

Please cite as:

Beauregard, T. A., Arevshatian, L., Booth, J. E., & Whittle, S. (2016). Listen carefully: Transgender voices in the workplace. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, doi: 10.1080/09585192.2016.1234503.

Abstract

We find that only 17% of FTSE 100 company websites refer directly to transgender ('trans') individuals, illustrating the extent to which trans voices are unheard in the workplace. We propose that these voices are missing for a number of reasons: voluntary silence to protect oneself from adverse circumstances; the subsumption of trans voices within the larger 'LGBT' community; assimilation, wherein many trans voices become affiliated with those of their post-transition gender; multiple trans voices arising from diversity within the transgender community; and limited access to voice mechanisms for transgender employees. We identify the negative implications of being unheard for individual trans employees, for organizational outcomes, and for business and management scholarship, and propose ways in which organizations can listen more carefully to trans voices. Finally, we introduce an agenda for future research that tests the applicability of the theoretical framework of invisible stigma disclosure to transgender individuals, and calls for new theoretical and empirical developments to identify HRM challenges and best practices for respecting trans employees and their choices to remain silent or be heard.

Key words:

Transgender

LGBT

Voice

Silence

Diversity

Introduction

“I was never going to become a beautiful, passable woman, and I was never going to be a man. It’s a quandary. But the trans condition is a beautiful mystery”

- Anohni (Beaumont-Thomas, 2016, p. 9)

Despite the increasing public presence of transgender (or ‘trans’) individuals in entertainment and media settings, and growing protective legislation, the world of business and management has not yet followed suit in paying greater attention to the needs of transgender employees. This is particularly the case in the United Kingdom (UK), where trans individuals are rarely mentioned in organizations’ diversity policies or statements. A review of FTSE 100 firms’ annual reports by lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) network OUTstanding demonstrates that 80% of these top UK firms do not have specific non-discrimination policies for transgender staff (Bentley, 2015). The business and management research literature largely echoes this silence, in both the UK and the US, and elsewhere (Collins, McFadden, Rocco, & Mathis, 2015; Ozturk & Tatli, 2015).

This invisibility of the trans population in both organizational communications and business and management literature results in inaudibility. The goal of this paper is to explore the reasons why these voices are unheard, and the implications of not hearing them. By examining the content of the FTSE 100 companies’ websites, the paper first illustrates the extent to which trans voices are unheard in UK-listed firms, before theorizing why this is the case. Lack of voice is usually attributed to lack of power (Morrison & Milliken, 2000), and for stigmatized groups, silence is considered to be either quiescent - an active, voluntary withholding of voice to protect oneself from adverse circumstances - or acquiescent, an involuntary withholding of voice that reflects an acceptance of adverse circumstances as being normal (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). The present paper extends current theory by reviewing extant literature and identifying additional motivations for employee silence that are particularly relevant to transgender individuals. The potential consequences of these unheard voices for transgender employees, employing organizations, and scholarship are then discussed, and suggestions are made for how organizations might elicit greater voice from trans individuals. The paper concludes by proposing an agenda for future research that tests the applicability of the theoretical framework of invisible stigma disclosure

(commonly used in the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender, or LGBT, literature) to transgender individuals, and calls for new theoretical and empirical developments to identify HRM challenges and best practices for respecting trans employees and their choices to remain silent or be heard.

A transgender individual is someone whose gender identity does not correspond to the sex that he or she was assigned at birth (Thanem, 2011). The word transgender is an umbrella term that includes, amongst other groups, transsexuals (those who experience gender dysphoria, or being ‘trapped in the wrong body’, and usually wish to physically transition to the opposite sex), intersexuals (those who are born with indeterminate biological sex markers), third genderists (those who are categorized as neither male nor female), genderqueers (those who identify with neither, both, or a combination of male and female genders), and agenderists (those who identify as genderless or gender neutral) (National Center for Transgender Equality, 2014). In contrast, a cisgender individual identifies as the gender that corresponds to the sex that he or she was assigned at birth (Oxford English Dictionary, 2015).

In recent years, transgender voices have become increasingly heard in popular culture. In 2014, trans actress Laverne Cox was nominated for an Emmy for her portrayal of a transgender woman in the television series ‘Orange is the New Black’. Former Olympian and current reality television star Bruce Jenner transitioned from male to female in 2015 and now stars in her own series, ‘I am Cait’. The popularity of transgender teenager and LGBTQ activist Jazz Jennings’ YouTube channel, in which she discusses her gender identity and answers questions from viewers, has led to her becoming a spokesmodel for Johnson & Johnson’s Clean & Clear line of products.

In many countries, transgender rights have also increased in recent years. In the United Kingdom, for example, the Sex Discrimination (Gender Reassignment) Regulations were introduced in 1999. The Gender Recognition Act, which provides gender recognition certificates and new birth certificates for individuals who have undergone gender transition, was introduced in 2004. In 2010, the UK Equality Act came into force and superseded the earlier Regulations. Under European Union law, discrimination on the basis of gender reassignment, gender identity, and/or gender expression is prohibited by five directives, including one introduced in 2006 that is related specifically to employment and occupation (Keuzenkamp, 2015).

