

**CONCEPTUALIZING AND DISRUPTING HETERONORMATIVITY AS
PERFORMATIVE IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION: SPEECH ACTS AND LGBTQ*
INJURIOUS LANGUAGE**

Nick Rumens

Patricia Lewis

Abstract

A slowly expanding literature has examined the problem of heteronormativity in management education. Scholars converge on the view that heteronormativity is constituted in and through management education, reproducing heteronormative binaristic notions of sexuality and gender in management curricula, teaching activities, academic scholarship and business schools. This research has demonstrated the negative outcomes for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer* (LGBTQ*) people, but questions remain about how heteronormativity is constituted as normative in management education. Addressing this, our essay demonstrates how heteronormativity is performatively constituted as normative through language, and what management educators can do to disrupt it. Analytically, Judith Butler's theory of performativity, which emphasizes the constitutive power of language and repetition of speech acts, is pivotal to conceptualizing heteronormativity as performative. This essay interrogates the performative effects of LGBTQ* injurious speech acts, lamented by scholars as ubiquitous and harmful, showing how they constitute and sustain heteronormativity as normative in management education. Remediating this, our proposal derives insight from Butler's ideas about reworking the power of injurious speech to inform management educators how they can disrupt the performativity of heteronormativity. In essence, this essay contributes novel theoretical ideas about conceptualizing and disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity in management education.

Keywords: heteronormativity, performativity, Judith Butler, LGBTQ sexualities and genders, language, injurious speech, speech acts, management education, resignification

In 2022, a report submitted to the Human Rights Council (HRC) stated that, “gender in many societies is viewed within a strict binary lens that has entrenched the hegemonic conceptualization of sexuality as being strictly heteronormative” (Mofokeng, 2022: 9). It is significant, albeit it long overdue, that the HRC has acknowledged the heteronormative arrangement and regulation of gender and sexuality in restrictive binaristic categories binaries (i.e., gender: man/woman; masculinity/femininity; sexuality: heterosexuality/homosexuality) as problematic and globally widespread. Research has shown how heteronormativity has brought with it negative psychological, financial, work-related, and social outcomes for those people whose real or perceived gender and sexuality do not conform to these binaries (Butler, 1990; Flores, Langton, Meyer, & Romero, 2020; Horton, Rydstrom, & Tonini, 2015; Knight, Shoveller, Oliffe, Gilbert, & Goldenberg, 2013; Ozturk, 2011; Torres & Rodrigues, 2022). The HRC’s expression of concern echoes those voiced by seminal queer theorists in the early 1990s (de Laetis, 1991; Sedgwick, 1990), including those who first coined the term heteronormativity (Warner, 1991, 1993). Mobilizing heteronormativity as an analytical category enabled scholars associated with queer theorizing to demonstrate how heteronormativity is discursively constituted, and to problematize the “normal” and “natural” status assigned to heterosexuality, which renders lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer¹ (LGBTQ*) sexualities and genders as “abnormal” and “unnatural” (Butler, 1990, 1993; Warner, 1991, 1993, 2000). Remediating this, queer theorists and activists, LGBTQ* people, organizations and lobby groups have more than most sought to effect landmark legal, economic, social and cultural reforms and initiatives to combat the inimical effects of heteronormativity. Despite progressive advances to those ends (Angelo & Bocci, 2021; Ball, 2019), heteronormativity persists (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights [FRA], 2020; Gerber & Gory, 2014; ILGA, 2020).

¹ The asterisk in LGBTQ* encompasses non-normative sexualities and genders not specified in this acronym

In 2020, a survey of LGBTQ* people in the European Union (EU), North Macedonia and Serbia concluded “little, if any, progress” had been made over the last decade in the way LGBTQ* people in the EU “experience their human and fundamental rights in daily life” (FRA, 2020: 3). In that regard, it is noteworthy that the United Nations (2019) has acknowledged offensive language toward LGBTQ* people in the virtual world as a “critical barrier” to the well-being of LGBTQ* people. This assertion is concomitant with scholarly research, which shows that slurs, pejoratives, insults and defamatory statements are “one of the most frequent forms of verbal derogation” against LGBTQ* people (Bilewicz & Soral, 2020: 6). This type of speech occurs in numerous social contexts, institutions, workplaces, political discourse, online environments and social media (Lingiardi et al., 2020; FRA, 2020). It is apparent also in higher education institutions (HEI), illustrated vividly in Okegbe’s (2021) analysis, which critiques the initial response of the President of Cleveland State University to defend not condemn a “hate speech” flier that graphically urged LGBTQ+ students to commit suicide.

In light of the above, the time is *now* to incorporate heteronormativity as an object of analysis into management education. Accordingly, the purpose of this essay focuses on *how* heteronormativity is performatively constituted in management education as normative, and what management educators can do to disrupt it. This essay pivots toward management education rather than learning, because management education has been shown to constitute and reproduce heteronormative notions of sexuality and gender in management curricula, syllabus content, teaching activities, academic scholarship and business schools (Ferry, 2018; Giddings & Pringle, 2011; Graham, Kennavane, & Wears, 2008; Graham & McFarlane, 2021; Ozturk & Rumens, 2014; Rumens, 2017, 2018; Schwartz, Van Esch, & Bilimoria, 2017). As such, we see management education taking a prominent role in combatting its own heteronormativity and

educating students whose future careers and decisions will shape the (mis)fortunes of LGBTQ* people, as they encounter heteronormativity in and outside the workplace. For this reason, Table 1, which provides sample questions for educators to ask students, is a resource to support educators at a practical level. Still, treating heteronormativity as an object of analysis in management education, with an emphasis on disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity, cannot alone eradicate heteronormativity. Changing institutional structures, campus climate, educational cultures, and student perceptions of LGBTQ* people and issues, has been shown to produce lasting effects in HEIs to that end (Hawley, 2015; Marine, 2011). As we elucidate in our concluding remarks, the ubiquitous, persistent and often “invisible” nature of heteronormativity means co-ordinated and sustained collaborations with multiple and diverse stakeholders are essential.

Analytically, Judith Butler’s theory of performativity facilitates the purpose of this essay, since it starts from the idea that language is not a closed system, but a linguistic form of constitutive power. The performative power of speech acts, in what they *do* rather than represent, is central to Butler’s (1990, 1993) theory of performativity, as a reiterative discursive practice that enacts or produces the phenomena that it both names and regulates. The performative nature of “injurious speech acts” is of particular importance in this essay (Butler, 1997/2021), as it steers our analysis away from clarifying what types of words are used to degrade LGBTQ* people, toward how injurious speech acts can performatively constitute heteronormativity. These theoretical resources underpin our essay and are defined in a glossary of terms as an appendix to this essay. Crucially, we seek to advance extant debates about heteronormativity and management education, and contribute novel theoretical ideas relating to the performative power of speech acts for disrupting heteronormativity.

We begin our essay by developing our provocation that management education can reproduce heteronormativity, critiquing how extant research has variously deployed heteronormativity as a concept and analytical category. Our central concern is that, with some exceptions, scholars tend not to examine fully how heteronormativity is normatively constituted through language, and, thus, how it can be disrupted through its performative quality. For this reason, our essay operates as a “disciplined provocation” (Vince & Hibbert, 2018) at the theoretical level, commencing in the part titled, ‘Queer theory and Judith Butler’s writing on performativity’. Here we derive insights from Butler’s theory of performativity, which we then mobilize in the next part, wherein heteronormativity is conceptualized as performative and linked to injurious speech. In so doing, we show how LGBTQ* injurious speech can performatively constitute and sustain heteronormativity as normative. Our proposal follows, which urges management educators to act by disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity. Accomplishing this, our proposal inspires action as follows: interrogating how speech acts normalize heteronormativity in management education; investigating the effects of injurious speech acts on LGBTQ* people; resignifying LGBTQ* injurious speech acts. The essay concludes by outlining the theoretical and practical implications for management education, as they relate to its role in eradicating heteronormativity.

