

Somers, J., Demasi, M., Burke, S., & Carr, P. (in press). Toilet talk: (Trans)

Gendered negotiation of public spaces. *Routledge International Handbook of Innovative Qualitative Psychological Research*. Eds. by Tseliou, E., Demuth, C., Georgaca, E., & Gough, B. Routledge

Abstract

Public toilet provision in the UK fails to meet the needs of cis women while trans communities are absent from current building regulations. This research explores how individuals negotiate differing positions on toilet provision and accessibility. The data was formed of online posts on Dezeen, a forum for building design professionals, and Mumsnet, a parenting forum, in response to the Ministry of Housing and Local Government 'Technical review on increasing accessibility and provision of toilets for men and women'. Discursive Psychology was used to explore how accessibility to toilets is constructed. There is also an opportunity to explore how a discursive approach can be applied interdisciplinary with town planning and the built environment. Gender identities are situated and constructed within public toilets. Talk about refuge in public bathrooms involved the negotiation of who belonged in differing gender categories and who warranted a need for refuge. Where men are explicitly acknowledged as an issue, cis and trans women are collectively identified as requiring a safe space. Cis women are presented as a threat to trans women and other cis women who are misgendered. Discourse about toilet provision draws upon both heteronormative ideology to challenge access to trans people and others who challenge normative gender roles. Talk about toilets involves warranting 'place-identity' as gender identity is situated and access limited to those who are constructed as belonging.

Toilet talk: (Trans) Gendered negotiation of public spaces

Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the recent public call for evidence by the United Kingdom's Ministry of Housing and Local Government entitled the *'Technical review on increasing accessibility and provision of toilets for men and women'¹* (MHCLG, 2021). The call for evidence includes both the provision of an independent public toilet such as in a park; toilets that are 'publicly accessible', for example in a shopping centre; to 'private toilets' where one needs to be a customer/employee, or seek consent to utilise; such as a café, etc. The limited availability during the COVID-19 lockdown in the UK highlights the importance of the accessibility of public toilets (BBC, 2020). In this chapter, we take an innovative approach from previous more sociologically based approaches into toilet provision by exploring how access to public spaces is negotiated from a combined discursive psychological and town planning perspective.

For sustainable development that meets modern needs, built environment professionals need to be aware of the role of toilet provision in addressing social justice and inequality. Government planning policy encourages 'sustainable development' which seeks to 'meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (Brundtland, 1987, para1). Decision making by built environment professionals has to balance economic, social and environmental values. Given that the UK is a member state of the United Nations, it is crucial that decisions reflect the 17 sustainable development goals (SDG) agreed as part of Agenda 2030 such as Clean Water and Sanitation (SDG6), Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG11) and Reduced Inequalities (SDG 10) (United Nations, 2015).

¹ Whilst this paper will only focus on this particular call for evidence, it is acknowledged that there is also another and separate call for evidence which relates to solely persons with impairments or disabilities and who may need to utilise a 'disabled toilet.'

Meeting sustainable development goals around toilet provision is challenging given that patriarchal policies have been inherited from Victorian policy makers (for example, Penner, 2001). Contemporary decision making embraces concepts such as ‘place making,’ people collectively reimagining how we use spaces to maximise their shared value (Project for Public Spaces, 2007). Whilst policy has progressed to reduce inequality, toilet provision does not consider the diverse needs present within the population with spaces provided for men and women only (British Standards, 2009; HM Government, 2010). Large queues for women’s toilets despite equal size provision with men, reflects the additional needs of users such as menstruation (Ramster et al., 2018). In addition to this, toilet provision needs to plan for the provision of non-binary and trans communities (Jones and Slater 2020). Both trans-men and trans-women utilise specifically gendered toilets and that planning for spaces needs to cater for these situations; for example, menstruation bins needing to be provided in all toilets. Safety is a further consideration as trans people avoid public toilets for fear of being harassed so gender neutral toilets may be a solution (Ellis et al., 2014). However, Colliver and Coyle (2020) found that gender neutral toilets were constructed as dangerous to women who are vulnerable and at risk of sexual violence. Planning for toilets that meets the needs of a diverse population is complex and requires the consideration of meeting differing needs.