Beyond a solid body of literature on discrimination against transgender individuals in the workplace, however, there has been very little research into the workplace experiences of what remains a small and marginalized community. A recent review of the scholarly literature on LGBT individuals in the workplace found that only 18 of the 263 journal articles identified in a systematic search (just under 7%) actually included transgender individuals in addition to lesbian, gay, and bisexual workers (McFadden, 2015). This exclusion of trans individuals has been attributed to difficulty in accessing a sufficient sample size (Schneider & Dimito, 2010), or the impossibility of collecting a genuinely random sample of transgender individuals, whose population is widely dispersed and often concealed (Schilt & Wiswall, 2008).

Voices unheard

Voice has been defined as the ‘discretionary communication of ideas, suggestions, concerns, or opinions about work-related issues with the intent to improve organizational and unit functioning’ (Morrison, 2011, p. 375). Dundon, Wilkinson, Marchington, and Ackers (2004) identify four different manifestations of voice: individual dissatisfaction focused on a specific issue with management; contributions to management decision-making; collective organization as a source of power to offset that of management; and mutuality of interest in the form of partnerships between employer and employees to establish long-term sustainability. While the latter three are arguably manifestations of voice that involve the workforce (or subsets of the workforce) as a collective entity, the first manifestation concerns individual employees. This manifestation of voice requires high levels of trust between management and employees (Dundon & Gollan, 2007), and is therefore particularly pertinent to transgender individuals, for whom a key aspect of voice is the ability to be accepted and recognized both formally and informally in one’s gender identity at work, as well as to have the same rights, benefits, and privileges as others (Bell, Özbilgin, Beauregard, & Sürgevil, 2011).

Employee voice is often expressed via elected representatives (e.g., for trade union members) or through the presence of employee network groups, and is reflected in organizational policies and practices. For example, the growth of women’s voice in the workplace can be seen in the proliferation of women’s employee network groups (Mercer, 2011), the increased provision of women’s leadership development programmes (Jay, 2014), and the rise in publicly stated targets for increased

representation of women in senior positions (Department of Business, Innovation & Skills, 2015). Where employer websites feature information about policies and practices such as these to protect women employees' rights and support their career advancement, we can suppose that the presence of this information reflects to some degree the presence of voice for women in that organization.

Organizations' websites are their public faces, the windows through which the world sees them. As such, organizational websites generally feature information and images designed to feature the best aspects of the organization, to appeal to both potential customers and potential recruits. This includes, where deemed relevant, information about the organization's diversity policies and practices. For instance, a Google search for 'gender diversity statement' yields, on the first page of results alone, links to diversity and inclusion statements with specific reference to gender or women for Prudential, SEGRO, Apple, Walker Morris, PwC, Barclays, PepsiCo and HSBC. These reflect the organizations' stated commitment to gender diversity and inclusion (which may, of course, be only tangentially affiliated with actual organizational practice).

As a means of illustrating the degree to which trans employees are similarly 'on the radar' of UK organizations, we examined the websites of FTSE 100 firms as listed in February 2015 for reference to transgender individuals. The FTSE 100 is an index composed of the 100 largest companies with the greatest market capitalization listed on the London Stock Exchange. These are often referred to as 'blue chip' companies or the 'gold standard' among top competitors; by investigating their websites, we can therefore gain insight into how well the largest and most profitable businesses are listening to transgender voices.

We performed a content analysis (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013) on company websites by classifying data according to three categories: gender, sexual orientation, and transgender. We began by reviewing company websites in three ways. First, we searched through web pages that were specifically focused on diversity or employment. These included, but are not limited to, web pages concerning corporate social responsibility (CSR), governance, sustainability, careers, and jobs. Then, we conducted a manual search via the company's own search function using relevant key words. These included, but are not limited to, 'gender', 'sexual orientation', 'LGBT', 'LGBTQ', and 'transgender'. Finally, we finished by

conducting a manual search using the Google search function with the company's name and our key words.

Data were coded in a directed approach according to our three categories (gender, sexual orientation, and transgender) if the references found were relevant (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Statements were deemed relevant if they alluded to diversity and inclusion in the organization (e.g., companies specifying that they do not discriminate based on gender and/or sexual orientation, companies describing how they create an inclusive diverse culture, companies showcasing diversity awards won, etc.). All FTSE 100 companies¹ were coded according to this framework. If no relevant references were found, we deemed that the company had not made a direct, relevant reference to gender, sexual orientation, and/or transgender that could be found on their websites by using our three-pronged search strategy. In line with good practice in qualitative methods, we engaged in multiple coding to cross check our categories and the interpretation of the data, and measured inter-rater reliability to confirm the accuracy of our coding (Armstrong, Gosling, Weinman, & Marteau, 1997; Barbour, 2001). A second researcher repeated the three-pronged search on a sample of twenty FTSE 100 companies and coded data with 99% similarity.

Our analysis indicates that while 97 companies made a direct, relevant reference to gender and 74 companies mentioned sexual orientation, only 31 companies made some relevant reference to trans individuals on their websites (see Appendix 1). Of these 31 companies, 17 referred directly to transgender individuals, while the remaining 14 made indirect references (to 'LGBT'). Eighteen of the 31 references specifically embodied the company's position on diversity and inclusion policy and practice, while 12 referred to LGBT employee groups and/or networks.

The most commonly used terminology was 'LGBT', followed by 'gender reassignment,' and then 'gender identity' and/or 'gender expression'. This suggests that trans issues are most likely to be appended to LGB matters in organizations, and that the organizational focus is on trans individuals who are undergoing or have undergone gender reassignment (also known as gender affirmation). Although our sample is very small, it does suggest that trans individuals who chose not to undergo

¹ *Although Shell A and Shell B are listed as two companies, they form part of the same parent company.

formal gender affirmation and/or who identify as or express themselves in a gender-nonconforming way are the least referenced in the data. Due to the small sample size, we cannot infer with certainty which sectors are leading in terms of transgender awareness and support. Our content analysis does reveal, however, that life insurance, banking, oil and gas, and media were the most likely to make a direct, relevant reference to transgender individuals in some form (e.g. LGBT, gender reassignment, gender identity, gender expression).

