Lund University

Department of Sociology

'Pinkwashing' or Protection? A Qualitative Analysis of the City of Copenhagen's LGBTI+ Policy

Author: Maja Bodekær Black

Master's Thesis WPMM42 30 credits

Spring semester 2020

Supervisor: Antionette Hetzler

Abstract

Exploring the City of Copenhagen's LGBTI+ policy, the aim of the thesis is to analyse problems involved in implementing policies within the field of identity politics. The City of Copenhagen has formulated a policy addressing the conditions of LGBT+ people in Copenhagen. However, the implementation of an equalities policy can face problems, as structural discrimination by the wider society is deeply entrenched. The analysis is based on Sara Ahmed's (2012) 'non-performativity', which is when actions are said to have been brought about, when in fact they haven't. By analysing the LGBTI+ policy as well as conducting interviews based on non-performativity, the objective is to explore to what extent the policy provides the leeway for municipal workers' discretion in implementation. Overall, the findings show that the likelihood of implementation depends greatly on how the policy initiatives are constructed and prioritised. However, the actions taken to strengthen the focus on LGBT+ at work were more a matter of 'pressure from below' than a result of the LGBTI+ policy. Thus, while the policy cannot be said to be fully non-performative, the policy and organisational culture contain elements which hinder meaningful implementation of the vision and goal.

Keywords: Non-performativity; LGBTQIA+; local government; Denmark; equalities work; policy

Popular science summary

The purpose of this thesis is to explore how the City of Copenhagen's LGBTI+ policy can increase the manoeuvre room for municipal workers in implementing the policy. It's difficult for local governments to work with equality in a way that improves the conditions for people in society, due to how entrenched stereotypes and inequality is in society. Therefore, it's important to analyse the policy. While the purpose and aim of the policy is admirable, that doesn't mean the policy is actually implemented, or, if it is, that it brings about the intentions and actions it mentions. I have carried out this project by making a text analysis of the LBGTI+ policy combined with interviews of people working in the City of Copenhagen. The text analysis and interviews were based on what Sara Ahmed (2012) has coined 'non-performativity'. In short, this means that the promises of acting on a particular matter aren't actually fulfilled, in spite of this seeming to be done. Because of this, I argue that the LGBTI+ policy in some aspects is non-performative, that it doesn't bring about its promises, which in turn affects how municipal workers are able to work with it in praxis.

Indholdsfortegnelse

List of acronyms and concepts

LGBTQIA: Lesbian; Gay; Bisexual; Transgender; Queer; Intersex; Asexual.

Homo-, bi-, transphobia and intersexism: Can be direct or indirect. The former can involve harassment or discrimination, and the latter (irrational) discomfort about and ignoring LGBT+ matters.

Genderisation and sexualisation: Making something gendered or sexualised in nature, i.e.

Normative: "[…] of, relating to or determining norms", or prescribing or conforming to norms (Merriam-Webster 2020).

He/She/Their: In the thesis I refrain from assigning pronouns to interviewees and only use it sparingly when part of a quote, or similar. Instead, I use they/their in singular.

Narrative: "[…] a way of presenting or understanding a situation or series of events that reflects and promotes a particular point of view or set of values" (Merriam-Webster 2020)

Community/'Fællesskab': When translating the Danish 'fællesskab' to English, the original meaning risks being lost. The use of 'community' in the thesis is mainly meant as a sharedness between people which isn't rooted in spatiality.

The City of Copenhagen's Values Foundation: Consists of the values equal worth, dialogue, trust and respect. In the thesis, it's usually referred to as the 'values foundation'.

1) Introduction

1.1 Introduction & background

The welfare state is meant to guarantee the rights of all of its citizens, irrespective of the identity markers they carry. Rights in the form of protection are usually related to factors like income, health care and (un)employment, the 'classic' issues of the welfare state. There are thus various points in life when a citizen will interact with the welfare state, or state institutions; be it during pregnancy and (early) parenthood, educational/work guidance for young people, during unemployment, or when facing illness. The point of interest in this paper, is the fact that people from the LGBTI+ community are likely to have dissimilar interactions with the welfare state *because of* the identity markers that signal 'deviance' compared to the cis- and heteronormative citizens. This reality is accentuated if a person carries multiple, intersecting identity markers – such as having a physical, sensory, psychological or intellectual disability or belonging to an ethnic or religious 'minority[1]'. History is rich with notions of 'deviance' and 'normality' which goes hand in hand with the various positions of privilege individuals may inhabit (Pease 2011:69-70). This is no less so when it comes to the historical role of the welfare state (Fahlgren et al. 2011).

Over time, the welfare state has played a role in idealising and regulating 'normal' behaviour (Fahlgren 2011:2-4; Kirkebæk 2006, 1999; Richardson 2005). This takes the form of normalising processes, which serve to demarcate the boundaries between 'the normal' and 'the deviant'; between those who act as they should, and those who should be corrected or helped to lead a desirable, 'normal life' (Fahlgren et al. 2011:3-4; Kirkebæk 2006; 1999:7-8). Thus, normalisation

> "[…] is a central analytical tool used to grasp the processes that define and produce what is considered natural or right, and at the same time, produce […] a civilized oppression through the production of 'Outsiderhood'" (Fahlgren et al. 2011:1).

What constitutes 'the normal' changes over time, and has led to discursive shifts with the rise of the neoliberal era's focus on the market and individuality (Fahlgren et al. 2011:4-5;

---

[1] On the term 'minority': I do not use the term as a way to signify an actual amount of people in the LGBTQIA or a religious community, the amount of people with a disability, or something fourth. It is rather to denote the fact that it stands in opposite to given normative standards in society, i.e. cisgender, whiteness, ability, etc.

Richardson & Monro 2013:134). Early examples of regulating behaviour via the production of Outsiderhood are "The island institution at Sprogø […] intended for antisocial mentally deficient women whose behaviour was 'dissolute and loose'" (Kirkebæk 2006:195) and the ban which forbade two men dancing together (KK 2019a:30). In recent times, normalisation processes are influenced by neoliberal individualisation, which hides the structural aspect of normalisation processes, and construct exclusion "[…] as nothing but the outcome of individual choice" (Fahlgren et al. 2011:5). Since (social) exclusion is disguised as the fault and responsibility of the individual, any discrimination LGBT+ people face in welfare state services have not been acknowledged as structural problems to be dealt with by the state. Relatedly, the professional culture, attitudes and beliefs within local government further can affect whether LGBT+ issues are perceived as individual concerns, and thus to what extent they'll be recognised (Richardson & Monro 2013).

While LGBT+ rights have been further extended and the days of dance-bans are over, the structural reproduction of the 'normal' vs. 'deviant' citizen is not. Such processes of normalisation can happen i.e. when outlining the rights for certain groups, or in welfare projects, where the needs and experiences of vulnerable groups are demarcated when planning and implementing projects to help them (Olofsdotter 2011:39). Thus, such normalisation processes cut across intersecting identity markers, such as ethnicity, socio- and geo-political positioning, and disability, and shape our relationship with the (welfare) state.

Since 1970, there has been an incremental extension of LGBT+ rights[2]. Such rights have involved i.e. lifting the aforementioned dance ban and allowing civil partnerships and marriage. For the past 10 years, the focus on LGBT+ issues has increased further, resulting in a number of reports, policies and rights-based improvements. Supporting the LGBT+ agenda has thus been put on the political radar, and has paved the way for reproducing the narrative of the egalitarian and tolerant nation (Petersen 2016:55). This narrative is especially evident in the policies and action plans which paradoxically are meant to address *existing* problems, i.e. higher suicide rates among LGBT+ people and poor service delivery in the health care sector.

The aforementioned problems have been conveyed in numerous reports, but also relate to specific issues for ethnic minorities in Denmark (Als Research 2015; Amnesty

---

[2] For a timeline, see Appendix A

International 2016; Aarhus Kommune 2019; Statens Institut for Folkesundhed 2015). While there are differences within the LGBT+ community, the findings generally report higher levels of mental health issues, including depression and suicidal thoughts/attempts, (slightly) greater tendencies of binge-drinking and drug use, as well as spending more 'time alone, unwantedly' (Statens Institut for Folkesundhed 2015; Als Research 2015). The greatest differences are shown for transgender people and ethnic minorities, who generally fare worse than white, Danish LGB people. For ethnic minorities, who constitute a "minority within the minority", there are more incidences of discrimination and threats or act of violence directed towards them from family members (Als Research 2015:16, my translation). Transgender people in general face greater stigmatisation and discriminatory behaviour from the public as well as the health care system, and have a weaker mental health profile (Amnesty International 2016; Statens Institut for Folkesundhed 2015).

The official policies and action plans formulated by national and local levels of government have, to some degree, set out to eradicate the reported problems faced by the LGBT+ community. They consist of concrete initiatives meant to address discrimination on a structural level. Besides the national action plan (Udenrigsministeriet 2018), Aarhus Municipality has joined the Rainbow Cities Network[3] and formed a Committee for Diversity and Equality (Aarhus Kommune 2020), while Copenhagen Municipality has formulated a policy for the period 2019-2023 and an annual status report (KK 2019a, 2019b). Although policy initiatives in this area symbolise political support and intention for change, it is inherently difficult for both national and local governments to implement policies aimed at addressing structural discrimination. This is in alignment with previous research, which has found external as well as internal barriers to successful implementation of equalities initiatives, and in general (Monro & Richardson 2014, 2013; Monro 2007; Hetzler 1984). Such barriers relate to the modernisation of the public sector, including spending cuts and efficiency improvements, dependence on individual staff members to drive change, and attitudes or beliefs which counter the goal of policy implementation (Monro & Richardson 2014, 2013; Monro 2007; Hetzler 2084; Strauss & Quinn 1993). The literature included in this area mainly rests on research conducted in the UK, since the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) and Disability Discrimination Act (2005), The Equality Act (of 2006 and 2010,

---

[3] The network involves 29 cities from 16 countries, which sign a statement of intent to improve the condictions of the LGBT+ constituents within the given city (https://www.rainbowcities.com/node/57; Aarhus Municipality 2018 (statement of intent; press release))

respectively) have made it mandatory for UK public and private organisations to have diversity policies, which is not the case in Denmark (Ahmed 2012:4; 8; 86). Due to low political priority of equalities legislation, opportunities in the form of legal frameworks have mainly improved post-2011, but mainly in a variegated manner which results in unequal protection against discrimination across equalities strands (Laursen & Thranesen 2019:3; Borchorst et al. 73-75; 79). The literature in the Danish field thus mainly refers to health and health care related aspects of LGBT+, as well as working conditions, and theoretical discussions on citizenship.

With regard to diversity and inclusion to address discrimination, other studies have analysed the ways in which policy documents create *the impression* of being taken up, of enabling meaningful action, but don't manage to enforce it (Almeida 2019; Kimura 2019; Bury 2015). Using Ahmed's (2005; 2012) non-performativity, it is argued that policies do not help to eradicate inequalities, but rather reinforce processes of racialisation, genderisation and sexualisation in texts, images and initiatives (Almeida 2019; Kimura 2019; Bury 2015).

This opens up for discussions on citizenship and the public identity, as the assumed equally inclusive status of citizenship in praxis is difficult to obtain due to cis- and heteronormative ideals of the 'Good Citizen' (Anderson & Hughes 2015:2-3; Winter 2018:110-111). What does this mean for the public identity, when some are more likely to experience something as their right than others, because their status as cisgender and heterosexual doesn't conflict with 'business as usual' approach to social rights in practice? (Hetzler 1994)

In terms of legislation, or what is termed law-in-the-books, rights have been granted so that homosexual couples could adopt on par with heterosexual couples; there are equal opportunities to marry and have church weddings; it has become possible to make internal agreements between a child's biological parents and their partner(s) on legal parenthood (as opposed to the previous 'stepchild adoption' process); LGBT+ asylum seekers have become recognised according to the refugee convention; the process of legally changing gender has become bureaucratically easier; and lastly 'transgender' was in 2017 removed from Danish Health Authorities' diagnosis list of mental illnesses (LGBT Denmark, undated). The World Health Organisation followed suit in 2019 (Human Rights Watch 2019). These legislative and other societal and institutional changes thus indicate a shift in the state's relationship to and responsibility for LGBT+ people.

1.2 Aim and scope of the thesis

Using The City of Copenhagen's LGBTI+ policy as a case, the aim of this thesis is to analyse problems involved in implementing policies within the field of identity politics, where structural discrimination by the wider society is deeply entrenched. More specifically, I am interested in exploring the connection between a given normative value of supporting diversity, and the political actions taken to support it. This study builds on previous literature, as it relates to the ways in which political institutions or organisations attempt to make societies more inclusive and open to diversity by implementing policies, while also looking into the problems related to such processes.

My theoretical framework and analysis is built around the concept of non-performativity primarily as used by Sara Ahmed and other scholars discussing failed implementation of policy and legislation (Almeida 2019; Bury 2015; Kimura 2014; Richardson & Monro 2013, Monro & Richardson 2014; Monro 2006). I have chosen this perspective in order to capture aspects of failed political policies on equalities work in Denmark. I explore this topic using a textual analysis of the City of Copenhagen's LGBTI+ policy, and semi-structured interviews with municipal staff who, at least in theory, have responsibility for invoking diversity and inclusiveness in their everyday dealings with both LGBTQIA+ individuals and the larger community.

1.3 Research question

Given the basic assumption underlying the theory of non-performativity, that is, the tendency of not doing what has been stated will be done, does the construction of the LGBTI+ policy increase the leeway for municipal workers to avoid implementation?

Hypothesis: Municipal workers' discretion in implementing the policy goals ensures the performativity of the policy.

My argument proceeds as follows: In the first section, I present the City of Copenhagen as an organisation and give a brief account of the LGBTI+ policy. I then proceed to explain my choice of theoretical and methodological frameworks. The following analysis is divided into two parts; I start with the textual analysis, applying non-performativity to the LGBTI+ policy, followed by presenting and analysing the findings from the interviews. Conclusively, I discuss the findings and propose directions for future research.

2) Presentation of the municipality and the policy

2.1 The City of Copenhagen

The City of Copenhagen consists of ca. 45.000 employees divided into the 7 Administrations: Employment & Integration, Culture & Leisure, Health & Care, Finance, Children & Youth, Social Services, and Technical & Environmental Administrations (KK undated). The administrations have varying sizes, and range from approximately 1650 employees in the Administration for Culture & Leisure to 18.000 in the Administration for Children & Youth (KK 2017b, 2017c).

Every administration is connected to a committee that oversees the daily managerial tasks within the given area (KK undated). The administration is headed by a mayor who also functions as a chairperson for the committee (KK undated). The municipality therefore has 6 mayors, as the 7th mayor, the Lord Mayor, of the Finance Administration holds the highest political position (KK undated). The committees and their respective mayors are represented at the City Council which sets the tasks for all committees (KK undated). The City Council Members are elected every four years (KK undated).

2.2. The LGBTI+ policy

The LGBTI+ policy is an official working document between 2019 and 2023, and is open to the public for download via The City of Copenhagen's website (KK 2019a). It was a political proposal by the Danish Social Liberal Party (Radikale Venstre) (KK 2017a). It was examined and adopted at a City Council meeting (Borgerrepræsentationen) on the 24th of August, 2017 (KK 2017a).

The 30-page long LGBTI+ policy is introduced with a note from the Lord Mayor, Frank Jensen, followed by a general thematic introduction. These two parts shed a light on the issues of the LGBT+ community as well as the areas in which the municipality, or Denmark generally, has fared well or been considered a 'frontrunner'. The main body of policy text has been divided according to the 7 administrations. Visually, the text mostly takes up about half an A4 page, whereas the rest of the space is used for descriptions of the legal advances in LGBT+ in a large font. At times, there are full A4 pages left for images that represent Copenhagen.

The policy lists 50 concrete initiatives divided among the 7 administration. It should be noted that the status report notifies of 54 initiatives, but I was only able to count 50 concrete initiatives besides a number of non-specified suggestions. Due to this, I focus only on those listed as 'concrete initiatives'. The individual administrations have been responsible for identifying areas for improvement and ensuring that the policy initiatives are anchored in the organisation (KK 2019b).

It is stated that annual status reports on the policy must be conducted in order to track the progression of the work in the administrations (KK 2019a). It therefore reports on the already implemented initiatives, initiatives that have been scheduled to be implemented and comments on matters of potential extension of the budgetary frame.

3) Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework presented here is based on concepts and theories within the field of sociology. The framework contributes to a fuller understanding of the chosen case, and as an analytical tool with which to analyse collected data. First, I introduce Sara Ahmed's theory 'non-performativity', which I will discuss further in the analytical section. I then account for the concept 'the public identity' and lastly the scope of interpretation in policy implementation.

