Proceedings of ICSPHS 2026 Symposium: Ethics, Law, and Psychology: Interdisciplinary Reconstruction of Humanities in Medicine
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU32422

Campus Microaggressions in Everyday Talk: How Sexual Minority Students Are Pushed into Invisibility Through Jokes, Assumptions, and Silence

Yifan Xie

BOLUO INNO ACADEMY, Shanghai, China
yeletian@boluozaixian.com

Abstract. Everyday campus interactions can marginalize sexual minority students without overt conflict. When bias is packaged as "jokes," casual assumptions, or well-meant advice, it becomes harder to identify and easier to perpetuate—yet its cumulative effects can be significant. This paper examines microaggressions in Chinese campus discourse and how routine language practices push sexual minority students toward invisibility in classrooms, dormitories, and peer groups. Using literature analysis, the study synthesizes prior findings on school bullying and minority stress and conducts thematic coding of publicly available narratives and discussion texts to identify recurring discursive patterns. The analysis maps four common forms: joke-driven teasing and group mockery, boundary-drawing through "normality", corrective "for your own good" talk, and blame reversal that labels dissent as "overly sensitive." Findings suggest that semantic ambiguity and plausible deniability lower the social cost of exclusion, shift attention from institutional norms to individual emotions, and narrow spaces for dialogue. Over time, these microaggressions undermine perceived safety and belonging, and reduce willingness to seek help, indicating a need for clearer linguistic boundaries and more reliable support pathways.

Keywords: Sexual minorities, Microaggressions, Campus discourse, Heteronormativity, Qualitative analysis

1. Introduction

Recent Chinese scholarship on school bullying and campus safety increasingly recognizes gendered harm, yet sexual minority students' experiences are still often treated as isolated incidents rather than everyday phenomena. Luo connects school-based gender bullying to physical and mental health among sexual and gender minority students and highlights "identity doubt" as a pathway through which harm is amplified under governance frameworks lacking a gender perspective [1]. Wei and Liu, using a sample of LGBT students, report significant associations between bullying victimization and depressive symptoms and suicidal ideation, suggesting that verbal exclusion can accumulate into enduring psychological risk [2]. Reviewing domestic bullying research, Liu notes persistent ambiguity in conceptual boundaries and insufficient attention to how interactional routines

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU32422

become tacitly permitted and reproduced [3]. Together, these studies imply a gap: how ordinary campus talk, not only extreme cases, sustains exclusion.

Accordingly, this paper explores microaggressions embedded in daily campus language and their implications for sexual minority students' safety, belonging, and help-seeking. It proceeds in three parts: (1) identifying common microaggressive forms in campus settings; (2) analyzing how heteronormative "normality," ambiguity, and plausible deniability enable low-cost exclusion and individualize structural problems; and (3) discussing potential consequences and practical intervention points. Methodologically, the study adopts literature analysis, combining prior research with thematic coding of public narratives and discussion texts. By offering an identifiable framework for subtle discrimination, this paper aims to provide references for improving the lived conditions of sexual minority groups in educational environments.

2. Clarifying "microaggressions" in campus talk

In campus discussions, "discrimination" is still conceptualized as explicit insults, physical violence, or formal exclusion. Yet for sexual minority students, the more routine experience is often subtler: a casual "Do you have a boyfriend yet?", a nickname that hints at deviance, or a reminder to "stop talking about that in the group chat." These moments may not meet narrow definitions of bullying, but they repeatedly communicate the same message: your identity is best kept invisible.

Microaggressions refer to everyday slights or biased expressions that appear small in isolation but gain significance through repetition. Their "micro" quality does not denote minor harm; it refers to their ordinary packaging. Speakers can retreat to safe explanations ("I was just joking"), while bystanders can normalize the exchange ("Don't take it seriously"). The burden of interpretation and response falls on the target, who must constantly calculate the costs of speaking: explain or stay silent, correct or endure, confront or preserve social ties.

A key feature in campus settings is the risk of being "read" or involuntarily outed. Even without disclosure, hairstyle, clothing, voice, or social media can trigger speculation. In dormitories and classrooms—high-density social environments—this uncertainty fosters chronic vigilance. Microaggressions, therefore, are not only moments of speech; they are repeated cues that shape what students feel permitted to say, how they manage self-presentation, and whether they view the environment as safe.

