

LGBT Career Development

Julie Gedro
Empire State College / SUNY

In this paper, I would like to open a conversation with my HRD colleagues about the issues related to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) career development. This paper provides some insights about LGBT career development, analyzing the factors that distinguish LGBT career development from heterosexual career development.

Keywords: Management, Sexual Orientation, LGBT Career Development

Despite the gains that have been made in recent years of the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) movement, it remains legal in 34 states for employers to discriminate against employees on the basis of sexual orientation, and it remains legal in 44 states for employers to discriminate against employees on the basis of sexual orientation and on the basis of gender identity and/or gender expression (Out and Equal Workplace Advocates, 2006). In the Fortune 100, however, 98% of companies include sexual orientation in their equal employment opportunity policy, 35% include gender identity/expression in their equal employment policy, and 77% offer domestic partner health benefits (Human Rights Campaign State of the Workplace Report, 2005-2006). Nikki Raeburn in *Changing Corporate America from the Inside Out*, (2004) studied this ostensible paradox and investigated why “with lesbian, gay and bisexual rights so hotly contested in the sociopolitical arena, how it is possible that gay-inclusive policies have become standard practice in so many companies across the country?” (p. 17). Raeburn’s conclusions suggested that forces for change within corporations include activism of employees within those organizations, and that the facilitators of successful policy change included coercive isomorphism and mimetic isomorphism. In other words, companies who were early adopters of LGBT inclusive policies became models of competitive practice for other companies who then adopted those policies (mimetic isomorphism). Companies who were apprehensive of risk within a burgeoning legal and sociopolitical environment of LGBT inclusion adopted policies based upon managing and avoiding that perceived risk (coercive isomorphism).

A significant and contemporary problem remains, however, that calls for the attention of researchers and practitioners of Human Resource Development. The problem is that despite the fact that much of large corporate America has adopted policies that indicate LGBT inclusion, and despite that fact that so much of HRD research focuses on career development, feminist research, and critical pedagogy, LGBT people continue to face particular career development challenges. This paper will explore those challenges by highlighting organizational heterosexism, drawing on career development and sexual identity development models, and identifying the unique challenges faced by lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgendered people.

Career Development and HRD

Bierema (2002) noted that “human resource development is an emerging discipline that is in the process of creating and validating knowledge” (p. 244). Bierema’s argument that feminist criticism, which “seeks to end oppression by critically evaluating a phenomenon (such as research) challenging underlying assumptions, and proposing alternatives” (p. 247) offers a valid lens through which to examine the systematic oppression of LGBT people resulting from homophobia and heterosexism. Fenwick (2004) also identified a way to identify, understand and trouble the status quo within HRD by challenging assumptions and opposing “the subjugation of human knowledge, skills, relationships, and education to organizational gain and goals that are primarily economic or instrumental” (p. 198).

Since there is a rich and historical argument within the HRD community of scholars about whether the field’s primary focus be on learning or on performance (Yorks, 2005), it is important to note that both paradigms contribute to the exploration of LGBT career development issues. After all, the effective career development of individuals benefits the individual as well as the organization. Clearly, when people have the benefit of career development activities, including progression, mentoring, and networking (Rocco, Gallagher, Gedro, Hornsby & van Loo, 2006)

they become more productive organizational members at the same time they have the opportunity to benefit personally and individually.

However, with respect to LGBT career development, the field of HRD does not systematically reflect one of the values identified by Bates and Chen (2005), which is that “HRD activities should recognize a responsibility for human and organizational development that goes beyond organizational goals” and that “HRD should work to build socially responsible organizations” (p. 351). The dearth of scholarship within the field regarding LGBT career development reflects and reinforces the homophobia and heterosexism of the larger society. Exploration of LGBT issues within the HRD does not abound, although we can learn from our sister fields of psychology, management, sociology, and career counseling. Unaided by research to help them understand the issues that LGBT people face within an organization, HRD practitioners lack information to help them structure activities and interventions to create inclusive and welcoming environments within which LGBT people are free to develop and progress. In effect, then, this paper is intended to serve as a bridge-builder between disciplines, and it is intended to open a conversation within HRD about the insights gathered from other fields.

Career development has gained recent attention as a neglected component of HRD efforts (McDonald & Hite, 2006). Hezlett and Gibson (2005) highlight that mentoring has gained attention as a career development endeavor. Although “workforce empowerment has been major HR policy objective since for twenty years in the US” (Woodall, 2005, p. 399), there is little attention paid to the career concerns and specific challenges faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons in organizational settings.

