationships among peers at school and university campus. Apendliender, Buchanan, McDougall and Sippola (2009) support that societal norms contend against human beliefs and practices. This may constitute jeopardization of students' academic performance.

McNulty (2013) supports that different personalities among students pose a competitive challenge on LGBTI communities and thereby help heterosexuals to be dominant on security provision to support diversity and encourage free individual participation towards community development, in the same vein. Barker (2012) emphasizes that unequal power tussles inflict a deliberate sentiment on the majority against a minority for their equal rights dividends. The researcher tried to figure out the ideological perspectives of the uniqueness that propels diversity embracement through activities to develop a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Moreover, Faull (2008) states clearly that inclusive policy can support inclusion of all groups at a university campus by displaying collective responsibilities. In line with Elechi, Morris and Schauer (2009), this emphasizes the force of ecological systems on student's day-to-day life at schools and universities.

3.6.6 Absence of campaigns and rallies to embrace LGBTI communities

It is imperative that intervention strategies be made to power this transformative approach that seeks to ensure a safe university campus for LGBTI communities – literature has emphasised anti-bullying policies, rallies and campaigns to this effect (Johnson, 2014; Kosciw et al. 2014; Kotch, 2014; Lozier & Beckman, 2012; McCormack, 2012; Molden & Finkel, 2010; Munson & Stelboun, 2013; Pyykonen, 2012; Republic of South Africa, 2011; Toomey et al. 2011; Stewart, 2010; Toomey & Russell, 2013). Lozier and Beckman (2012) and McCormack (2012) all suggest anti-bullying policies for implementation at all schools and universities, against homophobic attacks on students. Kotch (2014), Stewart (2010), Johnson (2014), concurred that teachers should be part of change that helps learners/students. It is also important to advocate for LGBTI alliances that will provide a supportive environment in case of crisis (Toomey & Russell, 2013; Toomey et al. 2011; Pyykonen, 2012; Molden & Finkel, 2010). This literature maintained, that awareness campaigns of LGBTI communities might empower and transform all students to embrace unity in diversity at university.

3.6.7 Religious beliefs against LGBTI communities' differences

Adamczyk and Pitt (2009), state that religiosity has posed a challenge for the acceptance of people's sexuality. This unfolds contradictions that society points at, at times to individual's assertions on a subject of sexuality which remains virtually different. Hence, contradictions are tantamount to no subject to any other as LGBTI communities' equal rights to choices of religion and beliefs unlike heterosexuals. Arch Bishop Desmond Tutu (1998), acknowledged that the indulgence of sexuality differentiation does not form its exclusion from the scriptural base, but anchored on Biblical law of forgiveness and acceptance for diversity and liberation through redemptive plans into God's family. Nonetheless, John (2017), in his lecture of hope for hopelessness, his message captured the entire family of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Intersex and Allies (LGBTQIA) said that it needs to handle issues related to LGBTQIA people with respect for humanity. John extends his teaching and has become part of daily discussions on the way we live in a civilized world today as

sociological changes, perceptions and human choices to life change. He therefore reconstructs that being homosexual does not mean any sociological problems, pointed that the RSA (2011), has committed to implement policies which are grounded on ecological systems to accommodate all people, protect and preserve legitimacy. In contrast, John (2017), asserts that someone tries to gain consciousness on a constant debate which extends violence among those who perceived homosexuality differently based on prejudice.

In practice, for LGBTI communities who strive to regain consciousness; The Bible states that “The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are an abomination unto the LORD thy God” (Deuteronomy 22:5, KJV). The Bible intends to give consciousness on behavioural part and draw the reader closer to normality. As such, LGBTI communities’ acceptance is often negotiated by the way people around them internalise religious beliefs and views that perceive their activities in the society they live. Munson and Stelboun (2013), state that conflicts impact on indoctrination and prejudice inherited, that LGBTI communities were different from heterosexual people according to their beliefs on normative principle. In contrast, norms and practices distinct worlds according to Fine and Spencer (2009) need to enhance social inclusivity and avoid isolation conflicts that emanated from indoctrination and prejudice of heterosexual against LGBTI communities at the university campus.

The researcher found a related doctrinal instict from cardinal point of Christian faith which is rooted in the Bible thus; **“For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life. For God sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him” (John 3:16-17, RSV)**. The researcher found that within these two verses, the word “loved” reveals the central point of God’s genuine kindness for humanity and care, to send his only son not to condemn the world against the misinterpretations given by believers today but to save them. So the researcher found that God’s love for the world continuously to be saved, as this wired within learning for humanity and maintain a circular ecological systems for all to enjoy a peaceful atmosphere within individual community.

3.6.8 Inconsistencies in policies regarding LGBTI communities

Clarke (2012) defines a transformative approach, as a drastic improvement of the present situation of events/experiences in a different paradigm. This asserts that a systems change be applied for betterment of previous imbalances left on policies, error negations and ascribes to beneficial means to ethical considerations on policy development. However, Haldeman (2012), states that ethical considerations on policy for practice stipulates to embrace LGBTI communities by supporting their experiences which channel towards a transformative approach to accept their connectivity with peers at a the university campus.

The White Paper on Foreign Policy (2011, p.35), supports that “Department and its Missions abroad will enhance their role in providing strategic information on global developments to all stakeholders, providing strategic guidance on policy options, and managing and facilitating South African activities and engagements abroad in order to deliver tangible outcomes for the betterment of the lives of South Africans”. This supports that betterment of life activities is maintained while there are guided policies on security of environment which allows diversity and strengthens peaceful engagement towards the sustainence of harmonious living among diverse people. The researcher agrees with Jacob (2013), who states that police should create a safe environment for LGBTI communities and individuals against abuses, but not at the expense of others. Nonetheless, there should be adequate application of transformative approach of inclusion into the university systems for the benefits of LGBTI communities and every student.

3.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has discussed literature by exploring the current situation regarding approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a University campus; examining the need for a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus; exploring key elements (thrusts) of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus; examining circumstances/conditions under which a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus may be successfully implemented; and identifying hindrances/barriers to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and suggest how these may be circumvented. The next chapter will be the methodology aspect of this study.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA GENERATION FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter discussed literature review couching this study. Literature review of chapter three followed the objectives and critical questions appropriately on a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. In addition, research questions were answered in the previous chapter, except the question of a proposed a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus which later answered in Chapter 8. This chapter focuses on research design and methodology; Participatory Action Research as an approach; ethical considerations; the profile of the research site, data generation; data analysis and chapter summary. The next section discusses research design and methodology.

4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The research design is a strategy of inquiry that moves from the underlying assumptions to research design, and data generation (Myers, 2009). This forms a plan to achieve rich data and appropriate findings in accordance with a qualitative study. Research design depends on the nature of the study. This study tries to provide an in-depth understanding for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011), Bertram and Christiansen (2014) supported that qualitative research seeks to explore a particular group of students and not intend to generalize it over the whole population due to different nature of their sexuality as LGBTI communities respectively.

Creswell (2013), De Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Strydom (2011) supported that there is a distinction to way which quantitative and qualitative researchers view the research nature design. This indicates that qualitative paradigm requires the research design to be more than a set of formulas discoveries and the qualitative researcher is rooted with understanding and explanation with naturalistic observation (Stake, 2010). Neuman (2014) further contends, rather than controlled measurement, with the subjective exploration of reality from the perspective of an insider, as critique to

outsider predominant in the quantitative paradigm. Nonetheless, the preceding argument, according to Chilisa (2012) and Chimirri (2015), argued, that design practices and design research, suffered a methodological paradigm shift towards collaboration with human materials zealous to benefit from a design. In this study, a qualitative paradigm shifts afore mentioned stands to collaborate with human materials that are to benefit from the design and the study is concerned to gain in-depth understanding access on explanatory perspective of the insider to the outsider. Based on the study value, those who envisaged benefiting maximally have to work along the researcher as a prospective research team.

4.2.1 Qualitative approach

This study used qualitative research approach to understand the phenomenon under study. Bogdan and Biklen (2007, p. 274) refer qualitative research as “an approach to social science research that emphasizes collecting descriptive data in natural settings, using inductive thinking, and emphasizes understanding the subjects point of view” whereas Glesne’s (2011, p. 293) spells out qualitative approach; “a type of research that focuses on qualities such as words or observations that are difficult to quantify and lend themselves to interpretation or deconstruction”.

De Vos et al. (2011, p. 309) and Merriam (2009), recognise that the qualitative research approach should be characterised by objectivism, interpretivism and constructionism. This seems clear that participatory action research aimed at making the best exploration of qualitative approach on the subject, which might determine its findings. Furthermore, De Vos et al. (2011, p. 310) state that the constructionism approach believes that there is no truth out there, only a narrative on reality which changes incessantly, and that reality is socially and personally constructed. As discussed in *Section 2.2.1.10*, Participatory action research is used in this study because the theoretical framework for this study is ecological systems, and PAR supports that knowledge should be socially constructed in participatory and this kept the research team to be actively involved in the study. Kumar (2014, p. 122) confirms that a research design serves as a roadmap that navigates the research journey through finding possible answers to research critical questions.

Merriam (2009) and Stake (2010) epitomise the central characteristics of qualitative research discuss include the followings; dependability, transferability, confirmability and acceptability. Glesne (2011) avers that researchers maintained a humanistic orientation which is tactically sceptical, analytical and introspective for good results on, qualitative research. According to Kumar (2014, p. 122), “a research design is a procedure with an operational plan that details what and how different methods and procedures are to be applied during the research process”. Further, Kumar (2014, p. 123) asserts that a research design is a plan through which the researcher decides how information will be generated from the participants (research team), how participants (research team) will be selected, how the information gathered should be analysed and how the findings should be conveyed.

4.2.2 Sampling techniques

The sampling in a qualitative research implies a choice for researchers to adhere to an appropriate tool which could couch the design study by enable participant to answer critical questions of the study (Gentles, Charles, Ploeg, & McKibbon, 2015). Charmaz (2014) maintains that instrumentation principles attract qualitative sampling of participants and accurate utilization of data until saturation is achieved. Based on Patton (2015) maintains that purposive sampling enhance the choice that form within discipline of research on the assumption to maximize a desired result through individual insights to envisage findings, normally happens between the interviewer and interviewee of a specific research.

Robinson (2014) opines that purposive and convenience sampling methods are an alternative explorative medium of qualitative research. Therefore, the researcher subscribed to purposive sampling to recruit his research team for the study. To gain participants' attention, the researcher firstly placed an advertisement on the notice boards at the campus on the nature of the study, stating that anyone who is interested to participate is free to contact them through email or phone. Through the advert, the researcher got a student who, through snowball sampling led him to four other members from the LGBTI communities who were willing to participate in the study. In support to the participants' recruitment process and in line with Krista and Mark (2010), who argue that a participant serves a prominent role as they can recruit other

participants in a sensitive type of study such that participants were difficult to find. The researcher identified one member of LGBTI communities to help getting other members for this study (Krista & Mark, 2010). Other participants were selected based on the assumption that they would add value to this study.

The researcher decided to allow only those who agreed to cooperate and adhere with the terms to participate in the study, as recommended by Palys and Atchison (2008). The tools used to gather information include focus group discussions, collages, dialogues, conversations and meetings. The researcher audiotaped the meetings, conversations and dialogues in order to generate rich data. The study participants were gathered through snowball sampling and convenience techniques, meaning that the results of this research can be applicable to the same population size. However, transferability of the results is possible for similar groups or contexts. The researcher found that with Bertram and Christiansen (2014) that a good qualitative research possess' basic rigors which include transferability, confirmability, dependability and credibility. On the importance by Silverman (2013) that states that research can be verified through triangulating evidence on the process of qualitative data process and management. It is therefore imperative to ensure that the coordination of the study follows the authentic process of qualitative research, as a researcher must maintain a subjective participation role.

4.2.3 Selection of participants

The study took place in one of the tertiary institutions in South Africa. In this study, the selection of participants involved those at the university and outside. Therefore, the selection of participants for this study was anchored on Bertram and Christiansen (2014) who emphasise research data selection procedures for sampling methods by acknowledging purposive and convenience sampling techniques in qualitative research. Van Manen (2014) states that the term sample should not refer to an empirical sample as a subset of a population. Yin (2014) contends that a sample requires categorization by selection, to offer clarity of their representation in the study. However, participant selection should have a clear rationale and fulfil a specific purpose related to the research question, which is why qualitative methods are commonly described as 'purposive' (Collingridge & Gantt 2008). As such the

researcher recruited participants for this study through purposive sampling in order to get individuals from the LGBTI communities as well as heterosexual participants. The total number of participants was 17. There were (5) participants from the LGBTI communities within the university; (3) Lecturers, (5) heterosexual students, one (1) SRC member, (1) LGBTI representative from outside the university, one (1) student Counsellor and development practitioner, as well as one on campus faith-based community representative. Only those who were willing and available were part of the study. The selected (17) participants were based on the assumption that they would add value in terms of their input to this study because the LGBTI communities' issues are not in isolation but involve others around them.

4.2.4 Critical paradigm

The critical paradigm is an approach which tries to examine and understand a phenomenon under study in a specific way by getting to the root of the concerns such as moral, inequality and social justice for emancipation which could be of analytical importance. Le Roux (2015) unveils that the critical paradigm tries to discover the hidden truth about a particular context. Jackson (2013), Hammett and Hoogendoorn (2012) argue that gaining access to an in-depth understanding of a subject entails deconstruction or decolonisation of knowledge to clearly subscribe to the reality around the phenomenon. As such, Higgs (2016) supports that knowledge unfolds from the reality of an individual perspective. This affirms that to understand problems one needs to centre research on individual interpretations of the problem. King (2015) disagrees that circumstances warrant argument that a remostly related similar to human rationality and which demands subjectivity to challenge an instance of precedencies.

However, Pillay, (2016) supports that conscious precedences align on antecedents of individual on current situational incidences as address to be differently handled. Terrell (2012) opens that intensive probing into a problem attracts change based on critiques and rigors. Therefore, this supports that critical paradigm rigors, critiques emerge on analytical events as socially constructed towards a transformation within the system (Ruggunan & Spiller, 2014) for system or human change and development. Transformative/critical paradigm enlighten to collective responsibilities to participate

actively for a change. This corresponds with King (2015) and Pillay (2016) that the critical paradigm is one of the most interesting tools for an in-depth construction of a transformative model to societal issues.

4.3 DATA GENERATION METHODS

The researcher applied both discussion protocols for focus groups, one-on-one deliberate interviews and scripts writing methods.

While, Kumar (2014) argues that before a researcher should begin generation of information from main potential research team, it therefore imperative to make sure that the participants were agreeable to share information with the researcher; participants must understand what is expected of them to do and must have adequate information on the study sought. The researcher thereby ensured that the research team who participated in the study was agreeable to participate and share information, as they were informed about what was expected of them and briefed about their active roles to play and the information required of them, as confirmed by Goodnough (2011). The participants take active role play in the study since researcher was undergoing study with them but not on them, mutual interaction was in place on the effectiveness of the study. Data generating tools for this study includes; interviews, deliberate dialogues, script writing and whatsapp chat from participants in accordance to De Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Strydom (2011) assumption of authentic data generation processes. However, research team were allocated 40 minutes minimum for the taking of data which were processed thereafter.

4.4 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Concerning ethical issues; the researcher was aware of the need to respect the concept of human rights, dignity and the privacy of participants during the course of this research, and after. According to De Vos et al. (2011, p. 113), researchers should adhere to sensitive ethical issues and explicitly state that data should never be obtained at the expense of human beings. McCarron (2013) confirms that participants have the right to participate or withdraw from the project at any time. Kumar (2014) states that there are many ethical issues to consider concerning research teams and

the researchers. In addition, Wiles (2012) supports the importance of ethical procedures serves to guarantee participants easy participation.

On this account, the researcher intends to adhere to the general recommendations to procure their consents by publicity via university notice boards, thereafter send out the consents forms to all participants. The permission to conduct the study from the university was sought and granted within a short time. All participants of this study ranged from 18-60 years old, so there will be no parental/guardians' permission since the participants were all mature enough to make their own decisions and suggestions by themselves. Kumar (2014) disagrees that there are many ethical issues to consider concerning research teams and researchers, while De Vos, Strydom, Fouché and Strydom (2011, p. 113) avowed that research should rely on mutual trust, acceptance, cooperation, promises and well-accepted conventions to fulfill the expectations between all research teams in a research project. Therefore, consents of the research team be sought, therefore, question of confidentiality ensure pseudonyms usage instead of real names for any transcriptions, aimed at shielding privacy and identity of participants. Guillemin and Heggen (2009) suggest that the necessary procedure be qualitative research, which advocates well informed participants of the study to permit free access on authentic findings. Otherwise, the scientific nature of the study will not be real and otherwise can jeopardize the study.

The issues of anonymity in a qualitative study is very important to seek permissions from the appropriate organization involved such as school/ministry/participants. Regarding anonymity, Miller, Mauthner and Jessop, (2012) proposed guiding steps to ensure that research maintains ethical principles by observing anonymity, informed consents and confidentiality. In addition, Murphy and Dingwall (2007) confirm that participants need be informed and reassured by the researcher that confidentiality will be maintained. Guillemin and Heggen (2009) explain that free negotiation between researcher and participants is considered important for the effectiveness of the study.

Therefore, the researcher requests that the research team at university only provide relevant responses and answer critical questions on the importance of this study. Participants are free to give their views and opinions. Lastly, the true responses to design a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University

campus, be audiotaped from focus groups and according to their chosen instrument of data generation. After all, the generation of data from the participants, the researcher will extend feedback to the participants one by one giving them manuscripts of their responses to confirm if is accurate and concise, and thereafter to the LGBTI communities, after proofreading the manuscripts. The researcher will give a copy of the thesis as a participatory benefit and a surprise to LGBTI communities as appreciation once the study is completed.

In this study, the researcher gave out consent forms which were signed by the all participants (research teams), there are no parental consents to sign in this regard as all participants are of mature age of (18-60), and capable to make their decisions without interference of parents or guardians. The researcher ensured that research teams participated spontaneously and willingly. Participants were guaranteed of anonymity, confidentiality, and gained the right to withdraw freely from participation in the study at any stage, and given liberal access to support with their interest on particular issues of dialogues to embracing LGBTI communities. The participants were not given money to participate in the research project, however, researchers could incur minor expenses to refresh after research and alternatively transport participants on research project purposes. The researcher was not biased during interaction with the research teams, findings generated are strictly ingenuous and friendless used the information for research purposes. The researcher debriefed the research teams when the research project was confirmed as completed. In future, the researcher will by no means indulge to use any data generated in this research for any other purposes than to take excerpts for research publications.

However, this research was conducted in an ethically answerable way and data was not generated at the expense of the research team. The gatekeeper letter of permission was applied for and given by the University of KwaZulu-Natal School of Education. Ethical clearance approval was granted by the University of KwaZulu-Natal Higher Research Ethics Committee (see Appendix 1). Participants were guaranteed of anonymity, confidentiality, and were told that they were free to withdraw from the study at any stage. The participants were not given money to participate in the research. The rights of the participants were safeguarded at all times during the research project. Participants' names were not be used anywhere in the study, and

instead pseudonyms were used. All the students (participants) signed consent forms (examples of the consent forms signed by participants (research teams), attached as *Appendix 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22*. All the students (participants) signed consent forms, attached as specified above, accordingly. That this was free and voluntary participation for the study are attached in the appendix). This study unveiled that sensitive research of this kind be flexible and allow anonymity like answering by writing, whatsapp chat and body language, could be helpful to generate more indepth rich data which ensure originality and truthfulness.

Table 4.1 RESEARCH TEAM DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Serial No:	Gender	Age	Academic qualification	Working experience	Professional qualification
1.	Male	24	BEd 3rdyr	Null	BEd FET
2.	Female	24	BEd 4 th yr	Null	BEd edu
3.	Female	21	BEd 2 nd yr	Null	BEd Mgt
4.	Male	22	BEd 3 rd yr	Null	BEd Sc.
5.	Male	21	BEd 4 th yr	2yrs	BEd ECD
6.	Male	24	BEd 4 th yr	3yrs	BEd His
7.	Male	27	BEd 3 rd yr	1yr	BEd Commerce
8.	Female	24	BEd 2 nd yr	Null	BEd Social justice
9.	Male	21	BEd 4 th yr	2yrs	BEd Bus.
10.	Male	20	BEd 3 rd yr	Null	BEd Edpsy
11.	Male	47	Lecturer	8yrs	MEd
12.	Female	36	lecturer	6yrs	MEd ECD
13.	Male	50	Lecturer	9yrs	PhD

14.	Male	23	BEd. Hons	1yr	BEd
15.	Male	38	Social worker	5yrs	Dip.
16.	Male	22	BEd 3 rd yr	Nil	Bed
17.	Male	29	Staff	6yrs	Med

The above table was limited to the brief demographic data representation of the research team for this study according to serial number, gender, age, academic qualification, working experiences and professional qualification.

4.5 PROFILES OF RESEARCH TEAM

Below are the profiles of all research team.

4.5.1 LGBTI communities

All the participants listed below are students who identify as LGBTI.

LGBTI Co (1) He attended 90% of the research project meetings.

LGBTI Co (2) She attended 70% of the research project meetings.

LGBTI Co (3) She attended 68% of the research meetings.

LGBTI Co (4) He attended 85% of the research project meetings.

LGBTI Co (5) He attended 95% of the research meetings.

4.5.2 Heterosexual Students

All the participants below are students who identify as heterosexual.

Stu (1) He attended 98% of the research project meetings.

Stu (2) He attended 87% of the research project meetings.

Stu (3) She attended 90% of the research meetings.

Stu (4) He attended 85% of the research project meeting.

Stu (5) He attended 95% of the research meetings.

4.5.3 University Lecturers

All the participants below are lecturers at the university.

University Lecturer 1 (UL1) He attended 100% of the meetings.

University Lecturer 2 (UL2) She attended 5% of the meetings.

University Lecturer 3 (UL3) He attended 11% of the meetings.

4.5.4 University SRC

The student representative council participant, known as **SRC (Gi)** He attended 95% of the meetings.

4.5.5 LGBTI community from outside university

The pseudonym used is **LGBTI COU 1**. He attended 98% of the meetings.

4.5.6 On campus faith thrusts

The On University Campus Faith Thrusts (**OCFT 1**) He attended 96% of the research project meetings.

4.5.7 University Students services practitioner

The University Students services practitioner (**USSP 1**) He attended 75% of the research project meetings.

4.6 RECRUITMENT OF RESEARCH TEAM

A letter asking for research participants was posted on the notice boards across the university campus. The LGBTI communities, heterosexual students, lecturers, SRC, on campus faith thrust and Student service practitioner agreed that the university campus could be used for interviews; the individual from the LGBTI community outside the university chose to conduct the meeting at his place of comfort. All participants signed consent forms prior to participation in the study.

4.6.1 Organizing the first meeting

The researcher sought ethical clearance from the University of KwaZulu-Natal Research Committee. An ethical clearance certificate was given as a full approval to conduct study by the University of KwaZulu-Natal Research Committee, attached code; *Appendix 4* and having received the ethical clearance certificate, the researcher has already secured permission to conduct a study at a university campus as a gatekeeper from the University of KwaZulu-Natal, attached code; *Appendix 3*. Based on the approval to conduct a study received, the researcher sent invitations to participate to all research teams, and consent forms to research teams, no parental/guardian consent was required, because all participants were above 18 years and they are able to make their own decisions. The LGBTI communities, Students, Lecturers, On campus faith thrust, SRC, students service practitioner and LGBTI communities from outside university were called telephonically to set the date that would be suitable for research teams, based on their schedule to attend the first research meeting. The proposed dates and times were communicated to other research teams from outside the university campus. A date that was suitable for everyone was set as a date for the first research project meeting. The invitation for the first research meeting, with the date, venue, time and agenda, sent to all the research team by emails and whatapp chatroom platform. The research project meetings proceedings are discussed below.

4.6.2 Research project meetings

According to Kemmis, McTaggart and Nixon (2014), participatory action research was opened so that researcher curiosity to approach research teams without intrusion against mutual interaction for effective project. In contrast, Kearney, Wood and Zuber-Skerritt (2013) maintained that free participation between researcher and research team contribute to the bias from discussion and perhaps serves a basis of conclusion. The researcher concur with De Vos et al. (2011, p. 404) who point out that PAR approaches are interactive and initiatives to integrate the research teams, thereby suffer and the researcher is not seen as dominant in the whole process. In this study, the records of discussions, dialogues and focus groups took audiotaping and field notes used in support to analyse findings and conclusions that will perpetuate transformative participation to ensure a change (Camarota & Fine, 2008). In addition, Kemmis, McTaggart and Nixon (2014) stated of the significance for selecting

data generation technique for a specific study restricted to the nature, therein qualitative or quantitative.

On data generation technique, McArthur (2012) affirms that data generating techniques that perpetuate authenticity in PAR include community forums, nominal groups, deliberate dialogues, focus groups, storytelling and workshops. Community forums, also known as community meetings, make provision for larger groups of not less than 50 participants depending on selection purposes. Nominal groups differentiation forms a small-group technique, usually around 8 members and is used when the needs or problems arises. This ensures community's self-survey techniques. Workshops usually provide for a bigger crowd than the community forum, but specifically target interest group and normally take place after some preliminary research has been completed. Focus groups are used when a small selected group of 5 to 10 members is drawn together to apply their expertise, opinions and contributions to a specific problem. Deliberate dialogues assume that group members share their own story by making valuable solutions and demonstrate their views on the subject.

Neuman (2014, p. 471) states that focus groups accrue special techniques to generate data through taking of voice notes in a group setting. Whereas, Kumar (2014, p. 156) postulates that "focus groups" are a form of a strategy in qualitative research whereby attitudes, opinions or perceptions towards an issue, product, service or programme are explored through a free and open discussion between members of a group and the researcher. Focus groups, according to Chilisa (2012), facilitated through group discussions that the researcher raises issues or asks questions that stimulate discussion among the team members. From data-generation techniques identified by McArthur (2012), this study used focus groups and scripts writing on participatory action data-generation technique. The focus groups, as discussed by Neuman (2014, p. 471), were found irrelevant and therefore, could not be used as a technique for this study. In this study, the researcher prefers to follow focus groups as discussed by Kumar (2014, p. 156) and De Vos et al. (2011, p. 502-503) that conversed focus groups as group of research team corroboration to apply their knowledge, experience and expertise towards a specific problem. This application of knowledge thus provides attitudes, opinions or perceptions on an issue, product, service, or programme

explored through a free and open discussion between research team member and the researcher. The next section discusses the first research project meeting.

4.6.2.1 First research project meeting

The first research project meeting took place at the research site on the date planned as per invitation, notification by email and whatsapp chat platform. The researcher and research team were present at the first meeting. Research teams include; LGBTI communities, students, Lecturers, SRC, Students service representative, On campus faith thrusts, and LGBTI communities from outside university. The LGBTI communities were fully in attendance and students also attend. All the participants attended the first meeting excluding the one lecturer, SRC representative, the Student services practitioner and the outside LGBTI representative; Lecturers; only one of them attend due to other commitments. SRC did not attend but sent message ahead of time, on campus faith thrust attended while LGBTI communities from outside university did not attend with no apology. The student's service practitioner was not in attendance but sent message of absence. The researcher found that the turnover is encouraging to suggest and agree on a date/time for the next meetings. The researcher asked their opinion to have all the interactive meetings recorded and all agreed to effect. The researcher asked to research team to submit their consent forms immediately they completed them. The proceedings began after the researcher obtained permission to record the session. The researcher welcomed all the researcher team and introduced everyone. The research topic, aims and objectives of the study were discussed fleetingly. The research team discussed how they would contribute to the project in relation to the aims and objectives of the study.

At the end of the first meeting, it becomes the researcher's responsibility to make sure that every participant fit in their part and to take in continuation from first meeting to the end of the study. However, the plan drawn, each team member's needs and availability considered, such as UL (2) who stated that he is unavailable as he had a lecture, which ended at three o'clock, and the times for meetings accommodated him. The dates proposed by the research team and checked whether the dates were suitable to research team before finalized.

4.6.2.2 Second research project meeting

The second research meeting was very different compared to what was planned. Much of the team did not attend. The researcher made a Whatsapp group to communicate with the participants. From the feedback from the participants, it seemed as though the groups wanted to meet separately. At this juncture, the research team suggested rescheduling the meetings to one-one meetings. The researcher agreed. The new dates were circulated through our Whatapp chat platform.

Before the end of August 2018

Table 4.2: Research plans

Date	Time	Activity	Responsible person
13 th August 2018	13:00pm- 13:30pm	Only two attended Meetings changes	Researcher/ research team
15 th August 2018	11:30am- 14:30pm	Meetings agreement Day	Researcher/ research team
17 th August 2018	10:30am- 11:30am	Data generation By attendance	Researcher/ research team
21 st August 2018	11:00am- 13:00pm	Data generation By attendance	Researcher/ research team
22 nd August2018	08:30am- 12:30pm	Data generation By attendance	Researcher/ research team
23 rd August 2018	11:00am- 12:00pm	Data generation By attendance	Researcher/ research team
End of research project	Not stipulated	Debriefing on the research project.	Researcher/ research team

Reflection after meeting summary

LGBTI co (4): Where are the people in the house? Sir...do you think we can start or what you think? Are people sent messages of their lateness or absent? Let hear please to know the next thing to do. Thanks.

Stu (1) SH5: *I think we should communicate ourselves if we really ready for this...three of us out seventeen cannot do anything. Maybe we can change what might not make it easy for others.*

OCFT: let see how many are we for few mins more, then we go, im I making any sense?

Researcher: Based on this signal of our team not present now, let wait for ten minutes for them and if they do not, we can decide and communicate them on platform so that there won't be anyone wasting time. All of us can have it the way we like as we are fully part of this study. At last we agreed the following dates **15th**, **17th**, **21**, **22nd** and **23th** and communicated others to make their suggestions which were in support to cooperate together as it nature participatory on date but features at different times.

Table: 4:3 Reflexive essay

Research team	Reflexive essay
SH3 – 17/08/2018	<p>“It was very good section and it should help bring about the understanding about LGBTI communities and things that need to be done to ensure safety and free and the LGBTI”.</p> <p>He suggested to ask few more questions and explore different views from different people; then start from the topic and arrange the essays and shows.</p>
SH2	<p>“Today’s session was good, I wrote what I feel about the LGBTI communities and there were some good questions where I had to respond freely”.</p>
SH3 & SH2	<p>In contrast to (SH3) advice, (SH2) affirms that “more questions can be asked about the LGBTI specifically and also we have to be asked how LGBTI feel about us ill-treating them, or our behavior towards them”.</p>
SRC 20/08/2018	<p>SRC applauded the importance of this study while making a note to consider other disciplines as participants for the study, to provide more different perspectives, views and</p>

	opinions to research questions raised to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.
SH4	SH4 pointed to the urgency of this study for the creation of more awareness from the entire university for insightful intervention to embracing LGBTI communities in a safe university environment.
SH1 21/08/2018	SH1 ; “Today’s session was very interesting. It is not everyday where you find people willing to talk about LGBTI communities, but it also makes you aware that the environment around you as you know it is change slowly. This also gives courage and reassurance to LGBTI communities that they are being recognized and slowly being accepted for who they are”. She maintained that “This session was both decent and attractive in terms of approach and invitation to being more open about the topic about LGBTI communities”.
USSP 22/08/2018	USSP reported “I felt relaxed and free to speak about real issues that affect the LGBTI community. I think it important for such platforms to occur to answer issues affecting the LGBTI community are addressed”. Also, Lesendreigh added that “perhaps provide clips and pictures that get though process activated. By seeing clips and pictures one begins to a feat the pain/frustration/need for support towards LGBTI community members”.
UL1	UL1 stated: “The session was great and informative. At least it informs the respondent to have a critical reflection on the issues around LGBTI community as well as on our society at large”. However, UL1 suggested that “From my perspective, I do not see anything wrong with the session. However, I will suggest restructuring of some of the interview questions. This is because some of the questions are overlapping each other”.

SH3	SH3 reflected that it “was very insightful and got me thinking about the different communities on campus and how they interact with one another”. However, noted that “some of the questions seemed to be pretty much the same, but other than that nothing needed to be improved on”.
LGBTI Co 2	LGBTI Co 2 reported that “the session was very informative. It was great seeing other LGBTI community member expressing similar thoughts”. LGBTI Co 2 also added that “To involve other people outside the LGBTI communities to hear point of view concerning the community. I feel as if more information as to how to transform the campus/university would be received/gathered”.
LGBTI Co 3	LGBTI Co 3: “Today’s session was very lively and I enjoyed it because I had to open up how I as a gay person feel And also raise my opinions on how to educate university students about LGBTI community. Also, I think we should invite more heterosexual people/straight people by saying this I mean they can learn more from our session and understand how we feel”.
SH5 23/08/2018	SH5: “Today’s session taught me that you mustn’t judge a person by his/her behavior, gender or the way he looks. It showed me that everyone is important in his way. To make this session more attractive, I think it should be runned as a debate or talk show”.

Consolidated meeting: Date is not yet finalized after the study completion, to discuss the final feedbacks with research team.

4.7 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was used as a data analysis instrument for this study in order to ensure the originality and authenticity of the study (Franzese, 2007). This

involves looking beyond the existing studies and strategically mapping out a unique theory of discovery to improve on incoming research thus logically advancing social transformation and wellbeing. Originality and authenticity to me, is structuring of a study in a total different way; “using a framework that no researcher has ever used; drawing a study specifically as a study appears by the findings without adding or subtracting data collections to make the study more attractive, otherwise”, there is no originality and authenticity, based on Anney (2014) and Gunawan (2015) maintained that research worthiness could be identified through its reflexivity nature; transferability, confirmability and dependability for transformation. Otherwise, extend beyond recycling and policing of previous studies.

Then, Gonsalvez (2013, p. 49) asserted that “CDA” is based on the social theory of language, which states that discourse is an important element in socialization which is based on communicative and interactive practices in a network of individuals, and the goals and purpose of socializing are achieved through discourse”. While, Fairclough (2013) professed that CDA be defined as a fundamental lens that is concerned with issues of discrimination, power and control, as manifested in language, and CDA aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, and legitimized by language use (or in discourse).

In congruence, Darder (2015) and Greener (2011) stated that CDA served as an interdisciplinary approach on textual study and aims to avert abuses of power promoted by those texts. Therefore, researcher teams are freely in a position to decide how their information is transmitted to the researcher, either by voice taking or textually. Texts are interpreted by analyzing linguistic or semiotic factors in the larger social and political contexts of circulation. In addition, Dieronitou (2014, p. 12) stated, “CDA” attempts to bring together text analysis with contemporary social, political and cultural theory and involves evaluation of force, power and relations in formation within the ever-changing, non-discursive global processes, such as economic, political and cultural processes. Based on the preceding discussions, Huckin, Andrus and Clary-Lemon (2012) concur that “CDA” often is used to analyze data since it relates in accordance to Bronnfrennbrener ecological systems (the theoretical framework for this study) and PAR (as data generation method for this study). Ecological systems theory, PAR and CDA conceptualized based on a discourse of social component, through

emergence of transformative and democratic practices concerned with embracing structural relationships to normalize dominance, discrimination, power and control among university students. Ecological systems theory, PAR and CDA deal with contemporary social, political and cultural theory and evaluation of force, power and relations within a transformative approach on global praxis such as economic, political and cultural processes. The researcher concurs with Gonsalvez (2013, p. 50) and Huckin et al. (2012, p. 108) that Ecological systems theory, PAR and CDA discourse negotiates power among individuals involved in the discursive process towards transformative approach.

According to Rahimi and Riasati (2011), discourse analysis approaches methods seeking to identify hegemony and emancipate marginalized individuals and ideas. In congruence, Dieronitou (2014, p. 12) and Oliver (2010) averred that CDA formed part of emancipatory critical social science, which determine a transformative platform to the achievement of a just social order through a critique of dialogues. Moreover, Gonsalvez (2013, p. 46) purported that “CDA is a way of understanding the meanings of the texts in order to determine areas of inequality, domination and marginalization, and discourse cannot only shape society, but it can also reproduce or recreate societies; it is often used to expose inequities, domination and outright oppressions”. Based on the preceding discussions, the researcher contends that CDA is aimed at emancipating the marginalised, by encouraging their engagement in a discourse in order to reshape the society. The emancipation nature of CDA suits the transformative aim of Ecological systems theory and PAR.

This aspect of the study has been themed based on the data findings that unfold within the subject explored as grounded by Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 78), Alholjailan (2012, p. 40) maintain that thematic analysis helps researcher to give credibility to flexibility on a research phenomenon and ensure that themes enhance analytical methods to provide clearer interpretation for the audience. The researcher found it helpful to apply this for adequate clarification and gain maximum understanding of this study.

The researcher found that these methods of data collection could give insights to develop different means that may be used interchangeably within the study premise like; script writings, body language interpretations and Whatsapp chat data to avoid researcher grounded on the project.

4.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter focused on research design and methodology for this study. PAR was discussed as an approach, along with the critical paradigm, sampling techniques, ethical considerations, the profile of the research site, data generation, and feedback from the meetings of the research team, as well as data analysis. The next chapter based on an introduction, data presentation, interpretation, and concluding remarks.

CHAPTER FIVE

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION ON A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter has focused on research design and methodology for this study. PAR were used as an approach, critical paradigm, ethical considerations, the profile of the research site, the profiles of research team, the researcher's background, data generation, extensively discussed during the meetings with the research team, as well as data analysis were discussed. This chapter established on the introduction, research objectives, data presentation, and interpretation, and chapter summary. This chapter looked at research objectives, data presentation, and interpretation based on research objectives, as well as chapter summary. The next section re-echoes the research objectives as discussed in Section 3.1 because this chapter discussed with regard to data generated.

5.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

As discussed on page 5, section 1.3, the aims and objectives of this study is to propose a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and the precise objectives of the study are:

To explore and explain the current situation regarding approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

To examine the need for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

To explore key elements (thrusts) of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus

To examine circumstances/conditions under which a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus may be successfully implemented.

To identify hindrances/barriers to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and suggest how these may be circumvented.

Therefore, these research objectives will be used to present, analyse and interpret data generated, for this study. The next section explores and explains the first research objective: to explore and explain the current situation regarding approaches to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

5.3 THE CURRENT SITUATION REGARDING TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACHES TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The discussions, from our general meetings to explore the current status of a transformative approach emanated from the data findings from alternatives perspectives from research team as unravel hereunder. As discussed earlier, in Section 3.2.1, pg. 66, (cf 3.2.1) noted the school climate regarded as the school improvement strategy aimed to promote a safer, supportive, and more inclusive learning environment for all students (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). This is in connection with research team; UL1 Donchido stated a way to make students enhance the co-existence among themselves at the classroom. Kosciw, Palmer, Kull and Greytak (2013), have demonstrated the negative impacts of peer victimisation on LGBTI students which could lead to psychological problems and poorer academic outcomes. Responses from participants are included below:

LGBTI Co 2: being of LGBTI member do not make me comfortable ...at times other student talk harshly to me like you don't look like it...what do you want to gain there? And so on...

LGBTI Co1: being LGBTI member to my peers does not make me feel good at all...its make me bad.

LGBTI Co 3: it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friends even among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right.

As stated earlier, Dirkx (2006) proposes that transformative approach helps LGBTI communities to learn with heterosexual students to use the contexts of their lives experiences to construct and reconstruct personal meaning for future empowerment. Bajaj (2011) argues that transformative approach is a paradigm shift from

transmissivity to a transformative state that enables all students to consider changes as a tools to appreciate unity in diversity among all students at a University. Illeris (2014) support that transformative enjoin students to abstain from horrific environmental states that can negatively inflict damage to others' future and strive to care for others' development. This spells out the current situation thus:

5.3.1 Hostile university climate for LGBTI communities

One of the major atmosphere at the university campus is to examine the above headings as found in chapter 3, section (cf 3.2.1), and the research team extracts said feedback from the participants on the environment at university is included below:

LGBTIOC: I have heard issues the LGBTI+, but not necessarily asking for my help but rather seeking advice re: coming out and being assaulted...Most issues the LGBTI+ concern safety, safety in and off campus (in residents).

LGBTI Co1: being LGBTI member to my peers does not make me feel good at all...its make me bad.

SRC (Gi): yes...we have heard numerous cases of LGBTI communities at a university campus...in office.

OCFT: Sincerely to be true in talking, as I knew on the campus because I act drama and poetry....majority students do show discriminating against gay and lesbian that happen to be around them. So this makes some gay and lesbian to feel helpless whenever they abuse then or call them different names. I can say that despite what media awareness and TV soapies – students like to act out against LGBTI communities in their own ways. To me, the attitudes of heterosexual students is from act of hatred, background and beliefs against homosexuality.

Stu 3 (Mr. Lukhozi): Not a close friend, we were doing Teaching Practices together. During break time we used to eat together and our files together.

LGBTI Co 2: being of LGBTI member do not make me comfortable ...at times other student talk harshly to me like you don't look like it...what do you want to gain there? And so on...

UL1 (*Donchido*): *I have noticed one kind of like...but not lead to any abuse...one student who is LGBTI...in fact...when student from LGBTI was responded to question...everyone was calm as student responded...so... that is all I've seen...so far...and I have not seen discrimination of LGBTI communities. I was happy when LGBTI communities responds in the classroom...even the entire class clap for them.*

LGBTI outside campus (LGBTIOC), on campus faith thrust (OCFT), and LGBTI Co2 confirmed the hostile state of the university campus for LGBTI communities. This was supported by Student Representative Council (SRC; Gi) that various cases were reported to their office. The researcher concurs with Ileris (2014) that a transformative approach is needed to address these challenging incidences against LGBTI community to provide security to embrace them at a university campus.

5.3.2 Tacit and subtle rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus by peers and staffs

It is also important to look at social marginalisation as it appears that educators were indirectly discriminating against LGBTI communities at schools and universities. McCormack (2012), (c f 3.2.2) research has demonstrated that LGBTI students tend to have negative experiences at schools and universities, suffer social marginalization and discrimination. One reason for this has been the homophobia of heterosexual students. Beyer (2012), disagrees that the majority of educators seem to deliberately remain silent on gender orientation differences and sexuality thereby disadvantage LGBTI communities of equal access to teaching and learning. The researcher agrees with the assumption of Ringrose and Renold (2010), that teachers/lecturers have a significant influence to preserve the equal rights of all students. Participant's responses include:

Stu 1(*SH5*): *[LGBTI communities are the communities which involves not only males and females but also involve gays, lesbians and bisexual people, LGBTI communities around my campus does exist but they are treated in a different way compared to straight males and females. I don't know whether it because*

they like to go as a group or because they feel not wanted by the other students].

Stu 2: [No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved].

LGBTI Co 3: it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friends even among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right.

LGBTIOC: Issues of discrimination and judgement that's need to educating everyone. That there is nothing wrong with being different. Cw

Stu 3: [Classmates have different emotions towards LGBTI communities. There are those who are familiar with the LGBTI communities who are responding well towards them, who knows and have understanding that LGBTI communities are people like us and have feelings like us. While others have no remorse towards LGBTI communities. They do not treat them as human beings and they treat them people without feelings].

UL1: I have noticed one kind of like...but not lead to any abuse...one student who is LGBTI...in fact...when student from LGBTI was responded to question...everyone was calm as student responded...so... that is all I've seen...so far...and I have not seen discrimination of LGBTI communities. I was happy when LGBTI communities responds in the classroom...even the entire class clap for them.

As student heterosexual, (Stu 1, SH5) revealed, that LGBTI communities do exist at the university campus. Stu 2 said that he does not judge anyone because he is a Christian (Bradeline) stated that she became a friend to someone in the LGBTI communities. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex 3 (LGBTI co 3) briefed on her past experience to current as things changes. LGBTIOC and Stu 3 and University Lecturer 1 (UL1) advised that the issue around discrimination to be handled properly to make other students see diversity in nature not a signal on different sexual orientation/identity.

5.3.3 Lack of Parental/Family supports for LGBTI communities

Another vital note is that LGBTI communities sometimes lack supportive family, peers and teachers (Williams et al., 2005; Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011) which causes LGBTI communities to undergo more victimisation and isolation within their families (Garofalo, Wolf, Wssow, Woods & Goodman, 1999).

Stu 2: *It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and though and beliefs.*

SRC (Gi): *firstly we have to understand the situation report...and secondary to that is their background...not the cause background...but the causes of the issue..., what drive them to such problems because LGBTI issues are socially constructed ...and is not as others see it in a normal way ...*

UL1 (Donchido) : *Amm...to the best of my knowledge...ammm...I've been teaching in the university for the numbers of years...now...I've not been seeing a kind of physical abuse...or...a kind of discrimination...or all sort...there is nothing of such against LGBTI communities...at the university.*

LGBTICo5: *there are gay people who failed to accept themselves....mmm...who afraid of people around them of being judge or harassed for being gay.*

LGBTI Co 2: *mmm...some students are friendly as I was saying but behaves differently...and the way when they see gay wear a bum short,, they say...oh my gosh! What did he showing us...if it were a girl who wear no one talks....so they won't show a kind of attitudes they showed when is a gay wear that and any other thing I say against ...who make ups...they say...ah...ay!... it showing that im not accepting gay that why I nan be saying why a gay is wearing bum skirts or use make ups ...mmm I don't think they really accept us in the university.*

It was evident from the above statements that acceptance varied between different groups.

5.3.4 Difficulties to sexual disclosure for LGBTI communities

Student might not disclose their sexuality for fear of what might happen to them. Difficulties to sexual disclosure emerge from fear of what might happen among heterosexual majority to avoid further crisis as Wang and Eccles (2012), (cf 3.2.4) confirm that sexual orientation disclosure among LGBTI communities, exposes their gender differences to assaults, verbal abuse and rape attempts from their peers at schools and universities' campuses. The expression that sexuality orientation and gender conformity expose LGBTI communities to position of heterosexual on gender non-conformity which extends hostile environment on internalize problems. Haney (2008), affirms that rejection and isolation of LGBTI communities deprived them of their full participation with heterosexual peers thus subject them to face disengagement and loneliness which can influence them to develop low self-esteem in their academic and life endeavors. Pile (2010), disagrees that reactivity of human behaviors forces active responses on change to stimulus in the university environment. This supports people's consciousness to adapt socially for interpersonal relationships.

USSP (Lisandary): *mmm...yes...that I am...I used to hold residence director for 5 years...while pursuing my postgraduate studies... and ...yeah...currently and I have LGBTI issues related to abuse...mmm...one of the student in residence in particular...we have different ages, genders...different religious background...en...together...each day issues...em...typical one is that of we having some outspoken LGBTI communities member at the res...they were not ashamed or shy to express themselves as to and unfortunately with some of the students. emm...emm... we heard about a gay students that in a meeting one of the gay student in the res with the other student because of way to shower....with how he treat his body...en...en...with lot of female students in the 'Res' and outspoken there with another male student...I mean is the other of course accusing of being in LGBTI communities.*

LGBTI Co 2: *it is said that...mmm...no matter what you do there will still some people who continue to say ill things about you...and that other people will accept and just carry on.*

USSP; *Taking from experiences of his managerial position, have recent case of abuse related to gender that there some outspoken among LGBTI student were not shy. The issue is talk about his body treatment and pricked at for being one of LGBTI communities. As he spoke to management to be moved to other residence as he faced discrimination but no change him for over a year before he was finally this year over 10-12 reported times...for his safety. LGBTI Co 2: stated that no matter what you do, there will still some people who continue to say ill things about you, just accept and carry on.*

USSP (Lisandry) *attested said that there were outspoken among LGBTI communities who can open up their identity and sexual orientation without fear. This asserts that as we have outspoken, there are possibility of shy or closet type who might prefer to stay undercover maybe due to fear of threat or abuses among peers.*

5.3.5 Heterosexual majority dominance

The patriarchy has positioned heterosexuals exhibits expressions of dominance to oppress target groups and communicate an intention to assert maintain dominance over a subjective others (Regan, 2009) (cf 3.2.5). This indicates that heterosexuals dominance suppress LGBTI communities to dictate activities behavior. Molden and Finkel (2010), support that submission occurs to different degrees; like some employees may follow orders without question, whereas others might express disagreement but concede when pressed. Nonetheless, Alatalo (2012), argues that heterosexual do often oppress LGBTI communities by dominance or privileges rather exercise collide with their sexuality for equal to behavioural experiences. In contrary, some religion has not welcomed the acceptance of LGBTI peoples in their obligatory rights to laws, regardless of behavioural imperfection on the reality and yet deprive messages that convey effectiveness (Dennett, 2007).

The researcher concurs that tolerance is anchored on respect for others and provides a shared pool of knowledge in anticipation for the research team to propose an approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. Based on LGBTI communities', Holt (2011), confirms that collaboration of knowledge makes sense of experiences of heterosexual students peers which build a tacit social trust to understand and respect them at the university campus. This ensures that LGBTI

communities share their own perspectives with their classmates. Robinson (2011), supports that ecological systems theory instigate communities to act on right and generally accepted consequences for perpetrating against individual's rights to ensure justice among their people.

LGBTI Co 3: *it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friends even among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right.*

LGBTI Co 1: *Amm...I think these people that need to know should be educated about us...they should be educated about us...even to the some of the students...they accused us...not that they want us but they don't know anything about us...no one is good to us...*

USSP (Lisandary): *okay...mmm... I said more enough in other question...I think the best approach to use is to allow students...emmm...educate themselves so that on the learning process, students will come with the knowledge of LGBTI and concept itself at the university to embrace, love and care...embrace...and minority students are good to LGBTI communities...it will show that not everyone is against the communities, tolerance...support for all and also have the forum with LGBTI organ...I think it might be good approach.*

OCFT: *Like seriously, with the look of things at the campus it appears to provide protective measures to make LGBTI communities safe among their peers, such I think to have a listening ears to them, tolerance to socialize with them like being friendly more acceptance and other good relationships to make LGBTI communities feel comfortable in the classroom and campus environment.*

The quotes by LGBTI Co1, Stu 3, OCFT, LGBTI Co 2 SRC (Gi), LGBTI Co 3 indicated of one or two difficulties, and discrimination among peers, while Stu 2 stated that they were doing some things together at TP but not a close friend, UL1 (Donchido) responded differently as written below: showed the situational analysis into transformative approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

The prevalence occurrence of our understanding of LGBTI communities is limited to happenings within the schools and Universities. This extends to the recognition of importance of school climate which was based on violence and less adaptive as challenges arose to cope for LGBTI communities (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-

D'Alessandro, 2013) (cf. 3.2.1) which deprive equal access to academic success for students (Kosciw, Greytak, Palmer, & Boesen, 2014; Kosciw et al., 2013; Toomey & Russell, 2013; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, & Russell, 2013). The finding statement from;

LGBTI Co1: being LGBTI member to my peers does not make me feel good at all...its make me bad.

OCFT: Sincerely to be true in talking, as I knew on the campus because I act drama and poetry....majority students do show discriminating against gay and lesbian that happen to be around them. So this makes some gay and lesbian to feel helpless whenever they abuse then or call them different names. I can say that despite what media awareness ant TV Sophies – students like to act out against LGBTI communities in their own ways. To me, the attitudes of heterosexual students is from act of hatred, background and beliefs against homosexuality.

Stu 1(SH5): [LGBTI communities are the communities which involves not only males and females but also involve gays, lesbians and bisexual people.... LGBTI communities around my campus does exist but they are treated in a different way compared to straight males and females. I don't know whether it because they like to go as a group or because they feel not wanted by the other students].