3.1 Non-performativity

Central to the thesis is Ahmed's application of non-performativity, as it informs the policy analysis. It's useful for analysing the problems behind failed policy implementation as well as for a critical engagement with diversity policies. Non-performativity is based on Austin's performative speech acts (Ahmed 2012:54). A performative speech act is an utterance which carries action and thus 'brings about the effect it names', if the conditions within which this speech act was uttered are right (Ahmed 2012:54-56). For example, an apology is only performative (brings something into effect) if it is sincere, if it is spoken "by the right person, to the right people, in a way that takes the right form." (Ahmed 2012:54; 116-117). As extended by Butler (1993), performative speech acts are capable of producing the effects they name through consistent repetition, which means that an utterance is not performative if it is

singular and random (Ahmed 2012:116). I may say 'you're under arrest' but it won't have the same effect as when a police officer says it – because my utterance would be singular and random, whereas the police officer's utterance is based on a reiteratively and normatively produced reality. Non-performativity, on the other hand, is not simply the opposite of a performative speech act. Non-performativity works when it does *not* bring something about, *while simultaneously* giving the impression that it *does* bring about an effect (Ahmed 2012:117). It is therefore not just an utterance spoken under the wrong conditions, but an utterance that *works* by not bringing about anything, in spite of being understood to do so (Ahmed 2012:117). Ahmed has furthermore extended this use of non-performative speech acts to include what she calls 'institutional speech acts' (Ahmed 2012:54-55). Institutional speech acts are statements which "might make claims *about* an institution, as well as on *behalf* of an institution" (Ahmed 2012:54-55). Speech acts can entail acts of naming; that is, assigning attributes, characteristics or values to an organisation (Ahmed 2012:54-55). Through this process of naming, it is possible to also direct action, i.e. making claims about the priorities which an organisation will follow in the future (Ahmed 2012:54-55).

In her analysis, Ahmed (2005:§3) focuses on three institutional speech acts; descriptions, commitments and performances. These three forms of speech acts work exactly by creating the *assumption* that they have brought about the named effects, thereby creating the illusion that the policy has brought about a change or improvement within the organisation (Ahmed 2005:§3).

3.1.1 Descriptions

Descriptions are the textual and visual ways to assign an organisation attributes and qualities, but also commitments and values – the former is more descriptive in character, the latter normative (Ahmed 2012:51-52). However, the two cannot be completely separated as "describing an organization as being diverse also indicates the values of that organization" (Ahmed 2012:52). Descriptions are therefore closely connected to commitments in the sense that the description of an organisation's commitment denotes the values or priorities of that organisation (Ahmed 2012:52). Such descriptions therefore cannot only be judged as true/false, because they aren't *merely* constative. Rather, they also need to be seen within their specific context and for what they bring about or not (Ahmed 2012:55-56). Performative

14

utterances would thus involve statements which were uttered within the right context, and perhaps also be true (Ahmed 2012:54-56). For example, a description of an organisation's values would be true or 'sincere', like the apology mentioned earlier. A non-performative utterance follows that a description of values is understood as being true (or 'sincere') but isn't. Thus, when an organisation is described as diverse and progressive, it is understood as being true, it's assumed to already have that quality (Ahmed 2012:54-55).

3.1.2 Commitments

Ahmed refers to institutional commitments[4] in policy documents as 'statements of commitment', and as the documentation of *"what an institution is behind or gets behind"* (2012:114). However, there can be a difference between statements that (seemingly) commit and commitment that is actually bounded to action (Ahmed 2012:114). Statements of commitment can encompass both descriptive and performative elements, which can take the form of self-declarations that may or may not bring into effect what they name (Ahmed 2012:115-116; 207). A self-declaration is an organisation's claim of inhabiting certain principles, through which it constructs itself as a subject that has qualities, values, and characteristics (2012:115). The statement 'we prioritise LGBT+ matters' can be read and understood as a performative. This means that the statement (of commitment) is understood to be true – the municipality is said to prioritise and actively prioritises LGBT+ matters. However, sometimes such a statement (of commitment) is understood to be true, to bring about an effect, but actually does not (Ahmed 2012:115-116). Thus, when the municipality says it prioritises LGBTI+ matters it is understood as and assumed to be true, but in praxis this prioritisation, the effect, does not take place (2012:116-117). For this, it can be said that "naming can be a way of not bringing something into effect" (Ahmed 2012:117). In other words, naming the prioritisation of LGBTI+ matters in the municipality stands in for the actual effect. I return to this in the analysis.

3.1.3 Performances

Ahmed (2005:§18, 2012:84-85) argues that policy documents are "forms of institutional performance", that is, the policy comes to work more as an indicator of how the organisation

---

[4] Ahmed uses the word 'institutions' to explore non-performativity within higher education. I use 'organisations' to talk about municipalities, but 'institutions' when I refer to Ahmed.

15

is 'doing well', a measurement of performance, but also by constructing a particular image of itself and its doing. Through these forms of institutional performance we can analyse the LGBTI+ policy as an indicator of how the municipality can perform well, and as a way of managing their image. The latter is beyond the scope of this thesis, but I will focus on mechanisms of measurements and checks in relation to the LGBTI+ policy and the first annual status report. Matters of measuring targets, progress and/or processes and checks of these fall under 'audit culture' as coined by Michael Powers (Ahmed 2012:84-85). Audit culture refers specifically to the expansion of auditable structures and systems from the private to the public sphere (Ahmed 2012:84-85; 105). Ahmed chooses the term 'performance culture' which also embraces the interrelatedness of documents and structures that enable the creation of the 'right' type of document (Ahmed 2012:84-85). The 'right' type of document is one which fulfils requirements, thereby leading to "an increasing self-consciousness about how to perform well in these systems" (Ahmed 2012:84-85). Criticisms therefore point to the inability of audits to check more than whether the correct processes have been carried out, and supports existing systems and structures rather than 'fostering self-critique' (2012:99-11; 105). Non-performativity in this area therefore refers to the limitations of the LGBTI+ policy to inspire changes in organisational culture and service delivery. While I recognise the vast history behind 'audit culture', I won't engage with matters of measurements, checks and processes beyond the relevance for the LGBTI+ policy.

3.2 Citizenships and identities

Over time, the literature on 'citizenship' has expanded and many new sub-fields have emerged, i.e. ecological citizenship, feminist citizenship, multicultural citizenship, consumerist citizenship (or the citizen as consumer), as well as sexual and intimate citizenships (Anderson & Hughes 2015:1). An account of the various forms of citizenship is beyond the scope of this thesis, but in the following I will look into the development of social rights in relation to the public identity.

The concept public identity is closely aligned with that of citizenship, as the legal developments in the latter, which constitutes civil, political and social elements, shapes the former (Hetzler 1998:7). In other words, the legal developments to citizenship, that is, the totality of the rights it embraces, shapes the public identity, and the degree to which people

are granted autonomy within a given rights system (Hetzler 1994:34). Social rights are the last type of rights citizens have seized, but these rights are not as well-established as a right in and of itself (Hetzler 1994:15). The state is legitimised to exercise power in order to uphold the rights of the citizens, and the citizenship status allows people to make demands based on the totality of rights this status offers (Hetzler 1994:16). Consequently, inclusion, expansion and retrenchment, as well as the relationship to the state, are key elements to understanding the dynamic nature of the public identity. Inclusion refers to those who are encompassed by citizenship, while expansion and retrenchment determine the waves that continuously demarcate the rights granted by citizenship status (Hetzler 1994:18-20). The totality of rights, or the available rights at given points in time, is therefore influenced by temporal developments where the expansion in rights, policies and laws strengthen the public identity, while retrenchments weaken it. This continuous and dynamic demarcation takes place in a dialogue between the state on the one hand, and citizens, who constitute a collective identity due to their common status as citizens, on the other (Hetzler 1994:15). Not only the available rights can be expanded, so can the group of people included in the citizenship (Hetzler 1994:18). Hetzler (1994:18-19) exemplifies this with the extension of voting rights the past 100-150 years, but one could also mention the extensions of same-sex couples' right to marry in church. Furthermore, the public identity is developed when the subjective experience of something as a right is also objectively given, that is, when expectations (and thus demands) an individuals have of the state are in alignment with the objective meeting of and possibilities offered by the state (Hetzler 1994:20-21). The public identity is thus strengthened when people perceive something as their right, and has an expectation of the state to meet this (Hetzler 1994:21).

In short, the public identity constitutes the relationship between citizens as a collective and the state, a relationship which is shaped by the developments to rights, law and policy. The public identity is gradually extended when the aforementioned legal developments result in greater autonomy to the individual, where the individual is free from being subject to repressive state power (Hetzler 1994:34). In this sense, there is also a clear distinction between those cases where there is an assumed extension of rights, where dominating values and ideals and the political language are strengthened, and those where the totality of available social rights are actually extended (Hetzler 1994:35)

17

3.3 The Scope of Implementation

Hetzler (1994:65) argues that all forms of legal texts involve a degree of uncertainty in terms of their implementation, whether they are strictly defined or loose frameworks. This can be extended to the area of municipal policies, because they function as frameworks for action in a similar ways, though without the same level of obligation. Such policies can be compared to a framework law, which works by setting a political or ideological frame for action, while its interpretation is left to those who are going to apply it in practice (Hetzler 1984:39-40). Thus, there is great manoeuvre room across workplaces when it comes to implementation and meeting local needs (Hetzler 1984:40; 42). A framework law, or an ideologically inspired policy, would then result in variegated implementation across departments and workplaces, and it becomes necessary to look into why the policy cannot work on its own (Hetzler 1984:44, 1994:74). There are various reasons for this, ranging from economic issues to 'non-accept' and the organisational culture of an organisation (Hetzler 1994:74-75).The first relates to the politically determined resources available. What do we prioritise in this particular local context and what is the economic foundation of these decisions? When it comes to equality initiatives, it is not uncommon for shiny subjects like diversity and equality to be left on the side, for the sake of 'more important issues' (Ahmed 2012:111) Non-accept refers to the cases when municipal workers don't accept a law, policy, or the ideology underpinning it (Hetzler 1994:75). When it comes to translating municipal policies to praxis, the likelihood of being sanctioned due to not fulfilling the goals or actions of the policy is smaller. Thus, while non-accept cannot be interpreted at the same level, it's still a vital component of ensuring policy implementation (Hetzler 1994:75). The organisational culture(s) also matter for policy implementation, and this so in various ways (Hetzler 1994:75).

4) Methodological framework

To best explore to what extent municipal workers can work with or around the policy, I apply two methods; textual analysis of the LGBTI+ policy and semi-structures interviews with municipal staff. The methodological framework applied in this thesis rests on the view of documents as "social facts" (Coffey 2013) as well as a phenomenological approach to interviews (Kvale 2007). Thus, my ontological standpoint is social constructionism.

4.1 Analysing documents and interviews

Viewing documents as "social facts" involves attentiveness to the myriad of ways they come to take up their present content and form, how they function and circulate within a given setting (Coffey 2014:369-370). In other words, documents are "produced, shared and used in socially organized ways" (Coffey 2014:369). These processes are grounded on conventional images of reality that a given organisation holds (Coffey 2014:373-374); i.e. the policies formulated by the City of Copenhagen are products of the worldview(s) the organisation holds and its conventional modes of working. Such a perspective on documents is in alignment with Ahmed's call to see how a policy circulates within an organisation and how its employees take it up (or not) for implementation (Ahmed 2012:50). In this sense, doing interviews and asking questions about the language and the (proposed vs. actual) function of the policy can illuminate the workings of (non-)performativity. By interviewing frontline and administrative employees, it's possible to gain insight into the workings in the organisation and the possibility of policies affecting change. As such, while documents present one version of reality, the lived experiences of the employees give further insight into praxis and the ways in which a policy produces something or "gets stuck" (Ahmed 2012:96).

The LGBTI+ policy is therefore analysed using non-performativity, dividing the first part of the analysis into three sections on descriptions, commitments, and performances (Ahmed 2012). I analysed the policy by identifying its descriptions and commitments, and used the annual status report to support my arguments on how the policy is held accountable. During this process, I noticed differences between Ahmed's cases and my own, which I describe in the analysis section. Content-wise, I look into the ways in which the administrations construct themselves, the target groups and proposed initiatives relative to LGBTI+ matters. I also look

into specific initiatives as constructs which have varying degrees of potentiality in terms of implementation.

The analysis of the interviews was carried out by initial coding (Linneberg & Korsgaard 2019). I didn't extent my coding to the second cycle, but rather used coding to structure relevant themes in the material, focusing on non-performativity (Linneberg & Korsgaard 2019:264-266). The codes directed my attention to potentiality or 'doing', and limitations to 'doing'. While there were many more themes to engage with, I narrowed my scope to fit the research question. This division into potentiality and limitations (or wills and walls, as I comment on later) fits the theoretical framework by embracing the varying nuances of implementation. Non-performativity means that commitments are read as fulfilling a promise, when it fact that does not happen (Ahmed 2012). Furthermore, interpretations of laws and policies can lead to variegated, interconnecting effects (Hetzler 1994). Given this, exploring the interviews through wills and walls gave space to contradictions and ambiguity, reflecting a complex reality within a large organisation.

Applying non-performativity opens up for a critical approach to the ways in which policies are constructed in order to influence social transformation. This form of exploration can furthermore allow us to gain insight into the ways in which the policy, and the (in)actions it fosters, challenge or reproduce existing inequalities.

4.2 Presentation and discussion of interviews
In this section I describe and reflect upon the practicalities around and decisions behind the interview process.

I conducted 9 interviews with municipal workers at Copenhagen Municipality, which lasted between 30 min. to 1½ hour each. The age range of the interviewees is 30-60, and they had worked there between approximately 2-10 years. The interviewees held different types of job roles, of which three were characterised as managerial or administrative, in some capacity. The interviewees were placed within 4 of the 7 administrations in the municipality; Social Services (Socialforvaltningen), Health & Care (Sundheds- & Omsorgsforvaltningen), Culture & Leisure (Kultur- & Fritidsforvaltningen) and Technical & Environmental (Teknik &

Miljøforvaltningen). Since the thesis is based on the City of Copenhagen and not a wider, anonymous selection of Danish municipalities, I will not describe their job roles or specific placement. This is done in order to secure the confidentiality of the interviewees (Kvale 2007:27-28). I decided to only name the administrations, under which the interviewees are located, with no further specification on the exact initiative they are involved with. Sometimes, giving brief descriptions about their work or local workplace has been essential for contextualisation. Here, I have kept the information as general as possible, leaving out place- and people specific information. Thus, my decisions are formed by confidentiality and awareness in order to inflict the least amount of potential harm on the interviewees (Kvale 2007:28).

The sampling procedure can be categorised as a mixture of purposive sampling and snowballing. I was first referred to the coordinator of the policy, who then provided me with contact information on potentially relevant people. I contacted most of them, and was either referred to other people, or was declined. Because I also initiated contact through a general inbox and to email addresses in specific departments, the exact number of refusals is unknown. However, I was declined/didn't get response from 4 people, of which two were potential candidates, and the other two 'gateway contacts' to people within the organisation. The reason for their decline is not believed to be due to their opinions of the LGBTI+ policy. I also contacted individuals, and was referred to other people of interest through interviewees. The process turned out to be long and tedious due to the outbreak of COVID-19 in Denmark and the government's 'lock-down' on the 11th of March. Additionally, I had to do my interviews via Zoom, Skype or phone, which made small talk and getting a connection with someone slightly more difficult.

Informed consent (Kvale 2007:27) was sent to interviewees prior to them finally accepting to participate. It was sent along with a general introduction to the thesis, specifying the themes and aims of the thesis, how the interview material would be handled, and matters of confidentiality. It was also stated that they have a right to withdraw. The informed consent was not signed by any of the interviewees, though the option was given. Even though not all interviewees requested seeing the material I would be using for the thesis, I sent out an email informing what material would be used, asked them whether they thought my interpretation of

their statements were true, and got a final approval from all but three of them to use it. Thus, validity mainly took the form of checking in with the interviewees, but also by re-reading my own arguments throughout the process (Kvale 2007:122-124).

The questions put forward related to the interviewees' experiences with the LGBTI+ policy, their workings environment and how or whether LGBT+ issues generally were applicable to them in their jobs. As the job positions differed greatly, the extent to which and awareness of how LGBT+ was relevant also differed, as I will return to this in the analysis.

Scripting the interview/interview guide (Kvale 2007:56-57; 60-61): While semi-structured interviews are meant to consist of fewer concretely structured questions, or themes, I had a slightly stricter approach. However, I still enabled openness for the interviewees' specific situations, because they posit very diverse types of job roles and experiences. Also, the interview guide was built around non-performativity, and therefore restricted the questions to cover all necessary aspects (Kvale 2007:104). As interviews help you learn during the process, I did adjust the interviews according to the interviewee in question, and asked follow-up questions when necessary. The interview guide was made up of introductory questions in the beginning, mainly concerning the job- and personal details that the interviewee in question wanted to focus on. The structure of the interviews differed, as it depended on what the interviewee was talking about. Therefore, the mixture of indirect, direct, probing, interpretive and specifying questions came at different points in time. (Kvale 2007:60-62)

4.3 Positionality

Writing the positionality provides the opportunity to be reflexive about the ways in which potential bias, assumptions and positioning has impacted the research project as whole (Thurairajah 2019:132). However, it has also been referred to as "the new methodological self-absorption", as quoted from Patai (1994), where the researcher takes centre stage without improving anything about the research itself (Thurairajah 2019:133). Thus, calls for a "reflexivity of discomfort" are to bring the research into an active engagement about the uncomfortable truths regarding the interactions with the interviewees (Thurairajah 2019:133-134). In my case, the following aspects were relevant.