LGBT Career Development

To propose a research agenda that focuses singularly on the career development concerns of LGBT people as a conversation within HRD is not intended to argue that LGBT people should be privileged as a discrete population, or that everyone within the field or HRD should study these issues, or that there is something “special” or essential about LGBT people. Nor does it implicate LGBT career issues as having a higher privilege over the career issues and challenges of member of other oppressed groups. “In spite of increased visibility and acceptance—and just African-Americans, Asian Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans continue to face job discrimination—gay men and lesbian women continue to experience difficulty in the workplace” (Pope, Barret, Szymanski, Chung, Singaravelu, McLean, & Sanabria, 2004, p. 159). Sexual orientation is a workplace issue because sexual orientation is pervasive. It is invisible to most people because of its heterosexual ubiquitousness. This orientation manifests any time someone places a picture of their spouse or children on their desk, wears a wedding ring, or brings a spouse to a company function. LGBT people do not have this privilege, and must negotiate the heterosexism of their organizational settings through a variety of strategies. Gedro, Cervero & Johnson-Bailey (2004) conducted a national study of lesbians in executive, director, and managerial positions in Fortune 500 corporations. In that study, the authors identified those negotiation strategies, which included surveying the political landscape of the organization, deciding when and how to come out, and learning how to serve as change agents to help educate people about sexual orientation workplace issues. This paper, therefore, is intended to highlight existing theories and models of career development and to synthesize them with the *specific* challenges that we LGBT people face.

Even though career concerns are an important psychosocial issue in the lives of gay men and lesbians, and career development is a foundational component of the Human Resource Development field, the literature on LGBT career development in HRD is virtually non-existent. In Young, Cady and Foxon’s (2006) article dealing with gender differences in mentoring, they noted that there is relatively little mentioned about sexual orientation and as such offered a research question framed around the issue. However, the lack of visibility and attention in the HRD field mirrors the lack of visibility that LGBT employees have traditionally and historically faced in society in general. In the main, gay individuals enter adulthood from a position of voicelessness—their experiences unheard and unwelcome in social institutions, including educational venues (Hill, 1996). Discrimination against LGBT people is pervasive in the workplace, with estimates between 25% and 66% noted in the career development literature (Alderson, 2003). There have been a relatively small number of published scholarly articles addressing this subject, which have all served the crucial function of defining gays and lesbians as a non-ethnic cultural minority (Croteau & Bieschke, 1996). Gays and lesbians in organizational America are less obvious, but they find varying levels of acceptance, which may explain why many openly gay businesspeople either own businesses or are in professions where sexual orientation is less of an issue (Dodg, 1997). Because of the energy that integrating a positive gay or lesbian identity requires, career development for gay people can be delayed, stalled or misdirected (Alderson, 2003).

While the field of HRD has not yet begun to vigorously study the career development of LGBT people, there are other fields that have. Career counseling literature offers some models and theories of career development and LGBT people that are helpful and instructive for HRD research and practice. Career development theories provide a framework to describe and understand occupational entrance, maintenance, and exit. Different theories use different lenses through which to understand career development, and include such dimensions as time, age, life stage, interests, and aptitudes. For example, Super's life-span, life-space approach has five stages: growth, exploration, establishment, maintenance, and disengagement (House, 2004). This model posits that "a person journeys through developing interests, skills, and values; exploring the world of work and trying tentative choices; developing greater commitment to a choice; adapting to changes in the world of work; and moving toward selective participation and retirement" (House, p. 246). For LGBT people, this life span and life stage model presents a valuable but incomplete representation. LGBT people often times are not aware of their sexual orientation until later in life when they perhaps have already selected and entered their occupation. For LGBT people who self-identify as LGBT earlier in life, perhaps during the planning phases of career, their particular selections of occupations can be affected. Therefore, Super's model presents an organization framework to understand, in a linear and uni-dimensional fashion, the stages of one's career. However, it does not factor in or account for the variety of other types of complications brought about by an LGBT person's realization of his or her sexual minority identity.