The above extracts indicate that that our understanding of approach to embracing LGBTI communities is not fully welcome at a university campus as LGBTI Co1, stu 1(SH5) and OCFT indicated that LGBTI communities have not been fully welcome at a university campus said on their statements. However, Tetreault et al. (2013), (cf. 3.2.1) found other results that anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex (LGBTI) emergence of bias that resulted some LGBTI students to pretend and hide their sexual identity from other students and staff due to the fear of stigmatization.

From data results; Stu 3: *Not a close friend, we were doing Teaching Practices together. During break time we used to eat together and our files together...*this shows the issue of indirect discrimination and unacceptance of LGBTI communities at a university campus by peers and staffs/lecturers.

McCormack (2012), research has demonstrated that LGBTI students tend to have negative experiences at schools and universities, suffer social marginalization and discrimination. This could be seen briefly with this statement;

Stu 4 (Bradeline): Yes, it was like a friend of friend that also became my friend I don't have a problem with people who are different from me. I enjoy their company and it allows me to learn more about LGBTI communities everyday. For the past two years I have not yet seen any discrimination towards LGBTI communities however I am not always on campus and I am not always around to bear witness to their everyday lives.

Stu 4 in his own experience boldly stated that for the past two years he has not seen any discrimination towards LGBTI communities though he is not always at campus and not around to bear witness to their everyday lives.

The researcher concurs with Lyubomirsky's (2008), (cf. 3.2.2) idea that sexual orientation disclosure among LGBTI communities may expose their gender differences to assaults, verbal abuses and may also lead to rape attempts from peers at schools and universities. At the absence of protective policy, Beitz (2009), opines that students right of privacy stands to jeopardized, inadequate protection and might intensify victimization experiences on LGBTI communities' against receiving transformation at a university campus. The research team responded to the discrimination and judgmental LGBTI communities experienced saying:

LGBTIOC: Issues of discrimination and judgement that's need to educating everyone. That there is nothing wrong with being different.

LGBTI Co 2: being of LGBTI member do not make me comfortable ...at times other student talk harshly to me like you don't look like it...what do you want to gain there? And so on...

LGBTIOC: I have heard issues the LGBTI+, but not necessarily asking for my help but rather seeking advice re: coming out and being assaulted...Most issues the LGBTI+ concern safety, safety in and off campus (in residents).

Meanwhile, research team reveals their understanding of their expectations and dissatisfaction as illustrated below:

Stu 4 (*Bradeline*): *LGBTI communities are an environment in which people of any gender get to express themselves in anyway. Boy who feel that they want to be girls can be girls they can even dress up as the opposite sex in order for them to feel like themselves fully....*

Stu 5 (*Sunflower*): *LGBTI communities are people whose sexual orientation is not heterosexual. They identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, transgender... Yes, I am friends with people part of LGBTI community. Reason being that I don't see them for their sexual orientation. They just good people I get along with that are my friends.*

It is imperative to create supportive environment, based on the informative understanding of who LGBTI communities are at a university campus. Another vital note of evidence is that LGBTI communities do lack supportive family, peers and teachers (Williams et al., 2005; Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011) (cf. 3.2.3) which cause LGBTI communities to undergo more victimization and isolation within their families and extension to universities (Garofalo, Wolf, Wssow, Woods & Goodman, 1999). LGBTI communities report that educators and teachers often did not intervene, even when they witnessed harassment physically from heterosexual students (Nakamoto & Schwartz, 2010; Pendragon, 2010) (cf. 3.2.3). This behaviour denied the assumption that those educators should play parental role at the university to challenge the wrong acts against students or victims. As stated below:

LGBTIOC: *We live in the 21st century so I honestly do not expect some of the happenings I read about re: Homophobia, Transphobia, gender based violence but because we live in a society that is hurt & that think violation means you care for someone is a problem.*

Stu 3: *Classmates have different emotions towards LGBTI communities. There are those who are familiar with the LGBTI communities who are responding well towards them, who knows and have understanding that LGBTI communities are people like us and have feelings like us. While others have no remorse towards LGBTI communities. They do not treat them as human beings and they treat them people without feelings.*

Stu 5 (*Sunflower*): *Yes, I am friends with people part of LGBTI community. Reason being that I don't see them for their sexual orientation. They just good people I*

get along with that are my friends.... Everyone I've been around or witnessed have been very welcoming and supportive of them treating them the same as any student regardless of sexual orientation.

The results indicated that is time to change for students who are heterosexuals; against LGBTI communities as they enter into a new millennium dispensation for all to have a moderate attitudes to embrace diversity and support individuals against rejection thus maintain temperate behaviour to one another.

When asked about discrimination and abuse, the research team indicated that:

This addresses what was a positive experience, to be handled within the university campus. The statement below support that attention is being given:

SRC (Gi): yes...we have heard numerous cases of LGBTI communities at a university campus...in office.

Stu 2: It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and though and beliefs.

Abuse, or any form of discrimination be handled in a good manner to avoid cases related by (SRC) (Gi) and provide acceptance and support to respect LGBTI communities as forwarded by Stu 2 (Lukhozi).

This correlates with Kotch (2014) (cf. 3.2.2) who confirms that precedencies on sexual orientation and gender conformity should provide coverage against peers' conflict on LGBTI communities to combat gender non-conformity from heterosexual towards extension of judgemental experiences to victimization. More so, our understanding reveals that LGBTI communities face lots of crisis among their peers at the university campus and need to be more tolerated through getting understanding as confirmed by these statements:

LGBTI Co 4: Mmm... I go to the section of attitudes...mmm...it is important to know that we are not different from other people....and mmm...I think people from LGBTI communities should take a leading role on this point...

LGBTI Co 1: *Amm...I think these people that need to know should be educated about us...they should be educated about us....even to the some of the students...they accused us...not that they want us but they don't know anything about us...no one is good to us...*

LGBTI Co 2: *it is said that...mmm...no matter what you do there will still some people who continue to say ill things about you...and that other people will accept and just carry on.*

Another important element towards our understanding of current approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus

Heterosexual majority dominance at a university campus (cf. 3.2.5); the patriarchy has positioned heterosexuals exhibit expressions of dominance to oppress target groups and communicate an intention to assert and maintain dominance over a subjective others (Regan, 2009). This indicates that heterosexual's dominance suppresses LGBTI communities to dictate activities behavior. Molden and Finkel (2010) (cf. 3.2.5), support that submission occurs to different degrees; like some employees may follow orders without question, whereas others might express disagreement but concede when pressed. Nonetheless, Alatalo (2012) (cf. 3.2.5), argues that heterosexuals do often oppress LGBTI communities by dominance or privileges rather exercise collision with their sexuality for equal to behavioural experiences. In contrary, religion has negotiated acceptance of practices of all to fulfil their obligation rights to laws, regardless of behavioural imperfection to compromise reality and deprive messages convey within the system of effectiveness (Dennett, 2007). The literature as revealed was supported by research team as follows: Participants stated that:

LGBTI Co 3 (Mwali): *Mmm...to me is just that some guys don't know how other feels and they just talk anyhow.*

LGBTI Co 4 (Marven): *Mmm... I go to the section of attitudes...mmm...it is important to know that we are not different from other people....and mmm...I think people from LGBTI communities should take a leading role on this point.*

In contrast the above statement by research teams; one of research team sees it in another version as written here:

UL1 (*Donchido*): *I have noticed one kind of like...but not lead to any abuse...one student who is LGBTI...in fact...when student from LGBTI was responded to question...everyone was calm as student responded...so... that is all I've seen...so far...and I have not seen discrimination of LGBTI communities. I was happy when LGBTI communities responds in the classroom...even the entire class clap for them.*

5.3.6 LGBTI communities' engagement and disengagement

Dehart et al. (2011) (cf. 5.2.6), promoted sense belongings for LGBTI communities at a university campus in study especially at the face of adversity and discrimination to improve self-dependency. This self-dependency propels diversity among students. As the statement from research team concur thus:

LGBTI Co 3: *it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friends even among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right.*

Stu 2: *No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved.*

Also, LGBTI Co 3 (*Mbali*): *it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friend seven among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right.*

While Stu 2 (*Mr Rogers*): *No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved.* Stu 2 have contrast experience of LGBTI co2 and LGBTI co3, maybe for not a member of LGBTI communities that make her experience differs.

Göransson and Nilholm (2014) (cf. 3.2.6) claim that a way-out to develop self-confidence is through communicable experiences which are directly similar to others related to belongingness; expressions like, you belong here, I know you can succeed." As such, these inspirational tips might boost morale standards to motivate and believe that each LGBTI communities can maneuver challenges of life. Boelen and Reijntjes (2009) (cf. 3.2.6), concur that lack of confidence for LGBTI communities might create difficulties for them due to stress thus lead to inability to withstand problems which

affect their resonance skills. The research teams revealed as follows in terms of awareness initiatives.

LGBTI Co 2: it is said that...mmm...no matter what you do there will still some people who continue to say ill things about you...and that other people will accept and just carry on.

Needham and Austin (2010) (cf. 3.2.6), directly state that non-disclosure of sexuality arises from intolerant attitudes and peer victimization perception against LGBTI communities at universities; simply they were powerless to challenge the situations. The researcher supports that family acceptance suggested by Ryan and Diaz (2009) (cf. 3.2.6), parental roles might be beneficial to embracing these LGBTI communities from home and extend that to university campuses in line with Ryan, Huebner, Diaz and Sanchez (2009) (cf. 3.2.6), support that enlightened family to abstain reject their own children for sexuality and gender orientation differences. Additionally, educators serve as second parents at schools and universities, Swank and Raiz (2010) (cf. 3.2.6) assert that LGBTI communities' unacceptance originates from peer's attitudes and negligence of some educators to address worrisome abuse cases reported by students on sexuality related issues. In contrast, Munson and Stelboun (2013) (cf. 3.2.6), claim that parental responsibilities failure could hamper to embracing LGBTI communities' for improvement their on psychological and physiological development.

The results showed that the majority should be educated on LGBTI communities at the university campus, statement includes: LGBTI Co 1 *and* LGBTI Co 2 who emphasized that educating people to understand about LGBTI communities is important.

According to Kotch, (2014) (cf. 3.2.2) who confirms that precedencies on sexual orientation and gender conformity should provide coverage against peers' conflict on LGBTI communities to combat gender non-conformity from heterosexual towards extension of judgemental experiences to victimization.

Stu 2: It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and thought and beliefs.

UL1 (Donchido) : *Amm...to the best of my knowledge...ammm...I've been teaching in the university for the numbers of years...now...I've not been seeing a kind of physical abuse...or...a kind of discrimination...or all sort...there is nothing of such against LGBTI communities...at the university.*

LGBTI Co 2: *When I'm with my friends at times they do not take it lightly with me by saying...it was not like you...you're so beautiful that in fact what you doing is not normal, how could you just blind to be like that?...they say that I'm lost... rather than see....that what I can say... {Paused}*

LGBTI Co 1: *Mmm... I do not like to say that LGBTI communities from campus may not be of help but their help may be limited to certain limit...if we have occasion for them to be guest or talks, they can be of help...but they cannot help to solve our problems and since they cannot provide that for us...I see less relevant they could be...*

The research team repeatedly emphasised the importance of respect, acceptance and tolerance for LGBTI communities.

5.3.7 Negative stereotype towards LGBTI communities

This negative stereotype is significant to the way peers look towards LGBTI communities at a university campus, and makes interaction difficult. Examples of negative attitudes are included below:

LGBTI Co 2: *When I'm with my friends at times they do not take it lightly with me by saying...it was not like you...you're so beautiful that in fact what you doing is not normal, how could you just blind to be like that?...they say that I'm lost... rather than see....that what I can say... {Paused}*

LGBTI Co 1: *Mmm... I do not like to say that LGBTI communities from campus may not be of help but their help may be limited to certain limit...if we have occasion for them to be guest or talks, they can be of help...but they cannot help to solve our problems and since they cannot provide that for us...I see less relevant they could be...*

Stu 4 (Bradeline): *No, it has to your own choice whether you want to accept LGBTI communities for who they are or not. They cannot change who they are just because of the opinion of those around them... Negative opinions of other students at the university.... I feel the more they continue being themselves and allowing others to also bring themselves in the open, although it will take time, people will acknowledge them and their perspective towards them will also change because at the end of the day we are all humans.*

Stu 1(SH5): *I have once had LGBTI friend, because when you are around them you always have a smile on your face. The most important thing that I have noticed about them is that they are straight forward talkers, they call a spade a spade... I think classmates or other students should not criticize the way they are, how they wear, how they live their lives and mostly important other students should stop calling them names. For example in class maybe one of LGBTI answers the question by student will whisper saying "I knew it was the gay talking, therefore he/she think he is better than us...*

In the above statement, LGBTI Co 2 expressed how she felt with friends that showed non-palatable relationships, however Stu 1(SH5) suggested to be in good rapport with them as they were outspoken, she advised classmates to stop criticizing them, in contrast, stated by LGBTI Co 1 of doubtful thought of involvement of outside LGBTI communities for help against their experiences at the university campus.

Pendragon (2010) (cf.3.2.7) advises that student's collective engagement be used to avert stereotype ideas that stigma places on differences, thereby embracing diversity. The researcher agrees with Demir, Özen, Doğan, Bilyk and Tyrell (2011) (cf.3.2.7) who asserted that social connectivity among students be empowered beyond praxis way of life. Nonetheless, Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) contend that LGBTI communities' relationships at times are continuation of friendly interaction with mates from high school to the university, lead to long life companionship or cohabitation among peers thereby give rise to psychological development.

According to Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco (2011) (cf.3.2.7) stated that only communal living among population of the ecosystem improves emotional and physical state of human health help to form equitable balance on human development. This supports the idea of commonality by Admaskus (2009) (cf.3.2.7) that communal living

among LGBTI communities maintain a life therapy, Fisher et al. (2012) affirmed that psychological stability coordinate perfect health for sustenance to embracing comfortable life towards a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities for active co-existence with others at a university campus. This implies attachment stated by Lemay and Clark, (2008) (cf.3.2.7) and Lyubomirsky (2008) (cf.3.2.7) had stronger effect to build a transformative approach on relationships to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. This indicates influence between LGBTI, communities and heterosexual students to understand each other likely helps to connect mentally and spiritually thus increase human development.

5.4 THE NEED FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The avenue which called for a transformative approach could be traced below.

5.4.1 Abuses of LGBTI communities

Ashley (2013) (cf. 3.3.2) asserts the inconclusive part of homosexuality education biases for evidence that exists on biological factors role-play in development of LGBTI or Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ). Research based needs of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI in a university campus arrives as when asked if participants have witnessed or heard of any abuse cases about LGBTI communities at a university before, participants responded: One of the research team revealed in her statement in related to corrective rape;

LGBTI Co 2: Mmm...I will say that what has happened to me, there was a guy who asking me out and he was asking...you don't love me? And I say that I prefer a gal than a guy...and he was like saying, why? ...you doing this! You're playing for both teams and I asked what he means...he was no ...he is like no ways!...like what you need is a big stick ...that big stick will change your life...{laughs} is like if I'm your boyfriend, I will give you hard...laugh! Laugh!! Laugh!!!...it will change you...if you get more of it...laughs continues...

USSP (Lisandary): one...educational campaigns to uncover that the truth about LGBTI communities, true behind gay and lesbian and even by the university...on the

issue side it is unfortunate that we had issues where a gay wanted to end his life for rejection, trying to commit suicide...it unfortunate that we have to do something and need to be supervised afterwards and but on her release from home, she informed that the reason why she wanted to end her life by commit suicide is because other student from "Res" say she is not to be raped but that is the object to be put inside her va-gi-na and show her that she is not a male ...she is trying to be male but she is not a male but a female....As I think an awareness campaigns and awareness education to embrace around the LGBTI communities amm...is an ongoing thing we have to create awareness and around the campus LGBTI communities...to upgrade our initiatives to make sure that LGBTI communities are safe on the campus among their peers.

LGBTI Co 5: Mmm....this year when I walk out with my boyfriend ...they say ha! You look straight why are you gay? Why are you doing this...but it is not comfortable for me when they say that so...it's frustrating....

In fact, society has placed a great stigma on LGBTI communities [common knowledge], it is not funny to see different views, in other ways, Payne (2007) (cf. 3.3.2), supports in accordance to school based on someone labelled as different sexual orientation against acceptability within school's culture be excluded, disconnected and isolated from the entire groups. The researcher disagrees with Stafford and Lesham (2008) (cf. 3.3.2) that agree on the inner ability to thrive on friendly inclusivity among students but follows part of Bajaj (2011) (cf. 3.3.2) that confirms the authenticity of creating knowledge as a light for all students empowerment; no one left out policy against year 2020 from emancipation of diversity. The researcher follow with Swarr (2012) (cf. 3.3.2) that indicates that the intense exclusion and isolation of LGBTI communities from having better relationships with their heterosexual peers thus influencing them negatively even on their academic performance.

In respect to research team statements, it showed that verbal abuse still exists at the university, LGBTI Co 2 and LGBTI Co 5 confirmed on their statement, while USSP (*Lisandary*) talked of the incident of a particular suicide attempt due to verbal abuse that many perhaps experience from bullying by the way.

In addition, bullying of LGBTI communities creates an internalized impact as Meland, Rydning, Lobben, Breidablik and Ekeland (2010) (cf. 3.3.2) studied that internalized impacts of bullying on the student that may lead to academic breakdown and very low self-esteem even at the university. In comparison with their Israeli counterparts, Burke (2010) asserts that LGBTI students in the United States were more likely to experience assault and harassment in schools but were more likely to have access to LGBTI supportive resources in their schools against the memorandum of human rights policies. The researcher sustains with Cislighi (2013) on his assumption that transformative approach be launched to strengthen social transformation and change within the educational system for security of human rights at a university campus.

OCFT: Like seriously, with the look of things at the campus it appears to provide protective measures to make LGBTI communities safe among their peers, such I think to have a listening ears to them, tolerance to socialize with them like being friendly more acceptance and other good relationships to make LGBTI communities feel comfortable in the classroom and campus environment.

5.4.2 Bullying of LGBTI communities

Bullying is one of the serious challenges experienced by learners/students from primary education to university education. Based social status of LGBTI communities; campus experiences are still challenging. Drawing from body of evidences, UNESCO (2012) (cf. 3.3.2) defined homophobic and transphobic bullying as a global problem that is a violation of students' rights and that it impedes educational success for LGBTI communities (cf.3.3.2) (Cornu, 2016; UNESCO, 2012). However, Meland, Rydning, Lobben, Breidablik and Ekeland (2010) (cf. 3.3.2) studied that internalized impacts of bullying on the student that may lead to academic breakdown and very low self-esteem even at the university. In comparison with their Israeli counterparts, Burke (2010) asserts that LGBTI students in the United States were more likely to experience assault and harassment in schools but were more likely to have access to LGBTI supportive resources in their schools against the memorandum of human rights policies.

In addition, unreported bullying and harassment of LGBTI communities, Toomey and Russell (2013) indicate that most LGBTI communities have experienced some forms of bullying at school and further many problems of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual students in the university. This might subscribe to inadequate academic performance, truancy, and dropping out of school, occur from direct or indirect effects of verbal and physical abuse from peer's results to emotional problems. Schröder-Abé and Schütz (2011) (cf. 3.3.2) point out that problems results in emotional stress and disorder for LGBTI communities understood by care to minimize tensions on systematic victimization and direct attacks eliminated. In addition, Wang, Iannotti and Luk, (2011) (cf. 3.3.2) assert that bullying experiences internalize fear and insecurity amongst LGBTI communities, leads to protection of themselves to avoid any abuse, which may be subject to absenteeism and later drop out.

Stewart (2010) (cf. 3.3.2) points out those LGBTI students are more likely to be victims of unwelcome and unfriendly educational experiences from their heterosexual counterparts. Moreover, Jacob (2013) (cf. 3.3.2) points out that, at university settings students identified by 14 others as LGBTI students, then face humiliation because of long standing prejudice and discrimination. The research team's response proves in contrary as indicated below:

LGBTIOC: I don't think there should be but they are, those who do not understand and are in a position of power tension to abuse their power and discriminate those they do not understand. However, Stu 4 follow persuasive tone thus:

Stu 4 (Bradeline): No, it has to your own choice whether you want to accept LGBTI communities for who they are or not. They cannot change who they are just because of the opinion of those around them... Negative opinions of other students at the university.... I feel the more they continue being themselves and allowing others to also bring themselves in the open, although it will take time, people will acknowledge them and their perspective towards them will also change because at the end of the day we are all humans.

USSP (Lisandary): emm...I think in this should be the students at large because the university is a community that comprises of many students, also the student in

the same...they will form part of...emm...that the student leadership...student representative council (SRC) on the campus we need to be active change...and members....emmm...I feel that all should be deeply involved in the embracing of LGBTI communities...many be the student who commit the crime among the student against other students be dealt with...I also think that ...I said earlier that campus HIV/AIDS services on that to know that LGBTI communities have abiding organ that stand for them...we need to have the meeting from both students and the organizations of staff members, RMS, cleaners, other protocols and management...and creating a particular form I would say....that one can say but is for all member of the staffs, students representatives meetings engaging dialogues...to engaging debates around the issues ...we can strive to get close to the students and form the approach to embracing LGBTI communities.

All the research team here makes wake up calls to embrace of LGBTI communities at a university campus without a negative stereotype then form a forum that could address the disparities or insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities that create vulnerability on others, so that people minds could change for real on people diversity.

5.4.3 Discrimination of LGBTI communities

Engagement and disengagement responses may be exhibited as both active coping strategies that coordinate involuntary responses to stress. Researchers further differentiate that voluntary engagement responses are classified into two distinct subtypes of coping strategies: primary control and secondary control strategies (cf. 3.3.3) (Blonal & Adalbajarnardottir, 2012; Wang & Eccles, 2012). Llera and Katsireba (2010, p. 32) supports that personality of LGBTI communities for love relationships to regulate their emotions towards their partners of the same sexual orientation. In contrast, secondary control responses are intended to gain control indirectly by accomodating or adapt to the stressful event or context and include strategies such as acceptance, positive thinking and cognitive knowledge. The researcher disagrees with Annear and Yates (2010) that discrimination of some member of LGBTIcommunities has disengaged them from their peers on school activities which

thereby limit them to chances of good lifestyles at a university campus. Discrimination and lack of knowledge exist, this was supported by:

Stu 5 (*Sunflower*): *Discrimination and lack of knowledge on the LGBTI communities' people not knowing would cause them to pull away and not embrace the unknown.*

LGBTI Co 2 (*Rosie*): *I think people that I've met do talk more of lesbian than gay...because they see the dress...they ask that apart from being lesbian what do you think you gain for being LGBTI members?*

LGBTI Co 1 (*Linda*): *Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI.*

The issues of discrimination could be so heavy on LGBTI communities because it determines their psychological and academic state to cope with their peers and other members of the university community. As LGBTI Co1 (Linda) tried to offer provision against discrimination.

On coping strategies, research has stated impact of stress and coping strategies (Skinner & Zimmer-Gembek, 2007; Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees and Skinner, 2011; Birditt, Antonucci & Tighe, 2012) (cf. 3.3.3) have found that continued exposure to either chronic stress or daily hassles on students who are LGBTI communities to gain resources, to reduce the ability to respond effectively to stressful situations, results to increases in symptoms of psychopathology (Graber & Sontag, 2008). Birditt et al. (2012) examine moderate effects to cope on the association between poverty and psychopathology, and then found that coping strategies serve mediation for students in the study. Although, these findings and other studies support the assertion that coping strategies during childhood and adolescence may be context-dependent and susceptible to influences directly from the stressor (Erath & Tu, 2014; Birditt et al. (2012) none of these studies have focused exclusively on social stressors that may be most salient to LGBTI communities based on stigmatization challenges at a university

campus. Tolerance stands as key to help LGBTI communities' students to develop and improve on their life challenges among themselves.

5.4.4 LGBTI Communities Harassment

Lozier and Beckman (2012) (cf. 3.3.4) found that harassment and intimidation encountered by LGBTI individuals in schools creates an unsafe and unsupportive environment for academic and social achievement. A study conducted by a research group at the University of Georgia (F) in 2002 with LGBTI students at university campus, data was collected from eighty-two (82) students who self-identified as LGBTI. The study found out that ninety percent (90%) of the participants reported to having heard anti-gay remarks or jokes while seventy five percent (75%) of participants knew someone who had been verbally harassed because of sexual orientation. The study findings revealed that almost half of the participants have experienced some form of prejudice on campus.

Based on Stewart (2010) (cf. 3.3.4), exposure, to defend LGBTI students amidst heterosexuals is forbidden by the perception of the campus climate that constitutes to support generality, stated by Tetreault et al. (2013) thus prompt teachers to learn more about students who are regarded as straight the question them about LGBTI to get clear information directly. This question attempts to help those LGBTI communities who look inferior to heterosexual students can be free from low self esteem that might endanger them emotionally. Barker (2012) (cf. 3.3.4) that students really need to embrace for who they are to impact them with knowledge ensure transformative approach for all rather on challenges questions of time.

The voices below are double perspectives to the issues of harassment at the university LGBTI Co 4 *stated on what to be done as a change of mindset while UL1 (Donchido) emphatically reacted to such occurrence that it shouldn't happen and perhaps for incase action must be taken.*

UL1 (Donchido): *that in the first place shouldn't happen...because...if it happens...the lecturer should come in...if that should happen...the course director should come in...leader of that particular module should come in...to intervene...in*

such case...is not something to let go for that particular student....it might lead to depression...lead to someone commit suicide or attempt...the coordinator even the cluster leader should be involved...so that the necessary steps can be taken...

LGBTICo5: there are gay people who failed to accept themselves....mmm...who afraid of people around them of being judge or harassed for being gay.

However, LGBTI Co 5 confirmed that some gay people who failed to accept themselves are afraid of people around them for fear of being judged or harassed for being gay. To the researcher, LGBTI communities may perhaps put themselves into danger or render themselves vulnerable to counter harassment at university campus and outside. In contrast, UL1 (Donchido) emphatically denounced LGBTI communities being harassed that it shouldn't be and in case such occurrence, the lecturer in such situation should take a bold step to intervene and take up the case to the respective authority. It seems that intervention is close as the statements of UL1 (Donchido) unfolds.

5.4.5 LGBTI communities' name-calling

In a study conducted by Dare (2015) cited Swearer, Turner, Givens and Pollack (2008) (cf. 3.3.5) who assert that name calling of students a "fag" or "gay" occurrences indirectly impose internal psychological stress on students which can result in a lack of coping at classroom activities, reduction to learning and end up having low grades, substance abuse, and depression. Kapeleris and Paivio (2011, p. 626) (cf. 3.3.5).concur that LGBTI students experience bullying, abuse, being picked on and name-calling, obviously set up barriers towards heterosexual peers thus making themselves vulnerable at University campus. However, Dare (2015), (cf. 3.3.5).study found that heterosexual peers point fingers at lesbians and gays, often call them suspected names; susi, tomboy and faggot to make them feel uncomfortable among their friends.

Notwithstanding, Ashley-Smith (2013) (cf. 3.3.5) supports that the intended act of name-calling is a signal to others in the majority to stigmatize LGBTI communities at a university campus, which links to bullying on perceived sexual orientation. This indicates that LGBTI communities are bullied by their peers accusing them of being

different and lady-like. Boelen and Reijntjes (2009) (cf. 3.3.5) assert that inner crisis is a symptom of social exclusion and thus subject students into disconnection from peers, develop low self-esteem or cultivate bad habits, among others at a university campus.

Nakamoto and Schwartz (2010) (cf. 3.3.5) suggest that a high risk of emotional distress reflects through depression and anxiety encountered by LGBTI communities from their sexuality disclosure among heterosexual counterparts at a university campus where they find themselves. Wang et al. (2011) stated that orientation possesses a sensitive hallmark to stigmatization, victimization and lack of support from both teachers and peers. The researcher finds out that Dehart et al. (2011) argued that actual *coming out* of LGBTI communities at the young age exposes them to be more visible and become subjected to labelling, teasing, name-calling and harassment from other students (Wang et al., 2011). Therefore, stresses acquired from the persistent incidences afore mentioned correspond to LGBTI communities, lead to depression, anxiety and substance abuse (Nakamoto & Schwartz, 2010). All this can be catered for through a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Stu 1(SH5): *[I have once had LGBTI friend, because when you are around them you always have a smile on your face. The most important thing that I have noticed about them is that they are straight forward talkers, they call a spade a spade... I think classmates or other students should not criticize the way they are, how they wear, how they live their lives and mostly important other students should stop calling them names. For example in class maybe one of LGBTI answers the question by student will whisper saying "I knew it was the gay talking, therefore he/she think he is better than us].*

Based on name-calling, it is evident that students who are LGBTI communities can be stigmatized and victimized by peers (Wang et al., 2011), in Stu1 (SH5) revealed that LGBTI communities were amazing people and should not be criticized or judged by peers. She also spoke about name-calling and cited her experience because it can inflict emotional stress on them if care is not taken, as Nakamoto and Schwartz (2010) (cf. 3.3.5) assert that depression may result from verbal assaults and thus can

affect academic performance. The researcher observed that name-calling is not that rampant against LGBTI communities at a university campus currently, but sign language was so obvious, which could be corrected instead of sign labeling others.

5.4.6 LGBTI communities Isolation

Another alarming reported, that issues like social and emotional isolation is the one of the most challenging problem facing LGBTI communities on campus, this extends the risk of both physical and mental health problems (Butler, 2008). McCormack (2011) states that fewer LGBTI communities opportune to further higher education due to their difficulty encountered at high school from their peers and hindered academic success as they feel unsafe and unprotected. Based on the lack of concentration; Robinson (2010) reveals that LGBTI learners find it difficult to concentrate in the class because of imagined thoughts and emotions that have occurred from negative incidences, fearing reoccurrence. From research by Grossman, Hammerness, and McDonald (2009) revealed that American LGBTI communities do not feel safe, or have sense of belonging at their school environment due to powerlessness from exclusion and marginalization which leaves them no control over how ere are being treated by heterosexual peers. So, vulnerability and inability to attach and to defend themselves, Craig, Tucker and Wagner (2008) research conducted that LGBTI students chose to remain invisible or in closet at school thereby protect themselves from discrimination and victimization from their peers.

LGBTI Co 1 (Linda): *Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI.*

SRC (Gi): *firstly...what you need to understand is that... change is a difficult thing...so now we know you should know that most of our students they are from rural*

areas...areas where...ah...ah... LGBTI communities are...are... not much been seeing there...or seeing things happening is not that way as present.. so for them came...to the institution of learning...therefore, for them..... coming into our institution of learning...therefore, there's need for them to be educated...it means that since that you're in the institution, there is a kind of thing for them to learn in an institution, there are particular the issue of LGBTI communities about issues around university...because some of the people hardly understand how someone can become a lesbian or someone become bisexual, they need to be taught throughout the process about LGBTI communities ...therefore, students need to be educated....so that they understand.

Notably, Seelman et al. (2012) averred that positive support and intervention for these LGBTI communities can be fuelled by the input of university counsellors, lecturers and social workers to foraid their good academic performance and improve talents towards attainment of excellence at the university. Koswic et al. (2014) further suggested that efficient gay-straight alliances be made available at the universities, thereby contributing to improvement of social, emotional, physical and academic enhancement of LGBTI communities at a university campus. Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Netshandam (2013) (cf. 3.3.6) in their study conducted at the University of South Africa (UNISA), investigated the experience of LGBTI students at a rural institution in the country. Findings from the study recommend structured programmes on social behaviour, focus on advocacy for a change to educate and support should be implemented at the institution. It was suggested that this would help empower them in dealing with stigma and discrimination.

LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) in her statement, proposed that people should come together to form the understanding that being gay or lesbian, in social life, should not be discriminating or judgmental, SRC (Gi) coming from the perspective that change is a difficult thing; considering students who just came to the university in the city should be educated, taught what they have not heard or seen physically in their rural areas but seeing on campus, they need orientation to understand. The researcher personally, found with the above statement that familiarization and orientation could play a vital role to create an embracing university environment.

5.4.7 LGBTI communities state of stigmatization

To understand the influence that stigmatization gives to sexuality differentiation at a university campus, Erath and Tu (2014) opine that higher levels of stress may occur during challenges encountered and puts LGBTI communities on a greater risk of emotional and behavioral problems. It has been well established in adult literature that how individuals cope with stress is often a strong indicator of psychosocial well-being. Skinner and Zimmer-Gembeck (2007) proffer on understanding the control mechanisms of stress and coping adaptation of LGBTI communities' interpersonal relationships and processes influence on psychopathology. This suggests a need for transformative approach that could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Furthermore, both coping responses and vulnerabilities to stress, Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees and Skinner (2011) propose that children's emotions influence their coping responses to stress around them to support interpersonal coping examinations and responses for LGBTI communities' stress on both voluntary/active (coping) and involuntary responses to stressful stimuli. In this, approach to voluntary or involuntary responses to stress, Zimmer-Gembeck et al. (2011) (cf. 3.3.7) also examine responses such as engagement with or disengagement from the stressful experience, responses to stress in their love relationships directly as experience to, influence a change of conditions. The stressor comes from the emotions and cognitions that arise from immediate problems to their life experiences.

LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie): *...emm...in Edgewood... there are forums...forums that so like multiple peoples don't want to accept lesbian and bisexual at their area....mmm...to see that need to address. I think there is a need to educate people on this to get to know LGBTI ...that is normal...it normal like gay and lesbian people should see it like that and also...I think it should be organize that people may not consider anyone to offend any with lifestyle.*

The stigma that society has placed on LGBTI communities, makes it obvious where heterosexuals stood on indoctrinations that create intolerance behavior which manifests at university campus, thus LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie) appealed to have a forum

where individuals can be educated on the normalizing of being gay or lesbian and the likes, so that no offence will be reported about the lifestyle of anyone.

5.4.8 Labelling and Stigma of LGBTI communities

In conclusion to this section, consider the labelling and stigma implications of LGBTI communities at a university campus, Swearer et.al. (2008) (cf. 3.3.7.1) explain that LGBTI students at the university may find it difficult to interact freely with their peers (heterosexual) due to fear of labelling and stigma that stereotypes have placed on their sexuality. This holds LGBTI communities to ransom of non-sharing their identity with others, and rather remain in *closet* for fear of rejection (cf. 3.3.7.1) (Romero-Canyas, Downey, Berenson, Ayduk & Kang, 2010). This attunes gender non-conformity of heterosexual students, and thus contribute to a hostile university environment for these minority LGBTI communities. Similarly, occurrences and incidences of rejection, subjects these LGBTI communities to loneliness and insecurity in their lives at university campus (cf. 3.3.7.1) (Hawkey & Cacioppo, 2010). As afore stated, constant stigmatization may marginalize LGBTI students at the university to experience isolation from other students, thereby cause depression and emotional instability which might result in suicidal thoughts and suicide attempts respectively (cf. 3.3.7.1) (Fafchamps & Shilpi, 2008; Fine & Spencer, 2009; Hawkey & Cacioppo, 2010; WHO, 2012). This indicates that uneasy interactions among LGBTI communities at the university can make itrd h to express their feelings, attractions and emotions, to perform psychologically well at the university.

Research participants reveals thus:

Stu 1(SH5): *Everybody around the university campus should be LGBTI community agent if and only if he/she is the member of LGBTI communities' management.*

LGBTI Co 5 (Chris): *Mmm....this year when I walk out with my boyfriend ...they say ha! You look straight why are you gay? ...why are you doing this...but it is not comfortable for me when they say that so...it's frustrating....*

LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie): *mmm...some students are friendly as I was saying but behaves differently...and the way when they see gay wear a bum short,, they say...oh my gosh! What did he showing us...if it were a girl who wear no one talks....so*

they won't show a kind of attitudes they showed when is a gay wear that and any other thing I say against ...who make ups...they say..ah. ay!... it showing that I'm not accepting gay that why I nan be saying why a gay is wearing bum skirts or use make ups ...mmm I don't think they really accept us in the university.

LGBTI Co 1 (Linda): Amm...I think these people that need to know should be educated about us...they should be educated about us....even to the some of the students...they accused us...not that they want us but they don't know anything about us...no one is good to us...

The above statements reveal that people's behavior at times does not conform to their verbalization, while labelling LGBTI communities indirectly and pretend to care about criticisms and stigma of identified person who are LGBTI communitiy members.

5.5 KEY ELEMENTS (THRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

Some key elements thrust could be detailed as follows;

5.5.1 Mutual engagement among LGBTI communities and heterosexuals

Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo & Gabriel (2011) (cf.3.4.1) suggested that student's engagement helps to actualize academic success for LGBTI communities by ensuring security of their future at a university campus. Meanwhile, Hughes, Harold and Boyer (2011) (cf.3.4.1) concur that love shared among LGBTI communities can be assured through their interpersonal relationships while trying to understand individual differences from their peers. The researcher reinforces the fact that academic success is possible, irrespective of challenges that LGBTI communities might encounter at a university campus. Dehart et al. (2011) suggest that a sense of belonging apportions confidence for LGBTI communities at a university campus to improve self-dependency and prolongs connectivity. In contrast, Boelen and Reijntjes (2009) (cf.3.4.1) found that a lack of concerned individuals for LGBTI communities creates difficulty for them to access the space to concentrate on stress and thus destabilizes their competence to real life endeavors.

Therefore, Gabb (2011) confirms that the power of holistic relationships of individual maintains relational communications for both LGBTI communities and heterosexual students understanding to connect mentally and physically for human development.

What do you think can be used to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus?

LGBTI Co 1 (Linda): *I thinks is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for them not for anyone...*

LGBTI Co 4 (Marven): *I just wanna add to the question on homosexuality....this is not homosexual or heterosexual ...to help people who are feminists to do say the thing of gay look feminist. So some of these judgement come from the feminist...something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself...*

LGBTI Co 4 (Marven): *I ...mmm... I feel like many things should be done ...is that what happen per time doesn't indicate on whatever people think is good for anyone ...actually people who are influential in education... people who can change the mindset of people, they don't want to hear or understand...especially in teaching should like maybe during teaching...writing on blackboard making examples using LGBTI communities in such like.... A boy and a gay getting married...what about gay marriage?...a gay married a gay...lesbian woman married woman and also have a happy life...so, this lead to see some other people who don't want to listen to others stories that yet there are LGBTI communities who are different in their approach to life.*

LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie): *Aaa.....I think LGBTI communities should be treated with respects among others...mmm...you can see that will make it perfect, yeah!*

In respect to the above questions; (Chopik et al. 2013) suggest a holistic relationship among students as confirmed by LGBTI Co 2 and LGBTI Co 1 who suggest a exchange of respect and freedom to allow everyone enjoy together. Nonetheless, LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) emphasized on getting to understand individual differences

through education to live harmoniously at the university campus is needed. Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco (2011) found that communal living helps in building a stable psychological health for LGBTI communities for co-existence among their peers.

5.5.2 Mindfulness behavior to embrace LGBTI communities

This is a key element thrust that could help both LGBTI communities and heterosexual communities to create a collaborative platform to enjoy a shared university campus based on a warm atmosphere to learn. Hofmann et al. (2010) (cf.3.4.2) in their quantitative study, found that mindfulness-based therapy has functional effects to treat depression and low self-esteem. The study further enhances that LGBTI communities desire a reliable transformative approach to promote efficacy during their time for study to achieve maximum results. Guasp (2011) (cf. 3.4.2) supports that healthcare plays a significant role to sustain LGBTI communities on therapy to improve on their threatening experience, which may infuse unstable living conditions under threatening circumstances.

Erath and Tu (2014) (cf.3.4.2) avert that mindfulness is therapy that encourages to stay in the present moment to cement a pleasant/unpleasant nature for neutrality to control behavioral indifferences with maturity. The researcher considers the point raised appropriately by Hawkley and Cacioppo (2010) (cf.3.4.2), that social exclusion stimulates disconnection and isolation among people, this supports that LGBTI communities equally need a favorable environment to prepare themselves for future responsibilities. Epstein (2009) (cf.3.4.2) confirms that individual development anchored on relational support for reconciliation of acceptance value that appreciates uniqueness in diversity. This discussion will help to instill change in both humans and the environment in readiness to nature.

What should be the attitudes of heterosexuals to LGBTI communities at a university campus?

LGBTI Co 1: *I thinks is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for them not for anyone...*

LGBTI Co 5: *these speak to educational organization that need to set approach to educate majority of students on LGBTI communities and to know that we are normal human beings... {Cough}....stop!*

The results above indicated that change is irrevocable, meaning that it is constant in nature, people do not like to change for many reasons known to them. This has to start firstly by ourselves then extend further. The statement from of LGBTI Co5 emphasized that educational organizations to set an approach to educate ourselves as LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) supported to be educated.

5.5.3 Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities

Feeney and Thrush (2010) (cf.3.4.3) assert that LGBTI communities refer to discoveries of new inventions of temperate attitudes that coordinate serenity with other groups by considering different status, religion, race and ethnicity against social integration among students at a university campus. The exploration on interactive influences on LGBTI communities at a university campus appeals to a transformative approach to embracing them, based on the fact that lives connect together (cf.3.4.3) (Fine & Spencer, 2009). This connotes that irrespective of sexuality, those LGBTI communities equally deserve respect and freedom of interaction with so called “dominant groups” at a university campus so that they will enjoy inclusive education environment with their peers in peace. Fitzsimons and Fishbach (2010) (cf.3.4.3), suggest that prudent LGBTI communities’ promote their life goals through the application of free attitudes as alternatives to applaud their academic activities at a university campus. Therefore, LGBTI communities’ aims to maneuver to connect socially and to engage actively in love relationships to improve their involvement at a university campus for progress of academic performance (cf.3.4.3) (Fafchanps & Shilpi, 2008). Everyday academic experiences in the absence of love might create emotional instability for LGBTI communities at a university campus amidst heterosexual peers.

Nevertheless, love relationships help LGBTI communities’ to achieve their expectations of academic excellence, particularly to secure a remarkable future for themselves (cf.3.4.3) (Santrock, 2008) (cf. 3.4.3). This indicates that love strengthens

interpersonal relationships for all students for their inclusion, to maximize campus life satisfaction. To life satisfaction, Berlart (2012) (cf.3.4.3) supports that interpersonal relationships are dynamic systems in nature, which might change continuously during life and existence. This might serve as therapy to stimulate LGBTI communities among peers at a university campus. As such, measures of complementing each other, affords appropriate security and emotional stability. Needham and Austin (2010) (cf.3.4.3) concur that love grows gradually as people get to know about LGBTI communities, and their attitudes towards discrimination and avoidance of close interaction. Gradually affection might deteriorate as people drift apart, live and form new relationships with others. This model describes that LGBTI communities' relationships are applied to other kinds of interpersonal relations.

What do you think can be used to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus?

The followings extract provides a possible solution to the above problem;

USSP (Lisandary): okay...mmm... I said more enough in other question...I think the best approach to use is to allow students...emmm...educate themselves so that on the learning process, students will come with the knowledge of LGBTI and concept itself at the university to embrace, love and care...embrace...and students are gold and to LGBTI communities...it will show that not everyone is against the communities, tolerance...support for all and also have the forum with LGBTI organ...I think it might be good approach.

Stu 2: This will bring about understand about LGBTI and improve how student relate to LGBTI.

Stu 2: Educate people about the Bill of rights and the responsibilities stipulated in the bill of right and reinforce those right and responsibilities in practice.

LGBTIOC: The Narrative needs to change and it starts with the students e.g Class of 1976, FEES MUST FALL MOVEMENT....Education education.... education - through discussion with solutions between students and management.

According to the above extracts, Fitzsimons and Fishbach (2010) (cf.3.4.3), promotion of life goal with the mindset full of assurance to fulfil life goals, indicated by Stu perhaps serves as an example cited; the fees-must-fall movement to achieve one goal by LGBTIOC to provide solutions. USSP (Lisandary) stated that learning can bring knowledge needed by LGBTI communities to gain support and tolerance from others. The researcher contends against the new invention of Feeney and Thrush (2010) (cf.3.4.3), that change is tantamount to all round recovery, based on the fact, that one contests his/her right, does not guarantee tolerance but rather calls for reconsideration, which is an expected impact.

5.5.4 Love to embrace LGBTI communities

Notably, love is a vital key element thrust that associates students together from, without sexuality, discrimination among themselves. According to Alatalo (2012) (cf.3.4.4), love helps to appreciate diversity. He considers the beauty of unity as a necessary tool for unity to promote life adaptation over circumstances. Apparently, Harrison and Shorthall (2011) (cf.3.4.4) affirm that love aligned with connection, caring, that individuals have to express relationships' satisfaction as a means through which interests shared at a time. Surprisingly, LGBTI communities, enjoy derived support from themselves, based on relationship satisfaction especially while they share about challenges on their sexuality. In addition, active goals lead to a preference to others and goals are in motivational priority, which have greater impacts on the closeness to the others (cf.3.4.4) (Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees & Skinner, 2011).

This supports that motivational priority apprehends closeness that displays feelings that one has for others as stated by Seelman et al. (2012) (cf. 3.4.4), love relationships entrench individual students to exercise remorse towards their life's goals achievement. Moreover, progress can increase and decrease by a student's motivational drive to achieve in life's endeavor (cf.3.4.4) (Fitzsimons & Fishbach, 2010). Progress plays an active role to reprioritize an individual's goals to shape feelings that students have about their peers to be helpful in their pursuit of goal's dynamic nature and self-regulation" (cf.3.4.4) (Fitzsimons & Fishbach, 2010, p. 546). The researcher suggests that people's feelings and emotions be constant to embrace one another, feel respected, adored and appreciated. I believe that if this is achieved,

it will promote an outstanding healthy lifestyle. The research team added the following vital points:

OCFT: *Like seriously, with the look of things at the campus it appears to provide protective measures to make LGBTI communities safe among their peers, such I think to have a listening ears to them, tolerance to socialize with them like being friendly more acceptance and other good relationships to make LGBTI communities feel comfortable in the classroom and campus environment.*

USSP (Lisandary): *okay...mmm... I said more enough in other question...I think the best approach to use is to allow students...emmm...educate themselves so that on the learning process, students will come with the knowledge of LGBTI and concept itself at the university to embrace, love and care...embrace...and students are gold and to LGBTI communities...it will show that not everyone is against the communities, tolerance...support for all and also have the forum with LGBTI organ...I think it might be good approach.*

USSP (Lisandary) alternatively enlightens us on how to rather err before taking action to embrace LGBTI communities as indicated on the afore cited extracts, OCFT maintained the duties of peers to have open ears, tolerate and socialize with them for provision of friendly environment to LGBTI communities. The researcher stands to suggest that tolerance should be mandatory as ecological systems requires a neutral relationships for humanity.

5.5.5 Freedom of LGBTI communities

In addition, there are limitations to the rights of individuals which makes it so unique to discover more endowment on life for among people within their social environment. Kelmer, Rhoades, Stanley and Markman (2013) (cf.3.4.5) confirmed that key elements to support the victims disconnected through circumstances and intervene to alleviate their commitment to regain their freedom and right to life. Peradventure, Graber and Sontag (2008) (cf.3.4.5) believe that LGBTI communities coming out of challenges might influence their behavior positively to engage in daily social life participation.

However, Bortolin, Adam and Jaime McCauley (2013) (cf.3.4.5) suggest that, repeated routine of stigmatization interferes with LGBTI communities at a university campus. Thereby no embracing approaches which are transformative in life transitions are in place. Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) (cf.3.4.5) concur that psychological cooperation attempts to propose a transformative approach which engenders LGBTI communities to maximize their potential in all round activities and to further complement efforts to actualize their life goals. Selhub (2009) (cf.3.4.5) confirms that intimacy of LGBTI communities' students in agreement with heterosexuals might create a welcoming atmosphere on their needs and interests to promote the quality of love relationships for a lifelong adventure. However, Ashley-Smith (2013) (cf.3.4.5) suggests that equity involves sharing of different opinions and views together, to engage common interests through developing a transformative approach that could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. This will invent intervention strategies for the whole university's students as a backup measure.

LGBTI Co 1: *Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI.*

Stu 4 (Bradeline): *No, it has to your own choice whether you want to accept LGBTI communities for who they are or not. They cannot change who they are just because of the opinion of those around them... Negative opinions of other students at the university.... I feel the more they continue being themselves and allowing others to also bring themselves in the open, although it will take time, people will acknowledge them and their perspective towards them will also change because at the end of the day we are all humans.*

LGBTI Co 1: *I thinks is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for them not for anyone...*

In the above statements by LGBTI Co 1, Stu 4 (Bradeline) re-affirmed the need of coming together for agreement and acceptance. This requires to be well knowledgeable on LGBTI communities and embracing humanity in general.

5.5.6 Cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities

Boylan (2008) (cf. 3.4.6) disagrees that the power of love centers on mechanisms that relate university students together, and depends on the assumptions that LGBTI communities students could appreciate themselves, and desire to cooperate with love relationships among peers. This instates an embracing ability of love, and signifies a collective responsibility for cordial agreements among students. Sherwood (2006) (cf.3.4.6) affirms that social, emotional, psychological, physical, spiritual and academic responsibilities are recursive needs to life accomplishments, hence these need to be made significant to prioritize choices of preference to influence a transformative approach which might lead to embracing LGBTI communities' interests by value of choices. Boylan (2008) (cf.3.4.6) supports that good ability is designed to accomplish human existence in the world of interdependence actualization. This supports that cooperation plays a significant role to mediate the gap between the LGBTI communities and heterosexuals as they co-exist within the same praxis of university campus.

Stu 2: It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and though and beliefs

LGBTI Co 1: in the past on campus, there were lot of discrimination on the campus against LGBTI communities and within the campus and many guys...students don not want to show that we are like them ...abuse, victimization and stigma. But now we are coming out of such stereotype idea....there are challenges on daily basis...and some things were changing to way they look at LGBTI communities...that at least we socialize among ourselves with little people around us who ready to tolerate us around them.

Results suggest that all should be respected and treated with acceptance, irrespective of beliefs and differences. Human is human and there is need and reason to be in harmony in order to strengthen our connectivity among ourselves at a university campus.

5.5.7 Friendships to embrace LGBTI communities

Demir, Ozen, Dogan, Bilgk and Tyrell (2011) (cf. 3.4.7) in their empirical research, revealed that the amount of happiness results in quality relationships, and hence matters in responsiveness levels promotes to mediate relationship differences between friendship and happiness functions. This confirms that out of loneliness comes companionship which might counsel LGBTI communities to stay happy through connectivity with their heterosexual peers (cf. 3.4.7) (Riggle et al. 2008). The mediation however, intensifies a theoretical lens to understand how friendships related to happiness. Meanwhile, some explanations suggest that to maintain and establish healthy friendships which might paradventure aim at empower fundamental needs and contribute to happiness that bring unity in diversity (cf. 3.4.7) (Demir and Weitekamp, 2007; Lyubomirsky, 2008). Basically, warm attention gained by LGBTI communities contributes to their happiness and is tailored by support received from their friends and families in times of need. This constitutes the experience of love within the friendship sphere that postulates potential influence on human social well-being (cf. 3.4.7) (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008; Lyubomirsky, 2008). The researcher is of the opinion that good interrelationships between heterosexual peers and LGBTI communities might promote happiness and improve on their mental lifestyles at a university campus.

Stu 5 (*Sunflower*): *Yes, I am friends with people part of LGBTI community. Reason being that I don't see them for their sexual orientation. They just good people I get along with that are my friends.... Everyone I've been around or witnessed have been very welcoming and supportive of them treating them the same as any student regardless of sexual orientation.*

It is very important to respect individual differences based on Stu 5 (*Sunflower*) who has indicated that some of LGBTI communities were good people to associate with,

and thought that through friendly interactions can support them to maximize their academic delivery at the university.

5.6 CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH CAN BE USED TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

In this sections, the circumstances under which a transformative approach could be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a campus were discussed below.