Firstly, I myself don't identify as an LGBTI+ person, which is likely to be reflected in what I give attention, how I write about these aspects and how I talked to interviewees about these things. Relatedly, the insider/outsider spectrum refers to the degree to which the researcher feels they share positionality with an interviewee and that this person holds 'insider knowledge' (2019:135). I had to be aware of which interviewees I was more likely to agree with and quote, and have done my best to balance interviewees' reflections. Lastly, I want to point out how the discursive 'choices' (however conscious they were) affected the interview and thus how I've interpreted the statements. For example, the choice of acronym for LGBT+ may alienate those who aren't confident in how to address these issues. The same goes for the use of a them/us binary construction – it can be easy to construct categories and cut corners when you're in the moment, which might be interpreted wrongly afterwards. When doing the analysis, I was therefore careful to ask interviewees for their opinion in a follow-up email at the end.

5) Analysis

5.1 The LGBTI+ Policy
5.1.1 A note from the Lord Mayor – or, how to analyse the LGBTI+ policy
The first part of the policy, the note from the Lord Mayor, is interesting to explore in terms of commitments, descriptions and performances, as it gives insight into the way the rest of the policy can be analysed.

The first two paragraphs describe the legal advances in Denmark and how Pride in Copenhagen has become a massively popular event which is attended and actively and supported by the municipality. These two sections illuminate how descriptions, as an institutional speech act, work. The municipality is attributed values, principles and characteristics through the process of description. It lists legal advances on the LGBTI+ area, the successes of Pride and the municipality's support of and participation in Pride, and an opinion poll, showing that 90% of Danes in 2015 thought same-sex people should be granted the same rights as opposite-sex people, compared to the European average which was 70% (KK 2019a:5). This list of 'achievements' can be interpreted as equating Denmark (but

especially Copenhagen) with tolerance, progressiveness and inclusivity. These positive descriptions are followed by a list of problems with discrimination, hate crimes, and poor physical and mental health among LGBTI+ citizens (KK 2019a:5). The list lays the foundation for a commitment by the municipality: "When we say that Copenhagen is for everyone, we mean it. That means we don't accept hate crimes, discrimination, violating behaviour or stigmatisation." (KK 2019a:5) This commitment is naturally infused with a notion of description: we *are* for everyone, and we *are not* accepting of discriminatory or hateful behaviour. The statement can be interpreted as a commitment by doing a holistic reading of the Lord Mayor's note. An earlier statement declares that there are problems with homo-, bi-, transphobia and intersexism in Copenhagen, so the hard stance against discriminatory and biased behaviour can be a way of signifying intent; which wrongdoings will be corrected with help from the municipality. Furthermore, the Lord Mayor's note states clearly that their stance on inclusivity is a promise: "Our city is – and shall be – for everyone […]. That's a constative and a promise." (KK 2019a:5) This promise is put to life by the LGBTI+ policy, which charts the frames for development and the obligation to equity. While this note does not clearly exemplify 'performances' one can argue that the subtle disclaimer "We can't solve everything with decisions at City Hall" (KK 2019a:5) is the first indication of lack of (financial) priority. The suspicions are further raised in the introduction where it's noted that only some initiatives are allocated resources. The rest remain political wishes yet to be fulfilled unless an opportunity arises. Thus, while the Lord Mayor's note and the introduction communicate priority to the LGBTI+ agenda based on moral values (being a matter of social justice) (Ahmed 2005:§31), the goals of diversity and inclusion are recognised as difficult to realise.

5.1.2 Descriptions

As explained in the theory section, textual descriptions aren't just descriptions; the context of the "speech situation" has to be taken into account to understand what the description does – other than (seemingly) ascertaining something to be proved true/false (Ahmed 2012:55-56). Thus, the sections of text which are more clearly descriptive *and* committing are dealt with in the next section on commitments. Here, I look into textual descriptions that either underscore the importance of values for 'doing' something, or describe the conditions of a population

group. These forms of descriptions aren't completely value or commitment neutral, but therefore also show how other things than commitments can be produced.

Since the LGBTI+ policy has been divided according to the 7 administrations, the descriptions often refer to the values of or support from the respective administrations, as opposed to the municipality on a whole.

(i)   Descriptions of values and action

The administrations describe themselves and their commitment(s) in terms of priorities and 'doings', or actions, based on values. In this sense, the administrations are constructed as entities which *work* towards something, towards a *priority*, because they inherently *value* inclusivity. This can i.e. take the shape of invest*ing* in something or meet*ing* service users in ways which indicate commitment to values of progressiveness or openness:

> The Technical & Environmental Administration works for a diverse Copenhagen. This is mirrored in projects like the establishment of the Rainbow Square or the holding of events like Copenhagen Pride. Both are an expression for a will and a readiness for all people in the city. (KK 2019a:24)

> The City of Copenhagen's value foundation also states that services users have to be met with respect, equal worth, dialogue and trust, and the municipality has to be an attractive workplace with a challenging and healthy work environment. (KK 2019a:18)

The quotes show the ways in which the municipality tries to connect itself with action, by promoting itself as having the ideals already valued in society, that is, progressiveness and equality (Ahmed 2012:57). In other words, it aligns itself with already-valued ideals, and uses them as the basis for explaining previous actions and expected behaviour on behalf of municipal staff. In this sense, the municipality is described as already having the values (and commitment) necessary to bring about the LGBTI+ policy – which, by virtue of the existence of the policy, hasn't happened. Descriptions are therefore not necessarily performative in the sense that they describe reality, but they can (re-)produce an existing narrative (Ahmed 2012:56-58). In turn, continued reproduction of a narrative of progressiveness becomes a conventional way of speaking about diversity relative to the organisation (Ahmed 2012:56-58). However, something else is also at play in these types of descriptions related to values and 'doing'.

As the second quote exemplifies, the relation between values underpinning an action/'doing' is not always straightforward, which can make it difficult to analyse. This quote describes the general values foundation which administrations and employees have to live up to in praxis. Thus, it's not as much a commitment to future action, i.e. a value underpinning a particular future initiative for LGBT+ inclusivity, as it is a statement of what can be expected, that is, what employees should be doing already according to the values foundation. Descriptions hesitating between statements about future action on the one hand, and existing values and expectations about living up to these, on the other, diffuses the intent with the statements. That is, it's trickier to claim where and when the municipality doesn't live up to its descriptions. For example, it doesn't state: 'the municipality meets service users with respect, etc.' but rather states: the "[…] values foundation also states that service users have to be met […]" (KK 2019a:18). Thus, the discursive play seems to be a political choice which functions as a 'measure of precaution'. By never fully stating that the municipality is currently inclusive towards service users, it can stop any criticisms of them claiming to be so. Ahmed argues the opposite in relation to commitments. The act of stating commitment can function as evidence for existing commitment, and thereby also of 'doing' (Ahmed 2005:§11). Ahmed (2005:§11) exemplifies this with the legitimating statement 'you can't call us racist, because we have stated commitment to anti-racism in our policies'. Thus, because the municipality doesn't often describe its inclusive nature directly, it cannot be criticised for something it dares not fully claim. However, not all descriptions are ambiguously written but rather state clear problems to address or ideal scenarios.

(ii)   The people of Copenhagen

This type of description can be divided into two: 'problems' and 'should's'. The former refers to the problems detected among potential and existing service users, and the second to the ideal experience of life at its various stages. These descriptions come to function as a legitimation for an initiative or giving attention to something in an administration.

'Problems' refers to issues within the population that has been proven in reports, for example:

> Reports show that more than 1 in 3 Danes have experienced derogatory speech about homosexual, bisexual and/or people in their workplace, and that 2 in 5 don't find it possible to be open about their sexuality at the workplace.(KK 2019a:9)

> Several LGBTI+ seniors experience the challenge that they feel alienated when met by heteronormative praxis in mainstream senior-initiatives [...] (KK 2019a:17)

These 'problems' describe the exact problems and their effects, i.e. how derogatory speech in the workplace leads to fewer people wanting to open up about their sexuality. After such a description, one or more initiatives are posed. In that sense, a given issue becomes concrete to work with.

'Should's' refer to the ideas of how people should experience life at various stages, i.e. what a child should be able to experience, or the possibilities available to people with physical or mental disability. For example:

> Children and young people must be ensured a good, developing and safe childhood and a stable foundation for life. Children should to experience room for diversity in day-to-day life in the shape of physical, written and spoken forms (that is, both in educational settings and signage). (KK 2019a:10)

> The administration prioritises that children and young people's sexuality and gender identity must be a natural part of their daily life. (KK 2019a:20)

Through these descriptions, the municipality reveals which ideas and target areas are prioritised and normalised in different ways. The language used to describe 'problems' and 'should's' contributes to creating an image of the administration as 'doing' by describing their awareness of (intersecting) injustices in society (Bury 2015:2018). In this sense, describing problems refocuses attention away from the problems and over to the administrations' intentions and proposed actions (Almeida 2016).

Descriptions construct people, their needs, the ideal childhood or work life, and, in turn, which 'wrongs' must be 'corrected'. Such descriptions are infused with ideas of what constitutes a 'normal' health profile or sense of self, and is seen in i.e. diagnoses guidelines, the National Idendtity No. system (Kirkebæk 1999; Statens Institut for Folkesundhed 2015:81-82). As Kirkebæk (1999:19) writes: "By describing what we fear and prefer to avoid, we also describe what we want and appreciate." Likewise, by describing problems and the optimal life 'trajectories' or experiences, we normalise certain wants and desires, and attach value to them (Fahlgren et al. 2011:8). By this I don't mean to criticise the municipality for

describing problems in society or wanting young people to be comfortable with matters of sexuality and gender identity. Rather, I wish to argue that descriptions not only produce conventional ways of speaking about organisations, as put forward by Ahmed, but also function as normalising processes whereby 'problems' and 'ideal life scenarios' are constructed according to what is 'appreciated or feared' in society at large (Fahlgren 2011:8; Richardson 2005:517-518). For example, positive descriptions of Pride weddings still normalise coupledom and marriage, which then is a mechanism of idealising those LGBT+ people who assimilate into the heterosexual norms of marriage (Richardson 2005:521-522). Therefore it's imperative to be aware of the small, seemingly insignificant shifts in boundaries of exclusion/inclusion relative to cis- and heterodominant norms and how this affects what we view as 'problems' or 'ideal life trajectories' (Fahlgren et al. 2011:7). While we're not dealing with public officials who construct people as 'morally deviant' and send them to asylums or institutions because they break norms of gender and sexuality (anymore) (Kirkebæk 2005:201), it's still important to remember that before September 1st 2014, legal sex change involved being diagnosed with 'transsexualism' and obliged castration (Amnesty 2016:5; Statens Institut for Folkesundhed 2015). Also, the World Health Organisation only changed their "diagnostic guidelines [so that they] no longer describe gender nonconformity as a 'mental disorder'" in 2019 (HRW 2019). Thus, descriptions can also negatively affect the public identity, if the discursive choices in policies support dominant perceptions and norms (Hetzler 1994). Therefore, while 'problems' and 'should's' may seem commonsensical or even neutral, a critical approach to national and local government policies is important to challenge the mechanisms by which normalisation processes privilege some people/groups over others, and thereby strengthen the public identity (Fahlgren 2011:7-8). Through description we assign priority and normality, and decide what counts as a problem, as well as how this problem should be addressed (Olofsdotter 2011:39).

5.1.3 Commitments

While Ahmed (2012:114-115) mainly refers to 'statements of commitment' as one whole, I divide it into two types, commitment statements and commitment initiatives, because of their variegated structure and potentiality. In other words, since they differ in how they were discursively constructed and in their potentiality of creating certain effects, they can be divided into two types of commitment. Another reason for doing this is the lack of

transferability; Ahmed (2012:114) points out that 'statements of commitment' are typically written as the very first thing in university diversity policies, which doesn't fully match the LGBTI+ policy, wherein commitments are placed within every administration-divided section *as well as* in the introductory pages. Additionally, as a political document to which municipal politicians are accountable, the policy is intentionally directive. Therefore, its types of commitments are different from those Ahmed writes about.

The LGBTI+ policy's commitment statements, which are similar to Ahmed's (2012:114-115) statements of commitment, indicate what the organisation 'is behind', or what it is committed to. For example:

> […] The [xxx] is committed to the fair and equal treatment of all individuals and aims to ensure that no-one in the [xxx] community is disadvantaged on the ground of race, cultural background, ethnic or national origin or religious beliefs. (Ahmed 2012:115)

> Our city is – and shall be – for everyone no matter their gender, age, skin colour, (dis)ability, sexuality and gender identity. This is both a constative and a promise. In Copenhagen you should be able to live the life you want, and be who you are. (KK 2019a:5, my translation).

On the other hand, the commitment initiatives are concrete and directive. I argue that commitments can take the form of initiatives because they are concrete intentions; they are actions which the municipality is committed to doing. They point out specific areas of attention and are thus closer to assigning some responsibility to a particular administration, department or unit:

> Concrete initiative: Suggestion to make the LGBTI+ area a part of personnel policies: The Central Administration within the [Culture & Leisure] administration will suggest Hoved-MED to include the LGBTI+ area in the administration's personnel policies. (KK 2019a:14)

In the following sections I engage first with commitment statements and afterwards commitment initiatives, exploring what they can do.

5.1.4 Commitment statements

The LGBTI+ policy is full of commitment statements throughout, often as self-declarations or as future (desired) actions (Ahmed 2012:115). The first example (from the LGBTI+ policy)

given above is a good depiction of an institutional speech act which simultaneously describes and commits. Its descriptive nature lies in the constative "Copenhagen is for everyone" while the commitment lies in the promise "and shall be" (KK 2019a:5). Thereby it denotes the values of the organisation, which at times can be contradictory (Ahmed 2012:52).

Contradiction in values can be read in the commitments stated in the Lord Mayor's note and the introduction. The introduction lists the vision and goal for change, followed by suggestions on how to do so. In the following quote, the municipality describes its core values, in the form of a vision and a goal, while committing to a particular course of action of accountability in meeting LGBTI+ citizens:

> The vision with the City of Copenhagen's LGBTI+ policy is to support the municipality in meeting LGBTI+ people with respect, equality, dialogue and trust and thereby ensure that the municipality's value foundation also counts for everyone in praxis.
> The goal with Copenhagen's LGBTI+ policy is to create an impetus for the individual administrations and the municipality as a whole works for equal opportunities for all inhabitants in Copenhagen in spite of sexuality and gender identity. (KK 2019a:6).

The municipality is constructed as an actor with commitment to LGBTI+ inclusion and equality by virtue of its own inadequacies. By describing that the values foundation is meant to account for LGBTI+ individuals as well, it insinuates a lack in praxis. However, acknowledging the faults in praxis can come to function as what Ahmed calls institutional pride (2012:116): by recognising they can do better and committing to doing better with the policy, the municipality can accumulate value for itself. In the note from the Lord Mayor it simultaneously says that "We can't solve everything with decisions at City Hall." (KK 2019a:5). Thus, the municipality at once commits to something but also denies that it, as a political organ, can fix the problems (entirely). Thus, on the one hand, the municipality can gain value by committing to improving conditions for LGBT+ people and, on the other, it can gain further value as being economically rational by making a disclaimer to implementation. This is not to criticise prioritisation or say that economically based judgements are unnecessary. It's rather to point out how the policy weighs and commits to two societal values, a healthy economy and progressiveness in equality matters, which in praxis can be contradictory. Usually, economic stability trumps equalities work which can affect implementation (Ahmed 2012:111; Monro & Richardson 2014:870-871). Generally, commitment statements are ambiguous and contradictory throughout.

