Legitimating LGBTQ+ Scholarship in Political Science and Making It Flourish

Jerry Thomas, *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, United States*
Scott N. Siegel, *San Francisco State University, United States*

ABSTRACT This article introduces the LGBTQ+ Special edition of PS. It traces major developments of queer scholarship in political science beginning with Kenneth Sherrill's 1973 paper, "Leaders in the Gay Activist Movement: The Problem of Finding Followers," which was the first paper presented at an APSA annual meeting on a queer topic. As part of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Professor Sherrill's first paper, this introduction describes the efforts scholars made in their work and in the American Political Science Association to legitimate LGBTQ+ scholarship during the past half decade.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LGBTQ SCHOLARSHIP IN THE DISCIPLINE

This special edition has its origins in APSA's fiftieth-anniversary celebration of the first queer politics paper presented at an annual meeting. In 1973 in New Orleans, Ken Sherrill presented, "Leaders in the Gay Activist Movement: The Problem of Finding the Followers," a report of his survey of gay men's attitudes at a firehouse and dancehall in New York City's Chinatown neighborhood. Many activists, scholars, and scholar-activists built on this key contribution, enabling the theoretical and empirical study of LGBTQ politics to flourish. Reflecting social and political changes over the past half-century, a large body of scholarship emerged on a variety of issues that affect LGBTQ communities, including public opinion, equal treatment by the state, and protection from discrimination and violence. The profession itself also started to become more inclusive of queer scholars and created organizations and resources to support them and the scholarship they produced. Celebrating the 50-year milestone of queer scholarship at APSA, Queer J. Thomas (2023, 4) writes, "Legitimating LGBTQ studies in political science was facilitated through the content of and methods in pioneering works like [Sherrill's] and many others, and pioneers also created an infrastructure in APSA to facilitate LGBTQ research, discourse, and publishing."

These developments would not have been possible without Ken Sherrill's initial presentation and forward-looking leadership, alongside the pioneering work of many colleagues committed to legitimizing queerness in society broadly and queer scholarship in the discipline specifically. This special edition recognizes some of the pathbreaking research his work inspired and celebrates contemporary and future pathways in queer scholarship in political science. As the articles in this edition attest, both in volume and kind, queer scholarship in the discipline has never been more legitimate or prolific in political science, although significant social, professional, and structural constraints remain.

Both LGBTQ rights and scholarship could not have advanced in the United States without the determination of scholar-activists like Ken Sherrill and many others. Sherrill was a New Yorker who was on the faculty at CUNY-Hunter College when he presented his groundbreaking paper at APSA's annual meeting in New Orleans. This was only a few years after the 1969 Stonewall Riots, the symbolic birth of the modern queer rights movement in the United States, although the struggle for equal treatment had antecedents in the preceding decades and in many other places in the United States and around the world. A decade later, the AIDS epidemic and the lack of an effective public health response to it further galvanized LGBTQ communities. In interviews with Sherrill before his death in 2023, he shared that in the height of the AIDS crisis in New York, he felt compelled as an elected official (he was the Democratic Party's District Leader in his legislative district) to attend AIDS funerals. Too often, many funerals occurred simultaneously, and Sherrill chose the one most likely to have few or hardly any people in attendance.

Still, the discipline disregarded his work; he was unable to publish his 1973 paper in a peer-reviewed outlet for about a quarter-century. In the interim, he shifted his scholarly attention to other LGBTQ scholarly efforts, particularly the ability of gays and lesbians to serve in the military. His work on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" dovetailed with a growing body of research on how the

Jerry Thomas *Associate Professor of Political Science at University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. He can be reached at thomasj@uwosh.edu.*
Scott N. Siegel *is Associate Professor of Political Science in the Department of International Relations at San Francisco State University. He can be reached at snsiegel@sfsu.edu.*

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of American Political Science Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

doi:10.1017/S1049096525101133

US military was grappling with social change and the growing acceptance of homosexuality; he also coedited the first American government textbook to explicitly name and picture gays and lesbians (Sherrill and Vogler 1982). And his work created space for future scholar-activists. For example, Aaron Belkin from San Francisco State University served as the founding director of the Palm Center, which advocated for gay and lesbian soldiers to serve openly in the US military. Belkin's research found that there were few negative impacts on military readiness and performance when gays and lesbians serve when studying gays and lesbians serving openly in other countries' national militaries around the world (Belkin 2011; Belkin and Bateman 2003). His and other advocates' work helped end the policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" in 2010.