3. Common forms and the discursive mechanisms that sustain them

This study organizes campus microaggressions into four recurring forms. These overlap in practice, but the grouping helps illustrate how exclusion operates with low conflict and high deniability.

3.1. Heteronormative assumptions: setting the question before "who you like"

Many interactions are rooted in the assumption that everyone is heterosexual and gender-conforming: asking girls which boy they like, asking boys whether they have a girlfriend, and treating heterosexual dating as the default milestone. If a sexual minority student avoids responding, such silence is often interpreted as shyness, pretense, or "being uncooperative," prompting further questioning. Even without malicious intent, these questions place non-heterosexual experience outside the shared story of "normal" campus life.

Mechanistically, the harm comes from framing. The question does not ask whether someone dates; it presupposes the gender of the partner. To answer honestly is to disclose; to refuse is to risk

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU32422

suspicion. In either case, the student's autonomy over visibility is reduced.

3.2. Joke-driven teasing and mobbing: turning difference into a stage

Microaggressions are frequently delivered under the guise of humor: calling a short-haired girl "T," asking "who is the man in the relationship," teasing an effeminate boy as "too feminine," or making suggestive jokes when two girls are close friends. Laughter allows the group to dismiss the interaction quickly, leaving the target with discomfort that is socially difficult to articulate. If they object, they may be labeled humorless or fragile.

The mechanism is social alignment. Joking fosters a shared emotional stance of amusement and positions the target as the object that unites the group. Because the speech act is "only a joke," the speaker can deny intent, while the group's laughter becomes evidence that the target is overreacting. This is why microaggressions often thrive in dormitories and peer clusters: the same individual repeat these scripts, reinforcing norms of acceptable talk.

3.3. Boundary-drawing through "normality": policing categories and demanding clarity

Another common form relies on "normal/abnormal" boundaries. Bisexual students may be framed as "wavering" or "greedy," pressured to "choose a side." Transgender or non-binary students may be repeatedly asked to "clarify—are you male or female?" These remarks are often presented as requests for clarity or common sense, but they enforce a binary template that makes complexity illegible.

The mechanism is category control. By insisting on a single "correct" category, speakers position nonconformity as confusion or deviance. Importantly, the boundary talk can be delivered without direct insults: the speaker may claim they are "just asking." Yet the effect is to label the student as a problem requiring resolution, rather than an individual deserving respect.

3.4. Benevolent correction and blame reversal: negation in a gentle voice

Microaggressions also manifest as protective advice: "Don't say it—it's bad for you," "Focus on studying first," or "Why make things complicated?" These statements can be sincere, but they shift responsibility onto the student: the environment needs no change; the student must learn concealment. When the student expresses discomfort, the conversation may pivot to blame reversal: "You're too sensitive," "Don't make a big deal," "Stop moralizing."

This form depends on moral positioning. "For your own good" speech claims care while denying the legitimacy of the identity. Blame reversal, in turn, relocates the problem from the remark to the target's emotion, framing critique as evidence of personality flaws. Such moves individualize what is fundamentally a contextual and institutional issue.

Across all four forms, two mechanisms are particularly important:

Plausible deniability via semantic ambiguity.

Microaggressive remarks often allow dual interpretations. The same sentence can function as a tease or a compliment, a stereotype or a "fact," a probing question or "just curiosity." When challenged, speakers can retreat to the benign meaning. Because intent is hard to prove in everyday talk, correction becomes socially risky; the critic is framed as escalating conflict.

Individualization and the redistribution of emotional labor.

Rather than treating campus norms as changeable, microaggressions treat the target's reaction as the main variable. The student is expected to manage others' discomfort, preserve harmony, and

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU32422

educate peers—typically without institutional support. Over time, this emotional labor encourages self-censorship: say less, correct less, disclose less.

4. Likely consequences and practical intervention points

Microaggressions are best understood as "water-drop" harm: one remark may be tolerable, but repeated exposure across contexts accumulates. The first effect is on expression. Students avoid personal topics, refuse certain labels, and withdraw from group interactions. The second effect is on relationships. Trust in peers and teachers declines; friendship selection becomes cautious, and social spaces shrink.