HETERONORMATIVITY AND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Academic research on heteronormativity and management education is scant. Conjecturing why this is the case, we suggest it may be a result of uncomfortableness or unawareness among

management education researchers with heteronormativity as a concept. Although numerous heterosexual people certainly experience the raw end of heteronormativity (e.g. single parent mothers, heterosexual people of color, men and women who cannot or do not conform to gender and sexual binaries), and many are aware of its deleterious outcomes for LGBTQ* people, survey-based research shows that heterosexuals “often fail to appreciate the advantages and entitlements that accrue from their own sexual orientation” (Simoni & Walters, 2001: 167). Equally, in some cultural contexts, heterosexuals cannot rely on the assumption that their heterosexuality will go unchallenged (Dean, 2014), but in those where it is rigorously defended and reinforced to the detriment of LGBTQ* people (ILGA, 2020), scholars may struggle to address heteronormativity as a serious topic of scholarly study. Further, it is from within the unquantified number of LGBTQ* scholars and their allies employed by business schools that interrogations of heteronormativity are more likely to ensue. Management education conferences, caucuses, student bodies, academics and institutions may indicate support for LGBTQ* scholars and research on heteronormativity, but some business schools have been shown to be unsupportive of either or both (Giddings & Pringle, 2011; Ozturk & Rumens, 2014). Beyond these conjectures, an emergent literature has started to examine the nature, manifestations and impact of heteronormativity on management education and the business schools in which it is practiced. We turn now to review this literature as the first step forward in voicing our provocation, before marshaling the theoretical resources that buttress our proposal.

McQuarrie (1998) was one of the first to flag the lack of attention paid by management educators to LGBTQ* topics in the classroom, asserting that “sexual orientation is often missing from discussions of diversity in the management courses” (1998: 165). Inspired by the growth in management research at the time that highlighted “the problems facing gays and lesbians in

organizations” (1998: 162), McQuarrie sought to incorporate LGBTQ* workplace issues into teaching activities. This generated discomfort among some heterosexual students who expressed homophobic views about LGBTQ* people, while other students spent a lot of time reassuring others that it was pedagogically useful to say words like “homosexual” and “homophobia” in the context of critical debate. While McQuarrie (1998) raised awareness of the LGBTQ* topics missing in management curricula, the issue of how to conceptualize heteronormativity is sidestepped. Although the “institutionalized norm of heterosexuality” is acknowledged (1998: 164), McQuarrie falls short of conceptualizing it as heteronormativity. Were this the case, we can begin to anticipate the potential for extending McQuarrie’s (1998) analysis beyond the manifest content, or lack thereof, in management syllabuses and curricula, toward how heteronormativity operates implicitly through language, constituting what is “normal” in management curricula, classrooms and teaching activities.

Scholarly complaints about similar knowledge gaps have been voiced to this day (Graham, Kennavane, & Wears, 2008; Graham & McFarlane, 2021; Schwartz et al., 2017; Stewart, Crary, & Humberd, 2008). Graham et al. (2008) conducted a systematic comparison of diversity management coverage in leading human resources textbooks, finding the majority did not include sexual orientation. Over a decade later, Graham and McFarlane (2021) reviewed the academic business education literature for concepts relating to non-conforming gender people and perspectives. They found a dire shortage of business education scholarship on gender non-conformity, leading them to conclude: “business educators [are] ill-equipped to include gender nonconforming individuals and topics in their classrooms” (2020: 615). Schwartz et al. (2017: 301) voice a similar lament, in this journal, about the poor level of awareness among management educators about transgender issues, leaving them unprepared to equip students with

the “thoughtful approaches to interacting with transgender employees and clients”. Although this body of literature does not engage fully with heteronormativity as an object of analysis, the knowledge gaps identified in this scholarship indicate heteronormativity at work, evident in how they have become normalized.

Another slender segment of literature throws light on the nature and impact of heteronormativity in business schools, as it is experienced by LGBTQ* management educators. From a lesbian perspective, Giddings and Pringle (2011) reflect on their experiences of heteronormative work life in a New Zealand business school, referring to the experience as “working in the mouth of the dragon”. They reflect on the relentless routine of having to decide whether or not to “come out” as lesbian to colleagues and students when heterosexuality is presumed. They highlight, amongst other implicit standards of normalization, how the “successful” female business school academic is unofficially required to dress (e.g. “professional” attire such as a “navy jacket”) in a way that subordinates personal preferences about how to embody a “lesbian” identity in the business school (2011: 97). What difference might it make if Giddings and Pringle (2011) were to deploy heteronormativity as an analytic category is one that may be partly answered in Ozturk and Rumens (2014). Examining how gay male academics in the UK conform to and/or contest heteronormativity’s regulatory effects, interview data showed how some gay male scholars encountered public displays of anti-LGBTQ* language from students. Demonstrated also is how heteronormative norms relating to sexuality and gender can operate as an implicit standard of normalization. In business school cultures described by study participants as normatively heterosexual and masculine, gender norms were seen to regulate how some gay men were constituted as gender conforming, and thus understood as “normal”, while others were denigrated and Othered for being “effeminate”.

Ozturk and Rumens (2014) illuminate the regulatory power of heteronormativity, through its reliance on gender and sexual norms that constitute restrictively normative conceptions of what both mean, but leave unanswered questions about how heteronormativity is constituted as normative.

Research by Ferry (2018) comes closest to the conceptualization of heteronormativity we find analytically valuable. Deriving conceptual insights from queer theories, Ferry (2018) identifies discourses of heteronormativity and leadership in some of the highest selling US texts on leadership. The analysis relies on an understanding of language as holding a constitutive value, demonstrated in Ferry's critique of leadership texts, in particular how implicit "heteronormative familial logics" constitutes leadership as "serving" heterosexual families. Here the authors of leadership texts refer to the family as a crucible for developing "hardiness" in leadership. In these instances, the family is constituted as heterosexual, safe and healthy. Leadership texts are interrogated for deploying "leadership models [that] imitate the heteronormative familial form of inheritance and generational succession", based on notions of leadership as "universal", "permanent" and "unchanging" (2018: 606). Ferry insists that leadership can function as a "technology of heteronormativity", in the Foucauldian sense of governmentality, where relations of regulatory power constitute a notion of leadership in strictly heteronormative terms. Like Ozturk and Rumens (2014), Ferry (2018) focuses on the regulatory effects of heteronormativity, but takes one step forward by showing us aspects of *how* heteronormativity is constituted as such through language, in leadership texts.

Thus far, a limited number of studies, largely informed by feminist and/or queer theorizing, have started to cultivate insights into the nature, content and effects of heteronormativity in management education and business schools. Concomitant with research

that specifies the nature of heteronormativity as “unrelenting”, “pervasive” and “insidious” (van der Toorn, 2020: 160), the scholarly work cited above shows also how management education can reproduce heteronormative sets of assumptions. One set of assumptions relate to how people are assumed to be heterosexual and to identify with the gender that aligns with the sex they were assigned at birth. A second set of assumptions concerns what genders and sexualities are normatively desirable not just in society, but also in specific management education and business school contexts. As some of the studies above indicate, encountering these assumptions in management education contexts is challenging for LGBTQ* people, with potentially harmful ramifications. Further, while some scholars have enlisted heteronormativity as an object of analysis, they tend not to examine fully how heteronormativity is normatively constituted through language, and, thus, how it can be disrupted through its performative quality. Therefore, and building on this slowly expanding literature, we marshal aspects of Judith Butler’s (1990, 1993) theory of performativity and injurious speech acts to develop the theoretical contribution of this essay.

Queer theory and Judith Butler’s writing on performativity

Butler’s (1990, 1993) early seminal scholarship on performativity and gender has become synonymous with queer theory. Queer theorizing emerged during the early 1990s in the United States, shaped by gay and lesbian studies, feminism and poststructuralism, within the humanities, as a continual, reflexive form of critique of what is “normal” in society (Berlant & Warner, 1998; de Lauretis, 1991; Sedgwick, 1990; Warner, 1991, 1993). As Halperin has often been quoted for writing, “queer is by definition whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant.