I would like to say that the commitment statements show a general, coherent picture, but this is not generally the case. As cliché as it may sound, variation is the only certainty. The administrations prioritise and formulate the commitment statements differently, which means arguments that fit one administration isn't necessarily transferable to another. Besides this, descriptions and commitment statements are often a lot alike, thereby making exact distinctions difficult. Due to this variegated nature, they can both be discursively ambiguous and discursively clear, and they can direct priority and be non-directive. The following quotes show this variation:

> The administration is a workplace with space to be yourself – whatever your gender, ethnic background, sexual orientation, gender identity, etc. To support that all employees experience this to be the case, the administration focuses on contributing to an inclusive environment. (KK 2019a:24)

> The City of Copenhagen's values foundation furthermore states that the municipality shall be a corporation in which diversity is considered an asset. (KK 2019a:26)

The first quote generally states that it wants to ensure an inclusive work environment, but rather than suggesting an initiative which would reach out to employees, it suggests adding LGBTI+ matters to the personnel policy. In this sense, one can argue that commitment statement and commitment initiative don't match – insofar as the addition doesn't involve some change in behaviour. Also, the statement indicates that the workplace is already inclusive, but the administration wants to work *towards* inclusivity to ensure that all employees experience this. Thus, the commitment statement indicates that employees who don't experience the workplace as diverse are incorrect, because the administration describes itself as so. However, instead of doing 'image management', the process of making people perceive the workplace as inclusive rather than changing the structures to actually make them inclusive, the administration wants to contribute to the inclusive environment, in the form of an initiative. Generally, the wordplay can be difficult to analyse without knowing the original argumentation behind the formulation. Thus, it's unclear who is wrong – the employee who has the 'wrong' perception of the workplace, or the workplace?

The second quote states that the municipality must see diversity as an asset. This is ambiguous to work with. Who would admit to not seeing diversity as an asset? What suggests it does or doesn't occur already? Common for both quotes, however, is their lack of very

specific focus on LGBT+. Instead, they focus on diversity as an aspiration in general, where "equality as similitude" puts matters of *shared* needs and interests between all citizens (irrespective of their social positioning) above the specific and variegated nature of their needs and experiences (Richardsen 2005:519-520). However, as with many of the other commitment statements, this is not always the case: "In Copenhagen we have to treat everyone equally – but not necessarily uniformly." (KK 2019a:6). Besides being variegated across the board, commitment statements also direct responsibility and 'doing' to different groups.

The administrations indicate direction or responsibility in terms of changing behaviour or beliefs, becoming knowledgeable, etc.

> All employees in the administration should be aware of and reflect upon the social and cultural norms they bring in, create and reproduce in the pedagogical space – this applies for gender, gender identity, sexuality, ethnicity, religion, age, etc. (KK 2019a:11)

> The Employment & Integration Administration supports newly arrived foreigners receive knowledge about the diversity in the Danish society. (KK 2019a:9)

The above quotes show how commitments can indicate various levels of action on behalf of the municipality, and who is meant to take up the action. The first quote posits employees as the object of attention; it's their knowledge and awareness that must be improved in order to limit an unconscious reproduction of norms. Awareness of how we unconsciously perceive, treat and affect people around us can be helpful in people-centred jobs, but depends on how they're taken up by employees, their pre-existing beliefs and the organisational culture within which they're placed (Monro 2007:4; Monro 2006: 26-31; Strauss & Quinn 1993:285-287).

Oppositely, however, in the second quote it's not only the employees who must be attentive. Here, the municipality is responsible for supporting and ensuring that 'foreigners' receive education. The outcome of this commitment is to influence people. Thus, (successful) implementation depends on two groups, employees and people. For the second quote, it's also important to point out the homonationalist undertones, exemplified in the narrative of 'national exceptionalism' (Petersen 2016:60). The narrative grounded on the idea of homosexuality as part of the national community, a national pride of progressiveness, contributes to "[Othering] other (racialized) population groups", especially people who are

Muslim (Petersen 2016:59). This stands in contrast to the Lord Mayor's note, in which bad behaviour (funnily enough towards 'ethnic minorities') isn't associated with anyone/anything concrete: "Another of the very exposed groups is LGBTI+ citizens with a different background than Danish. Too often they meet condemnation **from the surroundings**." (KK 2019a:5, my emphasis). Thus, it's important to be mindful of how the policy constructs actors, i.e. citizens or employees who have to 'change' or 'do' something, how they're meant to 'do' this, and what it says about the normalisation processes at play.

5.1.5 Commitment initiatives

As mentioned, there are 50 listed *concrete* initiatives in the LGBTI+ policy, or that which the organisation 'is behind' (Ahmed 2012:114). I have divided the commitment initiatives into three categories: tick-box, pre-existing, and vague. It should be noted that initiatives aren't always separable into the three categories but can overlap. Some tick-box initiatives existed before the policy became active in 2019, and some of the vague initiatives are 'tick-boxy'. The tick-box initiatives are actions which can be measured according to targets, and checked off when completed, without actually having to support it as a matter of principle:

> A tick box approach is when an action is completed to indicate yes. If a commitment can become a tick in the box, it suggests that institutions can make commitments without being behind them. (Ahmed 2012:119).

In the LGBTI+ policy, the following exemplify a tick-box initiative:

> All job adverts from Copenhagen Municipality state that the municipality sees diversity as a resource and appreciates that each employee contributes with their special background, personality and ability. (KK 2019a:27).

> The administration ensures that relevant knowledge and best practice-examples are available at www.bedstsammen.kk.dk so themes can be brought into use in connection with annual management meetings, pedagogical learning plans, anti-bullying plans and well-being surveys. (KK 2019a:11)

Write a diversity statement for job adverts, check. Develop a 'best practice'-page on an existing website, check. Insofar as the initiatives are set as measurable targets to meet rather than loosely defined goals, the initiatives become part of a performance culture where the targets don't necessarily correspond to the visions and goals (Ahmed 2012:85). It also

33

becomes a matter of supporting the initiatives as a matter of principle and belief, rather than a mere tick-in-the-box (Ahmed 2012:113-114; 118-119). The examples show how the administrations can suggest initiatives which aid 'going through the processes' and showing City Council that actions are being taken (Ahmed 2012:99). The question is what these initiatives bring about, as previous research also indicates that symbolic gestures are prioritised over e.g. service delivery (Monro 2007:5). Does the job advert statement support (un/less)biased hiring procedures? And do the 'best practice'-examples reach teachers and pedagogical staff and help them in their jobs? Thus, in order to commit an administration or an employee to doing something, the tick-box approach is not necessarily preferable. However, this is opposed by Monro (2006), who finds that equalities work is supported by performance indicators and measurements specifically focusing on sexualities matters. I return to this later.

The pre-existing initiatives do not refer to new activities, increased focus or a re-allocation of resources, but that doesn't mean that they don't 'do' or produce anything. The initiatives point to areas where LGBTI+ matters can be or have been incorporated within the administration:

> As a part of the education in Danish social relations under the integration-programme for new arrived foreigners, the benefit recipients covered by the Integration Law educated in diverse family structures and equality of treatment. [...] (KK 2019a:9)

> The holding of LGBTI+ weddings at Copenhagen Pride Week: In 2017 there were held trial weddings with an LGBTI+ focus where famous LGBTI+ persons held the speeches in connection with the wedding. Due to the good experiences the LGBTI+ weddings was held again at Copenhagen Pride Week 2018. (KK 2019a:15)

The first initiative exemplifies a core part of the municipality's tasks, though in praxis it's carried out by Danish Refugee Council[5]. It also relates to Almeida's work on the City of Toronto's diversity policy, in which she argues how the policy and the actions it inspires are premised on racialisation and 'race', and therefore also further reproduce racialisation and 'race' when implementing policy initiatives (Almeida 2016:104-105). Because of this, diversity discourse will always be performative and produce what it intends, like 'ethnic harmony', because this has always been premised on 'race' and racialisation and cannot be separated from it (Almeida 2016:104-105). Related to the first quote, this means that the

---

[5] I was notified of this by a potential interviewee who ended up declining to participate.

initiative necessarily promotes diversity on the premise of racialisation of the recipients and sexualisation and genderisation of LGBT+ individuals. Thus, in trying to promote diversity, the initiative reproduces diversity because diversity is rooted in racialisation, sexualisation and genderisation.

The second quote shows how CPH Pride Week weddings have been funded and prioritised every year since 2017, incl. 2019. It also exemplifies how initiatives sometimes don't fall into the three initiative-categories I constructed. As the outcome can be measured and it's a matter of going through the processes without needing actual commitment, it's both a tick-box and pre-existing initiative. It could be argued that marriage as an institution is prioritised because it's a norm for heterosexual couples, something they´re expected to want and do, being the good citizens they are (Petersen 2016:57; 58; Winter 2018:112-114; Anderson & Hughes 2015:3). Thus, as mentioned earlier, funding and prioritising Pride weddings is a way of reproducing the normality of coupledom and the (nuclear) family, which continues to be the "bedrock of the nation" (Winter 2018:123). Thus, as we saw with descriptions, in written commitment initiatives and in actually doing them, there is a risk of reproducing harmful norms.

The vague initiatives are not always easy to spot. While they're vague, they also direct action and may simultaneously be 'pre-existing':

> The administration is already working to prevent and fight loneliness among the elderly. I that connection, the administration will take initiative to investigate the possibilities and the need for entering into collaborative agreements with civil society actors with a special familiarity with and contact to elderly LGBTI+ citizens in order to prevent and ease loneliness in this specific target group. (KK 2019a:23)

This example is vague due to the lack of political promise. It directs action in the form of 'taking initiative to investigating possibilities', but cannot make further promises. In this sense, the administration is taking action but the formulation simultaneously functions as a precautionary measure, as seen in the descriptions. In case it won't be initiated, they haven't promised too much. As vague initiatives don't take up much of the policy, I won't go into further detail.

35

In the sense of bringing into being what has been named, the commitment initiatives in the LGBTI+ policy are more likely to do bring about an outcome than in Ahmed's case. Ahmed (2012:119) talks about commitments as substitutes to doing because the commitment, as a speech act, gives the illusion of bringing something about while not actually doing so. This is not exactly the case for the LGBTI+ policy. While the policy isn't legislatively bound, the administrations within the municipality are still accountable to City Council. However, some commitment initiatives are seemingly easier to implement as intended than others, by virtue of how they've been constructed, though even detailed and narrowly framed policies (and laws) can be interpreted and applied in variegated ways (Hetzler 1994:65). The tick-box initiatives specifically state what is meant to be done, i.e. formulating and signing a charter for democratic values, which leaves less room for variegated interpretation and implementation (Hetzler 1994:65). This stands as opposite to the pre-existing initiatives, which are meant to include an LGBT+ perspective to what is already done. Here, the room for interpretation increases, as the individual employee has to make judgements about how to act and respond to a particular situation (Hetzler 1984:128). For example, how do employees approach the counselling of young people in 'Health Check' (Sundhedstjek)? As I return to in the second part of the analysis, people have their respective ideas of what inclusive and respectful behaviour is, which can be clouded by (social, organisational and cultural) norms (Hetzler 1994:74-75; Monro 2007:4-6). The vague initiatives may on paper look vague, but be clear in action – i.e. make a recommendation to City Council to do x, or initiate dialogue with y. Thus, its vagueness is based on the political uncertainty that determines the potential extent and content of the initiative. What it actually turns into, what comes out of a dialogue or recommendation is less certain. This (potentially) gives room for employees to interpret what is to come of it and increases manoeuvre room to adjust the initiative to local needs and interests (Hetzler 1984:133-134). In terms of the public identity, the initiatives only strengthen this if they are capable of actually improving conditions for LGBTI+ people. Since people both have to feel or experience something as their right, and this right should be objectively available for the public identity to be developed (Hetzler 1994:20-21). Thus, if the policy commits and takes steps to improve service delivery but this change doesn't take place in practice, then the objective opportunity offered by the municipality is in place, but the subjective experience isn't. To what extent the policy brings about the changes it names is

therefore imperative to including people as equally as possible in their citizenship status (Anderson & Hughes 2015:2).

5.1.6 Performances

In conforming to and learning how to navigate 'performance culture' within organisations, there's a risk in creating documents which rather create an image of doing (well) than actually being workable (Ahmed 2005:§20; §23-24). Thus, organisations are conscious of how to construct documents around achievable targets that create a perception of doing (Ahmed 2005:§20; §23-24). It could be argued that the LGBTI+ policy falls within this description due to the nature of the policy initiatives. While the policy was set up according to specific actions and not measurable targets (i.e. training xx amount of employees in LGBTI+ matters), the formulation of and reporting mechanisms for the initiatives provide the opportunity to tick boxes: 'we have already implemented/are about to implement x, y, z initiatives'. This allows administrations and local workplaces to monitor their own progress on the self-chosen initiatives, rather than being subject to checks 'from above'. The LGBTI+ policy is a pilot-test to see how equality can shape practice, and is not subject to checks. As Ahmed (2012:98-99) finds, checks can play a big role in creating incentive to implementation, which I engage with further in the second part of the analysis. However, as Ahmed also points to, checks cannot show whether the desired change has taken place or whether it's merely another process which has been conducted (Ahmed 2012:99). Since the nature of reporting back on the LGBTI+ policy encourages administrations to work with initiatives as ticks-in-the-boxes, the lack of checks can prove problematic in those instances where (additional) funding hasn't been allocated or initiatives don't provide clear directions for action. Thus, when looking into the LGBTI+ policy in terms of its performance, the annual status report reveals a lot about the underlying work procedures, that is, the extent to which something has been/is in the process of being integrated into the work culture, or not. For example, the Children & Youth Administration has conducted more activities than initially funded (KK 2019b:4-5). An initiative I categorised 'vague' has resulted in one of the institutions doing a partnership with University College Copenhagen (Københavns Professionshøjskole) and with 'Mangold'[6], focusing on the norms and gender stereotypes reproduced in praxis (KK 2019b:5). Thus,

---

[6] Established by education- and gender sociologist Cecilie Nørgaard who teaches organisations, companies etc. about gender, stereotypes and norms.

Ahmed's argument that a policy can block recognition of what there's left to actually do, and that naming can substitute action, takes a different shape in the municipality (Ahmed 2012:100-101). Due to some level of accountability, the administrations are meant to carry out initiatives, as the first annual status report shows (KK 2019b). The general picture from the status report is that the majority of administrations are and have been working on the initiatives, thereby living up to some of the political promises in the policy. However, the status report cannot tell whether these initiatives improve praxis and the local work cultures, or inadvertently produce something else entirely, i.e. racialisation or sexualisation (Ahmed 2012:99; Almeida 2016:113; 118-119; Kimura 2013:533). Rather, we could ask whether the rapid implementation of a lot of initiatives is a sign of performance culture, that the policy merely creates the *perception* of 'doing'. They know how to decode and fulfil requirements, thereby 'producing comfort rather than self-critique' (Ahmed 2012:105). However, it's not possible to determine the reach and usefulness of the policy by only looking at the policy. I will therefore look into frontline and administrative workers' experiences in the next part.

In summary, the LGBTI+ policy doesn't fit neatly into the theoretical frames set by Ahmed (2012), but by adjusting i.e. 'statements of commitment' it contributes to the analysis. Above, I argued that descriptions and commitments can be problematic in the sense that they reproduce narratives and normative perceptions of the municipality and the people it's meant to service. Thus, depending on how they end up being read and taken up, they can hide the inequalities they're meant to address (Ahmed 2012:115). Furthermore, the policy and initiatives are constructed in a manner that doesn't necessarily allow changed behaviour being integrated into the organisation. This is i.e. due to what type of action the initiatives direct, and how the administrations are accountable to the policy as a political document. Thus, some of the mechanisms integrated in the policy can lead to the non-performativity of the policy. Non-performativity also weakens the public identity by not actually extending the rights or conditions of people. However, this greatly depends on how the policy lives in the municipality which I turn to now.

5.2 The LGBTI+ policy in action

In the first part I analysed the LGBTI+ policy based on non-performativity, laying the groundwork for the further analysis of municipal workers' experiences. This part is divided into two main sections based on the findings from the coding; wills and walls. These titles

refer to Ahmed's (2012:52) question "How does will become wall?", or how does the will to support (LGBTI+) diversity and inclusivity turn into inaction (wall)? The first section deals with the aspects enabling LGBT+ inclusivity to come into being, that is, municipal workers' level of discretion in working with or around the LGBTI+ policy. The second focuses on walls; on the structures, habits, norms and people that (can) hinder the implementation of the policy.

5.2.1 Wills

There are a number of aspects which influence the success of implementing initiatives. I have divided these into three categories. Firstly, 'diversity champions' are crucial for making any form of change from below. Second, this 'pressure from below' has to be supported by management in the form of meaningfulness, resources and priorities to work. Lastly, the policy initiatives have to be concrete and fall easily into existing structures at a given workplace to be implemented.