Even though the profession ignored Sherrill's work early in his career, his tenacity as both a scholar and activist helped advance queer politics as legitimate in society and political science. His work also helped shape the movement for LGBTQ rights. As governments increasingly legislated and adjudicated LTBTQ sexual and gender citizenship, queer scholarship in the discipline increased and contributed to securing equal protections, liberties, and dignities. For example, just over 25 years after the Stonewall Riots, Sherrill provided testimony in the US Supreme Court case *Romer v. Evans*, which held that discrimination against homosexuality was a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment of the US Constitution.[1] Sherrill's scholarship was cited in early decisions at the district court level:

> The Court also heard the testimony of Professor Kenneth Sherrill, a professor of political science at Hunter College in New York City. Professor Sherrill offered his opinion of the relative political power of gays, lesbians and bisexuals. He testified that gays, lesbians and bisexuals experience a striking level of dislike from the population in general. He testified that because of the hatred towards this group it is difficult for them to form political coalitions. He also noted that there are many more anti-gay initiatives than there are initiatives against other groups.... Professor Sherrill testified that federal, state and local lawmakers have proposed and enacted numerous bills and laws which limit the rights of, and public discussion about, gays lesbians and bisexuals. Professor Sherrill also testified that the gays earn roughly the same income as that of the average citizen but perhaps a bit less, and that the data collected in the United States Census reports are not entirely anonymous and that this could deter gays, lesbians and bisexuals from answering truthfully.[2]

Gradually, queer individuals were included more fully in democratic life and institutions, and the work of political scientists helped shape this trajectory. For example, in an important same-sex marriage case, *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, a witness opposed to legally recognizing same-sex marriages was discredited in part because he was unfamiliar with the work of political scientists Miriam Smith, Shane Phelan, Ellen Riggle, Barry Tadlock, and Mark Blasius.[3] Of particular note is that Riggle and Tadlock edited the seminal work, *Gays and Lesbians in the Democratic Process*, which included Sherrill's 1973 APSA paper (Riggle and Tadlock 1999). Reflecting on Sherrill's contribution, Ellen Riggle says, "Ken's paper talked to gay people about what was going on. It provided a much-needed narrative of the time, and historically. It gave gay people agency to tell their own stories" (Thomas 2023).

Ken Sherrill was part of the initial cohort of scholars who brought the study of queer politics into the mainstream. His efforts dovetailed with changes in public attitudes in general. Tolerance of homosexuality in the United States climbed significantly after the Stonewall Riots in 1969. According to the General Social Survey, the share of the American population claiming same-sex sexual relations was "always wrong" declined from 77% in 1977 to 46% in 2012 (Flores 2014). Gallup Polls show that the moral acceptability of same-sex relations climbed from 40% in 2001 in the United States to 64% in 2024. Although with significant variation, animus toward homosexuality declined in most other parts of the world, especially in Europe (Smith, Son, and Kim 2014). Support for policies guaranteeing equal treatment for sexual and gender minorities followed, especially for same-sex marriage (SSM). An increasing number of out-LGBTQ individuals were also elected to office and even became heads of government (Reynolds 2013). Consequently, governments around the world began making significant policy changes. For example, in 2001, the Netherlands was the only country in the world to legally recognize same-sex marriages; in 2025, 38 countries do so. The number of countries permitting same-sex adoption and legal protections from discrimination in private and public spaces, as well as the number of national laws against hate speech and violence based on sexual orientation or gender identity, has also increased.

In the US political elites are not moving ahead or faster than where public opinion stands (Lax and Phillips 2009), although some governments in Europe have done so (Siegel, Turnbull-Dugarte, and Olinger 2022). When national parliaments did not respond to changing public opinion, national courts sometimes did. For example, bans against discrimination based on sexual or gender identity and marriage equality only happened nationwide in the United States through decisions made by the US Supreme Court. Constitutional courts, not legislatures, in Austria, Taiwan and in many Latin American countries were key actors responsible for expanding LGBT rights legislation (Campana and Vaggione 2021). Constitutional courts, however, tend to follow rather than lead public opinion on LGBTQ rights, which is consistent with Gerald Rosenberg's (2023 [1991]) argument that courts are not effective agents for policy change.