There is nothing in particular to which it necessarily refers" (1995: 62 – original emphasis). Initial ideas about what queer theory could *do* related primarily to devising new ways of theorizing gay and lesbian sexualities without using heterosexuality as a starting point or normative benchmark (de Lauretis, 1991; Warner, 1991, 1993). De Lauretis (1991) took up the word "queer" because it already had radical political connotations as a non-normative mode of self-identification (e.g. "I'm queer"), and associations with LGBTQ* activism that sought to transform heteronormative societies. Under the name of queer theory, numerous scholars have interrogated heteronormativity as a regulatory normative regime, and voiced calls to action that aim to disrupt its normative alignment of sex, gender and sexual desire, so non-normative forms of association, intimacy and identifying may emerge (Bersani, 1995; Eng, 2010; Edelman, 2004; Halberstam, 2020).

Butler's writing on performativity is fleshed out in her views on the materialization of gender and sex (1990, 1993), which has come to characterize a particular strand of queer theorizing, even though Butler has never cast herself as a "queer theorist". In Butler's (1990, 1993) early texts, queer theorists found a theoretical account of gender that shattered the claims established in essentialist theories about the origins of gender and sexuality, as intrinsic, stable properties of the individual. In claiming gender as performative, Butler (1990, 1993) turned in part to the seminal linguistic theories of J. L. Austin (1962) for support. At the core of Austin's *How to do Things with Words* (1962) is the idea that language is not just a means by which we can describe something (e.g., "It's a rainy day"), but it can perform specific actions (e.g., "I hereby sentence you to imprisonment"). Austin asks us to discriminate between two types of speech acts. Illocutionary speech acts do what they say in the moment of being uttered through language that adheres to the rules of grammar and pronunciation, so it is easily understood. Of

particular interest to Butler is Austin's notion of "perlocutionary speech acts" (also referred to as "performative utterances"), since they produce effects and actions that are not always the same as the speech act itself. Austin (1962: 6) uses the example of marriage to illustrate this, stating that when someone says, "I do", in response to the question of "do you accept this hand in marriage?", this speech act performs an action. It does so because there already exists an "accepted conventional procedure" in which that procedure includes the "uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances" (Austin, 1962: 14). As such, it is the citation of established conventions, or laws, which give this and other performative speech acts the power to bind.

Butler (1990, 1993, 1997/2021) repeatedly invokes Austin's concept of "performative utterances", but it is revised from a poststructuralist perspective, indebted to Foucault and Derrida. Unlike Austin, Butler locates power not "in the [speaking] subject" but "in the citational legacy" that forms a context of "chain binding conventions" (1993: 225). Phrased differently, a performative speech act will struggle to function performatively without an established history of citational force (e.g., the countless times "I do" has been used in legalized marriage ceremonies over time). In that sense, Butler's conceptualization of power departs from Austin's because it is directed toward the *cumulative* effects of performative utterances.

The notion of performative speech acts undergirds Butler's theory of performativity, which is articulated through an account of gender as performative: as a discursive effect of the repeated citation of gender norms. Importantly, performativity is not a performance in its theatrical sense, where the subject is pre-formed and follows a script; rather, performativity refers to ongoing repetition. Contra to Austin (1962), who assumes a pre-formed rational subject, Butler (1990, 1993) submits that the gendering effects of performative speech acts, which bring

gender subjects into being, are possible only because they come with a history of ongoing citation. Illustrating this, Butler (1990) argues that the moment a child is named as a “girl”, the child is performatively constituted as a gendered subject (i.e., a “girl”) within a pre-existing, discursive regime that regulates gender. Here Butler (1993) attributes performative speech acts an interpellative function. Drawing on and revising Althusser’s (1971) notion of interpellation as a form of hailing, whereby the subject is brought into identity through ideology, Butler emphasizes the cumulative citational force of gender norms in the performative speech act of interpellating a child as a “girl”. Put differently, the child is interpellated as a “girl” only because there is an established history of naming babies as girls. Crucially, at this stage of infancy, the child cannot yet act upon that form of address or understand it. This example shows how subjects are interpellated into a state of becoming (e.g., as a “girl”) that is forced and repetitive. In this way, gender can be seen to be an effect of the “forcible citation” of gender norms.

Claiming that the subject does not create their own gender does not mean Butler voids the agentic capacity of the subject. Significantly, Butler (1990, 1993, 2004) maintains the subject has the capacity to break from mechanical patterns of repetition. In that sense, the subject can cite gender norms differently, and that these citations can produce different, sometimes non-normative realities of gender and gendered lives. Equally, deviations from established gender norms can have punishing effects, such as when girls are labelled “tomboys” for being too “masculine”. Similarly, LGBTQ* people who deviate from norms of heterosexuality can be penalized harshly (ILGA, 2020), even when such deviations are the only way in which LGBTQ* people can live meaningful lives. We turn now to tease out the theoretical purchase of this argument for how management educators can understand heteronormativity as performative.

Heteronormativity as performative and injurious speech acts

Butler's theory of gender performativity enables us to conceptualize heteronormativity as performative, whereby we can understand how it is repeatedly constituted in and through language. The ongoing repetition of gender and sexual norms within heteronormative constraints means they become embodied over time and are recognizable as "intelligible" genders and sexualities: "those which in some sense institute and maintain relations of coherence and continuity among sex, gender, sexual practice, and desire" (Butler, 1999: 23). For example, a "male" is assumed to be "masculine" and "heterosexual" and whose sexual attraction is oriented in an opposite direction.

At this juncture, Butler's (1997/2021) writing on "injurious speech" acts develops our argument that heteronormativity can be understood as performative, and how it is constituted as normative. While Butler recognizes how words such as insults and slurs can hurt us, her foremost concern is how injurious speech can act on people to expose and renew the linguistic vulnerabilities of particular subjects in specific contexts. Injurious speech is not merely about what derogatory words can hurt people, but about how performative speech acts can reinscribe the subject's vulnerability to language by repeatedly constituting the subject in ways not of their choosing. The power of injurious speech in the present is in part historical, derived from a history of injurious speech acts repeated in specific contexts in particular ways. This is manifestly evident in the citational histories of how LGBTQ* people have been variously interpellated under heteronormative constraints (e.g., through binaristic categories of sexuality and gender). As such, injurious speech can "*enact* domination" (Butler, 1997/2021: 19, original emphasis), or, in our terms, both constitute and sustain the performativity of heteronormativity.

In this vein, language is not intrinsically injurious; rather, it is heteronormativity that injures LGBTQ* subjects through language and the speech acts consequent upon it.

However, the gap between the context in which injurious speech originates and its effects means that injurious speech can have a meaning other than the one intended. Put another way, the speaker never has full control over their speech, in terms of anticipating how it will be interpreted and to what future use it may be pressed into. For Butler, the idea that injurious speech can be returned to the speaker in a way that is wrenched from its previous history of citation, whereby words are uttered without prior authorization, is what makes disruption and political change possible. Butler (1997/2021: 15) refers to this as resignifying injurious speech, producing a “counter-speech”, that is a type of “talking back”, which, when repeated over time and in different contexts, can rupture the link between speech acts and their power to injure. We can see this in how the word “queer”, formerly an offensive slur for LGBTQ* people, was hijacked by LGBTQ* groups and repeatedly resignified in other contexts, such that it has become a generally positive term for non-normative sexualities and genders. These theoretical insights have substantial implications for management educators, not the least of them being the potential for disrupting heteronormativity in management education through language. It is this potential we discuss next in our proposal.

DISRUPTING HETERONORMATIVITY IN MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

In what follows, we first contend that pedagogical spaces may be cultivated intentionally or open up advantageously in encounters that enable the performativity of heteronormative to be

disrupted. Specifically, disrupting heteronormativity is elaborated in this part of the essay as an ongoing rupture of the heteronormative strictures and values embedded and encoded within speech acts, which performatively constitute heteronormativity as normative. Here we conceptualize disruptions to the performativity of heteronormativity as language based, where, for instance, LGBTQ* subjects may repeatedly refuse to inhabit the normativity of language that injures.