The absence of transgender employees from diversity policies, as established by the OUTstanding research (Bentley, 2015), or diversity statements, as found in our own content analysis of FTSE 100 websites, can perhaps be attributed in part to the inability of trans individuals to fit the existing business case for diversity narrative as easily as other social category groups. The “war for talent” rhetoric often used to argue for an increase in the recruitment and retention of women, who comprise 50% of the population, or black and minority ethnic (BME) individuals, who make up 14% of the UK population (Sunak & Rajeswaran, 2014), may appear less relevant for a substantially smaller group such as trans individuals.

Estimating the prevalence of transgender individuals is difficult. There are few population-based data sources that assess LGBT identity, and many fail to disaggregate ‘T’ from ‘LGB’ in their survey questions (e.g., Gallup surveys). Clinic-based studies often define transgender individuals only as those who have undergone surgical transition and/or accessed specialist gender clinics for counseling and healthcare, which leaves out a potentially sizeable proportion of the trans community (e.g., De Cuypere et al., 2007; Reed, Rhodes, Schofield, & Wylie, 2009). Estimates range from 0.1% in the UK (Reed et al., 2009) to 0.3% in the US (Gates, 2011). Olyslager and Conway (2007) use global data to estimate the prevalence of transgender individuals as 1% of the population, but take into account only those who have “[a] desire to live and be accepted as a member of the opposite sex” (p. 3), which excludes genderqueer and agender individuals. American trans activist groups suggest that between 0.5% and 2% of the population have strong feelings of being transgender (Conway, 2002). In comparison, 1.6% of UK adults identify themselves as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in government-sponsored household surveys (Office for National Statistics, 2014), and government-sponsored health surveys have found that 2.3% of American adults aged over 18 and 3% of Canadians between the ages of 18

and 59 identify as LGB (Statistics Canada, 2015; Ward, Dahlhamer, Galinsky, & Joestl, 2014).

According to these figures, the LGB population may therefore be up to three times larger than the T population, accounting in part for why organizational initiatives to support LGB individuals are much more widespread (Stonewall, 2015). But are there other explanatory factors for the inaudibility of trans voices in the workplace? In the following sub-sections, we propose five reasons: quiescent (voluntary) silence; the subsumption of trans voices within the larger 'LGBT' group; issues of assimilation, wherein many trans voices become affiliated with those of their post-transition gender; multiple trans voices arising from diversity within the transgender community; and limited access to voice mechanisms for transgender employees.

Why are trans voices unheard?

Quiescent silence, the voluntary withholding of voice to protect oneself from unfavourable circumstances, is most often invoked for the lack of voice among marginalized or disadvantaged individuals (Knoll & van Dick, 2013). Scholarly evidence suggests that a majority of transgender and gender non-conforming employees experience workplace mistreatment or pursue self-protective actions to avoid mistreatment (Grant et al., 2011). Some scholars argue that those identifying as transgender are the most targeted minority group in terms of physical and psychological violence (Witten, 2008), and according to the International Labour Organization (2013), trans individuals suffer the highest degree of discrimination in employment. For example, in the UK, a survey of 872 self-identified transgender individuals found that 42% of those not living permanently in their preferred gender role feared that doing so might threaten their employment status, and that twenty-five percent of trans individuals felt obliged to change jobs due to harassment and bullying (Whittle, Turner, Al-Alami, Rundall, & Thorn, 2007).

Smaller-scale, qualitative research demonstrates that disclosure can engender employer questions about trans employees' credibility, maturity, mental health, and fitness for the profession (MacDonnell & Grigorovich, 2012). When transgender employees are dismissed following their gender transition in the workplace, employers often attribute termination to economic factors such as budget cuts; the transgender employees affected perceive that their transition was actually the motivating factor (Budge, Tebbe, & Howard, 2010). Microaggressions, which are

incidents involving incivility, or more understated experiences than blatant hostility or harassment, are also a significant component of workplace discrimination for visibly transgender individuals (Dispenza, Watson, Chung, & Brack, 2012). Johnston and Nadal's (2010) work on the microaggressions experienced by multiracial individuals show how being perceived as exotic and being questioned as to one's authenticity serves as a mechanism of exclusion. When individuals identify as a member of a particular group and this membership is challenged or denied by others, a sense of isolation is generated. The same occurs when individuals cannot be easily categorized by others and are interrogated as to their identity (e.g., "People would stop me in the subway and ask me what I was"; Nadal et al., 2011, p. 41). A workplace environment characterized by microaggressions such as these does not foster a climate supportive of transgender voice.

Negative attitudes and behaviours towards trans individuals can be attributed to wide-scale societal discomfort with the notion that gender is not a fixed construct, but fluid. A lack of association between gender identity and biological sex is perceived by many cisgender individuals to be unnatural (Berry, McGuffee, Rush, & Columbus, 2003). Cisnormativity refers to the assumption that all people are cisgender, and this assumption pervades most if not all societal institutions. Chapman and Gedro (2009) argue that dichotomized scripts regarding gender and sexuality dictate our thought processes, the content and manner of our speech, our interactions with others, and our sense of identity. Those who do not easily conform to these scripts are often met with discomfort, suspicion, or antagonism. For example, Priola, Lasio, De Simone and Serri (2014) describe how in a cisnormative organizational culture, a transgender employee tried to introduce the topic of gender identity to her co-workers in a light-hearted, humorous way; '[a]lthough she thinks that her colleagues have understood she is transgender she perceives that they would rather avoid the topic' (p. 12).