Career choice for LGBT people is influenced by the extent to which LGBT people internalize the messages about gender roles and heterosexuality. As they establish and maintain their careers, LGBT people face the greatest amount of challenge because of the decisions about identity management that they continually face (House, 2004, Button, 2004). LGBT people respond to organizational homophobia and heterosexism and the limitations that it places on their success by counterfeiting a false heterosexual identity, avoiding the issue of sexuality altogether, or either coming out explicitly and integrating their gay identity into the work context (Button, 2004). The Theory of Work Adjustment has four components: satisfaction, person-environment correspondence, reinforcement value, and ability (Degges-White & Shoffner, 2002). Satisfaction includes the ability to form and maintain relationships at work. This dimension of the theory reveals a tension: openness and authenticity are important factors in relationships, yet gay and lesbian people face a conundrum. On one hand, remaining closeted for fear of rejection, they are being inauthentic. On the other hand, coming out may result in rejection by co-workers. The person-environment correspondence dimension is the extent to which a person fits into his or her environment. For gays and lesbians, this fit may be hampered by overt harassment or subtle discrimination. Other dimensions of the Theory of Work Adjustment include reinforcement values, and abilities. Reinforcement values describe the intensity of the desire fulfill a psychological need (Degges-White & Shoffner). Being out on the job, for example, may have high reinforcement value for a gay or lesbian person, despite the career limitations that being out may place.

There is a common stereotype that lesbians and gay men are attracted to nontraditional career occupations for their gender (Chung, 1995). The career literature is limited in its exploration of career counseling with gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered persons (Chojnacki & Gelberg, 1994). Career models have begun to evolve that specifically address the unique issues of gays and lesbians in the workplace. Lesbians and gays possess characteristics that distinguish them from other oppressed persons, including the fact that they must decide whether, when and to what degree to disclose their minority status (Chojnacki & Gelberg, 1994).

In the last ten years has there been research addressing career issues with lesbians and gays (Pope, Barret, Szymanski, Chung, Singaravelu, McLean, & Sanabria, 2004). However, because there has not been a "concomitant increase in articles published on the career development of people who identify as bisexual, transgender, intersex, or questioning" (Pope, Barret, Szymanski, Chung, Singaravelu, McLean, & Sanabria, 2004, p. 159), this article reflects the greater amount of attention paid so far to career development issues with gays and lesbians than with bisexual and transgender people. Pope (1995) has done some work that delineates the appropriate interventions for career counselors working with lesbians and gays. These interventions include: examining one's own biases, becoming lesbian/gay affirmative, learning a model of gay/lesbian identity development, becoming familiar with the culture, supplying reading about "out" people, talking openly about employment discrimination, and helping clients overcome internalized negative stereotypes.

Lesbian or gay identity development does not occur similarly to the identity development of heterosexuals. Because of the heterosexism of society, the feelings of same sex attraction that a young person experiences can be alienating and embarrassing. Familial and societal expectations and assumptions of heterosexuality, accompanied by repression of non-heterosexual behavior, contribute to a need for identity resolution because generally no permission exists for sexual experimentation outside the accepted heterosexual norm (Boatwright, Gilbert, Forrest, & Ketzenberger, 1996). Given that career decisions are often crystallized in late adolescence or young adulthood, on the average, sexual identity development follows a similar timeline, it seems reasonable to consider both of these processes when formulating career research with sexual minorities (Lonborg & Phillips, 1996). While it would

seem surprising for heterosexual people to question whether or not a career is appropriate given their sexual orientation, it is quite normal for gay and lesbian individuals to consider the wisdom of their career choices (Lonborg & Phillips, 1996). Lindley argues:

Beyond the direct negative consequences of discrimination, LGB individuals must devote considerable energy to issues not faced by heterosexuals, such as how to manage their sexual identity at work and how to react to societal messages regarding what are and are not “acceptable” occupations for lesbians or gay men” (2006, p. 152).

A telling example of the complications of being gay and succeeding in one’s career is provided by the Harvard Business Review case entitled “Is this the right time to come out?” (Williamson, 1993). In this case, the protagonist, Adam Lawson, decides to tell his senior manager that he is bringing his partner (a man) to his firm’s silver anniversary dinner. George Campbell, Lawson’s manager, responds with confusion as well as ambivalence about whether or not to be supportive of his subordinates’ decision to come out at a company function. Lawson argues that were he bringing a wife, there would be no discussion over the appropriateness of his actions. However, since he is bringing his male partner (of five years), there is tension and unease. The case highlights the difficulties faced by managers who are not equipped to handle these sorts of workplace issues, and it is one that I use in my “Selected Topics in HRM: LGBT Issues” course offered through the State University of New York/ Empire State College’s Center for Distance Learning system.