Public opinion often does not change without social action, as Sherrill knew well. The rich scholarship on LGBTQ social movements, both national and transnational, shows how important they are to changing public opinion (Adam, Duyvendak, and Krouwel 2009; Ayoub 2016; Olsen 2014). Transnational movements and media have led to increased toleration of homosexuality and gay rights around the world (Ayoub and Garretson 2017).

It should be noted, however, that attitudes have not improved for all members of the queer community either to the same extent or increased at the same rate, with support for the transgender community and nondiscrimination measures lagging far behind that for gays and lesbians (Lewis et al. 2022). Policy advances, like same-sex partnerships, sometimes result in stagnation or lessened support for the next step, same-sex marriage (Abou-Chadi and Finnigan 2019). Legislative progress is also leading to increased polarization of attitudes over LGBT rights across the developed world, much like around other cultural issues.

METHODOLOGICAL PLURALISM, THEORY, AND SCHOLAR-ACTIVISM

Ken Sherrill's paper at the APSA annual meeting laid the groundwork for understanding public opinion about gays and lesbians and their self-perceptions. Sherrill was trying to open the door to understanding these types of attitudinal and policy shifts, but the

discipline was and still is slow in accepting such scholarship. A steady stream of queer political scholarship has appeared in journals and as monographs, and significant contributions have been made in each of the discipline's main subfields, drawing on work from queer and feminist theory and from other disciplines (Ayoub 2022). Still, the total amount of scholarship is still relatively paltry. Between 2017 and 2023, the period for which we have the most robust data, only 0.55% of articles appearing in the discipline's top five journals dealt with LGBTQ topics (Piscopo 2025). By dedicating a special issue of *PS* to queer scholarship we are trying to fill that gap.

The subdisciplines in political science began to splinter over methodological and epistemological issues during the Perestroika! movement of the late 1990s and 2000s. It affected the empirical study of LGBTQ politics no differently than other areas of study. It opened up space for more methodological pluralism, theory development, and scholarly development. For example, early theorists, such as Shane Phelan (2010), who theorized sexual citizenship, and Joan Tronto (2013), who examined political feminisms, led a substantial number of political scientists to conceptualize innovative models of LGBTQ politics. Theorists remain active in contemporary queer political science as shown many of the articles in this special edition.

Whether theorizing or examining queer politics empirically, a growing number of scholar-activists studying queer politics also emerged over the past 50 years. Set against the backdrop of political scientists' efforts to legitimize the subfield by rooting it in scientific objectivities, scholar-activists began engaging queer politics routinely in the discipline's journals. Peer-reviewed work appeared in *New Political Science*, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, and *Politics and Gender*.

There was a major focus on sources of support for extending equal treatment to gays and lesbian couples, such as through same-sex marriage (Abou-Chadi and Finnigan 2019; Aloni 2010; Gaines and Garand 2010), same-sex partner adoption (Takács, Szalma, and Bartus 2016), antidiscrimination measures (Bell 1998), and fair treatment for LGBTQ immigrants claiming asylum (Lewis and Naples 2014; Ritholtz and Buxton 2021). International relations scholars focused on how norms of fair treatment and acceptance spread, often by international institutions and courts (Helfer and Voeten 2014; Swiebel 2009; Thiel 2015). More recently, scholars have examined the political backlash generated by the expansion of queer rights around the world or efforts to roll them back, particularly in Europe (Ayoub and Page 2020; Bishin et al. 2016). In the most severe situations of discrimination, governments and militia have targeted sexual and gender minorities for violence and killing (Ritholtz 2024). Not all these stories were being told in the pages of academic journals.

However, with the notable exception of the study of LGBTQ rights social movements, primarily in developed countries, few pages in political science journals are devoted to the political attitudes and beliefs of queer minorities themselves. Recent work considers not only how established institutions responded to the demands of social activists but also how social activists debated and argued among themselves in crafting their political agenda (Murib 2023), their inclusion in the US Democratic Party (Proctor 2022), and how gays and lesbians vote in national elections (Turnbull-Dugarte 2020). Some policy areas were prioritized over others when studying LGBTQ politics. Many activists in the LGBTQ community, for example, argue that the overwhelming policy focus on same-sex marriage and partnerships legislation has come at the expense of other issues that need higher priority (Proctor 2022).