Morrison and Rothman (2009) highlight how employee silence is shaped by the power imbalance between managers and subordinates, which contributes to employee beliefs that voice is unlikely to be heard, and potentially dangerous if it is. We suggest that this power imbalance is intensified for transgender employees, whose marginalized status in society affords them even less power than the average non-managerial worker. Employees' willingness to give voice is influenced by the

external environment, and what they perceive to be the prevailing climate of opinion toward their identity (Bowen & Blackmon, 2003). If transgender individuals feel unable to disclose their personal identity at work because of a negative climate toward that identity, they are unlikely to risk ‘coming out’ by giving voice to transgender issues. For transitioning or post-transition individuals who do not always “pass” as their affirmed gender, disclosure may be a moot point, as they are visibly “other.” The desire to avoid additional attention and negative interactions may, however, dissuade these employees from giving voice in the workplace. Fear of prejudice, harassment, termination, or any other negative consequences is likely to result in quiescent or defensive silence: the active withholding of relevant ideas, information, or opinions as a form of self-protection (Bell et al., 2011; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003).

As evidenced in our content analysis of FTSE 100 websites, trans individuals are often categorized with lesbian, gay and bisexual individuals (the ‘T’ in LGBT) in organisational policy or diversity initiatives (Mottet & Tanis, 2008). As a group, LGBT voices tend to be dominated by L and G. This may be due in part to the historical mobilization of gay activists, which created a social movement ultimately focused on anti-discrimination legislation on the basis of sexual orientation and equal rights for same-sex couples, rather than protection from discrimination based on gender identity. Trans individuals are often considered by straight, cisgender individuals as ‘an obscure and misunderstood subgroup of the gay community’ (Curry, 2014). Barclay and Scott (2006) characterize the trans community as relatively small compared with the LBG populations, which contributes to a lack of visibility and voice even within LGBT networks. While the association with LGB individuals and with the greater voice and therefore power of the gay rights movement has helped promote transgender issues to some extent, being subsumed within the category ‘LGBT’ may also make it more difficult for trans voices to be heard.

Certainly, there are commonalities between gay, lesbian, bisexual and trans employees in terms of the issues they face in the workplace; e.g., the stigma associated with being perceived as ‘deviant,’ the experience of prejudice and discrimination, the concerns regarding identity management and decisions about whether or how much personal information to disclose to co-workers. However, there are other issues that are very separate and distinct to either trans or LGB individuals.

Gender identity and expression are related to identifying (or not) as a particular gender. This is unrelated to sexual orientation, which refers to a pattern of romantic and/or sexual attraction to members of the same or opposite sex and/or gender (American Psychological Association, 2012). Gender identity and sexual orientation can interact, as when a female employee is perceived as a lesbian until she undergoes gender transition, presents as a man, and ‘becomes’ heterosexual. However, gender identity and sexual orientation remain discrete constructs and can result in different issues. For instance, transgender individuals who choose to undergo gender affirmation encounter unique social, physical, and psychological challenges that are not experienced by their gay, lesbian, and bisexual counterparts (Kwon, 2013; Pepper & Lorah, 2008). General attitudes toward transgender individuals are often much more hostile than those toward gay, lesbian, or bisexual individuals, and can therefore exert more severe personal and professional consequences (Human Rights Campaign, 2009; Kwon, 2013; Ozturk, 2011).

According to McFadden (2015), a shared queer identity and historical associations between gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender individuals have produced an interconnected and unified LGBT community. However, there is evidence that not all members of the LGBT community perceive this shared identity. In their model of career-related discrimination for female-to-male transgender individuals, Dispenza et al. (2012) identify horizontal oppressions from the lesbian, gay, and bisexual community as a key element. Online petitions such as ‘Drop the T’ demand the disassociation of trans individuals from the LGB community, and catalogue a list of complaints. These range from ‘men claiming to be transgender demanding access to bathrooms, locker rooms, women’s shelters and other such spaces reserved for women’ to a fundamental incompatibility between gay men and women’s advocacy for expanding and redefining gender concepts, and the ‘regressive’ trans movement to reassert and codify traditional concepts of masculine and feminine (Drop the T, 2015).

Curry (2014) points to the frequent use in the gay community of the derogatory word ‘tranny,’ and ensuing discussions among gay individuals about whether trans individuals are simply too sensitive and should not be taking offense. Scholars have in fact documented a history of competitive ‘border wars’ between drag queens, who are generally gay men who dress as women to perform entertainment, and transwomen, who are male-to-female transgender individuals (Perkins, 1983;

Rupp & Taylor, 2004). Schilt and Connell (2007) describe an interviewee who has transitioned from male to female in the workplace, but encounters animosity from a gay co-worker who repeatedly makes reference to her birth gender and suggests that she retains too many masculine traits. We are not suggesting that these types of incident are representative of the general tenor of relations between the LGB and the trans communities. However, there are evidently limits to the extent to which LGB and T interests and sense of community coincide, and the voices of the larger and more vocal group are apt to take precedence.