Objections to calls for toilets that meet the needs of trans and non-binary communities come from groups that view gender on a limited binary. Trans-Exclusionary Radical Feminists (TERF) or gender critical feminists believe that trans-women are not women and that provision and policies regarding provision should reflect this (Hines, 2017). This highlights how access to toilets is negotiated and involves the construction of gender. Both cis and trans women who are perceived as ‘butch’ may be misgendered and have their presence within the women’s toilet challenged (Skeggs, 2001; Jones & Slater, 2020). Groups that are constructed as non-

conforming to binary gender identities have a shared experience around access to public toilets (Mackay, 2019).

The psychology of the toilet has explored how toilets are constructed as a site and the role of gender in their accessibility. Haslam (2012) notes that few other public places are segregated by gender. Domestic bathrooms do not have urinals and people do not have bodily differences that require different spaces in toilets (Goffman, 1977). Similarly, changing spaces such as in sports contexts are segregated and debate has been found to focus on women's provision in debates around widening access to trans people (Knott-Fayle, 2022). Blumell et al. (2019) used social constructionist Thematic Analysis to generate themes around the need for protection from men, threats of violence towards trans people and sex differences presented as natural. Arguments about the safety of young women were also found by Colliver and Coyle (2020) to warrant gender neutral toilets as controversial. Discursive Psychology (DP) provides an opportunity to explore how talk is situated, psychological constructs such as identity are used and how people manage their accountability (Edwards & Potter, 1992). Talk about spaces involves warranting 'place-identity' (Korpela, 1989) as identity is situated and key to forming communities. Place identity has been used to informally warrant access to beaches to groups in South Africa (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003). DP allows researchers to consider how speakers account for their position on toilet provision and who is allowed to access them.

The call for evidence provides an opportunity to explore how toilet provision is constructed and speakers account for their position around accessibility for people who are not perceived to comply with heteronormative gender identities. By using DP, this paper will be able to build on previous research by being able to explore the variance in talk and our research question; how do individuals manage to negotiate differing positions on toilet provision and accessibility? This variance in talk could not be explored using other qualitative approaches

and provides an innovative approach to address, a shared concern for psychologists and town planners, in how place making and identity work can be examined as a practical and negotiable matter.

Method

We used DP to analyse two online sources – one magazine article with 25 comments (the architecture and design magazine, Dezeen) and one forum discussion board with 62 posts (from the parenting support website, Mumsnet) – where the government call for evidence for a technical review of the provision of toilets (see above) for men and women was discussed. The overall aim of the review was to give a '*clear steer in building standards guidance*' (MHCLG, 2021) by addressing concerns such as replacing female toilets with gender neutral toilets; the number of cubicles needed for women; as well as exploring the idea of ensuring fair provision of gender neutral toilets.

The research was approved by Teesside University's ethics committee and followed the British Psychological Society's guidelines for internet mediated research (2021). As per the terms and conditions of using Mumsnet for research, original usernames have been redacted as well as any identifiable information and the timestamp of posts for both forums. We did this for data from Dezeen also.

We applied a DP approach (Edwards & Potter, 1992) to the data, focusing on the 'action orientation' of discussions, that is, what people *do* with their talk. This approach works with naturalistic data as it avoids data that is "researcher provoked" (Augoustinos et al., 2005, p. 321). The way DP approaches psychological topics is to treat them as negotiable matters, rather than fixed entities that reside inside the minds of the speakers. This negotiation takes place through discourse, which is recognised as a prime site worthy of empirical scrutiny rather than relegate it to a transparent window to the mind (Edwards & Potter, 1992). Rather, DP proposes

an “empirical alternative by looking to discourse as a site where psychologically relevant action unfolds” (Demasi, 2022, p.2). The strength of DP is in appreciating the practical, and actual, complexity of social psychological phenomena as it unfolds in a real life setting rather than treat discourse as a mere proxy for some other type of abstract phenomena (ibid.).

As part of a wider agenda of respecifying social psychological phenomena (see Huma et al., 2020), we will treat notions such as ‘gender’ and ‘safety’ as matters that are worked up, negotiated and resisted in discourse. The analysis focused on two parts: firstly, how the issue of safety was constructed when discussing gender neutral public toilets, secondly, how internet users talked about gender identity as a social accomplishment. From our analytic perspective discourse is not a medium to study the psychological notion of ‘gender’ inside people’s minds. Rather, ‘gender’, as a social psychological phenomenon, is sited *in* discourse and is an action-oriented matter (e.g., Wiggins & Potter, 2008). Extracts are presented exactly as they originally appeared, so all spelling and grammar errors remain. The numbers in brackets refer to lines on the extracts.