In sync with Butler, we do not elaborate our proposal as a list of prescriptions or as a pedagogical framework, as both can function as regulatory devices that unintentionally supplant one set of norms and state of orthodoxy with another. Butler's approach to her subject matter resists this by adopting a more open-ended prose, where questions are frequently raised but may remain unresolved, and theoretical possibilities explored but not exhausted (Salih, 2002). Along the same line, Table 1 provides sample questions educators can ask of students, in order to interrogate heteronormativity from a Butlerian perspective, with the aim of disrupting its performative constitution. These questions relate to the three parts of our proposal, which may be read as discrete but interconnected pedagogical actions. As we contend, disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity is most effective when the actions outlined below are concurrent, repeated, and part of a larger constellation of interventions that combat heteronormativity. We consider this further in our concluding remarks.

At this point, it is important to connect with wider extant educational research that has started to examine the fruitfulness of Butler's writing on speech acts and performativity as pedagogical resources for disrupting heteronormativity (Ashe, 2009; Eichhorn, 2001; Forrest, Keener, & Harkins, 2010; Peters & Swanson, 2004). This scholarship reminds us that incorporating Butler's ideas and theories into management education may be disruptive by and

of itself, especially as sexuality and gender are not the standard fare of management education curricula (Rumens, 2017). Moreover, as Peters and Swanson (2004: 296) aver, LGBTQ* students “rarely see, let alone have a say about, their own issues in the academic curriculum”, so opportunities to deploy scholarly material, such as Butler’s writing on injurious speech, which foregrounds the role of language surrounding LGBTQ* issues, is particularly salient. Indeed, the consideration of how students “make meaning of and feel about a curriculum and other class experiences” can enhance its relevance (Bartunek & Ren, 2022: 514). Writing on the benefits of Butler’s notion of injurious speech in that regard, Ashe (2009) found using contemporary examples of injurious speech in political discourse on sexuality in Northern Ireland (NI) helped students to interrogate its implications in their own society. One outcome was that students were motivated to research the historical, social and political conditions through which injurious speech acts emerge and exert citational force in NI. Additionally, students appeared able to think through how they and others might act, contemplating ways to resist injurious speech, particularly where forms of counter-speech were possible. However, pedagogical encounters that aim to re-work the citational force of injurious LGBTQ* speech do not produce guaranteed outcomes, as noted in Forrest et al.’s (2010) account of how some students re-enacted rather than repeated the injurious speech acts they were encouraged to examine. Such insights reveal that educators must engage with risk and move outside of their comfort zones when utilizing injurious speech acts as pedagogical instruments, which we comment on in the third part of this proposal.

Interrogating how speech acts normalize heteronormativity in management education

Here we argue that disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity in management education requires educators to help students interrogate how heteronormativity is normalized. Pedagogical encounters and contexts that unpack how injurious language normalizes heteronormativity can channel attention to how heteronormativity constitutes LGBTQ* sexualities and genders under duress. Pursuing this endeavor, educators can elect to use existing examples from management research. In so doing, students could appreciate how LGBTQ* people can expect to encounter injurious speech (Bilewicz & Soral, 2020), even within management education contexts and in teaching activities (Ferry, 2018; Giddings & Pringle, 2011; Ozturk & Rumens, 2014).

We suggest drawing on Giddings and Pringle's (2011) account of heteronormativity in a New Zealand business school, because it is an example in which one student is reported as saying the term "lesbian" was uttered only twice throughout her degree program. A Butlerian reading of this study insists we ask questions about how the performativity of heteronormativity has constituted the word "lesbian" as seemingly "unsayable". Is it, for instance, that management curricula performatively constitute the normativity of what is "sayable" and "unsayable" as it pertains to sexuality, specifically lesbian sexualities, in the context of management education? Addressing a question such as this requires educators to ask students to think through how speech acts can exert performative force to normalize heteronormativity (Butler, 1990, 2004; Warner, 1993). When considered as a speech act, the utterance of "lesbian" in Giddings and Pringle (2011) threatens to shatter the normalization of the silence that surrounds the term "lesbian", and, by extension, to call out the normative omissions in management curricula and teaching activities. Viewed as such, the term "lesbian" is not just a word that describes something, but, to recap, it is an utterance that "acts". For this reason, educators must be

concerned with how speech acts can sustain and/or disrupt the performativity of heteronormativity, since it can retrench the ground upon which they can be interpellated into being in ways of their own choosing.

Following on from this, educators may engage students in problematizing how the performativity of heteronormativity is reproduced through the language in management texts. This angle of interrogation treats management texts not merely as repositories of knowledge or as holding only an instructional value, but as examples of the interpellative power of language. At stake here is the ability of LGBTQ* people to recognize themselves in management texts and discourse. However, what we propose is not merely a matter of identifying what management texts mention LGBTQ* sexualities and genders, and what ones do not. As Ferry (2018) amply demonstrates, management texts normalize heteronormative cultural logics and binaristic categories of sexuality and gender, such that they regulate what can and cannot be said about LGBTQ* sexualities and genders. Adopting a Butlerian mode of analysis could enable educators to delve deeper and move beyond more obvious issues surrounding the “proper” LGBTQ* content of management curricula and texts. While these are undoubtedly pertinent issues, it is the analysis of explicit and implicit norms of heteronormativity that can shed light on how they govern the kind of speech through which LGBTQ* subjects are brought into being.

One option available to educators is to encourage students to analyze management texts where no explicit references are made to LGBTQ* people, exemplified in Ferry (2018), where students could expose the implicit normalization of heterosexuality in how topics such as “leadership” and “management” are brought into being through language. Another option involves analyzing examples of the growing number of management texts that now include LGBTQ* issues. One line of questioning could focus on how language is used in these texts to

constitute specific representations of LGBTQ* sexualities and genders, but not others. Angled in this way, discussion can concentrate on exploring how speech acts brings LGBTQ* sexualities and genders into being *under constraint*. Is it the case, as demonstrated in Bendl et al.'s (2008) analysis of management diversity discourse, that LGBTQ* sexualities and genders are frequently constituted as discrete, fixed categories that lend themselves to being “managed” in ways that do not challenge heteronormativity? Ensuing classroom debates could address broader issues about how LGBTQ* people can obtain, in Butler’s words, “cultural control over their own representation and narrativization” in and through language (1997/2021: 132). Thinking over the possibilities for LGBTQ* people to authorize their own speech acts requires contemplating the various positions of LGBTQ* people in societies. In other words, educators and students need to get to grips with how language makes possible, but also threatens, the modes of social existence open to LGBTQ* subjects.

The effects of injurious speech acts on LGBTQ* people

Accepting that the interrogation of how heteronormativity is normalized in management education through language is potentially disruptive, another mode of action relates to teaching that centers on the effects of injurious speech on LGBTQ* people, and why such speech acts must cease. We suggest that educators can draw on examples in extant management research where LGBTQ* subjects are directly called out and named as Other. One reason for so doing is that such examples may resonate deeply with management students, especially with those who have witnessed and/or experienced such speech acts in and outside HEIs. In particular, Ozturk and Rumens (2014) provides fertile ground to stimulate debate, not least because it documents

how an MBA student interrupts an educator during a lecture on sexual orientation issues in the workplace, and says: “I cannot see why homosexuality is relevant on a management degree, it’s disgusting”. Reflecting on this incident, the educator notes: “some other students murmured in agreement”. Applying Butler’s ideas on injurious speech alerts us to how such utterances can inflict immediate injury, as in the case of the educator who describes its paralyzing effect: “I didn’t know what to do. I wanted the ground to open up and swallow me whole” (Ozturk & Rumens, 2014: 508). This quotation underscores Butler’s concerns with how injurious speech acts may “appear to fix or paralyze the one it hails” (1997/2021: 2), which can be experienced as pain at a personal level. The context in which this speech act is uttered contributes to the educator’s sense of being out of control, being “paralyzed” in a large lecture theatre in front of 100 or so MBA students. As Butler (1997/2021: 4) maintains, being injured by speech is to “suffer a loss of context”, which may be felt by the subject as a disorienting sense of not knowing where they are. That injurious speech can be unanticipated and uttered without warning can dislodge the sense of context the subject has within an established community of speakers, and in this instance professional pedagogical speakers within a university business school. This, in turn, can shape how educators are viewed by students, especially by those who may rely on educators to deal with LGBTQ* injurious speech effectively.