As HRD researchers and practitioners, we can help illuminate the terrain for managers who are likely to be well-intended and fair-minded, yet lack the skill set to deal with LGBT employees and the issues that arise. HRD research holds a bright promise to provide some insights about career stage and sexual identity development. By adding the dimension of sexual identity development to existing models, HRD could develop precise frameworks, theories, and even perhaps tools for practitioners that help LGBT people select, develop, manage, and exit their vocational lives.

Models presented by the field of psychotherapy can be useful for HRD professionals in understanding the differences between LGBT development and heterosexual development. Australian psychotherapist Vivienne Cass (1979) crafted such a model of homosexual identity development, which perhaps poses significant questions for our field. Cass’s model posits six stages to forming a gay or identity: a) identity confusion, in which individuals begin to question and experience a sense of confusion about their sexual orientation; b) identity comparison, in which individuals begin to externally explore and compare their thoughts and feelings about sexual orientation with others; c) identity tolerance, in which individuals present themselves as being heterosexual in nongay environments while establishing increased contact with the lesbian and gay community; d) identity acceptance, in which individuals develop and embrace positive attitudes toward their gay or lesbian identity; e) identity pride, in which individuals feels proud of lesbian or gay identity; and f) identity synthesis, in which individual are willing to disclose their sexual orientation and can deal with the range of positive to negative reactions this may elicit from others (Mobley & Slaney, 1996). This model is useful for helping understand the disconnect between companies’ inclusive policies and the problematic situations that many LGBT employees find themselves in.

Lesbian Career Development

Lesbians are often stereotyped as truck drivers, athletes, mechanics, and other male-dominated occupations (Pope, Barret, Szymanski, Chung, Singaravelu, McLean, & Sanabria, 2004). Lesbians are less likely to make vocational and life choices based on accommodating men or conforming to traditional gender roles (Fassinger, 1996). Therefore, lesbians are freer than heterosexual women to explore a wider variety of careers. Lesbians, however, face a paradigm of unique considerations as they develop their careers. Lesbians often avoid divulging their sexual orientation in order to avoid harassment, rejection and violence (Caron & Ulin, 1997). Although many contemporary authors emphasize the similarities between lesbians and heterosexual women in appearance, interests, goals and identities, lesbians face more obstacles as they work to achieve their career goals, and they follow career paths that are more circuitous (Degges-White & Shoffner, 2002).

Lesbian career development is often more circuitous than for heterosexual women because lesbians face negative stereotypes not only because of their sex, but also because of their sexual orientation (Hetherington & Orzek, 1989). Traditional male occupations such as lawyer, doctor, and office manager are considered to be high in complexity, strength, and prestige and power; yet lesbians are stereotyped in occupations that are not prestigious nor require a college degree (Hetherington & Orzek, 1989). Lesbians face challenges in career development that occur even before they begin careers. When examining the considerations of career counselors in working with lesbian clients, Degges-White & Shoffner (2002) noted that “lesbians who disclose their sexual identity may be steered away from positions in which they would work with children or from choosing a career that would reinforce typical lesbian stereotypes” (p. 91). Fassinger indicates that “it is a regrettable reality that, despite the ameliorating effects of liberal gender roles and high levels of career commitment in this population, lesbians (as are women in general)

tend to be employed far beneath their skills and education, and to be severely underpaid relative to their male counterparts (1995, p. 153).

Gay Career Development

As part of the dominant male gender, gay men have gender privilege upon which to draw. Nevertheless, gay men have unique challenges with respect to negotiating their careers. Gay men are often stereotyped as hairdressers, florists, dancers, actors, secretaries, nurses, flight attendants, and other female-dominated occupation (Pope, Barret, Szymanski, Chung, Singaravelu, McLean, & Sanabria, 2004). The business community defines and places value judgments on gender and sexual identity, attributing positive values toward masculinity and heterosexuality and negative values toward femininity and homosexuality (Miller, 1995). Gay men face gender role stigma, and they also face AIDS-related stigma (Ragins, Cornwell, & Miller, 2003). Many theories of career development are sexist and heterosexist, and they focus on “influences such as the nuclear family, children, organized religion, and finding the right woman” (Prince, 1995, p. 173). Male socialization is based upon success and achievement, but for gay men, this socialization is often confounded by sexual identity development (Prince). That is, because gay men come out at different points in their lives—with some coming out early in life and others coming out in mid-life, career issues must be balanced with personal identity development. Nam Cam Trau and Hartel (2004) determined the factors that influence gay male career development are framed by sexual orientation identity, career identity salience, occupational choice, and sexual identity disclosure and coping strategies. Nam Cam Trau and Hartel argue that the early socialization of acceptable, gendered behavior steers gay men toward masculine types of occupations and away from feminine types of occupations. Once in a male-dominated masculine career field, however, gay men face workplace harassment and prejudicial treatment because of their homosexuality.