Analysis – Gender as Rhetoric

In our analysis, we explore how identity is constructed as situated, in the rhetorical constructions for and against non-binary public toilets, and how the negotiation of identities in this shared context becomes a manner of place making. Public bathrooms are warranted as a source of refuge and gender is rhetorically constructed to these ends. Where the need for refuge is presented as an unidentified other, men are a rhetorical absence (Billig, 1987) within the extracts. The use of a rhetorical absence allows forum users to negotiate in their talk the threat from cisgendered men. Where men are explicitly acknowledged as an issue, cisgendered and trans women are collectively identified as requiring a safe space. Cisgendered women are presented as a threat to trans women and other cisgendered women who are misgendered. Talk

about refuge in public bathrooms involved the negotiation of who belonged in differing gender categories and who warranted a need for refuge. The first example of how this is discussed is seen in the first extract, taken from Mumsnet.

Extract 1 – Mumsnet, AB *Need for refuge from an unidentified other*

1 I think if we're demanding women only toilets, we need to demand safe toilets for
2 trans people too. The statistics tell us that trans people just as vulnerable to
3 abuse as cisgendered women, thus I feel it is our duty to protect them too.
4 Additionally, for people who are neither male nor female, without gender neutral
5 facilities they cannot enter either toilet without facing abuse. If that's the case,
6 the toilet isn't even functioning as a toilet!
7 Of course, creating gender neutral toilets is not in opposition to gendered
8 facilities and women-only spaces. But in my view we have to ensure that
9 wherever toilets are available there is a gender neutral option, otherwise we leave
10 a group of vulnerable people in danger.

Here AB constructs public bathrooms as a source of safety (1) and invokes the principle of equity as a moral imperative. A safe public space is something transgender people have an equal right to, and it is presented as a morally consistent matter (“if we’re demanding... we need to... too” 1-2), as well as a matter of women’s “duty”. In the first three lines of the transcript AB constructs the responsibility of safety of cisgender and transgender people as a joint one, and this is done by claiming the existence of evidence (2) to corroborate her point (Potter, 1996). Both groups warrant a safe space because, as evidence says, both groups are at risk. However, AB maintains some separation from transgender people by demanding separate toilets for them, rather than including them in using women’s toilets.

In lines 4-6 AB elaborates on this point. The absence of gender neutral toilets is constructed as a fallacy. The very fundamental sanitary function of toilets has not been met when non-binary members of the public have no accessible space. The role of public bathrooms here is treated as a matter that is wholly inclusive; either everyone, including non-binary people, have access to public bathrooms or they are not bathrooms at all. The poster then puts forward a concession (7), suggesting that a gender neutral toilet does not negate a gender-specific one. It

is a form of defensive rhetoric (Billig, 1996) that anticipates the potential counterargument that AB might be arguing for gender neutral toilets only. In doing so, the poster is presenting herself as a rational person. Resisting the notion that one would have to choose between gender-specific or -neutral toilets, instead she argues for both. The argument rests on the need to protect two vulnerable groups – cisgender women and trans men and women. Failing to do so is presented as a moral failure, whereby the failure forms an active failure (9; “we leave”) on behalf of cisgender people. Cisgendered men present a rhetorical absence within the extract, that is considered as revealing as what is mentioned (Billig & Marinho, 2017), given the prevalence of male violence towards women. Unlike other groups within the corpus such as ‘butch women’, cisgendered men are not warranted as needing a sanctuary in public toilets. Trans and non-binary people are constructed as the other, albeit welcome, who are in need of protection, the same as ciswomen.

Thus, AB constructs both a moral imperative and the moral agency on behalf of ‘us’ (who this constitutes is not wholly clear but appears to suggest cisgendered people) to make sure that everyone is safe. In this instance, the public bathroom as a source of safety is made available to everyone even if cis-, trans- and non-binary gendered people are constructed as different from each other. The next extract is from Dezeen, showing how not complying with gender norms by presenting as a ‘cis butch lesbian’ can affect people’s ability to access toilets safely.