5.6.1 Staffs' lack of support for LGBTI communities

This part addresses staffs/teachers uncaring attitudes to support matters related to LGBTI communities or related sexuality issues at the university campus. Francis (2012) (cf. 3.5.1) states that there is a need to create more intensive awareness and teaching of sexuality will cater for the social, emotional, health and educational well-being of all learners and supporting diversity on teaching and learning in South African schools. The attempt is to remove homophobia, which commonly deprives learner's interest and militate against their emotions on good academic performance of homosexual students who keep to themselves at universities (Neto & Pinto, 2015). Francis (2013) (cf. 3.5.1) affirms that LGBTI communities' students find it very difficult to socialize among their peers who are heterosexual and maintain adequately in team activities or presentations, yet struggling to gain tolerance of fellow students, which may have negative influence on their academic performance. Thomas (2011) (cf. 3.5.1) asserts that human quality lifestyle depends on the quality of interaction students have around them also militates against enjoyment they have together, confirms that good relationships make happier engagement among student communities to provide a transformative approach for sound mental health. This supports that more LGBTI communities gain embracing love among peers from heterosexuals that could medically avert depression, anger, mania and other psychological problems. Taylor and Snowdon (2014) (cf. 3.5.1) agree that LGBTI communities' students are intensively motivated towards achieving greater success in their lives whenever life seems fun and play. Notably, Swank and Raiz (2010) (cf. 3.5.1) affirm that heterosexuals make different interpretations of LGBTI communities based on their home background, and understanding of sexuality and gender differences. More so,

their ability to adapt to the new university campus environment in which they find themselves seems difficult (cf. 3.5.1) (Langbein & Yost, 2009). Notwithstanding, circumstances may create opportunities that embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

The results above showed that staffs/lecturers and the entire management should intervene in creating and enabling a university environment that accommodates all, as pointed for all to see, unity in diversity, not picturing sexual abnormality but with care for and support all students, especially LGBTI communities.

5.6.2 Changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities

Another need is the changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities to intervene on the perceptions and acceptance giving by others. Chopik, Edelstein and Fraley (2013) (cf. 3.5.2) advocate life for life adaptation in order to develop a transformative approach that caters for systematic problems through the changing of attitudes to accommodate diversity, for LGBTI communities that are struggling to participate at the university campus activities. The change of attitudes will seek to strengthen friendly connections required among students (cf. 3.5.2) (Hall, Evans & Nixon, 2013). To the researcher, Lemay and Clark (2008) support that social connectivity with other students revolves across life, by mauldering about LGBTI communities' relationships at times plays a continuation of friendly association with mates from high school to the advance stage in university, which may lead to long life companionships as married couples.

Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2014) (cf. 3.5.2) contends that attachments have a stronger effect to build a transformative approach on relationships to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. As both LGBTI communities and heterosexual students understand each other, it helps to connect mentally and spiritually thus increasing human development. In most cases, others perceived being non-heterosexual or being gender non-conforming as un-African (Brouard & Pieterse, 2012) (cf. 3.5.2), this indicates homophobic attitude among people. Meanwhile, a good number of studies have investigated the causes and characteristics of homophobia, but have not provided adequately how those practices/behaviours can be challenged

and minimised (cf. 3.5.2) (Rispel et al. 2012; Müller, 2013). LGBTI individuals are not only experiencing challenges in broader communities, but also in places like universities (cf. 3.5.2) (Arndt and De Bruin, 2006; Human Rights Watch, 2012; Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Ganga-Limando, 2015; Mavhandu-Mudzusi & Sandy, 2015). The challenges are mostly experienced in communities where heteronormativity is stressed, such as rural communities and extends to rural universities. Collins (2009) (cf.3.5.2) suggests that heteronormativity perspective mainly promotes heterosexuality as the only 'normal' sexual orientation without contest or trespass to other different sexuality. Therefore, word "heteronormativity" refers to a set of institutional practices that systematically legitimise and establish heterosexuality as the norm for sexual and broader social relations (Taylor & Snowden, 2014) notwithstanding others sexual orientation practices.

The studies conducted, and media reports indicate that there is intolerance of any sexual orientation different from heterosexuality and gender roles indicate the extent of stigma and discrimination around LGBTI individuals (cf. 3.5.2) (DeBarros 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2014). Nonetheless, exposure of LGBTI communities to humiliation by regarding them as an outcast through the means of name-calling and public threat from heterosexuals is commonly found (cf. 3.5.2) (DeBarros 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Sandy 2015). Furthermore, Reygan (2013) (cf. 3.5.2) opens that there is a need for schools to be teaching anti-oppressive pedagogies which perhaps subscribe to sexual and gender minorities in education.

Beitz (2009) (cf. 3.5.2) acknowledges that socialisation propels a lifelong process which helps to learn social expectations and ways to interact with other people. At this, people apportion consciousness on sexuality so that they can learn to accept each other. Johnson (2014) asserts that socialisation assists populace to embrace LGBTI and consider it not as an oppositional and behavioural aspect that LGBTI is aberrant by violence in contest. Noteworthy, Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald, (2009) (cf. 3.5.2) argue that poor sexual education orientation of teachers in high schools may internalize learners from high schools to higher institutions, where campus clearly shows homophobia towards LGBTI communities. This perhaps will demystify the preconceived ideas of heterosexuality versus homosexuality.

Francis (2012), Francis and DePalma (2014) (cf. 3.5.2) emphasize that students should be equipped with skills to challenge inequality and discrimination in their study environment, and affirm that learning activities do not promote discrimination. Johnson (2014) affirms that the concept of diversity includes recognition for individual sexuality to support that each individual is unique in thought, and it encompasses individual differences.

SRC (Gi): *Firstly...what you need to understand is that... change is a difficult thing...so now we know you should know that most of our students they are from rural areas...areas where...ah...ah... LGBTI communities are...are... not much been seeing there...or seeing things happening is not that way as present.. so for them came...to the institution of learning...therefore, for them..... coming into our institution of learning...therefore, there's need for them to be educated...it means that since that you're in the institution, there is a kind of thing for them to learn in an institution, there are particular the issue of LGBTI communities about issues around university...because some of the people hardly understand how someone can become a lesbian or someone become bisexual, they need to be taught throughout the process about LGBTI communities ...therefore, students need to be educated....so that they understand.*

USSP (Lisandary): *Emm...m...I think one of the approach we can use...em...m...is the on the campus base, Is probably using what we called Edutem...to use edutem ... to involve education at time...I think I like to...and lack of education ...emm...mm...we are a great of subject of change to students. I think I too lack of understanding about LGBTI communities...emm....m...approach I said is to hold awareness...emm...get LGBTI student to speak on the experiences...and to see how these adapt and how they are in the residences and how feeling each other and go theyemm... approach of embracing a program of...of.. education terms where they will have time to entertaining- through health, play, drama...and songs that could be created and making entertainment that will bring all students together in the campus...creating awareness...take away fear for being LGBTI among students.*

In respect to the above results; it was noted that despite the difficult change to do as stated by SRC (Gi), it is imperative we adapt to embrace others who may share different sexuality; LGBTI communities should be accommodated through education and deeper understanding about LGBTI communities. This will seek to transform reasoning and negative stereotype that the majority heterosexuals might have on LGBTI communities at a university campus.

5.6.3 Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI communities

LGBTI communities sometimes did not receive welcome arms from their heterosexual counterparts at university and this subjects them to loneliness, depression for low self-esteem. Barnes, Brown, Krusemark, Campbell and Rogge (2007) (cf. 3.5.3) suggested that higher levels of mindfulness are normative precautions to sustain higher levels of relationship satisfaction; therefore, educators are cautioned to consider good self-esteem as an education target to support transformation. The researcher contends that practiced mindfulness to relate with students might serve to inform educators and practitioners to focus on promoting family healthy relationships to improve student's low self-esteem.

On the other hand, Birditt, Antonucci and Tighe (2012) (cf. 3.5.3) concurred that mindfulness ensures relationship satisfaction from a conflict discussion trait towards lower emotional stress responses through positive pre-and-post-conflict change of perception over love and tolerance. The researcher contends that transformative approach will be helpful to embracing LGBTI communities at a University campus, on a discovery that mindfulness will help both heterosexual and LGBTI communities to secure good self-esteem without interference with others against cooperation for tolerance at a university campus. Hofmann et al. (2010) in their quantitative study found that mindfulness-based therapy has a functioning effect to treat depression and low self-esteem that represent common symptoms among the LGBTI communities' students and universities.

Neff (2011) (cf. 3.5.3) supports that good self-esteem averts persistent-character judgment through one's wrong perception to nail diversity, and thus cultivate self-compassion for one another. This supports to limit self-criticism and eschew its negative effects that can serve as hindrances to achieve goals towards highest

potential, more contented and a fulfilled life. In addition, Erath and Tu (2014) (cf. 3.5.3) emphasize that contention arguments on sexuality with negative confrontations might create a threat for the LGBTI communities instead of encouraging them to cultivate positive creativity to cope with their academic responsibility, without undermining their essential social wellbeing. He further extends to improve on good self-esteem through character development that can fortify self-worth against challenges in terms of emotional, physical, social and educational features to develop amore positive mind that establishes possibilities.

Stu 1(SH5): *LGBTI communities are the communities which involves not only males and females but also involve gays, lesbians and bisexual people.... LGBTI communities around my campus does exist but they are treated in a different way compared to straight males and females. I don't know whether it because they like to go as a group or because they feel not wanted by the other students.*

LGBTIOC: *Issues of discrimination and judgement that's need to educating everyone. That there is nothing wrong with being different.*

LGBTIOC: *We live in the 21st century so I honestly do not expect some of the happenings I read about re: Homophobia, Transphobia, gender based violence but because we live in a society that is hurt & that think violation means you care for someone is a problem.*

Stu 3: *[Classmates have different emotions towards LGBTI communities. There are those who are familiar with the LGBTI communities who are responding well towards them, who knows and have understanding that LGBTI communities are people like us and have feelings like us. While others have no remorse towards LGBTI communities. They do not treat them as human beings and they treat those people without feelings].*

Stu 5 (Sunflower): *[Yes, I am friends with people part of LGBTI community. Reason being that I don't see them for their sexual orientation. They just good people I get along with that are my friends.... Everyone I've been around or witnessed have been very welcoming and supportive of them treating them the same as any student regardless of sexual orientation].*

Stu 2: *[It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and though and beliefs].*

LGBTI Co 4: *Mmm... I go to the section of attitudes...mmm...it is important to know that we are not different from other people....and mmm...I think people from LGBTI communities should take a leading role on this point...*

LGBTI Co 1: *Amm...I think these people that need to know should be educated about us...they should be educated about us....even to the some of the students...they accused us...not that they want us but they don't know anything about us...no one is good to us...*

The statements above suggested that individuals can be supported when a good atmosphere is created to perpetuate good self-esteem for LGBTI communities to compete without guilt or blame that might hamper their academic engagement among peers at a university campus.

5.6.4 Changing of prejudice about LGBTI communities

Brikkels (2014) (cf. 3.5.4) confirms that prejudice of non-conforming behaviour of the majority of heterosexual individuals, regard relationships with the same sex as abnormal and against the norms, values of their society, and therefore they collude together to rape these gays and lesbians within their community. Fewer LGBTI communities suffer this in silence, this indicates the act of hatred and intolerance of gender differences that Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo, and Gabriel (2011) (cf. 3.5.4) pointed out, by heterosexual communities, are internalized experiences by LGBTI communities' when they come out over their sexuality.

Swank and Raiz (2010) (cf. 3.5.4) concur that change of attitudes serve a prominent role for recovery of LGBTI communities from outside into diverse world, through broad awareness to transform society and universities through forgiveness to accommodate all without discrepancies. This shows that education on sexuality and related subjects

is cogent to prepare the universities and society to share common knowledge that embraces diversity. Needham and Austin (2010) (cf. 3.5.4) confirm that sexual orientation needs to be handled with caution from parents and thereby allow full acceptance to acknowledge LGBTI communities' identity to gain support that will help them to play their roles at homes, schools, universities and society.

The free access to engagement among peers at a university campus will reignite LGBTI communities' efficiency in their academic and social performances that enact support to appropriate their opportunities (cf. 3.5.4) (Blondal & Sigrun, 2009). Berlant (2012) (cf. 3.5.4) agrees that attitude change and love maintain equity and fairness that humans should consider individuals as family which needs empathy at any time of difficulties to cuddle for their recovery. Alatalo (2012) (cf. 3.5.4) emphasises on the importance of equality for humanity which should not be negotiated and confirms that love is paramount to judicial arbitration. The researcher envisages that this study could purposely support LGBTI communities to gain more confidence over challenges in their lives and conquer emotional problems such as; depression, anxiety, suicidal thought and unfavorable condition. Block (2008) asserts that community acceptance postulates therapy to reduce or eliminate emotional problems adopted from gender/sexuality encounters and help them to cope socially with others at a university campus respectively.

UL1 (*Donchido*): *one...a University...academic community...stakeholders, non-governmental organizations...court people....churches...hospital....our family...in fact member of the communities...because...it affect all of us together.*

LGBTI Co 3: *what like? Debates and dialogues be done from lecture venues on the LGBTI communities relationship among classmate should be taught correctly by the lecturers...so students understand.*

OCFT: *Uhhh....about barriers/hindrances....I can say what I think could be problems is in case where university do not want to support the approach to embracing LGBTI communities fully. Also...situation that LGBTI communities do not want to be part of the programme may be due to past of their experiences of stigmatization, abuses or hatred among heterosexual*

students not to have a repeat of the scene. Another hindrance can be non-conformity of heterosexual about LGBTI communities. Also, lack of provision for such initiative at the university and less homophobic environment to change to unknown ideas.

LGBTI Co 1: Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI.

The emergence of the statement aforementioned concurred that attitudes of other students be corrected to avoid discrimination of others either against disability or LGBTI communities and leveling different practices that might undermine communality among students at large.

5.6.5 University campus implementation of anti-bullying program to embracing LGBTI communities

This aspect is the key medium to support students who might be marginalized or bullied by other students or peers aiming at lessening such occurrences at schools and university campuses. On this note of importance, Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, and Bartkiewicz (2010) (cf. 3.5.5) concur on the need to implement school-wide anti-bullying policies to reduce or eliminate victimization and for the benefits of LGBTI learners in the schools. This synthesizes that LGBTI communities at a university campus and homes experience social prejudice, harassment, stigmatization and rejection by their peers, friends and pushed them to intensified loneliness that makes these students vulnerable to suicidal thought (cf. 3.5.5) (Aragon, Poteat & Espelage, 2014; Aspendliedder, Buchanan, McDougall & Sippola, 2009). This shows that disassociation evidence and isolation may endanger a victim of abuses in any form and trigger minds to wrong thoughts, which can lead them to perpetual ideation, at the

absence of good counsel and supportive measure; such a student may commit suicide.

Van Aswegen (2008) (cf. 3.5.5) suggests that intervention measures are required to assure equilibrium in circumstances to accommodate varieties of identities among students at the university environments. Moreover, psychosocial support enhanced psychosocial wellbeing of individual student competencies and capacities to deal with their lives' demands and manage love relationships well, enabling them to understand their environment, status engaging with, make choices, and have hope for their promising future (cf. 3.5.5) (Halderman, 2012). To this fact, Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) (cf. 3.5.5) reveal that students' psychosocial well-being covers other aspects of their lives, such as appropriate emotions, relevant thoughts or cognitions, mental health, develop morality, enhance positive relationships with family, peers and teachers. Bortlin, Adam and Jaime McCauley (2013) (cf. 3.5.5) support that students' psychosocial wellbeing affects every aspect of their lives and this might reflect on their ability to learn, health, play and to relate adequately well with other people as they grow.

LGBTI Co 3: what like? Debates and dialogues be done from lecture venues on the LGBTI communities relationship among classmate should be taught correctly by the lecturers...so students understand.

UL1 (Donchido): yeah! It will be implemented if all the member of the University is part and parcel of the program...it will be very...very...successful...if all the staff members be part to form this approach that will embracing LGBTI communities

LGBTI Co 3: what like? Debates and dialogues be done from lecture venues on the LGBTI communities relationship among classmate should be taught correctly by the lecturers...so students understand.

The above statements presented that program to be established such that debates and dialogues can be used as a medium to communicate to the populace to have a different relook on LGBTI communities and challenges to provide intervention to accommodate all from stress of victimization, abuses or any violence acts against LGBTI communities as equal rights to education among peers.

5.6.6 Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities

Pyykkönen (2012) (cf. 3.5.6) concurs that there is a need to support LGBTI communities at a university campus among their peers, socially to enhance their sustenance and improve wellbeing. Psychosocial support is described as a continuum of care and momentum which aims is gear towards ensuring social, emotional and psychological wellbeing of students at the university campus (cf. 3.5.6) (Gabb, 2011). This support aims at improve students' academic achievement like the whole university's students to include LGBTI communities. Obviously, the provision of psychosocial support services aimed to enhance physical wellness and emotional wellbeing of LGBTI communities' students who are vulnerable to abuse and fear experience insecurity at a university campus for disclosure of their sexuality among other students (cf. 3.5.6) (Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011). Psychosocial combines entities responsible for social competence which is difficult to separate from physical and biological aspect of life (cf. 3.5.6) (Boden, Fischer & Neihuis, 2010). The term directs attention towards LGBTI communities who suffer stigmatization rather than focus exclusively on the physical/psychological aspects of health and wellbeing. Carlson and Sperry (2010) (cf. 3.5.6) emphasise that LGBTI communities' psychosocial needs be observed within the interpersonal contexts of broader family and community networks against the significant role that coordinate the human lives through relating with other people of the same environment.

LGBTI Co 4: I just wanna add to the question on homosexuality....this is not homosexual or heterosexual ...to help people who are feminists to do say the thing of gay look feminist. So some of these judgement come from the feminist...something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself...

UL1: amm...the best approach I can think...if am to provide solution...I think the thing should start at the classroom...as a professional teacher or lecturer...to teach our students to understand that there's no problem to be friendly with LGBTI communities and make them to know that there are different

in sexual orientation....as a teacher...it has to be my responsibility to educate my students to understand that there are other sexual identities and there is no different in LGBTI communities and others...is just a matter of different sexual orientation. So as a teacher...it has to be my responsibility to help my students understand all this...because...where they are coming from...from their various villages...from their various cultural backgrounds....they do not know and their culture do not allow them from their communities they lives...and the way they were brought up is how then they feel them...I think everything starts there...

UL1 (donchido): *that in the first place shouldn't happen...because...if it happens...the lecturer should come in...if that should happen...the course director should come in...leader of that particular module should come in...to intervene...in such case...is not something to let go for that particular student....it might lead to depression...lead to someone commit suicide or attempt...the coordinator even the cluster leader should be involved...so that the necessary steps can be taken...*

Here the psychosocial support should not be someone's ideology on gender issues, sexuality, disability and more but an approach that can engage all students without neglecting any, coming to one understanding of the subject of acceptance and embracing each other as such LGBTI communities as valued respective individuals that form belongingness at a university campus.

5.6.7 Provision of improved safety at university campus to embracing LGBTI communities

A university campus in this context is an environment that seeks to accommodate a populace of students for education development in general. In this study, University campus often formed sites of victimisation for LGBTI communities (cf. 3.5.7) (D'Augelli et al., 2006; SAHRC, 2007). LGBTI communities have been found to encounter vulnerability at university campuses because of their sexuality identification. This occurs because of their sexual orientation and the way they express their gender identity (cf. 3.5.7) (Aspenlieder, Buchanan, McDougall, & Sippola, 2009; Tetreault, Fette, Meidlinger & Hope, 2013; Renn, 2010; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, Card & Russell,

2010). Labelling and disassociation of LGBTI communities on a daily basis by heterosexual students can prevent them from achieving academic success and engaging fully in campus endeavours. As result of opposition to sexuality, it becomes so difficult for LGBTI communities to perform well academically because there is no enabling academic environment to attend lectures without fear for their safety and emotional wellbeing (cf. 3.5.7) (Fisher, Poirier & Blau, 2012).

Sadly, students who attend unsecured university campus environments are more likely to alienate themselves from these homophobic environments by being absent or dropping out (cf. 3.5.7) (Aragon, Poteat, & Espelage, 2014; Lozier & Beckman, 2012). The researcher noticed that fewer students did not find it easy to share their social life problems with anyone for fear of more bad encounters; they rather take leave from school or withdraw for the semester. On this note, Lamanna and Reidmann (2009) (cf. 3.5.7) maintain that performance of students needs follow-up to encroach transformative ideas, to enable university campus to be more adaptable for LGBTI communities to enjoy a supportive atmosphere to maximize their potential like their heterosexual peers across the high schools, colleges and universities.

Birditt, Antonucci and Tighe (2012) (cf. 3.5.7) state some problems which heterosexual students usually place on LGBTI communities includes; loneliness, insecurity, depression and isolation which often results in internalizing problems. Lyubomirsky (2008) (cf. 3.5.7) confirms that internalized emotions have no distinctive ends for LGBTI communities, ethically, students only get support to handle their challenges to recover faster. Gaine and Guardia (2009) (cf. 3.5.7) contend that perspectives for unequal gender differences be addressed to normalize the competition that persistently arrives between wider heterosexuals and LGBTI communities at the same university campus. To this, there is need for optimum dialogues and awareness to provide support services to LGBTI communities who may be marginalized due to sexual orientation and thus suffer unequal measure of relationships that embrace a democratic state of students.

Stu 1(SH5): [To change the state of LGBTI communities, I think they should be some sort of a campaign which will run once a week. I think if the campus management and lecturers support the campaign, LGBTI communities will feel

included, wanted and special to the campus because they have the management support].

Stu 5 (Sunflower): *[Talks and seminars should be held when students enter the university on the different communities found in varsity and educating them on such Students, student's body, management and outsiders, professionals who are more knowledgeable on the topic helping educate students. All being treated equally. And all these factors not being made to define them students being seen and treated and such for they are].*

Stu 4 (Bradeline): *[Involve student's participation. There is a huge number of student in the university and they all enjoy doing different things. Have an event that can involve all the student, must include team work/building and social interaction. Anyone can be an agent especially within the university from RA (Residence Assistant) to the house committee].*

OCFT: *[I think this question is very difficult to address as I felt majorly this involves the entire school management to look into the creation of welcoming university environment that will embrace LGBTI communities and other cultural diversity. More to say is that, through a platform of awareness campaigns of the university in general to be part of the initiative of inclusion of all students. I see that if management can support and all stakeholders with the collaboration of students/student's representative council – a fair approach can be launched when all bodies are adequately represented in the design of such approach that will benefit all students and LGBTI communities].*

Stu 2: *[Create awareness campaign in which students will be taught about LGBTI communities; once they understand they will be able to treat them with acceptance and Respect].*

Stu 1 and Stu 2 suggested a campaign that will include university management to make LGBTI communities feel included on the program to be accepted and respected while Stu 5 and Stu 4 requested talks, seminars and student's participation that will involve large number of students, allowing professionals to be speakers to educate university students on LGBTI communities, creating social relation. However, On

Campus Faith Thrust (OCFT) supports to ensure welcoming University environments through the joint effort to launch inclusive University campus. The researcher discovered that varieties of perspectives can form a transformative initiative to embrace LGBTI communities among heterosexuals to build a participatory network that helps academic and emotional states of all students.

5.7 HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The followings could be barriers to a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus as discussed below.

5.7.1 Dominance of heterosexuals over LGBTI communities

Noticeable heterosexual dominance engenders marginalization of the LGBTI communities and hence impact negatively on their academic performance and lives indirectly. On this note, Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowics, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) (cf. 3.6.1) maintained that monitoring of involvement on activities participation are normative to transformation that might make the university campus more attractive for LGBTI communities to enjoy a supportive atmosphere to maximize their potential like heterosexual peers across the high schools, colleges and universities. The research team presented thus;

USSP (Lisandary): *Em... I think for one...am...going to say that...em...in addressing LGBTI...we need to start with a top- down-approach...I think is important that in addressing issues related that they need to be familiarized especially the management and to write down to junior staffs and emm... students...of course there are obstacles...emm...as I have said before the stigma attached to LGBTI communities...mmm...create a sense of vulnerability within the campus where...students afraid to express themselves in fear of victimized around the campus and of course...we need to get the involvement of monitoring team within the off campus and of course management should be aware of this which should be found...so the top-down-approach that I was saying from the management....permission from LGBTI communities and also put of the local*

government...partnering with local organizations...to embracing the awareness campaigns ...the awareness of LGBTI community.

LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie): I think there should be awareness campaigns...show talk and during awareness...there should be experts to...to...to teach the students about LGBTI, were and the res...of the organization should be...should be more...mmm...active around the campuses like building the wall of awareness...so that people be more aware and that people should be....ah...ah...ah...active expert...a person who can be able to let students understand whatsapp on organization about and how can treat the people in the organization...

SRC (Gi): it is through educational forum whereby all students can be present to be part of this program...even cleaners...even inner bodies...ground...ground to come do the issues of educators to come and deal with issues of LGBTI because the communities...because...everyone need to be part and be educated...

Based on the point of view of University Student Services Practitioner (USSP; Lisandry), advised a top-down approach of recruiting all stakeholders even to the junior staff to find a way to embracing LGBTI communities while LGBTI Co 2 supported that awareness campaigns and talk shows should be put in place where experts can provide activities around campus. At this, SRC (Gi) considered an educational forum that will allow the coming up of LGBTI communities' issues, discusses all the bodies, from the cleaners to the top management. The researcher confirmed that round table of the entire department and management were required to set a transformative approach, collaboratively to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

5.7.2 Different perspectives on embracing LGBTI communities

A Simon, Aikins and Prinstein (2008) (cf. 3.6.2), study found that socialization factors align with differences which enclose adjustment on similarities among LGBTI communities but difficult to provide security for their consciousness to collective belongingness. This study found that connecting factors of relationships intend to popularize LGBTI communities and reduce their interest to physical attraction and

depressive symptoms. Moreover, Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) (cf. 3.6.2) noted that LGBTI communities socialize at a university campus by engaging in love relationships through inclusion of others to choose friends who tolerate them on their daily interactions on the university campus. Guasp (2011) (cf. 3.6.2) asserts that absence of welcome of LGBTI communities acquire difficulties from interpersonal relationships which masked with stereotype and prejudice among people in their environments. Savage (2010) (cf. 3.6.2) affirms that social stress experienced by LGBTI communities' sexuality deprives them of friendly relationships with peers accrue to social rejection. Romero-Canyas, Downey, Berenson, Ayduk and Kang (2010) revealed that social rejection pushes LGBTI communities out of unacceptance to love from counterparts whose familiarity with them, rather than uncared heterosexual peers against their security. The following findings were presented and interpreted below;

SRC (Gi): Like everyone should be friendly...yes...all must be aware of LGBTI communities so as to create rapport and learning.

USSP (Lisandary): Well... the relevant part of it is that to be part of it is personal...I see from the onset being a student who have the limited knowledge of LGBTI...eh...en... coming into the structures have spoken about and would begin to create an open mind to know more about LGBTI communities and ... I seen the relevant idea is this...because coming through the process of learning is there on a transformative approach to learning....is still relevant to transform mind ...one getting a better understanding of LGBTI and also at the same time in coming in support of the world the LGBTI communities is having...

LGBTI Co 3: I think what Rosie says is true to be involve in many activities that inform LGBTI communities....people that know homosexual thing...it should be people who are also the school be involved in organizing campaigns that can bring change to people understanding of LGBTI.

LGBTI Co 1: to organize a programme that will be controlled by LGBTI communities and get other department involve in the program met that all the students and management involvement...maybe to involve all in the university in the thing to all involvement.

USSP (Lisandary): *Em... I think for one...am...going to say that...em...in addressing LGBTI...we need to start with a top- down-approach...I think is important that in addressing issues related that they need to be familiarized especially the management and to write down to junior staffs and emm... students...of course there are obstacles...emm...as I have said before the stigma attached to LGBTI communities...mmm...create a sense of vulnerability within the campus where...students afraid to express themselves in fear of victimized around the campus and of course...we need to get the involvement of monitoring team within the off campus and of course management should be aware of this which should be found...so the top-down-approach that I was saying from the managementpermission from LGBTI communities and also put of the local government...partnering with local organizations...to embracing the awareness campaignsthe awareness of LGBTI community.*

On the above data results; it therefore found need to create a friendly atmosphere and show love to LGBTI communities, develop an open mind to be able to teach those who have limited knowledge about LGBTI communities to be tolerable. However, as LGBTI Co 1 stated, to form a program controlled by LGBTI communities with management involvement, while USSP suggested that the university must take a standing role to monitor the implementation of embracing LGBTI communities through campaigns, even government needs to be involved.

5.7.3 Insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities

To ensure moderate attitudes and sufficient knowledge to avoid mishaps and misunderstandings between LGBTI communities and heterosexuals, Molden and Finkel (2010), Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) (cf. 3.6.3) stated that imbalance made possible through moderate attitudes to activate forgiveness on past wrongs of the past and embracing a collective insight to propose a transformative approach may be beneficial to LGBTI communities while heterosexuals moderate their attitudes and characters.

Haldeman (2012) (cf. 3.6.3) shows that negative peers' rejection and victimization due to insufficient knowledge, deprives LGBTI communities of equal access to choice on

their sexuality, and thus perpetuate low self-esteem and might cultivate bad habits. The bad habits, which include anxiety, depression, behavior problems and substance abuse may be traceable to peer rejection. In contrast, Robinson (2011) (cf. 3.6.3) asserts that enough knowledge be given to heterosexual students about LGBTI communities to provide them with flexible access to happiness against wrong perception of attitudes and behaviors. Barker (2012) (cf. 3.6.3) affirms that knowledge acquisition promotes situational management on sexuality issues related, and thus provides intervention strategies to counsel the victims in times of difficulties. This opens that lecturers and educators be available to show their expertise to support all students to have courage in readiness to future challenges, LGBTI communities inclusive on a transformative way of embracement at a university campus. Data presented the following;

Stu 5 (*Sunflower*): *[More information and knowledge being taught to learners. Educating them on LGBTI communities. Currently that need to change is more awareness and knowledge need to be made available to all students. This can be done in talks during orientation week and also integrated in classes].*

LGBTI Co 2: *I think people that I've met do talk more of lesbian than gay...because they see the dress...they ask that apart from being lesbian what do you think you gain for being LGBTI members?*

LGBTI Co 1: *Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI.*

Stu 2: *[Encourage internal LGBTI Networking and communities create a strong culture of inclusiveness].*

LGBTI Co 4: *I just wanna add to the question on homosexuality....this is not homosexual or heterosexual ...to help people who are feminists to do say the thing of gay look feminist. So some of these judgement come from the*

feminist...something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself...

LGBTI Co 1: I think is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for them not for anyone...

LGBTI Co 5: these speak to educational organization that need to set approach to educate majority of students on LGBTI communities and to know that we are normal human beings... {Cough}....stop!

SRC (Gi): firstly...what you need to understand is that... change is a difficult thing...so now we know you should know that most of our students they are from rural areas...areas where...ah...ah... LGBTI communities are...are...not much been seeing there...or seeing things happening is not that way as present.. so for them came...to the institution of learning...therefore, for them..... coming into our institution of learning...therefore, there's need for them to be educated...it means that since that you're in the institution, there is a kind of thing for them to learn in an institution, there are particular the issue of LGBTI communities about issues around university...because some of the people hardly understand how someone can become a lesbian or someone become bisexual, they need to be taught throughout the process about LGBTI communities...therefore, students need to be educated....so that they understand.

LGBTI Co 4: I ...mmm... I feel like many things should be done ...is that what happen per time doesn't indicate on whatever people think is good for anyone ...actually people who are influential in education... people who can change the mindset of people, they don't want to hear or understand...especially in teaching should like maybe during teaching...writing on blackboard making examples using LGBTI communities in such like.... A boy and a gay getting married...what about gay marriage?...a gay married a gay...lesbian woman married woman and also have a happy life...so, this lead to see some other people who don't want to listen to others stories that yet there are LGBTI communities who are different in their approach to live.

5.7.4 Limited spaces for debates/dialogues on LGBTI communities issues

At the university campus, there is less attention to diversity which can encourage a debate to improve on dialogues and activities for students, especially on sexuality education (cf. 3.6.4) (Clark, 2012). Goransson and Nilholm (2014) (cf. 3.6.4) unveil that varieties of activities were holistically structured to accommodate all students, being helpful to diversity awareness for all students without marginalizing any group to participate. DoE (2013) (cf. 3.6.4) confirmed that there is need for dialogues and debates occasionally that will broaden the importance of inclusion of diversity at a university campus on the core embracing value for transformative approach and social change.

Hall, Evans and Nixon (2013) (cf. 3.6.4) suggest that dialogues and debate spaces be made for interaction, that promotes peaceful co-existence among students in general, set a boundary to maintain balanced relationships between heterosexual, and homosexual (LGBTI communities) at a university campus. Diversity dialogues and debates that involve LGBTI communities' issues at a university campus are not intensively situated to create awareness by embracing diversity (cf. 3.6.4) (Litvin, 2006). Booyesen, Kelly, Nkomo and Steyn (2007) suggested that special attention be given to meetings related to inclusive education programs to enlighten the entire university on the significance of embracing ecological systems for equal acceptance of individuals to promote unity among all students. The researcher suggests that constant avenues be slated for these events for opinions and views that may have long term transformative impacts. In regards to the above discussion in this section, the following data results address some points related as thus:

LGBTIOC: My suggestion would be for varsities across the country to have LGBTI MOVEMENTS that is accessible to all students.

Stu 3: Yes, more programs and more students must be involved to participate to support and understand the LGBTI communities.

Stu 2: Create awareness campaign in which students will be taught about LGBTI communities; once they understand they will be able to treat them with acceptance and Respect. Yes. Use social nature and mass media to change hearts and minds].

Stu 5 (*Sunflower*): *[Talks and seminars should be held when students enter the university on the different communities found in varsity and educating them on such... Students, student's body, management and outsiders, professionals who are more knowledgeable on the topic helping educate students.... All being treated equally. And all these factors not being made to define them students being seen and treated and such for they are. Seminars, talks and pamphlets educating students on LGBTI communities. More information and knowledge being taught to learners. Educating them on LGBTI communities].*

Stu 4 (*Bradeline*): *[Involve student's participation. There is a huge number of student in the University and they all enjoy doing different things. Have an event that can involve all the student, must include team work/building and social interaction... Anyone can be an agent especially within the university from RA (Residence Assistant) to the house committee. It must be showcased for free at a location that is always full of people].*

The research team voiced out loudly that campaigns, awareness and seminars could be of help to effect the core objective of embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and extend the strategies in various dimension as stated above, which can drive the implementation of a transformative approach for all students.

5.7.5 Capacity to provide necessary intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus

Payne (2007) (cf. 3.6.5) supports that in accordance with schools where someone who is labelled as of different sexual orientation against acceptability within school's culture, be excluded, disconnected and isolated from the entire groups. Pyykonen (2012) (cf. 3.6.5) further opines that, exclusion and isolation of LGBTI students is exacerbated by their inability to form close friendships with heterosexual counterparts and peers due to conflict of interest. Based on intolerance, according to Msibi (2012) (cf. 3.6.5), he argues that teachers who impose invalid fear of homosexuals in their learners create such action that promotes LGBTI exclusion and isolation thus making it difficult for these students to make friends with their heterosexual peers at schools and universities.

Bhana (2012) and Reygan (2013) (cf. 3.6.5) concur that fear of homophobic abuse prevents heterosexual students from associating or socializing with LGBTI students on campus. This may intensify social exclusion for the LGBTI communities in a university campus. Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012) (cf. 3.6.5) disagree that teachers should mitigate students' exclusion leading to isolation among their peers despite the applied strategies within reach to embrace diversity in the classroom. As such, that idea should be challenged to create safe co-existence among students in general. Aspendliender, Buchanan, McDougall and Sippola (2009) (cf. 3.6.5) support that societal norms contend against human beliefs and practices. This may constitute to jeopardize students' academic performance.

McNulty (2013) (cf. 3.6.5) supports that unequal personality among university students gives heterosexuals courage to provide intervention for diversity in individual participation towards a community development. In the same vein, Barker (2012) (cf. 3.6.5) emphasizes that unequal power tussles inflict deliberate sentiments on the majority against the minority for their equal right dividends. Moreover, Faull (2008) (cf. 3.6.5) states clearly that inclusive policy has its cause to support the team participation and other recreational programs for all students at a university campus by displaying collective responsibilities, in line with Elechi, Morris and Schauer (2009) (cf. 3.6.5) who emphasize on ecological systems to relate effectively with students' day-to-day life at schools and universities.

Stu 4 (Bradeline): *[Involve student's participation. There is a huge number of student in the university and they all enjoy doing different things. Have an event that can involve all the student, must include team work/building and social interaction].*

Stu 3: *[University should introduce subjects on modules that will help students to understand more about LGBTI communities. In addition, all the relevant stakeholders must support the learning and studying of the LGBTI communities].*

USSP (Lisandary): *Yes; yeah... {Laughs!}...has it be the support structure is paramount support...because...em...in the issues of LGBTI, we need to create*

a smaller student community that will form part of the structure through the management and student representatives... and to creating small focus groups leading to forum debate and seen into the structure of LGBTI. Mmm...one of the thing I think can be ...emm...we need to get clearer among ourselves while full research on the effect of emm...LGBTI group...em...can be the reason why I'm saying is the research based approach ...of course research and debates can results to have some literature to back up...is a good part of research to be part of the studies.

LGBTI Co 3: what like? Debates and dialogues be done from lecture venues on the LGBTI communities relationship among classmate should be taught correctly by the lecturers...so students understand.

LGBTI Co 2: Emmm...mmm...mmm...I think if there be drawings, charts, pictures to advertise LGBTI communities in the campus...will be of help to give more information about LGBTI communities.

UL1: yeah! It will be implemented if all the member of the university is part and parcel of the program...it will be very...very...successful...if all the staff members be part to form this approach that will embracing LGBTI communities.

SRC (Gi): we are all agents of the change...the LGBTI itself, the academic...the academials....eh...eh...eh...the student leadership...themselves...everyone....within and institution...because they do not exist in island...which is institution and this institution comprises of many...therefore, all bodies mentioned within the institution...because...university comprises of many bodies...many bodies...because if we all together as every to be part of this approach...everyone will enjoy it.

UL1: amm...the best approach I can think...if am to provide solution...I think the thing should start at the classroom...as a professional teacher or lecturer...to teach our students to understand that there's no problem to be friendly with LGBTI communities and make them to know that there are different in sexual orientation....as a teacher...it has to be my responsibility to educate my students to understand that there are other sexual identities and there is no different in LGBTI communities and others...is just a matter or different sexual orientation. So as a teacher...it has to be my responsibility to help my students understand all this...because...where they are coming from...from their various

villages...from their various cultural backgrounds....they do not know and their culture do not allow them from their communities they lives...and the way they were brought up is how then they feel them...I think everything starts there...

USSP: Emm...m...I think one of the approach we can use...em...m.....is the on the campus base... Is probably using what we called Edutem...to use edutem ... to involve education at time...I think I like to...and lack of education ...emm...mm...we are a great of subject of change to students. I think I too lack of understanding about LGBTI communities...emm...m...approach I said is to hold awareness...emm...get LGBTI student to speak on the experiences...and to see how these adapt and how they are in the residences and how feeling each other and go theyemm... approach of embracing a program of...of.. education terms where they will have time to entertaining- through health, play, drama...and songs that could be created and making entertainment that will bring all students together in the campus...creating awareness...take away fear for being LGBTI among students.

LGBTIOC: The student bodies (e.g sport union/LGBTI+ Union which deals with issues of the community as a whole) as well as the general management and also making sure that the LGBTI+ are represented in all the bodies so they feel part and parcel of the decision making.

Stu 3: [Yes, more programs and more students must be involved to participate to support and understand the LGBTI communities].

Based on the data presented, it showed that not much has been done to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. However, efforts have been put in place to ensure a more embracing way of inclusivity programs that will offer LGBTI communities to have more participation on their activities on what is good for them, to make University campus more attractive and supportive for all students.

5.7.6 Absence of campaigns and rallies to embrace LGBTI communities

On the campaigns and rallies that could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus the extracts stated as follows;

LGBTI Co 4: *Mmm... too much I want to say... I think there should be more funds provision for LGBTI communities...mmm...to make the people who are not LGBTI communities knows we are...so that more can be done...mmm... education program through sport, games...also if can be little or more of awareness campaigns and create forum to educate people that nothing wrong with gay and allow people to know more about LGBTI...even people know to educate themselves on the... to see the good on how people can view things personally.*

USSP: *As I think an awareness campaigns and awareness education to embrace around the LGBTI communities amm...is an ongoing thing we have to create awareness and around the campus LGBTI communities...to upgrade our initiatives to make sure that LGBTI communities are safe on the campus among their peers.*

LGBTI Co 4: *...I think it will go far to people who do not aware of LGBTI communities and people need to know....mmm...I think this has to go to the issues of lecturers, the pastors to allow people to know and stop to discriminate LGBTI communities...people who friendly will benefit from the study...also social worker people.*

Stu 1(SH5): *[To change the state of LGBTI communities, I think they should be some sort of a campaign which will run once a week. I think if the campus management and lecturers support the campaign, LGBTI communities will feel included, wanted and special to the campus because they have the management support].*

OCFT: *[I think this question is very difficult to address as I felt majorly this involves the entire school management to look into the creation of welcoming university environment that will embrace LGBTI communities and other cultural diversity. More to say is that, through a platform of awareness campaigns of the university in general to be part of the initiative of inclusion of all students. I see that if*

management can support and all stakeholders with the collaboration of students /student's representative council – a fair approach can be launched when all bodies are adequately represented in the design of such approach that will benefit all students and LGBTI communities].

Stu 2: *[Create awareness campaign in which students will be taught about LGBTI communities; once they understand they will be able to treat them with acceptance and Respect].*

LGBTI Co 2: *I think there should be awareness campaigns...show talk and during awareness...there should be experts to...to...to teach the students about LGBTI, were and the res...of the organization should be...should be more...mmm...active around the campuses like building the wall of awareness...so that people be more aware and that people should be....ah...ah...ah...active expert...a person who can be able to let students understand what's up on organization about and how can treat the people in the organization*

As afore stated, results suggested that organizing and coordination of effective campaigns and rallies that will be more informative, transformative and welcoming, should be allowed to pilot the embracing aspect of this to enjoin university in general to be aware of diversity and maintain non-discriminatory behavior on one group over another.

5.7.7 Religious and beliefs on LGBTI communities' differences at a university campus

Adamczyk and Pitt (2009) (cf. 3.6.6), unveil that religiosity has posed a difference to individual perception on others' beliefs mostly for acceptance of sexuality that is often contested between heterosexuals and homosexual communities. This unfolds contradiction that society points to at times, to individual's assertions on a subject of sexuality which remains virtually different. Hence, contradictions tantamount to no subject to any other as LGBTI communities' equal rights to choices of religion and beliefs unlike heterosexuals. Arch Bishop Desmond Tutu (1998) (cf. 3.6.6), acknowledged that the indulgence of sexuality differentiation does not form its

exclusion from the scriptural base, but anchored on biblical law of forgiveness and acceptance for diversity liberation through a redemptive plan into God's family.

Nonetheless, John (2017) (cf. 3.6.6), in his lecture of hope for hopelessness message, related to LGBTI communities entirely suggests that passion is needed to handle sensitive issues like this by his teaching extension to become a part of daily discussions for transformation on the fact that we live in a well-civilized world, whereby paradigm shifts continuously. He took recognizing that being homosexual is not supposed to bring sociological problems, as RSA (2011), committed South African policies aspired to implement policies which grounded on ecological systems to accommodate all people by protecting and ensure their preservation legitimately. In contrast, John (2017) (cf. 3.6.6), asserts that if someone tries to gain consciousness in a constant debate, which extends violence among those who perceive homosexuality differently on prejudice. In practice, for LGBTI communities who strive to regain consciousness; The Bible tries to correct some practices in a tactical way, "a woman should not wear anything pertaining to a man" (Deuteronomy 22:5, KJV).

The Bible intends to give consciousness on behavioural parts and draws the reader closer to normalcy. As such, LGBTI communities' acceptance is often negotiated by how the way people around view and perceive their activities in the society they live. Munson and Stelboun (2013) (cf. 3.6.6), state, conflicts impact of indoctrination and prejudice inherited that LGBTI communities were different from heterosexual people according to their beliefs on normative principle. In contrast, norms and practices distinguish worlds according to Fine and Spencer (2009) (cf. 3.6.6), need to enhance social inclusivity and avoid isolation and conflicts that emanated from indoctrination and prejudice of heterosexual against LGBTI communities at the university campus.

LGBTI Co 4:...I think it will go far to people who do not aware of LGBTI communities and people need to know....mmm...I think this has to go to the issues of lecturers, the pastors to allow people to know and stop to discriminate LGBTI communities...people who friendly will benefit from the study...also social worker people.

Stu 1 (SH5): *[To change the state of LGBTI communities, I think they should be some sort of a campaign which will run once a week. I think if the campus management and lecturers support the campaign, LGBTI communities will feel included, wanted and special to the campus because they have the management support].*

SRC (Gi): *[Like everyone should be friendly...yes...all must be aware of LGBTI communities so as to create rapport and learning].*

UL1 (Donchido): *I think our campuses ...like I have said...cultural issues...religious issues ...but most of the religion do not believe that such could be allowed...I think if something has to be done ...it should start from our religion to address...as far as religion is playing a prominent role on our students – the issues that occur or occurring in our institution...down to our education system and Whatever thing that should be done should start from religious group...*

Stu 2: *[Resistance from people who are Christian; people who do not relate any identity with the LGBTI].*

The researcher suggests an awareness empowerment that could center on friendly relationships among all students without using religious sentiments to set barriers against LGBTI communities among their heterosexual counterparts. It is evident that cultural issues pose great havoc on students' relationship where religious beliefs contradict other's behavior, gender, sexuality and opinions, thus do not set a definite conformity to the standard of practice towards others. This the researcher found very challenging and discriminatory against the social lifestyle of LGBTI communities and thus arouse interest to the degree of acceptance and societal demands on values for others.

5.7.8 Inconsistency of policies regards LGBTI communities

Clarke (2012) (cf. 3.6.7), defines a transformative approach as a drastic improvement of the present situation of events/experiences in a different paradigm. This asserts a systems change be applied for betterment of previous imbalances left on policies, error negations and ascribes to beneficial means to ethical consideration on policy

development. However, Haldeman (2012) (cf. 3.6.7), states that ethical consideration on policy for practice stipulates to embrace LGBTI communities by supporting their experiences, which channel towards a transformative approach to accept their connectivity with peers at a the university campus.

The White Paper on Foreign Policy (2011) (cf. 3.6.7), supports that tolerance should be maintained to make education free for all, encourage love, empathy, equity and unity to promote nation development. Using a transformative approach of social change to empower LGBTI communities through *ecological systems* at a university campus is needed. Hawkley and Cacioppo (2010) (cf. 3.6.7), support that the application of love on ecological systems to provide a way-out by converting rejection and loneliness emergence from marginalization of LGBTI communities at a university campus. The researcher agrees with Jacob (2013) (cf. 3.6.7), who contends that police should create a safe environment for LGBTI communities in times of their abuses, but not at the expense of others. Nonetheless, there should be adequate application of transformative approach of inclusion into the university systems for the benefits of LGBTI communities and every student.

Stu 2: *[Educate people about the Bill of rights and the responsibilities stipulated in the bill of right and reinforce those right and responsibilities in practice].*

LGBTI Co 4: *I think the management about LGBTI communities are not that they are supposed to help us in time of any issues or abusers...but there is still no much change with them ...the education that we saying has to go round...because they know that there are LGBTI communities...management, but more can be done than now.*

LGBTI Co 3: *I think what Rosie says is true to be involve in many activities that inform LGBTI communities....people that know homosexual thing...it should be people who are also the school be involved in organizing campaigns that can bring change to people understanding of LGBTI.*

LGBTI Co1: *To organize a programme that will be controlled by LGBTI communities and get other department involve in the program met that all the*

students and management involvement...maybe to involve all in the University in the thing to all involvement.

Firstly, Stu 2 opens to teaching the of bill of rights and responsibilities to individuals, LGBTI Co 4 suggests that management should awake to their duties in case of abusers, while LGBTI Co 3 *and* LGBTI Co 1 advise to involve LGBTI communities in the activities related to policies formulation in conjunction with the management. I concur that policies should be re-adjusted in a way to accommodate and protect all students at the university campus, irrespective of their groups.

In conclusion to this section, the policies should be treated with consistency on the note that any perpetrator to violate human rights especially students who are LGBTI communities in particular and other groups of people should be dealt with severely. To ensure that even verbal abuse is perennial to a fine or disciplinary measures to protect and strengthen policies that govern citizens. The researcher found that beliefs systems of heterosexuals on homosexuals cannot be overruled completely albeit there is like a 20/80 tolerance, based on this study which shows that LGBTI communities' negative experiences are not 100%, but by preferences which could be practically understood. The researcher subjects to the point of Asante (2012) that a transformative approach should not be contextualized and judgemental, rather persuasive to have a tolerable character.

5.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has presented, and interpreted data based on the research objectives. Extracts to support data presented were used in this chapter. The next chapter handles data discussion and analysis for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

CHAPTER SIX

DATA INTERPRETATION ON A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter has presented, and interpreted data in regard to research objectives. Data discussions and analysis featured in this chapter. The next chapter considered findings, conclusions and recommendations for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. This chapter provided data discussions and analysis according to the study objectives for clarity. The next commenced with current situation regarding approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

6.2 A SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS REGARDING TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACHES TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The findings indicated the current situation of LGBTI communities at a university campus as analysed below.

6.2.1 Hostile university climate for LGBTI communities

Based on LGBTI Co2 report as stated that; *“being of LGBTI member do not make me comfortable ...at times other student talk harshly to me like you don’t look like it...what do you want to gain there? And so on...”* (LGBTI Co 2), in similar with LGBTI Co1; *“being LGBTI member to my peers does not make me feel good at all...its make me bad”*. (LGBTI Co1). Both LGBTI Co1 and LGBTI Co2 expressed with the usage of “not comfortable” as other students talk harshly to LGBTI Co2 based on the question asked; *“what do you want to gain there? And so on”*, this related to LGBTI Co1; revealed that, *“my peers does not make me feel good at all...its make me bad”*. The participant’s experiences does not correspond with Thapa, Cohen, Guffey and Higgins-D’Alessandro (2013), inclusive school environment. However, the situational incidence of LGBTI Co3 proved otherwise as stated thus; *“it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friends even among heterosexual students...things*

are slowly coming right". (LGBTI Co 3) this showed that gradual tolerance occurred to her by getting used to it for justified transforming encounter (Dirkx, 2006, Msibi, 2012).

Meanwhile, findings confirmed that there are some hostile encounters on LGBTI communities as expressed by LGBTIOC and SRC statements;

"I have heard issues the LGBTI+, but not necessarily asking for my help but rather seeking advice they are: coming out and being assaulted...Most issues the LGBTI+ concern safety, safety in and off campus (in residents)" (LGBTIOC). *"Yes...we have heard numerous cases of LGBTI communities at a university campus...in office"* (SRC (Gi)). From LGBTIOC and SRC statements; it was stated that issues were heard of LGBTI communities, *"but not necessarily asking for my help but rather seeking advice"* she further *"concerns of safety in and off campus"*. In the above statements, especially SRC; *"Yes...we have heard numerous cases of LGBTI communities at a University campus...in office"*. Also, OCFT maintained that *"majority students do show discriminating against gay and lesbian that happen to be around them, pointed at discrimination impact which have impact on LGBTI communities as further stated; "So this makes some gay and lesbian to feel helpless whenever they abuse then or call them different names (OCFT). Not only been discriminated but also "abuse and call them different names" those statements contradict what Bajaj (2011), Illeris (2014) meant for appreciation of unity in diversity among all students at a university. Sadly, OCFT extend that; "students like to act out against LGBTI communities in their own ways. To me, the attitudes of heterosexual students is from act of hatred, background and beliefs against homosexuality" (OCFT). Such behaviour showed indirectly from Stu 3, who expressed about his relationship with one member of LGBTI communities thus: "Not a close friend, we were doing Teaching Practices together. During break time we used to eat together and our files together". (Stu 3). Notably, Stu 3 action showed a little of friendly but ideally distance but he could sustain the student relationships during teaching practice, possibly he could change his action after teaching practice or continue neutrality with his "Not a close friend"*.