SUPPORTING QUEER SCHOLARS IN THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Change in the discipline and society at large would not have been possible had scholars like Sherrill not also been activists for their community both inside and outside the profession. LGBT politics would not exist as an area of study if members of the profession had not, in the words of the late activist Harvey Milk, "come out." Visibility was key to changing norms in society and the profession (Ayoub 2016).

Ken Sherrill was also a trailblazer in this respect. He and Phil Ryan formed the American Political Science Association's first Gay Caucus in 1974 to bring together queer scholars in the profession (Ayoub 2022, 160). Sherrill was one of the first members of the Committee on the Status of LGBT Individuals in the Profession in 1992. Both groups provided queer members with networking opportunities and sponsored panels and roundtables at APSA annual meetings. Under the leadership of Angelia Wilson and Susan Burgess, APSA created the Sexuality and Politics section in 2007, which became an organized division at annual meetings in which queer politics could be routinely engaged. Sherrill's activism inspired other professional associations to dedicate spaces for queer scholars and scholarship, such as the LGBTQA Caucus within the International Studies Association in 2010 and the Gender and Sexuality Network within the Council for European Studies in 2011. To encourage the further research in "me studies" related to LGBTQ politics, three scholarly awards have been created: the APSA Centennial Center's Ken Sherrill Award for Best Dissertation Proposal for the Empirical Study of LGBTQ Politics, the Cynthia Weber Best APSA Conference Paper Award, as well as the Robert Bailey Award for best conference paper, which is given out by APSA's LGBTQ Caucus.

Even as the discipline has begun to welcome work on LGBTQ politics and the profession has opened up to queer scholars, informal barriers are still in place that prevent the full acceptance of scholarship of queer issues. Many queer scholars continue to report feeling that they and their scholarship are marginalized in the discipline (Majic and Strolovitch 2020). For example, the study of LGBTQ politics as an area of research is not given specific attention when hiring decisions are being made, and being a queer scholar is not perceived as a positive quality in hiring a candidate (Novkov and Barclay 2010). Although graduate students are trained in advanced methods and diverse theoretical perspectives, the subject of LGBTQ politics is missing from many course syllabi.

In some circles, the study of queer topics by queer scholars is still dismissed as a fruitless endeavor in "me studies" (Ayoub and Rose 2016). Pioneering queer scholars have had to gain legitimacy as researchers to exist openly in the discipline. Much of the early queer scholarship in political science was produced by queers themselves, so identified based on their personal and professional interactions with colleagues in the absence of empirical studies or data examining this connection. Queer and non-queer scholars

conducting LGBTQ studies need support and protections in the discipline to help ensure that they can flourish in the academy, receive tenure, and expand the scope of queer scholarship to more topics and to regions outside the United States. Certainly, what is studied reflects who is studying it, which explains both the progress made so far and the continuing constraints on queer scholarship.

QUEER FUTURES

In his 1973 paper, Sherrill argued that it was time for political science to "start paying serious attention to the gay movement." We can say with a high degree of confidence that researchers have responded. Given changing attitudes in society and in the profession, more resources, and more "out" scholars, the study of LGBTQ politics has flourished. Contributions to the empirical study of LGBTQ politics have come from nearly all political science fields. Yet, there remain significant gaps in our knowledge, from appropriate survey methodologies to the politics of LGBTQ rights outside the Western context. The contributions to this special issue start to address that gap.

Most of the empirical work on LGBTQ politics has been limited to the "G" and "L." Both the "B" and the "T" have generated less research, although the gap is slowly beginning to close. Some of that progress is accounted for by the increased tolerance and acceptance of transgender and gender-nonconforming minorities in the profession and in society at large, even though that research is also being done in the midst of a strong backlash to LGBTQ rights around the world (Velasco 2023). In addition, policies that affect or interest certain affluent, cisgender members of the community have been a primary focus of much research. For example, one of the criticisms of the movement for same-sex partnership/same-sex marriage legislation in the United States and elsewhere was that these policies primarily benefited upper-income, white couples in monogamous relationships (Bernstein 2018). In contrast, the interests of transgender, gender-nonconforming, and racially minoritized LGBTQ communities were comparatively ignored, although they are subject to higher rates of violence and social discrimination. Other issues, such as discrimination against marginalized groups, queer immigrants, or issues of LGBTQ public health after the AIDS crisis, have received less attention as well.