Both Giddings and Pringle (2011) and Ozturk and Rumens (2014) can be read as converging on the capacity of language to injure LGBTQ* people through its interpellative power, that is, to be called into linguistic being in a specific way, not of the subject’s choosing. But, in Ozturk and Rumens (2014), the effects of injurious speech encompass also its capacity to reinscribe the linguistic vulnerabilities to which “homosexuals” are currently susceptible. Educators may encourage students to ask, what is it specifically that makes the speech act that

constitutes “homosexuality” as “disgusting” particularly offensive to LGBTQ* people? Here educators and students must deliberate how injurious speech acts injure only when they are animated through a citational history steeped in heteronormativity, which has repeatedly brought “homosexuals” into linguistic being as “disgusting”. Pertinent then is knowledge of citational histories that performatively constitute LGBTQ* sexualities and genders with injurious effects.

Expanding this point, educators can utilize scholarly materials produced by historians of sexuality. Historical research on human sexualities demonstrates how, for example, gay men have been constituted as “deviants”, “perverts”, “sinners” and “disease carriers” (D’Emilio, 1983; Foucault, 1979). Faderman’s (1991) seminal work on the development of lesbian subcultures in twentieth century America reveals how lesbian histories are different to those of gay men, demonstrating how gendered derogatory terms, including “dyke”, “bulldyke”, “lipsticks” and “bull daggers”, masculinize lesbians, while insults aimed at gay men have a citational history of over identifying them in feminine terms (e.g., as “sissies”, “fairies” and “pansies”). By comparison, Angelides’s (2001) history of bisexuality shows how bisexuals have been constituted in heteronormative terms of “excess” (having access to both men and women as sexual partners) and “indecision” (they have yet to decide if they are heterosexual or homosexual). Opprobrium targeted at bisexuals is explained in part because bisexuality has functioned historically as an Other to sexuality itself, since its existence threatens to undermine the heteronormative binary of heterosexuality/homosexuality.

In conjunction with Butler’s theory of performativity and speech acts, the intertwined histories of LGBTQ* sexualities and genders can provide a counterpoint to the utterance that “homosexuality” is “disgusting”. With the weight of historical research in tow, educators can foster a deeper understanding about how LGBTQ* people are interpellated as different kinds of

subjects, which addresses again a fundamental point made by Butler (1997/2021), that injurious speech can threaten the existence of specific subjects. As the example of injurious speech in Ozturk and Rumens (2014) shows, language can “wield its own violence” (Butler, 1997/2021: 6) that is bound up in how it performatively constitutes those it hails into being and those it does not. Knowledge of these citational histories not only offers educators a chance to interrogate how speech acts work performatively, but they can furnish insights into how LGBTQ* people have engaged in Butler’s notion of “counter-speech”. Following on from this, educators could challenge students to think through how LGBTQ* people in education and other work domains can respond to injurious speech acts, in order to rupture their power to injure. We turn next to consider this mode of disruption to the performativity of heteronormativity.

The resignification of LGBTQ* injurious speech acts

For Butler (1997/2021), the resignification of injurious speech acts represents a particularly fruitful avenue for political action. For our purposes, resignification is a linguistic practice that can potentially disrupt the performativity of heteronormativity in management education. In practice, reworking the power of injurious speech so it is directed back to the speaker, in the hope that it serves another use than the one it was originally intended, is no small matter. The repetition of injurious language to alter how it is understood is freighted with risk, for there is no guarantee that it will be understood in an affirmative mode. Yet, as Butler avers, it is a necessary risk taken in response to how injurious speech constitutes the subject at risk of being injured. Considering this, the remainder of our proposal concentrates on how educators and students can think through the possibilities for resignifying LGBTQ* injurious speech acts.

Let us contemplate a management classroom scenario in which a student makes an off-the-cuff remark that implies gay men are not “proper” men because they are naturally more feminine than masculine. One response educators can adopt is to refute its content immediately, and/or reprimand or “cancel” out the speaker. These types of responses may be supported by some business schools and HEIs, as part of a strategy to create and maintain “inclusive” management education contexts. However, Butler (1997/2021) offers an alternative perspective on how to address such speech acts, which emphasizes that contesting the content of injurious speech acts and/or shutting them down can reinforce the performative power of language that injures. For Butler, calling out speech acts that are injurious or their speakers as offensive does not make them otherwise, unless efforts are made to engage in linguistic resignification. This is not a way of saying that management educators cannot or should not challenge the content of speech acts that injure and/or avoid repeating them in class. The expediencies of teaching can be such that it is necessary to react quickly and reflect later on how to address the occurrence of injurious speech acts. Nor does Butler rule out acting in this way; rather, Butler wagers that we consider how, in particular contexts, we can *use* injurious speech acts to disrupt their citational force.

To illustrate, Butler (in Olson & Worsham, 2000: 759-760) recalls “walking on a street in Berkeley [when] some kid leaned out of a window and asked, ‘Are you a lesbian?’ Just like that.” Butler replies in the affirmative: “Yes, I *am* a lesbian” (emphasis in original). As Butler reflects, the questioner was really asking of her, are you something I fear? Furthermore, the questioner attempts to exercise “power over [Butler]” by “exposing” her as lesbian through the question posed. Butler reasons that her ability to offer a quick retort in the affirmative (i.e., “I *am* a lesbian”) depletes the power of language to injure her. The questioner is understood by Butler

as posing a question about how and if the word “lesbian” can be used, to which Butler’s response informs her “interrogator” that “lesbian” can be claimed in an affirmative mode. It is quite feasible that the child in Butler’s example leaves the scene of address with an unaltered negative view of what “lesbian” means, but it also the case that, upon hearing the word resignified and returned in the affirmative, the child is deterred from repeating its injurious use, knowing it does not always injure.

Resuming our scenario, one option is to return injurious speech to the speaker in an affirmative mode. Unanticipated speech acts can be mobilized as pedagogical resources, whereby educators respond swiftly to the speech act, such as encouraging the speaker to reflect on how the speech they have uttered can be potentially injurious to gay men. This could begin with an affirmative statement, “some gay men *do* identify positively as feminine, but many others identify differently in terms of gender”; followed by a question: in what contexts and for what purposes does the claim, gay men are naturally more masculine than feminine, make gay men feel inferior? Redirecting the injurious power of the student’s speech act in this way can commence the work of resignification in a pedagogical context that encourages critical interrogation. Questions that probe the power of injurious speech acts (see Table 1) could stimulate debate beyond clarifying the content and expressions of “offensive” and “non-offensive” language. The latter questions, as useful as they are, do not shine light on differences in the contexts, modes of address, speakers and the aims in the use of injurious speech acts. Following Butler (1997/2021), educators would not focus on formulating a “typology” of uses, contexts, modes of address and speakers, but interrogate how differences in all these features operate within a heteronormative field of discursive power. Sample questions in Table 1, which relate to resignifying injurious speech acts, may be used to excite this type of disruptive

interrogation, enabling educators and students to critique the heteronormative binaristic categories of sexuality and gender at work in our scenario.