In contrast, UL1 expressed that, *"I have noticed one kind of like...but not lead to any abuse"* (UL1), witnessed but maintained that was not lead to any abuse, this supported the earlier statement of unfavourable University campus experience with LGBTI communities. UL1 further stated *one student who is LGBTI...in fact...when student from LGBTI was responded to question...everyone was calm as student*

responded...so... that is all I've seen...so far...and I have not seen discrimination of LGBTI communities". I was happy when LGBTI communities responds in the classroom...even the entire class clap for them" (UL1). This expression, confirmed that teacher's/lecturer's impact counts in various classrooms to see all students participate in classroom work and activities (Bajaj, 2011; Illeris (2014). LGBTIOC, OCFT, and LGBTI Co2 confirmed a hostile state at the University campus for LGBTI communities. As supported by SRC (Gi) various related cases were reported to their office. Data findings agree with Illeris (2014) that a transformative approach is needed to address these challenging incidences against the LGBTI community to provide security to embrace them at a university campus.

6.2.2 Tacit and subtle rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus by peers and staffs

This aspect is very important to look at social marginalisation; it appears that educators were indirectly discriminating against LGBTI communities at schools and universities through their actions towards groups individually. McCormack (2012), (c f 3.2.2) research has demonstrated that LGBTI students tend to have negative experiences at schools and universities, suffer social marginalization and discrimination. One reason for this, has been the homophobia of heterosexual students. Beyer (2012), disagrees that the majority of educators seem to deliberately remain silent on gender orientation differences and sexuality, and thereby disadvantage LGBTI communities in equal access to teaching and learning.

Participant's responses include: data unveiled thus; "*LGBTI communities are the communities which involves not only males and females but also involve gays, lesbians and bisexual people, LGBTI communities around my campus does exist but they are treated in a different way compared to straight males and females. I don't know whether it because they like to go as a group or because they feel not wanted by the other students]*" (Stu 1).

Stu 1 understanding of LGBTI communities explained but very thoughtful stated; "*LGBTI communities around my campus does exist but they are treated in a different way compared to straight males and females*" she confusedly expressed that "*I don't*

know whether it because they like to go as a group or because they feel not wanted by the other students” (Stu1). Stu 1 in her view pointed that LGBTI communities were been treated differently, this concurred to negative experiences (McCormack, 2012). In contrary to tacit and subtle rejection of LGBTI communities, findings exposed thus; “No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved” (Stu 2).

“It seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friends even among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right” (LGBTI Co 3).

Here, both Stu 2 and LGBTI Co3 shared an opposite statement on friendship with LGBTI communities, for LGBTI Co3, it was not easy to have friends among Heterosexual mates but indicated that *“things are slowly coming right”* and Stu 2 stated that; *“[No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved]”*. With Stu 2, it showed that he implied not to be involved because he *“I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved “*. It clearly stated that Stu 2 does keep away from LGBTI communities. On the above differentiations, LGBTI OC do not have this taught; *“Issues of discrimination and judgement that’s need to educating everyone. That there is nothing wrong with being different” (LGBTI OC)*. At times, it easier said than done, but in pretence truth can be seen. Yet, Stu 3 supported that *“Classmates have different emotions towards LGBTI communities, clarified that “There are those who are familiar with the LGBTI communities who are responding well towards them, who knows and have understanding that LGBTI communities are people like us and have feelings like us. This expression corresponds with equal right to respect others (Ringrose & Renold, 2010). Stu3 further revealed that other “They do not treat them as human beings and they treat them people without feelings]”*. Obviously, McCormack (2012), points out that LGBTI students have negative experiences at schools and universities, suffer social marginalization and discrimination is relevant to the above statements.

The above data analysis showed that situational circumstances as LGBTI communities witnessed various levels of relational disconnection, such like rejection among their peers at university. Stu 1 revealed, that LGBTI communities do exist at the university campus but have been treated differently by others, such that Stu 2

expressed his opinion not to judge anyone but does not like to be involved as a Christian he claimed to be, Stu 3 declared that she became a friend to someone in the LGBTI communities. Likewise, LGBTI co 3 briefed on her past experience, that things seemed to change currently. To influence the current conditions for LGBTI communities; LGBTIOC and Stu 3 and UL1 advised that the issue of discrimination need to be handled properly to make other students see diversity in nature not a stigma on different sexual orientation/identity.

6.2.3 Lack of Parental/Family supports for LGBTI communities

Another vital aspect is that LGBTI communities sometimes lack supportive family, peers and teachers (Williams et al., 2005; Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011) which causes LGBTI communities to undergo more victimisation and isolation within their families (Garofalo, Wolf, Wssow, Woods & Goodman, 1999).

Research teams responded affirmatively as follows;

Stu 2 and UL1 disagreed by stating that LGTBI communities were enjoying respect and acceptance by everyone as maintained below:

“It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone. But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and though and beliefs” (Stu 2)

“Firstly we have to understand the situation report...and secondary to that is their background...not the cause background...but the causes of the issue..., what drive them to such problems because LGBTI issues are socially constructed ...and is not as others see it in a normal way ...” (SRC)

“Amm...to the best of my knowledge...ammm...I’ve been teaching in the university for the numbers of years...now...I’ve not been seeing a kind of physical abuse...or...a kind of discrimination...or all sort...there is nothing of such against LGBTI communities...at the University” (UL1)

In this section, Stu 2 revealed that there is differentiation to the family support and related, he maintained that, *“It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone”*. Also UL1 considered, but at a different angle with

this statement; *“I’ve not been seeing a kind of physical abuse...or...a kind of discrimination...or all sort...there is nothing of such against LGBTI communities...at the university”* (UL1). However, SRC responded a lack of LGBTI community by family through the statement; *“firstly we have to understand the situation report...and secondary to that is their background...not the cause background...but the causes of the issue..., what drive them to such problems because LGBTI issues are socially constructed ...and is not as others see it in a normal way ...”* (SRC). SRC statement, pointed to why LGBTI communities were not welcome by all students, was that *“LGBTI issues are socially constructed, and is not as other see it in a normal way”*

Meanwhile, LGBTI Co5 and LGBTI Cos2 addressed this point in a total different way, for example; LGBTI Co5 emphatically stated that, *“there are gay people who failed to accept themselves....mmm...who afraid of people around them of being judge or harassed for being gay”* (LGBTI Co5). This expression asserted that acceptability begins from oneself before extension to others, indirectly meant that LGBTI communities may not need more support from friends and families. In other way, LGBTI Co2 confirmed that people’s talk may change along; seen from her expression; *“mmm...some students are friendly as I was saying but behaves differently”*, as found in her statement all manners of questions that people frequently asked below:

“mmm...some students are friendly as I was saying but behaves differently...and the way when they see gay wear a bum short,, they say...oh my gosh! What did he showing us...if it were a girl who wear no one talks....so they won’t show a kind of attitudes they showed when is a gay wear that and any other thing I say against ...who make ups...they say...ah... ay!... it showing that I’m not accepting gay that why I nan be saying why a gay is wearing bum skirts or use make ups ...mmm I don’t think they really accept us in the university” (LGBTI Co 2).

It is imperative to create a support environment, based on the informative understanding of who LGBTI communities are at a university campus. Another vital note as evidenced is that LGBTI communities do lack supportive family, peers and teachers (Williams et al., 2005; Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011) (cf. 3.2.3) which cause LGBTI communities to undergo more victimization and isolation within their families and extension to universities (Garofalo, Wolf, Wssow, Woods & Goodman, 1999). LGBTI

communities report that staffs and teachers often did not intervene, even when they witnessed harassment physically from heterosexual students (Nakamoto & Schwartz, 2010; Pendragon, 2010) (cf. 3.2.3). This behaviour denied the assumption that those staffs should play a parental role at the university to challenge the wrong acts against students or victims.

The above extracts indicate that our understanding of approach to embracing LGBTI communities is not fully welcome at a university campus as LGBTI Co1, Stu 1 and OUCFT indicated that LGBTI communities have not been fully welcome at a University campus as said in their statements. However, Tetreault et al. (2013), (cf. 3.2.1) found that anti-lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or intersex (LGBTI) emergence of bias that resulted some LGBTI students to pretend and hide their sexual identity from other students and staff due to the fear of stigmatization. From data results; Stu 3: *Not a close friend, we were doing Teaching Practices together. During break time we used to eat together and our files together...* this shows the issue of indirect discrimination and unacceptance of LGBTI communities at a university campus by peers and staffs/lecturers.

It was evident from the above statements that family/peers supports varied from one people to another and these findings indicated the reality state on this section.

6.2.4 Difficulties on sexual disclosure for LGBTI communities

This section analysed and discussed the difficulties to sexual disclosure for LGBTI communities at a University campus. Data findings were explored hereunder; USSP disclosed that *“currently and I have LGBTI issues related to abuse”* in his statement, an outspoken LGBTI member, who was bold enough to expressed himself; as confirmed, *“having some outspoken LGBTI communities member at the res...they were not ashamed or shy to express themselves as to and unfortunately with some of the students”*. Furthermore, USSP expressed *“we heard about a gay students that in a meeting one of the gay student in the res with the other student because of way to shower....with how he treat his body with lot of female students in the ‘Res’ and outspoken there with another male student”* However, pointed out a contrast from his previous statement that indicated thus; *“I mean is the other of course accusing of being*

in LGBTI communities” (USSP). Based on the disclosure, LGBTI Co 2 declared that, “*no matter what you do there will still some people who continue to say ill things about you...and that other people will accept and just carry on*”. This statement implied that difficulty will persist, as people cannot not go the same way, she ended up by suggesting “move on” as a way out for people’s unending talk against LGBTI communities.

USSP; Taking from experiences in his managerial position; a recent case of abuse related to gender that there are some outspoken among LGBTI students were not shy. The issue is talk about his body treatment and pricked at for being one of LGBTI communities. As he spoke to management to be moved to other residence as he faced discrimination but no change him for over a year before, he was finally this year over 10-12 reported times...for his safety. LGBTI Co 2: stated that no matter what you do, there will still some people who continue to say ill things about you, you just accept and carry on.

USSP attested and said that there were outspoken among LGBTI communities who can open up their identity and sexual orientation without fear. This asserts that as we have outspoken, there is possibility of having shy or closet type who might prefer to stay undercover maybe due to fear of threat or abuses among peers.

6.2.5 Heterosexual majority dominance

The patriarchy has positioned heterosexuals’ exhibits expressions of dominance to oppress target groups and communicate an intention to assert and maintain dominance over a subjective others (Regan, 2009) (cf 3.2.5). This indicates that heterosexuals’ dominance suppresses LGBTI communities to dictate activities’ behaviour. Molden and Finkel (2010), support that submission occurs to different degrees; like some employees may follow orders without question, whereas others might express disagreement but concede when pressed. Nonetheless, Alatalo (2012), argues that heterosexuals do often oppress LGBTI communities by dominance or privileges rather exercise collision with their sexuality for equal to behavioural experiences.

LGBTICo3 expressed breaking of barriers between LGBTI communities and heterosexual as follows; “*it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have*

friends even among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right” (LGBTI Co3). Based on LGBTI Co1 statement; “I think these people that need to know should be educated about us” referred to “heterosexuals” because they are the dominant population at a University campus, maintained that “no one is good to us”. Being a minority population does not matter but education for all students at all schools and universities. The statement below responded to the action expected against dominance of heterosexuals;

”I think these people that need to know should be educated about us...they should be educated about us....even to the some of the students...they accused us...not that they want us but they don’t know anything about us...no one is good to us...(LGBTI Co 1). USSP acknowledged that, “students will come with the knowledge of LGBTI and concept itself at the university to embrace, love and care...embrace...and minority students are good to LGBTI communities”. He maintained that moderate Heterosexual domination is necessary “it will show that not everyone is against the communities, tolerance...support for all and also have the forum with LGBTI organ...I think it might be good approach” (USSP). In contrast, OCFT advocated for “protective measures to make LGBTI communities safe among their peers, such I think to have a listening ears to them, tolerance to socialize with them like being friendly more acceptance and other good relationships to make LGBTI communities feel comfortable in the classroom and campus environment”. The statement was indirectly referred to heterosexual’s cautions through a protective measure to make LGBTI communities comfortable among the majority population.

The data findings by LGBTI Co1, Stu 3, OCFT, LGBTI Co 2 SRC, LGBTI Co 3 indicated of one or two difficulties, and discrimination among peers, while Stu 2 stated that they were doing some things together at TP but not a close friend, UL1 responded differently as written below: showed the situational analysis into transformative approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

This extends to recognizing the importance of school climate which was based on violence and less adaptive challenges arose against cope for LGBTI communities (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D’Alessandro, 2013) (cf. 3.2.1) which deprive equal access to academic success for students (Kosciw, Greytak, Palmer, & Boesen, 2014;

Kosciw et al., 2013; Toomey & Russell, 2013; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, & Russell, 2013). The statement below confirmed that;

LGBTI Co1: *being LGBTI member to my peers does not make me feel good at all...its make me bad.*

OCFT: *“majority students do show discriminating against gay and lesbian that happen to be around them. So this makes some gay and lesbian to feel helpless whenever they abuse then or call them different names. I can say that despite what media awareness ant TV Soaphies – students like to act out against LGBTI communities in their own ways. To me, the attitudes of heterosexual students is from act of hatred, background and beliefs against homosexuality. The results stated by Stu 1 indicated that”, “[LGBTI communities around my campus does exist but they are treated in a different way compared to straight males and females. I don’t know whether it because they like to go as a group or because they feel not wanted by the other students].* These statements indicates that there are classes between students; majority versus minority.

This point indirectly corresponds with Llera and Katsirebas (2010, p. 29), (cf. 3.2.2) who confirm that LGBTI communities cohabit among other students at a University campus by maintaining their interest to transform socially through peers’ intervention. Beitz (2009), opines that students’ right to privacy jeopardized adequate protection and might intensify victimization experiences on LGBTI communities’ against receiving transformation at a university campus. The research team responded against heterosexual dominance and on discrimination and judgmental LGBTI communities experience as the research team reveals their understanding of their expectations and dissatisfaction as illustrated by that:

LGBTI Co 3 (Mwali): *Mmm...to me is just that some guys don’t know how other feels and they just talk anyhow.*

LGBTI Co 4 (Marven): *Mmm... I go to the section of attitudes...mmm...it is important to know that we are not different from other people....and mmm...I think people from LGBTI communities should take a leading role on this point...*

The above statements by LGBTI Co3 and LGBTI Co4 were similar on the behaviour of heterosexual peers who just talk anyhow is treated differently.

6.2.6 LGBTI communities' engagement and disengagement

In this section, findings related to LGBTI communities was explored for discussion and analysed accordingly.

Dehart et al. (2011) (cf. 5.2.6), promoted a sense belonging for LGBTI communities at a university campus in a study especially in the face of adversity and discrimination to improve self-dependency. This provides self-dependency that could propel diversity among students. As the statement from research team concurs thus:

LGBTI Co 3: *it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friends even among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right.*

Stu 2: *No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved.*

In this statement, LGBTI Co 3 responded that engagement experiences she had with fellow students at a University campus; *"it seems very difficult in the first place but now...we can have friend seven among heterosexual students...things are slowly coming right.* The statement by LGBTI Co3 indicated that interactions were coming right gradually for her, while Stu 2 expressed that *"No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it one of those things I do not judge but I cannot be involved.* On this point, his response indicated that because he is Christian, is why he does not want to be involved, in that vein, he partially tried to avoid himself from LGBTI communities, this corresponded with (Swank & Raiz, 2010) (cf. 3.2.6), unacceptance of individual base on differences. With LGBTI Co2, maintained that no matter, *"no matter what you do there will still some people who continue to say ill things about you...and that other people will accept and just carry on"* (LGBTI Co2). The statement contradicted Ryan, Huebner, Diaz and Sanchez (2009) (cf. 3.2.6) who support what could beneficial to engagement with LGBTI communities at a university campus. The statement of both Stu 2 and LGBTI Co3 might significantly hamper psychological and physiological development of as confirmed by Munson and Stelboun (2013) (cf. 3.2.6).

Stu 2 stated that acceptance that promotes engagement among LGBTI communities and Heterosexual students varies as confirmed thus; *"It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone. But the classmate is different*

some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and thought and beliefs” (Stu2). As this could be likened to Kotch (2014) (cf. 3.2.2), that precedencies on sexual orientation and gender conflict on LGBTI communities to combat gender non-conformity of heterosexual which extend to judgemental experiences. This related to LGBTI Co2 statement; that “When I’m with my friends at times they do not take it lightly with me by saying...it was not like you...you’re so beautiful that in fact what you doing is not normal, how could you just blind to be like that?...they say that I’m lost... rather than see....that what I can say... {Paused} (LGBTI Co2). It was evident that LGBTI Co1 buttressed a point that could fastening LGBTI communities engagement among their peers heterosexual “if we have occasion for them to be guest or talks, they can be of help...but they cannot help to solve our problems and since they cannot provide that for us...I see less relevant they could be”(LGBTI Co1). The above analysis correlates with Demir, Özen, Doğan, Bilyk and Tyrell (2011) (cf.3.2.7) who asserted that social connectivity among students be empowered beyond praxis way of life.

The above discussions and analysis showed that LGBTI communities’ engagement and disengagement was determined by the limitation of their counterpart’s understanding to tolerate and promote collaborative environment at the university campus.

6.2.7 Negative stereotype towards LGBTI communities

This negative stereotype is significant to the way peers look towards LGBTI communities at a university campus, and makes interaction difficult. Examples of negative attitudes are included below:

The statement by LGBTI Co2 which stated that *“it was not like you...you’re so beautiful that in fact what you doing is not normal, how could you just blind to be like that?”* Showed one of the stereotype ideas on the questioned action to say what is normal or abnormal with someone else. Another was expressed here with LGBTI Co1 as follows; *“but they cannot help to solve our problems and since they cannot provide that for us”*, LGBTI Co1 revealed that their heterosexual peers might not help them solve their problems out correctly. Otherwise, Stu4 confirmed that there are negative opinions of

others at the university with her statement; *“They cannot change who they are just because of the opinion of those around them... Negative opinions of other students at the university”*. She further that *“I feel the more they continue being themselves and allowing others to also bring themselves in the open, although it will take time, people will acknowledge them and their perspective towards them (Stu 4)*. In support to the stereotype against LGBTI communities, Stu 1 cited an example in respect that; *“For example in class maybe one of LGBTI answers the question by student will whisper saying “I knew it was the gay talking, therefore he/she think he is better than us”*. However, Stu 4 maintained that *“at the end of the day we are all humans”* while Stu 1 advised that, *“I think classmates or other students should not criticize the way they are, how they wear, how they live their lives and mostly important other students should stop calling them names”* (Stu1). Pendragon (2010) (cf.3.2.7) advises that student’s collective engagement thereby embrace diversity.

In the above statement, LGBTI Co 2 expressed how she felt with friends that showed non-palatable relationships, however Stu 1(SH5) suggested to be in good rapport with them as they were outspoken, she advised classmates to stop criticizing them, in contrary stated LGBTI Co 1 of doubtful thought of involvement of outside LGBTI communities for help against their experiences at the University campus.

Findings were not in agreement with Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco (2011) (cf.3.2.7) which stated that communal living, influences population of the ecosystem thus improves emotional and physical state of human health help to form equitable balance on human development. Stereotype ideas were identified as a reflex between LGBTI, communities and heterosexual students, which call for understanding to help aid mental and physical connection thus for human development.

6.3 THE NEED FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

This section explained needs for a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities as follows.

6.3.1 Abuses of LGBTI communities

Abuses of LGBTI communities were analysed and discussed in this section, Ashley (2013) (cf. 3.3.2) asserts the inconclusive part of homosexuality education biases for evidence that exist on biological factors role-play in development of LGBTI/ Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ). Research based needs of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI in a university campus as discussed by the research team; participant responded hereunder; statement related to corrective rape revealed that; *there was a guy who asking me out and he was asking...you don't love me? And I say that I prefer a gal than a guy...and he was like saying, why? ...you doing this! You're playing for both teams and I asked what he means...he was no ...he is like no ways!...like what you need is a big stick ...that big stick will change your life...{laughs} is like if I'm your boyfriend, I will give you hard...laugh! Laugh!! Laugh!!!...it will change you...if you get more of it...laughs continues"* (LGBTI Co2). The statement sounded funny, even though it was verbal abuse and sexual harassment; by mentioned that *"like what you need is a big stick ...that big stick will change your life...{laughs} is like if I'm your boyfriend, I will give you hard"* (LGBTI Co2). Meanwhile, USSP revealed an incident which has similar verbal abuse/ sexual assaults, as seen in this statement that; *"say she is not to be raped but that is the object to be put inside her va-gi-na and show her that she is not a male...she is trying to be male but she is not a male but a female"* (USSP).

However, LGBTI Co5 also shared verbal abuse as written below;

"Mmm....this year when I walk out with my boyfriend ...they say ha! You look straight why are you gay? Why are you doing this...but it is not comfortable for me when they say that so...it's frustrating" (LGBTI Co2). From the above discussion it showed that USSP, LGBTI Co2 and LGBTI Co5 shared verbal abuses but to different degrees; both USSP and LGBTI Co2 were verbal abuses with sexual assaults/harassment while

LGBTI Co5 expressed only verbal abuse. It indicated that two of those participants experienced verbal abuses/sexual related while one confirmed verbal abuse. The above findings aligned with Burke (2010) asserts that LGBTI students in the United States were more likely to experience assault and harassment in schools but with more likely access to supportive resources. In respect to research team statements, it showed that verbal abuse still exists at the university, LGBTI Co 2 and LGBTI Co 5 confirmed on their statement, while USSP *“talked of the incident of a particular suicide attempt due to verbal abuse that may perhaps experience from bullying by the way”*(USSP). As the findings showed, USSP and OUCFT suggested university preventive measures to protect LGBTI communities against bullying and abuses to maintain human rights of all students at the university as Cislighi (2013), stated for transformative changes.

Therefore, the societal beliefs have placed a great stigma on LGBTI communities [common knowledge], it is not funny to entertain different views, otherwise, Payne (2007) (cf. 3.3.2), supports that someone labelled for different sexual orientation against the acceptance of school’s culture excluded, disconnected and isolated from the entire groups. *“Like seriously, with the look of things at the campus it appears to provide protective measures to make LGBTI communities safe among their peers, such I think to have a listening ears to them, tolerance to socialize with them like being friendly more acceptance and other good relationships to make LGBTI communities feel comfortable in the classroom and campus environment”* (OCFT).

In respect to research team statements, it showed that verbal abuse does still exist at the university, LGBTI Co 2 and LGBTI Co 5 confirmed in their statement, while USSP *talked of the incident of a particular suicide attempt due to verbal abuse that may perhaps experience from bullying by the way*. As the findings showed, USSP and OCFT suggested university preventive measures to protect LGBTI communities against bullying and abuses to maintain human rights of all students at the university as Cislighi (2013), stated for transformative changes.

However, LGBTI Co 5 confirmed that some gay people who failed to accept themselves who are afraid of people around them of being judged or harassed for being gay. To the researcher, LGBTI communities may perhaps put themselves into danger or vulnerability to counter harassment at university campus and outside. In

contrast, UL1 emphatically denounced LGBTI communities being harassed that it shouldn't be and in case such occurrence, the lecturer in such situation should take a bold step to intervene and take up the case to the respective authority. It seems that intervention is close as the statements of UL1 (Donchido) unfolds.

6.3.2 Bullying of LGBTI communities

Bullying is one of the serious challenges experienced by learners/students as it could begin from primary education to university education. Based social status of LGBTI communities; university campus experiences are still challenging. Drawing from bodies of evidence, UNESCO (2012) (cf. 3.3.2), (Cornu, 2016; UNESCO, 2012). However, Meland, Rydning, Lobben, Breidablik and Ekeland (2010) (cf. 3.3.2) studied that internalized impacts of bullying on the student thus leads to academic breakdown and very low self-esteem, even at the university. In comparison with their Israeli counterparts, Burke (2010) asserts that LGBTI students were more likely to experience assault and harassment at schools but in United State there is more accesse to LGBTI supportive resources. In addition, unreported bullying and harassment of LGBTI communities, Toomey and Russell (2013) indicate that up to 12% of LGBTI communities in USA have experienced some forms of bullying at school and further many problems of lesbian, gay, and bisexual students in the university. In addition, Wang, Iannotti and Luk, (2011) (cf. 3.3.2) assert that bullying experiences internalize fear and insecurity amongst LGBTI communities, leads to protecting themselves to avoid any abuse, which may be subject to absenteeism and later drop out.

Stewart (2010) (cf. 3.3.2) points out those LGBTI students are more likely to be victims of unwelcome and unfriendly educational experiences from their heterosexual counterparts. Moreover, Jacob (2013) (cf. 3.3.2) points out that, at university settings students identified by 14 others as LGBTI students, then face humiliation because of long standing prejudice and discrimination. The research team responses prove contrary as indicated below:

LGBTIOC: I don't think there should be but they are, those who do not understand and are in a position of power tension to abuse their power and discriminate those they do

not understand. However, Stu 4 follow persuasive tone thus: “No, it has to your own choice whether you want to accept LGBTI communities for who they are or not” (LGBTIOC). USSP supported that “we can strive to get close to the students and form the approach to embracing LGBTI communities” (USSP). He further maintained that there should be cautions means to stop misbehaviour behaviour against students versus students “many be the student who commit the crime among the student against other students be dealt with” (USSP).

All the research teams here make wake up calls to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus against negative stereotype, then form a forum that could address the disparities or insufficient knowledge and avoid bullying of LGBTI communities that could be vulnerable among others, so that people’s minds could change to diversity.

6.3.3 Discrimination of LGBTI communities

The discrimination of LGBTI communities was physically noticed in this study as exposed by the research team;

Llera and Katsireba (2010, p. 32) supports that the personality of LGBTI communities for love relationships to regulate their emotions towards their partners of the same sexual orientation. In contrast, secondary control responses are intended to gain control indirectly by accommodating or adapting to the stressful event or context and include strategies such as acceptance, positive thinking and cognitive knowledge. Annear and Yates (2010) that discrimination of some member of LGBTI communities has disengaged them from their peers on school activities, which thereby limit them to chances of good lifestyles at a university campus. Discrimination and lack of knowledge exists, this was supported by Stu 5 and LGBTI Co2 below:

Stu 5: “Discrimination and lack of knowledge on the LGBTI communities’ people not knowing would cause them to pull away and not embrace the unknown”.

LGBTI Co 2: “I think people that I’ve met do talk more of lesbian than gay...because they see the dress...they ask that apart from being lesbian what do you think you gain for being LGBTI members?”

Both Stu 5 and LGBTI Co 2 signalled that heterosexual’s discrimination could be lack of knowledge about LGBTI communities and that has been a contention for

discrimination. They suggested along with LGBTI Co1 to retreat together and eliminate the differences.

Another participants; LGBTI Co1 stated that the majority of students have to find a meeting point to educate themselves, to avoid discrimination which could impose homophobic attacks on LGBTI communities at the university thus;

LGBTI Co 1 (*Linda*): *Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI.*

The issues of discrimination could weigh so heavily on LGBTI communities because it determines their psychological and academic state to cope with their peers and other members of the university community. LGBTI Co1 tried to offer provision against discrimination.

6.3.4 LGBTI communities' name-calling

In this section, name calling appeared once by Stu 1, *"I think classmates or other students should not criticize the way they are, how they wear, how they live their lives and mostly important other students should stop calling them names"* this was extracted from Stu 1 *"[I have once had LGBTI friend, because when you are around them you always have a smile on your face. The most important thing that I have noticed about them is that they are straight forward talkers, they call a spade a spade... I think classmates or other students should not criticize the way they are, how they wear, how they live their lives and mostly important other students should stop calling them names. For example in class maybe one of LGBTI answers the question by student will whisper saying, I knew it was the gay talking, therefore he/she think he is better than us]"*.

Based on name calling, it is evident that students who are LGBTI communities can be stigmatized and victimized by peers (Wang et al., 2011), in Stu1 revealed that LGBTI

communities were amazing people and should not be criticized or judged by peers. She also spoke about name calling, cited her experience because it can inflict emotional stress on them if care is not taken as Nakamoto and Schwartz (2010) (cf. 3.3.5) assert that depression may result from verbal assaults and thus can affect academic performance. The researcher observed that name-calling is not that rampant against LGBTI communities at a university campus currently, but sign language were so obvious which could be corrected instead of sign label others.

In a study conducted by Dare (2015) cited Swearer, Turner, Givens and Pollack (2008) (cf. 3.3.5) asserts that name-calling of students a “fag” or “gay” occurrences indirectly impose internal psychological stress on students which can result in lack of coping at classroom activities, reduction to learning and end up in having low grades, substance abuse, and depression. However, Dare (2015), (cf. 3.3.5).study found that heterosexual peers point fingers at lesbians and gays, and often call suspected names, such as; susi, tomboy and faggot to make them feel uncomfortable among their friends.

Notwithstanding, Ashley-Smith (2013) (cf. 3.3.5).supports that intended acts of name-calling is a signal to others in the majority to stigmatize LGBTI communities at a university campus, this links to bullying on perceived sexual orientation. This indicates that LGBTI communities are bullied by their peers who accuse them for being different and lady-like. Boelen and Reijntjes (2009) (cf. 3.3.5) posit that social exclusion thus subjects students to peer disconnection and develop low self-esteem or cultivate bad habits among others at a university campus.

6.3.5 Stigmatization and labelling of LGBTI communities

Labelling and stigmatization issues could be explained alternatively, however findings were discussed and through analysis by research participants revealed hereunder:

Stu 1: *“Everybody around the university campus should be LGBTI community agent if and only if he/she is the member of LGBTI communities’ management”.*

LGBTI Co 5: *“Mmm....this year when I walk out with my boyfriend ...they say ha! You look straight why are you gay? ...why are you doing this...but it is not comfortable for me when they say that so...it’s frustrating”.*

LGBTI Co 2: *...emm...in Edgewood... there are forums...forums that so like multiple peoples don’t want to accept lesbian and bisexual at their area....mmm...to see that need to address. I think there is a need to educate people on this to get to know LGBTI ...that is normal...it normal like gay and lesbian people should see it like that and also...I think it should be organize that people may not consider anyone to offend any with lifestyle.*

LGBTI Co 1 (Linda): *Amm...I think these people that need to know should be educated about us...they should be educated about us....even to the some of the students...they accused us...not that they want us but they don’t know anything about us...no one is good to us...*

The above statements reveal that people’s behaviour at times do not conform to their saying while labelling LGBTI communities indirectly and pretend as if they care, criticisms and stigma on identified persons who are LGBTI community members. These were expressed by LGBTI Co1 expressed that, *“even to the some of the students...they accused us”* (LGBTI Co1), LGBTI Co2 revealed that, *“it showing that I’m not accepting gay that why I will be saying why a gay is wearing bum skirts or use make ups”* and LGBTI Co5 lamented this statement *“they say ha! You look straight why are you gay? ...why are you doing this”*. Research teams have related expressions against labelling and stigma around them. This supports Erath and Tu (2014) that stigmatization gives sexuality differentiation at a University campus among their peers.

The next presented key elements (thrusts) of a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

6.4 KEY ELEMENTS (THRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The following were some key elements (thrusts) of a transformative approach that could be used to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus as discussed and analysed hereunder;

6.4.1 Mutual Engagement among LGBTI communities and Heterosexuals

This section provided an accommodative platform to relate appropriately between heterosexual and LGBTI communities. These were discussed from the data and analysed below;

LGBTI Co 1 *"I thinks is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for them not for anyone..."*

"I just wanna add to the question on homosexuality....this is not homosexual or heterosexual ...to help people who are feminists to do say the thing of gay look feminist. So some of these judgement come from the feminist...something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself" (LGBTI Co 4).

LGBTI Co 4: *I ...mmm... I feel like many things should be done ...is that what happen per time doesn't indicate on whatever people think is good for anyone...actually people who are influential in education... people who can change the mind-set of people, they don't want to hear or understand...especially in teaching should like maybe during teaching...writing on blackboard making examples using LGBTI communities in such like.... A boy and a gay getting married...what about gay marriage?...a gay married a gay...lesbian woman married woman and also have a happy life...so, this lead to see some other people who don't want to listen to others stories that yet there are LGBTI communities who are different in their approach to life".*

LGBTI Co 2: *Aaa.....I think LGBTI communities should be treated with respects among others...mmm...you can see that will make it perfect, yeah!*

Based on the LGBTI Co1 expressed that *“I thinks is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for them not for anyone...”* LGBTI Co4 advocates that everyone should be educated, cited an example thus; *... people who can change the mind-set of people, they don't want to hear or understand...especially in teaching should like maybe during teaching...writing on blackboard making examples using LGBTI communities in such like”*

In respect to the above questions; (Chopik et al. 2013) suggest holistic relationships among students as confirmed by LGBTI Co 2 and LGBTI Co 1 who suggest a exchange of respect and freedom to allow everyone enjoy together. Nonetheless, LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) emphasized on getting to understand individual difference through education to live harmoniously at the university campus. Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco (2011) suggested that communal living helps to build stable psychological health for LGBTI communities for co-existence among their peers.

6.4.2 Mindfulness behaviour to embrace LGBTI communities

The discussion here covered the attitudes of heterosexuals to LGBTI communities at a university campus through literature review as; Erath and Tu (2014) (cf.3.4.2) avert that mindfulness is therapy that practice encourages to stay in the present moment to cement pleasant/unpleasant nature for neutrality to control behavioral indifferences with maturity. Hawkey and Cacioppo (2010) (cf.3.4.2) maintain that social exclusion stimulates disconnection and isolation among people, this supports that LGBTI communities equally need favorable environment to prepare themselves for future responsibilities. Epstein (2009) (cf.3.4.2) confirms that individual development anchors on relational support for reconciliation of acceptance value that appreciates uniqueness in diversity. These discussions could help to instil change in both human and environment in readiness to nature. The findings revealed as follows;

LGBTI Co 1: *I thinks is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for them not for anyone”.*

LGBTI Co 5: *these speak to educational organization that need to set approach to educate majority of students on LGBTI communities and to know that we are normal human beings... {Cough}....stop!*

LGBTI Co 1 and LGBTI Co 5 proposed that education could coordinate behaviour of every member of the university communities to gain over the majority by ensured peaceful relationships. The results above indicated that change is irrevocable, meaning that it constant in nature, people do not like to change for many reasons known to them. This haves to start firstly by ourselves then extend further. The statement from of LGBTI Co5 emphasized that educational organizations to set an approach to educate individuals as LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) supported.

6.4.3 Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities

In this section, tolerance was considered to be one of the key elements that could help to embrace LGBTI communities at a university. Therefore, findings and literature was used to analyse accordingly.

Nevertheless, love relationships help LGBTI communities to achieve their expectation on academic excellence, particularly to secure a remarkable future for themselves (cf.3.4.3) (Santrock, 2008) (cf. 3.4.3). This indicates that love strengthens interpersonal relationships for all students for their inclusion to maximize campus life satisfaction. As to life satisfaction, Berlart (2012) (cf.3.4.3) supports that interpersonal relationships are dynamic systems by nature, which might change continuously during life existence. This might serve as therapy to stimulate LGBTI communities among peers at a university campus. As such, measures of complementing each other afford appropriate security and emotional stability. Needham and Austin (2010) (cf.3.4.3) concur that love grows gradually as people get to know about LGBTI communities, and towards their attitudes toward discrimination and avoidance of close interaction. Tolerance is an inherent point to embrace diversity such as LGBTI communities among their mates at a university campus could be channelled by the data findings from research team which are highlighted below.

The followings extract could provide a possible solution to the subject of the section above;

USSP, Stu2 and LGBTIOC were responded as stated hereunder;

USSP: *okay...mmm... I said more enough in other question...I think the best approach to use is to allow students...emmm...educate themselves so that on the learning process, students will come with the knowledge of LGBTI and concept itself at the University to embrace, love and care...embrace...and students are gold and to LGBTI communities...it will show that not everyone is against the communities, tolerance...support for all and also have the forum with LGBTI organ...I think it might be good approach. Stu 2: Educate people about the Bill of rights and the responsibilities stipulated in the bill of right and reinforce those right and responsibilities in practice. This will bring about understand about LGBTI and improve how student relate to LGBTI.*

LGBTIOC: *The Narrative needs to change and it starts with the students e.g Class of 1976, FEES MUST FALL MOVEMENT....Education education.... education - through discussion with solutions between students and management.*

According the above extracts, Fitzsimons and Fishbach's (2010) (cf.3.4.3), promotion of life goal with the mind-set full of assurance to fulfil life goals, indicated by Stu perhaps go as example cited by the "fees must fall movement" to achieve one goal by LGBTIOC to provide solutions. USSP stated that learning can bring knowledge needed by LGBTI communities to gain support and tolerance from others. Feeney and Thrush (2010) (cf.3.4.3) state, that change is tantamount to all round recovery, based on the fact that one contesting his/her right does not guarantee tolerance but rather noted for reconsideration, which is an expected impact.

6.4.4 Love to embrace LGBTI communities

The subject here is interwoven by tolerance and care, based on the intent of background literature. Love is a vital key element thrust that associates students together without sexuality discrimination among themselves. According to Alatalo (2012) (cf.3.4.4), love helps to appreciate diversity. He considers the beauty of unity as a necessary tool to promote life adaptation over circumstances. Apparently, Harrison and Shorthall (2011) (cf.3.4.4) affirm that love aligns with connection and caring, that individuals have to express for relationship satisfaction and a means through which interests are shared the time. Surprisingly, LGBTI communities, enjoy

derived support from themselves based on relationship satisfaction, especially while they share about challenges due to the nature of their sexuality. In addition, active goals lead to a preference to others and goals are a motivational priority, which has greater impact on the closeness to the others (cf.3.4.4) (Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees & Skinner, 2011).

The research team added the following vital points:

OUCFT: Like seriously, with the look of things at the campus it appears to provide protective measures to make LGBTI communities safe among their peers, such I think to have a listening ears to them, tolerance to socialize with them like being friendly more acceptance and other good relationships to make LGBTI communities feel comfortable in the classroom and campus environment.

USSP alternatively enlightens how to rather err before taking action to embracing LGBTI communities as indicated, on the afore cited extracts OCFT maintained the duties of peers include, to have open ears, tolerate and socialize with them for provision of friendly a environment to LGBTI communities. The researcher stands to suggest that tolerance should be mandatory as the foundation of ecological systems to embrace humanity.

6.4.5 Friendly cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities

Friendly cooperation to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus, is a crucial factor that coordinates to a mental and social stability. Sherwood (2006) (cf.3.4.6) affirms that social, emotional, psychological, physical, spiritual and academic responsibilities are recursive needs to life accomplishment. As such cooperation allows personal relationships in approaches that could embrace LGBTI communities' interest on value and choices of communication. Boylan (2008) (cf.3.4.6) supports that good ability is designed to accomplish human existence in the world of interdependence actualization. This supports that friendly cooperation plays a significant role to mediate the gap between the LGBTI communities and heterosexuals as they co-exist within the same praxis of university campus.

Stu 2: *It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and though and beliefs.*

LGBTI Co 1: *in the past on campus, there were lot of discrimination on the campus against LGBTI communities and within the campus and many guys...students don not want to show that we are like them ...abuse, victimization and stigma. But now we are coming out of such stereotype idea....there are challenges on daily basis...and some things were changing to way they look at LGBTI communities...that at least we socialize among ourselves with little people around us who ready to tolerate us around them.*

Basically, warm attention gained by LGBTI communities in their happiness is tailored by support received from their friends and families in times of need. This constitutes to the experience of love within the friendship sphere that potentially postulates influence on human social well-being (cf. 3.4.7) (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2008; Lyubomirsky, 2008). The researcher is the opinion that good interrelationships between heterosexual peers and LGBTI communities might promote happiness and improve on their mental lifestyles at a university campus.

Stu 5: *Yes, I am friends with people part of LGBTI community. Reason being that I don't see them for their sexual orientation. They just good people I get along with that are my friends.... Everyone I've been around or witnessed have been very welcoming and supportive of them treating them the same as any student regardless of sexual orientation.*

Results suggested that both Stu 2 and LGBTI Co 1 expressed their mind towards abuse, victimization and stigma which should be addressed by cooperation to learn more about others. Findings indicated that respect is to be given through cooperation and acceptance, irrespective of beliefs and differences, human is human, there is need and reason to be in harmony to strengthen our connectivity among ourselves at a University campus. It is very important to respect individual differences based on Stu 5, who indicated that some of LGBTI communities were good people to associate with

and thought that through friendly interaction one can support them to maximize their academic delivery at the university.

6.5 CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH CAN BE USED TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The following presented conditions under which transformative approach could feature to embrace LGBTI communities thus;

6.5.1 Staffs lack of support for LGBTI communities at a University campus

This part addressed staffs/teachers uncaring attitudes to support matters related to LGBTI communities or related sexuality issues at the university campus. Francis (2012) (cf. 3.5.1) states that there is a need to create more intensive awareness and teaching of sexuality, which will cater for the social, emotional, health and educational well-being of all learners and support diversity on teaching and learning in South African schools. The attempt is to remove homophobia, which commonly deprives learner's interest and militate against their emotions on the good academic performance of homosexual students who attract to themselves at the universities (Neto & Pinto, 2015). Notably, Swank and Raiz (2010) (cf. 3.5.1) affirm that heterosexuals make different interpretations of LGBTI communities based on their home background, understanding of sexuality and gender differences. More so, their ability to adapt to the new university campus environment which they find themselves in seems difficult (cf. 3.5.1) (Langbein & Yost, 2009). Notwithstanding, circumstances may create its opportunities that embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. This is expressed by Stu 3 and Stu 1 thus;

Stu 3: [The university and management. To get a sense of what is happening on the ground and how to make constructive changes that benefit all].

Stu 1(SH5) [To change the state of LGBTI communities, I think they should be some sort of a campaign which will run once a week. I think if the campus management and lecturers support the campaign, LGBTI communities will feel included, wanted and special to the campus because they have the management support].

The results of the above statements suggested that educators/lecturers and the entire management should intervene in creating an enabling university environment that accommodates all as pointed out, for all to see unity in diversity, and not picturing sexuality abnormality but with care support for all student, especially LGBTI communities.

6.5.2 Changing of attitudes/prejudices towards LGBTI communities

In this section, the findings were considered changes of attitudes and prejudices mentioned, as stated towards LGBTI communities at a university campus, Beitz (2009) (cf. 3.5.2) acknowledges that socialisation propels a lifelong process which helps to learn social expectations and ways to interact with other people. At this, people apporportion consciousness on sexuality so that they can learn to accept each other. Johnson (2014) asserts that socialisation assists populace to embrace LGBTI and consider not opposing the behavioural aspect that LGBTI is aberrant by combat and violence on contest. Noteworthy, Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald, (2009) (cf. 3.5.2) argue that poor sexual education orientation of teachers in high schools may internalize learners from high schools to higher institutions, where campus clearly signifies homophobia on LGBTI communities. This perhaps will demystify the preconceived idea of heterosexuality versus homosexuality.

Findings suggested that there is need to make avenues to talk about the issues of prejudices and attitudes as confirmed by OCFT and LGBTI Co1 as follows;

OCFT: *“Uhhh....about barriers/hindrances....I can say what I think could be problems is in case where University do not want to support the approach to embracing LGBTI communities fully. Also...situation that LGBTI communities do not want to be part of the programme may be due to past of their experiences of stigmatization, abuses or hatred among heterosexual students not to have a repeat of the scene. Another hindrance can be non-conformity of heterosexual about LGBTI communities. Also, lack of provision for such initiative at the University and less homophobic environment to change to unknown ideas”.*

LGBTI Co 1: *“Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI”*. OCFT and LGBTI Co1 found non-conformity of heterosexuals and see inequality as barriers against prejudices by maintain non-discriminating attitudes to LGBTI communities. In contrast, Francis (2012), Francis and DePalma (2014) (cf. 3.5.2) emphasize that students should be equipped with skills to challenge inequality and discrimination in their study environment, and affirm that learning activities do not promote discrimination. Participant UL1 and LGBTI Co3 revealed thus;

UL1: *one...a university...academic community...stakeholders, non-governmental organizations...court people....churches...hospital....our family...in fact member of the communities...because...it affect all of us together*. LGBTI Co 3: *what like? Debates and dialogues be done from lecture venues on the LGBTI communities relationship among classmate should be taught correctly by the lecturers...so students understand*. However, Johnson (2014) affirms that the concept of diversity includes recognition for individual sexuality to support that each individual is unique in thought, and it encompasses individual differences. OCFT statement disagreed that *“another hindrance can be non-conformity of heterosexual about LGBTI communities. Also, lack of provision for such initiative at the university and less homophobic environment to change to unknown ideas”*. Also, SRC statement provided valuable point for such attitudes thus; SRC: *“Firstly...what you need to understand is that... change is a difficult thing...so now we know you should know that most of our students they are from rural areas...areas where...ah...ah... LGBTI communities are...are... not much been seeing there...or seeing things happening is not that way as present”*

The above statement maintained that as Brikkels (2014) (cf. 3.5.4) confirms that prejudice and non-conforming behaviour of the majority of heterosexual individuals regard relationships as abnormal and against the norms and values of their society. As OCFT confirmed *“about barriers/hindrances....I can say what I think could be problems is in case where university do not want to support the approach to embracing LGBTI communities fully”*. Through the above statement, attitudes of the majority of heterosexual students could be corrected to avoid any prejudices against LGBTI

communities and levelling different practices that might undermine communality among students at large. However, LGBTI Co 4: *“Mmm... I go to the section of attitudes...mmm...it is important to know that we are not different from other people....and mmm...I think people from LGBTI communities should take a leading role on this point”*. LGBTI Co4 statement addressed those others to have changed attitudes because they are all different from the people around them.

In respect to the above results; it was noted that despite the difficult change to do as stated by SRC and LGBTI Co4, advised to embrace others who may share different sexuality; LGBTI communities should be accommodated through education and deeper understanding about LGBTI communities. This could transform reasoning and negative stereotype that the majority of heterosexual might have on LGBTI communities at a university campus.

6.5.3 Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI communities

It is very important to explore promotion of good self-esteem for LGBTI communities at a university campus. This section discusses findings and literature review.

Neff (2011) (cf. 3.5.3) supports that good self-esteem averts persistent-character judgment through one’s wrong perception to nail diversity, thus cultivate self-compassion for one another. This supports to limit self-criticism and eschew its negative effects that can serve as hindrances to achieve goals towards highest potential, a more contented and fulfilled life. In addition, Erath and Tu (2014) (cf. 3.5.3) emphasize that contention arguments on sexuality with negative confrontations might create a threat for the LGBTI communities instead of encouraging them to cultivate positive creativity to cope with their academic responsibility without undermining their essential social wellbeing. He further extend, to improve on good self-esteem through character development that can fortify self-worth against challenges in terms of emotional, physical, social and educational features to develop a more positive mind that establishes possibilities. In contrast to literature, Stu 1: *“I don’t know whether it because they like to go as a group or because they feel not wanted by the other students”*. LGBTIOC: *Issues of discrimination and judgement that’s need to educating everyone. That there is nothing wrong with being different. LGBTIOC: We live in the*

21st century so I honestly do not expect some of the happenings I read about re: Homophobia, Transphobia, gender based violence but because we live in a society that is hurt & that think violation means you care for someone is a problem. Stu 3: Classmates have different emotions towards LGBTI communities. There are those who are familiar with the LGBTI communities who are responding well towards them, who knows and have understanding that LGBTI communities are people like us and have feelings like us. Stu 3 “While others have no remorse towards LGBTI communities. They do not treat them as human beings and they treat those people without feelings”. Stu 5 and LGBTI Co 1 approached differently as stated; Stu 5: “My suggestion will benefit the current state of LGBTI by bringing back their self-esteem because once you are criticized of something you end-up losing your self-esteem. Having support of the university management is like having your mother’s blessings so that why I say the LGBTI will re-develop their self-esteem and self-love”. LGBTI Co 1: Amm...I think these people that need to know should be educated about us...they should be educated about us....even to the some of the students...they accused us...not that they want us but they don’t know anything about us...no one is good to us”...

Statements above suggested that individual can be supportive where a good atmosphere is created to perpetuate good self-esteem for all, LGBTI communities inclusive, to have rapports without guilt or blame that might hamper their academic engagement among peers at a university campus.

6.5.4 University campus implementation of anti-bullying program to embracing LGBTI communities

The inclusion of core ecological systems insights, that clearly address issues such as bullying, discrimination and abuses to have a dire penalty is highly required for schools, colleges and universities be implemented and freely executed for the rights of all students.

LGBTI Co 3: “what like? Debates and dialogues be done from lecture venues on the LGBTI communities relationship among classmate should be taught correctly by the lecturers...so students understand.”

UL1: *“yeah! It will be implemented if all the member of the University is part and parcel of the program...it will be very...very...successful...if all the staff members be part to form this approach that will embracing LGBTI communities”.*

UL1 and LGBTI Co 3 suggested that dialogues, debates, and a parcel of programmes be implemented, to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. The above statements presented that programs need to be established such that debates and dialogues can be used as a medium to communicate the populace to have a different relook on LGBTI communities and challenges to provide interventions to accommodate all students from stress of victimization, abuses or any violence acts against LGBTI communities as equal to rights of education among peers.

6.5.5 Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities

Various support would be needed to help categories of students at Schools and universities to meet both psychological and psychosocial problems of learners/ students to ensure mental development. Pyykkönen (2012) (cf. 3.5.6) concurs that there is a need to support LGBTI communities at a university campus among their peers socially, to enhance their sustenance and improve wellbeing. Psychosocial support is describes as a continuum of care and momentum which is geared towards ensuring social, emotional and psychological wellbeing of students at the university campus (cf. 3.5.6) (Gabb, 2011).

However, the findings between LGBTI Co 4 and UL1 were expressed thus;

LGBTI Co 4: *I just wanna add to the question on homosexuality....this is not homosexual or heterosexual ...to help people who are feminists to do say the thing of gay look feminist. So some of these judgement come from the feminist...something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself...*

UL1 : *amm...the best approach I can think...if am to provide solution...I think the thing should start at the classroom...as a professional teacher or lecturer...to teach our students to understand that there's no problem to be friendly with LGBTI communities and make them to know that there are different*

in sexual orientation....as a teacher...it has to be my responsibility to educate my students to understand that there are other sexual identities and there is no different in LGBTI communities and others...is just a matter of different sexual orientation. So as a teacher...it has to be my responsibility to help my students understand all this...because...where they are coming from...from their various villages...from their various cultural backgrounds....they do not know and their culture do not allow them from their communities they lives...and the way they were brought up is how then they feel them...I think everything starts there...