Empirical research on bullying provides supporting these pathways. Studies on sexual minority students in China report associations between bullying experiences and mental-health indicators such as depressive symptoms and suicidal ideation, as well as negative links with perceived social support and self-esteem [2]. Survey reports on school climate also document frequent experiences of verbal harassment, nicknaming, and exclusion among sexual and gender minority students and discuss their implications for well-being and risk behaviors [4]. These findings do not suggest a single joke directly causes severe outcomes; rather, they illustrate how hostile or unsupportive environments can make cumulative stress clinically meaningful.

Help-seeking is a particularly sensitive outcome. Students avoid seeking help not because they "do not need it," but because they anticipate secondary costs: being questioned, having to "prove" their identity, being advised to stay quiet, or being treated as the source of trouble. When everyday discourse frames disclosure as risky, students may delay seeking assistance until distress becomes overwhelming.

Given these dynamics, interventions should prioritize feasibility—small changes that disrupt tacit permission for microaggressions.

4.1. Make language boundaries explicit and teachable

Anti-bullying education often focuses on physical aggression and overlooks linguistic harm. Class meetings and relevant courses can use de-personalized examples to unpack common scripts—"it's just a joke," "you're too sensitive," "normal people"—and discuss why they silence marginalized groups. The goal is not to incite moral panic, but to transform vague discomfort into articulable norms: defining respectful curiosity, teaching how to halt teasing without humiliation, and guiding sincere apologize without defensiveness.

4.2. Build credible support pathways with low disclosure costs

Availability of support alone is insufficient if students doubt teachers or counselors will understand. Schools can clarify referral procedures, offer anonymous consultation channels, and provide basic training for staff on sexual and gender diversity. Reports on school gender-based violence also emphasize strengthening institutional perspectives and policy supports so that responsibility does not fall entirely on students [5].

4.3. Equip bystanders with "lightweight" intervention options

Not all bystanders will confront peer publicly, but they can learn low-escalation moves: ending a joke with "let's not use that," changing the topic, or checking in privately with the targeted student afterward. These actions may seem small, but they break the cycle where silence is equated with

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU32422

consent. Over time, such micro-interventions can raise the social cost of exclusionary talk and expand spaces for students to speak.

Overall, reducing campus microaggressions requires treating everyday language as part of the environment, not a private matter of personality. When institution visibly prioritize respect and support, students no longer face a binary choice between invisibility and conflict.

5. Conclusion

This paper analyzes how microaggressions embedded in everyday campus language marginalize sexual minority students without overt conflict. Rather than relying on explicit hostility, these remarks are often packaged as jokes, common sense, or "caring" advice, which makes them difficult to challenge and easy to reproduce. Through literature analysis, the study identifies four recurring forms: teasing and group mockery framed as humor, heteronormative assumptions that presuppose heterosexuality, boundary-drawing through "normality" that polices categories, and blame reversal that recasts discomfort as excessive sensitivity. Across forms, semantic ambiguity and plausible deniability reduce the social cost of exclusion, while individualization shifts attention from institutional norms to the target's emotions and personality. As a result, microaggressions do more than harm individual interactions: they narrow conversational spaces, encourage self-censorship, and gradually erode perceived safety and belonging. Consistent with prior research on bullying and school climate, these dynamics can also weaken trust in support systems and lower willingness to seek help, especially when disclosure is anticipated to invite questioning or secondary stigma. Practical implications include clarifying language boundaries in educational settings, building credible and low-cost support pathways, and equipping bystanders with minimally escalatory intervention options that interrupt the "silence equals consent" routine.

Limitations should be noted. First, the case materials are drawn mainly from publicly available narratives and discussions, which cannot fully capture nonverbal cues or the relational context that shapes meaning. Second, the study does not compare microaggression patterns across school types or regions. Future research could conduct ethically approved interviews and observations, examine institutional variation, and evaluate the effectiveness of staff training and bystander education on improving campus climate.

References

[1] Luo, M. (2020). Analysis on the influence mechanism of gender bullying and students' physical and mental health on campus: A case study of sexual and gender minority students. Global Education , 49(4), 15–30.
[2] Wei, C., & Liu, W. (2015). Relationship between mental health and school bullying among sexual minority students. Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 23(4), 701-705.
[3] Liu, Y. (2016). Review and sociological reflection on school bullying research. Contemporary Youth Research, (5), 21–26.
[4] Tongyu (Common Language). (2016). School climate survey report for sexual and gender minority students in Mainland China (Part 1 and Part 2).
[5] Tongyu (Common Language). (2017). Gender-based violence in schools: Empirical research and policy recommendations.