(i)   'Diversity champions' and pressure from below

The LGBTI+ policy, or at least its vision and goal, is more likely to be implemented if it's set in motion from below, that is, the role of 'diversity champions' shapes the actions taken at the individual workplaces (Ahmed 2012:131-135). The term 'diversity champion' is applied by Ahmed (2012:131) as a way of describing the importance of individuals' genuine commitment to diversity (policies) and their ability to re-focus attention on implementation. The existence and effort of diversity champions can be accidental (2012:132). That is, where they're placed in the organisation and whether they're interested in diversity matters is coincidental, and without them diversity initiatives are less likely to be of concern to the management:

> *[…] I happen to be at this workplace and happen to offer my help in how to talk about a transgender man, for example, but it's not something we've been told from above, that we need to put extra focus on or know more about. (I-1)*

> *They were allocated money to teach all personnel when they received [x] […] and there is basically no one who is there now, who attended the course back then. So when I started, there were employees who didn't even know that [our workplace] has a [x] profile. And then I thought 'this is really dead'. We had the profile at the face of it, but nothing really happened. (I-6)*

The two quotes exemplify the accidentalness of exposing gaps in frontline work and working with equalities initiatives, respectively. The frontline workers came to embody the diversity champion by becoming the go-to person at work. Ahmed (2012:131; 133) and Monro (2006:30-31) mainly refer to management level champions and the importance of their seniority and credibility to bring about changes, but this was not the case among the interviewees for this project. Rather, besides the two frontline workers already mentioned, a third has been involved with matters related to sexuality, but not specifically LGBT+. However, challenging norms about desire, sexuality, and the stigma their fluidity can be argued to be a *supportive element* to the LGBT+ agenda. I don't equate a focus on sexuality and reducing stigma with LGBT+ work, but recognise the importance of the former to gradually reconfigure how people think about the latter. These three 'champions' work in one or more teams, where they're able to influence their co-workers and management, make suggestions for activities, structure work in networks, and similar micro-level behaviours. Thus, they have been able to get involved with issues of gender, sexuality and/or a specific focus on LGBT+ by talking to and giving feedback to co-workers, holding small presentations, creating collaborative agreements across departments, etc.

> *I love working at [x] because it means I get to sort of tease people a bit if they become too normative. Then I can say, aarrh, let's not be too normative!" // "A group of volunteers who hold a weekly event called [x] [...] When I started working here, our activity employees[7] didn't do anything for [x]. And then I talked to [y] and found out that we're allowed to provide cake at [x] but it was the volunteers who brought everything! Arh!* (**I-6[8]**)

> *Yeah, I think there´s a great openness towards it [LGBT+ matters] when you bring it up. I think the challenge has been the lack of awareness about what people don't know. So someone sort have to go in and say, hey, you have a blind spot there. And they listen to it, so that's nice, and it's received really well.* (**I-1**)

> *I was allowed to collaborate with the [x type of] frontline personnel and it was decided that we should have a network of [theme] ambassadors. And we have a network we meet with 3-4 times per year and talk about all sorts of things. We have made a [z] policy, we have made a preparedness plan for [c], and the last thing we did was to go through this [v] report.* (**I-5**)

---

[7] Coordinating role and is in charge of arranging i.e. courses, networks or mentorships, participating in activities aimed at the particular target group in question, etc.
[8] For the original quotes in Danish, see Appendix C

Besides showing how acts of supporting LGBT+ or sexuality can take place in structured or fluid ways, the quotes also indicate how working with LGBT+, sexuality, or diversity in general, can be professionalised and become an inherent part of the work culture. For example, micro-level exchanges can create safe spaces to learn from each other and increase awareness, and thus also create a common ground from which to discuss their work. While relying on 'diversity champions' makes equalities work more 'fragile', local level structures in the form of networks and collegial feedback and banter offering a cultural backdrop can still influence co-workers attitudes and work practices (Monro 2006:30). It is also important to note that these actions were not incentivised by the LGBTI+ policy.

Even though interviewees have worked around rather than with the LGBTI+ policy, it doesn't mean nothing has happened. It has rather been in the sense that they found gaps which seemed natural and necessary to fulfil. Therefore, working-around-the-document is not to be understood as a conscious substitute to a failed policy, as most the frontline interviewees didn't know the LGBTI+ policy (at all or well). One frontline worker became aware of the policy, but only because of a random encounter during work they already carried out as part of living up to the workplace's support for LGBT+ service users. Thus, it was not the policy itself that initiated this boundary work around the policy, but rather a flat-lined, pre-existing initiative that was in the process of being awoken via personal initiative. After encountering the policy, however, it came to be a way to put pressure on management, whether this would work or not. Thus, locally within the municipality the policy can still bring about *something*, even though this something isn't necessarily the initial intent. Also, while the evidence is not strong in my data set, Ahmed's (2012:120) argument that policy documents are better as supplementing tools to verbal pressure was supported by 4 interviewees; policies can put pressure on managers and employees to live up to the commitments supposed to be inherent to the organisation already. Working around the document, in the form of pressure, has rather taken the form of suggestions for activities and minor adjustment in existing practices.

(ii) *The role of management support: 'Meaningfulness',' resources' and 'priorities'*

Diversity champions cannot work alone and their efforts are especially vulnerable to dismissal if they don't have management on their side. While pressure from below was not the norm among the interviewees, 4 interviewees were generally positive when asked if they thought

there is room for introducing new initiatives. However, though it seemed possible to do, they still kept a foot solidly planted in reality, and what the workplace would be able to do and offer. For pressure to work, the keywords 'meaningfulness', 'resources' and 'priorities' are imperative. In the following quotes 3 interviewees make sense of the necessary aspects of supporting initiatives from below:

> *And it was fine in the beginning, the first 6 months. I just told them, you know what, I think we should start teaching again, and they were like 'yes, let's do it!' [...] [B]ut since then it's been a bit more like 'oh, we don't really have the resources for it' and stuff. And they're apologetic, but it's also kind of frustrating.* ***(I-6)***

> *I think you'd go a bit deeper and look into the type of problem it would address, and see if it can be managed with existing measures. That being said, our politicians are very interested in this area, so maybe. But it has to be measured relative to resources and such. [...] It's not out of the question, it just necessitate that we see the need for it. There's room for it, it's just a priority.* ***(I-7)***

> *The keyword in this, relative to what is prioritised, is meaningfulness. Is it meaningful for the [target group]? [...] And I also think part of it is making it meaningful for managers and employees by doing things that make sense for the [target group]. [...] I know they are very challenged in terms of operational elements, and we need to ensure that the budget is coherent, and we have to save so-and-so many millions [DKK]. [...] So it's important, but I actually experience that, if initiatives can help employees and if it's possible to frame it meaningfully, it'll be prioritised.* ***(I-5)***

Thus, employees' discretion is shaped by the local reality. What resources are available, what functions do the employees hold (frontline or administrative) and what else is occurring politically or in the administration the moment? (Monro 2006:27-29) The economic situation varies from department to department, which affects the ability employees have to engaging with LGBT+ issues, *if that's what they choose to focus on*. I-2 returned to the matter of being lucky in terms of where the job is placed, as it means there is more (economically funded) manoeuvre room to focus on the target group. However, having available funds is not always a marker of possibility. Two interviewees talked about their unit being allocated financial resources for 'a project' giving attention to sexuality. 'The projects' didn't have an LGBT+ focus originally, but they have either been explicitly written into the LGBTI+ policy, or functioned as a foundation for their work in that area. During the interviews, one stated that LGBT+ matters were irrelevant for their work, and a third interviewee found that the focus was almost non-existing when they started working there. Thus, there are a number of things at play here. Firstly, being allocated resources at some point does not necessarily involve a

continued focus on the matter later on. Second, there is no clear idea of what LGBT+ work entails, since disagreements can exist within one workplace.

In terms of priorities, interviewees found that operational and practical matters would usually be prioritised higher than others, especially if managers are held accountable to their bosses. 'The political winds' blowing in a particular direction also affects the ways in which operational elements at work are prioritised. Thus, prioritising LGBT+ matters over other elements can be tricky, but if a given workplace can find manoeuvre room and meaningfulness to it, it can be prioritised. Furthermore, those workplaces which had no direct management connected to their daily operation were more influenced by local decisions among co-workers.

Meaningfulness as a term can be difficult to define, but was talked about as relevance and that which improves a situation for service users. However, meaningfulness was most often talked about in relation to resources; I-1's manager had said that their presentation might lead to "getting some funds for something", while I-8 and I-9 spoke of very limited budgets and thus the importance of being able to join organisations and pool resources of various kinds in order to carry out something which might be meaningful for the target group. Thus, while it seems that meaning is the main reason for looking into extending or instigating LGBT+ initiatives, resources would be the first barrier to cross.

Since the economic foundation, manoeuvre room to prioritise non-operational activities at a workplace and meaningfulness matter greatly for employees being able to pressure and get support from management, it's also a recipe for variegated implementation across departments, administrations, etc.

(iii)   Implemented policy initiatives

As noted in the first part of the analysis, some of the policy initiatives have already been carried out. Only two of the interviewees currently work on or have contributed to implementing an initiative in the policy, and 5 of them had been introduced to the policy as a part of their work. The rest of the interviewees either work in an area where the initiative is 'pre-existing', and therefore doesn't actively affect the direction of their work, or funds haven't been allocated to the initiative in question yet. The two implemented initiatives can be categorised as 'tick-box', as they involve an action which is not continuous but is concrete to work with and has an 'end point'. As we saw in the first part, however, tick-box initiatives are

not necessarily the initiatives most likely to be implemented. What matters, is the degree to which it's concrete and the relevant for the workplace and makes sense for the employees, as several interviewees pointed out.

> *General policies set frameworks for how we should do our job, how we should act and a lot of it is about behaviour and attitudes, or values and attitudes. And typically, values-based policies- what I do, is to translate them to expected behaviour. So in terms of policies, it's all about making it concrete for the individual employee [...]* ***(I-3)***

> *On a day-to-day basis, we have to look at how much we can implement. It's always difficult to know to what extent you can put a given vision to life. [...] And a lot of it is lost on the way, unfortunately. Because a lot of times the visions are massive and implementing it would require a lot of resources we don't have. [...] At the end of the day, it's the user-oriented aspects that make the most sense, that's what works.* ***(I-8)***

The use of the LGBTI+ policy therefore depends on the possibilities of working with and/or around it (Ahmed 2012:118).

The fact that tick-box initiatives have been or are in the process of being implemented does not automatically make the policy performative in the sense of supporting the overall vision and goals of the LGBTI+ policy. Rather, one should question the initiatives in terms of what ideals or practices they promote. Since the policy was not actively used by interviewees or initiatives implemented at their workplaces, I won't get develop this part further.

5.2.2 Walls

The hindrances to implementing the LGBTI+ policy can be divided into three aspects: the structures and frames of work influencing the degree to which municipal workers can implement the policy; the various ways in which employees can negatively affect the implementation, whether this is intended or not; and the limitations of the LGBTI+ policy.

(i) *The structures faming equalities work*

The frames structuring work in general and work with policies can be a limitation to implementation. These limitations often relate to the concrete vs. abstract. An example is the two differences between the UK and Danish cases, legislation on and evaluations of equalities work (Monro 2006; Ahmed 2012; Borchhorst et al. 2012). As mentioned earlier in the thesis, the extent of laws on the LGBT+ area in Denmark is restricted, and policies are only

beginning to influence national and local level governments (Århus Kommune 2020; Udenrigsministeriet 2018). Gender identity and expression are not included in legislation at all, 'transvistitism' is in praxis protected under 'sexual orientation', which in turn only is protected if a complaint refers to discrimination within the labour market (Laursen & Thranesen 2019:3-4). This affects local governments' attempts at implementation as they are not bound by law to cater to any specific LGBT+ needs, which previous research indicates can be helpful (Monro & Richardson 2014:872). While legislation may be useful as a 'stick' motivation to design and implement initiatives, local governments across the UK still show variegated results (Monro & Richardson 2014:873). Such variety even *within* the municipality is not surprising, since policies usually have the function of setting frames and values according to which work has to be organised rather than directing specific action, as several pointed out. Legislative matters were 'unquestioned', in the sense that once something has been communicated as a 'must do' task to the employees, it will be given greater attention as a matter of course. Thus, if there were any legislative demands from the state there might be a greater incentive to ensure that they live up to service standards. One interviewee thought about this relation between what a policy and law can do in their work, respectively:

> *Well, I would prefer to say that it doesn't make a difference, because I hope we work in that way anyway. That we already give room for everyone whatever their sexuality, gender identity and so on. But that said, it might make us more aware of helping the young people who come to us with LGBT questions [...] It might expand our embrace because we know what they actually have right to be helped, and we have to provide that to the best of our ability. (I-2)*

Another interviewee elaborates on the distinction between law and policy:

> *Well, legislation is something we have to comply to. Policies are more something where you recommend someone to do so-and-so, but it's not something you have to follow. [...] It's something we strive towards doing but you're not completely bound in the same way. That's at least not the experience. (I-4)*

This is interesting when considering the status of social rights. As Hetzler (1994:15-16) argues, social rights are not placed on an equally secure foundation as political and civil rights, though they're imperative for the welfare of citizens. Thus, when equality matters are ranked lower than social rights, it goes to show how difficult it can be to ensure attention and priority, and make meaningful changes (Monro & Richardson 2014:871). This means that it

becomes even trickier to ensure a healthy development of the public identity for all citizens. This is further emphasised by the fact that in practice, the important matter is to meet targets or work according to certain goals specific to the individual administrations.

In this sense, targets seem to equate attention or action; "What gets measured gets done" (Monro & Richardson 2014:874, quoting an interviewee). The positive focus on targets and checks to ensure 'doing' was familiar to one interviewee:

> *If there's something we're measured on, man we get a lot of support. […] It's so nice, I love inspections. But insofar as something is being inspected, it gets an over-focus. Our profile is just our internal profile, we measure it ourselves, it's whatever we think. But nobody's coming around to check up on us and say 'maybe you should be a bit more norm critical or work on this'.* **(I-6)**

Thus, targets and checks ensure the managers' willingness to do something in that area. What is simultaneously at play, however, is the way such attention to 'activities that are measured and inspected' becomes subject to too much attention relative to other areas. The interviewee found that the only way to get a proper attention to LGBT+ at the workplace is if a policy or an action plan with a proper backing can direct action, responsibility and ensure that someone checks up on the bosses to make sure it's being implemented. Monro & Richardson (2014:874) argue for the importance of checks in getting past the hurdles of inattention and opposition. Once performance measures are in place, something will happen. This stands somewhat at odds with Ahmed (2012:110) who argues for critical awareness of performance culture in equalities work. Targets and performance measures aren't inherently good for the equalities agenda, nor is the lack of them necessarily better (Ahmed 2012:110). I-1 was more concerned with the problems of the current use of targets as getting in the way of quality assurance of the job, and less focused on the potentiality of targets in improving the equalities agenda:

> *[…] I experience that it's more important to have x amount of conversations than the content and quality of those conversations. […] I think it's about the fact that our raison d'etre is dependent on targets, because that's the only thing we're being measured on, and not whether we stick to the legislation or what we have been put in the world to do.* **(I-1)**

As such, if it's all about reaching a given amount without looking at the quality of the work behind it, the initiatives won't support the overall vision or goals of the LGBTI+ policy

(Ahmed 2012:85; Monro 2007:21). To attempt overcoming such problems, Monro engages (2006:32) with the "politicisation of measurements", the process of making targets, indicators and measurements political in nature, in the sense that they are founded on a political stance of supporting LGBT+. More specifically, it would involve using experiences of factors implicating processes of implementation to develop performance indicators relevant for capturing LGBT+ specific matters, i.e. reducing hate crimes by so-and-so much (Monro 2006:35). However, these recommendations are to be taken with a grain of salt as some of them exemplify the problems of non-performativity pointed out by Ahmed (2012). One notable example is the recommendation of writing commitments to diversity: "A proactive stance towards supporting diversity" (Monro 2007:32). Besides the structures framing work, individual agency plays a great role.

(ii)   The role of individuals

When laws or policy are to be implemented, the people who are responsible for doing so will naturally shape how it ends up being applied in practice (Hetzler 1994:75, 1984:125-128). Particularly interesting to this case is the role of values, habits and norms, and to what extent they shape implementation of tick-boxy, pre-existing and vague initiatives. 3 interviewees spoke more specifically on the role of values as a foundation for day-to-day work and more generally as an approach to meeting service users.