According to LGBTI Co 4 statement explained “to help people who are feminists to do say the thing of gay look feminist”, Participants found a question on the subject of LGBTI interpreted differently by those who he referred to as feminists that came to light by conversation. LGBTI Co4 continued that; “So some of these judgement come from the feminist...something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself”. UL1 viewed differently through this statement; “the best approach I can think...if am to provide solution...I think the thing should start at the classroom...as a professional teacher or lecturer...to teach our students to understand that there’s no problem to be friendly with LGBTI communities and make them to know that there are different in sexual orientation....as a teacher”. Both LGBTI Co4 and UL1’s statements showed means through which intensified socialization of students could promote effectiveness. Kapeleri and Paivio (2011) concur that psychosocial support services enhance physical wellness and emotional wellbeing.

UL1: *that in the first place shouldn’t happen...because...if it happens...the lecturer should come in...if that should happen...the course director should come in...leader of that particular module should come in...to intervene...in such case...is not something to let go for that particular student....it might lead to depression...lead to someone commit suicide or attempt...the coordinator even the cluster leader should be involved...so that the necessary steps can be taken...*

Based on UL1 statement above maintained, prompt intervention steps to be taken to get every single student to avoid negative experience while socializing a “leader of that particular module should come in...to intervene...in such case...is not something to let go for that particular student....it might lead to depression among peers”; to

avoid, by his statement “depression”. The psychosocial supports explained an approach that could engage all students without neglecting any, coming to an understanding of the subject of acceptance and embracing each other as such LGBTI communities as valued respective individual that form belongingness at a university campus.

6.5.6 Provision of improved safety at university campus to embracing LGBTI communities

As results of an opposition to sexuality, it becomes so difficult for LGBTI communities to perform well academically because there is no enabling academic environment to attend lectures without fear of their safety and emotional wellbeing (cf. 3.5.7) (Fisher, Poirier & Blau, 2012). The findings indicated hereunder:

Stu 5: *[Talks and seminars should be head when students enter the university on the different communities found in varsity and educating them on such Students, student’s body, management and outsiders, professionals who are more knowledgeable on the topic helping educate students. All being treated equally. And all these factors not being made to define them students being seen and treated and such for they are].* Stu 4: *[Involve student’s participation. There is a huge number of student in the university and they all enjoy doing different things. Have an event that can involve all the student, must include team work/building and social interaction. Anyone can be an agent especially within the University from RA (Residence Assistant) to the house committee].*

Stu 5 perceived that talks and seminar should be used as a means of improving accommodation of students as statement cited; “*Talks and seminars should be head when students enter the university on the different communities found in varsity and educating them on such Students, student’s body, management and outsiders, professionals who are more knowledgeable on the topic helping educate students*”. While Stu 4 also stated that university should include student participation to enjoy collaboration and social interaction, statement stated; “*Have an event that can involve all the student, must include team work/building and social interaction*”.

Stu 1: *[To change the state of LGBTI communities, I think they should be some sort of a campaign which will run once a week. I think if the campus management and lecturers support the campaign, LGBTI communities will feel included, wanted and special to the campus because they have the management support].* OCFT: *[I think this question is very difficult to address as I felt majorly this involves the entire school management to look into the creation of welcoming university environment that will embrace LGBTI communities and other cultural diversity. More to say is that, through a platform of awareness campaigns of the university in general to be part of the initiative of inclusion of all students. I see that if management can support and all stakeholders with the collaboration of students/student's representative council – a fair approach can be launched when all bodies are adequately represented in the design of such approach that will benefit all students and LGBTI communities].* Stu 2: *[Create awareness campaign in which students will be taught about LGBTI communities; once they understand they will be able to treat them with acceptance and Respect].*

Stu 1 and Stu 2 suggested that campaigns should include university management and make LGBTI communities feel included on the program to be accepted and respected, while Stu 5 and Stu 4 requested talks, seminars and student's participation that will involve a large number of students, allowing professionals to be speakers to educate university students on LGBTI communities, creating social relation. However, (OCFT) supports to ensure a welcoming university environment through the joint effort to launch an inclusive university campus. Data findings by Stu 4, Stu 5, Stu 1, and OCFT discovered that varieties of perspectives can form a transformative initiative to embrace LGBTI communities among heterosexuals and to build a participatory network that helps academic and emotional states of all students. The next is hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

6.6 HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

Here are the suggested barriers to a transformative approach to could embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus;

6.6.1 Dominance of heterosexuals over LGBTI communities

On the hindrances, discussions for this study, it was obvious that heterosexual dominance indicates marginalization of sexuality between heterosexuals and homosexuals, and as such LGBTI communities fail in this classified margin, and hence puts these groups into a different position among their peers. On this note, Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowics, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) (cf. 3.6.1) maintained that monitoring of involvement in activities participation are normative to transformation that might make the University campus more attractive for LGBTI communities to enjoy a supportive atmosphere to maximize their potential like their heterosexual peers across the high schools, colleges and universities.

USSP: *Em... I think for one...am...going to say that...em...in addressing LGBTI...we need to start with a top- down-approach...I think is important that in addressing issues related that they need to be familiarized especially the management and to write down to junior staffs and emm... students...of course there are obstacles...emm...as I have said before the stigma attached to LGBTI communities...mmm...create a sense of vulnerability within the campus where...students afraid to express themselves in fear of victimized around the campus and of course...we need to get the involvement of monitoring team within the off campus and of course management should be aware of this which should be found...so the top-down-approach that I was saying from the managementpermission from LGBTI communities and also put of the local government...partnering with local organizations...to embracing the awareness campaignsthe awareness of LGBTI community.*

LGBTI Co 2: *I think there should be awareness campaigns...show talk and during awareness...there should be experts to...to...to teach the students about LGBTI, were and the res...of the organization should be...should be more...mmm...active around the campuses like building the wall of*

awareness...so that people be more aware and that people should be....ah...ah...ah...active expert...a person who can be able to let students understand WhatsApp on organization about and how can treat the people in the organization...

SRC: it is through educational forum whereby all students can be present to be part of this program...even cleaners...even inner bodies...ground...ground to come do the issues of educators to come and deal with issues of LGBTI because the communities...because...everyone need to be part and be educated...

Based on that point of view, of USSP advised a top-down approach of recruiting all stakeholder even to the junior staff to find a way to embrace LGBTI communities, while LGBTI Co 2 supported that awareness campaigns and talk shows should be put in place where experts can provide activities around campus. At this, SRC considered an educational forum that will allow the coming up of LGBTI communities' issues, and discuss it all the bodies, from the cleaners to the top management. The researcher confirmed that a round table of the entire department and management would be required to set a transformative approach collaboratively to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

6.6.2 Different perspectives to embracing LGBTI communities

This importance of different perspectives to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus is explored, based on Simon, Aikins and Prinstein (2008) (cf. 3.6.2), socialization factors that linked differences to adjustment to similarities among LGBTI communities, but indicates difficulty to provide security consciousness to collective belongingness. Bierman (2004) (cf. 3.6.2) opens that depressive behaviour symptoms emanate from peer rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus, launches relational aggression and emerging victimization significantly imposes changes to their concentration over time. Moreover, Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) (cf. 3.6.2) noted that LGBTI communities socialize at a university campus by engaging in love relationships through inclusion of others to choose friends who tolerate them in their daily interactions at the university campus.

SRC: Like everyone should be friendly...yes...all must be aware of LGBTI communities so as to create rapport and learning.

USSP: *Well... the relevant part of it is that to be part of it is personal...I see from the onset being a student who have the limited knowledge of LGBTI...eh...en... coming into the structures have spoken about and would begin to create an open mind to know more about LGBTI communities and ... I seen the relevant idea is this...because coming through the process of learning is there on a transformative approach to learning....is still relevant to transform mind ...one getting a better understanding of LGBTI and also at the same time in coming in support of the world the LGBTI communities is having...*

Both SRC and USSP statements opposed Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo and Gabriel (2011) that LGBTI communities socialize by engaging in love relationships through inclusion of others to choose friends who tolerate them on their daily interactions at the University campus.

Meanwhile LGBTI Co 3 and LGBTI Co 1 suggested differently as stated below;

LGBTI Co 3: *I think what Rosie says is true to be involve in many activities that inform LGBTI communities....people that know homosexual thing...it should be people who are also the school be involved in organizing campaigns that can bring change to people understanding of LGBTI.*

LGBTI Co 1: *to organize a programme that will be controlled by LGBTI communities and get other department involve in the program met that all the students and management involvement...maybe to involve all in the university in the thing to all involvement.*

On the above data results; it is therefore found needed to create a friendly atmosphere and show love to LGBTI communities, develop an open mind to be able to teach those who have limited knowledge about LGBTI communities to be tolerable. However, as LGBTI Co 1 stated to form a program controlled by LGBTI communities with management involvement, while USSP suggested that universities must take a standing role to monitor the implementation of embracing LGBTI communities through campaigns, even government needs to be involved.

6.6.3 Insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities

This section provided data findings, which addressed the subject of insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities at a university. The discussions were stated below:

Stu 5: *[More information and knowledge being taught to learners. Educating them on LGBTI communities. Currently that need to change is more awareness and knowledge need to be made available to all students. This can be done in talks during orientation week and also integrated in classes].* LGBTI Co 2: *I think people that I've met do talk more of lesbian than gay...because they see the dress...they ask that apart from being lesbian what do you think you gain for being LGBTI members?*

LGBTI Co 1: *Mmm....it is very important that...there are need to come together to look into the issues that may limit LGBTI communities from other students together and part of the students to bring people together and tell them that being gay or lesbian or any form of homo should be considered as part of social life...so in that sense people should not discriminating against differences...to advice some people who are homophobic to other people...LGBTI.* Stu 2: *[Encourage internal LGBTI Networking and communities create a strong culture of inclusiveness].*

The findings by Stu 5, LGBTI Co5 and Stu 1 expressed that more information and education should be given to learners/student about LGBTI communities, while LGBTI Co2 considered needs to come together and talk about the LGBTI issues to avoid differential discrimination. However, Stu 2 expressed a new insight to encourage internal LGBTI networking to create a strong culture of inclusiveness.

LGBTI Co 4: *I just wanna add to the question on homosexuality....this is not homosexual or heterosexual ...to help people who are feminists to do say the thing of gay look feminist. So some of these judgement come from the feminist...something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself"...* LGBTI Co 1: *I thinks is very good to educate ourselves more on the needs to give everyone a chance to freedom of life they choose...is for*

them not for anyone”...LGBTI Co 5: these speak to educational organization that need to set approach to educate majority of students on LGBTI communities and to know that we are normal human beings... {Cough}....stop!

SRC emphasized on the need for the student majority to be educated, LGBTI Co4 approached it differently but later expressed that “*something that judge LGBTI communities and homosexuality and teaching on the sexuality and too much...and I think it depends on how you take yourself...*” this showed that LGBTI Co4 was educating himself to focus on his personality.

SRC: *firstly...what you need to understand is that... change is a difficult thing... therefore, there’s need for them to be educated...it means that since that you’re in the institution, there is a kind of thing for them to learn in an institution, there are particular the issue of LGBTI communities about issues around University...because some of the people hardly understand how someone can become a lesbian or someone become bisexual, they need to be taught throughout the process about LGBTI communities...therefore, students need to be educated....so that they understand.*

LGBTI Co 4: *I ...mmm... I feel like many things should be done ...is that what happen per time doesn’t indicate on whatever people think is good for anyone ...actually people who are influential in education... people who can change the mind-set of people, they don’t want to hear or understand...especially in teaching should like maybe during teaching...writing on blackboard making examples using LGBTI communities in such like.... A boy and a gay getting married...what about gay marriage?...a gay married a gay...lesbian woman married woman and also have a happy life...so, this lead to see some other people who don’t want to listen to others stories that yet there are LGBTI communities who are different in their approach to live.*

Findings as discussed from LGBTI Co4, SRC, LGBTI Co1, LGBTI Co5, Stu 2, Stu 5, and LGBTI Co2 indicated that SRC, LGBTI Co1, LGBTI Co5, Stu 2, Stu 5, and LGBTI Co2, that due to a lack of adequate knowledge about LGBTI communities, there should be more education to explain and provide better knowledge to those who needed information except, LGBTI Co4 who emphasized internal LGBTI networking to create inclusiveness that could embrace LGBTI communities.

6.6.4 Limited spaces to debates/dialogues on LGBTI communities issues

At times, to resolve issues, comes through dialogues (common sense), this aspect of the discussions presented limited spaces to debate/dialogues on LGBTI communities issues. This confirms that at the university campus, there is less attention paid to diversity that can encourage a debate to improve on dialogue activities for students, especially on sexuality education (cf. 3.6.4) (Clark, 2012). Goransson and Nilholm (2014) (cf. 3.6.4) unveil that varieties of activities were holistically structured to accommodate all students, meanwhile helpful for diversity awareness for all students without marginalizing any group to participate. Findings stated below;

LGBTIOC: My suggestion would be for varsities across the country to have LGBTI MOVEMENTS that is accessible to all students. Stu 3: Yes, more programs and more students must be involved to participate to support and understand the LGBTI communities.

Here LGBTIOC and Stu 3 suggested a movement and more programs to allow more student support. Meanwhile Stu 2 and Stu 5 maintained on talks, seminars and awareness campaigns, even through social media to educate everyone. This corresponded with Hall, Evans and Nixon (2013) (cf. 3.6.4) who suggest that dialogues and debate spaces for interactions to promote a peaceful co-existence among students, hence set a boundary to maintain balanced relationships between heterosexual and homosexual (LGBTI communities) and at a university campus. Diversity, dialogues and debates that involve LGBTI communities' issues at a university campus are not intensively situated to create awareness by embracing diversity (cf. 3.6.4) (Litvin, 2006). Stu 2 and Stu 5 confirmed that awareness campaigns, talks and seminars be provided to ensure that LGBTI communities were treated with acceptance. Also mass media can be used to strengthen awareness and contribute to changing hearts and minds.

Stu 2: Create awareness campaign in which students will be taught about LGBTI communities; once they understand they will be able to treat them with acceptance and Respect... Yes. Use social nature and mass media to change hearts and minds. Stu 5: [Talks and seminars should be held when students enter the university on the different communities found in varsity and educating

them on such... Students, student's body, management and outsiders, professionals who are more knowledgeable on the topic helping educate students.... All being treated equally. And all these factors not being made to define those students being seen and treated and such for who they are... Seminars, talks and pamphlets educating students on LGBTI communities. More information and knowledge being taught to learners. Educating them on LGBTI communities].

In order to support debate and dialogues, Stu 4's statement maintained that, *"Involve student's participation. There is a huge number of student in the university and they all enjoy doing different things. Have an event that can involve all the student, must include team work/building and social interaction... Anyone can be an agent especially within the university from RA (Residence Assistant) to the house committee...It must be showcased for free at a location that is always full of people"* (Stu 4).

In regards to the above discussions the data findings addressed that campaigns, awareness and seminars could be of help to effect the core objective that could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus and extend the strategies in various dimension as stated above, to drive the implementation of a transformative approach for all students.

6.6.5 Capacity to provide necessary intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities

Another vital part of this objective was to enhance necessary intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. The following findings discussed as expressed hereunder:

Stu 4: *[Involve student's participation. There is a huge number of student in the university and they all enjoy doing different things. Have an event that can involve all the student, must include team work/building and social interaction].*

Stu 3: *[University should introduce subjects on modules that will help students to understand more about LGBTI communities. In addition, all the relevant stakeholders must support the learning and studying of the LGBTI*

communities...Yes, more programs and more students must be involved to participate to support and understand the LGBTI communities].

The statements from both Stu 4 and Stu 3 supported that the university could include teamwork/building and social interaction to support communities of LGBTI, USSP advised to create small focus groups of students structured into LGBTI to chaired debate forums. It was also suggested to research and debate with literature back up while, LGBTI Co 2 suggested, drawings, charts and pictures to advertise LGBTI communities on campus.

USSP: *Yes; yeah... {Laughs!}...has it be the support structure is paramount support...because...em...in the issues of LGBTI, we need to create a smaller student community that will form part of the structure through the management and student representatives...en...individuals so I think...and to creating small focus groups leading to forum debate and seen into the structure of LGBTI. Mmm...one of the thing I think can be...emm...we need to get clearer among ourselves while full research on the effect of emm...LGBTI group...em...can be the reason why I'm saying is the research based approach ...of course research and debates can results to have some literature to back up...is a good part of research to be part of the studies.*

LGBTI Co 2: *Emmm...mmm...mmm...I think if there be drawings, charts, pictures to advertise LGBTI communities in the campus...will be of help to give more information about LGBTI communities.*

Moreover, UL1 and SRC called for the university to be part of the program and called for academia to make alternatives for a functioning approach.

UL1: *yeah! It will be implemented if all the member of the university is part and parcel of the program...it will be very...very...successful...if all the staff members be part to form this approach that will embracing LGBTI communities.*

SRC: *we are all agents of the change...the LGBTI itself, the academic...the academia's....eh...eh...eh...the student leadership...themselves...everyone....within and institution...because they do not exist in island...which is institution and this institution comprises of many...therefore, all bodies mentioned within the*

institution...because...university comprises of many bodies...many bodies...because if we all together as every to be part of this approach...everyone will enjoy it.

UL1: amm...the best approach I can think...if am to provide solution...I think the thing should start at the classroom...as a professional teacher or lecturer...to teach our students to understand that there's no problem to be friendly with LGBTI communities and make them to know that there are different in sexual orientation ...it has to be my responsibility to educate my students to understand that there are other sexual identities and there is no different in LGBTI communities and others...is just a matter or different sexual orientation...because... they are coming from...from their various villages...from their various cultural backgrounds....they do not know and their culture do not allow them from their communities they lives...and the way they were brought up is how then they feel them...I think everything starts there...

USSP: Emm...m...I think one of the approach we can use... to use edutem ...and lack of education ...emm...mm...we are a great of subject of change to students. I think I too lack of understanding about LGBTI communities ...approach I said is to hold awareness ...get LGBTI student to speak on the experiences...and to see how these adapt and how they are in the residences and how feeling each other and go theyemm... approach of embracing a program of...of.. education terms where they will have time to entertaining through health, play, drama...and songs that could be created and making entertainment that will bring all students together in the campus...creating awareness...take away fear for being LGBTI among students.

LGBTIOC: The student bodies (e.g sport union/ LGBTI+ Union which deals with issues of the community as a whole) as well as the general management and also making sure that the LGBTI+ are represented in all the bodies so they feel part and parcel of the decision making.

Based on the findings, Stu 4, Stu 3, USSP, LGBTI Co 3, LGBTI Co2, UL1 and LGBTIOC have made different interventions to embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus. All these were inclusive approaches packaged which could offer LGBTI communities more participation in their activities to make a university campus more attractive and supportive for all students.

6.6.6 Religious and beliefs on LGBTI communities' differences at a University campus

This part discussed a sensitive perspective where the majority hides while showing intolerance to LGBTI communities. Sometimes the subject of who or not, how and why, LGBTI members are posing unending arguments, according to Adamczyk and Pitt (2009) (cf. 3.6.6), stated that religiosity has pose a difference to individual perceptions on others' beliefs, mostly for acceptance of sexuality which often leads to conflict between heterosexuals and homosexual communities.

Statement of Stu 2: *[Resistance from people who are Christian; people who do not relate any identity with the LGBTI].*

Stu 3: *[It differs; the management treat LGBTI with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone But the classmate is different some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there some resistance come from those people with rigid lifestyle and though and beliefs].* Both Stu 2 and Stu 3 shared similar perception of Christian and people with rigid beliefs were problem to LGBTI communities' acceptance.

This above statement unfolds contradictions that society points to, at times to individual's assertions on a subject of sexuality which remains virtually different. Hence, contradictions tantamount to no subject to any other as LGBTI communities' equal rights to choices of religion and beliefs, unlike heterosexuals. As Munson and Stelbourn (2013) (cf. 3.6.6) state, conflicts impact on indoctrination and prejudice inherited that LGBTI communities were different from heterosexual people, according to their beliefs on normative principles. In contrast, norms and practices distinguish worlds. According to Fine and Spencer (2009) (cf. 3.6.6), the need to enhance social inclusivity to avoid isolation conflicts that emanated from indoctrination and prejudice of heterosexual against LGBTI communities at the university campus.

LGBTI Co 4: *...I think it will go far to people who do not aware of LGBTI communities and people need to know....mmm...I think this has to go to the issues of lecturers, the pastors to allow people to know and stop to discriminate LGBTI communities...people who friendly will benefit from the study...also social worker people.*

Stu 1: *[To change the state of LGBTI communities, I think they should be some sort of a campaign which will run once a week. I think if the campus management and lecturers support the campaign, LGBTI communities will feel included, wanted and special to the campus because they have the management support].*

SRC: *[Like everyone should be friendly...yes...all must be aware of LGBTI communities so as to create rapport and learning].*

UL1: *I think our campuses ...like I have said...cultural issues...religious issues ...but most of the religion do not believe that such could be allowed...I think if something has to be done ...it should start from our religion to address...as far as religion is playing a prominent role on our students – the issues that occur or occurring in our institution...down to our education system and Whatever thing that should be done should start from religious group...*

From the above findings; Stu 2 and Stu 3 identified the religious impact on people's views over LGBTI communities, while LGBTI Co4 and Stu 1 craved for support through various offices, as well as SRC and UL1 assert mutual rapport for everyone at the University.

6.6.7 Inconsistency of policies regards LGBTI communities

The major aspect that seems to have greater influence on embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus rests on the consistency of the policies. This dependency addresses equality rights of all students. However, Haldeman (2012) (cf. 3.6.7), states that ethical considerations on policy for practice stipulates to embrace LGBTI communities by supporting their experiences which channel towards a transformative approach, to accept their connectivity with peers at a the university campus.

The White Paper on Foreign Policy (2011) (cf. 3.6.7), supports that tolerance should be maintained to make education free for all, encourages love, empathy, equity and unity to promote nation development. The findings are discussed as follows;

Stu 2: *[Educate people about the Bill of rights and the responsibilities stipulated in the bill of right and reinforce those right and responsibilities in practice].*

LGBTI Co 1: *to organize a programme that will be controlled by LGBTI communities and get other department involve in the program met that all the students and management involvement...maybe to involve all in the university in the thing to all involvement.* The idea of educating people about the bill of rights by Stu 2 and LGBTI Co1, management involvement aligned with Hawkley and Cacioppo (2010) (cf. 3.6.7), that supports love application as grounded on ecological systems to provide a way-out from marginalization of LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Yet the following statements of LGBTI Co 4 and LGBTI Co 3, expressed that consistency should be a helpful medium through law enforcement agents as Jacob (2013) (cf. 3.6.7), confirmed the implementation of individual rights by the state.

LGBTI Co 4: *I think the management about LGBTI communities are not that they are supposed to help us in time of any issues or abusers...but there is still no much change with them...the education that we saying has to go round...because they know that there are LGBTI communities...management, but more can be done than now.*

LGBTI Co 3: *I think what Rosie says is true to be involve in many activities that inform LGBTI communities....people that know homosexual thing...it should be people who are also the school be involved in organizing campaigns that can bring change to people understanding of LGBTI.*

Firstly, Stu 2 opens to teaching the bill of rights and responsibilities to individuals. LGBTI Co 4 suggests that management should awake to their duties in the case of abusers, while LGBTI Co 3 and LGBTI Co 1 advised to involve LGBTI communities in activities related to policy formulation in conjunction with management. The researcher concur that policies should be re-adjusted in a way to accommodate and protect all students at the university campus, irrespective of their groups.

In conclusion to this section, findings maintained, according to the objective of the study which could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. From the data findings it was noted that belief systems of heterosexuals on homosexuals cannot be overruled completely, albeit there is a 20/80 tolerance balance, based on this study which shows that LGBTI communities' negative experiences are not 100% but by preferences which could be practically understood.

6.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has discussed and analysed data based on six research objectives. Extracts to support data presented were used in this chapter. A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus shall be proposed in Chapter seven. The next chapter focuses on findings, conclusions and recommendations for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter discussed and, analyzed data generated, alongside research objectives. This emanated from meetings and extracts of proceedings that were castoff to support the data presented, as the study sought to propose a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. Chapter eight will present “A transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. This chapter details findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the objectives of this study, limitations of the study, implications for further research and chapter summary.

7.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON THE CURRENT SITUATION REGARDING APPROACHES TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

This section discussed the summarized of findings below.

7.2.1 Present University climate on LGBTI communities

These findings supported empirical data (cf. 3.6 and cf. 5.3), on “To enjoy a transformative approach at a university campus.” In order consider a transformative approach that might embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus, the following should be considered (cf. 2.3.2, cf. 3.8 and cf. 5.7). Wang and Eccles (2012) (cf. 5.3.4) showed differences in gender identity which may attract conflicts of identification of LGBTI communities, since there are dominant heterosexuals at a university campus. The researcher found that parental and family support is imperative to reduce influences of the incidences that often occur at the university against LGBTI communities. As Williams et al. (2005), Kapeleri and Paivio (2011) (cf. 5.3.3) observed, the contrast exposed that a lack of supportive families, peer and teachers constitute heavily towards the occurrences of hostile atmospheres at the university

campus for LGBTI communities. Therefore, non-discriminatory behaviour and an inclusive learning environment can be employed into the current state, based on Thapa, Cohen, Guffey and Higgins-D'Alessandro (2013) (cf. 3.2.1), to promote a safer, supportive and inclusive environment for all students. Kosciw et al. (2010) stated that LGBTI communities were experiencing hard times at schools and universities where homophobic attacks are unavoidable, thereby converting a school environment into a battlefield, with name-calling and yelling on a daily basis. The research teams' statements; LGBTI Co 3 *experienced* difficulties in the first instance but she is getting better now. LGBTIOC, (cf. 5.3.2) showed identified discrimination among peers for being a LGBTI member.

Based on the research team's responses; LGBTIOC, OCFT, LGBTI Co2, expressed one thing or another that confirmed the hostility state of the university campus for LGBTI communities. More, so, this was supported by SRC (Gi) that various related cases were reported to their office. Ileris (2014) (cf. 2.2.2) that an approach transformative is need on these challenging incidences against LGBTI communities, to provide security to embrace them at a university campus. In accordance with a changing of behaviour, Stu 4 (Bradeline) (cf. 5.3.2) expressed that she does not have a problem with people who are different from her.

7.2.2 Attitudes of university community members on LGBTI communities

Another part of the situational analysis into a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus was cognizance of a social marginalization as it appears that educators/lecturers indirectly accepted LGBTI communities at schools and universities. McCormack (2012), (cf. 3.2.2) confirmed LGBTI students' negative experiences at schools and universities, social marginalization and discrimination. This has been homophobia from heterosexual students. Beyer (2012) (cf. 3.2.2), disagrees that the educators/lecturers seem to deliberately remain silent on gender orientation differences and sexuality thereby disadvantage LGBTI communities of equal access to teaching and learning. The researcher stands with the assumption of Ringrose and Renold (2010) (cf. 3.2.2), that teachers/lecturers' input has a significant influence to preserve equal rights of all students, whereas silence to

LGBTI communities' voices on abuse from peers might cause them internalise emotional problems regarding their sexuality at a university campus. Yet, Lozier and Beckman (2012) argue that LGBTI communities' peer rejection at a university campus, incurs unconscious struggles for them to find their levels of engagement and co-exist among others, and towards achieving their life goals. This point indirectly corresponds with Llera and Katsirebas (2010, p. 29) (c f 3.2.2), who confirmed that LGBTI communities who cohabit among other students at a university campus might engage love in relationships to facilitate their visibility by maintaining their interest to transform socially, through peer intervention strategy. The findings related to literature showed attitudes of heterosexuals on LGBTI communities at university campus by peers, lecturers and educators were written thus:

SH5 confirmed different treatment was given to LGBTI communities. LGBTI Co 3 expressed her experience as to the treatment by peers as toxic, but changing slowly now, LGBTIOC pointed at discrimination and judgement (McCormack, 2012), (cf. 3.2.2) that required everyone to be educated about LGBTI communities. Stu 4 (*Bradeline*) sees no problem to be friends with LGBTI communities, enjoy their company but disagreed on LGBTI communities been discriminated against. Stu 3 considered LGBTI communities as people like us who have feelings and emotions, just as we do, and raised eyebrow that they (heterosexuals) do not treat them as human beings instead treat them like people without feelings (Kosciw et al., 2010). As Stu 1 (SH5) revealed that LGBTI communities do exist at the university campus, but the question still remains relevant that indirect acceptance from peers occurred. Stu 2 is not so familiar nor judges anyone because he is a Christian and Stu 4 (*Bradeline*) who stated that she became a friend someone who is LGBTI and does not discriminate, just being fair and trying to learn more from them, while LGBTI co 3 confessed that the past experiences to current, have changed. LGBTIOC, Stu 3 and UL1 (*Donchido*) talked around discrimination to be handled properly, as there is no problem with different sexual orientation/identity. This required a change of attitudes to strengthen relationships among students (c.f 3.5.2) at a university campus.

7.2.3 Low measure of peers and management supports

A lack of parental/family support for LGBTI communities opens exposure to LGBTI communities as noted (cf 3.2.3). Another vital note of evidence is that LGBTI communities do lack supportive family, peers and teachers (Williams et al., 2005; Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011), which causes LGBTI communities to undergo more victimization and isolation within their families and by extension at universities (Garofalo, Wolf, Wssow, Woods & Goodman, 1999). Teachers play a second parent role at schools and university. Research findings followed empirical literature thus:

Stu 2: Family support is vital to highlight management support required by individuals, for acceptance (cf. 5.3.3) to be found, and that findings contrast evidence that differs from the outcomes because; in this case, the management treats LGBTI communities with respect, acceptance and equal to everyone. But the classmates are different, some people treat them with acceptance and respect but there is some resistance from those people with a rigid lifestyle and dogmatic beliefs.

According to LGBTI Co 2, (5.3.3) it is obvious that peers might be saying something about LGBTI communities, and be doing different things based on reactions to clothing and makeup, emphasizes doubtful acceptance. LGBTICo 5 (5.3.3) stated that some gay people failed to accept themselves maybe due to fear of harassment for being gay by people around them. SRC (*Gi*) (5.3.3) support that due to some reports, they had showed that attitudes should consider background factors and what might cause the problems among students, because LGBTI issues are socially constructed that is why others do not see it in a normal way. While UL1 (Donchido) (5.3.3) claimed, in contrast that he has not witnessed any discriminating or abusive against LGBTI communities at the university.

It was evident from the above statements, that level of acceptance varied and started from oneself, peers and family. In fact, as individual heterosexuals possess different attitudes which are clearly signalled, indicate antecedent of heterosexuals. It actually defines who we are, as part of human personality to embrace one another.

7.2.4 Fear of disclosure of sexuality based on stereotype for warm acceptance

Difficulties to sexual disclosure might derive from fear of what might happen among the heterosexual majority to avoid further crisis as Wang and Eccles (2012), (cf 3.2.4) (cf.5.3.4) confirm, that sexual orientation disclosure among LGBTI communities, exposes their gender differences to assaults, verbal abuse and rape attempts from their peers at schools and universities' campuses. The expression that sexuality orientation and gender conformity exposes LGBTI communities to the position of heterosexuals on gender non-conformity, which extends to a hostile environment in internalizing problems. Haney (2008) (cf.5.3.4), notes that rejection and isolation of LGBTI communities deprived them of their full participation with heterosexual peers and thus subjects them to face disengagement and loneliness which can influence them to develop low self-esteem in their academic and life endeavors. Pile (2010) (cf.5.3.4), disagrees that reactivity of human behaviors forces active responses on change to stimulus in the university environment. This supports people's consciousness to adapt socially for interpersonal relationships.

With the statement of LGBTI Co2 and LGBTI Co4 (cf.5.3.4) in contrast, seemed to be confident in themselves to not care what people may say about you to avoid loneliness, depression and suicidal thought. USSP (Lisandry) (cf.5.3.4) attested to being confident, and that there were outspoken among LGBTI communities, who can open up their identity and sexual orientation without shame. This asserts that there is an increase in the disclosure on sexual identity as we confirmed outspokenness among LGBTI communities who can boldly stand up for themselves. However, there is the possibility to find shy or closet types who might prefer to stay undisclosed, maybe due to fear or threat or abuses from among their peers.

7.2.5 Beliefs of heterosexuals dominance to relate with LGBTI communities

The patriarchy has positioned heterosexuals to exhibit expressions of dominance to oppress target groups and communicate an intention to assert and maintain dominance over subjective others (Regan, 2009) (cf 3.2.5), with the heterosexual dominance that suppresses LGBTI communities to function effectively. Molden and Finkel (2010), (cf. 5.3.5) concurred to different degrees, which restricted LGBTI

communities to have no option than being submitted to majority rule which was argued by Alatalo (2012), (5.3.5), that heterosexuals do often oppress LGBTI communities by dominance of privileges rather exercise collusion with their sexuality for equal behavioural experiences. This was tracked to religious negotiation, and the acceptance of practices for all to fulfil their obligation and rights to laws, regardless of behavioural imperfection to compromise the reality system of effectiveness (5.3.5) (Dennett, 2007).

The following extracts by LGBTI Co1, Stu 3, OCFT, LGBTI Co 2 SRC (Gi), LGBTI Co 3 (5.3.5) indicated one or two difficulties with discrimination among peers, while Stu 2 stated that they were doing some things together at Teaching Practice (TP) but not as close friends, UL1 (Donchido) (5.3.5) responded differently as written below: showed the situational analysis into transformative approaches to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

The prevalent occurrence of our understanding of LGBTI communities is limited to happenings within the schools and universities. This extends to the recognition of the importance of school climates which were based on violence and less adaptive challenges arose to cope for LGBTI communities (Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013) (cf. 3.2.1) (5.3.5) which deprives equal access to academic success for students (5.3.5) (Kosciw, Greytak, Palmer, & Boesen, 2014; Kosciw et al., 2013; Toomey & Russell, 2013; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, & Russell, 2013). The finding statement from;

The above extracts indicate that our understanding of approaches to embracing LGBTI communities is not fully welcome at a university campus as LGBTI Co1, OUCFT, and Stu 1(*SH5*), had said in their statements.

However, Tetreault et al. (2013), (cf. 3.2.1) (5.3.5) found other results, that anti-Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex (LGBTI) emergence of bias that resulted some LGBTI students to pretend or hide their sexual identity from other students and staff due to the fear of stigmatization.

From data results; Stu 3: (cf. 5.3.5) not a close friend, we were doing Teaching Practices together. During break time we used to eat together and kept our files altogether...this shows the issue of indirect discrimination and unacceptance of LGBTI communities at a university campus by peers and staffs/lecturers.

McCormack (2012) demonstrated that LGBTI students have negative experiences at schools and universities, and suffered social marginalization and discrimination. The above statement identified that there are wide populations of heterosexuals who oppose LGBTI communities at a university campus, and affirm majority domination at all levels. Beyer (2012), (cf. 3.2.2) (cf. 5.3.5) disagrees that the majority of educators seem to deliberately remain silent on gender orientation differences and sexuality, thereby disadvantaging LGBTI communities in equal access to teaching and learning. At the absence of protective policy, Beitz (2009) (cf. 5.3.5), opines that students' right of privacy stands to be jeopardized, and inadequate protection might intensify victimization experiences on LGBTI communities' against receiving transformation at a university campus. The research team stated that discrimination and judgment should be addressed, hereunder;

LGBTIOC and LGBTI Co 2 (cf. 5.3.5), Issues of discrimination and judgement of the majority of heterosexuals, required that individuals have to tolerate everyone.

Meanwhile, research teams reveal their understanding of the expectations and dissatisfaction as illustrated below:

Stu 4 (*Bradeline*) (cf. 5.3.5), *indicated* that differences on sexuality by choices helped LGBTI communities to explore more of themselves among the heterosexual domination to express themselves more in any way.

The results contended with the perception of university community heterosexuals of the millennium changes for moderate attitudes towards LGBTI communities in terms of support and temperate behaviour. However, Cornu (2016) (cf. 5.3.5), study compared LGBTI student communities in United State and Israel, and results found that homosexuality has encountered homophobic attacks from heterosexuals.

Research teams indicate differential insight on the cases of abuse of LGBTI communities thus:

This intends that abuse must be dealt with as stated by UL1 (Donchido) from the classroom, that any form of discrimination be handled in a good manner to avoid cases related (SRC) (Gi) and provide acceptance and support to respect LGBTI communities as forwarded by Stu 2, that LGBTI communities be treated with respect and acceptance.

Heterosexual majority dominance at a university campus (cf. 3.2.5) (cf.5.3.5), stated that patriarchy has positioned heterosexuals to exhibit expressions of dominance to oppress target groups and communicate an intention to assert and maintain dominance over a subjective others (Regan, 2009). This indicates that heterosexual dominance suppresses LGBTI communities to dictate activities and behavior. Molden and Finkel (2010) (cf. 3.2.5) (cf.5.3.5), support that submission occurs to different degrees; like some employees may follow orders without question, whereas others might express disagreement but concede when pressed. Nonetheless, Alatalo (2012) (cf. 3.2.5) (cf.5.3.5), argues that heterosexuals do often oppress LGBTI communities by dominance or privileges rather exercise collude with their sexuality for equal behavioural experiences. In contrast, religion has negotiated acceptance of practices of all to fulfil their obligation rights to laws, regardless of behavioural imperfection to compromise reality and deprive messages within of effect (cf.5.3.5) (Dennett, 2007). The above findings indicated that majority heterosexual domination influenced the behaviour shown by LGBTI communities in both results and literature.

7.2.6 Marginal disengagement of LGBTI communities at a university campus

Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo & Gabriel (2011), (cf. 5.3.6) suggest that student's engagement helps to actualize academic success for disadvantaged LGBTI communities' future at a University campus. Meanwhile, love role shared among students as emphasized in Goldberg (2014) (cf. 5.3.6) that family belongingness actualizes their interpersonal relationships while familiar with individual differences from heterosexual peers. Bajaj (2014) (cf. 5.3.6) (cf. 5.3.6) educational rights be implemented in accordance to inclusivity principles found in DoE (2008) (cf. 5.3.6), to cater for initial difficulty encountered to gradual success and demonstrate by persistent effort to overcome difficulties. Dehart et al. (2011) (cf. 5.3.6), promoted a sense belongings for LGBTI communities at a university campus in this study especially at the face of abuse and discrimination to improve self-dependency. This self-dependency propels accommodation of diversity among students. As the statement from the research team concurs thus:

Based on the results, both Stu 2 and LGBTI Co 3 statements reflected a kind of indirect disconnection or withdrawal from other students at the university, while LGBTI Co 2 reported of deeper acts of verbal behavior which may perhaps lead to disengagement/engagement among peers at the university campus.

Göransson and Nilholm (2014) (cf. 3.2.6) (cf. 5.3.6) claimed way-out is to develop a self-confidence through communicating experiences which are similar to others' belongingness; expressions like, you belong here, I know you can succeed." As such, these inspirational tips might boost morale standards to motivate and believe that each LGBTI community can win over the challenges of life. Boelen and Reijntjes (2009) (cf. 3.2.6) (cf. 5.3.6), concur that a lack of confidence in LGBTI communities might create difficulties for them due to stress, and thus lead to inability to withstand problems which affect their resilience skills. Research teams revealed the following in alignment to gaining self-confidence on LGBTI Co 1 and LGBTI Co 2 statements on disconnection caused by verbal assaults on LGBTI communities.

The researcher thinks of Needham and Austin (2010) (cf. 3.2.6) (cf. 5.3.6), who directly state that non-disclosure of sexuality arises from intolerant attitudes and peer victimization perception against LGBTI communities at universities; they were simply powerless to challenge the situations. The family acceptance, suggested by Ryan and Diaz (2009) (cf. 3.2.6), and parental roles might be beneficial to embracing these LGBTI communities from home and extend to university campuses in line with Ryan, Huebner, Diaz and Sanchez (2009) (cf. 3.2.6). Support that enlightened family to abstain from rejecting their own children for sexuality and gender orientation differences. Additionally, educators serve as second parents at schools and universities, Swank and Raiz (2010) (cf. 3.2.6) assert that LGBTI communities' unacceptance and peer's attitudes and negligence of some educators to address worrisome abuse cases reported by students on sexuality related issues. In contrast, Munson and Stelboun (2013) (cf. 3.2.6), claim that parental responsibilities play a vital role to embracing LGBTI communities' to gain improvement on psychological and physiological development from homes and to the universities.

The results showed that the majority should be educated on LGBTI communities at the university campus, statement includes: LGBTI Co 1 *and* LGBTI Co 2 who

emphasized on educating people to understand more about LGBTI communities to avoid rejection from schools and homes.

Kotch (2014) (cf. 3.2.2) confirms that precedencies on sexual orientation and gender conformity should provide coverage against peers' conflict on LGBTI communities to combat gender non-conformity from heterosexuals towards an extension of judgemental experiences to victimization. The inclusivity of Benedek (2012) (cf. 5.3.6) provides an educational approach significant to maintain and sustain human rights against irregularities for the implementers of the policies at a university campus. More so, our understanding reveals that LGBTI communities face lots of crisis among their peers at the university campus as confirmed by these statements from Stu 2, UL1 (Donchido), LGBTI Co 2, LGBTI Co 1 and USSP (Lisandary) were exchangeable emphasized on disengagement.

The research team repeatedly hammered on the importance of respect, acceptance and tolerance for LGBTI communities Stu 2, LGBTI Co 2, LGBTI Co 1, UL1 (Donchido) and USSP (Lisandry) to see with general eyes that human beings are unique and diverse in nature thus required to live a sociable life together at the university campus and outside.

7.2.7 Direct verbal hardships imposed from heterosexual peers on differences

This negative stereotype is significant to the way peers look towards LGBTI communities at a university campus to make interaction difficult. Chopik, Edelstein and Fraley (2013) (cf. 3.2.7) suggest that life adaptation occurs from change of attitudes to accommodate diversity and develop a transformative approach to handle stereotype; such LGBTI communities that struggles practically for their full participation at a university campus. The negative attitudes come from stereotype which confirmed as follows:

In the above statement, LGBTI Co 2 expressed how she felt with friends that showed non-palatable relationships, however Stu 1 (SH5) suggested to be in good rapport with them as they were forward talkers, she advised classmates to stop criticizing them, in contrary stated LGBTI Co 1 of doubtful thought of involvement of outside LGBTI communities for help against their experiences at the university campus.

Pendragon (2010) (cf.3.2.7) advises that student's collective engagement be used to avert stereotype ideas that stigma places on, thereby embracing diversity. The researcher agrees with Demir, Özen, Doğan, Bilyk and Tyrell (2011) (cf.3.2.7) (cf. 5.2.6) who asserted that social connectivity among students be empowered beyond praxis way of life. Nonetheless, Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) contend that LGBTI communities' relationships at times are a continuation of friendly interactions with mates from high school to the university, lead to long life companionship or cohabitation among peers thereby give rise to psychological development.

According to Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco (2011) (cf.3.2.7) (cf. 5.2.6) stated that only communal living among population of the ecosystem improves emotional and physical state of human health help to form equitable balance on human development. This supports the idea of commonality by Admaskus (2009) (cf.3.2.7) that communal living among LGBTI communities maintains a life therapy, Fisher et al. (2012) affirmed that psychological stability coordinates perfect health for sustenance to embracing a comfortable life towards a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities, for active co-existence with others at a university campus. This implies attachment, as stated by Lemay and Clark, (2008) (cf.3.2.7) and Lyubomirsky (2008) (cf.3.2.7) had stronger effect to build a transformative approach on relationships to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. This indicated that LGBTI communities and heterosexual students need to understand each other which likely helps to connect mentally and psychologically, and thus increase their development.

7.3 THE NEED FOR A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MAY BE JUSTIFIED

This section provided some reasons for an embracing transformative approach for LGBTI communities at a university campus as follows:

7.3.1 Verbal /sexual abuse confrontation from heterosexuals

Ashley (2013) (cf. 3.3.2) asserts the inconclusive part of homosexuality education biases for evidence that exists on biological factors role-play on development of LGBTI

or Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ). Research based needs of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI in a university campus arrives as some utterances are directed to express how people felt against having LGBTI members around them. One of the research team revealed in her statement related to corrective rape;

LGBTI Co 2 (cf.5.4.1), that she have to be fucked very well to have a change of life while USSP (Lisandary) (cf.5.4.1), shared similar but different because in his own expression, stated that the “use an object on her vagina” to show her that she is female not male. In other view, LGBTI Co 5 (cf.5.4.1) has presented the comment of his community on her being gay which it considered frustrating.

The above society has placed a great stigma on LGBTI communities [common knowledge], it is not funny to see different views, in other way, Payne (2007) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.1), supports in accordance to schools based on someone labelled as different sexual orientation against acceptable within school’s culture excluded, disconnected and isolated from the entire groups. Stafford and Lesham (2008) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.1), agree on the inner ability to thrive on friendly inclusivity among students but follow part of Bajaj (2011) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.1), that confirms the authenticity of creating knowledge as light for all students’ empowerment; no one left out policy against year 2020 from emancipation of diversity. Swarr (2012) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.1) indicates that intense exclusion and isolation of LGBTI communities deprive them from having better relationships with their heterosexual peers, thus influencing them negatively even in their academic performance.

In respect to research team statements, it showed that verbal abuse ere still exists at the university, LGBTI Co 2 (cf.5.4.1) *and* LGBTI Co 5 (cf.5.4.1) confirmed with their statement, while USSP (Lisandary) talked of an incident of a particular suicide attempt due to verbal abuse that she may have experienced, and from bullying.

In addition, bullying of LGBTI communities creates an internalized impact as Meland, Rydning, Lobben, Breidablik and Ekeland (2010) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.1) studied that internalized impacts of bullying on the student that may lead to academic breakdown and very low self-esteem even at the university. In comparison with their Israeli counterparts, Burke (2010) (cf.5.4.1) asserts that LGBTI students in the United States were more likely to experience assault and harassment in schools but were

more likely to have access to LGBTI supportive resources in their schools against the memorandum of human rights policies. Cislighi (2013) (cf.5.4.1) assumption that transformative approaches be launched to strengthen social transformation, and change within the educational system for security of human rights at a university campus.

USSP (Lisandary) (cf.5.4.1), provided that learning should inform individual reasoning to embrace and love another, he maintained that it might be a good approach. OCFT (cf.5.4.1) found that listening ears could help to socialize more with LGBTI communities, thus being comfortable together in the classroom and university campus. In the same vein, Stu 1(SH5) (cf.5.4.1) shared her experience of being friends with LGBTI communities, that they were amazing people with ever smiling faces, and urged to stop criticizing them and make them uncomfortable with behavior.

In the findings it showed that not every student hates LGBTI communities, should that be the approach to respect other is highly expected to change from abusive to embracing. This also indicates that there are some ways to enjoy students-students relationships for greater future at the university campus.

7.3.2 Unending arguments related to LGBTI communities on a change of personality

Based on the social status of LGBTI communities; so many questions to know how and when campus experiences still remain challenging. Drawing from the body of evidence, UNESCO (2012) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) defined homophobic and transphobic bullying as a global problem that is a violation of students' rights and that it impedes educational success for LGBTI communities (cf.3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) (Cornu, 2016; UNESCO, 2012). However, a Meland, Rydning, Lobben, Breidablik and Ekeland (2010) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) study found that bullying internalized impacts on the student may lead to academic breakdown and very low self-esteem even at the university. In comparison with their Israeli counterparts, Burke (2010) (cf.5.4.2) asserts that LGBTI students in the United States were more likely to experience assault and harassment in schools but were more likely to have access to LGBTI supportive resources in their schools against the memorandum of human rights policies. The

researcher sustains that Cislaghi's (2013) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) assumption of transformative approach be launched to strengthen social transformation and change to the educational system to protect against the violation of human rights at a university campus.

In addition, unreported bullying and harassment of LGBTI communities, Toomey and Russell (2013; Wang, Iannotti and Luk, (2011) (cf.5.4.2), supported that LGBTI communities experienced forms of bullying may extend to other problems for lesbian, gay, and bisexual students at the university campus. Schröder-Abé and Schütz (2011) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) point out that problems result in emotional stress and disorder for LGBTI communities, understood by attempts to minimize systematic tensions on victimization and direct attacks eliminated. Blondal and Sigrun (2009) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) apparently state that perpetual insecurity occurrence of LGBTI communities at a university increases in the form of yelling and name-calling from heterosexual students that persistently appears through verbal abuse/harassment, which can apprehend dropout of university. The researcher concurs with Wang et al. (2011; Swarr, 2012; Kotch, 2014) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) that bullying plays a negative effect on LGBTI communities by making them vulnerable to any type of assaults, hate and abuses that may hinder their full participation on university activities. However, Stewart (2010; Jacob, 2013) (cf. 3.3.2) (cf.5.4.2) pointed out those LGBTI students are more likely to be victims of unwelcome and unfriendly educational experiences from their heterosexual counterparts.

LGBTIOC (cf.5.4.2) affirmed that even people in power abuse it to discriminate but hammed that those who do not understand, should be and others who do continue. Stu 4 (Bradeline) (cf.5.4.2) specifically stated, no matter what, no one can change people since it was a matter of choices, seeing LGBTI communities to be more open about themselves so that the perception of majorities may change gradually towards them. USSP (Lisandary) (cf.5.4.2) advised a forum that will form representation of every member of the university to discuss in a debatable manner for an active transformative change to find a suitable approach to embracing LGBTI communities among others.

All the research teams here make awake calls to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus coming out from negative stereotype, and then form a forum that could address the disparities or insufficient knowledge about LGBTI communities and provide that secured atmosphere for everyone, so that peoples' minds could change for real on peoples' diversity.

7.3.3 Skepticism of university community about LGBTI communities

Engagement and disengagement responses may exhibit as both active coping strategies that coordinate involuntary responses to stress. Researchers further differentiate, that voluntary engagement responses are classified into two distinct subtypes of coping strategies: primary control and secondary control strategies (cf. 3.3.3) (cf.5.4.3) (Blonal & Adalbajarnardottir, 2012; Wang & Eccles, 2012). Llera and Katsireba (2010, p. 32) (cf.5.4.3) support that personality of LGBTI communities for love relationships to regulate their emotions towards their partners of the same identity. In contrast, secondary control responses are intended to gain control indirectly by accommodating or adapting to the stressful event or context and include strategies such as acceptance, positive thinking and cognitive knowledge. The scepticism of other members of the university community, as Annear and Yates (2010) (cf.5.4.3) contend that discrimination force some member of LGBTI communities to disengaged them from their peers on school activities which thereby limits their chances of good lifestyles at a university campus. Discrimination and lack of knowledge exists, this was supported by:

Stu 5 (Sunflower) (cf.5.4.3) and LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie) (cf.5.4.3) showed that discrimination and lack of knowledge of LGBTI communities, is by people unknown to LGBTI communities. Based on the need to learn of LGBTI communities LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) (cf.5.4.3) confirmed the need to come together to clarify issues of differences and to address homophobic attempts of heterosexuals against LGBTI communities. LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie) made it clear that some people she met talked of lesbian compared to gay, while others keep on asking questions of what she stands to gain from being LGBTI member.

The findings showed that heterosexuals were so confused about LGBTI communities and demand answers to the unclear information or understanding, perhaps their attitudes can change if they got answers to their skepticism about LGBTI communities. In other way, issues of discrimination could weigh so heavily on LGBTI communities because it determines their psychological and academic state to cope with their peers and other members of the university community. As LGBTI Co1 (Linda) tried to offer provision against discrimination.