Significantly, pedagogical contexts in management education could perform the recontextualizing of injurious speech acts to enable resignification. Still, teaching that uses LGBTQ* injurious speech acts can feel uncomfortable and laden with risk, for educators and students. Repeating LGBTQ* injurious speech in the classroom to rework its injurious power may deter management educators. While in some pedagogical contexts, it may not be possible to repeat injurious speech acts. Here Butler (1997/2021: xx) is emphatic, teaching about injurious speech has to repeat “words that wound”, if educators are to avoid a “paradoxical situation” where an essay or class on interrogating the power of injurious speech “cannot even mention the words that are considered injurious”. Circumscribed in this way, LGBTQ* injurious speech is at risk of becoming taboo, maintaining its power to injure within a domain that remains heteronormative. For some educators and students, there is the risk of anxiety if they have been the targets of the same injurious language being subject to scrutiny. We are profoundly sympathetic to such concerns and acknowledge that it is sometimes not possible to resignify injurious speech acts when they are linked to personal and professional anxiety and trauma. Yet, in other instances, it can be pedagogically productive if educators and students move out of their comfort zones and act to dislodge the power of language to injure LGBTQ* people.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this essay, we have set out to show how heteronormativity is constituted performatively as normative through language, and what management educators can do to disrupt it. Butler’s

(1990, 1993, 1997/2021, 2004) writing on speech acts, gender performativity and injurious speech has enabled us to formulate the theoretical context for us to develop our arguments to that end. In that respect, we explicate the theoretical and practical implications for management education and educators. Regarding the former, we conclude first that connecting performativity and heteronormativity enables educators to interrogate how heteronormativity is performatively constituted through language. Assigning language a constitutive value permits an understanding of how performative speech acts produce effects, constituting heteronormativity as normative. Thus, conceptualizing heteronormativity as performative advances current conceptions and analyzes of heteronormativity and management education that tend to focus on its nature, content and impacts on LGBTQ* people (Giddings & Pringle, 2011; McQuarrie, 1998; Ozturk and Rumens, 2014). Specifically, understanding heteronormativity as performative opens doors for educators to examine in pedagogical contexts *how* it is discursively constituted and reproduced as normative through language. Gaining such knowledge could inform how management education might be considered and practiced otherwise, from how management curricula can be deployed to combat heteronormativity to incorporating queer theories into pedagogical contexts that incite ongoing analyzes of what is normal.

Second, in conceptualizing heteronormativity as performatively constituted, Butler's scholarship urges educators not to think of language as intrinsically injurious, or locate the power of injurious speech as emanating from one speaker. Rather, it is within a discursive field of heteronormativity that prior speakers and histories of citational force are conditioned and shape how LGBTQ* subjects are vulnerable to language in specific ways. Pertinent to our essay is Butler's (1990, 1993, 1997/2021) argument that language has a constitutive force that makes possible certain forms of social existence, while foreclosing others. As we have shown, injurious

language can produce different effects, but its capacity to threaten the existence of LGBTQ* subjects is of utmost concern, not only in how some speech acts announce what they intend to do (e.g., “I’m going to attack you because you’re a homosexual”), but also in how they constitute LGBTQ* subjects in ways not of their choosing. Thus, knowledge of these linguistic vulnerabilities can enable educators to assess how, for example, management curricula and texts can produce binaristic heteronormative concepts of sexuality and gender that many LGBTQ* people cannot or do not wish to be slotted into. Understanding that language has a central role in constituting LGBTQ* subjects in a field of heteronormative power, *under duress*, means that educators must incorporate into management education the sexualities and genders that rupture heteronormative binaristic categories of sexuality and gender.

Third, a Butlerian theory of performativity can inspire educators and students to disrupt the performativity of heteronormativity by reworking the citational force of injurious speech acts. As we have discussed above, injurious speech acts can be mobilized as pedagogical devices, which seek to repeat not re-enact their injurious effects, fostering linguistic occasions, both planned and unanticipated, for pedagogical purposes for which they were never intended. In practical terms, educators must specify how the repetition of injurious speech will occur, by whom and the pedagogical contexts in which it is interrogated. Also, it involves asking questions (see Table 1) that challenge students to engage with a theory of performativity that has potentially political effects, in how it can disrupt the performativity of heteronormativity. Despite the aforementioned risks associated with this endeavor, management students will enter places of work that are heteronormative, where they are likely to encounter LGBTQ* injurious speech acts that sustain heteronormativity. Providing pedagogical contexts in management education for exploring these issues, where LGBTQ* injurious speech can be interrogated, is pivotal for

developing the skills needed by students to disrupt – potentially resignify - such speech in the workplace.

At this stage, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of what we have proposed. We anticipate the critics who may reproach us for advancing a proposal based on “language games”, a criticism that has been levelled at Butler, for the emphasis placed on the power of language (see Nussbaum, 1999). Countering this, we reiterate one of Butler’s key points, that is, language acts upon us – and injures us - because we are linguistic beings, whose conditions of social existence are constituted by language. As such, we live in language and the linguistic power of language has to be accounted for, not least in how it constitutes the performativity of heteronormativity. Still, we are more receptive to the argument that disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity, as we have set out above, depends on repetition. We are acutely aware that slippage can occur between repeating and re-enacting injurious speech (Forrest et al., 2010), and it may be impossible for educators and students to engage in such repetition, especially in institutions and cultural contexts where heteronormativity is strictly regulated. Furthermore, not all repetitions will be successful in disjointing language from its power to injure LGBTQ* subjects (Butler, 1997/2021; Eichhorn, 2001). This may daunt educators and students from engaging in repetition, but the fact that some repetitions will fail to resignify only reinforces the necessity of repetition so disruptions to heteronormativity are generated over time. For this reason, disrupting heteronormativity will have minimal impact if it is annexed within single modules or limited to isolated classroom activities. Rather, it is a repetitive endeavor that must occur throughout diverse management education contexts, encounters and in the HEIs in which it is practised. We recognize the challenge this presents, but models of management education that elicit the sustained collaboration and commitment of diverse stakeholders from marginalized

groups, including LGBTQ* staff and students, is essential and a “form of good practice” in that respect (Dodd, Graves, & Hentzen, 2022).

Considering the above, one practical implication for management education concerns locating our proposal in a larger landscape of remedial action currently taken to eradicate heteronormativity. As a global problem (HRC, 2022), we posit that heteronormativity qualifies as one of society’s “grand challenges” (George, Howard-Grenville, Joshi, & Tihanyi, 2016: 1881; Ferraro, Etzion, & Gehman, 2015), on the basis that it is a “critical barrier” in societies, whose removal would help solve the social problem of LGBTQ* discrimination, with the high likelihood of global impact. In practice, heteronormativity is manifestly different in and across world regions, from those that criminalize same-sex intimacies (ILGA, 2020), to those countries where the normalization of some but not all LGBTQ* sexualities and genders is underway (Drucker, 2015). Interrogating the performativity of heteronormativity in management education contexts in regions where “homosexuality” is criminalized or enwrapped in silence may not be practically possible, as sexuality and gender are particularly sensitive conductors of extreme views that escalate quickly into debates about moral absolutes (Weeks, 2011).

Related to this is an implication for practice that highlights the potentially productive collaborations between management education, businesses, human rights organisations, LGBTQ* activists and academics. We anticipate the benefits to be gained from such collaborations that include building inroads into cultures and societies that establish strict moral and social standards about what sexualities and genders are “natural” and “right”, and which are not. In turn, this emphasizes the importance of providing more diversity, equality and inclusion programs in organizations (Evan, 2022). As such, we align ourselves with other management scholars for whom management education must play a prominent role in tackling social

inequality (Fotaki & Prasad, 2015; Neal, 2017; Zulfiqar, & Prasad, 2021). At the risk of stating the obvious, we do not foresee situations where such divisions of interest and conflicts of view suddenly disappear. But we can imagine the means by which such differences might be addressed to agree shared goals and aspirations. Collaborating with multiple stakeholders in consortia, for instance, has been evidenced as an effective means by which efforts can be coordinated and agreed, in order to enhance goal alignment (Olsen, Sofka, & Grimpe, 2016). We are realistic about what can be achieved here, as progress is likely to be small and incremental, although extremely important.