Gay men have to deal with the expectations that society and the world of work place on them as part of the dominant gender, and they concurrently have to come to terms with their sexuality. Gay men often times “prematurely foreclose on career choices because of limited awareness or constriction of self-concept” (Prince, 1995, p. 169). Gay men may develop, as a result of homophobic messages, a sense of powerlessness and a feeling that they are unable to affect events in their lives (Schope, 2004). When a gay man comes out in his career, he risks disrupting his potential for advancement. In the higher echelons of a corporation, heterosexuality is assumed and homosexuality remains controversial. Gay men face a unique kind of gender bias. Simoni (1996) observed that “heterosexual men have reported more negative attitudes toward gay men” (in Bowman, 2003, p. 65) and that negative attitudes about lesbians are easier to change than for gay men. Additionally, Bowman indicated that lesbians are less visible because their relationships are often assumed to be platonic, yet gay men are more visible and more “universally condemned” (p. 65). One of the most notable gay male executives, Alan Gilmour, kept his sexual orientation a secret at the Ford Corporation, and was passed over for the CEO position at Ford in the early 1990s. Gilmour noted:

As time has passed, business has become more accepting of homosexuality. But it is still a controversial subject. And businesses in general don't want their executives to be controversial. Some people think this is not fair; I think it is the reality of the world we live in. In the past 20 or 30 years, we have been moving away from the glamorous CEO and focusing more on products and services a company offers. And in doing that, a controversial executive—either because of his political beliefs or because he hasn't paid his income taxes or whatever—is a diversion. Companies don't want diversions. They don't want executive personality being discussed; they want the products to be discussed (Taylor, 1997, p. 7).

Bisexual and Transgender Career Development

While the counseling and career development literature has been making some inroads with respect to lesbians and gays, there is very little to date written about bisexual and transgender career development. However, to not include a discussion, however brief, in this paper about bisexual and transgender career development would reinforce and replicate the lack of attention paid to those populations. Bisexuality, which means attraction to persons of either sex, “can occur simultaneously or serially” (Reynolds & Hanjorgiris, 2000, in Bowman, 2003) Bisexuals are challenged by the expectations and demands of both the heterosexual as well as the homosexual community to “commit” to an orientation (Bowman, 2003). There is very little career development research on bisexual identity and career, which suggests a future direction for HRD research.

Witten (2002) proclaims that

“it is time to abandon the patriarchal linguistic constructions imposed on us and see new ways to express the truths of our beliefs. The linear thinking of Male (M) and Female (F) has forced us to think of a connect-the-dots continuum that still buys into the social constructions of dyadic sex and gender and the subsequent emergent sexualities from that construct” (p. 3)

“Transgender” refers to a broad term used to encompass all manifestations of crossing gender barriers. It includes all who crossdress or otherwise transgress gender norms. The Minnesota Human Rights Act includes transgender people and defines them as: “having or being perceived as having a self-image or identity not traditionally associated with one’s biological maleness or femaleness” (Davis, 2006). While there is an emergent curiosity of transgender issues in workplace policy discussions, there is virtually no evidence of research in HRD dealing with this population in any respect. So while there is little to say in a specific manner about career development and transgender issues, it bears mention as a sub-set of the LGBT population to which attention should be paid. Transgender people face transphobia, which means fear, hatred, disgust and discrimination (Carroll & Gilroy, 2002, p. 234). There are resources that provide guideline to assist managers and human resource managers with employees who transition on the job. The term transitioning “refers to the process through which a person modifies his or her personal characteristics and/or manner of gender expression to be consistent with his or her gender identity” (Human Rights Campaign Workplace Gender Transition Guidelines, 2006). However, there are limited resources to help transgender people make career development decisions other than the process of transition. There remains a vast terrain of exploration and research dealing with the intersection of transgender identity and career development.