Based on the confrontation of arguments from heterosexuals, research has stated impact of stress and coping strategies (Skinner & Zimmer-Gembek, 2007; Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees & Skinner, 2011; Birditt, Antonucci & Tighe, 2012) (cf. 3.3.3) (cf.5.4.3) have found that continued exposure to chronic stress or daily hassles on LGBTI communities to gain resources, reduces the ability to respond effectively to stressful situations, resulting in an increase of symptoms of psychopathology (cf.5.4.3) (Graber and Sontag, 2008). Birditt et al. (2012) (cf.5.4.3) examine moderate effects to cope on the association between poverty and psychopathology, and then found that coping strategies serve mediation for students in the study. Nonetheless, studies support the assertion that coping strategies during childhood and adolescence may be context-dependent and susceptible to influences directly from the stressor (cf.5.4.3) (Erath and Tu, 2014; Birditt et al. (2012)). None of these studies have focused exclusively on social stressors that may be most salient to LGBTI communities, based on stigmatization challenges at a university campus. A tolerance stand is key to help LGBTI communities' students to develop and improve on their life challenges among themselves.

7.3.4 Empowering inclusion of all students from classrooms

Lozier and Beckman (2012) (cf. 3.3.4) (cf.5.4.4) found that harassment and intimidation encountered by LGBTI individuals in schools creates an unsafe and unsupportive environment for academic and social achievement. Barker (2012) (cf. 3.3.4) (cf.5.4.4) agrees that inclusion principles overcome negative experiences thereby empowering all students, without indulgence at any expense of others due to the change from analogue to digital world. One of the challenges that indicated hatred

for LGBTI communities are persistent assaults and embarrassment from heterosexuals. In contrast to Bajaj (2011; Bajaj, 2012) (cf. 3.3.4) (cf.5.4.4) who maintained that teachers were professionals, have to use their potential for transformation to enforce liberality through human rights to education. Based on Stewart (2010) (cf. 3.3.4) (cf.5.4.4) who exposed that to defend LGBTI students amidst of heterosexuals through their perception of the campus climate to support all students, stated by Tetreault et al. (2013) (cf. 3.3.4) (cf.5.4.4) thus prompting teachers to understand more about their students, who are were regarded to ask a direct question; why you are a gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender or intersex? This attempt to question LGBTI communities might display inferiority on them to heterosexists, thus endangering them emotionally. Barker (2012) (cf. 3.3.4) (cf.5.4.4), that students really need to embrace individuals for who they are, and to impact them with knowledge that ensures a transformative approach for all, rather than challenges and questions of time.

LGBTI Co 4 (cf.5.4.4) stated that it was in the interest of all students to learn to appreciate one another instead of thinking of what is good or bad for someone, to provide education and to make people knowledgeable about gay and lesbian lifestyles. However, LGBTI Co 5 (cf.5.4.4) confirmed that some gay people who failed to accept themselves are afraid of people around them for fear of being judged or harassed for being gay.

To the researcher, LGBTI communities may perhaps put themselves into danger or vulnerability to counter harassment at university campus and outside. In contrast, UL1 (Donchido) (cf.5.4.4) emphatically denounced LGBTI communities being harassed that it shouldn't be, and in case such occurrence, the lecturer in such situation should take a bold step to intervene and take up the case with the respective authority. It seems that intervention is close as the statements of UL1 (Donchido) (cf.5.4.4) unfolds.

The researcher can say that inclusion practice is a collective effort from the students, lecturers and management, for it imparts efficiency if the transformative approach might prevail against the current state.

7.3.5 Removal of social exclusion on LGBTI communities

In a study conducted by Dare (2015) (cf.5.4.5) cited Swearer, Turner, Givens and Pollack (2008) (cf. 3.3.5) asserts that name calling of students a “fag” or “gay” occurrences indirectly impose internal psychological stress on students which can result in a lack of coping at classroom activities, reduction to learning and end up in having low grades, substance abuse, and depression. Kapeleris and Paivio (2011, p. 626) (cf. 3.3.5). (cf.5.4.5) concur that LGBTI students experience bullying, abuse, being picked on and name-calling, which obviously set up marginalizing barriers towards heterosexual peers, thus making them vulnerable on university campus. However, a Dare (2015), (cf. 3.3.5) (cf.5.4.5) study found that heterosexual peers point fingers at Lesbians and gays, often calling them suspected names, like susi, tomboy and faggot to make them feel uncomfortable among their friends.

Notwithstanding, Ashley-Smith (2013) (cf. 3.3.5; cf.5.4.5) supports that intended acts of name-calling is a signal to others in the majorly to stigmatize LGBTI communities at a university campus, this links to bullying on perceived sexual orientation. This indicates that LGBTI communities are bullied by their peers, who accuse them for being different and lady-like. Boelen and Reijntjes (2009) (cf. 3.3.5; cf.5.4.5) assert that inner crisis is a symptom of social exclusion, and thus subjects students to disconnection from peers and they develop low self-esteem or cultivate bad habits among others at a university campus. Nakamoto and Schwartz (2010) (cf. 3.3.5) (cf.5.4.5) suggest that a high risk of emotional distress reflects through depression and anxiety is encountered by LGBTI communities for their sexuality disclosure among heterosexual counterparts at a university campus they find themselves at. Wang et al. (2011) (cf.5.4.5) stated that orientation possess a sensitive hallmark to stigmatization, victimization and lack of support from both teachers and peers. The researcher finds out that Dehart et al. (2011) (cf.5.4.5) state that actual *coming out* of LGBTI communities at a young age exposes them to be more visible and become subjected to labelling, teasing, name-calling and harassment from other students (Wang et al. 2011). Therefore, stresses acquired from the persistent incidences afore mentioned correspond to LGBTI communities, lead to depression, anxiety and substance abuse (cf.5.4.5) (Nakamoto and Schwartz 2010). All this can be catered for through a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Stu 1 (SH5) (cf.5.4.5), the research team could see the reason to ignore such behavior might set marginalization against LGBTI communities, and giving an avenue to enjoy ourselves as students, in with our real identity and to stop calling LGBTI communities names for the fact that we are all human.

On the subject of social exclusion, the majority of students should therefore consider no one less human than others, because we all created in a very unique image. The researcher perceived that there are lots of ideas of segregation and social exclusion especially, if any student is identified as a HIV patient or LGBTI communities, it is mostly heterosexuals spear heading such actions which might subject that particular individual to isolation and rejection, which may lead to underperformance in their academic activities.

Based on name calling, it is evident that students who are LGBTI communities can be stigmatized and victimized by peers. (Wang et al., 2011) (cf.5.4.5), in Stu1 (SH5) revealed that LGBTI communities were amazing people and should not be criticized or judged by peers. She also spoke about name calling and cited her experience because it can inflict emotional stress on them if there is no care, as Nakamoto and Schwartz (2010) (cf. 3.3.5) (cf.5.4.5) assert that depression may result from verbal assaults, which thus can affect academic performance. The researcher observed that name-calling is not that common against LGBTI communities at a university campus currently, but actions of people (sign and body language) were so obvious which could be corrected instead of sign labelling others.

7.3.6 Educating for change around university campus

Educating all at the university campus on issues that need change, to eliminate what leads to social and emotional isolation is one of the most challenging problems facing LGBTI communities on campus, as this might extend the risk of both physical and mental health behaviour problems (cf.5.4.6) (Butler, 2008). McCormack (2011) (cf.5.4.6) states that fewer LGBTI communities opportune to further higher education due to the difficulties encountered at high school from their peers, and hindered academic success as they feel unsafe and unprotected. An unattended university campus causes a lack of concentration; Robinson (2010) (cf.5.4.6) reveals that LGBTI

learners find it difficult to concentrate in the class because of imagined thoughts and emotions that occurred from negative incidences, fearing reoccurrence. From research by Grossman et al. (2009) (cf.5.4.6), reveals that American LGBTI communities do not feel safe or have sense of belonging at their school environment due to powerlessness from exclusion and marginalization which leaves them with no control over how they are being treated by heterosexual peers. So, on vulnerability to attack and inability to defend themselves, Craig, Tucker and Wagner (2008) (cf.5.4.6) research conducted that LGBTI students chose to remain invisible or in closet at school, thereby protecting themselves from discrimination and victimization from their peers. LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) (cf.5.4.6), supported that meetings should be held to educate people clearly on LGBTI communities for better understanding, to seek a social life against discrimination. SRC (Gi) (cf.5.4.6) emphasized on the background knowledge to share with new students coming from rural areas, who don't have hard perceptions on what they never, or hardly heard of when back home, as the university is new environment for them to learn more, even on accepting others and collaborate effectively.

Notably, Seelman et al. (2012) (cf.5.4.6) averted that positive support and intervention for these LGBTI communities can be fueled by the input university counsellor, lecturers and social workers to for their good academic performance, and improve talents towards attainment of excellence at the university. Koswic et al. (2014) (cf.5.4.6) further suggested that efficient gay-straight alliances be made available at the universities by contributing to improvements on social, emotional, physical and academic enhancement of LGBTI communities at a university campus. Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Netshandam (2013) (cf. 3.3.6) (cf.5.4.6) focused on advocacy for a change to education and support should be implemented at the institution. It was suggested that this would help empower them in dealing with stigma and discrimination.

LGBTI Co 1 (cf.5.4.6) in her statement, proposed that people should come together to come to the understanding that being gay or lesbian, in a social life, need not discriminate or judge. SRC (Gi) comes from the perspective that change is a difficult thing; considering students who are just came to the university in the city should be

educated and taught about what they have not heard of or seen physically, in their rural areas, but now see on campus, they need orientation to understand.

The researcher personally, found with the above statement that familiarization and orientation could play a vital role to create an embracing university environment.

7.3.7 Creation of peaceful university campus

To understand the influence that stigmatization gives to sexuality differentiation at a university campus, Erath and Tu (2014) (cf.5.4.7) opine that higher levels of stress may occur during challenges encountered and put LGBTI communities at greater risk of emotional and behavioral problems. It has been well established in the adult literature that how individuals cope with stress is often a strong indicator of psychosocial well-being. Skinner and Zimmer-Gembeck (2007) proffer on understanding the control mechanisms to stress, and coping adaptations of LGBTI communities' interpersonal relationships and processes which influence the psychopathology. This suggests a need for transformative approaches that could embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Furthermore, on both coping responses and vulnerabilities to stress, Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees and Skinner (2011) propose that children's emotions influence their coping responses to stress around them. One needs to support interpersonal coping examinations and responses for LGBTI communities' stress on both voluntary/active (coping) and involuntary responses to stressful stimuli. In this, approach to voluntary or involuntary responses to stress, Zimmer-Gembeck et al. (2011) (cf. 3.3.7) also examine responses as engaging with or disengaging from the stressful experience response to stress in their love relationships directly influences the experience too of change of condition. The stressor comes from the emotions and cognitions that arise from immediate problems in their life experiences.

LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie) suggested forming forums so that multiple people that do not want to accept lesbian and bisexuals, to see that their issues can be addressed and come

to agreement by education of the people to see the normality of LGBTI communities and their lifestyle.

In regards to the stigma that society has placed on LGBTI communities, make it obvious how heterosexuals stood on indoctrination that creates intolerant behavior which manifests itself at university campus, thus LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie) appealed to have a forum where individuals can be educated on the normality of being gay or lesbian and the likes so that no offence will be reported on lifestyle to cause anyone a problem.

7.3.8 Societal non-conformity over LGBTI communities

This section considers labelling and stigma implications of LGBTI communities at a university campus. Swearer et.al. (2008) (cf. 3.3.7.1) explain that LGBTI students at the university may find it difficult to interact freely with their peers (heterosexuals) due to fear of labelling and stigma that stereotype have placed on their sexuality. This holds LGBTI communities to a ransom of non-sharing their identity with others and rather remain '*in closet*' for fear of rejection (cf. 3.3.7.1) (Romero-Canyas, Downey, Berenson, Ayduk & Kang, 2010). This attunes gender non-conformity of heterosexual students and thus contributes towards a hostile university environment for these minority LGBTI communities. Similarly, occurrences of rejection incidence subject these LGBTI communities to loneliness and insecurity in their lives at university campus (cf. 3.3.7.1) (Hawkey & Cacioppo, 2010). As afore stated, constant stigmatization may marginalize LGBTI students at the university to experience isolation from other students, thereby causing depression and emotional instability, which might result in suicidal thought and suicide attempts respectively (cf. 3.3.7.1) (Fafchamps & Shilpi, 2008; Fine & Spencer, 2009; Hawkey & Cacioppo, 2010; WHO, 2012). This indicates that uneasy interactions among LGBTI communities at the university can be ugly to express on their feelings, attraction and emotions, to perform psychologically well at the university.

Research participants revealed thus:

LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie) showed that her friend does not want to accept here for being lesbian, with some insulted language, LGBTI Co 5 (Chris) also expressed similar for

being gay which indicated, that his community does not conform to him as gay. LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) in other way recommend that awareness is needed, whereby people be educated to stop accusing LGBTI communities of not conforming, instead of accepting them or just letting them be. Stu 1(SH5) also confirmed that heterosexual students still don't welcome LGBTI communities in their lifestyle, of wearing and make up, she acknowledged that all of us should be agents of change.

The above statements reveal that people's behavior at times does not conform to their saying; "different things not mentioned" while labelling LGBTI communities indirectly and pretend as if they care, placing criticisms and stigma on identified persons who are LGBTI community members.

7.4 SOME KEY THRUSTS OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS SHOULD BE BORNE IN MIND

There are some considered key thrusts of a transformative approach that one should have in mind, when embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus, as stated hereunder:

7.4.1 Collaborative Engagement among LGBTI communities and University populace

This section found that collaborative engagement among LGBTI communities is important as Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvallo & Gabriel (2011) (cf.3.4.1) (cf. 5.5.1) suggested that student's engagement helps to actualize academic success for LGBTI communities by ensureing the security of their future at a university campus. Meanwhile, Hughes, Harold and Boyer (2011) (cf.3.4.1) (cf. 5.5.1) stated that they concurred that love sharing among LGBTI communities assured their interpersonal relationships. This connotes that academic success could be possibly be overturned, irrespective of challenges encountered by LGBTI communities at a university campus. Dehart et al. (2011) (cf. 5.5.1) suggest that a sense of belonging apportions confidence for LGBTI communities at a university campus to improve self-dependency and prolongs connectivity among their peers.

In contrast, Boelen and Reijntjes (2009) (cf.3.4.1) (cf. 5.5.1) found that a lack of confidence of LGBTI communities posed difficulties for them to access the full concentration of space in their academic performance, thus destabilizing their competence in real life endeavors. Riggle, Whitman, Olson, Rostosky & Strong (2008) (cf.3.4.1) (cf. 5.5.1) discovered that LGBTI communities witnessed exclusion from their heterosexual peers at a university campus, by stigma based on prejudice. The self-reinforcement chain however positively reclaims power for individuals and reinforces stereotypes while disrupting negative behaviour (Li, Dobinson & Ross, 2012). Influence of positive behaviour in life adaptation, Chopik, Edelstein and Fraley (2013) (cf. 5.5.1), suggest, life for life adaptation to develop a transformative approach through a change of attitudes to embracing diversity. This approach seeks to strengthen friendly connections that required all students, irrespective of gender and sexual differences, to encourage democracy and promote friendly relationships as progressive manner (cf. 5.5.1) (Chopik et al., 2013). To the researcher, this social connectivity with other students may perhaps extend across the way of life. LGBTI communities' relationships at times for continue with friendly with mates from high school to the university, which may lead to life long companionships as married couples.

According to Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco (2011), assert that communal living among the population of the ecosystem improves emotional and physical states of human health and helps to form a balanced development. This supports that communal living among LGBTI communities at a university campus maintains therapy towards a transformative approach. Apparently, Coleyshaw (2010) (cf.3.4.1) (cf. 5.5.1) emphasizes that psychological health provides an embracing capacity to healthy lifestyles of individuals. This maintains attachment to coordinate a transformative approach network of embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Therefore, Gabb (2011) (cf. 5.5.1) confirms that the power of holistic relationships of individuals maintains relational communication, for both LGBTI communities and heterosexual students, understanding to connect mentally and physically for human development.

In respect to the above questions; (Chopik et al. 2013) (cf. 5.5.1) suggest holistic relationships among students as confirmed by LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie) and LGBTI Co 1

(Linda) who suggest an exchange of respect and freedom to allow everyone to join together. Nonetheless, LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) (cf. 5.5.1) emphasized getting to understand individual differences through education to live harmoniously at the university campus. The researcher found based on Conde, Figueiredo and Bifulco's (2011) (cf. 5.5.1) assumption, that communal living helps in building stable psychological health for LGBTI communities for co-existence among their peers.

7.4.2 Conscious understanding of LGBTI communities throughout sections

This is a key element thrust that can help both LGBTI communities and heterosexual communities to create a collaborative platform to enjoy a shared university campus sphere with a warmth atmosphere to learn. Hofmann et al. (2010) (cf.3.4.2) (cf. 5.5.2) in their quantitative study, found that mindfulness-based therapy has a functional effect to treat depression and low self-esteem. The study further enhances that LGBTI communities desire a reliable transformative approach to promote efficacy during their time for study to achieve maximal result as learning required. Guasp (2011) (cf. 3.4.2) (cf. 5.5.2) supports that healthcare plays a significant role to sustain LGBTI communities on therapy, to improve on their threatening experiences, which might infuse unstable life conditions under threatened circumstances.

Erath and Tu (2014) (cf.3.4.2) (cf. 5.5.2) avert that mindfulness is therapy that practices to encourage to stay in the present moment to cement pleasant/unpleasant nature for neutrality, to control behavioral indifferences with maturity. The researcher considers Hawkley and Cacioppo's (2010) (cf.3.4.2) point raised that social exclusion stimulates disconnection and isolation among people, which supports that LGBTI communities equally need a favorable environment to prepare themselves for future responsibilities. Epstein (2009) (cf.3.4.2) confirms that individual development anchors on relational support for reconciliation and acceptance values that appreciate uniqueness in diversity. These discussions could help to instill change in both humans and environment in readiness to nature.

The results above indicated that change is irrevocable, meaning that it is constant in nature, (cf. 5.5.2) people do not like to change for many reasons known only to them.

This has to start firstly with ourselves then extend further. The statement from SRC (Gi) shown in the first paragraph, while LGBTI Co 5 emphasized for educational organizations to set an approach to educate , as LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) supported to be educated.

7.4.3 Liberating individual mind about humanity values

One of the vital approaches is to have the mind liberated about humane values. Feeney and Thrush (2010) (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3) assert that LGBTI communities refer to discovery of new inventions of temperate attitudes, to coordinate serenity with other groups by considering different status, religion, race and ethnicity, against social integration among students at a university campus. The exploration of interaction influences on LGBTI communities at a university campus appeals to a transformative approach to embrace them in the fact that lives connect together (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3) (Fine & Spencer, 2009). This connotes that irrespective of sexuality, those LGBTI communities equally deserve respect and freedom of interaction with so called “dominant groups” at a university campus so that they can enjoy an inclusive education environment with their peers in one peace. Fitzsimons and Fishbach (2010) (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3), suggest that it is prudent for LGBTI communities to promote their life goals through the application of free attitudes as alternatives to applauding their academic activities at a university campus. Therefore, LGBTI communities aimed at maneuvering to connect socially to engage actively in love relationships to improve their involvement at a university campus to progress on academic performance (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3) (Fafchanps & Shilpi, 2008).

Everyday academic experiences in the absence of love might create emotional instability for LGBTI communities at a university campus, amidst of heterosexual peers. Nevertheless, love relationships help LGBTI communities to achieve their expectations on academic excellence, particularly to secure a remarkable future for themselves (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3) (Santrock, 2008). This indicates that love strengthens interpersonal relationships among all students for their inclusion to maximize campus life satisfaction. As to life satisfaction, Berlart (2012), Needham and Austin (2010) (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3) support that interpersonal relationships are dynamic systems to

promote love, which might grow continuously during interaction by avoidance of discrimination. This serves as therapy to stimulate LGBTI communities among their peers at a university campus. As such, measures of closeness with others affords to appropriate security and emotional stability. Gradually affection might deteriorate as people drift apart and form new relationships with others through new kinds of interpersonal relations.

The followings extract provides a possible solution to the above problem;

According the above extracts, Fitzsimons and Fishbach (2010) (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3), a promotion of life goal and a mindset full of assurance to fulfil life goals, as indicated by Stu 2 (Mr Rogers) (cf. 5.5.3), perhaps goes as example cited, feesmustfall movement to achieve ones attempt on a goal by LGBTIOC to provide solutions. USSP (Lisandary) (cf. 5.5.3) stated that learning can influence knowledge needed by LGBTI communities to gain support and tolerance from others. Feeney and Thrush (2010) (cf.3.4.3) (cf. 5.5.3), on new inventions that change is tantamount to all round recovery, based on the fact, that one contests his/her right, does not guarantee tolerance but rather noted for reconsideration of emotional stability expected.

7.4.4 Care application to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus

Notably, love is a vital key thrust element that associates students together from without sexuality discrimination among themselves. According to Alatalo (2012), Harrison and Shorthall (2011) (cf.3.4.4) (cf. 5.5.4), affirmed that love aligns with individualistic connectionand caring, that express relationship satisfaction to appreciate unity in diversity. He asserts the beauty of unity which is a necessary tool for unity to promote life adaptation over circumstances. Surprisingly, LGBTI communities enjoy derived support from themselves, based on their relationship satisfaction, especially while they shared their challenges on sexuality (Zimmer-Gembeck, Lees & Skinner, 2011) (cf.3.4.4) (cf. 5.5.4). This maintained cooperative attachment among others.

This supports that motivational priority apprehends closeness that displays feelings that one has for others, as stated by Seelman et al. (2012) (cf. 3.4.4) (cf. 5.5.4), love

relationships entrench individual students to exercise remorse towards their life goals achievement. Moreover, progress can increase and decrease by a student's motivational drive to achieve the life endeavor (cf.3.4.4) (cf. 5.5.4), (Fitzsimons & Fishbach, 2010). Progress plays an active role to reprioritize individual goals to shape feelings that students have about their peers, for help in their goal pursuit in the dynamic nature of goals and self-regulation" (cf.3.4.4) (Fitzsimons & Fishbach, 2010, p. 546). The researcher suggests that if people' feelings and emotions can be constant, it could help to embrace one another, feel respected, adored and appreciated. The researcher believes that if this is achievable, thus promote a healthy lifestyle. The research team added the following vital points:

USSP (Lisandary), alternatively enlightened us on how to rather err before taking action to embrace LGBTI communities, as indicated on the earlier cited extracts. OCFT maintained the duties of peers to have open ears, tolerate and socialize with them for provision of a friendly environment to LGBTI communities. The researcher stands to suggest that tolerance should be enforced as the foundational backbone of ecological systems on humanity.

7.4.5 Retreat for a change of habit on diversity

There are limitations to the rights of individuals which makes it so unique to discover more endowment on life among people within their social environment. Kelmer, Rhoades, Stanley and Markman (2013) (cf.3.4.5) (cf. 5.5.5), confirmed that the key element to support the victims, disconnected through circumstances and intervene to alleviate their commitment to regain their freedom and right to life. Peradventure, Graber and Sontag (2008) (cf.3.4.5) (cf. 5.5.5), believe that LGBTI communities coming out of challenges might influence their behavior positively to engage on daily social life participation. However, Bortolin, Adam and Jaime McCauley (2013) (cf.3.4.5) (cf. 5.5.5), suggest that, repeated routine on stigmatization interferes with LGBTI communities at a university campus, whereby no embracing approaches are made, which are transformative on life transitions. Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) (cf.3.4.5) (cf. 5.5.5), concur that psychological cooperation attempts are needed, to permit a transformative approach to empower LGBTI communities to maximize their potential in all round activities and to further actualize their life goals.

Selhub (2009) (cf.3.4.5) (cf. 5.5.5), confirms that intimacy of LGBTI communities' students in agreement with the heterosexual majority creates a welcoming atmosphere to their needs and interests to promote adequate love relationships for a lifelong adventure. However, Ashley-Smith (2013) (cf.3.4.5) (cf. 5.5.5), suggests that equity involves sharing of opinions and views to engage common interests for developing a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. This could invent an intervention strategy for the entire university's students to have good rapports.

In the above statements by LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) (cf. 5.5.5), Stu 4 (Bradeline) re-affirmed a coming together for agreement and acceptance. This accounted to be well knowledgeable on LGBTI communities and embrace humanity in general. The findings indicated that once people can form a gathering to cohabit and set priorities straight on changes that they desired, to have a lasting abounding participation among themselves at a university campus. This section supports that a perception of negative opinions should be corrected to allow free access, and allow collective responsibilities that unites all students and not have a discriminatory attitude.

7.4.6 Create a welcoming/friendly atmosphere

Boylan (2008) (cf. 3.4.6) (cf. 5.5.6), disagrees that the power of love is a central mechanism that relates university students together, and depends on the assumptions that LGBTI communities students could appreciate themselves, and desire cooperation by having love relationships among peers. This intestates an embracing ability to love and signifies a collective responsibility for cordial agreement among students. Sherwood (2006) (cf.3.4.6) (cf. 5.5.6), affirms that social, emotional, psychological, physical, spiritual and academic responsibilities are recursive needs to life accomplishment, hence these needs are significant, to prioritize choices of preference to influence a transformative approach, whic might lead to embracing LGBTI communities' interest by value of choices. Boylan (2008) (cf.3.4.6) (cf. 5.5.6), supports that good ability is designed to accomplish human existence in the world of interdependence actualization. This supports that cooperation plays a significant role to mediate the gap between the LGBTI communities and heterosexuals as they co-exist within the same praxis of university campus.

Results: Stu 2 (Mr Rogers) (cf. 5.5.6), and LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) (cf. 5.5.6); Stu 2 (Mr Rogers) stated that the measure of treatment received differs, and confirmed that the management treats LGBTI with respect, acceptance and as equal to everyone, but mentioned that the classmate is different, some of them treat them with acceptance and respect but there some others' resistance comes from people with a rigid lifestyle and beliefs. Also, LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) (cf. 5.5.6), on her own, found that there was lots of discrimination and some guys do not admit that they are human like them, and thus internalized stigma and victimization. She finally confessed that they are able to socialize with those who want them around. This note suggests that all should be respected and treated with acceptance, irrespective of beliefs and differences, human is human, there is need and reason to be in harmony to strengthen connectivity among ourselves at a university campus.

7.4.7 Maintain neutrality to human sexuality/gender differences

Demir, Ozen, Dogan, Bilgk and Tyrell (2011) (cf. 3.4.7) (cf. 5.5.7), in their empirical research, reveal that the amount of happiness results in quality relationships, hence matters in responsiveness levels, and propels to mediate relationship differences between friendship and happiness functions. This confirms that from loneliness comes companionship, which might counsel LGBTI communities to stay happy through connectivity with their heterosexual peers (cf. 3.4.7) (cf. 5.5.7), (Riggle et al. 2008). The mediation however, intensifies a theoretical lens to understand how friendships related to happiness. Meanwhile, some explanations suggest, maintaining and establishing healthy friendships which might peradventure aim at empowering fundamental needs, and contribute to happiness that brings unity in diversity (cf. 3.4.7) (cf. 5.5.7), (Demir and Weitekamp, 2007; Lyubomirsky, 2008). Basically, warm attention gained by LGBTI communities in their happiness is tailored by support received from their friends and families in times of need. This constitutes to the experience of love within the friendship sphere that postulates and potentially influences human social well-being (cf. 3.4.7) (cf. 5.5.7), (Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2008; Lyubomirsky 2008). The researcher is of the opinion that good interrelationships between heterosexual peers and LGBTI communities might promote happiness and improve on their mental lifestyles at a university campus.

It is very important to respect individual differences based on Stu 5 (Sunflower) who indicated that some of LGBTI communities were good people to associate with and thought that through friendly interactions one can support them to maximize their academic delivery at the university. The literature with findings met equilibrium to see what could help mutual relationships among all students at a university campus.

7.5 THERE ARE SOME CIRCUMSTANCES/CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS MAY THRIVE

Here are conditions /circumstances under which a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities may thrive and it could be seen below.

7.5.1 Management's/ Staff's eagerness to support LGBTI communities

This part addresses staff's/lecturers uncaring attitudes to support matters related to LGBTI communities or related sexuality issues at the university campus. Francis (2012); Neto and Pinto (2015) (cf. 3.5.1) (cf. 5.6.1) stated that there is a need to create more intensive awareness and teaching of sexuality will cater for the social, emotional, health and educational well-being of all learners and supporting diversity against teaching and learning of homophobia in South African schools and universities.

SRC (Gi) (cf. 5.6.1) reveals that we are all agents that should ensure change, and also pointed to LGBTI, the academia, and student leadership on the note that no one stays an island, to jointly come together in the approach that will accommodate all. However, UL1 (Donchido) (cf. 5.6.1) stresses the point that education should start from lecturers in their various classes to educate all students on sexuality and not to see problem with sexual orientation, because of the different background of many students which ought to be aware. He considered these as helpful tips for embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Francis (2013) (cf. 3.5.1) (cf. 5.6.1) affirms that LGBTI communities' students find it very difficult to socialize among their peers who are heterosexual and participate adequately in team activities or presentations, yet struggle to enjoy tolerance and support from fellow students, which may have a negative influence on their academic

performance. Thomas (2011) (cf. 3.5.1) (cf. 5.6.1) asserts that human lifestyles depend on the quality of students' peer interaction, thus militates against their socialization, and happier relationships in engagement with their community to provide a transformative approach for healthy co-existence. This reveals that more LGBTI communities tend to gain embracing love among peer heterosexuals that could medically avert depression, anger, mania and other psychological problems. Taylor and Snowdon (2014) (cf. 3.5.1) (cf. 5.6.1) agreed, motivating an avenue to greater success through fun and play. Notably, Swank and Raiz (2010) (cf. 3.5.1) affirm a different interpretation, heterosexual and LGBTI communities formed basically on their home background, understanding of sexuality and gender differences (cf. 3.5.1) (cf. 5.6.1) (Langbein & Yost, 2009) and thereby found adaptation difficult. Notwithstanding, circumstances may create it's opportunities that embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus.

The results above showed that educators/lecturers and entire management should intervene in creating an enabling university environment that accommodates all, as pointed by SRC (Gi) and UL1 (Donchido), for all to see unity in diversity, not picturing sexuality abnormality but with care and support for all students especially LGBTI communities.

7.5.2 General changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities

Also, another condition that revealed urgency, is traced to changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities constitutes intervention to the perceptions and acceptance given to others. Chopik, Edelstein and Fraley (2013) (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) assert life for life advocacy to adaptation and develop a transformative approach that cares systematically towards changing of attitudes to accommodate LGBTI communities that compete to socialize unlike others at the university campus activities. The said change of attitudes may strengthen friendly connections among all students (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) (Hall, Evans & Nixon, 2013; Lemay & Clark, 2008). Social connectivity impacts LGBTI communities in relationship attachment for personal development. Mavhandu-Mudzusi (2014) (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) the influence of attachment to build a transformative approach on stronger relationships leads to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. This affirmed LGBTI

communities' and heterosexual student's connection, both mentally and physically thus increasing human development against other perceived non-heterosexual or gender non-conforming as called un-African (Brouard & Pieterse, 2012) (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2). Homophobic attitude replants itself among people. Studies investigated homophobic causes and homophobia, without providing adequately how those practices/behaviours can be cautioned and minimised (cf. 3.5.2) (Rispel et al. 2012; Müller, 2013) LGBTI individuals' challenges in broader communities and also at the universities (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) (Arndt and De Bruin 2006; Human Rights Watch, 2012; Mavhandu- Mudzusi 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Ganga-Limando, 2015; Mavhandu-Mudzusi & Sandy, 2015).

Mostly, challenges are experienced in communities where heteronormativity is dominant, like rural communities and spread to rural universities. Collins (2009) (cf.3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) concurs that heteronormativity perspectives mainly promote heterosexuality as the only 'normal' sexual orientation while underscoring other sexuality in practice. Therefore, "heteronormativity" refers to a set of institutional practices that systematically legitimise and establish heterosexuality as the norm for sexual, and hence broader social relations (Taylor & Snowdon, 2014) (cf. 5.6.2), regardless of other sexual orientation practices. Some studies were conducted, and indicated that there is intolerance of sexual orientation, apart from what heterosexuality and gender roles have placed on the extent of the stigma and hate towards LGBTI communities (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) (DeBarros, 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi, 2014).

Nonetheless, this exposures LGBTI communities to humiliation by regarding them as outcasts by means of name-calling and public threat from heterosexuals (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) (DeBarros, 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi 2014; Mavhandu-Mudzusi and Sandy, 2015). Furthermore, Reygan (2013) (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) opens that there is a need for schools to be teaching anti-oppressive pedagogies which perhaps demands teaching sexuality and gender education. Johnson (2014; Beitz, 2009) (cf. 5.6.2) asserted that socialisation assists populace to embrace LGBTI and consider no oppositional behavioural, and to accept others with their different sexual orientation. Noteworthy Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald, (2009) (cf. 3.5.2) (cf. 5.6.2) argue that poor sexual education orientation of teachers in high schools may

internalize learners from high schools admission to higher institutions, campus which show homophobic behaviour on LGBTI communities. This perhaps will demystify the preconceived idea of heterosexuality versus homosexuality.

Francis (2012), Francis and DePalma (2014) (cf. 3.5.2) emphasize that students should be equipped with skills to challenge inequality and discrimination in their study environment, and affirm that learning activities do not promote discrimination. Johnson (2014) (cf. 5.6.2) affirms that the concept of diversity includes recognition for individual sexuality, to supports that each individual is unique in thought, and it encompasses individual differences.

In respect to the above results; it was noted that despite the difficult change to do as stated by SRC (Gi), it is imperative we adapt to embracing others who may share different sexuality; LGBTI communities should be accommodated through education and deeper understanding about LGBTI communities. This intends to transform reasoning and negative stereotype that the majority of heterosexuals might have about LGBTI communities at a university campus.

7.5.3 Embracing indiscriminating association of every students

LGBTI communities sometimes, did suffer warmth from their heterosexual counterparts at university and this subject them to loneness, depression for low self-esteem. Barnes, Brown, Krusemark, Campbell and Rogge (2007) (cf. 3.5.3) (cf. 5.6.3) suggested that higher levels of mindful positioning of non-judgmental behavior are normative precautions to sustain relationship satisfaction among students; therefore, staffs/lecturers were cautioned to consider good self-esteem as an ultimate target to support transformation. The researcher contends that mindfulness practice among students might serve to educate lecturers and change practitioners to focus on promoting healthy family relationships, to improve student's low self-esteem. On the other hand, Birditt, Antonucci and Tighe (2012) (cf. 3.5.3) (cf. 5.6.3) concurred that ensuring relationship satisfaction from a conflict discussion trait towards lower emotional stress responses through positive pre-and-post-conflict change of perceptions over love and tolerance. Hofmann, Sawyer, Witt and Oh (2010) (cf. 5.6.3),

study found that mindfulness-based therapy has functioning effects to treat depression and low self-esteem among the LGBTI communities' students at the universities.

Neff (2011) (cf. 3.5.3) (cf. 5.6.3) supports that good self-esteem averts persistent character judgment through one's perception to nail diversity, thus cultivate self-compassion for one another. This supports to limit self-criticism and eschew its negative effects that can serve as hindrances to achieve goals towards highest potential, more contented and a fulfilled life. In addition, Erath and Tu (2014) (cf. 3.5.3) (cf. 5.6.3) emphasize that argument on sexuality with negative posits might create a threat for the LGBTI communities, instead of cultivating positive creativity ability to cope with their academic responsibility without undermining their social wellbeing. He further extends to improve on good self-esteem through character development that can negate self-worth against challenges in terms of emotional, physical, social and educational features to develop a more positive mind that establishes possibilities.

Stu 1(*SH5*): stated that unequal treatment was given to LGBTI communities, who either feel unwanted or like to go as group, apparently. LGBTIOC confirmed that discrimination and judgment needs to be addressed, for in the 21st century all sorts of violence can be addressed through education. Stu 3 (Mr. Lukhozi): expressed the responsiveness of people towards them due to their sexuality, while Stu 5 (Sunflower) In contrast maintained that LGBTI communities should not be seen for their sexual orientation, and reflected that all she witnessed, has been welcoming and supportive treatment by all students as equal, regardless of sexual orientation. However, Stu 2 (Mr Rogers) statement indicated discriminative utterances "No; it never occurred to me just that I befriend any LGBTI member and I am a Christian so it is one of those things that I do not judge but I cannot be involved". UL1 (Donchido) testified about his classroom experience of LGBTI community members, answered questions in the class, yet it did not lead to discrimination, even it made the whole class to clap for him. LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) and LGBTI co 1 stated thus: I think people from LGBTI communities should take a leading role on this point to educate individuals.

Statements above suggested that individual, conditioned support is determined when a good atmosphere is created, which likely perpetuates good self-esteem for LGBTI communities to relate freely without guilt or blame against their academic and other engagements among peers at a university campus.

7.5.4 Readiness to accept transformative approach for life

This section intends to handle the interest to give a transformative approach room to plant change that lasts, Brikkels (2014) (cf. 3.5.4) (cf. 5.6.4) confirms that prejudice and non-conforming behaviour of the majority heterosexual individuals regard relationships with the LGBTI communities as abnormal and against their values and societal norms, then pushed them to collude together on rape actions towards gays and lesbians as corrective measures within their community. These acts thus opened fewer LGBTI communities to suffer even worse in silence, but indicates acts of hatred and intolerance of gender differences that Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvalho, and Gabriel (2011) (cf. 3.5.4) (cf. 5.6.4) pointed out for internalized experiences from heterosexual community as LGBTI communities come out over their sexuality. Swank and Raiz (2010) (cf. 3.5.4) concur that a change of attitudes serves prominently on recovery for LGBTI communities into a diverse world, through broad awareness to transform society and universities through forgiveness, means to accommodate all. This appeals for education on sexuality and relates to prepare both universities and society to share common knowledge that embraces LGBTI communities.

Needham and Austin (2010) (cf. 3.5.4) (cf. 5.6.4) confirm that sexual orientation needs be handled with caution from parents, thereby allowing full acceptance to let LGBTI communities play their roles at homes, schools, universities and society. To ensure free access to engagement among peers at a university campus may reignite LGBTI communities' efficiency in their academic and social performance and support to appropriate their opportunities (cf. 3.5.4) (cf. 5.6.4) (Blondal & Sigrun, 2009). Berlant (2012) and Alatalo (2012) (cf. 3.5.4) (cf. 5.6.4) agreed that attitude change through love maintains equity and fairness on the non-negotiable importance of humanity as judicial arbitration for recovery. One has to support LGBTI communities for emancipation at the university and gained freedom on their sexual orientation and enjoyment, mediated by love through education. Ashley-Smith (2013) (cf. 5.6.4) notes that prejudice extends risk against embracing all students in contrast to inclusive education policy instead of creating a normative university environment, irrespective of status and gender differences.

However, Fisher, Poririer and Blau (2012) (cf. 3.5.4) (cf. 5.6.4) provide an intervention to assist students found in a moody state and anxiety causes isolated/marginalized experiences against peer acceptance belongingness. "LGBTI communities" thereby need help to overcome such experiences and challenges at a university campus. The researcher envisages that this study might offer support for LGBTI communities to gain more confidence over challenges of life and conquer emotional problems such as; depression, anxiety, suicidal thought and unfavorable conditions. Block (2008) (cf. 3.5.4) (cf. 5.6.4) asserts that community acceptance significantly postulates to reduce/eliminate emotional problems created by gender/sexuality encounters and thus helps to cope socially with others at a university campus respectively. The findings summarized thus:

LGBTI Co 4 (cf. 5.6.4) pointed out that mostly people with a feminist approach were problematic to apportion judgement on LGBTI communities, while OUCFT empathically shoot at the case where the university itself does not want the approach to embrace LGBTI communities, based on the acceptance of transformative approach. Therefore, UL1 (cf. 5.6.4), LGBTI Co 1 and LGBTI Co 3 suggested that debates and dialogues at lectures venues, churches, hospitals, community stakeholders, non-governmental organization and law courts should work collectively to address this approach, for what affects one affects us all. There is need to learn effectively and work against any form of homophobic behaviors against LGBTI communities at a university campus.

This findings section from research team showed emergence that the statement aforementioned concurred, that attitudes of other students be corrected to avoid discrimination of others, either against disability or LGBTI communities and leveling different practices, that might undermine communality among students at large in a wide range of subjects, from different quarters.

7.5.5 University implementation constant awareness debates, rallies and campaigns of anti-abuse program to embracing LGBTI communities

This aspect is the key medium to support students who might be marginalized or bullied by other students or peers, aiming at lessening such occurrences at schools and university campuses. On this note of importance, Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, and Bartkiewicz, (2010) (cf. 3.5.5) concur on the need to implement school-wide anti-bullying policies to reduce or eliminate victimization and for the benefits of LGBTI learners in the schools. This confirmed that LGBTI communities at a university campus and homes experience social prejudice, harassment and stigmatization to rejection by their peers, friends and pushed them to intensified loneliness subject to vulnerability and intent suicidal thought (cf. 3.5.5) (Aragon, Poteat & Espelage, 2014; Aspendlied, Buchanan, McDougall & Sippola, 2009). This revealed that isolation may worsen abused victims to wrong thoughts, which can lead to perpetual ideation, and in the absence of good counsel and supportive measure, may result in suicide attempts.

Van Aswegen (2008) (cf. 3.5.5) suggests that intervention and measure is required to assure an equilibrium of circumstances to accommodate varieties of identities among students in the university environments. Moreover, psychosocial support and enhanced psychosocial wellbeing of individual student competencies and capacities to deal with their lives' demands and to manage love relationships well, enabling them to understand their environment, status engaging with, making choices, and having hope for their promising future (cf. 3.5.5) (Halderman, 2012). To this fact, Diener and Biswas-Diener (2008) (cf. 3.5.5) reveal that students' psychosocial well-being covers other aspects of their lives, such as appropriate emotions, relevant thoughts or cognitions, mental health, develop morality, enhance positive relationships with family, peers and teachers. Bortlin, Adam and Jaime McCauley (2013) (cf. 3.5.5) support that students' psychosocial wellbeing affects every aspect of their lives and this might reflect in their ability to learn, health, play and to relate adequately well with other people as they grow.

LGBTI Co 3 (Mwali) suggested debates and dialogues, for students to be correctly informed about LGBTI communities. UL1 (Donchido) supported that a program implementation drive should involve all members of the university to ensure a

successful approach, with clarity on sexual orientation and gender differences to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus starting in classrooms.

The above statements presented that programs to be established such that debates and dialogues can be used as a medium to communicate to the populace to have a different relook on LGBTI communities and challenges to provide interventions that accommodate all from stress of victimization, abuses or any violent acts against LGBTI communities as equal to rights of education among peers.

7.5.6 Provision of secured residences/ facilities to embracing LGBTI communities

It expedient that security measures are needed for every student to have a stable learning environment. This is one of the perquisites for academic excellence. Based on this fact, Pyykkönen (2012) (cf. 3.5.6) (cf. 5.6.6) concurs that there is a need to support LGBTI communities at a university campus among their peers socially, to enhance their sustenance and improve wellbeing. Psychosocial support is a continuum of care and momentum which is geared towards ensuring social, emotional and psychological wellbeing of students at the university campus (cf. 3.5.6) (cf. 5.6.6) (Gabb, 2011; Carlson & Sperry (2010)). This support is aimed to improve students' academic achievement, as in all university students, including LGBTI communities.

Therefore, psychosocial support services aim to enhance physical wellness and emotional wellbeing of LGBTI communities' students who are vulnerable to abuse and fear experience insecurity at a university campus for disclosure of their sexuality among other students (cf. 3.5.6) (cf. 5.6.6) (Kapeleri & Paivio, 2011; Boden, Fischer & Neihuis, 2010). Psychosocial service combines social competence, which is inseparable from the physical and biological aspect of life. The term directs attention towards LGBTI communities who suffer stigmatization, rather than focus exclusively on the physical/psychological aspects of health and wellbeing. The findings indicated the required security and facilities are written below:

LGBTI Co 4 (cf. 5.6.6) supports that much needs to be done, but recommends on how one takes oneself, while UL1 (Donchido) (cf. 5.6.6) contested that discrimination in the

classroom should not be accepted, rather if happens, there should be follow up to avoid bad behavior of the victims for the security of all students, it is very important.

Here the psychosocial support should not be someones ideology on gender issues, sexuality, disability and more, but an approach that would engage all students without neglecting any, coming to one understanding of the subject of acceptance and embracing each other, as such LGBTI communities are valued, respective individuals that form belongingness at a university campus.

In this study, a university campus often formed sites of victimisation for LGBTI communities (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.6) (D'Augelli et al., 2006; SAHRC, 2007). LGBTI communities were found encountering vulnerability at university campuses because of their sexuality identification, Sexual orientation and the way they expressed their gender identity (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.6) (Aspenlieder, Buchanan, McDougall, & Sippola, 2009; Tetreault, Fette, Meidlinger & Hope, 2013; Renn, 2010; Toomey, Ryan, Diaz, Card & Russell, 2010). LGBTI communities' labelling and disassociating of, on a daily basis from heterosexual students might hinder their maximum delivery on academic success and thereby disengage off campus endeavours. As opposing behaviour to their sexuality, makes it so difficult for LGBTI communities to perform well academically because there is no or little supportive academic environment to attend lectures without fear of their safety and emotional wellbeing (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.6) (Fisher, Poirier & Blau, 2012).

Evidently, students who attend unsecured university campus environments are more likely to withdraw themselves from these homophobic environments by being absent or dropping out (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.6) (Aragon, Poteat, & Espelage, 2014; Lozier & Beckman, 2012). The researcher noticed that fewer students were comfortable to share their social life problems for fear of more bad encounters; they rather take leave from school or withdraw from the semester. On this note, Lamanna and Reidmann (2009) (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.6) maintain that students' performance needs follow-up to encroach transformative ideas to enable a university campus to be more adaptable for

LGBTI communities to enjoy a supportive atmosphere to maximize their potential, like their heterosexual peers across the high schools, colleges and universities.

Birditt, Antonucci and Tighe (2012) (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.6) stated some problems from heterosexual students effect on LGBTI communities include; loneliness, insecurity, depression and isolation which often results in internalizing problems. Gaine and Guardia (2009; Lyubomirsky, 2008) (cf. 3.5.7) contended, that perspectives for unequal gender differences be addressed to normalize from internalized problems that compete persistently between wider heterosexuals and LGBTI communities at the same university campus. To this, there is need for dialogues and awareness to provide a support service to LGBTI communities who may be marginalized due to sexual orientation, and thus suffer unequal measure of relationships that embrace democratic state of students.

Stu 1 and Stu 2 suggested a campaign that should include university management and make LGBTI communities feel included in the program, to be accepted and respected, while Stu 5 and Stu 4 requested talks, seminars and student's participation that will involve a large number of students, allowing professionals to be speakers, to educate university students on LGBTI communities, creating social relationships. However, OCFT supports to ensure a welcoming University environment through the joint effort to launch an inclusive university campus.

The researcher discovered that varieties of perspectives can form a transformative initiative to embrace LGBTI communities among heterosexuals, to build a participatory network that helps academic and emotional states of all students.

7.6 WE SHOULD BE CAUTIOUS REGARDING SOME HINDRANCES/BARRIERS TO A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

There some hindrances/barriers against a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities that we need to be cautious of at a university campus, these were stated below.

7.6.1 Heterosexual sovereignty over LGBTI communities

A University campus in this context is an environment that seeks to accommodate a populace of students for education development in general. In this study, a university campus often formed sites of victimisation for LGBTI communities (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.7) (D'Augelli et al., 2006; SAHRC, 2007). LGBTI communities were found of encountering vulnerability at university campuses because of their sexuality identification. As result of opposition to sexuality, it becomes so difficult for LGBTI communities to perform well, academically because there is fear for their safety and emotional wellbeing (cf. 3.5.7) (Fisher, Poirier & Blau, 2012). On this note, Lamanna and Reidmann (2009) (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.7) maintain transformative ideas to enable University campus to be more adaptable for LGBTI communities to enjoy a supportive atmosphere to maximize their potential like their heterosexual peers at the universities.

Birditt et al. (2012) (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.7) state some problems which heterosexual students usually place on LGBTI communities include; loneliness, insecurity, depression and isolation which often results in internalizing problems. Lyubomirsky (2008) (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.7) confirms that internalized emotions have no distinctive ends to LGBTI communities; ethically, only support aids students to handle their challenges and recover faster. Gaine and Guardia (2009) (cf. 3.5.7) (cf. 5.6.7) contend that perspectives for unequal gender differences be addressed to normalize the competition that persistently arrives between wider heterosexuals and LGBTI communities at the same university campus. To this, there is need for ultima dialogues and awareness to provide a support service to LGBTI communities who may be marginalized due to sexual orientation and thus suffer unequal measures of relationships that embrace democratic states of students.

Stu 1 (cf. 5.6.7) and Stu 2 suggested a campaign that will include the university management and make LGBTI communities feel included in the program to be accepted and respected while Stu 5 (cf. 5.6.7) and Stu 4 requested talks, seminars and student's participation that will involve a large number of students allowing professionals to be speakers to educate university students on LGBTI communities, creating social relationships. However, OCFT (cf. 5.6.7) supports to ensure a welcoming University environment through the joint effort to launch an inclusive university campus.

The researcher discovered that varieties of perspectives can form a transformative initiative to embrace LGBTI communities among heterosexuals and build a participatory network that helps academic and emotional states of all students.

Based on the point of view of USSP (Lisandry) advised a top-down approach of recruiting all stakeholders even to the junior staff to find a way to embrace LGBTI communities, while LGBTI Co 2 supported that awareness campaigns and talk shows should be put in place at where experts can provide activities around campus. At this, SRC (Gi) considered an educational forum that will allow the coming up of LGBTI communities' issues, discussed all the bodies, from the cleaners to the top management. The researcher confirmed that round table of the entire department and management was required to set up a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

7.6.2 Uncirculated possibilities that LGBTI communities are human beings

Simon, Aikins and Prinstein (2008) (cf. 3.6.2)'s, study found that socialization factors align with difficulties to provide security for their consciousness to collective belongingness. This factor of relationships intends to popularize LGBTI communities and reduce their interest in physical attraction and depressive symptoms. Bierman (2004) (cf. 3.6.2) (cf. 5.7.2) opens that depressive behavior from peer rejection of LGBTI communities at university campus and relational aggression and emerging victimization, significantly imposes danger to their concentration over time.

Moreover, Dehart, Pelham, Fiedorowicz, Carvalho and Gabriel (2011) (cf. 3.6.2) (cf. 5.7.2) noted that LGBTI communities socialize at a university campus by engaging in love relationships through inclusion of others, friends' choices for daily tolerance and mutual interactions at the university campus. Guasp (2011) (cf. 3.6.2) (cf. 5.7.2) asserts that absence of welcome of LGBTI communities imposes difficulties from interpersonal relationships, as masked by stereotype and prejudice among peers in their environments. Stereotype and prejudice poses unresolved problems for LGBTI communities to move past social stress experiences. (cf. 3.6.2) (cf. 5.7.2) (Graber and Sontag, 2008). Social stress emerged from interactions and relationships with others. Sometimes you feel like it's 'not you', but 'everyone else' and that is pretty much the definition of social stress. Savage (2010) (cf. 3.6.2) (cf. 5.7.2) affirms that social stress experience by LGBTI communities, sexuality deprive them of friendly relationships with peers which accrue to social rejection. Romero-Canyas, Downey, Berenson, Ayduk and Kang (2010) (cf. 5.7.2) revealed that social rejection pushes LGBTI communities out of unacceptance, to love from counterparts who are more familiar with them than uncaring heterosexual peers.