Last, there is a significant implication for advancing management education scholarship. We recommend the generation of knowledge regarding heteronormativity and management education. Given its nascent quality, this topic area urgently requires empirical and theoretical development. Future scholarship could range from investigating how LGBTQ* management educators and students encounter and confront heteronormativity, surveying and interviewing management students about the skills they feel they need to combat heteronormativity as future managers and leaders, to research that examines the efficacy of specific pedagogies that galvanize heteronormativity as an object of analysis. There is a great deal at stake here. If we continue to do very little in this area, both management educators and students will be left unequipped to meet obligations and demands placed on them by those who are wounded by LGBTQ* injurious speech, and the organizations and diverse others who seek to eradicate heteronormativity in societies around the globe.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Professor Dirk Lindebaum and three anonymous reviewers for their support, insight, and constructive feedback on previous versions of this essay.

APPENDIX

Glossary of terms

Binaries – linguistic forms of organizing and regulating sex, sexuality and gender into hierarchical opposites (e.g., male/female; heterosexual/homosexual; masculinity/femininity).

Citationality – For each spoken or written word to be understood and intelligible, it must refer to previous uses of itself.

Discourse – a linguistic mode through which power and language act, conditioning and specifying the possibility for subjects, sex, gender, sexuality, etc., to materialize.

Gender – Not based on biology sex assigned at birth, but a repetition of stylized acts that produces the effect of a coherent gender; a regulatory norm; an effect of discourse.

Heteronormative discourse – Constitutes and normalizes sex, sexuality and gender as bounded, stable and internal properties of the subject, organized into binaries; normalizes heterosexuality.

Heteronormativity – A normative regime that constitutes heterosexuality as “natural” and “normal”, providing a normative standard against which LGBTQ* sexualities are “unnatural” and “abnormal”.

Heterosexuality – A category of knowledge about sexuality where sexual attraction and desires are organized as opposite between men and women; when constituted in heteronormative discourse it is privileged as “natural” and “normal”, as a model for society.

Homosexuality – A heteronormative category of knowledge about same-sex sexual desire and attractions whose meanings are constituted as being oppositional and inferior to heterosexuality.

Injurious speech – Speech acts that act on subjects by wounding them to expose and renew the linguistic vulnerabilities of particular subjects in specific contexts

Interpellation – A term coined by Louis Althusser to describe how subjects are hailed into being by ideology.

Iterability – Implies that each spoken or written word can be re-used and changed differently in the process of iteration.

LGBTQ* - Acronym that refers to lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer * sexualities and genders. The asterisk denotes other non-normative sexualities and genders (e.g. pansexual, genderqueer, non-binary) but how it is used is inconsistent and often debated.

Language – Not a closed system of signs and signifiers, but a constitutive force that brings subjects into being through its interpellative and performative acts.

Illocutionary speech acts – they do what they say in the moment of being uttered, through language that adheres to the rules of grammar and pronunciation, so it is easily understood.

Performance – Assumes a pre-formed subject in a form of theatrical self-presentation; not to be confused with performativity.

Performativity – In Butler’s writing, a language based theory of how the forced reiterative and constrained citation of gender norms produces the effect of gender as coherent and stable.

Performative speech acts – In Butler’s terms, these acts perform a specific action and exercise a binding power that is derived from the cumulative force of their citational history.

Perlocutionary speech acts – Produce specific effects and actions that are not the same as the speech act itself.

Power – Located in language/discourse, evidenced by its citational and constitutive force.

Queer – Formerly an insult against LGBTQ* people; also an identity category for non-normative genders and sexualities; whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant.

Queer theory/theorizing – A constellation of theoretical resources drawn from feminism, gay and lesbian studies and poststructuralism, used to critique what is “normal”, emphasizing how we might escape the restrictions and constraints of normative regimes. It has an established history of being used to analyze sexuality and gender, and critiquing heteronormativity.

Sexual orientation: designates an individual’s sexual and romantic attraction to other people (or “lack thereof”), forming the basis of an individual’s sexual identity.

Sexuality – Not based on biology sex assigned at birth, but a repetition of stylized acts that produces the effect a coherent sexuality; a regulatory norm; an effect of discourse.

Speech act – Language is not just a means to describe something, it acts upon us.

Subject(s) – A linguistic category constituted in and through language.

Utterance – Constatative utterances describe something; performative utterances are those that perform actions.

References

Althusser, L. 1971. Ideology and ideological state apparatuses, in *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*, trans. Brewster, B. London: New Left books.

Angelides, S. 2001. *A history of bisexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Angelo, P.J., & Bocci, D. 2021. *The Changing Landscape of Global LGBTQ+ Rights*. 29 January 2021. Available at <https://www.cfr.org/article/changing-landscape-global-lgbtq-rights> (Accessed: 22 November 2022).

Ashe, F. 2009. Iris Robinson's excitable speech: sexuality and conflict transformation in Northern Ireland. *Politics*, 29: 20-27.

Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Ball, C.A. 2019. *The queering of corporate America: How big business went from LGBTQ adversary to ally*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Baker, A. C., Hillier, A., & Perry, M. 2020. Street-level bureaucrats and intersectional policy logic: A case study of LGBTQ policy and implementation barriers. *Journal of Policy Practice and Research*, 1: 96-112.

Bartunek, J. M., & Ren, I. Y. 2022. Curriculum isn’t enough: What relevant teaching means, how it feels, why it matters, and what it requires. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 21: 503-516.

Bendl, R., Fleischmann, A., & Walenta, C. 2008. Diversity management discourse meets queer theory. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 23: 382-394.

Berlant, L., & Warner, M. 1998. Sex in public. *Critical inquiry*, 24: 547-566.

Bersani, L. 1996. *Homos*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

- Bilewicz, M., & Soral, W. 2020. Hate speech epidemic. The dynamic effects of derogatory language on intergroup relations and political radicalization. *Political Psychology*, 41: 3-33.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of "sex"*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1997/2021. *Excitable speech*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1999. *Gender trouble. Anniversary edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 2004. *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 2010. Performative agency. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 3: 147-161.
- D'Emilio, J. 1983. *Sexual politics, sexual communities: the making of a homosexual minority in the United States, 1940-1970*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- De Lauretis, T. 1991. Queer theory: Lesbian and gay sexualities an introduction. *differences*, 3: iii-xviii.
- Dean, J.J. 2014. *Straights*. New York: New York University Press.
- DePalma, R., & Atkinson, E. 2010. The nature of institutional heteronormativity in primary schools and practice-based responses. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26: 1669-1676.
- Dodd, T., Graves, C., & Hentzen, J. 2022. Impact and university business training courses delivered to the marginalized: A systematic review. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 21: 449-469.
- Drucker, P. 2015. *Warped: Gay normality and queer anti-capitalism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Eichhorn, K. 2001. Re-in/citing linguistic injuries: speech acts, cyberhate, and the spatial and temporal character of networked environments. *Computers and Composition*, 18: 293-304.
- Edelman, L. 2004. *No future*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Eng, D. L. 2010. *The feeling of kinship*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). 2020. *A long way to go for LGBTI equality*. Luxembourg: FRA.
- Evan, R.J. 2022. Diversity and Inclusion Matters: Tactics and Tools to Inspire Equity and Game-Changing Performance. *Academy of management Learning & Education*, 00: 1-3.
- Faderman, L. 1991. *Odd girls and twilight lovers: A history of lesbian life in twentieth-century America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ferraro, F., Etzion, D., & Gehman, J. 2015. Tackling grand challenges pragmatically: robust action revisited. *Organization Studies*, 36: 363-390.

Ferry, N. C. 2018. It's a family business!: Leadership texts as technologies of heteronormativity. *Leadership*, 14: 603-621.

Flores, A. R., Langton, L., Meyer, I. H., & Romero, A. P. 2020. Victimization rates and traits of sexual and gender minorities in the United States: Results from the national crime victimization survey, 2017. *Science Advances*, 6: 1-10.

Foucault, M. 1979. *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. London: Vintage.

Forrest, M., Keener, T., & Harkins, M. J. 2010. Understanding narrative relations in teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 38: 87-101.

Fotaki, M., & Prasad, A. 2015. Questioning neoliberal capitalism and economic inequality in business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14: 556-575.

George, G., Howard-Grenville, J., Jshi, A., & Tihanyi, L. 2016. Understanding and tackling societal grand challenges through management research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1880-1895.