Implications and Challenges for HRD

I have provided an overview of the issues and challenges for LGBT people with respect to their career development. Organizational heterosexism and homophobia are stubborn phenomena that continue to pervade the workplace, and LGBT people have to navigate a complex mix of personal, sexual, social, interpersonal, and intrapersonal issues as they establish, develop and maintain their careers. HRD professionals must become educated and aware of the challenges faced by LGBT people in the organization. Hatcher (2006) has identified the importance of continuing to redefine HRD and to understand that HRD has responsibilities and consequences beyond the obvious. HRD should evaluate how heterosexism and homophobia affect HRD initiatives, and then develop strategies in both research as well as practice to interrupt the inequities created by intolerance and invisibility of LGBT people.

LGBT people continue to face developmental challenges caused by workplace hostility, harassment, and less access to promotional and developmental programs than heterosexuals (Bierema, 2002). There is a “disclosure dilemma” that LGBT people face, because deciding how and when to disclose one’s sexual orientation is “one of the toughest issues that gay men and lesbians face because it involves a considerable amount of turmoil and a fear of retaliation or rejection” (Griffith & Hebl, 2002, p. 1192). Button (2004) suggests that “human resource professionals, career counselors, and other practitioners who work with lesbian and gay individuals need to be aware that there are different strategies by which disclosure outcomes are reached and these have important outcomes for the individual” (p. 491).

McDonald and Hite (2005) suggest that HRD can support supervisors in career development of employees by “helping supervisors develop a greater awareness of the multiple ways they affect issues of fairness and equity” (p. 426). There are several levers that the field of HRD can push in order to remove the obstacles that LGBT people face. There is a critical need for research on the career development and related concerns of LGBT people, as evidenced by the dearth of literature within the field. The career counseling field has begun the work of sensitizing career counselors to these issues, and HRD has the opportunity and an obligation to follow suit. Just as career counselors can successfully work with LGBT clients by understanding the challenges, actively demonstrating support and affirmation, understanding how to guide and coach clients about occupation selection and career advancement, HRD professionals can and should develop these same competencies.

References

- Alderson, K. (2003, January). *The corporate closet: Career challenges of gay and lesbian individuals*. Paper presented at the convention of the National Consultation on Career Development, Ottawa, ON.
- Bates, R., and Chen, H. S. (2005). Value priorities of Human Resource Development Professionals. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16(3), 345-68.
- Bierema, L. (2002). A feminist approach to HRD research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 1(2), 244-268.
- Bierema, L. (2002). The sociocultural contexts of learning in the workplace. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2002(96), 69-87.
- Boatwright, K. J., Gilbert, M.S., Forrest, L., & Ketzenberger, K. (1996). Impact of identity development upon career trajectory: Listening to the voices of lesbian women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(2), 210-228.