SRC (Gi) (cf. 5.7.2) advised friendliness, and awareness of LGBTI communities and to create rapport to learning. More so, USSP (Lisandary) (cf. 5.7.2) encouraged more avenues to be opened to explore more from LGBTI communities in order to have better understanding in coming to support of their world. LGBTI Co 3 (Mbali) (cf. 5.7.2) the researcher thinks what Rosie said about the university could helpful, and is true to allow many activities that inform about LGBTI communities, this may create a platform to share ideas related to knowing about homosexuals. LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) (cf. 5.7.2) suggested a program controlled by LGBTI communities but involving the entire management. USSP (lisandary) (cf. 5.7.2) presented the idea of a top-down-approach to addressing related issues, this may cater for vulnerability occurrences and empower monitoring to see it implemented successfully through awareness and campaigns.

On the above data results; it therefore found needed, to create a friendly atmosphere and show love to LGBTI communities, develop an open mind to be able to teach those who have limited knowledge about LGBTI communities to be tolerable. However, as LGBTI Co 1 (cf. 5.7.2) stated, to form a program controlled by LGBTI communities with management involvement, while USSP (cf. 5.7.2) suggested that the university

must take a standing role to monitor the implementation of embracing LGBTI communities through campaigns, even government need to be involved.

7.6.3 Unsupported spaces to debate/dialogues on LGBTI communities issues

Barker (2012) (cf. 3.6.3) (cf. 5.7.3) affirms that knowledge acquisition promotes situational management on sexuality related issues of and provide intervention ways for counselling the needy in times of difficulties. However, Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012) (cf. 3.6.3) (cf. 5.7.3), contend that educators/lecturers should help students through inclusive education platforms by allocating time to listen to grievances of sensitivity nature of their experiences and to caution attitudes of all students at a university campus. To ensure moderate attitudes, sufficient knowledge is needed to avoid mishaps and misunderstandings between LGBTI communities and heterosexuals. Molden and Finkel (2010) and Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) (cf. 3.6.3) (cf. 5.7.3) suggested forgiveness attitudes possibilities through moderate behavior and embracing a collective insight to propose a transformative approach, beneficial to LGBTI communities and heterosexuals respectively.

This ensures total acceptance of ecological systems that caters for equality of all students' better future, freedom, and peace to prepare LGBTI communities against future challenges. Haldeman (2012) (cf. 3.6.3) (cf. 5.7.3) averts that negative peers' rejection and victimization relates to insufficient knowledge, and deprived LGBTI communities of equal access with their peers, and thus cultivate bad habits which includes anxiety and substance abuse. In contrast, Robinson (2011) (cf. 3.6.3) (cf. 5.7.3) asserts that enough knowledge be given to heterosexuals about LGBTI communities, and hence provide them with flexible insight to happiness against wrong perceptions of attitudes and behaviors. Barker (2012) (cf. 3.6.3) (cf. 5.7.3) affirms that knowledge acquisition promotes situational management on sexuality issues related, thus provides intervention strategies to counsel the victims in times of difficulties.

Stu 1(SH5), Stu 5 (Sunflower), LGBTI Co 2 (Rosie), LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) found that it is paramount to enhance and intensify education to provide basic knowledge to the entire university so that information about LGBTI communities might gain majority understanding, and provide differences resolution that will make the University

accommodating for every student and management. On the other hand, LGBTI Co 5 (Chris), USSP (Lisandary) and SRC (Gi) confirmed the arguments on the difficulty to change and why people are so rigid on certain behavior of others. This rests on a better networking system to have common understanding about ourselves and better dialogues to provide a transformative approach with love for an enjoyable university campus. The collective findings centered on compulsory inclusiveness for all students, without discrimination.

7.6.4 University capacity to provide prompts intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities

The University has a great deal of responsibilities to see what is lacking for making a transformative approach that enables all to enjoy fullness of the university experiences. At the university campus, there is less attention to diversity that can encourage a debate to improve on dialogues and activities for students, especially on sexuality education (cf. 3.6.4) (Clark, 2012). Goransson and Nilholm (2014) (cf. 3.6.4) (cf. 5.7.4) suggest varieties of holistic activities structured to accommodate all students without marginalization of any group to participate. DoE (2013), Hall, Evans and Nixon (2013) (cf. 3.6.4) (cf. 5.7.4) confirmed that occasional dialogues and debates could broaden inclusion of diversity at a university campus, as core embracing medium of ecological systems for a transformative approach and social change. Booysen, Kelly, Nkomo and Steyn (2007); Litvin (2006) suggested that special attention be given to meetings related to inclusive education programs to enlighten the entire university on the significance of embracing ecological systems for equal acceptance of individuals to promote unity among all students. The researcher suggests that constant avenue be slated for these events, for opinions and views that may have a long transformative impact.

In regard to the above discussion in this section, the following data results address some points related as thus:

LGBTIOC (cf. 5.7.4) suggested accessibility to LGBTI movements across all varsities to all students. Stu 2 (Mr. Rogers) (cf. 5.7.4) supports to create awareness campaigns

through social media that will strengthen acceptance and respect. Stu 5 (Sunflower) (cf. 5.7.4) concurs to hold talks and seminars for all students and the invitation of various universities to the topic to benefit students as a whole, even other outside stakeholders. Stu 4 (Bradeline) (cf. 5.7.4) enjoined student's participation, on huge numbers of students to include team work/building and social interaction, even RAs (Residence Assistant) to the house committees to make a contribution on a transformative approach that could embrace all everyone at a university.

The research team voiced out loudly that campaigns, awareness and seminars could be of help to effect the core objective of embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus, and extend the strategies in various dimension as stated above, which can drive the implementation of a transformative approach for all students.

7.6.5 Religious and beliefs against LGBTI communities at a university campus

Adamczyk and Pitt (2009) (cf. 3.6.6), unveil that religiosity has posed a difference to individual perception on others' beliefs, mostly on the acceptance of sexuality that is often contested between heterosexuals and homosexual communities. This unfolds the contradiction from society that points at times to individual's assertions on a subject of sexuality which remains virtually different. Hence, contradictions are tantamount to no subject on any other as LGBTI communities' equal rights to choices of religion and beliefs unlike heterosexuals. Arch Bishop Desmond Tutu (1998), acknowledged that the indulgence of sexuality differentiation does not form its exclusion from the scriptural epistemology, but anchored on Biblical law of forgiveness and acceptance for diversity liberation through redemptive plans into God's family. Nonetheless, John (2017) (cf. 3.6.6) lectured on hope for hopelessness, confirms his message to LGBTI wider communities; virtually suggests that passion is required to handle issues as we live in a globalized world which continuously needs change of behaviour for accepting others.

Brikkels (2014) (cf. 3.6.6) confirms that prejudice and non-conforming behaviour of the majority of heterosexual individuals, regard relationships with the same sex as abnormal and against the norms and values of their society, and therefore they collude together to rape these gays and lesbians within their community. Swank and Raiz

(2010) (cf. 3.6.6) concur that a change of attitudes serves a prominent role for recovery of LGBTI communities from outside, into the diverse world through broad awareness to transform society and universities through forgiveness to accommodate all, without discrepancies. Needham and Austin (2010) confirm that sexual orientation needs to be handled with caution from parents thereby allow full acceptance to acknowledge LGBTI communities to gain support that could help them to play their roles at homes, schools, universities and society.

Bhana (2012) and Reygan (2013) (cf. 3.6.5) (cf. 5.7.5) concur that fear of homophobic abuse prevents heterosexual students from associating or socializing with LGBTI students on campus. This may intensify the social exclusion for the LGBTI communities in a university campus. Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012) (cf. 3.6.5) (cf. 5.7.5) disagree that teachers should mitigate on students' exclusion, which leads to isolation among their peers despite the applicable strategies within reach to embrace diversity in the classroom. The researcher agrees with Msibi (2012) (cf. 3.6.5) (cf. 5.7.5) that staffs, at time contribute indirectly to student's stigma, especially LGBTI cases who thus internalise their relationships among peers at school and university campus. Aspendliender, Buchanan, McDougall and Sippola (2009) (cf. 3.6.5) support that societal norms contend against human beliefs and practices. This may constitute to jeopardization of students' academic performance.

McNulty (2013) (cf. 3.6.5) (cf. 5.7.5) supports that unequal personality among University students give heterosexuals courage to provide intervention for diversity and individual participation towards community development. In the same vein, Barker (2012) (cf. 3.6.5) (cf. 5.7.5) emphasizes that unequal power tussles inflict a deliberate sentiment on the majority against minorities for their equal right dividends. The researcher tries to figure out ideological perspectives of the uniqueness that propels diversity embracement through activities to develop a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Moreover, Faull (2008) (cf. 3.6.5) (cf. 5.7.5) states clearly that inclusive policy has it's cause to support the team participation and other recreational programs for all students at a university campus by displaying collective responsibilities, in line with Elechi, Morris and Schauer (2009) (cf. 3.6.5) (cf. 5.7.5), this emphasizes the force of ecological systems on students' day-to-day life at schools and universities.

Stu 3 (cf. 5.7.5), suggests the teaching of subjects in modules for understanding LGBTI communities and more s to support, LGBTI. Co 2 (cf. 5.7.5) recommended the advertisement of LGBTI communities on charts, drawings and pictures, however, Stu 4 and USSP (cf. 5.7.5) concurred on support structures through management/students' representatives to form a focus groups forum to fully research LGBTI communities' structures Yet, UL1, LGBTIOC and SRC (Gi) (cf. 5.7.5) encouraged all to be part of the change, mentioned academic, and general management and leadership to fully be part by making sure that effective, positive action is taking place. Meanwhile, USSP (cf. 5.7.5) eventually suggested that Edutem be used to help the change.

Based on the argument, data showed that not much has been done to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. However, efforts have been put in place to ensure more embracing ways of inclusivity programs that will offer LGBTI communities to have more participation in the activities that embrace diversity to make a university campus more attractive and supportive for all students.

7.6.6 Societal indoctrination about heterosexuality/homosexuality

Munson and Stelboum (2013) (cf. 3.6.6) (cf. 5.7.6), state conflicts impact on indoctrination and prejudices inherited, that LGBTI communities were different from heterosexual people according to their beliefs on normative principle. In contrast, norms and practices distinguish worlds, according to Fine and Spencer (2009) (cf. 3.6.6) (cf. 5.7.6), need to enhance social inclusivity and avoid isolation conflicts that emanated from indoctrination and prejudice of heterosexuals against LGBTI communities at the university campus. Societal indoctrination and perceptions of students' extracts were stated below:

LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) supports reaching out to those who are unaware, such as lecturers and pastors to know about LGBTI communities and advise people to stop discriminating. Stu 1(SH5) suggests changing the state of LGBTI communities, and suggested campaigns to run weekly, if possible by the management/lecturers in

support to include LGBTI communities. SRC (Gi) requested everyone to be friendly, and to be aware of LGBTI communities, so as to create rapport and learning. UL1 (Donchido) talked about cultural and religious issues as constraints which need to be addressed together to provide solutions for our education system. In contrast Stu 2 (Mr Rogers) revealed more resistance from people who are Christian; people who do not relate any identity with the LGBTI.

The researcher found the shocking point from educating Marvin's suggestion, to get pastors and imams involved to educate people from their side, to awareness that could enhance friendly relationships among all students against the use of religious sentiments which might impose barriers against LGBTI communities among their heterosexual counterparts. This indicates that cultural issues could pose great havoc on student's relationship through religious beliefs and sentiments on, gender and sexuality, thereby showing nonconformity to others' acceptability. On this note, the researcher found it very challenging and discriminatory to individuals who see it difficult to tolerate other differences on being LGBTI communities and label to the degree of acceptance and societal values for others.

7.6.7 Schools/tertiary institutions policies exemption or neutrality on LGBTI communities

Clarke (2012) (cf. 3.6.7), defines a transformative approach as a drastic improvement of the present situation of events/experiences in a different paradigm. This asserts a systems change be applied for betterment of previous imbalances left in policies' error negations and ascribes to beneficial means to ethical consideration on policy development. However, Haldeman (2012) (cf. 3.6.7), states that ethical consideration on policy for practice stipulates to embrace LGBTI communities by supporting their experiences which channel towards a transformative approach to accept their connectivity with peers at a the university campus. The White Paper on Foreign Policy (2011) (cf. 3.6.7), supports that tolerance should be maintained to make education free for all, encourage love, empathy, equity and unity to promote nation development. And to use a transformative approach of social change to empower LGBTI

communities through *ecological systems* adaptation at a university campus. Hawkey and Cacioppo (2010) (cf. 3.6.7), support that application of love emerge from ecological systemse relationships with others to provide a way-out by convert rejection and loneliness emergence from marginalization of LGBTI communities at a university campus. Jacob (2013) (cf. 3.6.7), contends that the police should create a safe environment for LGBTI communities in times of their abuses, but not at the expense of others. Nonetheless, there should be adequate application of transformative approach to inclusion into the university systems for the benefits of LGBTI communities and every student. The extracts below indicated what to do and how to do it correctly:

Stu 2 (Mr Rogers) consider the bill of rights and to reinforce those rights and responsibilities in practice. LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) followed the same direction that management is supposed to help us in time of any issues or abusers of LGBTI communities be dealt with, but there is still not much change with them round. LGBTI Co 3 (Mbali) and LGBTI Co 1 (Linda): supported to be more involved in activities that can bring a change to be organized and controlled by LGBTI communities.

Stu 2 (Mr Rogers) opens to teaching the bill of rights and responsibilities to individuals. LGBTI Co 4 (Marven) suggests that management should awake to their duties in case of abusers, while LGBTI Co 3 (Mbali) and LGBTI Co 1 (Linda) advises to involve LGBTI communities in the related activities and policy formulation, in conjunction to the management.

The researcher concurs that policies should be re-adjusted in a way to accommodate and protect all students at the university campus, irrespective of their groups.

7.7 CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE STUDY

A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus required rigorous re-invention and follow-up of behavioral activities of the whole university and heterosexuals in particular. This study has found different input, ideas and elements that could trigger the effectiveness of embracing as part of a transformative approach. As appeared throughout the study, it was noted that a

transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is a collective responsibility. This has left no stone unturned without apportioning some valuable change of perceptions towards others to all at the university. Change of perception on stereotype ideas towards a more understandable end about LGBTI communities through an intensive education.

There is some clarity that unmasked the insight into being socialized with others in a peaceful and tolerable space without conflicts or abuse of anyone. However, this study has placed a strong responsibility on the university management to ensure that no students suffer discrimination, abuse, stigma or victimization during their course of study. In the advent of their academic pursuits demands their socializing way among their peers from rural background from all races. The emergence of this study indicated that sexual orientation, gender identity and differences as it were, should not in any way pose any barriers to learning or segregate students as they intend to explore their academic and secular world.

To achieve this goal, this study has unveiled that campaigns, talk shows, seminars, debates, dialogues and inscriptions of LGBTI communities' pictures indicating accommodative universities be used to publicize their inclusiveness. Meanwhile, the universities' policies should therefore be reconsidered in a clearer tone as HIV and AIDS, Disabled were stated for inclusion. LGBTI communities should be treated with such inclusivity and honor to avert the horrible past experiences among their peers at the university campus. The researcher found that a transformative approach could give the opportunities for those categories of participants that formed research team's voices to address the issues of LGBTI communities from various perspectives by coming to the ground knowledge of providing answers in accordance with the study objectives.

The research team were able to indicate the gaps needed for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Some of the identified elements were found to be tools for effective implementation of the approach that aimed changing the current state of LGBTI communities, which revealed discrimination by their peer heterosexuals. The research team made suggestions from findings that could help to smooth the embracing part of the transformative approach

for LGBTI communities at a University campus. The study utilizes a democratic way of contribution from different categories of the study to present its value on liberality for acceptance of humanity.

7.8 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY: THEORETICAL, METHODOLOGICAL AS WELL AS CONTRIBUTIONS TO PRACTICE

In this section, the theory of this study is Ecological systems theory, it has coched the study to address the urgency that seeks to embrace humanity such as LGBTI communities in particular. The researcher found that ecological systems theory gave voices to the voiceless, marginalized people from the university campus, with the collective effort for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities thus helps heterosexuals to find gaps to work on for harmonious relationships. This theory showed that individuals should be valued and treated normally, but unfortunately, findings altered the collective insight to participation as the study found from the research team to justify what the objectives of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus could be.

Ecological systems theory has geared this study on a reliable rock, as considered from the starting of this research, and found the ground to build the structure that holds all the sections. The researcher found that the theoretical provision of self value could be applied to gain neutrality and unconscious interpretation of others' differences than one's own weaknesses is one reality to emulate from this study. In either way, attributing reasoning to ensure welfare of what coins another satisfaction to a social and mental wellbeing follows individual method of approach to maintain fairness with others. Ecological systems theory couched throughout, indicated respect to personality of individuals which positioned the research team and researcher thus to come the whole way to form the study. This theory has contributed great value to the study by showing the preservation of human relational system, dignity, ensured human rights through various perspectives that protected consciousness on privacy to life of LGBTI communities. Ecological systems theory accompanied methodological underpinning has coordinated and reflected the research team' participation to care for others and maintained equity among heterosexuals and homosexuals.

The researcher found that theoretical instrumentation of this study colluded with the methodology whereby the research team were given the preference to determine how their participation would inform the study, parts played were indicated and showed that the central pillar which is theory, is fully unitized in coherence to the orderliness of this study. The selection of the research team had a significant importance on the effectiveness of this study, however the meeting organized for the data generation has informed the strategical organization that allowed the authenticity of the study as the research team were participating as they agreed on the subject. The researcher's initiative and compliance to the ethical issues related thus helped the successful execution of the study, however the follow-up of process strived to revolve on the theoretical base of participatory action involved, ensured the qualitative nature of the study.

In data generation process, the research team were allowed to determine how to avail for the meeting that is convenient for them in collaboration, to the desired end of the research together with the researcher. The researcher found it very crucial that from top to the bottom management at the university should take note of ecological systems insight to stop marginalizing any identified LGBTI communities and related at the university. The researcher maintained that ecological systems application should be included in our policies and followed accurately to the execution of LGBTI communities' rights which anchored to accommodate all students at the university be accorded priority. Lastly, the researched should be given the privilege to be part of policy making so that the policies can be moderated with their inclusiveness as stakeholders of the system.

7.9 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted at only one university campus of KwaZulu-Natal in the Durban metropolis but was not done at any other campuses or universities. The study sample size was selected because a transformative approach was not yet launched at the university campus chosen, but have LGBTI communities not fully recognized. Categories of research team; LGBTI communities (LGBTI Co), On Campus Faith Thrust (OCFT), Student's Heterosexuals (SH), University Lecturer (UL), LGBTI Communities From Outside University (LGBTIOC), Student Representative Council

(SRC), and University Student's Service Practitioner (USSP) were part of the data generation process, due to the nature/structure of the study. The other challenge was that change of method on data generation based the research team's meetings as they decided with the researcher's consent.

The ethical consideration of ecological systems theory as drawn from participatory showed reluctance on instrumentation planned which have a dire setback to a change of data generation methods. However, both methodological and theoretical aspects of this study unveiled the harmonious gratification that could be used in a type of sensitive research like this in future. However, different theory like "Ubuntu" could be used to arrive at a different results of this type of study in another contexts. The researcher ensured the availability to attend the meetings as indicated on the schedule date hundred percent of the research team's meetings. Some of the field notes were not discussed in a research team's meeting, but were written as a report. The next section discusses recommendations.

7.10 RECOMMENDATIONS

A transformative approach should be applied at the university to allow all students to enjoy the campus experiences as they admire to study, especially LGBTI communities. Education must be effectively communicated in preparing new students coming into the university during and after their orientations. Transformative approaches that could embrace LGBTI communities with their heterosexual counterparts should be monitored by the management to ensure fairness to all students to be free from any forms of assaults, harassment and abuse at the university campus. The university management should embark on a forum that will see to the welfare of LGBTI communities, to secure their full inclusion, and to safeguard their rights to education like the heterosexual majority. Timely monitoring of reports of any complaints from LGBTI communities is required, to reassure their security at university residences both inside campus and outside for prompt support. Transformative approaches should be grounded on ecological systems that adhere to respect and acceptance of diversity to ensure equality. Transformative approaches must involve every section and department to embrace by provision of intervention measures to accommodating LGBTI communities and heterosexual so that mutual understanding

could enhance effective engagement for all students. It must create enormous space to share equal chances at university campus activities among students' wider population as a roadmap to enjoy a transformative approach.

This study maintained the ecological systems theory could be followed as its precepts suggest respect and acceptance of other's differences, "who they are and not what people assume them to be" in the real life. To ensure change of behavior towards others through ecological systems theory application, this may caution one's reasoning towards LGBTI communities and others maintain fairness to gender and sexuality. Methodologically, this study helps the researcher to identify the difficulties, while undertaking sensitive research like this, be fully prepared for any eventuality that might arrive along the study. It also, empowers the researcher to be highly proactive to apply relevant methods of data generation on the eventuality. The next section focused on implications for further research.

7.11 IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on the limitation of this study, the researcher recommends that this same study should be conducted in other campuses of the University of KwaZulu-Natal and extend to other universities. The study should also be conducted at colleges in different provinces to find out perhaps different or similar results could emerge. Research must be conducted to determine the transferability of this study to other university campuses. The next section comprises the chapter summary.

7.12 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The aim of this study was to propose a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. This chapter has discussed a summary of findings for this study, conclusions drawn from the study, contribution of the study: theoretical, methodological, contribution to practice, limitations, recommendations, implication for further study as well as research team's demographic data and chapter summary. The next chapter will propose a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE PROPOSED TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study has proposed a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. The previous chapter had discussed summary of findings for this study, conclusions drawn from the study, contribution of the study: theoretical, methodological, contribution to practice, limitations, and recommendations, implication for further study as well as research team's demographic data and chapter summary. This chapter provided, proposes a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

Therefore, in this final chapter of this study, a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus is discussed. In order to propose a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus, this chapter will discuss the conditions for the successful implementation of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and the elements of transformative approach. The transformative approach will be proposed, and a summary of the study and impressions from the study will be included. Lastly, the concluding remarks are discussed. The next section discusses the conditions for the successful implementation for a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

8.2 THE CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The conditions for successful implementation of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus are discussed below;

8.2.1 Changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities

Changing of attitudes towards LGBTI communities is extremely important to reduce discrimination from their peers, of which includes, maintaining to provide free participation of all. This has been pointed in (cf. 6.5.3; cf.6.6.2) seek to liberate individual minds about humanity values to maintain temperate attitudes to flow interaction that could promote academic performance of LGBTI communities. However, (cf. 5.5.3) to ensure collaborative efforts for collective student's progress thus (cf. 6.4.4) empower inclusion to overcome any forms of negative experiences among LGBTI communities and heterosexual peers at a university campus.

8.2.2 Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI Communities

Promoting good self-esteem for LGBTI communities comes from creating a welcoming atmosphere that strengthens social, emotional, psychological, physical, and spiritual aspects and academic responsibilities are recursive needs of life accomplishment (cf.3.4.6; cf. 6.5.6). The LGBTI communities should portray themselves as showing reliance mind-set to stand steadily on their personality without intimidation from heterosexual peers and managements.

8.2.3 Changing of prejudice about LGBTI communities

To change prejudice against LGBTI communities, involves continuous education to understand the background of LGBTI people and communities which will help to encourage different behaviour.

8.2.4 University campus implementation of anti-discrimination programmes to embracing LGBTI communities

The university needs to implement an anti-discrimination program that focuses on embracing LGBTI communities. Bullying occurs in high Schools, and universities only continue such abuses. The implementation of anti-discrimination or anti-bullying programmes will help to put a check on, and instil caution in the majority at the university campus (cf. 6.7.7) as effectiveness in order to promote fairness and justice.

8.2.5 Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities

Psychosocial support for LGBTI communities should be enhanced to make them enjoy equal opportunities to relate with their peers normally, to create a welcoming atmosphere for them on campus. The engagement of student's relationships in team work and university activities participation is vital.

8.2.6 Provision of improved and safe University campus

Provision of improved safe a university campus that will embrace LGBTI communities is vitally important. Each department should have the common goal of treating all students fairly. Security measures should be taken consciously so that all people, including the LGBTI communities may walk freely in the university environment.

8.3 KEY ELEMENTS (THRUSTS) OF A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACE LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

These key elements (thrusts) of a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus are presented below.

8.3.1 Mutual Engagement among LGBTI communities and heterosexuals

This intervention is anchored on the capacity of the entire university community of students to form some kind of rapport that allows all to socialise freely with their peers without being labelled of their sexual and gender identities. As such, this employs frivolous connections that give access to participation among different identities of both heterosexuals and LGBTI communities thereby create harmonious cohabitation with no discrimination of any group. The avoidance of contestation and confrontation when students do engage, will strengthen the relationships with students, thus empowering mutual engagement.

8.3.2 Mindfulness behaviour to embrace LGBTI communities

The researcher considers this recommendation as one of the key thrusts to embracing LGBTI communities because mindfulness encourages all actions to be considered so that no actions unconsciously cause harm on individuals. In this study, it appeared

that some students chose to remain neutral to LGBTI communities' issues which show that they were learning indirectly from their silence while socializing with them through event participation. Mindful behaviour among sexual orientation has influence that helps individual to relate together freely and allow LGBTI communities to achieve a sense of belonging with their peers with no discriminating effect on their sexual orientation and gender identification.

8.3.3 Tolerance to embracing LGBTI communities

Tolerance is also very important for the majority of heterosexuals. It is important to remind heterosexual students that they should try to accept who someone is, because no one has control over how others decide to live their lives. Tolerance ensures good relationships and shifts experiences to enhance unity in diversity.

8.3.4 Care to embrace LGBTI communities

Care for LGBTI communities serves as another vital key element, for it shows how well love, could be seen as tool to create an understanding of individuals within the campus (and outside campus) by respecting the choices that individuals make without judging or intimidating one another. Care is a good characteristic to include, because ecological systems emphasises that we are better with others influences around us.

8.3.5 Cooperation to embracing LGBTI communities

Cooperation entails cooperative behaviours to embracing LGBTI communities; this could be considered as the main issues where heterosexuals failed, by accusing LGBTI communities of a wrong choice of lifestyle. This showed a lack of cooperation to the acceptance of differences, such notions at times may prompt to use corrective rape on identified lesbians. The importance of this calls for support by avoiding harsh behaviour towards individual differences and even beliefs, or religious perceptions is equal to denying mutual understanding of LGBTI communities acceptance thus deprive friendly relationships with heterosexual students thereby deny others to enjoy the university campus experience. Therefore, cooperation amounts to an easy avenue towards embracing LGBTI communities.

8.3.6 Good friendships to embracing LGBTI communities

The researcher found that this recommendation is easier said than done for the majority of students. To maintain good friendships varies, as some students from different backgrounds were trying to get familiar with the LGBTI phenomenon made it a bit tense to apply in a natural sense. This however shows that to learn is to respect individual interests and allow communication to pave the way for friendships. To create good relationships is a solid base for embracing LGBTI communities within the larger population at a university campus.

8.3.7 Management's support for LGBTI communities

In this section, a university may not exist without its management and departments. Management support in the application of the ecological systems theory seems very important because they have the power to stand as a caution of misconduct and can penalise students who contravene rules or laws. Management needs to play a more active role and take active steps on any cases of abuse reported, as well as harassment and stigmatisation of the LGBTI communities present at the university. This must be taken seriously for good relationships and for students' safety. The next section is a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus.

8.4 A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

The key concepts of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus are featured hereunder.

Table 8.4.1: Concepts of proposed for transformative approach

Concepts of ecological systems for a transformative approach	Approach	Action
Collaborative engagement	University campuses should demand collaborative engagement among all students; LGBTI communities and heterosexuals can learn as a team players to achieve their academic duties thus allow absolute involvement in university activities.	It should be non-discriminating and there should be no stigmatisation of LGBTI communities to guarantee teaching and learning that embraces all students.
Conscious understanding	To get familiar to ensure both heterosexuals and LGBTI communities have a conscious understanding about what LGBTI are and behave naturally with them This will serves as a precaution against any attempt or act of injustice against LGBTI individuals.	As a knowledge-based approach, once there is an in-depth understanding of what LGBTI communities are about, this will enable heterosexual students to embrace their counterparts and make the university campus

		more accommodating for LGBTI communities.
Care	Another element is care; it entails respects for others' opinions, lives, gender differences and sexual orientation at the university campus. To care means to accept what someone sees as good for them and maintain fairness with one's decision making. LGBTI communities should be treated with care, warm and gentle behaviour.	This should be encouraged at the university campus to promote confidence in LGBTI communities so that they could learn effectively without any fear, stress or rejection from their heterosexual peers at a university campus.
Retreat for a change	To create a platform through interactions such as debates, seminars and talk show formats that will bring LGBTI communities together to have discussions to educate on others on differences of sexuality and genders that will broaden people's minds, for transformative approach on a change of behaviour.	Continuous meetings should occur to ensure lasting solutions to change disparities/conflicts between LGBTI communities and heterosexuals at a university campus.
Creation of friendly atmosphere	Make sure that there is no discrimination against LGBTI communities,	It is important to take by taking active steps to encourage a diverse

	<p>particularly in terms of religious beliefs, and negative views and behaviours to LGBTI communities.</p>	<p>atmosphere, which creates a sense of individual and collective belonging. It is important for all students and management to be supportive by showing a friendly space for communal living.</p>
<p>Acceptance of gender/sexual differences</p>	<p>There needs to be consensus for the acceptance of gender/sexual differences among heterosexuals to accept LGBTI communities and make them welcome at the university campus.</p>	<p>The attempt to embracing LGBTI communities will enable heterosexual students to reduce a threat of inferiority and alleviate the fear of interaction thus enjoy equal opportunities. This maintains that everyone is normal human beings irrespective of gender differences.</p>
<p>Readiness to accept a transformative approach for life</p>	<p>To ensure that individual is awake to change by having fair understanding to maintain peace with others and developing a positive mind towards others who might be considered as minority such as LGBTI communities, disabled, HIV and other identified</p>	<p>Both parties – LGBTI communities and heterosexuals – must agree to embrace transformative the approach to maintain fairness to all people through love and passion to implement what is good for all without marginalising any groups.</p>

	personality at university campus.	
Provision of secured residences to embracing LGBTI communities	Good security measures are needed at all university residences to be more accommodative for LGBTI communities. This need to be enforced to ensure and reassure LGBTI communities that they are safe against abuse or rape at their residences.	Heterosexuals and LGBTI communities must protect any suspected victim against abuse at the university campus. This will serves as collective efforts to make residences safer for LGBTI communities so that they feel secure and value the University intervention on their lives and education.
University capacity to provide prompt intervention strategies to embrace LGBTI communities	To supply the university with the preventive and to provide a supportive intervention in case of any like developing countries catered for their LGBTI communities which shows that they were supported to any attain any level of education as their peers do.	This suggests that the university uses available resources to activate intervention strategies and monitor the functioning and implementation of these innovative strategies that will include LGBTI communities.
University policies support for LGBTI communities	To ensure that university policies have a provision to support LGBTI communities. Policy should be constantly monitored and updated to protect LGBTI	Having the policies to support LGBTI communities are important because they are human beings and have rights to life, along with heterosexuals and

	<p>communities and that appropriate policy is in place so that any perpetrators can be dealt with appropriately.</p>	<p>shouldn't be discriminated against based on their sexual orientation and gender identity</p>
--	--	---

In an attempt to propose this transformative approach, and make it a practical instrument, the aforementioned elements should be used meticulously. The next section is the summary of the study.

8.5 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The primary aim of this study was to propose a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus. The theoretical framework chosen for this study was Bronfrenbrenner ecological systems theory. This study has succeeded in accomplishing the objectives of ecological systems theory, as appeared in Chapter two. The data generation method for this study was PAR, which emphasised the full participation of the research teams who would benefit from this study. The objectives of PAR were achieved, as discussed in chapter four. The research objectives served as a guide for the literature review, data generation, data presentation, data analysis, data interpretation, research findings, research conclusions and research recommendations.

In this chapter, the study has succeeded in proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. Therefore, the aim of the study was realised, as it was specifically to propose a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. It is believed that the proposed transformative approach should be enforced by different stakeholders who care for humanity, unhlich relationships and fairness towards LGBTI communities at a university campus. Finally, the researcher strongly believed that the proposed transformative approach could trigger more research on its transferability. The next section considers the impressions from the study.

8.6 IMPRESSIONS FROM THE STUDY

This study succeeded in confirming the use of ecological systems as a theoretical framework, and PAR as the data generation method in educational research. The study managed to show that the group of people who were affected by the problem under investigation were keen to contribute positively to change through consciousness. At this university, LGBTI communities who had encountered different forms of abuse and voicelessness were given preference to raise their views and concerns which were previously left unrecognised. From this study, LGBTI communities revealed that discrimination occurs on all sides, from peers and management, as most of their reports were not taken seriously. LGBTI communities, UL, SRC, LGBTIOC and USSP collectively suggested that a transformative approach should be launched at the university as corrective measures to the past incidences. The study recommended that wider spaces be made available for some other stakeholders to come with their perceptions and opinions on a transformative approach, as this should be introduced and maintained collaboratively.

This study indicated that research in participatory form let the researcher to play an intermediary role, as the researcher cannot be the sole determinant in any stages of the study, but altogether make decisions as the data generation process unfolds. The research teams had rich information that was critical for the study, which they contributed. The study proved that different categories of the research team can equally, collectively and individually participate to address the identified questions. The participants, such as USSP, UL, LGBTIOC and SRC, were able to work collectively and respectively without any difficulties during the research meetings. The research team was empowered through their participation in the study which was evident from their comments in extracts in chapter four.

The transformative approach in this study, accentuates respect for LGBTI communities through everyday experiences with their heterosexual peers to promote continuous participation at a university campus. In this study context, a transformative approach aims to make heterosexuals students understand what behaviours will make their university more tolerable for all students. The study emphasises that a

transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities should be maintained from students all the way up to top management. The study emphasised that the transformative approach is the main tool to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. There were varieties of ideas and perceptions highlighted throughout the study to embracing LGBTI communities and ensured that they were included, just as the heterosexual counterparts to enjoy equal opportunities to effectively participate in university campus activities.

The study found that management and heterosexual students do not give adequate support to LGBTI communities at a university campus, which they should, according to inclusive education policies. This supports that LGBTI communities should have confidence in the management provision to make them comfortable around their peers without encountering any inferiority complex among their heterosexual counterparts at a university campus. University policies should provide the structure to reassure LGBTI communities of their educational rights, thus preventing any struggles they are experience among their heterosexual peers. This study found that the transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities allows LGBTI students to enjoy stable relationships to aid their academic performance and participation on activities at the university campus.

The study employed collective, collaborative and participatory approaches to pave the way to embracing LGBTI communities, thus allowing them to interact and function without fear within the university campus. The study recommends that the collective approach should be maintained, to drive the approach that supports LGBTI communities at a university campus. One of the main aspects of the collaborative application is that LGBTI communities were actively engaged to be part of a transformative approach that will help them to be relate freely among their peers without any judgemental arguments at university campus. The study has adopted a critical paradigm throughout the exploration of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. The study recommends that care and love should be included while dealing with embracing LGBTI communities as a transformative guideline at a university campus.

The study also recommended that some key concepts such as; empathy, acceptance, tolerance and love should be seriously invested/monitored to make sure that no shortcomings arise while embracing LGBTI communities, as well as creating a sense of belonging that strengthens inclusive education.

The study contributed to developing a transformative approach that ensures harmony among students in general. It unveiled that for the proposed transformative approach to be effectively implemented, it has to go through a from the top down approach from lecturers and management to be supportive to sensitivity issues related to LGBTI communities and to proactively manage the negative occurrences to reassure the safety of all students on a regular basis. Secondly, the transformative approach should be jointly supported without excluding any staff, from the least to the top management should be adequately trained with required resources for this task. Thirdly, there should be free networks of services implementation of a transformative approach to embrace LGBTI communities; all the organs of the university must be educated to get them prepared to allow the approach to function as it is a core objective, without avoidance of responsibilities. The study made a worthwhile contribution by inventing a transformative approach for effective embracing of LGBTI communities at a university campus. The researcher suggests that research should be done on the ways that heterosexual students could contribute towards towards embracing LGBTI communities at the university campuses. This could help this approach to have long term impact over all people.

8.7 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This chapter sought to propose a transformative approach through Ubuntu theory to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus. The conditions for successful implementation of a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus were discussed. The transformative approach itself to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus was discussed. The summary of the study and impressions from the study were discussed.

9 REFERENCES

- Adamczyk, A. & Pitt, C. (2009). Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context. *Social Science Research*, 38 (2), 338-351.
- Alholjailan, M. I. (2012). Thematic Analysis: A critical review of its process and evaluation. *West East Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 39-47.
- Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2010). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. Routledge: New York.
- Alaga, E. (2011). Gender and Sexuality Policy in West Africa. Friedrich-Stifting. Nigeria.
- Alatalo, J. (2012). *Unconditional Love for Humanity: The New Earth*. Peninsula: America.
- Ama, B. (2014). The historical discourse on African humanism. In *Ubuntu: Curating the archive*, edited by Leonhard Praeg, and Siphokazi Magadla, UKZN Press.
- American Psychological Association. (2012). Association Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Clients. 67(1), 10–42.
- Annear, K.D., & Yates, G. C. R. (2010). Restrictive and Supportive Parenting: Effects on Children's School Affect and Emotional Responses. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 37(1), 63-82.
- Anney, V. N. (2014). Ensuring the Quality of the Findings of Qualitative Research: Looking at Trustworthiness Criteria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)* 5(2): 272-281.
- Aragon, S. R., Poteat, V. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2014). The influence of peer victimization on educational outcomes for LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ high school students. *Journal of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Youth*, 11. 1À19. doi:10.1080/19361653.2014.840761.
- Art, D. (2012). What do we know about authoritarianism after ten years?. *Comparative Politics*, 44(3): 351–373.
- Arum, R. (2011). *Improve relationships to improve student performance*. Phi Delta Kappan, 93(2), 8-13.
- Asante, M. K. (2007). *An Afrocentric manifesto: Toward an African renaissance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

- Asante, M. K. (2012). The character of Kwame Nkrumah's united Africa vision. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 4(10), 12-25.
- Ashley-Smith, J. (2013). *Risk assessment for object conservation*. City: Routledge.
- Aspenlieder, L., Buchanan, C. M., McDougall, P., & Sippola, L. K. (2009). Gender nonconformity and peer victimization in pre-and early adolescence. *International Journal of Developmental Science*, 3(1), 3-16.
- Bajaj, M. (2011). Human rights education: Ideology, location, and approaches. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 33(2), 481-508.
- Bajaj, M. (2011). *Schooling for Social Change: The Rise and Impact of Human Rights Education in India*. New York & London: Continuum.
- Bajaj, M. (2014). "The Productive Plasticity of Rights: Globalization, Education and Human Rights." *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures*, edited by Stromquist and Monkman, 51-66. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Balfour, R.J., Karlsson, J., Moletsane, I., & Pillay, D. (2009). Researching Postgraduate educational research in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 23(6): 1086-1100.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barber, M. E. (2012). Mental health effects of don't ask don't tell. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health* 16(4): 346–352.
- Barker, M. (2012). *Rewriting the Rules*. London: Routledge.
- Barker, M., & Langdrige, D. (2008). II. Bisexuality: Working with a silenced sexuality. *Feminism & Psychology*, 18, 389–394.
- Barnes, S., Brown, K. W., Krusemark, E., Campbell, W. K., & Rogge, R. D. (2007). The role of mindfulness in romantic relationship satisfaction and responses to relationship stress. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 33, 482–500.
- Barry, C. M., Madsen, S. D., Nelson, L. J., Carroll, J. S., & Badger, S. (2009). Friendship and romantic relationship qualities in emerging adulthood: Differential associations with identity development and achieved adulthood criteria. *Journal of Adult Development*, 16(4), 209–222.
- Beitz, C. R. (2009). *The Idea of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benedek, W., ed. (2012). *Understanding Human Rights: Manual on Human Rights Education*. Wien: ADC.
- Berlant, L. (2012). *Desire/Love*. Brooklyn, NY: Punctum Books.

- Bernard, R. B. & Ryan, G. W. (2010). *Analyzing qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Bertram, C., & Christiansen, L. (2014). *Understanding research: An Introduction to reading research*, Van Schaik. Pretoria.
- Berzonsky, M. D. & Kuk, L. S. (2005). Identity status, identity processing style, and intrinsic transition to university. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 15(1)*, 81-98.
- Beyer, C. (2012). Picture that: Supporting sexuality educators in narrowing the knowledge/practice gap. *South African Journal of Education, 32*:367-380.
- Bhana, D. (2012). Understanding and addressing homophobia in schools: A view from teachers. *South African Journal of Education, 32(3)*, 307-318.
- Bierman, K. L. (2004). *Peer rejection: Developmental processes and intervention*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Birditt, K., Antonucci, T., & Tighe, L. (2012). Enacted support during stressful life events in middle and older adulthood: An examination of the interpersonal context. *Psychology and Aging, 27*, 735-736.
- Black-Hawkins, K., & Florian, L. (2012). Classroom teachers' craft knowledge of their inclusive practice, *Teachers and Teaching 18(5)*, 567-584.
- Black-Hawkins, K., Florian, L., & Rouse, M. (2007). *Achievement and Inclusion in Schools*. London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Block, P. (2008). *Community: The structure of belonging*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Blondal, K. S., & Adalbjarnardottir, A. (2012). *Parenting in Relation to School Dropout through Student Engagement: A Longitudinal Study*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Blondal, K.S & Sigrun, A. (2009). Parenting practices and school dropout: A longitudinal study. *Adolescence (44)*, 176, 729-749
- Boden, J., Fischer, J., & Niehuis, S. (2010). Predicting marital adjustment from young adults' initial levels and changes in emotional intimacy over time: A 25-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Adult Development, 17*, 121-134.
- Boehm, C. (2011). *Moral Origins: The Evolution of Virtue, Altruism, and Shame*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boelen, P. A., & Reijntjes, A. (2009). Negative cognitions in emotional problems following romantic relationship break-ups. *Stress and Health, 25(1)*, 11-19.

- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Booyesen, L., Kelly, C., Nkomo, S., & Steyn, M. (2007). Rethinking the Diversity Paradigm: South African Practices. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities, and Nations*, 7 (4), 1-13.
- Bortolin, S., Adam, B. D., & Jaime McCauley, C. B. (2013). *Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Youth Experiences of School Climate*. Department of Sociology and Anthropology: University of Windsor.
- Boyd, L. (2013). The problem with freedom: Homosexuality and Human Rights in Uganda. *Anthropological Quarterly*. 86, (3), 697-724.
- Boylan, M. (2008). *The good, the true, and the beautiful*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Braun, B., McCoy, T., & Finkbeiner, N. (2013). Extension of education theoretical framework with criterion-referenced assessment tools. Maryland: University of Maryland Extension.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, (2). 77-101.
- Brennan, D. J., Ross, L. E., Dobinson, C., Veldhuizen, S., & Steele, L. S. (2010). Men's sexual orientation and health in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 101, 255–258.s
- Brikkels, M. A. (2014). *Social and Educational experiences of secondary school lesbian youth. (Unpublished Dissertation)* Master Degree of Psychology, Pretoria.
- Broodryk, J. (2002). *Ubuntu: Life lessons from Africa*. Pretoria: Ubuntu School of Philosophy.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1989). Ecological systems theory. *Annals of Child Development*, 6, 187-241.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (Ed.). (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. London.

- Bunnell, T., Yea, S., Peake, L., Skelton, T., & Smith, M. (2012). Geographies of friendships. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36, 490-507.
- Burke, R. (2010). *Decolonization and the Evolution of International Human Rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Burnham, O. (2000). *African wisdom*. London: Piatkus.
- Burns, H. (2009). *Education as Sustainability: An Action Research Study of the Burns Model of Sustainability Pedagogy*. PhD diss., University of Portland.
- Butler, A. H. (2008). Navigating institutional homophobia: A challenge for South African social work with gay and lesbian youth. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 19(1), 71-88.
- Caillaud, S., & Kalampalikis, N. (2013). 'Focus groups and ecological practices: a psychosocial approach', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 10, 382–401.
- Cammarota, J. & Fine, M. (2008). *Evolutionizing education youth Participatory Action Research in motion*. New York: Routledge.
- Caracciola, D., Mungai, A.M., & Thiong'o, N.W. (2009). *In the Spirit of Ubuntu*. Sense Publishers: Rotterdam, Netherlands.
- Carter, C. E., & Goldfried, M. R. (2006). The impact of client sexual orientation and gender on challenges and victimization experiences. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 7(4), 9-22.
- Charmaz, K. C. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chaney, M. P. (2008). Muscle dysmorphia, self-esteem, and loneliness among gay and bisexual men. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 7(2), 157-172.
- Chasi, C. (2017). What we should have learnt from Mandela. *African Studies* 76 :(4), 491-507.
- Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chimirri, N. A. (2015). Designing psychological co-research of emancipatory-technical relevance across age thresholds. *Outlines – Critical Practice Studies*, 16(2):26-51.
- Chio, V. C. M., & Fandt, P. M. (2007). Photovoice in the diversity classroom: Engagement, voice, and the “eye/I” of the camera. *Journal of Management Education*, 31, 484-504.

- Chopik, W. J., Edelstein, R. S., & Fraley, R. C. (2013). From the cradle to the grave: Adult attachment across the lifespan. *Journal of Personality*, 81, 171–183.
- Cislaghi, B. (2013). “Human Rights Education, Social Change and Human Development: The Case of a Fulbe West African Rural Community.” PhD, POLIS, University of Leeds.
- Clarke, P. (2012). *Education for Sustainability: Becoming Naturally Smart*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Sage.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). Abington, OX: Routledge.
- Coleyshaw, L. (2010). The power of paradigms: A discussion of the absence of bullying research in the context of the university student experience. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education* 15(4), 377–386.
- Conde, A., Figueiredo, B., & Bifulco, A. (2011). Attachment style and psychological adjustment in couples. *Attachment & Human Development*, 13(3), 271-291.
- Cornu, C. (2016). Preventing, addressing homophobic, and transphobic bullying in education: A human rights–based approach using the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 13(1–2), 6-17.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*, 3rd edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cross, D. I. (2009). Alignment, Cohesion, and Change: Examining Mathematics Teachers’ Belief Structures and Their Influence on Instructional Practices, *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 12, 325–346.
- Crothers, L. (2007). Bullying of sexually diverse children and adolescents. *NASP Communique*, 35, 28-30.
- D’Augelli, A. R., Grossman, A. H., & Starks, M. T. (2006). Childhood gender atypicality, victimization, and PTSD among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 1462–1482.
- D’Augelli, A. R., Hershberger, S. L., & Pilkington, N. W. (1998). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth and their families: Disclosure of sexual orientation and its consequences. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 68,361–371.

- Danielle-Alyssa, B. (2014). Concluding reflections: The 'fierce urgency of now'. In *Ubuntu: Curating the archive*, ed. Leonhard Praeg, and Siphokazi Magadla, 193–212. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Darder, A. (2015). Decolonizing Interpretive Research: A critical bicultural methodology for social change. *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 14(2):63-77.
- Dare, S. A. (2015). *Investigating the experiences of gay high school learners and the impacts thereof on their academic performance. (Unpublished Dissertation for Master's Degree)*. University of KwaZulu-Natal, Edgewood Campus: Durban South Africa.
- Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. London: Bantam Press.
- De Vos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouché, C. B., & Strydom, C. L. S. (2011). *Research at grass roots: For the social sciences and human service professions*. 4th edition. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Dehart, T., Pelham, B., Fiedorowicz, L., Carvallo, M., & Gabriel, S. (2011). Including others in the implicit self: Implicit evaluation of significant others. *Self & Identity*, 10 (1), 127-135.
- Demir, M. (2010). Close relationships and happiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 11(3), 293-313.
- Demir, M., Özen, A., Doğan, A., Bilyk, N., & Tyrell, F. (2011). I matter to my friend, therefore I am happy: Friendship, mattering, and happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12, 983–1005.
- Dennett, D. C. (2007). *Breaking the Spell*. London: Penguin Books.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln Y. S. (Eds.). (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Department of Basic Education. (2013). *Education for all; 2013 Country progress report*. Pretoria: Department of Basic Education.
- Department of Education. (DoE). (2002). National Curriculum Statement Grades 10–12 (General) Life Sciences (Pretoria, Department of Education).
- Department of Education. (DoE). (2008). *National Curriculum Statement Grades 10–12 (General) Life Sciences* (Pretoria, Department of Education).
- Department of Education. (2001). *Education White Paper 6. Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System*. Pretoria: Government Printers.

- Department of Education. (2008). *National Strategy on Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Diener, E., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2008). *Happiness: Unlocking the mysteries of psychological wealth*. Malden, MA: Wiley/Blackwell.
- Dieronitou, I. (2014). The ontological and epistemological foundations of qualitative and quantitative approaches to research with particular reference to content and discourse analysis of textbooks. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2(10):1-17.
- Dirkx, J. M. (2006). Engaging emotions in adult learning: A Jungian perspective on emotion and transformative learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 26(2), 15-26.
- Drucilla, C., & Muvangua, N. (Eds.). (2011). *uBuntu and the law: African ideals and post-apartheid jurisprudence*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Dunne, C. (2011). The place of the literature review in grounded theory research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14(2), 111-124.
- Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing Black: Race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 876-893.
- Elechi, O. O., Morris, S.V.C., & Schauer, E. J. (2009). Restoring Justice (Ubuntu): An African Perspective. *Journal of Criminal Justice*: 37, (4), pp. 317-327.
- Elechi, O. O., Morris, S.V.C., & Schauer, E. J. (2010). Restoring Justice (Ubuntu): An African Perspective. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 20(1):73-85.
- Epstein, R. (2009). *Who's your daddy and other writings on queer parenting*. Toronto, ON: Sumach Press.
- Erath, S. A., & Tu, K. M. (2014). Peer stress in preadolescence: Linking physiological and coping responses with social competence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24, 757-771.
- Espelage, D. L. Aragon, S. R., Birkett, M., & Koenig, B. W. (2008). Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have? *School Psychology Review*, 37(2), 202-217.
- Fafchamps, M., & Shilpi, F. (2008). *Isolation and subjective welfare: Evidence from South Asia. Policy Research*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Routledge.
- Faull, A. (2008). Policing Diversity: An analysis of a diversity intervention and its effects on a South African Police Service station. (iNCUDISA, Ed.) Amsterdam: Rozenberg.
- Feeney, B. C., & Thrush, R. L. (2010). Relationship influences on exploration in adulthood: The characteristics and function of a secure base. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98 (1), 57–76.
- Fernandes, S. (2010). *Who can stop the drums? Urban social movements in Chavez's Venezuela*, London: Duke University Press.
- Fine, M., & Spencer, R. (2009). *Social isolation: Development of an assessment tool for HACC services*. Centre for Research on Social Inclusion, New South Wales Department of Disability, Ageing and Home Care.
- Fisher, K. Poirier, J., & Blau, G. (2012). *Improving emotional and behavioural outcomes for LGBT youth: A guide for professional*. Maryland, USA: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Fitzsimons, G. M., & Fishbach, A. (2010). Shifting closeness: Interpersonal effects of personal goal progress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 535-549.
- Francis, D. (2013). 'You know the homophobic stuff is not in me, like us, it's out there'. Using Participatory Theatre to challenge heterosexism and heteronormativity in a South African school. *South African Journal of Education* 33(4): 1–14.
- Francis, G. (2012). Too good to be true: Publication bias in two prominent studies from experimental psychology. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 19, 151-156.
- Franzese, A. (2007). 'To Thine Own Self Be True? An Exploration of Authenticity.' Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, NC.
- Futhwa, F. (2011). *Setho: Afrikan thought and belief system*. Alberton: Nalane ka Fexekile Futhwa.
- Gabb, J. (2011). Family lives and relational living: taking account of otherness *Sociological Research Online*, 16(4).
- Gaine, G. S., & La Guardia, J. G. (2009). The unique contributions of motivations to maintain a relationship and motivations toward relational activities to relationship well-being. *Motivation & Emotion*, 33, 184-202.