By prioritizing the study of certain policy issues over others, we risk several unfavorable outcomes. First, the results obtained bias the wishes or wants of some segments of the LGBTQ community. Second, we risk producing scholarship that is untethered to the social and political reality that members of the LGBTQ community face. Finally, the voices of marginalized communities are silenced once again in our academic research. The articles in this special issue address that gap by recentering the study of LGBTQ politics on how different members of the LGBTQ community establish their political identity and mobilize across different issue areas.

A pattern in LGBT-related scholarship published since Sherrill's first presentation is how frequently LGBTQ rights and individuals were the *object*, rather than the subject of research—to the detriment of our empirical research projects. Much attention has been devoted to what majority society thinks about sexual and gender minorities and less to what members of the LGBTQ community believe. We need to strive to have LGBTQ individuals be the subjects of our research.

Over the past 50 years, the field of LGBTQ politics has also embraced an array of methodologies to answer important questions. Public opinion scholars apply advanced quantitative methods to analyze large datasets. However, this trend reflects the privileging of quantitative methods by journal editorial boards (Piscopo 2025). As in other research areas, empirical work on LGBTQ politics using qualitative methods is missing from leading journals. We anticipate that new technologies, like machine learning, will be helpful for future scholarship. However, the availability and trends in new methodologies should not drive our research questions: theory development and puzzle solving should direct our scholarship. As in the subject area, methodological diversity should continue to be valued.

In addition to treating members of the LGBTQ communities as subjects and applying diverse methodologies, the field is also slowly expanding to include regions beyond the United States and the Global North. Except in East Asia, the literature on LGBTQ politics remains comparatively undeveloped in the Global South (Jung 2024; Rich 2024). This is due not only to the more hostile social environment in which researchers may find themselves because of their socioeconomic, geographic, and ethnic backgrounds but also to structural barriers to persons of color and a dearth of financial resources to support such research.

CONCLUSION

Scholarship on LGBTQ rights has always moved in tandem with broader social and political change. As the gay rights movements around the world changed people's attitudes, the discipline began to open up to accommodate more research on LGBTQ rights. Established institutions began to direct resources and attention to the topic as well. LGBTQ politics branched out from the humanities and social theory to political science. An infrastructure began to form to support this work. For example, public opinion surveys began to include questions about the acceptability of homosexuality and, later, same-sex partnerships or marriage. Academic journals in the discipline became increasingly receptive to work on LGBTQ politics. Research foundations and professional associations provided much-needed financial resources to carry out field research. More broadly, most universities and colleges have nondiscrimination policies protecting LGBTQ students and LGBTQ resource centers that provide needed social support and counseling services.

Although there has been a half-century of work to legitimate LGBTQ+ scholarship and help it flourish since Sherrill presented his paper on gay men's attitudes, there are many areas in which progress is still necessary. First, inspired by Sherrill's work, we need to consider all members of the queer community as subjects, rather than objects of research (Sherrill 1973). We need to expand our attention to the interests and needs of all member groups of the queer community, identifying important differences among them and how policy makers and stakeholders have responded to them. The geographic scope of investigation needs to expand to include the politics of LGBTQ rights in areas outside the world of rich democracies. However, those changes cannot occur unless important parts of the profession, including academic journals, increase their receptivity to understanding the politics of the LGBTQ community.

In summary, although much progress has been made, research on LGBTQ politics remains marginalized. As Ken Sherrill remarked

near the end of his life, "The sad truth [is] that people won't read beyond the title if it begins with LGBTIQ. Knowing that, editors think that they are wasting scarce resources by including our work. It's a vicious cycle. Things are not as bad as they used to be but they remain bad" (Ayoub 2022, 157)." The articles in this special issue take additional action to break that cycle and create paths to keep moving forward that Ken Sherrill started fifty years ago. ■

NOTES

1. *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620 (1996).
2. *Equality Foundation of Greater Cincinnati, Inc. v. City of Cincinnati*, 860 F. Supp 417, 425 (S.D. Ohio, 1994).
3. *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 702 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Cal. 2010).

REFERENCES

Abou-Chadi, Tarik, and Ryan Finnigan. 2019. "Rights for Same-Sex Couples and Public Attitudes toward Gays and Lesbians in Europe." *Comparative Political Studies* 52 (6): 868–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414018797947.