Extract 2 – Dezeen, **AR**

1 Binary trans people **should** be fine to use public gendered toilets but the data and
2 their experiences show that they aren't. It is not that they **feel** uncomfortable. They
3 are regularly confronted, harassed and physically assaulted in these spaces. I am a
4 cis butch lesbian and I speak from experience. I have been physically and verbally
5 assaulted by cis-gender women simply for using the toilets I am supposed to use.
6 There are endless documented cases of cis women assaulting women like me in
7 public bathrooms. What of those safety issues? Why shouldn't all women be safe

The comment from AR mirrors the point in extract 1, in that there is a moral imperative for binary and transgender people to not feel threatened, again drawing upon evidence. Extract 2 constructs a similar disjuncture between how things should be and how they are but upgrades it in two ways. One, she specifies that the abuse takes place in female public toilets rather than outside of them (2-3). Second, she reinforces this point by drawing from her personal experience, this is in the form of a three-part list (Jefferson, 1990) which escalates in severity with each example. By invoking primary experience of such confrontations (4), it rhetorically reinforces her claims by claiming direct experience (Wooffitt, 1992). In addition, this experience is made relevant by using the additional descriptives of 'butch' and lesbian'. AR presents herself as a cis woman, but not one that conforms to a heteronormative understanding of a 'cisgender woman'. This is a notable parallel with the findings of Stokoe and Edwards (2007), where they note how pairing of a national category with a negative characteristic marks the claim as unambiguously racist. Here, the pairing of a description ('butch') with a category ('lesbian') is significant. It is not a prejudiced claim on account of being self-ascribed, however it does highlight issues with non-conformity to normative gender roles. This suggests that the problem of safety goes beyond gender; it is also about non-conformity towards normative gender roles.

The treatment of her experience as typical of such confrontations paired with constructing her attendance of female toilets as normal ("simply... I am supposed to use"; 5) reinforces her argument that public bathroom accessibility and safety is not exclusively a cis-gender matter, emphasised by various categories of women being utilised ('women like me', cis-gender women). It further manages her position as neutral; that is, she is treating the experience as normal and common to reify it (Potter, 1996). Her point is stated in unambiguous terms with the final two rhetorical questions in line 7, worded in such a way as to strongly imply that the answer to both questions is affirmative of an inclusive definition of 'woman'.

So far we have talked about a more inclusive discussion of public toilets, where people talk about cisgender and trans women as needing this space for public protection. In extract 1 the source of this need for protection is not specified. Extract 2 still orients to public toilets as safe spaces, but the commenter, who by self-identification does not conform to a normative cisgender woman's category, problematises this by treating the absence of safety as a moral failure rooted at normative gender roles rather than explicitly identifying men as the source of oppression. What we can observe so far, then, is that public toilets are treated as safe spaces, or that they *should* be safe spaces, for people who do not conform to so-called traditional genders or gender roles. Curiously, this discussion seems to focus exclusively on women's public toilets. The absence of a safe public toilet for men is a significant rhetorical omission – thus treating the matter of public toilets as a source of safety as an exclusively female matter.

Next, we cover instances of where gender identity – particularly that of a woman – is treated as a negotiable matter. We look at instances how negotiated gender identity plays into arguments for and against inclusive public toilets. Firstly, a Mumsnet user refers to 'evidence' that other discussants have provided in an attempt to show that transwomen are in danger in public toilets.

Extract 3 – GB, Mumsnet

1 I have yet to see any evidence that transwomen are in any more danger in the men's
2 toilets than other vulnerable male groups like teenagers (experiencing unbelievably
3 high rates of violence) and small camp men? I have asked interested parties for that
4 evidence but they only produced that survey that you linked to earlier and tbh that was
5 6 yrs ago and in the US.
6 Life is different in many ways in the UK (our men have traditionally loved a bit of
7 recreational cross dressing - a large chunk of comedy in my childhood was based on
8 men dressed as women and the students were always off on tarts and vicars night etc –
9 men dressing up in stockings and suspenders- look at the dressing up for the Rocky
10 Horrir show).
11 So British men have been used to female presenting (and females who can't be
12 bothered to wait) people using the men's toilets.