> *Well, have to sit down once per year and think about what we want to do for the rest of the year. So we have a [profession-related] discussion, but also a values-based discussion, about how we want to greet and meet all of the people coming here. So it's pretty important, or for me it's quite important, that all people feel welcome whatever their gender, ethnicity, economic situation and whatnot. (I-9)*

> *We have, due to our location, different norms and values that shape our work. [...]If you want to be a part of the community, well, then you have to be appreciative and open towards difference [...] But it's complex. It's about being attentive to and accommodating towards all of these people every day [...] (I-8)*

For these particular frontline workers, the importance lies in behaviour underpinned by values of being welcoming and accommodating towards service users as individuals. These values can be in alignment with administration-specific values formulated in a policy, or, as I-9 states, local discussions about how they want to shape their work with people. In relation to the LGBTI+ policy, an administrative employee stated:

47

We use it more as an underlying value because we don't work with specific target groups […] I would say that it's an important foundation. We don't have an immediate, large target group that we specifically need to take into consideration. We just have to know that we always provide [people] the same level of good service and that we treat them with respect. And we understand this in relation to doing it for all groups, whatever their preferences or naturalness. (I-3)

The values underpinning the LGBTI+ policy, and therefore also the municipality generally, are considered to be tightly connected to equality of treatment in praxis. Adhering to norms of diversity and equality of service provision were therefore quite strong among interviewees, which is also supported by Monro (2007:5; 7-8). As the municipality's value foundation expects employees to adhere to its values of equal worth, respect, dialogue and trust, this is not surprising. Values were considered important by multiple interviewees when it comes to the connection between having the *will* to work towards diversity and LGBTI+ inclusion on the one hand, and *actually having* an inclusive approach to their work on the other. Even if an employee were to hold homo-, bi-, transphobic or intersexist beliefs or values, living up to professional behaviour at work would ensure that service users are treated according to the values foundation. The extent to which professional situation is integrated with personal values and beliefs affect the response to diversity policies (Hetzler 1984:125-128, Richardson & Monro 2013:135). Thus, if someone's personal attitudes or beliefs don't correspond to the professional situation, i.e. dissatisfaction with a new policy, it can lead to non-accept, which I deal with below (Hetzler 1994; Monro & Richardson 2013).

While interviewees argue that their co-workers can separate their own beliefs or biases from the work situation, it demands a great level of awareness. Even though values of diversity and inclusivity are a matter of course, implementation may not have the wished for effect. This can be practiced, if the correct conditions are in place, as we saw with the diversity champions who have integrated it into their workplaces and –practices. To illustrate this, the following examples are 2 interviewees' sense-makings about the role of personal beliefs or (unconscious) biases in a professional setting:

"There are always, from time to time, and of course this counts for all workplaces, the talk about 'if only everyone were alike', or... But I think people are good at saying 'whoops,' stopping themselves and thinking 'no, of course they have to have the right to be in that way, and of course this is the way things should be.' […] Of course, sometimes

there are people who become a bit grumpy but I generally think there's an attitude of 'hey, no that's just out pre-understanding of this, we're not supposed to force it on them, we have to help the young people the best way possible, that's all'" **(I-2)**

"I think, if you were more attentive of it, there would be some jokes that wouldn't have been said. I would say. I don't actually experience it here. I think several of my co-workers whom I know to be homosexual so it's not really something you talk about. It's just the way things are." **(I-4)**

Thus, the interviewees recognise the actual or potential existence of "office banter" and "[…] negative attitudes about sexual [and gender, red.] minorities" (Richardson & Monro 2013:140-141). However, the interviewees also found that this wasn't in opposition to doing their work 'properly', in the sense that service users get the help they need, and matters of sexuality aren't considered an oddity. Also, one could argue that banter or statements which reflect negatively on LGBT+ matters are more about insecurities on someone's lack of knowledge about the same (Richardson & Monro 2013:144). In alignment with this, Richardson & Monro (2013:141) find that prejudice is managed by making it a private matter, that is, a person who states negative attitudes would face consequences in their career, making them outwardly appear acting in accordance with the equalities work, but maintaining their 'private beliefs'. In this sense, being accepting or supportive of the LGBT+ agenda becomes a matter of behaviour rather than beliefs or values – if you act according to the values of our equalities work, then your private beliefs aren't an issue (Richardson & Monro 2013:141). In the Danish case, homo-, bi- or transphobic banter, however it's intended or received, does not seem to be privatised in the same manner. While some may maintain a negative attitude or belief about LGBT+ matters *and* express it at work, it can still be separated from the professional person, whose behaviour towards service users is what counts. However, as Bob Pease (2011) argues:

> Because oppression is embedded in cultural norms and public institutions, many oppressive practices are normalized in everyday life and become habituated and unconscious. Many of the injustices people suffer in neo-liberal welfare states are the results of the attitudes and practices of people going about their daily lives who are not aware of how their assumptions of superiority impact on the lives of others. Such people do not see themselves as […] oppressing others. (Pease 2011:69)

Thus, while the assumption is that we can separate our personal beliefs and professional behaviour, we still have to be critical towards our unconscious and habituated behaviour. Of

course, this is always easier said than done, since the habituation of behaviours or beliefs means that they "become second nature", we don't notice how we rely on previous experiences, or schematas, to "fill in the gap" when we encounter something in the now (Ahmed 2012:21; Strauss & Quinn:1993:285). Accordingly, if the formal and informal structures of an organisation support these processes of habituation, then there is less manoeuvre room to challenge organisational inequalities (Monro 2007:4). In other words, noticing and changing behaviour is difficult, if prejudice and 'homophobic banter' are supported via informal structures (of "social approval and disapproval") and are in line with the general official, hetero- and cis-dominant structures ("institutional rules and structures" which benefit services and service users that fall under hetero- and cis-dominant norms) (Monro 2007:4). This becomes even more difficult if personal beliefs lead to non-accept.

As mentioned in the theory section, non-accept is the mechanism by which employees fail to implement legislation or policies, thereby leading to variegated implementation across contexts (Hetzler 1994:75). In the case of the LGBTI+ policy, non-accept could involve deeming the policy unimportant, whether this is based on a stated professional or values-based judgement. Some interviewees spoke of the incompatibility of actively working with LGBTI+ matters at work. There was no general opposition to the policy or what it might help on but the attitude was that the particular workplaces were, by nature of the target groups, not the most relevant place to start.

> *I have difficulty seeing how this can be a part of my day-to-day work. I only meet a lot of [target group]. [...] But you have to keep up with the Copenhageners and their development (I-8)*

> *The thing about there being [an LGBTI+ policy] is not something that has taken up a lot of space with us. No more than of course beginning to think about it in relation to the work, and in relation to gender neutrality which is a relatively new phenomenon for us to work with. It's not something that lives in the institutions. It's not relevant. There are completely different elements at play. (I-5)*

The quotes show the adherence to values of openness, in the sense of being open and respectful to matters you previously haven't dealt with. This can be related to the findings in previous studies on organisational change, arguing that some employees might, while welcoming the change per se, find it impractical or difficult to take in and work with (Richardson & Monro 2013:135). Richardson & Monro (2013:135) write how Cutcher (2009)

explored this in relation to people's habituated understanding of themselves and their workplace. Cutcher (2009) showed how a shift in organisational practice can cause resistance to or ambivalence in implementation when changes occur (Richardson & Monro 2013:135). Thus, while interviewees across the board were in favour of giving attention to LGBT+ matters, there might be a notion of ambivalence in implementation due to the professional judgement. In this sense, the experiences and habituated work practices a person has gained over the years may be incongruent with the new demands, which are then deemed unfitting. However, as one interviewee point out:

> *My colleagues wouldn't do anything differently. So we wouldn't really need the [policy initiative]. Of course I'm open to learning something new and getting a new approach to it, but I don't think I'd change my approach to people [...]* ***(I-9)***

This quote shows the ambiguity of the processes involved in individuals' responses to change and implementation, as the potentiality of the policy initiative in affecting work are recognised, but professional experience and personal values of openness towards everyone weighs in. Relatedly, Richardson & Monro (2013:144) found that some employees may be hesitant to or directly opposed to implementing equalities work if they fear coming off as ignorant about LGB matters. Two interviewees indicated this to be the case when speaking about de-mystifying LGBT+ matters:

> *I hope it can open up for a constructive discussion. It would also be really good to get in some people who live in it and is it, explain it. I think it would be much better for the employee-group I'm in. To get it de-mystified. Because I think the thing about attending a course where there are a lot of words, it becomes a bit unreal and dangerous compared to being able to speak to someone who's transgender. That would make it more legitimate to ask the questions in a safe space and have it de-mystified. (I-9)*

Thus, this gap between comfort and discomfort in having to manage LGBT+ matters at work would have to be bridged and dealt with properly so as to not inhibit implementation.

Another aspect which came up in relation to potential non-accept is the integration of the public/private divide; since particularly sexuality has been rendered a private matter, the integration into the public sector can be resisted by those who have to work with it (Richardson & Monro 2013:138; 143). However, this picture is not clear-cut:

*[...] As a [profession] it's good to know what family structures look like currently. What is it we as [profession] have to support? So professionally, [the LGBTI+ policy] makes sense. Once it's concretised in a policy, that's when you start to attend courses and it's being worked with. Personally, I think people should have their private lives the way they want. But the trick is to be careful not to impose other people your private life in all respects (**I-8**)*

In this quote, we see the ambiguousness pertaining to the public/private divide and personal beliefs; while the personal opinion is that matters related to the private sphere should remain private, the policy is also welcomed in the sense that it may support or improve existing work practices.

Similarly interesting is the process of "depoliticization of difference" which highlights "the worth of every individual as an individual" (Richardson & Monro 2013:133-134). Thereby, LGBT+ people are recognised and accepted on the basis of their individuality, their rights as individuals, rather than tied to their LGBT+ identity (Richardson & Monro 2013:133-134; 139-140). Some interviewees spoke in favour of such a de-sexualised and de-genderised attention to equality whereby the importance lies in sameness:

*Professionally I'm thinking 'why this group?' Why isn't there a policy for disabled people or people with a different background than Danish, why is this group the special one? Also in terms of how they might be perceived, it can expose them a bit. At the same time, it can also support them. But what about all of the other groups? (**I-9**)*

*Of course I think it's fine and that it's good that there's a focus on it. But at the same time I think, personally, that the thing about making policies for minorities is something you have to be mindful of. Because it can create a feeling of special treatment, which probably isn't ideal, when the thought behind it really is 'we all should be equal' (**I-4**).*

While none of the interviewees were opposed to supporting LGBT+, concerns related to the potential risk of creating an imbalance between equality strands. Thus, while such attitudes may become a barrier for implementation, as Richardson & Monro (2013:140-141) found, it hasn't been the case among the interviewees. Rather, while concerns were expressed in various ways, no one used it as an 'excuse' to avoid 'doing'. In this sense, arguing for equality on the basis of sameness doesn't produce certain behaviours, or inaction for that matter. It's rather connected to personal thoughts on the best approach forward. For example, one interviewee connected it to practical concerns:

I think a lot of people thought it peculiar that it had to be this particular topic the politicians wanted to make a cross-cutting policy on. And personally I was a bit sad that it was an LGBTI+ policy and not a policy for minorities in general. […] [E]very time we do a cross-cutting policy, or other cross-cutting rules, the more of them there are, the more limitations there will be, and the more our managers and employees have to take into account. […] And at the same time we have to focus on lessening the potential administrative burden. **(I-7)**

Here, the argument around 'equality as sameness' isn't connected to an judgement of it being unsuitable or worries that it'll create a hierarchical imbalance between equality strands within the municipality, but rather a matter of it adding to an administrative burden.

(iii)   The circulability of 'the progressive municipality'

Just like individual-level habituated practices and attitudes can affect the implementation of policies, so can the organisational habits, including the circulability of the narrative of the municipality as progressive (Ahmed 2012:56; Hetzler 1994:75). I addressed this previously in 'Descriptions' based on the policy. Among interviewees, the municipality was similarly constructed as diverse and a frontrunner:

[Diversity] is addressed because it's something we want to be known for. We want to be progressive, and we think we manage that quite well. Just look at what happened in Copenhagen within the past 10 years. **(I-3)**

It's a municipality where we focus on the fact that we're the largest municipality in the country and that we have to take the first step. We have the opportunities to do it. And I think this is influenced by the fact that the municipality perhaps is a bit ahead of other places in the country in leading the way and wanting to lead the way. **(I-2)**

However, this narrative was contested by some interviewees. I-1 pointed to the potential for development in how to meet minority service users at work, and I-6 of the general lack of norm critique. Besides such comments, the progressive and diverse municipality seems to be a generally shared object. However, an interesting point is how 'diversity' was interpreted:

The focus on diversity is more from a social perspective. A lot of people hold different types of flex-jobs, senior jobs and these kinds of things, and they try to include the whole working force to a greater extent than I experienced in the state. But no, no diversity per se. **(I-4)**

Thus, diversity is not necessarily always understood to include sexuality, cis-/transgender and ethnicity, but rather socio-economic positioning and disability, as which are more classic welfare state issues. The question is how this ambiguous understanding of diversity affects processes of normalisation. Self-declarations of commitment, values and 'what the organisation is' can contribute to ignoring existing inequalities, and participate in normalising certain behaviours, attitudes, and "institutional rules" (Ahmed 2012:115-116; Monro 2007:4). Thus, verbal or written statements about or on behalf of the organisation don't necessarily reflect an actual presence of diversity. Rather, what is reproduced is the idea of the organisation as diverse (Ahmed 2012:56). This feeds back into the maters of individuals in organisations; if politicians, administrative and frontline workers alike generally share an idea of the municipality as diverse, progressive and tolerant, this may affect the perceived need for initiatives on LGBT+ and other equality strands. In this sense, non-performativity and the public identity connect. If we say and believe that we're providing inclusive services but some service users don't experience this as being the case due to their identity markers, then the public identity cannot be fully argued to as having been strengthened for everyone. However, the above is not a claim that there is no will to change, no actions taken, or a secret desire to fool those who hope for change in the LGBT+ area. It is rather to say that habits and norms are barriers to creating awareness and meaningful action, and this in turn affects the public identity.

5.2.3 The policy

     (i)   Circulability and use of the LGBTI+ policy

Ahmed (2012:95-96) argues that the more a policy circulates, the less it's likely to bring about changes. It thus ends up becoming a "friendly document" which doesn't challenge anything but is merely passed around, creating an image of 'doing' (Ahmed 2012:95-96). As I mentioned earlier, the LGBTI+ policy as a political document has more weight than the policies Ahmed refers to, in the sense that administrations are accountable to the politicians in implementing the initiatives. In this sense, the effect and reach of the policy cannot be equated with how and how much it's passed around. Also, the communication and circulation of the document relies more on local workplace habits and internal communication channels. This circulation of the document has been variegated across workplaces.

Four interviewees had not been introduced to the LGBTI+ policy as a part of their work before doing the interview. Three of these four interviewees had either looked up the policy before the interview or been introduced to it in some other capacity. Another three had been introduced to it at a team or personnel meeting, where it has been briefly discussed but to a smaller or larger degree put away again. The final two have been aware of it since it was first made public; of one them has taken part of an initiative implementation, the other one not. While all of the interviewees are connected to projects or workplaces mentioned as a commitment initiative in the policy, two were not aware of this being the case at the time of the interview. This may be because most of the initiatives are 'pre-existing'. If the initiative has existed before the policy and the policy has been communicated poorly to the employees, or done so before them starting work, there was little chance of them getting to know of the policy. In this sense, the circulation of the LGBTI+ policy was variegated and due to i.e. high replacement rate of staff in some workplaces, there is a greater risk of knowledge and the effort from initiative being lost. This also speaks to the potential use of the policy; what can it bring about, and how can this translate into long-term improvements in service delivery?

In summary, the factors shaping municipal workers' discretion in implementing the LGBTI+ policy are multi-faceted. The policy itself is not completely non-performative due to its political nature, which naturally leads to some employees working with the policy for shorter or longer periods of time. However, integrating the policy into daily work can prove difficult, and relies on the structures that frame work, individuals' attitudes and them seeing how the policy can be relevant, management and an embracing work culture with space to learn from each other. A couple of factors thus support the non-performativity of the policy. For example, targets and checks have potentiality but are prioritised in other areas, not equalities work; the circulability of the narrative of the municipality as inclusive and progressive can potentially hinder further insights into how praxis can be improved; and how employees would have to use to policy as a way to create pressure on management to further the LGBT´+ agenda.

5) Concluding discussion

In the thesis, I have looked into the influence of institutional speech acts on the LGBTI+ policy, that is, how the policy has been constructed in terms of descriptions, commitments and performance, and whether they are non-performative. As the theoretical frames don't fit the case perfectly, there are different nuances at play in the municipal policy than in the policies and institutions explored by Ahmed (2012). I have also addressed factors like individual agency and organisational culture, though it has been beyond the scope of the thesis to engage fully with this. I discuss the findings in the remainder of the section.

In the analysis we saw how the LGBTI+ policy faces implementation challenges due to a number of factors. Looking at the policy alone, the commitment initiatives greatly influence the extent to which employees are able to work with LGBT+ matters. However, commitment initiatives and statements as well as descriptions are also capable of reproducing a particular narrative about the organisation, increasing the risk of creating images of the organisation as diverse, inclusive and progressive *already*, when it's not necessarily reflected in praxis (Ahmed 2012). Likewise, these 'institutional speech acts' can reproduce normative perceptions of i.e. marriage as an institution or equality in general rather than specifically tied to equality strands, which may have an effect on praxis. Thus, as Almeida (2016) argued, policies can reproduce e.g. racialisation both in their written form, but also in their implementation. This strengthens existing organisational structures and inequalities in the sense that the image of doing something in the name of inclusivity and diversity accumulates value for the organisation, while meaningful changes aren't brought about – but instead risk reproducing normative ideals and values, and 'equality on the basis of similitude'. The matter of normalisation processes is important to keep in mind when addressing inequalities; while demarcations of those who are included/excluded are unavoidable and constantly shift, mindfulness of how it can affect service delivery is important.