Adam, Barry D., Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Andre Krouwel. 2009. *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics: National Imprints of a Worldwide Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Aloni, Erez. 2010. "Incrementalism, Civil Unions, and the Possibility of Predicting Legal Recognition of Same-Sex Marriage." *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy* 18 (1): 105.

Ayoub, Phillip M. 2016. *When States Come Out: Europe's Sexual Minorities and the Politics of Visibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ayoub, Phillip M. 2022. "Not That Niche: Making Room for the Study of LGBTIQ People in Political Science." *European Journal of Politics and Gender* 5 (2): 154–72. https://doi.org/10.1332/251510821X16345581767345.

Ayoub, Phillip M., and Jeremiah Garretson. 2017. "Getting the Message Out: Media Context and Global Changes in Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Comparative Political Studies* 50 (8): 1055–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414016666836.

Ayoub, Phillip M., and Douglas Page. 2020. "When Do Opponents of Gay Rights Mobilize? Explaining Political Participation in Times of Backlash against Liberalism." *Political Research Quarterly* 73 (3): 696–713. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912919853377.

Ayoub, Phillip, and Deondra Rose. 2016. "In Defense of 'Me' Studies." *Inside Higher Ed*, 2016. https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/04/14/scholarly-importance-studying-issues-related-ones-own-identity-essay.

Belkin, Aaron. 2011. *How We Won: Progressive Lessons from the Repeal of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."* Washington, DC: Huffington Post Media Group.

Belkin, Aaron, and Geoffrey Bateman, eds. 2003. *Don't Ask, Don't Tell: Debating the Gay Ban in the Military*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Bell, Mark. 1998. "Sexual Orientation and Anti-Discrimination Policy: The European Community." In *Politics of Sexuality: Identity, Gender and Citizenship*, eds. Terrell Carver and Veronique Mottier, 58–67. London: Routledge.

Bernstein, Mary. 2018. "Same-Sex Marriage and the Assimilationist Dilemma: A Research Agenda on Marriage Equality and the Future of LGBTQ Activism, Politics, Communities, and Identities." *Journal of Homosexuality* 65 (14): 1941–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1423211.

Bishin, Benjamin G., Thomas J. Hayes, Matthew B. Incantalupo, and Charles Anthony Smith. 2016. "Opinion Backlash and Public Attitudes: Are Political Advances in Gay Rights Counterproductive?" *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (3): 625–48. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12181.

Campana, Maximiliano, and Juan Marco Vaggione. 2021. "Courts and Same-Sex Marriage in Latin America." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1189.

Flores, Andrew R. 2014. *National Trends in Public Opinion on LGBT Rights in the United States*. Los Angeles: Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Public-Opinion-LGBT-US-Nov-2014.pdf.

Gaines, N. Susan, and James C. Garand. 2010. "Morality, Equality, or Locality: Analyzing the Determinants of Support for Same-Sex Marriage." *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (3): 553–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912909333132.

Helfer, Laurence R., and Erik Voeten. 2014. "International Courts as Agents of Legal Change: Evidence from LGBT Rights in Europe." *International Organization* 68 (1): 77–110. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818313000398.

Jung, Minwoo. 2024. "Flexible Masculinities: Negotiating Gender, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Global Asia." *Current Sociology*, September. https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921241275685.

Lax, Jeffrey R., and Justin H. Phillips. 2009. "Gay Rights in the States: Public Opinion and Policy Responsiveness." *American Political Science Review* 103 (3): 367–86. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055409990050.

Lewis, Daniel C., Andrew R. Flores, Donald P. Haider-Markel, Patrick R. Miller, and Jami K. Taylor. 2022. "Transitioning Opinion? Assessing the Dynamics of Public Attitudes toward Transgender Rights." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 86 (2): 343–68. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfac014.

Lewis, Rachel A., and Nancy A, Naples. 2014. "Introduction: Queer Migration, Asylum, and Displacement." *Sexualities* 17 (8): 911–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460714552251.

Majic, Samantha, and Dara Z. Strolovitch. 2020. "Editors' Introduction: Mentoring and Marginalization." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (4): 763–69. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096520000773.

Murib, Zein. 2023. *Terms of Exclusion: Rightful Citizenship Claims and the Construction of LGBT Political Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Novkov, Julie, and Scott Barclay. 2010. "Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and the Transgendered in Political Science: Report on a Discipline-Wide Survey." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43 (1): 95–106. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096510990641.