In this extract, GB questions the legitimacy of the safety concerns of trans women. This is done in two ways, first by questioning the validity and relevance of the safety concerns and, second, by invoking national and cultural norms to normalise by treating people dressing as members of the opposite sex and people living as a different gender to one assigned at birth as same.

The first strategy begins with a form of whataboutism, by invoking other categories of males who might be at risk (1-3). This does two things. First, it treats trans women as another form of male and, thus, places their categorical relevance to that of men. That is, trans women are to be oriented to and treated as cisgendered men. Second, by resisting the uniqueness of transgender people's safety in public toilets the relevance of this discussion is downgraded. In essence, GB treats the matter as not warranting a special concern.

To further solidify this position, GB orients to a counterargument and any potential evidence by dismissing its relevance (Burke & Demasi, 2019; Demasi, 2019) as outdated and culturally irrelevant. Further, by portraying GB's ideological opponents as producing insufficient evidence they are portrayed as incompetent ("they only produced a survey"; 4) and, by this incompetence, GB constructs these ideological opponents as having an axe to grind (see Potter, 1996).

The second strategy links from this, by invoking national and cultural standards. The first instance of this is the dismissal of evidence by it being American (5). GB continues on from this by claiming that people in the UK behave in a different manner to those from the US; particularly in that cross-dressing is treated as a standard part of British comedy and humour. Words such as 'traditional' (6) and 'always' (8) treats this type of behaviour as stable and usual for British people; rooting this type of behaviour down to cultural characteristics rather than having any particular stake in the matter (Edwards & Potter, 1992; Potter, 1996). By treating this type of behaviour as recreational (7) and generally something done in a light-hearted

manner (6-10) normalises cross-dressing, but not as a serious matter downgrading the importance of trans people's safety.

What GB does, then, is to deny trans women's safety as a serious matter because it is something that is regularly done in the UK for fun, undermining evidence cited to treat the matter as serious and, finally, by conflating trans women and cross-dressing. This final point discursively delegitimises trans women and their safety concern as a legitimate matter from a Mumsnet user in support of single sex toilets.

The next extract is taken from a Dezeen discussant, who is arguing against unisex toilets by presenting public toilet provision as meeting biological needs.

Extract 4 – Dezeen, WH

1 Unfortunately anatomy is a real thing in bathroom design. Men (and people with
2 penises) don't do well with toilet seats. They also don't like touching them/lifting
3 them in public toilets, and end up urinating on the seats. Women (and people with
4 vaginas) need to sit down to pee, and end up having to deal with urine all over toilet
5 seats. As a women, this is a frequent and awful experience, and one of the many
6 reasons I hate unisex toilets

In this extract, WH argues against unisex toilets on grounds of mechanical differences ('anatomy'; 1). The argument here is framed less about excluding transgender people from male or female toilets, and more about arguing for the maintenance of separate gender toilets. There is a degree of inclusion towards transgender people, most observably in the parentheticals on lines 2-3 ('and people with penises') and 3-4 ('and people with vaginas'). The apparent inclusion of gender identity has its limits; transgender people can be recognised as having male or female genitalia but WH does not treat this as enough to constitute a man or a woman. It is the additional description of transgender people ([gender] + [person with matching genitalia]) that marks them as separate, according to WH, from 'men' and 'women'.

Intermingled with this distinction of cis- and transgender people is the supporting argument on grounds of mechanical differences. Male and female genitalia, being inherently different, means different ways of using toilets. For women this causes a problem due to male restrictions, and the additional dispositional disinclination ('they also don't like touching them'; 2) to maintain bathroom hygiene – WH's footing (Goffman, 1979) places WH as speaking on behalf of men. Basing the argument on the mechanics of genitalia also roots it in an observable physical dimension. This is a means of rhetorically reifying (see Potter, 1996) the argument; for WH, unisex toilets present physical restrictions rather than a disinclination on behalf of WH to have unisex toilets. It is a form of managing their stake and interest (Edwards & Potter, 1992; Potter, 1996).