Assimilation

Assimilation into a post-transition gender category may also lend itself to the inaudibility of trans voices. Those individuals who undergo gender affirmation and present publicly as the opposite gender may subsequently ‘disappear’ into the larger categories of men or women. As Schilt and Connell (2007) argue, trans individuals who remain in their jobs while undergoing the transition to the opposite gender are not necessarily doing so because of a political desire to be visible. Gender affirmation, whether it involves surgical treatment or not, entails physical, psychological and emotional transition. Remaining in the same job during transition is therefore a way of maintaining stability in a life that is changing on many other fronts. Post-transition, trans individuals who are starting a new job in a new organization may wish to blend or assimilate, rather than being identified as ‘other’ by disclosing their trans identity.

Deliberately concealing one’s transgender status following gender affirmation is known as ‘going stealth,’ and is a strategy chosen by many, but not all, trans individuals (Davis, 2009). Schilt’s (2006) research yields evidence of large numbers of trans individuals who sever all ties with the transgender community following their gender affirmation, a phenomenon known as ‘deep stealth.’ It must be noted that stealth is not an option for all trans individuals, particularly those who transition from a male to a female gender presentation. The presence (or absence) of secondary sex characteristics such as height, body shape, distribution of body, facial and head hair, Adam’s apples, and pitch of one’s voice can render some individuals more easily “read” as transgender than others (Schrock, Boyd, & Leaf, 2009). Hormones, electrolysis, cosmetics, and surgery can help individuals “pass”, but not everyone has financial access to these treatments, nor do they necessarily render individuals indistinguishable from the cisgender population.

For those who are able and willing to “go stealth,” the decision not to disclose may be due to a strong sense of identification with the post-transition gender – a desire to live an authentic life as a man or woman - and/or a desire to avoid the stigma and discrimination associated with being identified as trans, as discussed in the previous section (Dietert & Dentice, 2009). Alternatively, we may draw upon Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) work on self-construal and speculate that trans individuals who ‘go stealth’ have an independent mode of being, in which they see themselves as individuals whose behaviour is motivated by their internal repertoire of thoughts, feelings, and actions. In contrast, trans individuals who have an interdependent self-construal may identify themselves more as members of the transgender community. For instance, one of the trans individuals participating in Bender-Baird’s (2011) research describes himself as coming from a background of activism, and being a visible transman is seen as central to his identity. Whether attributable to strong identification with one’s affirmed gender, a wish to avoid negative treatment, or an independent self-construal, ‘going stealth’ means that trans issues and voices may be lost among the voices and concerns of larger, binary gender categories.

Multiple trans voices

Trans voices may also be unheard because transgender individuals do not form a unified, homogeneous population that speaks with one voice. As illustrated by the definition of ‘transgender’ provided at the beginning of this paper, there is diversity within the trans community. Those trans individuals who do not fully identify as either gender (who may refer to themselves as genderqueer, or genderfluid) may face different challenges than those individuals transitioning from female-to-male (FtM) or male-to-female (MtF). Genderqueer individuals may identify as both male *and* female, or neither; they may experience their gender identity as being fluctuating or fluid, or may identify as a third gender. They may also identify as being without gender (agender) (Human Rights Campaign, 2015). Whereas FtM and MtF individuals may encounter resistance from co-workers and/or supervisors who do not easily accept the ‘normality’ or legitimacy of identifying with a gender opposite to that which was assigned at birth, genderqueer individuals face additional stigma for not complying with the socially accepted binary categorization of individuals as either male or female.

The experience of gender variance among genderqueer individuals renders less distinct the allegedly discrete boundary demarcations of both biological sex and

socially constructed gender. Binary categories of ‘male’ and ‘female’ are inadequate in this context; they cannot accurately characterize the fluid nature of gender as experienced by genderqueer individuals (MacDonnell & Grigorovich, 2012). Genderqueer individuals thus challenge the supposedly orderly construction of gender that is accepted by and pervades most societies. While FtM and MtF individuals undoubtedly face very high levels of prejudice and discrimination, they are still categorizable by the cisgender population as belonging, or not belonging, to the ‘male’ group or the ‘female’ group. As such, they may retain a greater claim to social legitimacy and acceptability (Richardson & Monro, 2012). Genderqueer individuals cannot be categorized so easily. Encountering nonconformists of this nature requires more cognitive complexity and may inspire more distrust and hostility among co-workers, due to the threat they pose to the status quo.

Workplace obstacles may therefore differ for different subgroups of transgender individuals. While FtM and MtF individuals may struggle to be accepted by others as members of their post-transition gender category, genderqueer individuals are more likely to meet with outright incomprehension and efforts by co-workers to safely assign them to existing but non-applicable categories. Having multiple voices within one group, that is relatively small to begin with, may contribute to difficulty in being heard. The voices of genderqueer individuals may be the most difficult for cisgender individuals to listen to, because they are more challenging to the normative binary construal of gender and prompt a re-evaluation of that construal, which may be a psychologically uncomfortable experience for many listeners. Many cisgender individuals may not want to hear the voices of genderqueer individuals, because the ambiguity that they represent is too complicated a prospect to comfortably resolve.

Limited access to voice mechanisms

Although there is research to suggest that trans individuals in the UK have higher average educational levels than the wider population and are more likely to work in professional and managerial occupations (Whittle et al., 2007), data also show that most trans individuals in Europe are employed at the lower end of the wage spectrum (Whittle, Turner, Coombs, & Rhodes, 2008). Unemployment rates may also be higher among transgender individuals; small-scale surveys conducted in the UK in 2007-2008 have found unemployment rates between 14-37% among transgender

respondents, compared to a national average of 5% at that time (Hills et al., 2010; Rundall, 2011).