Gerber, P., & Gory, J. 2014. The UN Human Rights Committee and LGBT rights: what is it doing? What could it be doing? *Human Rights Law Review*, 14: 403-439.

Giddings, L., & Pringle, J. 2011. Heteronormativity at work: stories from two lesbian academics. *Women's Studies Journal*, 25: 91– 100.

Graham, S. C., & MacFarlane, A. J. 2021. Gender nonconforming individuals and business education: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Education*, 45: 599-626.

Graham, M.E., Kennavane, E. & Wears, K.H. 2008. Diversity management content in introductory human resource management textbooks. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7: 429-433.

Halberstam, J. 2020. *Wild things: The disorder of desire*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Halperin, D. M. 1995. *Saint Foucault: Towards a gay hagiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawley, J. C. (Ed.). 2015. *Expanding the circle: Creating an inclusive environment in higher education for LGBTQ students and studies*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Horton, P., Rydstrom, H., & Tonini, M. 2015. Contesting heteronormativity: The fight for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender recognition in India and Vietnam. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17: 1059-1073.

International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association [ILGA]. (2020). *World State Sponsored Homophobia Report*. ILGA.

Knight, R., Shoveller, J. A., Oliffe, J. L., Gilbert, M., & Goldenberg, S. 2013. Heteronormativity hurts everyone: Experiences of young men and clinicians with sexually transmitted infection/HIV testing in British Columbia, Canada. *Health*, 17: 441-459.

Lingiardi, V., Carone, N., Semeraro, G., Musto, C., D'Amico, M., & Brena, S. 2020. Mapping Twitter hate speech towards social and sexual minorities: A lexicon-based approach to semantic content analysis. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 39: 711-721.

Marine, S. B. 2011. *Stonewall's Legacy: Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, and Transgender Students in Higher Education: AEHE* (Vol. 152). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

McQuarrie, F. A. 1998. Expanding the concept of diversity: Discussing sexual orientation in the management classroom. *Journal of Management Education*, 22: 162-172.

Mofokeng, T. 2022. *Violence and its impact on the right to health. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.* A/HRC/50/28. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G22/310/91/PDF/G2231091.pdf?OpenElement> (Accessed: 22 November 2022).

Neal, M. 2017. Learning from poverty: Why business schools should address poverty, and how they can go about it. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16: 54-69.

Ng, E. S., & Rumens, N. 2017. Diversity and inclusion for LGBT workers: Current issues and new horizons for research. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 34: 109-120.

Nussbaum, M. C. 1999. The professor of parody. *New Republic*, 220: 37-45.

Okegbe, S. 2021. Rhetorical Analysis of an Organizational Artifact: A University's Response in Defense of Hate Speech. *New Media and Mass Communication*, 95: 67-74.

Olsen, A. Ø., Sofka, W., & Grimpe, C. 2016. Coordinated exploration for grand challenges: The role of advocacy groups in search consortia. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59: 2232–2255

Olson, G. A., & Worsham, L. 2000. Changing the subject: Judith Butler's politics of radical resignification. *JAC*, 20: 727-765.

Ozturk, M. B. 2011. Sexual orientation discrimination: Exploring the experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual employees in Turkey. *Human Relations*, 64: 1099-1118.

Ozturk, M. B., & Rumens, N. 2014. Gay male academics in UK business and management schools: Negotiating heteronormativities in everyday work life. *British Journal of Management*, 25: 503-517.

Peters, B., & Swanson, D. 2004. Queering the conflicts: What LGBT students can teach us in the classroom and online. *Computers and Composition*, 21: 295-313.

Ragins, B. R., Singh, R., & Cornwell, J. M. 2007. Making the invisible visible: Fear and disclosure of sexual orientation at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92: 1103- 1118.

Rumens, N. 2017. Queering lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender identities in human resource development and management education contexts. *Management Learning*, 48: 227-242.

Rumens, N. 2018. *Queer business: Queering organization sexualities*. New York: Routledge.

Salih, S. 2002. *Judith Butler*. London: Routledge.

Schwartz, H. M., Van Esch, C., & Bilimoria, D. 2017. Bringing transgender issues into management education: A call to action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 16: 300-313.

Sedgwick, E. K. 1990. *Epistemology of the closet*. London: Penguin.

Simoni, J. M., & Walters, K. L. 2001. Heterosexual identity and heterosexism: Recognizing privilege to reduce prejudice. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 41: 157-172.

Stewart, M. M., Crary, M., & Humberd, B. K. 2008. Teaching value in diversity: On the folly of espousing inclusion, while practicing exclusion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7: 374-386.

Torres, C.A., & Rodrigues, D.L. 2022. Heteronormative beliefs and internalized homonegativity in the coming out process of Portuguese and Turkish sexual minority men. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 19: 663-677.

United Nations. 2019. *Hate speech in the digital world a 'critical obstacle for LGBTI people': UN's Bachelet*. Available at <https://news.un.org/en/story/2019/09/1047322>. (Accessed: 22 November 2022).

van der Toorn, J., Pliskin, R., & Morgenroth, T. 2020. Not quite over the rainbow: The unrelenting and insidious nature of heteronormative ideology. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 34: 160-165.

Vince, R., & Hibbert, P. 2018. From the AMLE editorial team: Disciplined provocation: Writing essays for AMLE. *Academy of Management, Learning and Education*, 17: 397-400.

Warner, M. 1991. Introduction: Fear of a queer planet. *Social text*, 29: 3-17.

Warner, M. (Ed.). 1993. *Fear of a queer planet: Queer politics and social theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Warner, M. 2000. *The trouble with normal: Sex, politics, and the ethics of queer life*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Weeks, J. 2011. *The languages of sexuality*. London: Routledge.

Zulfiqar, G., & Prasad, A. 2021. Challenging social inequality in the Global South: Class, privilege, and consciousness-raising through critical management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 20: 156-181.

Table 1	
Interrogating and disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity in management education	
Pedagogical Actions	Butlerian inspired questions for educators to ask students
Interrogating how speech acts normalize heteronormativity in management education	<p>How are LGBTQ* sexualities and genders constituted in management texts through language?</p> <p>In what ways do these performative constitutions sustain and/or disrupt the performativity of heteronormativity?</p> <p>How are LGBTQ* knowledge gaps normalized in management education?</p> <p>What are the normalizing effects of LGBTQ* knowledge gaps in management texts, in terms of constituting what is “sayable” and “unsayable” about LGBTQ* sexualities and genders?</p> <p>How would management texts read differently if LGBTQ* people contributed to them?</p> <p>Should management education be concerned with the performative constitution of heteronormativity?</p>
Investigating the effects of injurious speech acts on LGBTQ* people	<p>What gives injurious speech the power to injure LGBTQ* in management education contexts and encounters?</p> <p>What are the forms LGBTQ* injurious speech acts take in management education?</p> <p>What are the linguistic effects of injurious speech acts on LGBTQ* subjects in management education, business and society?</p> <p>Should we oppose or “cancel out” LGBTQ* injurious speech in management education contexts?</p> <p>What do the prior histories of LGBTQ* injurious speech and its speakers tell us about how LGBTQ* injurious speech has the power to injure in the present?</p> <p>What differences might there be in how LGBTQ* injurious speech is used and its effects in management education contexts in specific world regions?</p>
Realizing the potential for resignifying LGBTQ* injurious speech acts	<p>What management education contexts might foreclose the possibility of a critical response to LGBTQ* injurious speech?</p> <p>In what types of pedagogical contexts can educators mobilize LGBTQ* injurious speech acts as pedagogical instruments?</p> <p>How can LGBTQ* people refuse to inhabit the normativity of heteronormative language in management education curricula, classrooms, and business schools?</p> <p>What forms might “affirmative” modes of resignification find in management education?</p> <p>What is required of management educators and students to engage in the repetition of resignification, in order to disarm LGBTQ* injurious speech acts?</p> <p>What other actions are needed to support the linguistic practice of resignification in disrupting the performativity of heteronormativity in management education over time?</p>