The extract concludes with a concluding remark from WH, in essence a take on the argument above that tells the reader how to interpret the argument. WH invokes the identity of a woman to colour the event as a negative experience. The problem of unisex toilets is presented as primarily a problem for women, and one that is stable one. It is at the end of all of this argument based on men, women and physiological differences that WH adds one more opinion: 'one of the many reasons I hate unisex toilets' (5-6). This rhetorically works up the position that WH's view on unisex toilets is reasoned, consistent and not based on one reason alone. This is an example of offensive and defensive rhetoric (Billig, 1991): the mention of multiple reasons works against a potential counterargument that focuses on the points made at the start of the extract.

The last two extracts have covered instances of negotiated gender identity and how these features in arguments for and against inclusive public toilets. In the extracts there are various degrees and types of resistance towards an inclusive view on trans women in particular. These counterarguments took the form of challenging the genuineness of trans women's difficulties regarding public toilets and arguing against their womanhood based on birth gender

and the normative life experiences of a 'natal' woman. So, while extracts 1 and 2 have looked that the 'place' component of the place-identity dyad we argue for, extracts 3 and 4 elaborate on the identity aspect of this dyad.

What is in common with all these arguments against trans women being recognised as women is that of womanhood. In all the examples, trans women are warranted as having some "residual" male features and used as an argument in denying the womanhood of trans women. The negotiated nature of being a 'woman' here, then, is bound up in the absence of any type of maleness. A failure to meet this 'criteria' implies that being outside of the relevant identity also means being denied access to an identity-bound physical space – in this instance public toilets. In this manner identity negotiations form an integral part of place making, just as negotiating the particular nature of a physical space, in our case public toilets, has implications on identities bound with its use.

Discussion

Discourse about toilet provision and gender draws upon both heteronormative and egalitarian ideology. The heteronormative ideology present in benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1997) is used to challenge access to trans people and others who challenge normative gender roles. Differing norms around toilets depending on where they are situated, and to what end, means a social constructionist approach, DP in our case, can successfully explore how public toilet provision is warranted or resisted by posters. Discourse about toilets as a location allows individuals to account for the access and barring of others based on how their gender identity is presented. Place identity is used with other rhetorical strategies that have been found in research on talk about racism (e.g., Dixon & Durrheim, 2000) to allow speakers to warrant themselves as fair and rational when engaging in prejudicial talk. Despite the prominence of talk about safety, there is a lack of empirical evidence to support claims about the risk to

cisgendered women (Laylor, 2016) who are more at risk in a domestic setting (Kogan, 2007). However, arguments about safety allow debates about toilet provision to be oriented around presenting trans liberation as costly to the rights of others (Blumell et al., 2019).

Trans liberation as a threat to heteronormativity

Individuals constructed as outside of heteronormative gender boundaries warrant cis gender women as a threat within the public toilet, a place assigned as a refuge. This finding supports previous empirical evidence (Mackay, 2019) and the recorded increase of people who do not present as cis women in a heteronormative manner being challenged in women's toilets (Maurice, 2021). Gender segregation within public toilets is warranted as an everyday assumption (Mackay, 2021) reflecting the social construction of practices within toilets such as hand washing, acceptability of conversation and cleanliness. There is a need to challenge the heteronormative ideology that supports the restriction of access such as the presence of 'penis panics' (Schilt & Westbrook, 2015) constructed in discourse about gender neutral provision in UK media.

Place identity and rhetorical strategies: Talk about toilets as situated and restricted

Talk about public toilets uses place identity as speakers construct their gender identity to warrant legitimacy of access to themselves and others. Talk about gender identities draw upon heteronormative ideology to limit access to groups who are presented as not conforming. When accounting for restricted toilet access, speakers are required to present themselves as being fair and rational using rhetorical strategies that are seen in talk about racism (see, inter alia, Billig, 1991). Posters negotiate dilemmas between arguments that draw upon heteronormative ideology to maintain gender segregation or egalitarian ideals in the need for gender neutral toilets. Given that in making places, groups such as developers view toilets in a retail setting as unneeded and loss making (Piha & Rääkkönen, 2017), it is unlikely that provision will be

expanded without policy intervention. Currently, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks that Local Planning Authorities make policies and decisions to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places (MHCLG, 2020). Whilst there is nothing specific regarding toilets, there is an emphasis on planning positively for shared spaces and local services to enhance social and cultural well-being for all sections of the community. This emphasis in the NPPF is present in guidance documents aimed at place making and an important consideration in planning decisions such as Secured by Design, a design-led crime prevention initiative led by the Police (Secured By Design, 2015).