Research in the US reveals a similar situation. A large-scale study of over 6,000 transgender individuals found that they were twice as likely to experience unemployment and four times more likely to live in extreme poverty than the general population, despite having educational qualifications at almost twice the rate (Harrison, Grant, & Herman, 2012). Smaller-scale studies in the United States also demonstrate a consistent pattern of high unemployment rates for transgender individuals, and low income for those who are employed (Bocking, Huang, Ding, Robinson, & Rosser, 2005; Kenagy, 2005; Lombardi, Wilchins, Priesing, & Malouf, 2002; Reback, Simon, Bemis, & Gatson, 2001).

Discrimination may be either directly or indirectly responsible for these negative employment outcomes. Even if transgender employees are not dismissed as a consequence of their gender identity status, they may feel compelled to exit a workplace environment that proves unsupportive or actively discriminatory and/or threatening. Alternatively, post-transition transgender employees may choose not to disclose their prior employment history and work experience, in order to avoid revealing their previous gender presentation (Levitt & Ippolito, 2014; Sangganjanavanich, 2009). For instance, trans men interviewed by MacDonnell and Grigorovich (2012) reported needing to change jobs and/or careers in order to be able to work in their chosen gender. Relevant education, skills, and job experience may therefore not be represented on a transgender job applicant's CV, and employers may thus perceive a lack of qualifications, skills deficits, and gaps in employment history that denote an applicant's suitability only for low-level positions, if any. Transgender individuals who have had negative experiences in the workplace may also remove themselves from the formal labour market entirely, becoming economically inactive, or seek work in the informal economy (e.g., sex work; Nadal, Davidoff, & Fujii-Doe, 2014; Operario, Soma, & Underhill, 2008).

Many economically active trans individuals may not be located in traditional work organizations. Research by the Scottish Transgender Alliance has found a high reported self-employment rate among trans individuals: 20% compared to a national average of 13% at the time the study was conducted (Morton, 2008). Self-employment may be an attractive option for those who have encountered negative treatment in the past, and who now wish to avoid situations where they wield little

control over their work environment and have little choice over which people they must interact with on a day to day basis (Mitchell & Howarth, 2009). Many jobs in the knowledge or information technology sectors can be easily adapted to working from home, granting workers greater privacy as well as control, and may therefore be particularly well suited to a group as qualified as that of the transgender population.

These high rates of economic inactivity, underemployment, and self-employment suggest that transgender individuals have low levels of status and power in most workplace contexts, and few representatives in management ranks to drive change from the top. These characteristics imply correspondingly low levels of voice. These rates also suggest that working trans individuals are not often to be found in large firms with expert HRM or diversity management capability. Trans individuals working in micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which represent 60% of all private sector employment in the UK, may also be subject to limited HRM structures and few formal policies (Mayson & Barrett, 2006). While research suggests that SMEs offer more opportunities for informal supports, based on close personal relationships (Lewis, Stumbitz, Miles, & Rouse, 2014), this may happen more often for employees perceived as conforming more closely to societal norms (e.g., mothers) than for individuals who are seen as transgressing socially acceptable boundaries, such as gender. Given that nearly 58% of transgender individuals participating in a small-scale UK study reported negative interpersonal experiences at work, including harassment and abuse (Rundall & Vecchiotti, 2010), the trust and close personal relationships necessary for support to be offered is less likely to be in place for transgender employees. Given that employees in organizations with established HRM structures are more likely to have access to voice mechanisms via both union membership and employer-led initiatives (Bryson, Willman, Gomez, & Kretschmer, 2007), we can conclude that trans individuals are likely to have limited access to both formal and informal voice mechanisms. This too renders trans voices less audible in the workplace.

Consequences of unheard transgender voices

Not hearing trans voices in the workplace has repercussions for both transgender individuals and employing organizations. This section will outline those consequences before presenting an agenda for future scholarship.

Outcomes for transgender individuals

Transgender voices are caught in a vicious circle. When voices are unheard, they are likely to become silenced and marginalized. When voices become silenced and marginalized, they go unheard. This cycle contributes to increased workplace exclusion for trans individuals, and tacitly condones the continuation of discrimination towards and abuse of trans members of staff. This is disadvantageous from a health and safety perspective, as trans individuals experience higher levels of depression and anxiety than the general population, in part due to experiencing harassment, bullying, and other forms of mistreatment at work (Bockting, Miner, Swinburne Romine, Hamilton, & Coleman, 2013; Budge, Adelson, & Howard, 2013). Trans individuals may also be prone to professional isolation, and consequent mental distress, triggered by moving jobs or careers in an effort to avoid disclosing a stigmatized identity (MacDonnell & Grigorovich, 2012).