Olsen, Kristine A. 2014. "Telling Our Stories: Narrative and Framing in the Movement for Same-Sex Marriage." *Social Movement Studies* 13 (2): 248–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2013.842464.

Phelan, Shane. 2010. *Sexual Strangers: Gays, Lesbians, and Dilemmas of Citizenship*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Piscopo, Jennifer M. 2025. "Still Marginalized? Gender and LGBTQIA+ Scholarship in Top Political Science Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 58 (1): 131–38. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096524000441.

Proctor, Andrew. 2022. "Coming out to Vote: The Construction of a Lesbian and Gay Electoral Constituency in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 116 (3): 777–90. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055421001465.

Reynolds, Andrew. 2013. "Representation and Rights: The Impact of LGBT Legislators in Comparative Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 107 (2): 259–74. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055413000051.

Rich, Timothy S. 2024. "Moving the Needle on LGBT Acceptance and Tolerance in East Asia: Survey Evidence from Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan." *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* 20 (2). https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=18157238&AN=182629696&h=sXoPYbcAuFWc3094coMqSgkKSNTIVuqYa2QCEyl6A91yrR6Ar9HXnG6JRRYMDNcpNs%2BIjIcK9hanrira1CJ3VA%3D%3D&crl=c.

Riggle, Ellen D. B., and Barry L. Tadlock, eds. 1999. *Gays and Lesbians in the Democratic Process: Public Policy, Public Opinion, and Political Representation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ritholtz, Samuel. 2024. "Brutality on Display: Media Coverage and the Spectacle of Anti-LGBTQ Violence in the Colombian Civil War." *Third World Quarterly* 45 (5): 903–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2024.2315307.

Ritholtz, Samuel, and Rebecca Buxton. 2021. "Queer Kinship and the Rights of Refugee Families." *Migration Studies* 9 (3): 1075–95.

Rosenberg, Gerald N. 2023 [1991]. *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?* 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/H/bo193463251.html.

Sherrill, Kenneth S. 1973. "Leaders in the Gay Activist Movement: The Problem of Finding the Followers." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New Orleans.

Sherrill, Kenneth S., and David J. Vogler. 1982. *Power, Policy, and Participation: An Introduction to American Government*. New York: Harper & Row.

Siegel, Scott, Stuart J. Turnbull-Dugarte, and Brian A. Olinger. 2022. "Where Is the Party? Explaining Positions on Same-Sex Marriage in Europe among Would-Be Members of Parliament." *European Journal of Politics and Gender* 5 (1): 83–108. https://doi.org/10.1332/251510821X16267702086451.

Smith, Tom, Jaesok Son, and Jibun Kim. 2014. *Public Attitudes towards Homosexuality and Gay Rights across Time and Countries*. Los Angeles: Williams Institute. https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Public-Attitude-LGBT-Int-Nov-2014.pdf.

Swiebel, Joke. 2009. "The European Union's Policies to Safeguard and Promote Diversity." In *Diversity in the European Union*, eds. Elisabeth Prügl and Markus Thiel, 21–36. New York: Palgrave Macmillan US. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230104167_2.

Takács, Judit, Ivett Szalma, and Tamás Bartus. 2016. "Social Attitudes toward Adoption by Same-Sex Couples in Europe." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 45 (7): 1787–98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0691-9.

Thiel, Markus. 2015. "Sexualities in World Politics." In *Sexualities in World Politics: How LGBTQ Claims Shape International Relations*, eds. Manuela Lavinas Picq and Markus Thiel, 75–91. New York: Routledge.

Thomas, Queer Jerry. 2023. "Celebrating Fifty Years of LGBTQ+ Scholarship: Kenneth Sherrill, An LGBTQ+ Leader Who Has No Trouble Finding Followers." *Political Science Now*, August.

Tronto, Joan C. 2013. *Caring Democracy: Markets, Equality, and Justice*. New York: NYU Press.

Turnbull-Dugarte, Stuart J. 2020. "Who Wins the British Lavender Vote? (Mostly) Labour." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 10 (3): 388–409. https://politicalsciencenow.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/PST-3.3-Kenneth-Sherrill-Article-1.pdf; https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2020.1838304.

Velasco, Kristopher. 2023. "Transnational Backlash and the Deinstitutionalization of Liberal Norms: LGBT+ Rights in a Contested World." *American Journal of Sociology* 128 (5): 1381–1429. https://doi.org/10.1086/724724.