This chapter provides an innovative approach to how DP can be applied to challenge prejudicial arguments about trans rights around toilets. Burke and Demasi (2021) discuss an example of countering extreme prejudice by undermining the rational base of such arguments. This did not stop the prejudice but gave some rhetorical room to expose the prejudiced position as prejudiced, rather than a reasoned one. Future work might look further into examples where heteronormative arguments are challenged. The lack of discussion around toilets through official government policy and guidance is also noticeable. With toilets and sanitation being an essential need and right for all humans that is enshrined in the SDG's, the issues and debates identified throughout this paper highlight that now is a time for change and that more focus needs to be made on its provision and appropriate place making for our rich and diverse communities.

References

- Augoustinos, M., Tuffin, K., & Every, D. (2005). New racism, meritocracy and individualism: Constraining affirmative action in education. *Discourse and Society* 16(3), 315–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926505051168>
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

- Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions: Studies in rhetorical psychology*. Sage.
- Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and Thinking – A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*, 2nd Ed. Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M., & Marinho, C. (2017). *The politics and rhetoric of commemoration: How the Portuguese parliament celebrates the 1974 revolution*. Bloomsbury
- Blumell, L.E., Huemmer, J., & Sternadori, M. (2019). Protecting the Ladies: Benevolent Sexism, Heteronormativity, and Partisanship in Online Discussions of Gender-Neutral Bathrooms. *Mass Communication and Society*, 22(3), 365-388.
DOI:10.1080/15205436.2018.1547833
- British Broadcasting Corporation (2020). *Coronavirus: When will public toilets be reopened?*
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-52774794>
- British Psychological Society (2021). Ethics Guidelines for Internet-mediated Research. British Psychological Society.
- British Standards (2009). Sanitary installations. Code of practice for the design of sanitary facilities and scales of provision of sanitary and associated appliances. *British Standards Institute*.
- Brundtland, G. (1987). Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. *United Nations General Assembly*.
- Burke, S. & Demasi, M.A. (2019). Applying Discursive Psychology to ‘Fact’ Construction in Political Discourse. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(5), e12449. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12449>
- Burke, S. & Demasi, M.A. (2021). “This country will be big racist one day”: Extreme Prejudice as Reasoned Discourse in Face-to-face Interactions. In Demasi, M.A., Burke, S. & Tileagă, C. (Eds). *Political Communication: Discursive Perspectives* (pp. 205-229). Palgrave.
- Colliver, B. & Coyle, A. (2020) Risk of sexual violence against women and girls in the construction of 'gender-neutral toilets': a discourse analysis of comments on YouTube

- videos. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence* 4(3), 359–376,
<https://doi.org/10.1332/239868020X15894511554617>
- Demasi, M.A. (2019). Facts as Social Action in Political Debates about Great Britain and the European Union. *Political Psychology*, 40(1), 3-20. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12496>
- Demasi, M. (2022). Discourse. In: The Palgrave Encyclopedia of the Possible. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-98390-5_195-1
- Dixon, J., & Durrheim, K. (2000). Displacing place-identity: A discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(1), 27-44. DOI: 10.1348/014466600164318
- Dixon, J., & Durrheim, K. (2003). Contact and the ecology of racial division: Some varieties of informal segregation'. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(1), 1-23. DOI: 10.1348/014466603763276090
- Edwards, D., and Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology*. Sage
- Ellis, S. J., McNeill, J., and Bailey, L. (2014). Gender, stage of transition and situational avoidance: a UK study of trans people's experiences. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy* 29(3), 351-364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681994.2014.902925>
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1997). Hostile and Benevolent Sexism: Measuring Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes Toward Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 119-135,
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00104.x>.
- Goffman, E. (1977). The Arrangement between the Sexes. *Theory and Society* 4 (3), 301-331.
- Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, 25, 1–29.
- Haslam, N. (2012). *Psychology in the Bathroom*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Hines, S. (2017) The feminist frontier: on trans and feminism. *Journal of Gender Studies* 28(2), 145-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1411791>
- HM Government (2016). The Building Regulations 2010: Access to and use of buildings: Part M. *Her Majesty's Stationary Office*