In those areas where there was manoeuvre room to suggest or set LGBT+ activities in motion, it was driven by 'diversity champions' rather than the policy. While they relied greatly on management to the meaningfulness and provide resources and priority to LGBT+, it was generally the feeling that management and co-workers alike were open towards engaging with these issues and learning from these individuals. The hindrances seemed to be the structures

56

framing work, that is, the role of targets and checks, and the specificity of legislation relative to policies. Attention is prioritised to the low-practical areas, and the areas monitored by checks or targets. Furthermore, the role of individuals at the workplace and also make or break the degree to which a policy will be implemented. If it doesn't seem relevant to the local situation or employees can't see themselves in the work put forward by a given policy, then there's less likelihood of it being implemented. Likewise, the view of equality and the level of confidence surrounding matters of LGBT+ also make such work successful – or not. While I didn't have a lot of data supporting these arguments, I found them important to include due to their being supported in previous literature. Thus, municipal workers' discretion is affected greatly by the initiatives and the local workplace opportunities and cultures.

Overall, I argue that the LGBTI+ policy has tendencies of non-performativity, due to the way it was constructed. As a political document, the administrations and local workplaces are accountable to live up to the initiatives in the policy to the best of their ability. Thus, several initiatives have already been implemented. However, the pre-existing initiatives didn't necessarily make a difference, as local LGBT+ supporting work was shaped by previous projects. Here, there could be great room for discretion but again, it wasn't incentivised by the policy. Thus, I would argue that the policy is non-performative in the sense of not bringing about what it names when specific and direct action isn't indicated, and where there hasn't been allocated resources to incentivise action.

Such a conclusion is interesting in terms of discussing the public identity.
The public identity is useful in pinpointing the distinction the policies which strengthen dominant values and interests in society, and those that actually increase individuals' autonomy through expanded social rights (Hetzler 1994:35). This discrepancy matters when laws and policies have to be interpreted for implementation. As the non-performativity of a policy means it gives the impression of bringing about what it names, rather than actually doing so, it means that the policy risks strengthening the dominant values and interest in society while accumulating value for the organisation that formulated it – rather than strengthening the public identity. Thus, the relationship between a normative value in society and the political actions to support it isn't straightforward.

57

I was not able to get all of the types of interviewees that I initially intended. This is partly due to COVID-19 becoming more serious in Denmark during time of sampling, but also due to my lack of insider knowledge of the workings of the organisation. While I found one gateway person who was able to guide me in the beginning, the lack of easily accessible information and contact details restricted the sampling procedure and reach. Also, because it wasn't feasible in terms of time to get more interviewees, there might be local knowledge other departments that I haven't reached. In terms of conducting the interviews, some of the questions posed to interviewees invoked different answers. Thus, my interviewing skills are still developing, which shapes how people responded to me and answered the questions. Lastly, the topic itself might have been sensitive for some interviewees, in the sense of whether they felt confident that I wouldn't misuse what they said to 'trash talk' the municipality. I tried getting around this by contacting them before handing in the thesis, so they had a chance to reflect further on what I wanted to use for the thesis.

Due to the lack of research in the Danish field, it would be interesting to see how local governments attempt to work with equalities initiatives. Also, while I didn't focus on normalisation processes per se, they are crucial for any type of work which can influence the demarcation of people as 'normal/deviant' or 'included/excluded' – and all of the nuances in between. Thus, due to the scope of the thesis, I have attempted to add to the existing international body of literature but more specific work on the connection between equalities work and normalisation processes is needed.

Reference list:

Ahmed, S., 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S., 2005. The Non-Performativity of Anti-racism. *Borderlands*, 5(3), §1-§39

Almeida, S., 2016. Exposing the threads: A critical interrogation of the policies, practices and (non-)performativity of diversity in the City of Toronto. *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies*, vol. 16, pp. 96-126.

Als Research APS, 2015. *Nydanske LGBT-personers levevilkår*. Copenhagen: Als Research APS

Amnesty International, 2016. *Briefing*: *Transkønnedes adgang til sundhed i Danmark. Opfølgning på Amnesty's rapport fra 2014*. Copenhagen: Amnesty International

Anderson, B. & Hughes, V., 2015. Introduction. In: Anderson & Hughes, eds. *Citizenship and its Others*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-9

Borchorst, A., Freidenvall, L., Kantola, J., Reisel, L., & Teigen M., 2012. Institutionalizing Intersectionality in the Nordic Countries: Anti-Discrimination and Equality in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. In: Krizsan, Skjeie & Squires (eds.) *Institutionalizing Intersectionality: The Changing Nature of European Equality Regimes*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Available at: https://search-ebscohost-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat02271a&AN=atoz.ebs1414448e&site=eds-live&scope=site [Accessed 23 May 2020]

Bury, J., 2015. Non-performing inclusion: A critique of the English Football Association's Action Plan on homophobia in football. *International Review of the Sociology of Sport*, 50(2), pp. 211-226.

Coffey, A., 2014. Analysing Documents. In: Flick (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. SAGE Publications Ltd.: London, pp. 367-379. [Accessed 23 May 2020] doi: 10.4135/9781446282243.

Fahlgren, S., Johansson, A., & Mulinari, D., 2011. Introduction: Challenging Normalization Processes in a Neoliberal Welfare State. In: Fahlgren, Johansson, & Mulinari (eds.) *Normalisation & Outsiderhood: Feminist Readings of a Neoliberal Welfare State. [online]*. Bentham Science Publishers. Available at: https://search-ebscohost-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat07147a&AN=lub.6179507&site=eds-live&scope=site [Accessed 2 May 2020]

Hetzler, A. 1984., *Lagens roll i socialpolitiken*. Lund: Liber

Hetzler, A. 1994., *Socialpolitik i verkligheten*. Lund: Bokbox Förlag

Human Rights Watch, 2019. *New Health Guidelines Propel Transgender Rights*. [online] Available at: https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/05/27/new-health-guidelines-propel-transgender-rights [Accessed: 22.05.2020]

Kirkebæk, B., 2005. Sexuality as Disability: The Women on Sprogø and Danish Society. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 7(3-4), pp. 194-205

Kirkebæk, B., 1999. The Order of Classification and The Disorder of the Human Being. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research,* (1)1, pp. 4-12

Kimura, M., 2014. Non-performativity of university and subjectification of students: the question of equality and diversity in UK universities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(4), pp. 523-540. DOI: 10.1080/01425692.2013.777207

Kvale, S., 2007. *Doing interviews. The SAGE Qualitative Research Kit*. SAGE Publications, Ltd.: London. [Accessed 23 May 2020] doi: 10.4135/9781849208963.

Københavns Kommune (KK), 2017. *Dagsorden for 21. Medlemsforslag om udarbejdelse af en LGBT-politik for Københavns Kommune (2017-0287949)*. [online] Available at: https://www.kk.dk/indhold/borgerrepraesentationens-modemateriale/24082017/edoc-agenda/4ed0c77c-a82b-4636-82a4-d7e8ca0aee9e/4cfcf1c7-c517-4430-b5ae-8623653e3ce2 [Accessed 10.05.2020]

Københavns Kommune (KK) (undated). The City of Copenhagen Government. [online] Available at: https://international.kk.dk/artikel/city-copenhagen-government [Accessed 11 May 2020]

Københavns Kommune (KK), 2019a. *København klar med Danmarks første LGBTI+ politik* [online] Available at: https://www.kk.dk/nyheder/koebenhavn-klar-med-danmarks-foerste-lgbti-politik [Accessed 25 May 2020]

Københavns Kommune (KK), 2019b. *Dagsorden for 10. Afrapportering på Københavns Kommunes arbejde med LGBTI+- politikken for 2019 (2019-0302234).* [online] Available at: https://www.kk.dk/indhold/okonomiudvalgets-modemateriale/10122019/edoc-

agenda/24332191-84c2-4d9e-9241-5bf105c007c8/8dee1cf2-a4fa-487e-be5e-13bbf2e9de1d

[Accessed 25 May 2020]

Laursen S. & Thranesen, T., 2019. *Anbefalinger til revision af lovgivning, mv*. København: LGBT Komiteen

LGBT Danmark (undated) LGBT historie i Danmark, [online] Available at: https://library.aru.ac.uk/referencing/files/Harvard_referencing_201718.pdf [Accessed 18 May 2020]

Linneberg, M. & Korsgaard, S., 2019. Coding Qualitative Data: A Synthesis Guiding the Novice. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 19(3), pp. 259-270. DOI 10.1108/QRJ-12-2018-0012

Dictionary, Merriam-Webster (2020) Merriam-Webster.com [online] Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/normative> [Accessed 23 May. 2020]

Dictionary, Merriam-Webster (2020) Merriam-Webster.com [online] Available at: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/narrative> [Accessed 23 May. 2020]

Monro, S., 2006. Evaluating Local Government Equalities Work: The Case of Sexualities Initiatives in the UK. *Local Government Studies*, 32(1), pp.19–39

Monro, S., 2007. New Institutionalism and Sexuality at Work in Local *Government. Gender, Work & Organization*, 14(1), pp.1-19

Monro, S. & Richardson, D., 2014. Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Populations: The Role of English Local Government. *Local Government Studies*, 40(6), 869-887.

Olofsdotter, G., 2011. "The Other Woman": Constructing Needs in a Training Project for Disabled Women and Immigrant Women. In: Fahlgren, Johansson, & Mulinari (eds.) *Normalisation & Outsiderhood: Feminist Readings of a Neoliberal Welfare State*. Ch. 4. [Elektronisk resurs]. Bentham Science Publishers. Available at: https://search-ebscohost-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat07147a&AN=lub.6179507&site=eds-live&scope=site [Accessed 23 May 2020]

Pease , B., 2011. Normalisation as Hidden Privilege. In: Fahlgren, Johansson, & Mulinari (eds.) *Normalisation & Outsiderhood: Feminist Readings of a Neoliberal Welfare State*. *[Elektronisk resurs]*. Bentham Science Publishers. Available at: https://search-ebscohost-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat07147a&AN=lub.6179507&site=eds-live&scope=site [Accessed 23 May 2020]

Petersen, M., 2016 "These are queer times indeed". *Kvinder, Køn & Forskning*, nr. 4., pp. 55-64.

Richardson, D., & Monro, S., 2013. Public duty and private prejudice: sexualities equalities and local government. *The Sociological Review*, vol. 61, 131-152.

Richardson, D., 2005 Desiring Sameness? The Rise of a Neoliberal Politics of Normalisation. *Antipode*, 37(3), pp. 515-535

Statens Institut for Folkesundhed, 2015. LGBT-sundhed. Helbred og trivsel blandt lesbiske, bøsser, biseksuelle og transpersoner. Copenhagen: Statens Institut for Folkesundhed

Strauss, C. & Quinn, N., 1993. A Cognitive/Cultural Anthropology. In: Borofsky, R., eds. Assessing Cultural Anthropology. New York: Mcgraw-Hill.

Thurairajah, K., 2019. Uncloaking the Researcher: Boundaries in Qualitative Research. *Przeglad Socjologii Jakosciowej*, 15(1), pp. 132-147.

Udenrigsministeriet, 2018. *Handlingsplan til fremme af tryghed, trivsel og lige muligheder for LGBTI-personer*. Copenhagen: Udenrigsministeriet. Available at: https://www.regeringen.dk/media/5348/lgbti-handlingsplan.pdf [Accessed 25 May 2020]

Winter, B. 2018. "Tampering with Society's DNA" or "Making Society Stronger": A Comparative Perspective on Family, Religion and Gay Rights in the Construction of the Nation. In: Mulholland, Montagna & SandersMcDonagh (eds.) *Genderising Nationalism: Intersections of Nation, Gender & Sexuality*. Springer International Publishing, https://search-ebscohost-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat07147a&AN=lub.5156668&site=eds-live&scope=site [Accessed 23 May 2020]

Århus Kommune, 2020. *Udvalget for Mangfoldighed & Ligestilling*. [online] Århus: Århus Kommune. Available via: https://www.aarhus.dk/demokrati/politik/raad-og-naevn/udvalget-for-mangfoldighed-og-ligestilling/#10 [Accessed 25 May 2020]

Appendix

A) Timeline: legislative advances regarding LGBT+ (LGBT Denmark, undated)

<u>1973</u>:   The dance-ban is lifted; two men can dance together now.

<u>1976</u>:   The age of consent for homosexual couples is put to 15 years of age, the same as for heterosexual couples. The Folketing removes Criminal Law, §225, stk. 2 which states that a person who 'practices sexual immorality' with someone of the same sex under the age of 18, can be punished with up to 4 years in prison.

<u>1981</u>:   Homosexuality is removed from the Danish Health Authority's list of psychological illnesses.

<u>1986</u>:   The Folketing enacts a law which equates cohabitating same-sex people/couples with married couples in terms of inheritance tax.

<u>1987</u>:   Prohibition against differential treatment: discrimination based on sexual orientation is prohibited.

<u>1989</u>:   Introducing same-sex registered partnerships

<u>1996</u>:   Prohibition of direct or indirect differential treatment in the workplace due to "sexual orientation, 'race', skin colour, religion or faith, political standing, age, disability and national, social or ethnic heritage"

<u>1997</u>:   Lesbian couples and single women are denied treatment with in vitro fertilisation.

<u>1999</u>:   - As the law on registered partnerships is changed, same-sex couples can become legal parents by step-child adoption.
         - Foreigners who have lived in Denmark for at least two years are allowed to form a registered partnership.

2006:   The right to in vitro fertilisation is extended to lesbian women.

2009:   The 'co-mother' in lesbian couples who receive in vitro fertilisation can adopt at birth rather than having to wait three months.

2010:   Same-sex couples can adopt on par with heterosexual couples.

2012:   Gender neutral marriage is legalised. Thus, same-sex couples can wed in church as well as at City Hall.

2013:   - Stepchild adoption is no longer necessary to become a legal parent. "A man, woman and her female partner can form an agreement on whether the man or the partner is to recognise the legal parenthood of the child"
- Danish Immigration Service decides that LGBT+ people who are granted asylum in Denmark are to be considered refugees according to the Refugee Convention and receive convention status rather than protection status.

2014:   It's possible to choose your own gender and receive a new National Identity number without medical treatment or assessment.

2017:   'Transgender' is removed from the Danish Health Authority's list of psychological disorders.

B) Interview Questions

- Could you provide a short introduction of yourself?

- How long have you worked where you are now?

- Why did you choose to work there?

- Which tasks do you have on a regular workday?

- Which policies, e.g. a welfare policy or health policy, are relevant for you in your work?

- In what way is such a policy relevant in your work? – Would you say the same goes for the LGBTI+ policy?

     - What do you structure your work around (if you don't have a concrete policy that works as a framework)? How does this framework affect your work?

- What makes you and your co-workers feel obliged to implement a policy?

- When your workplace is presented to a policy that is to be incorporated into your work, what ensures its implementation?

- Working with a policy, like a health policy, isn't the same as having to work according to legislation. They exist in different levels, so to speak. What does this distinction mean for you in your work?

- When and how did you find out that there is an LGBTI+ policy?

     - How was the policy received in your workplace? (What were the reactions to it?)

     - How often is the LGBTI+ policy talked about or referenced to?

- What do you think about the policy seen from a professional perspective and a personal perspective, respectively?

     - Do you think your colleagues agree with you?

- What aspects are prioritised or given most attention at work? (Does anything always trump other areas?)

- Can you tell me how you work with LGBT+ matters at your workplace?

- I'm interested in the ways in which people can become categorised as 'normal' or 'abnormal', i.e. due to sexuality, disability, etc. I'm curious to know how ideas of what is normal, who is normal, and why, is relevant in your work?

- If you were to implement initiatives related to LGBT+ at work, would there be space to do so? Would it be able to be funded?

- Are there any societal tendencies which affect the available resources over time?

- How would you describe the City of Copenhagen based on the concept 'diversity'? (According to work environment, organisation, the approach to citizens and service users or what you find relevant)
- What thought have you had regarding the role of the welfare state does or should play in terms of meeting the interests of various groups?
- Do you think you work where you do in 5 years?
- Anything we didn't talk about that you find relevant? Something you think is important for me to know? Anything you thought of during the interview?

C) Quotes from interviews
I-1:
"[…] At jeg tilfældigvis er på denne her arbejdsplads og tilfældigvis har tilbudt at hjælpe med hvordan man omtaler en transkønnet mand, for eksempel, men det er ikke noget vi har fået at vide ovenfra, at vi skal sætte noget mere fokus på, eller vide noget mere om."