Research has shown that employee networks and trade union initiatives inclusive of trans individuals can provide collective voice to transgender employees who are facing discrimination (Colgan & McKearney, 2012). The paucity of information regarding these types of networks in FTSE 100 firms, and the established underemployment of many trans individuals discussed earlier, suggests that all too few transgender employees are able to employ this voice to fight back against mistreatment in the workplace. These issues also complicate the ability of trans individuals to navigate the HRM systems that may exist in their organizations; without voice, trans employees are unable to ask questions or provide guidance to their employers regarding their needs or preferences. Employers may then interpret silence or inaudibility as evidence that trans employees have nothing to say, and that no changes within the organization are needed. By preventing organizational leaders from having the information necessary to make effective decisions or to correct problems regarding the treatment of trans employees, unheard voices contribute to the intensification of those problems (Morrison & Rothman, 2009). Given the high rates of discrimination and abuse perpetrated against transgender individuals, as reviewed earlier in this paper, and the high incidence of depression and attempted suicide among members of the trans community (Budge et al., 2013; Clements-Nolle, Marx, & Katz, 2006), any increase in voice that may increase awareness and acceptance of transgender issues has the potential to make a considerable impact on the lives of trans employees.

Outcomes for organizations

Failing to acknowledge and therefore hear transgender voices demonstrates a lack of commitment by employers to supporting trans employees and creating a fully inclusive workplace environment. This, in turn, deprives organizations of the benefits that can arise from becoming more inclusive; for example, research finds that inclusive environments enhance worker attitudes (for a review, see McKay & Avery, 2015), and are associated with higher work quality (Sabharwal, 2014). Supportive diversity climates result in higher sales per hour (McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008), and are related to higher levels of sales growth and customer satisfaction (McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2009; McKay, Avery, Liao, & Morris, 2011). Research with transgender individuals shows that when they receive support from their coworkers after disclosure of their gender identity, levels of self-reported happiness increase (Law, Martinez, Ruggs, Hebl, and Akers, 2011). This has implications for the workplace climate and possibly for the morale of all employees, via emotional contagion (Vijayalakshmi & Bhattacharyya, 2012). As Collins et al. (2015) argue, the contributions of trans individuals can go unnoticed and underutilized if those individuals do not meet the ‘traditional’ standards established by, and for, cisgender individuals. Not feeling safe and accepted in the workplace can have a deleterious effect on trans individuals’ work productivity (Bender-Baird, 2011). Creating a climate of inclusion is necessary in order to facilitate the full participation of trans individuals at work, and this is unachievable as long as trans voices go unheard.

Kopelman, Brief, and Guzzo (1990) posit that HRM practices are precursors to organizational climates, which suggests that having a clear inclusion or non-discrimination policy or set of practices related to transgender employees – and making these visible on firms’ websites – has the potential to improve not just transgender employee experiences on the job, but also performance across staff members more widely. Organizational websites provide information to potential newcomers regarding the expectations of the organization, and are therefore a source of socialization. Following the ASA (attraction-selection-attrition) framework developed by Schneider (1987), potential newcomers who see websites featuring a specific transgender policy are apt to believe that the organization espouses inclusion of transgender employees and does not tolerate negative behaviour toward members of this group. Individuals who appreciate or identify with this stance are therefore likely to select themselves into the firm. Over time, this population of the organization

with like-minded individuals can create a 'trans-friendly' organizational climate that benefits transgender and cisgender employees alike with its emphasis on acceptance and inclusion and rejection of prejudice and discrimination.

While the business case for diversity is rarely used in conjunction with transgender individuals, it seems likely that recruitment, retention, and talent management issues arise from organizations' continued failure to hear trans voices. Employers who wish to recruit, select, and retain qualified staff members would do well to demonstrate support for a highly educated and qualified community such as trans individuals (Harrison et al., 2012). According to the resource-based view of the firm, an organization's competitive advantage lies primarily in the resources at its disposal that are of value and cannot easily be imitated by other firms (Richard & Johnson, 2001). Organizations that recognize the presence and value of their transgender employees could therefore use this to drive their competitive advantage, by providing an environment in which trans employees can flourish and thus creating a heterogeneous workforce that is not easily replicated by competitors.

As Collins et al. (2015) note, the absence of HR-related research on trans issues helps to contribute to the continuing marginalization of transgender employees. Minimal research among trans individuals with regard to their workplace experiences means that there is little knowledge of the spectrum of transgender experiences at work. As a result, too many organisations still have no specific transgender policy, and many of those that do are focused exclusively on gender affirmation surgery, which not all trans employees will undergo. Even for those trans individuals who do undergo medical gender affirmation procedures, exploratory research suggests that their concerns are with ongoing transitions without a set endpoint: the daily challenges of living and working in one's affirmed gender, and the significance of one's profession as it relates to an individual's trans identity (MacDonnell & Grigorovich, 2012). An organizational policy with a broader emphasis on respect for employees' affirmed gender identity, whether that be male, female, or a more fluid interpretation of gender altogether, may be more effective in signalling inclusiveness for transgender individuals. Such a policy emphasis may also help to foster an atmosphere of acceptance for all employees who do not conform strictly to societal norms (e.g., for gender expression, sexual orientation, able-bodiedness, age, weight, social class, religion, race or ethnicity).

A rigid before-and-after transition model of transgender experiences in the workplace discourages organisations from taking into consideration the wider workplace concerns of transgender employees, and developing more relevant and effective HRM practices. For instance, organizations may benefit from incorporating trans issues in existing learning and development activities. Staff surveys could include response options for gender beyond 'male' and 'female.' Diversity training could include specific reference to trans individuals; higher-level workshops could be provided to key staff, incorporating more detailed information on the diversity of gender identities and expressions present within the trans community. Being introduced to the notion that gender is not necessarily a static, binary construct may help employees and managers to slowly develop a more open-minded perspective on diversity and difference. For genderqueer individuals, working alongside those who are less fixated on assigning everyone to one of two categories may be a liberating experience. Even a low level of background knowledge can engender more positive attitudes; for example, Rudin et al. (2015) found that exposing undergraduate business students to a brief article about transgender individuals produced more inclusive (as compared to legally compliant, or hostile) responses to a scenario involving a co-worker disagreement over accommodating the bathroom choices of a transgender employee.