- Bowman, S. (2003). A call to action in lesbian, gay, and bisexual theory building and research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 31(1), 63-69.
- Button, S. (2004). Identity management strategies utilized by lesbian and gay employees. *Group and Organization Management*, 29(4), 470-494.
- Caron, S. L. & Ulin, M. (1997). Closeting and the quality of lesbian relationships. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 78(4), 413-419.
- Carroll, L. and Gilroy, P. (2002). Transgender issues in counselor preparation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41(3), 233-242.
- Cass, V. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 44(2), 178-190.
- Chojnacki, J. T., & Gelberg, S. (1994). Toward a conceptualization of career counseling with gay/lesbian/bisexual persons. *Journal of Career Development*, 21(1), 3-10.
- Chung, Y. B. (1995). Career decision making of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Career Development Quarterly*, 44(2), 178-190.
- Croteau, J. M., & Bieschke, K.J. (1996). Beyond pioneering: An introduction to the special issue on the vocational issues of lesbian women and gay men. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(2), 119-124.
- Davis, D. (2006). Differently gendered people: Clarifying the diversity. Retrieved September 17, 2006, from <http://www.debradavis.org/gecpage/defi.html>
- Degges-White, S. & Shoffner, M. (2002). Career Counseling with Lesbian Clients: Using the Theory of Work Adjustment as a Framework." *The Career Development Quarterly*, 51(1), 87-96.
- Dodge, S. (1997). Out and in business: Gay and lesbian business people are increasingly open about who they are, whether in Portland or the rest of the state. *Oregon Business*, 18(11), 66.
- Fassinger, R. E. (1996). Notes from the margins: Integrating lesbian experience into the vocational psychology of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(2), 160-175.
- Fassinger, R. E. (1995). From invisibility to integration: lesbian identity in the workplace. *Career Development Quarterly*, 44(2), 148-168.
- Fenwick, T. (2004). Toward a critical HRD in theory and practice. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 53(3), 193-209.
- Gedro, J., Cervero, R., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2004). How lesbians learn to negotiate the heterosexism of corporate America. *Human Resource Development International*, 7(2), 181-195.
- Griffith, K. & Hebl, M. (2002). The disclosure dilemma for gay men and lesbians: "Coming out" at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1191-1199.
- Hatcher, T. (2006). An editor's challenge to Human Resource Development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-4.
- Hetherington & Orzek. (1989). Career counseling and life planning with lesbian women. *Journal of Counseling and development*, 68(1), 52-57.
- Hezlett, S. & Gibson, S. (2005). Mentoring and Human Resource Development: Where we are and where we need to go. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 7(4), 446-469.
- Hill, R. (1995). Gay discourse in adult education: A critical review. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 45(3), 142-158.
- House, C. (2004). Integrating barriers to Caucasian lesbians' career development and Super's life-span, life-space approach. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 52(3), 246-255.
- Human Rights Campaign (2005-2006). *The state of the workplace for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Human Rights Campaign Foundation.
- Human Rights Campaign (2006). Workplace gender transition guidelines. Washington, D.C.: *Human Rights Campaign Foundation*. Retrieved on September 17, 2006 from http://www.hrc.org/Template.cfm?Section=Work_Life
- Lindley, L. (2006). The paradox of self-efficacy: Research with diverse populations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 14(1), 143-160.
- Lonborg, S. D., & Phillips, J. M. (1996). Investigating the career development of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people: methodological considerations and recommendations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 4(2), 176-194.
- McDonald, K. & Hite, L. (2005). Reviving the relevance of career development in Human Resource Development. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(4), 418-439.
- Miller, G. (1995). *The gay male's odyssey in the corporate world*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Mobley, M. & Slaney, R. B. (1996). Holland's theory: Its relevance for lesbian women and gay men. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(2), 125-135.
- Nam Cam Tau, R. and Cartel, C. (2004). One career, two identities: An assessment of gay men's career trajectory. *Career Development International*, 9(7), 627-637.

- Out and Equal Workplace Advocates (2006). *Building Bridges Diversity Training Program*. San Francisco, CA: Daniel Tussey.
- Prince, J. (1995). Influences on the career development of gay men. *Career Development Quarterly*, 44(2), 168-178.
- Pope, M., Barret, B., Szymanski, D., Chung, B., Singaravelu, H. McLean, R., & Sanabria, S. (2004). Culturally appropriate career counseling with gay and lesbian clients. *Career Development Quarterly*, 53(2), 158-177.
- Pope, M. (1995). Career interventions for gay and lesbian clients: A synopsis of practice knowledge and research needs. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 44(2), 191-203.
- Raeburn, N. (2004). *Changing corporate America from the inside out*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ragins, B., Cornwell, J., & Miller, J. (2003). Heterosexism in the Workplace. *Group and Organization Management*, 28(1), 45-74.
- Rocco, T. S., Gallagher S., Gedro, J., Hornsby, E. E., & van Loo, J. (2006). Sexual orientation, diversity, and issues of workplace equity. In Fredrick M. Nafukho and Hsin-Chih Chen (Eds.), *2006 Academy of human resource development proceedings* (pp. 1040-1045). Bowling Green, OH: Academy of Human Resource Development.
- Schope, R. (2004). Practitioners need to ask: Culturally competent practice requires knowing where the gay male client is in the coming out process. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 74(2), 257-270.
- Taylor, A. (1997, September 8). My life as a gay executive. *Fortune*, 136(5), 106-110.
- Williamson, A. (1993). Is this the right time to come out? *Harvard Business Review*, 1-7.
- Witten, T. (2001). White paper: Transgender and intersex aging issues. *TranScience Research Institute*. Retrieved August 30, 2006, from <http://www.transcience.org>
- Woodall, J. (2005). Theoretical frameworks for comparing HRD in an international context. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8(4), 399-402.
- Yorks, L. (2005). *Strategic Human Resource Development*. Mason, OH: Thomson-Southwestern Press.
- Young, A., Cady, S. & Foxon, M. (2006). Demystifying gender differences in mentoring: Theoretical perspectives and challenges for future research on gender and mentoring. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(2), 148-175.