"Ja, jeg synes, at der er rigtig stor åbenhed over for det [LGBT+ opmærkomshedspunkter], når man kommer med det. Jeg tror udfordringen har været den manglende bevidsthed om omkring det folk ikke vidste. Så der skal ligesom nogen ind der kan sige, 'hov, du har lige en blind plet her'. Og så bliver der lyttet, så det er rigtig fint, og det er blevet taget rigtig godt imod."

"[…] Jeg oplever, at det er vigtigere at have x antal samtaler, end indholdet og kvaliteten af de samtaler. […] Jeg tror det handler om, at vires eksistensberettigelse afhænger af måltal, for det der det eneste der bliver målt på, og ikke om vi overholder love, eller det vi er blevet sat i verden for."

I-2:
"Der kommer jo altid, indimellem, og det gør der selvfølgelig på alle arbejdspladser, den dér snak om, 'hvis nu bare alle var ens' […] Men jeg synes, at folk er rigtig gode til hurtigt at sige 'hov' og lige stoppe sig selv og tænke 'nej, selvfølgelig skal de have ret til at være sådan og selvfølgelig skal det være sådan' […] Og selvfølgelig kan der være nogle der mugger lidt, men jeg synes generelt, at der er en holdning af at 'hov, nej, det er jo vores forforståelse af det her, det skal presse ind, vi skal bare hjælpe de unge bedst muligt'."

"Det er jo en kommune hvor fokus er på, at vi er den største kommune i landet, og at vi skal gå foran, tage skridtet før de andre. Vi har mulighederne til det. Og det synes jeg også bærer præg af, at kommunen måske er lidt på forkant ift. andre steder i landet med at vise vejen, og gerne vil vise vejen."

I-3:
"Vi har det mere med som en underliggende værdi, fordi vi beskæftiger os ikke specifikt med specifikke samfundsgrupper [...] Umiddelbart ville jeg sige, at der er et vigtigt fundament. Vi har ikke umiddelbart en stor målgruppe her for os, som vi specifikt behøver at forholde os til. Vi skal bare vide, at vi til enhver tid giver dem den samme gode service, og at vi optræder med respekt. Og der ser vi det mere i sammenhæng med, at det skal vi gøre for alle grupper uanset deres præferencer eller naturligheder."

"[Mangfoldighed] italesættes også, for det er noget, vi gerne vil være kendt for. Være kendt for at tænke i fornyelse, tænke i innovation, tænke i at gøre ting på nye måder. Vi vil gerne være progressive, og der synes vi selv, at der går ret godt. Bare se på hvad der er sket i København i de sidste 10 år."

"Altså, generelle politikker er jo rammesættende for, hvordan vi egentlig skal udføre vores arbejde, og hvordan vi skal agere, og rigtig meget af det handler om adfærd og holdninger, eller værdier og adfærd. Og typisk er det sådan at værdipolitikker- det som jeg gør, det er at oversætte dem til forventet adfærd. Så også hvad gælder politikker, så handler det om at gøre det konkret for den enkelte medarbejder [...]"

I-4:
"Jamen, man kan sige, lovgivning skal vi rette os efter. Politikker, det er mere noget som man genstiller til, at nu skal man gøre sådan eller sådan, men det er ikke noget man *skal* følge. [...] Det er noget vi bestræber os på, men man er ikke bundet af det helt på samme måde. Det er i hvert fald ikke oplevelsen."
"Jeg tror også, hvis man var mere opmærksom på det, så ville der måske være nogle vittigheder eller kommentarer som der ikke ville være blevet sagt. Der er flere af mine

medarbejdere som jeg ved er homoseksuelle, så det er ikke noget man snakker om. Sådan er det bare.”

”Jeg synes jo, at det er fint, at det er der, og at man har fokus på det. Men stadig synes jeg, rent personligt, at det dér med at lave politikker for minoriteter, det er også noget man skal være varsom med. Det kan også skabe følelsen af særbehandling, hvilket måske ikke altid er så hensigtsmæssigt, når tanken egentlig er, at 'vi alle skal være lige'.”

”Der er fokus på mangfoldighed, men mere fra et socialt perspektiv. Der er rigtig mange folk, forskellige typer flexjob or seniorjob, og alle sådan nogle ting. Man prøver at inkludere hele arbejdsmarkedet i langt højere grad end jeg har oplevet i staten. Men nej, ikke ift. mangfoldighed som sådan.”

I-5:
”Jeg fik lov til [at] samarbejde med det [x type] frontpersonale og det blev besluttet, at vi skulle have et netværk af [y] ambassadører. Og vi har et netværk hvor vi mødes 3-4 gange om året og taler om alle mulige forskellige ting. Vi har lavet en [z], vi har lavet en beredskabsplan for [c], og det sidste vi lige har lavet, det var, at vi gennemgik denne her [v] undersøgelse.”

“Det der er hovedordet I dét her, ift. hvad der får prioritet og plads, det er mening. Giver det mening for [målgruppe]? […] Og det synes jeg også er noget af det, at kunne skabe mening for ledere og medarbejdere ift. at det gavner [målgruppen]. [...] Jeg ved jo godt at de også er rigtig udfordrede af driftsmæssige ting, altså sådan noget med at vi også skal sikre, at der er et budget der hænger sammen, og at vi igen skal spare jeg ved ikke hvor mange millioner. […] Så det er vigtigt, men jeg oplever egentlig, at hvis der er initiativer der kan hjælpe medarbejderne, og hvis de kan tale mening frem i det, så oplever jeg, at det bliver prioriteret.”

”Det dér med at der var en [LGBTI+ politik] er ikke noget, der har fyldt herinde hos os. Ikke andet end at man selvfølgelig tænker nogle ting ind i de her forskellige ting, også ift. kønsneutralitet, som er et forholdsvist nyt fænomen for os at arbejde med. Der er ikke noget der lever ude på institutionerne. Der er ikke noget der er relevant, synes jeg. Det er nogle helt andre problematikker der er i spil.”

I-6:

"De fik en pulje penge til at undervise al personalet da de fik [x][…] og der er stort set ingen af dem, der er der nu, som var til undervisningen dengang. Så da jeg startede, var der medarbejdere der ikke vidste, at [vores arbejdsplads] har en [x] profil. Og så tænkte jeg, 'det er virkelig dødt'. Vi havde profilen udadtil, men der skete ikke rigtig noget."

"Jeg elsker at være på [x], for jeg må gerne drille mennesker lidt hvis de bliver lidt for normative. Så kan jeg sige, 'ahh, nu skal vi ikke være for normative!' // "Nogle frivillige holder [et ugentlig event] som hedder [x] […] Da jeg startede, der gjorde vores aktivitetsmedarbejdere ingenting for [x]. Og så snakkede jeg med [y] og fandt ud af, at vi faktisk godt må få kage med på [x], men det var de frivillige som tog det hele med selv! Arh!"

"Og det var rigtig fint i starten, det første halve år. Og så fortalte jeg dem, ved I hvad, jeg synes, at vi skal begynde at undervise igen, og de var bare, yes, ind med det […] [M]en siden har det været lidt, 'ej, vi har jo ikke rigtig ressourcerne til det' og sådan. Og de er undskyldende over for det, men det er lidt frustrerende også."

"Hvis der er noget vi bliver malt på, hold da op vi får opbakning. […] Det er så dejligt, det er rigtig godt, jeg elsker tilsyn. Men i og med at der er tilsyn på noget, så bliver der over-fokus på det. Vores profil, det er jo bare vores interne profil, det måler vi selv på, det er hvad vi selv synes. Men der er jo ingen der kommer og kigger på os og siger at 'I burde nok være lidt mere normkritiske eller arbejde lidt mere med det her'."

I-7:

"Der tror jeg lige at man ville gå et spadestik dybere, og undersøge hvad det er for en problemstilling, og om man vil kunne løse den med nogle af de tiltag, der er der i forvejen. Men man kan sige, at vores politikkere, som er meget interesseret i det område, så det kan da godt være. Men det skal jo hele tiden måles op ift. ressourcer og sådan. […] Det er slet ikke helt udelukket, men det kræver, at vi kan se at der er et behov for det. […] Ter er plads til det, det er bare en prioritering."

69

"Jeg tror, at der var mange der syntes, at det var pudsigt, at det lige netop skulle være det område, som politikkerne syntes, at der skulle laves en tværgående politik for. Og personlige var jeg også lidt ked af at det var LGBTI+ politik, og ikke en politik for minoriteter generelt. […] [H]ver eneste gang vi laver en tværgående politik, eller andre tværgående regler, så jo flere af dem der bliver, jo flere begrænsninger er der, og jo flere ting er der som vores ledere og medarbejdere skal tage højde for. […] Vi har jo samtidig fokus på at mindske den administrative byrde, der kunne være."

I-8:
"Vi har, qua vores placering, nogle lidt andre normer og værdiset. […] Hvis du vil være en del af fællesskabet, jamen så skal du vær anerkendende og imødekommende over for forskellighed. […] Men det er ret komplekst. Det er noget med, hvordan kan vi tilgodese alle de her mennesker […]"

"Jeg har svært ved at se, hvordan det kan blive konkret i min hverdag. Jeg møder kun en masse [målgruppe]. […] Men derfor synes jeg altid, at man skal følge med københavnerne og deres udvikling."

"[…] Som [profession] er det godt at vide, hvordan familiestrukturer er pt. Hvad er det man som [profession] skal gå ind og understøtte? Fra et fagligt synspunkt giver det mening. Når det først bliver konkretiseret sm en politik, så er det at man begynder at få nogle kurser, og der bliver arbejdet med det. Helt personligt, så synes jeg at folk skal have deres privatliv, som de føler, at de vil have deres privatliv. Dér hvor man skal være forsigtigt, er, at man ikke skal pådutte andre mennesker sit privatliv i alle henseender. […] Privatlivet er helligt, synes jeg."

"I hverdagen bliver vi nødt til at sige, hvor meget kan vi udmønte det. Det er altid svært at vide, hvor meget man kan sætte den enkelte vision ud i praksis. […] Og der går også en masse af det tabt, desværre. Fordi mange gange er det jo nogle kæmpe visioner, som ville skulle kræve en masse ressourcer, der ikke er til rådighed. […] Og i sidste ende, så er det det borgernære der giver mest mening."

I-9:

"Altså, vi skal jo sidde én gang m året, og tænke over hvad vi gerne vil lave resten af året. Så der har vi en pædagogisk snak, men og en værdisnak om hvordan vi gerne vil tage imod og møde de mennesker der kommer. Så det er ret vigtigt, eller for mig er det ret vigtigt, det dér med at alle mennesker føler sig velkomne uanset køn, etnicitet, økonomi, eller hvad det kan være."

"Mine kollegaer, de ville ikke gøre forskel. Så det er ikke sådan at vi har meget brug for det [politikinitiativ]. Selvfølgelig er jeg åben for at lære noget nyt og rå en ny tilgang til det, men jeg tror, at den måde jeg ser mennesker […]"

"Jeg håber bare, at der kan blive åbnet op for en konstruktiv snak om det. Det kunne også være rigtig fedt at få nogle mennesker ind, som selv lever i det og er det, og forklarer det. Jeg tror, at det ville være meget bedre for den medarbejdergruppe jeg er i. At få det afmystificeret. For jeg tror, at det dér med at komme på et kursus og der er mange ord, det bliver lidt uvirkeligt og farligt, ift. at snakke med én der er transkønnet. Så ville det være legalt at stille spørgsmål i en tryg gruppe, og så bliver det afmystificeret."

"Med faglige briller, der bliver jeg sådan lidt 'hvorfor er det lige den gruppe?' Hvorfor er der ikke nogen politik for handicappede eller folk med anden etnisk herkomst end dansk, hvor er det lige denne her gruppe, som er speciel? Også ift. synet på dem, at det kan komme til at udstille dem lidt. Samtidig kan det også bakke op om dem. Men hvad med alle de andre grupper?"

D) Quotes from the LGBTI+ policy

"Teknik- & Miljøforvaltningen arbejder for et mangfoldigt København. Det afspejles for eksempel i projekter som etableringen af Regnbuepladsen eller afholdelse af arrangementer com Copenhagen Pride. Begge er et udtryk for en vilje og parathed over for alle mennesker i byen." (KK 2019a:24)

"Af Købehavns Kommunes værdigrundlag fremgår i øvrigt, at brugeren skal mødes med respekt, ligeværdighed, dialog og tillid, og at kommunen skal være en attraktiv arbejdsplads med et udfordrende og sundt arbejdsmiljø." (KK 2019a:18)

"Undersøgelser har vist, at mere end hver tredje dansker har oplevet, at der tales nedsættende om homoseksuelle, biseksuelle og/eller transkønnede på deres arbejdsplads og at du ud af fem ikke oplever, at de kan være åbne omkring deres seksualitet på arbejdspladsen." (KK 2019a:9)

"Flere LGBTI+ seniorer oplever udfordringen, at de i mainstream-seniortilbud føler sig fremmedgjorte i mødet med en ofte heteronormativ praksis [...]" (KK 2019a:17)

"Børn og unge skal sikres en god, udviklende og tryg barndom og et stabilt grundlag for livet. Børn skal opleve en dagligdag, hvor fysiske rammer og skrift og tale (både i undervisning og i forbindelse med skiltning) giver plads til mangfoldighed." (KK 2019a:10)

"Forvaltningen prioriteter, at børn og unges seksualitet og kønsidentitet skal være en naturlig del af deres daglige liv." (KK 2019a:20)

"Vores by er – og skal være – for alle uanset køn, alder, hudfarve, handicap, religion, seksualitet og kønsidentitet. Det er både en konstatering og et løfte. I København skal man kunne leve det liv, man ønsker og være den, man er."(KK 2019a:5)

"Konkret initiativ: Forslag om at gøre LGBTI+ området til en del af personalepolitikker: Centraladministrationen i forvaltnignen vil foreslå Hoved-MED at medtage LGBTI+ området i forvaltningens personalepolitikker." (KK 2019a:14)

"Visionen med Københavns Kommunes LGBTI+ politik er at understøtte, at kommunen møder LGBTI+ personer med respekt, ligeværdighed, dialog og tillid og dermed sikre, at kommunens værdigrundlag også i praksis gælder for alle.
Målet med Københavns LGBTI+ politik er at skabe et afsæt for, at de enkelte forvaltninger og kommunen som helhed arbejder for lige muligheder for alle københavnere uanset seksualitet og kønsidentitet." (KK 2019a:6)

"Forvaltningen er en arbejdsplads, hvor der er plads til at være sig selv – uanset køn, etnisk baggrund, seksuel orientering, kønsidentitet mv. For at understøtte, at alle medarbejder oplever, at det er tilfældet, har forvaltningen fokus på at bidrage til et rummeligt arbejdsmiljø." (KK 2019a:24)

"Af Københavns værdigrundlag fremgår det desuden, at kommunen skal være en virksomhed, hvor mangfoldighed betragtes som et aktiv." (KK 2019a:26)

"Alle medarbejdere i forvaltningen skal være bevidste og reflekterende over de sociale og kulturelle normer, de bringer ind, skaber og reproducerer I det pædagogiske rum – det gælder køn, kønsidentitet, seksualitet, etnicitet, religion, alder med videre." (KK 2019a:11)

"Beskæftigelses- og Integrationsforvaltningen understøtter, at nyankomne udlændinge opnår kendskab til diversiteten i det danske samfund."(KK 2019a:9)

"Af alle Københavns Kommunes stillingsopslag fremgår det, at kommunen ser mangfoldgihed som en ressource og værdsæter, at medarbejderne hver især bidrager med deres særlige baggrund, personlighed og evne." (KK 2019a:27).

"Forvaltningen sørger for, at relevant viden og best practice-eksempler er tilgængelige på bedstsammen.kk.dk, så emner kan bringes i spil i forbindelse med årlige ledermøder, pædagogiske læreplaner, antimobbeplaner og trivselsundersøgelser." (KK 2019a:11)

"Som en del af undervisningen I danske samfundsforhold under integrationsprogrammet for nyankomne udlændinge bliver ydelsesmodtagere omfattet af integrationsloven undervest I mangfoldige familiestrukturer og ligebehandling." (KK 2019a:9)

"Afholdelse af LGBTI+ vielser til Copenhagen Pride Week: I 2017 blev der på forsøgsbasis afholdt vielser med LGBTI+ fokus, hvor kendte LGBTI+ personer holdt talerne i forbindelse med vielsen. På baggrund af gode erfaringer bliver igen afholdt LGBTI+ vielser i forbindelse med Copenhagen Pride Week 2018." (KK 2019a:15)

"Forvaltningen arbejder allerede for at forebygge og bekæmpe ensomhed blandt ældre. I den forbindelse vil forvaltningen tage initiativ til at undersøge mulighederne og behovet for at udvikle samarbejdsaftaler med civilsamfundsaktører med særligt kendskab og kontakt til ældre LGBTI+ personer med henblik på at forebygge og afhjælpe ensomhed specifikt i denne målgruppe."(KK 2019a:23)