- Huma, B., Alexander, M., Stokoe, E., & Tileagă, C. (2020). Introduction to special issue on discursive psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 17(3), 313–335, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1729910>.
- Jefferson, G. (1990). List Construction as a Task and Resource. In G. Psathas (Ed.) *Interaction Competence* (pp.63-92). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Jones, C., and Slater, J. (2020). The toilet debate: Stalling trans possibilities and defending women’s protected spaces. *The Sociological Review Monographs* 68 (4), 834-851. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120934697>
- Knott-Fayle, G. (2022). *Cisgenderism in Sports Talk: A Discursive Analysis*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Loughborough University. <https://doi.org/10.26174/thesis.lboro.17152118.v1>
- Kogan, T. S. (2007). Sex-separation in public restrooms: Law, architecture, and gender. *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law*, 14(1), 1–259.
- Korpela, K. M. (1989). Place-identity as a product of environmental self regulation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 9, 241-256, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944\(89\)80038-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(89)80038-6).
- Laylor, J. A. (2016). The battle over bathrooms: A solution without a problem. *American Journal of Public Health*, 106(8), 1349. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2016.303300
- Mackay, F. (2019). No woman’s land? Revisiting border zone denizens. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 23(3), 397-409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10894160.2019.1565521>
- Mackay, F. (2021). *Female Masculinities and the Gender Wars: The Politics of Sex*. I.B. Tauris.
- Maurice, E.P. (2021). Butch lesbian confronted ‘tens of times’ in public toilets as anti-trans hostility spills over. *Pink News*, 19th January [Butch lesbian harassed 'tens of times' in public toilets by anti-trans people \(pinknews.co.uk\)](https://www.pinknews.co.uk/news/2021/01/19/butch-lesbian-harassed-tens-of-times-in-public-toilets-by-anti-trans-people/)
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2020) ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ Published by APS Group on behalf of the controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office

- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021). *Toilet provision for men and women: call for evidence* <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/toilet-provision-for-men-and-women-call-for-evidence>
- Penner, B. (2001). A world of Unmentionable Suffering: Women's Public Conveniences in Victorian London. *Journal of Design History* 14 (1) 35-51, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jdh/14.1.35>
- Piha, S., & Rääkkönen, J. (2017). When nature calls: The role of customer toilets in retail stores. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 36, 33-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.01.005>
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality – discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Sage Publications
- Project for Public Spaces (2007) 'What is Place Making?' <https://www.pps.org/article/what-is-placemaking>
- Ramster, G., Greed, C., & Bichard, J., (2018). How inclusion can exclude: The case of public toilet provision for women. *Built Environment* 44(1), 52-76. DOI:10.2148/BENV.44.1.52.
- Schilt, K., & Westbrook, L. (2015). Bathroom battlegrounds and penis panics. *Contexts*, 14(3), 26–31. doi:10.1177/1536504215596943
- Secured By Design (2015) 'Commercial Developments' Published by the Police Crime Prevention Initiatives, London
- Skeggs, B. (2001). The Toilet Paper: Femininity, Class and Mis-Recognition. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 4 (24), 295-307, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395\(01\)00186-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395(01)00186-8)
- Stokoe, E., & Edwards, D. (2007). 'Black this, black that': Racial insults and reported speech in neighbour complaints and police interrogations. *Discourse and Society* 18(3), 337–372, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507075477>.
- United Nations (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. *United Nations General Assembly*.

Wiggins, S., & Potter, J. (2008). Discursive psychology. In C. Willig & W. S. Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (pp. 73–90). Sage Publications.

Wooffitt, R. (1992). *Telling tales of the unexpected: The organization of factual discourse*. Rowman & Littlefield.

References for further reading

Colliver, B. and Coyle, A. (2020) Risk of sexual violence against women and girls in the construction of 'gender-neutral toilets': a discourse analysis of comments on YouTube videos. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence* 4(3), 359–376,
<https://doi.org/10.1332/239868020X15894511554617>

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive Psychology*. Sage.

Greed, C. H. (2019) Joining the queue: Including women's toilet needs in public space. *The Sociological Review Monographs* 67. 908-926.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026119854274>

Wiggins, S. (2017). *Discursive Psychology: Theory, Method and Applications*. Sage.