- Gainor, K. (2000). Including transgender issues in lesbian, gay and bisexual psychology: Implications for clinical practice and training. In B. Greene, & G. Croom (Eds.), *Psychological Perspectives on Lesbian and Gay Issues, Volume 5: Education, research, and practice in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered psychology: A resource manual*. (pp. 131-161). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Gay Lesbian Straight Education Network. (GLSEN) (2012). *The 2011 national school climate survey: Executive summary*.
- Gelo, O., Braakmann, D., & Benetka, G. (2008). Quantitative and qualitative research: Beyond the debate. *Integrative Psychological & Behavioral Science*, 42, 266-290.
- Gentles, S. J., Charles, C., Ploeg, J., & McKibbin, K. (2015). Sampling in Qualitative Research: Insights from an Overview of the Methods Literature. *The Qualitative Report*, 20 (11), 1772-1789.
- Glassman, M., Erdem, G., & Bartholomew, M. (2013). Action research and its history as an adult education movement for social change. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 63, 272-288.
- Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Goldberg, A. E. (2010). *Lesbian and gay parents and their children: Research on the family life cycle*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gonsalvez, L. (2013). Using Critical Discourse Analysis to address the gaps, exclusions and oversights in active citizenship education. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*, Paper 4945.
- Goodnough, K. (2011). Examining the long-term impact of collaborative action research on teacher identity and practice: the perceptions of K–12 teachers, *Educational Action Research*, 19:1, 73-86.
- Göransson, K., & Nilholm, C. (2014). Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings – a critical analysis of research on inclusive education, *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(3), 265-280.
- Graber, J. A., & Sontag, L. M. (2008). (2nd Ed). *Internalizing problems during adolescence*. In: Lerner RM, Steinberg L, editors. *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. New York: Wiley. In press.

- Graham, M. J. (1999). The African-centred worldview: Toward a paradigm of social work. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30(1), 103-122.
- Graham, R., Bradford, J., de Vries, B., & Garofalo, R. (2011). *The health of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people: Building a foundation for better understanding*. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine.
- Grange L.L. (2011). The Philosophy of Ubuntu and Education in South Africa. In: Veugelers W. (Eds) *Education and Humanism. Moral Development and Citizenship Education*. Sense Publishers.
- Greenbank, P. (2003). The role of values in educational research: The case for reflexivity. *British educational research journal*, 29(6), 791-801.
- Greener, I. (2011). *Designing Social Research – A Guide For The Bewildered*. London: Sage.
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 15 (2), 273-289.
- Grusec, J. E. (1992). Social learning theory and developmental psychology: The legacies of Robert Sears and Albert Bandura. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(5), 776-786.
- Guarino, N., Oberle, D., & Staab, S. (2009). What Is an Ontology? In: Staab S., Studer R. (Eds) *Handbook on Ontologies*. International Handbooks on Information Systems. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Guasp, A. (2011). *Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People in Later Life*. London: Stonewal.
- Guillemin, M., & Heggen, K. (2009). Rapport and respect: negotiating ethical relations between researcher and participant. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 12(3), 291-299.
- Gunawan, J. (2015). Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research. *Belitung Nursing Journal*. 2015 December; 1(1):10-11.
- Gyekye, K. (1997). *Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience*. New York. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Haldeman, D. (2012). Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Am Psychology*, 67(1), 10- 42.
- Hall, S., Evans, J., & Nixon, S. (2013). *Representation*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage.

- Hammett, D., & Hoogendoorn, G. (2012). 'Reflections on the politics and practices of knowledge production beyond the Anglo-American core: An introductory note', *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 33(3), 283–286.
- Harrison, M. A., & Shorthall, J. C. (2011). Women and Men in Love: Who Really Feels It and Says It First? *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(6), 727- 736.
- Hawley, L. C., & Cacioppo, J.T. (2010). Loneliness matters: A theoretical and empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Ann. Behave. Med.*, 40, 218–227.
- Helliker, K. (2012). Civil society and state-centred struggles. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 30(1): 35–47.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative Research Methods*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Higgs, P. (2016). The African Renaissance and the decolonisation of the curriculum. *Africanising the curriculum: Indigenous perspectives and theories*, African Sun Media, Pretoria.
- Hill, J. S., Pace, T. M., & Robbins, R. R. (2010). Decolonizing personality assessment and honoring indigenous voices: A critical examination of the MMPI-2. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16, 16-25.
- Hlalele, D. (2012). Social justice and rural education in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 30(1): 111-118
- Hofmann, S. G., Sawyer, A. T., Witt, A. A., & Oh, D. (2010). The effect of mindfulness-based therapy on anxiety and depression: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 78(2), 169.
- Hollick, M. (2006). *The Science of Oneness*. O Books: Winchester.
- Holliday, A. H. (2007). *Doing and writing qualitative research* (2nd Ed.) London: Sage.
- Holt, M. (2011). Gay men and ambivalence about “gay community”: from gay committee attachment to personal communities. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 13, 857–888.
- Hornby, A. S. (2013). *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*. International Students’ edition. New 9th edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hornby, A. S., In Turnbull, J., In Lea, D., In Parkinson, D., In Phillips, P., & In Ashby, M. (2010). *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of current English*.
- Hossein, N. S. (2010). *Islam in the Modern World*. Los Angeles: HarperCollins.

- Hountondji, P. (2002). *The struggle for Meaning: Reflections on Philosophy, Culture and Democracy in Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Centre for International Studies.
- Huckin, T., Andrus, J. & Clary-Lemon, J. (2012). *Critical Discourse Analysis, rhetoric, and composition, CCC, 64(1):1-29*.
- Hughes, T., Szalacha, L. A., & McNair, R. (2010). Substance abuse and mental health disparities: Comparisons across sexual identity groups in a national sample of young Australian women. *Social Science & Medicine, 71*, 824–831.
- Hughes, A., Harold, R., & Boyer, J. (2011). Awareness of LGBT aging issues among aging service network providers. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 54*, 659–677.
- Hunter, L., Emerald, E., & Martin, G. (2013). *Participatory activist research in the globalised world: Social change through the cultural professions*. New York, USA: Springer.
- Idang, G. E. (2015). African Culture and Values. Phronimon Volume 16 | Number 2 | pp. 97–111. Unisa Press: South Africa.
- Illeris, K. (2014). Transformative learning and identity. *Journal of Transformative Education, 12(2)*, 148-163.
- Imenda, S. (2014). Is there a conceptual difference between theoretical and conceptual frameworks? *Journal of Social Science, 38(2):185-195*.
- Jackson, T. (2013). 'Reconstructing the indigenous in African management research', *Management International Review 53(1)*, 13–38.
- Jacob, S. (2013). Creating safe and welcoming schools for LGBT students: Ethical and legal issues. *Journal of School Violence, 12:1, 98-115*, DOI: 10.1080/15388220.2012.724356
- Jesson, J. (2011). *Doing Your Literature Review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. London: SAGE.
- Johnson, B. (2014). The Need to Prepare Future Teachers to Understand and Combat Homophobia in Schools. *South African Journal of Higher Education 28, 4: 1249– 1268*.
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (1999). Ubuntu in South Africa: A sociolinguistic perspective to a pan-African concept. *Critical arts, 13(2)*, 24-41.
- Kanyanta-manga II., Senior Chief Mwamba. (2011). *Shalapo mune Cani Candala*. Retrieved from <http://www.umubemba.org/shalapo.html>

- Kapeleris, A. R., & Paivio, S. C. (2011). Identity and emotional competence as mediators of the relation between childhood psychological maltreatment and adult love relationships. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 20(6), 617- 635.
- Kapwepwe, S. M. (1970). *Afrika kuti twabelela uluse lelo tekuti tulabe* [Africa should forgive but never forget]. Lusaka: National Education Company of Zambia.
- Kapwepwe, S. M. (2005). *Shalapo Canicandala* [Bye-bye Canicandala]. Lusaka: Zambia Educational Publishing. (Original work published 1967).
- Karsten, L. & Illa, H. (2005), 'Ubuntu as a Key African Management Concept: Contextual Background and Practical Insights for Knowledge Application', *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 20 (7), 607-620.
- Kasonde, E. (2003). *Imilimo ya bena-kale* [Old crafts] (4th Ed.). Lusaka: Zambia Educational Publishing.
- Kawulich, B.B. (2011). Gatekeeping: An ongoing adventure in research. *Field Methods Journal*, 23(1), 57-76.
- Kearney, J., Wood, L., & Zuber-Skerrit, O. (2013). University–community partnerships through Participatory Action Learning and Action Research (PALAR). Gateways: *International Journal of Community Research and Engagement* (in press).
- Keener, E., Strough, J., & Didonato, L. (2012). Gender differences and similarities in strategies for managing conflict with friends and romantic partners. *Sex Roles*, 67(1-2), 83-97.
- Kemmis, S., Mctaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The Action Research Planner: Doing Critical Participatory Action Research*. Singapore: Springer.
- Kim, S.J., & Merriam, S. B. (2011). Methodological Challenges in Studying Transformative Learning. Adult Education Research Conference. Kansas State University Libraries New Prairie Press, 2011:364-370.
- King, D. (2015). 'The possibilities and perils of critical performativity: Learning from four case studies', *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 31(2), 255–265.
- Kingsley, O. (2010). African traditional education: A viable alternative for peace building process in modern Africa. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences*, 2, 136-159.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (2010). *The Facebook effect: The inside story of the company that is connecting the world*, New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

- Kitchel, T. & Ball, A. L. (2014). Quantitative Theoretical and Conceptual Framework Use in Agricultural Education Research. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 55(1):186-199.
- Korosteleva, E. (2012). Questioning democracy promotion: *Belarus' response to the 'Colour Revolutions'*. *Democratization*, 19(1): 37–59.
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Diaz, E. M., & Bartkiewicz, M. J. (2010). *The 2009 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Palmer, N. A., & Boesen, M. J. (2014). *The 2013 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN.
- Kotch, N. (2014). SA defends homosexual rights for Africa. Sunday times. Retrieved June 28, 2014, from [http:// www.bdlive.co.za](http://www.bdlive.co.za).
- Krista J. G., & Mark S. H. (2010). Respondent-driven sampling: An assessment of current methodology. *Sociological Methodology*, 40:285–327.
- Krista J. G. (2008). *Inference from Partially-Observed Network Data*. PhD in Statistics, University of Washington.
- Kumar, R. (2014). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. 4th edition. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Kumar, R., (2012). *Research Methodology. A Step-By-Step Guide for Beginners*. Sage.
- Lamanna, M. A., & Reidmann, A. (2009). *Marriages & families: Making choices in a diverse society (10th Ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Langbein, L., & Yost, M. A. (2009). Same-sex marriage and negative externalities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90, 292–308.
- Le Roux, E. (2015). *A social history of the university presses in apartheid South Africa: Between complicity and resistance*, Brill, Leiden.
- Le, B., Dove, N. L., Agnew, C. R., Korn, M. S., & Mutso, A. A. (2010). Predicting non-marital romantic relationship dissolution: A meta-analytic synthesis. *Personal Relationships*, 17, 90, 377–390.
- Lee, J. (2012). The effects of the teacher-student relationship and academic press on student engagement and academic performance. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 53, 330-340.

- Lemay, E. P., & Clark, M. S. (2008). How the head liberates the heart: Projection of communal responsiveness guides relationship promotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 647-671.
- Letseka, M. (2000). *African Philosophy and Educational Discourses*. In *African Voices in Education*. Higgs, P. Vakalisa, Z. Mda, T. & Assie Lumumba, N. (Ed.). Lansdowne: Juta.
- Letseka, M. (2012). In defense of ubuntu. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *31*, 47-60.
- Lewis, D. (2013). Civil Society and the Authoritarian State: Cooperation, Contestation and Discourse. *Journal of Civil Society* *9*: (3), 325-340.
- Lewis, G. (2014). *Justice otherwise: Thoughts on Ubuntu*. In *Ubuntu: Curating the archive*, ed. Leonhard Praeg, and Siphokazi Magadla, 10–26. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Li, W., Dobinson, C., & Ross, L. E. (2012). *Unique issues bisexual people face in intimate relationships: A descriptive exploration of lived experience*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Litvin, D. R. (2006). *Diversity: Making space for a better case*. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J. K. Pringle, *Handbook of workforce diversity*. London: Sage.
- Llera, D. J., & Katsirebas, E. (2010). Remapping the journey of lesbian youth through strength and “truth telling”. *Journal of lesbian studies*, *14*(1), 26-35.
- Locke, L. F., Silverman, S. J., & Spriduso, W. W. (2010). *Reading and understanding research*, (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Lozier, A., & Beckman, O.T. (2012). Safe school environments for lgbtq youth: are nebraska schools providing a safe environment? *International Journal of Psychology: A Biopsychosocial Approach*, *11*. 13-28.
- Lyons, H. Z., Bike, D. H., Johnson, A., & Bethea, A. (2012). Culturally competent qualitative research with people of African descent. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *38*, 153-171.
- Lyons, H. Z., Bike, D., Ojeda, L., Rosales Meza, R., Johnson, A., & Flores, L. Y. (2013). Qualitative research as social justice practice with culturally diverse populations. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology*.
- Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). *The how of happiness: A scientific approach to getting the life you want*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Maathai, W. (2009). *The Challenge for Africa*. London: Arrow Books.

- MacDonald, D.A. (2010). Ubuntu bashing: The marketisation of 'African values' in South Metz. *Review of African Political Economy* 37(124): 139–152.
- Madey, S. F., & Rodgers, L. (2009). The effect of attachment and Sternberg's triangular theory of love on relationship satisfaction. *Individual Differences Research*, 7, 76- 84.
- Malunga, C. (2009). *Understanding organizational leadership through Ubuntu*. Adonis & Abbey: London.
- Mannarini, T, Fedi, A & Trippetti, S (2010). 'Public involvement: how to encourage citizen participation', *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, vol. 20, pp. 262–274.
- Mark, R. & Fink, A. (2005). *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research, (4th Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Masolo, D. A. (2010). *Self and community in a changing world*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Mavhandu-Mudzusi, A. H. (2014). Experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex students regarding sports participation in a South African rural-based university. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance* 20 (22): 710–720.
- Mavhandu-Mudzusi, A. H. & Netshandama, V. O. (2013). The attitudes of students towards the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex community: A case of a South African rural-based university. *The African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance Supplement* 1(1): 56–66.
- Mazama, A. (2001). The Afrocentric paradigm: Contours and definitions. *Journal of Black Studies*, 31(4), 387-405.
- Mbiti, J. (1970). *African religions and philosophy*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- McArthur. J. (2012). Virtuous mess and wicked clarity: Struggle in higher education research. *Higher Education Research and Development* 31(3): 419–430.
- McCandless, E. (2011). *Polarisation and transformation in Zimbabwe*, Lanham: Lexington Books.
- McCarron, M. C. E. (2013). Negotiating responsibility for navigating ethical issues in qualitative research: A review of Miller, Birch, Mauthner, and Jessop's (2012).

- Ethics in Qualitative Research, Second Edition. The Qualitative Report*, 18(Rev. 29), 1-4.
- McCormack, M. (2012). 'The positive experiences of openly gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered students in a Christian sixth form college.' *Sociological research online*, 17 (3). p. 5.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education: Evidence-Based Inquiry*. New York. Pearson Education, Inc.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- McNiff, J. & Whitehead, J. (2006). *All you need to know about action research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McNulty, J. K. (2013). Personality and relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Close Relationships*. (pp. 535–552). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Meland, E., J. Rydning, S., Lobben, H., Breidablik, J. & Ekeland, T. J. (2010). Emotional, self-conceptual and relational characteristics of bullies and the bullied. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health* 38, no. 8: 359–67.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Metz, T & Gaie, J. B. R. (2010). The African ethic of Ubuntu/Botho: Implications for research on morality. *Journal of Moral Education*, 39, 273-290.
- Metz, T. (2007). Towards an African moral theory. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 15, 321-341.
- Metz, T. (2010a). 'Human dignity, capital punishment, and an African moral theory: toward a new philosophy of human rights', *Journal of Human Rights* 9(1), 81–99.
- Metz, T. (2010b). 'Recent work in African ethics', *Journal of Moral Education* 39(3), 381–391.
- Metz, T. (2011). 'Ubuntu as a moral theory and human rights in South Africa', *African Human Rights Law Journal* 11(2), 532–559.
- Metz, T. (2011). *An African theory of dignity and a relational conception of poverty*. In J. W. De Cruchy (Ed.), *the humanist imperative in South Africa* (pp. 233-242). Stellenbosch: Sun Press.

- Metz, T. (2012). 'Developing African political philosophy: moral-theoretic strategies', *Philosophia Africana* 14(1), 61–83.
- Metz, T. (2015). Ubuntu and the value of self-expression in the mass media. *Communication* 41 (3), 388-403.
- Meyer, M. D. (2009). 'I'm just trying to find my way like most kids': Bisexuality, adolescence and the drama of One Tree Hill. *Sexuality & Culture*, 13, 237–251.
- Miller, S.J. (2013). *Introduction to Ontology Concepts and Terminology. Tutorials. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*. Topalis, P. (n.d) Ontology Prommer. NIAD Bioinformatics Resource Centre for Vertebrate Vectors of Human Pathogens.
- Miller, T., Birch, M., Mauthner, M., & Jessop, J. (Eds.). (2012). *Ethics in qualitative research* (2nd Ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Mkhize, N., Mukuka, R., & Wambugu, N. (2008). *Xenophobic negrophobia?* Retrieved from <http://mukukawesu.blogspot.com/2008/06/xenophobic-negrophobia>. html
- Molden, D. C, Lee, A. Y., & Higgins, E. T. (2008). Motivations for promotion and prevention. In J. Y. Shah & W. L. Gardner (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation science* (pp. 169-187). New York: Guilford Press.
- Molden, D. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2010). Motivations for promotion and prevention and the role of trust and commitment in interpersonal forgiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 255-268.
- Moore, M. (2011). *Invisible families: Gay identities, relationships, and motherhood among Black women*. University of California Press.
- More, M. P. (2004). Philosophy in south Africa Under and After Apartheid. In A Companion to African Philosophy, Wiredu, K. (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- More, M. P. Philosophy in South Africa Under and After Apartheid. In A Companion to African Philosophy. Wiredu, K. (Ed. (2004). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Morehouse, R. (2011). *Beginning Interpretive Inquiry: A Step-by-Step Approach to Research and Evaluation*. USA: Routledge.
- Morry, M. M., Reich, T., & Kito, M. (2010). How do I see you relative to myself? Relationship quality as a predictor of self-and partner-enhancement within cross-sex friendships, dating relationships, and marriages. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 150, 369- 392.

- Msibi, T. (2012). "I'm used to it now: Experiences of homophobia among queer youth in South African township schools. *Gender and Education*. 24(5), pp. 515-534.
- Mukuka, R. (2011). *Ifitabo fya ciBemba/Bemba literature*. Retrieved from <http://www.umubemba.org/literature.html>.
- Mukuka, R. (2012, July). *Afrocentric psychology: Conceptual perspectives from Bemba authors*. Paper presented at the 30th International Congress of Psychology, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Müller, A. (2013). Teaching lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender health in a South African health sciences faculty: *Addressing the gap*. *BMC Medical Education* 13(174): 1–7.
- Munson, M., & Stelboum, J. (2013). *The lesbian polyamory reader: Open relationships, non-monogamy, and casual sex*. City: Routledge.
- Murove, M. F. (2008) 'On African Ethics and the Appropriation of Western Capitalism: Cultural and Moral Constraints to the Evolution of Capitalism in Post-Colonial Africa', in R. Nicolson (ed.), *Persons in Community: African Ethics in a Global Culture* (University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, Scottsville, South Africa), pp. 85-110.
- Murphy, E., & Dingwall, R. (2007). Informed consent, anticipatory regulation and ethnographic practice. *Social Science and Medicine*, 65(11), 2223–2234.
- Myers, D. (2010). *Social psychology*. London: McGraw-hill Companies.
- Myers, M. D. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Business & Management* Sage. London.
- Nakamoto, J., & Schwartz, D. (2010). Is peer victimization associated with academic achievement? A meta-analytic review. *Social Development*, 19, 221–242.
- Napoli, P. M. (2015). Social media and the public interest: Governance of news platforms in the realm of individual and algorithmic gatekeepers. *Telecommunications Policy* 39: (9), 751-760.
- Nduna, M. & P. Kiguwa. (2017). 'Why do we have sex?' Reflections from a Stepping Stones participatory action research with youth LGBTI in Johannesburg. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 31(4): 167–183.
- Needham, B. L., & Austin, E. L. (2010). Sexual orientation, parental support, and health during the transition to young adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39, 1189–1198.
- Neff, K. D. (2011). *Self-compassion. Stop beating yourself up and leave insecurity behind*. New York: William Morrow.

- Neto, F., & Pinto, M. C. (2015). Satisfaction with love life across the adult life span. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 10, 289-304.
- Netshandama, V. O., A. H. Mavhandu-Mudzusi & P. Matshidze. (2017). Deconstructing matula (taboo): A multi-stakeholder narrative about LGBTI. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 31(4): 307–324.
- Neuman, W.L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Pearson New International Edition. 7th edition. England, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Newton, T. (2011). *Embracing Otherness, embracing myself. Ted Ideas Worth Spreading*: Ted Global.
- Nilsen, P. (2015). *Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. Implementation Science*. Division of Community Medicine, Department of Medical and Health Sciences, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden.
- Njoh, A. J. (2008). Colonial philosophies, urban space, and racial segregation in British and French colonial Africa. *Journal of Black Studies*, 38(4), 579-599.
- Nkomo, S., & Stewart, M. (2006). *Diverse identities in organisations*. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nord, *Handbook of Organization Studies* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nobles, W. (2012, July). *Shattered consciousness, fractured identity: Black psychology and the restoration of the African psyche*. Paper presented at the 30th International Congress of Psychology, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Nyanzi, S. (2013). *Dismantling reified African Culture through localised homosexuality's in Uganda*. Makerere Institute of Social Research, Uganda: Kampala.
- O'Higgins-Norman, J. (2009). *Straight talking: explorations on homosexuality and homophobia in secondary schools in Ireland*. School of Education studies, Dublin City University. Vol. 9, No. 4, November 2009, 381–393.
- Oliver, K. (2010). Motherhood, sexuality, and pregnant embodiment: *Twenty-five years of gestation*. *Hypatia*, 25, 760–777.
- Oliver, P. (2010). *Understanding The Research Process*. London: Sage.
- Orth, U., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Robins, R. W. (2010). Self-esteem development from young adulthood to old age: A cohort-sequential longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 645– 658.

- Overall, N. C., Fletcher, G. J., & Simpson, J. A. (2010). Helping each other grow: Romantic partner support, self-improvement, and relationship quality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1496–1513.
- Oztas, F. (2010). Self-esteem, occupational self-esteem, and epistemological beliefs of Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(3), 321-326.
- Palys, T & Atchison, C. (2008). *Research decision: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives*. Toronto, Canada: Thomson Nelson.
- Parks, C. A., Hughes, T. L., & Werkmeister-Rozas, L. (2009). Defining sexual identity and sexual orientation in research with lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. In W. Meezan & J. L. Martin (Eds.), *Handbook of research with lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender populations* (pp. 71–99). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Parliament the Republic of South Africa: SAHRC (2007). *Report of the ad hoc Committee on the Review of Chapter 9 and Associated Institutions*. Parliament of the Republic of South Africa.
- Patrick, C. (2009). *Africa: The politics of suffering and smiling*. London: Zed Books.
- Patrick, H., Knee, C. R., Canevello, A., & Lonsbary, C (2007). The role of need fulfillment in relationship functioning and well-being: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92,434-456.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4th Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Payne, C. M. (2007). *I've got the light of freedom: The organizing tradition and the Mississippi freedom struggle*. University of California Press.
- Pendragon, D. K. (2010). Coping behaviors among sexual minority female youth. *Journal of lesbian studies*, 14(1), 5-15.
- Pile, S. (2010). Emotions and affect in recent human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35: 5–20.
- Pillay, S.R. (2016). 'Silence is violence :(critical) psychology in an era of Rhodes must fall and fees must fall', *South African Journal of Psychology* 46(2), 155–159.
- Pinet, F., Roussey, C., Brun, T. & Vigier, F. (2009). *The use of UML as a tool for the formalization of standards and the design of ontologies in agriculture*. In: *Advances in Modeling Agricultural Systems*, 18 p. Springer, New York.

- Piper-Mandy, E., & Rowe, T. D. (2010). Educating African-centred psychologists: Towards a comprehensive paradigm. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 3(8), 5-23.
- Polat, F. (2011). Inclusion in education: A step towards social justice. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(1): 50-58.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (2010). Qualitative research in multicultural psychology: Philosophical underpinnings, popular approaches, and ethical considerations. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16, 581-589.
- Praeg, L., & Magadla, S. (eds.) (2014). *Ubuntu: Curating the archive*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Praeg, L. (2014). *A report on Ubuntu*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Punch, F. K. (2009). *Introduction to research methods in education*. London: Sage.
- Pyykkönen, M. (2012). UNESCO and cultural diversity: democratisation, commodification or governmentalisation of culture? *International journal of cultural policy*, 18(5), 545-562.
- Rafferty, F. (2009). Boys should be boys-is it that simple? *Education Journal*, 116, 32-33.
- Rahimi, F. & Riasati, M. J. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis: Scrutinizing Ideologically Driven Discourses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(16):107-112.
- Rakotsoane, F. C. L., & van Niekerk, A. A. (2017). Human life invaluable: An emerging African bioethical principle. *South African Journal of Philosophy* 36: (2), 252-262.
- Rania, N., Migliorini, L., Rebor, S & Cardinali, P. (2015). Photovoice and Interpretation of Pictures in a Group Discussion: A Community Psychology Approach, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12 (4), 382-396.
- Ratsoy, G. (2013). Interculturalism and Theatrefront: Shifting Meanings in Canadian Collective Creation. *Theatre Research in Canada/Recherches théâtrales au Canada*, 34(1): 99-114.
- Reavey, P. (ed.) (2012). *Review of visual methods in psychology: using and interpreting images in qualitative research*, Routledge, New York.

- Regan, P. C. (2009). Love, Companionate and Passionate. In H. T. Reis & S. Sprecher (Eds). *Encyclopedia of Human Relationships (Vol. 2, pp. 1007–1011)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Renn, K. (2010). *LGBTI and queer research in higher education: The state and status of the field. Educational Researcher, 39 (2)*.
- Republic of South Africa. (2011). *White Paper on South Africa's Foreign Policy, Building a Better World: The Diplomacy of Ubuntu, Final Draft*. Pretoria: Government Printers: 1-36.
- Reygan, F. (2012). LGBTI affirming educational practice: Developing anti-homophobic bullying materials. *Journal of Educational Studies 12(1): 229–239*.
- Reygan, F. & D. Francis. (2015). Emotions and pedagogies of discomfort: Teachers' responses to sexual and gender diversity in the Free State, South Africa. *Education as Change 19(1): 101–119*.
- Riggle, E. D., Whitman, J. S., Olson, A., Rostosky, S. S., & Strong, S. (2008). The positive aspects of being a lesbian or gay man. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39(2)*, 210.
- Ringrose, J., & Renold, E. (2010). Normative cruelties and gender deviants: The performative effects of bully discourses for girl and boys in school. *British Educational Research Journal 36, no. 4: 573–79*.
- Robinson, K. (2011). *Out of our minds: Learning to be creative*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Robinson, O. C. (2014). Sampling in Interview-Based Qualitative Research: A Theoretical and Practical Guide, *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 11:1*, 25-41
- Romero-Canyas, R., Downey, G., Berenson, K., Ayduk, O., & Kang, N. J. (2010). Rejection sensitivity and the rejection-hostility link in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality, 78(1)*, 119-148.
- Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., & Hunter, J. (2009). Disclosure of sexual orientation and subsequent substance use and abuse among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths: Critical role of disclosure reactions. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 23 (1)*, 175–184.
- Ross, L. E., Dobinson, C., & Eady, A. (2010). Perceived determinants of mental health for bisexual people: A qualitative examination. *American Journal of Public Health, 100*, 496–502.

- Ross, L. E., Siegel, A., Dobinson, C., Epstein, R., & Steele, L. S. (2012). 'I don't want to turn totally invisible': Mental health, stressors and supports among bisexual women during the perinatal period. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 8(2), 137–154.
- Roy, B. (2010). On the Emerging Issues of Cultural, Linguistic and Biological Diversity Conservation: Examples from India's North East. *Journal of Indian Anthropology. Social*. 45: 179-92.
- Ruggunan, S. & Spiller, D. (2014). 'Critical pedagogy for teaching HRM in the context of social change', *African Journal of Business Ethics* 8(1), 29-43.
- Rule, P., & John, V. (2011). *Your guide to case study research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Rusnak, S. A. M. (2014). Reconciling Three Countries' Current Laws with Human Rights in the Face of International Law. *Annual Survey of International & Comparative Law: Vol. 20: Iss. 1*, Article 10.
- Russell, S. T., Serif, H. & Truong, N. L. (2001). School outcomes of sexual minority youth in the United States: evidence from a national study. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 111–127.
- Ryan, C. (2009a). *Helping families support their lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) children*. Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development.
- Ryan, C. (2009b). *Supportive families, healthy children: Helping families with lesbian, gay, bisexual & transgender children*. San Francisco: Family Acceptance Project, San Francisco State University.
- Ryan, C., & Diaz, R. (2009). *FA Prisk Assessment Tool*. San Francisco: Family Acceptance Project, San Francisco State University.
- Ryan, C., Huebner, D., Diaz, R. M., & Sanchez, J. (2009). Family rejection as a predictor of negative health outcomes in white and Latino lesbian, gay and bisexual young adults. *Pediatrics*, 123(1), 346–352.
- Santrock, J. W. (2008). *Educational psychology* (3rd Ed.). New York. McGraw-Hill.
- Sassler, S. (2010). Partnering Across the Life Course: Sex, Relationships, and Mate Selection. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 557–575.
- Savage, M. (2010). *Identities and Social Change in Britain since 1940: The Politics of Method*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Seelman, K. L., Walls, N. E., Hazel, C., & Wisneski, H. (2012). Student school engagement among sexual minority students: Understanding the contributors to predicting academic outcomes. *Journal of Social Service Research, 38*(1), 3-17.
- Selhub, E. (2009). *The love response*. New York, NY: Random House, Inc.
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and Violence*. New York: Norton.
- Sharp, J. (2009). *Success With Your Education Research Project*. Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Sherwood, L. (2006). *Fundamentals of physiology: A human perspective*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Shutte, A. (2001). *Ubuntu. An Ethic for a New South Africa*. Cape Town. Clusser Publication.
- Simon, V., Aikins, J., & Prinstein, M. (2008). Romantic partner selection and socialization during early adolescence. *Child Development, 79*, 1676-1692.
- Simons, P. (2012). Four categories and more. In Tahko, T. E., editor, *Contemporary Aristotelian Metaphysics*, pages 126–139. Cam.
- Silverman, D. (2013). "What Counts as Qualitative Research? Some Cautionary Comments." *Qualitative Sociology Review 9*(2):48-55.
- Skinner, E. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2007). The development of coping. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 119–144.
- Smart, C. (2007). *Personal Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Sonderling, S. (2013). 'To speak is to fight: War as structure of thought in Lyotard's postmodern condition'. *Communicare 32*(2): 1–19.
- Stafford, V. & Lesham, S. (2008). *Stepping Stones to Achieving Your Doctorate*. Maidenhead: Open UP.
- Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*: The Guilford Press.
- Sternberg, R. J, & Weis, K, (eds.) (2006). *The New Psychology of Love*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stewart, T. (2010). *Defensive masquerading for inclusion and survival among gifted Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBTI) students*. USA: Routledge.
- Stokes, J. (2013). *How to do Media and Cultural Studies. 2nd edition*. London: Sage.
- Svinicki, M. D. (2010). A guidebook on conceptual frameworks for research in Engineering Education. *Rigorous Research in Engineering Education*.

- Swank, E. & Raiz, L. (2010). Attitudes towards gays and lesbians among undergraduate social work students. *Affilia* 25, 19–29.
- Swarr, A. L. (2012). Paradoxes of butchness: Lesbian masculinities and sexual violence in contemporary South Africa. *Signs*, 37, 961–986.
- Swearer, S. M., Turner, R. K., Givens J.E. & Pollack W.S. (2008). “You’re so gay!” Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review*, 37 (2), 160-173.
- Tavallaei, M. & Abu Talib, M. (2010). A General Perspective on Role of Theory in Qualitative Research. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 3(11):570-577.
- Taylor, E. W. (2008). Transformative learning theory. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 119, 5-15.
- Teddlie, C. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1 (1), 77-100.
- Terrell, S. R. (2012). ‘Mixed-methods research methodologies’, *The Qualitative Report* 17(1), 254–280.
- Tetreault, P. A., Fette, R., Meidlinger, P. C., & Hope, D. (2013). Perceptions of campus climate by sexual minorities. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 60(7), 947-964.
- Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D’Alessandro, A. (2013). A review of school climate research. *Review of Educational Research*, 83, 357-385.
- The Council for Global Equality. (2012). *How to Protect LGBTI Persons around the World from Violence: Blueprint For The Next U.S Administration*. USA. Available at www.humanrightsfirst.org
- Themane, M. J. & Mamabolo, J. M. (2011). Diversity as a Curricular Challenge in South African Schools. Available at www.saqqa.org.za/docs/events/2011/rpl_conf/posters/themane.pdf. (Accessed on 15 May 2012).
- The Stonewall Global Diversity Champion for community development. (2014). Top 100 Employers 2014 project: *The Workplace Equality Index*. Stonewall.
- Thomas, S. P. (2011). What is mattering and how does it relate to mental health? *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 32, 485-500.
- Tomasello, M. (2009). *Why We Cooperate*. Boston: MIT Press.

- Toomey, R. B., & Russell, S. T. (2013). Gay-straight alliances, social justice involvement, and school victimization of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer youth implications for school wellbeing and plans to vote. *Youth & Society*, 45(4), 500–522.
- Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., & Russell, S. T. (2011). High school gay–straight alliances (GSAs) and young adult well-being: An examination of GSA presence, participation, and perceived effectiveness. *Applied Developmental Science*, 15(4), 175–185.
- Toomey, R. B., Ryan, C., Diaz, R. M., Card, N. A., & Russell, S. T. (2010). Gender-nonconforming lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth: school victimization and young adult psychosocial adjustment. *Developmental psychology*, 46(6), 1580.
- Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. New York, NY: Image Double Day.
- Udo-Akang, D. (2012). Theoretical Constructs, Concepts, and Applications. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(9):89-97.
- Ulrich, L. (2011). *Bisexual invisibility: Impacts and recommendations*. San Francisco, CA: San Francisco Human Rights Commission.
- Van Inwagen, P. (2012). *What is an ontological category?* In Novak, L., and Prokop Sousedik, D. D. N., and Svoboda, D., editors, *Metaphysics: Aristotelian, Scholastic, Analytic*, pages 11–24. Ontos Verlag.
- van Manen, M. (2014). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Vicari, S. (2014). Networks of Contention: The Shape of Online Transnationalism in Early Twenty-First Century Social Movement Coalitions. *Social Movement Studies* 13: (1), 92-109.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R.W. Rieber & A.S. Carton (Eds.), the collected works of L.S. Vygotsky, Volume 1: Problems of general psychology (pp. 39–285). New York: Plenum Press.
- Waites, M. (2016). *The new trans-national politics of LGBT human rights in the Commonwealth: what can UK NGOs learn from the global South?* In: Stella, F., Taylor, Y., Reynolds, T. and Rogers, A. (eds.) *Sexuality, Citizenship and*

- Belonging: TransNational and Intersectional Perspectives. Series: Routledge advances in critical diversities. Routledge: London, pp. 73-94.
- Walker, J., Barrett, H., Wilson, G., & Chang, Y. S. (2010). *Understanding the Needs of Adults (particularly parents). Regarding Relationship Support*. Research Brief DCSF-RBX-10-01. London: DCFS.
- Wals, A. (2010). Mirroring, Gestalt switching and transformative social learning: Stepping stones for developing sustainability competence. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education* 11, 4: 380-390.
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Luk, J. W. (2011). Peer victimization and academic adjustment among early adolescents: Moderation by gender and mediation by perceived classmate support. *Journal of School Health*, 81, 386–392.
- Wang, M.T., & Eccles, J. S. (2012). Social support matters: Longitudinal effects of social support on three dimensions of school engagement from middle to high school. *Child Development*, 83, 877– 895.
- Ward, S. (2011). *Why blend in: Accepting individual Differences within Self and Others*, Florida State University, Florida.
- Wiles, R. (2012). *What Are Qualitative Research Ethics?* London: Bloomsbury.
- Williams, T., Connolly, J., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (2005). Peer victimization, social support, and psychosocial adjustment of sexual minority adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34, 471–482.
- Wilson, D. S. (2011). *The Neighborhood Project: Using Evolution to Improve My City, One Block at a Time*. New York: Little, Brown.
- Wilson, D. S., Hayes, S. C., Biglan, A., & Embry, D. (2012). Evolving the Future: Toward a Science of Intentional Change. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* (under review).
- Wilson, E. (2009). *School-Based Research – A Guide For Education Students*. London: Sage.
- Wilson, E. & Stutchbury, K. (2009) Chapter 4 - Research Design and Ethics, in Wilson, E. (2009). *School Based Research A Guide For Education Students*. London: Sage.
- Wiredu, K. (1996). *Cultural Universals and Particulars: An African perspective*. Bloomington: Indiana. University Press.

- World Health Organization. (2012). World suicide prevention day. 2012. http://www.who.int/mediacentre/events/annual/world_suicide_prevention_day/en/Access ed.16.6.202.
- Wyandotte, A., & Huh, S. (2012). *Of toads, gardens, and possibilities: A phenomenological approach to transformative education*.
- Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P. (2011). *Interpretive Approaches to Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. Netherlands: Routledge.
- Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They're not magic. *Review of Educational Research, 81*, 267–301.
- Yin, R. K. (2012). *Application of Case Study Research*. Sage. Los Angeles.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Young, L. (2006). Participatory action research (PAR): A research strategy for nursing? *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 28*(5), 499-504.
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Lees, D., & Skinner, E. A. (2011). Children's emotions and coping with interpersonal stress as correlates of social competence. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 63*, 131–141.

APPENDIX 1: ETHICAL CERTIFICATE



15 September 2017

Mr Sunday A Dare 212558320
School of Education
Edgewood Campus

Dear Mr Dare

Protocol reference number: HSS/0920/017D

Project title: A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus.

Full Approval – Committee Reviewed Protocol

With regards to your response received 13 September 2017 to our letter of 8 August 2017, the Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee has considered the abovementioned application and the protocol has been granted FULL APPROVAL.

Any alterations to the approved research protocol i.e. Questionnaire/Interview Schedule, Informed Consent Form, Title of the Project; Location of the Study, Research Approach/Methods must be reviewed and approved through an amendment /modification prior to its implementation. Please quote the above reference number for all queries relating to this study. Please note: Research data should be securely stored in the discipline/department for a period of 5 years.

The ethical clearance certificate is only valid for a period of 3 years from the date of issue. Thereafter Recertification must be applied for on an annual basis.

Best wishes for the successful completion of your research protocol.

Yours faithfully

Dr Shenuka Singh (Chair)

/px

cc Supervisor: Prof DJ Hlalele
cc Academic Leader Research: Dr SB Khoza
cc School Administrator: Ms T Khumalo, Ms P Ncayiyana and Ms Y Mafolwane

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr Shenuka Singh (Chair)

Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building

Postal Address: Private Bag X64001, Durban 4000

Telephone: +27 (0) 31 260 3587/8350/4557 Facsimile: +27 (0) 31 260 4609 Email: simbapo@ukzn.ac.za / snymam@ukzn.ac.za / mohuna@ukzn.ac.za

Website: www.ukzn.ac.za



100 YEARS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Founding Campuses: Edgewood Howard College Medical School Pietermaritzburg Westville

APPENDIX 2: GATEKEEPER PERMISSION LETTER



1 September 2017

Sunday Adesoji Dare
School of Education
College of Humanities
Edgewood Campus
UKZN
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Dear Sunday

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH

Gatekeeper's permission is hereby granted for you to conduct research at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), towards your postgraduate degree, provided Ethical clearance has been obtained. We note the title of your research project is:

"A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus".

It is noted that you will be constituting your sample by conducting interviews, and/or focus groups with students on the Edgewood campus.

Please ensure that the following appears on your notice/questionnaire:

- Ethical clearance number;
- Research title and details of the research, the researcher and the supervisor;
- Consent form is attached to the notice/questionnaire and to be signed by user before he/she fills in questionnaire;
- gatekeepers approval by the Registrar.

You are not authorized to contact staff and students using 'Microsoft Outlook' address book. Identity numbers and email addresses of individuals are not a matter of public record and are protected according to Section 14 of the South African Constitution, as well as the Protection of Public Information Act. For the release of such information over to yourself for research purposes, the University of KwaZulu-Natal will need express consent from the relevant data subjects. Data collected must be treated with due confidentiality and anonymity.

Yours sincerely

MR SS MOKOENA
REGISTRAR

Office of the Registrar

Postal Address: Private Bag 281001, Durban, South Africa

Telephone: +27 (0) 31 280 8006/2206 Facsimile: +27 (0) 31 260 7824/2204 Email: registrar@ukzn.ac.za

Website: www.ukzn.ac.za



100 YEARS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Founding Campuses: Edgewood Howard College Medical School Pietermaritzburg Westville

APPENDIX 3

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 21-08-2017.

The registrar
University of KwaZuluNatal

Dear Sir/Ma,

RE: PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY AT THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. I hereby humbly seek for the permission to conduct my research at the university Edgewood campus as the field for this study. This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote more a conducive learning university environment.

However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to eschew out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape attitudes towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences.

My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. I will adhere strictly to the ethics involved. This study will benefit the students' majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

I will be thankful if my request to conduct this study is consider soonest.

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Adesoji Dare

APPENDIX 4: TURNITIN REPORT

11/18/2018

Turnitin

Document Viewer

Turnitin Originality Report

Processed on: 17-Nov-2018 12:23 AM CAT
 ID: 1040584661
 Word Count: 93819
 Submitted: 1

A Transformative Approach To Embracing LGBTI ... By Sunday Dare

Similarity Index
8%

Similarity by Source
 Internet Sources: 6%
 Publications: 3%
 Student Papers: 5%

[exclude quoted](#)
 [exclude bibliography](#)
 [exclude small matches](#)
 [download](#)
[refresh](#)
 [print](#)
 mode: quickview (classic) report

1% match (Internet from 31-Aug-2018)	☰
http://ulspace.ul.ac.za	
1% match (Internet from 29-Oct-2017)	☰
http://www.journals.ac.za	
<1% match (Internet from 21-Nov-2017)	☰
https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10802-008-9239-3.pdf	
<1% match (Internet from 15-Sep-2013)	☰
http://www.ajol.info	
<1% match (publications)	☰
Pizmony-Levy, Oren, and Joseph G. Kosciw. "School climate and the experience of LGBT students: A comparison of the United States and Israel", Journal of LGBT Youth, 2016.	
<1% match (Internet from 16-Apr-2018)	☰
https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/45885/Brikkel_Social_2015.pdf?sq=	
<1% match (student papers from 21-Oct-2017)	☰
Submitted to University of KwaZulu-Natal on 2017-10-21	
<1% match (Internet from 24-Mar-2017)	☰
https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/a521/c176af4f65956814222f281bc3cc971f87b5.pdf	
<1% match (Internet from 30-Jun-2018)	☰
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interpersonal_relationship	

https://www.turnitin.com/newreport_classic.asp?lang=en_us&old=1040584661&it=1&bypass_cv=1

1/160

APPENDIX 5: CERTIFICATE OF LANGUAGE EDITING



You Write. We Edit. You Love it.

06 December 2018

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN



RE: CONFIRMATION OF LANGUAGE EDITING SERVICES: SUNDAY ADESOJI DARE.

I confirm that I have done Language Editing for Sunday Adesoji Dare's dissertation titled:

A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO EMBRACING LGBTI COMMUNITIES AT A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS.

The Dissertation now conforms to the University of KwaZulu-Natal's language editing standards.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lynn N Sibanda".

Lynn N Sibanda

Tel: 011 050 0376

Mobile: 071 989 0983

Email: lynn@lovetoedit.co.za

Member of the [Professional Editors Guild](#)

The logo for the Professional Editors Guild features the text "Professional EDITORS Guild" in a black, sans-serif font. The word "EDITORS" is in a larger, bold font. To the right of the text is a small green leaf-like graphic. Above the text is a decorative graphic of several horizontal, slightly curved lines in a reddish-brown color, resembling the pages of an open book.

Professional
EDITORS
Guild

Address: 16 Countesses Ave, Randburg, South Africa, 2194 | **Telephone:** +27 11 050 0376 | **Email:** info@lovetoedit.co.za
Website: www.lovetoedit.co.za | **Registration Number:** 2016/ 425723/ 07

APPENDIX 6

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant: LGBTI Communities

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A	B	C	D	E
Age					
Year of study					
Sex					

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names:

Signature

____/____/____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 7

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant: Students

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A	B	C	D	E
Age					
Year of study					
Sex					

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names:

Signature

____/____/_____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 8

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant: Lecturers

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A	B	C
Age			
Position			
Sex			

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names: Sunday Dare

Signature

_____/_____/_____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 9

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant: On Campus faith thrust

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals. Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A
Age	
Position	
Sex	

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names:

Signature

_____/_____/_____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 10

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant: Students Representative Council (SRC)

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study. This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A
Age	
Position	
Sex	

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names:

Signature

_____/_____/_____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 11

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +273 1 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant Prospective Participants: University Students Services Practitioner

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals. Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A
Age	
Position	
Sex	

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study.
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names:

Signature

_____/_____/_____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 12

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant: LGBTI communities from outside campus

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals. Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A
Age	
Position	
Sex	

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names:

Signature

____/____/_____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 13

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant: Psychologist

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals. Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

- Your confidentiality is guaranteed as your inputs will not be attributed to you in person, but reported as a population of member’s opinion.
- The focus groups interview, deliberate dialogues, discussions, meetings and conversations may last 30-40minutes only as specified in the study.
- Any information given cannot be used against you, and the data generation will be used purposely for this research only.
- Data will be stored in secure storage in the custody of my promoter and be destroyed after 5 years.
- You have a choice to participate, not participate or stop participating in the research. You are free by right of decisions, no penalty for taking such an action.

- Your involvement is purely for academic purposes only, and there are no financial benefits involved.
- If you are willing to be audiotaped, please indicate (by ticking as applicable) whether or not you are willing to allow to be recorded by either of these equipment:

A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

	A
Age	
Position	
Sex	

B: PART PROPOSED QUESTIONS

- Are there any current approaches you know that can embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Do you think a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities is needed at a university campus?
- In which conditions/conditions you think a transformative approach can be implemented successfully to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- In what ways can a transformative approach be used to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?
- Can you state the hindrances/barriers to a transformative approach against embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus and how these be circumvented?
- How can through a transformative approach, succeed in embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus?

C: DATA GENERATING TOOLS

	Willing	Not willing
Audio tape		
Video tape		

1. I fully understand the nature and purpose of the research study
2. I therefore give full consent to participate and do so freely without any coercion
3. I fully understand the implications and risks of participating in this research study.
4. I hereby give permission for the use of information obtained during the study and the use of the findings thereof.

Full names:

Signature

_____/_____/_____
Date

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 14

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017.

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Participant: LGBTI communities

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609. Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 15

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date:20-06-2017

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Participant Prospective Participant: Students

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity, which they can practice in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will help LGBTI communities’ students to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. This study will benefit the student’s majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609. Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za
Date: 20-06-2017.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 16

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017.

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Participant Prospective Participant: Lecturers

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity, which they can practice in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will help LGBTI communities' students to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. This study will benefit the student's majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609. Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 17

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017.

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Participant Prospective Participant: On Campus faith thrust

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity, which they can practice in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will help LGBTI communities’ students to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. This study will benefit the student’s majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609. Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 18

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017.

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Participant Prospective Participant: Student Representative Council (SRC)

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity, which they can practice in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will help LGBTI communities’ students to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. This study will benefit the student’s majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609. Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 19

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017.

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Prospective Participants: University Students Services Practitioner

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity, which they can practice in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will help LGBTI communities' students to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. This study will benefit the student's majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609. Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 20

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Dear Participant Prospective Participant: LGBTI communities from outside campus

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity, which they can practice in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will help LGBTI communities’ students to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. This study will benefit the student’s majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Your participation will contribute great value to this study.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609. Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 21

Researcher

Sunday Dare
477 City life
U-2265
Smith street
Durban
4001
Contact: 0735598921
Email: sdare14@yahoo.com

Promoter

Prof. D.J Hlalele
University of KwaZulu-Natal
CS102 Main Tutorial Building
Edgewood campus Richmond Road
Pinetown
3605
Contact: +2731 2603858
Email: HlaleleD@ukzn.ac.za

Date: 20-06-2017.

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant Prospective Participant: Psychologist

I Sunday Adesoji Dare, a PhD student of Educational Psychology at Edgewood Campus is about conducting a study on “**A transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a University Campus**”. Please kindly accept my sincere request in assistance to be part of conducting this research study.

This study is about to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a University campus among their heterosexual students peers, with innovative to engage in accommodating and encouraging diversity to promote a conducive learning environment. However, the study hope to encourage students in wider population to come out of stigmatization and abuses that LGBTI communities has been experienced in the past and reshape towards a coping style for equal education opportunities among all students at a university of KwaZulu-Natal. This study gained it motivation from the stigma that has been their everyday experiences of LGBTI communities, as I noticed that University is the only environment that can educate students to embrace humanity in different environment. This study aims at a proposing a transformative approach to embracing LGBTI communities at a university campus through a deliberate dialogues, focus groups discussion, meetings and conversations that will bring love to students in general irrespective of their sexuality and gender differences. My study intends to propose a transformative approach that will embrace LGBTI communities at a university campus to enjoy their academic lives without threat of discrimination and stigmatization. I will audiotape all the meetings for 30-40 minutes maximum. This study will benefit the students’ majority (heterosexual) to see beyond stigma but strive to tolerate one another by supporting LGBTI communities as part of individual and embrace them to live a happy life altogether at a university campus thus assist them to achieve their academic goals.

Your participation in the study is voluntary and your basic human rights will respected and protected at all times. We will maintain confidentiality, non-disclosure of personal information and identity, inform you at all times of the processes involved in the research study. There will be audiotaping within 40mins per meetings. You also have the right to leave or discontinue participation should you feel uncomfortable at any stage.

Humanities & Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Dr. Shenuka Sign (Chair) Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building. Postal Address: Private Bag X54001, Durban 4000. Telephones: +27(0)31 260 3587/8350/4557. Facsimile: +27(0) 31 260 4609.
Email: ximbap@ukzn.ac.za, snyman@ukzn.ac.za, mohump@ukzn.ac.za

Yours thankfully,



Sunday Dare

APPENDIX 22: LETTER OF RE-EDITING

95 Uplands Road
Backridge
Pietermaritzburg
3201
17 May 2019

To whom it may concern,

RE: Editing of Thesis by Sunday Dare

This thesis, "*A Transformative Approach To Embracing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender And Intersex (LGBTI) Communities*" has been professionally edited.

Yours Sincerely



(Mrs) D.N. Wodak