Outcomes for business and management scholarship

Transgender voices are worth listening to for their own sake, so that the workplace experiences of trans employees can be understood and improved. Failing to listen to transgender voices also means, however, that scholars miss out on a unique lens through which to view the social construction of gender in the workplace. For example, Schilt and Wiswall's (2008) study of forty-three trans individuals determined that average earnings for FtM transgender employees increased slightly following their gender transitions, while average earnings for MtF transgender employees fell by nearly one-third. This result is consistent with qualitative work demonstrating that for many MtF individuals, becoming a woman was often associated with a loss of authority in the workplace, harassment on the job, and termination; for FtM individuals, becoming a man was frequently associated with an increase in respect and authority (Dozier, 2005; Schilt, 2006). Research also suggests that the experience of trans individuals may open up new avenues for exploring how gender can be performed in the workplace, and what the outcomes of this

performance might be for both employees and their clients. For instance, one of the trans individuals interviewed in MacDonnell and Grigorovich's (2012) study spoke of feeling as though he 'does masculinity' differently than other men do, and that this gives him an advantage in his professional health care work with men who often have complex health issues. He reported that these men sought him out to discuss difficult issues that they were not comfortable discussing with straight, cisgender male or female providers. Research findings such as these give us inimitable insights into the nature of gender stereotypes and resulting workplace inequality, as well as new and effective ways in which gender can be performed at work.

Future scholarship

I feel that just because I'm transgender doesn't mean anyone cares, nor should they. ... At work, my transition has nothing to do with the work I'm doing - so why bring it up? Why make it a deal for everyone there?

- K. Danielle (2013)

If you're not out at your job, and you're not out to friends and others, how is the world going to associate the positive things you do with the trans community as well, who could use more goodwill ambassadors and positive role models?

- Monica Roberts (2013)

One of MacDonnell and Grigorovich's (2012) interviewees opined that 'Being trans gives me a unique position in the world and ... I want that to be known' (p. 7). As we know from accounts of 'going stealth,' however, not all transgender individuals feel the same way. This tension between some members of the trans population wanting to be known and heard, and others not wanting to be identified, creates a dilemma for organizational policy makers (for whom 'one size fits all' is an easier prospect) on the one hand and an opportunity for researchers on the other. Disclosing one's identity in work and nonwork domains is dependent on perceived disclosure consequences, supportive contextual factors, and individual differences (Ragins, 2008). If individuals are 'out' with their stigmatized identity in all domains, then they have complete identity integration. If there is disclosure discrepancy across domains, this disconnect is said to impose psychological harm (Ragins, 2008). As a survival mechanism, stigmatized employees may create a façade to conform to organisational practices, and employees who deviate from their authentic self to fit

with organizational norms often experience burnout and eventually exit the organisation (Hewlin, 2003, 2009).

Invisible stigma disclosure is a theoretical framework commonly used in the LGBT research literature, but usually in the context of LGB individuals. We may therefore question its applicability to the transgender community. To begin with, many trans individuals are not “invisible” and thus may not have the option of constructing façades. For those who are able to “pass” more easily as their affirmed gender, to what extent does identity non-disclosure constitute a “façade,” given that these individuals have undergone gender transition and may no longer see the gender identity they were assigned at birth as having a great deal of relevance to their current, more fully authentic self? Research among individuals who do not wish to be identified is extremely difficult and therefore rare, but discussions on transgender blogs and forums suggest that “going stealth” is materially different from “passing” as one’s affirmed gender and not volunteering information about one’s trans identity at work. For instance, a self-described “proud transsexual woman” argues that her gender transition is irrelevant to her work and thus she does not speak of it, but will do so when the circumstances require it (Danielle, 2013). Some trans individuals argue that “passing” as cisgender in the workplace or society at large does not preclude being “out and proud” of one’s trans status among close friends and family, or of being willing to disclose said trans status to co-workers or acquaintances when they pose direct questions (Roberts, 2013). Deep stealth, in contrast, involves both public and private denial and is perceived as being motivated by fear of harassment and discrimination, requiring constant vigilance and anxiety (Bender-Baird, 2011; Denny, 2013).

Disclosure discrepancy and its negative outcomes can likely be attributed to trans individuals who pursue a “deep stealth” strategy, as disclosure is limited to themselves and does not take place across life domains, but does “passing” equate to disclosure discrepancy as currently conceptualized? Research on invisible stigma disclosure has largely been focused on LGB individuals and those with health conditions that do not manifest themselves in noticeable outward symptoms (e.g., Lonardi, 2007; Ragins, 2008). Future research with transgender individuals would be well placed to explore the utility of this theoretical framework for types of invisible (or less visible) stigma beyond sexual orientation and health or disability. Pioneering work on LGB employees borrowed theory from literature on ethnic minorities before

developing its own framework (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001), and research with transgender employees now finds itself drawing upon LGB theory in the absence of its own theoretical lens. As the workplace experiences of trans individuals are different from those of LGB employees, new theoretical and empirical developments are thus required to advance knowledge in this area. For instance, a desire to be one's authentic self may contribute to less, rather than more, disclosure at work for trans employees who are less visibly transgender. A gay man may choose to "come out" in the workplace to achieve identity integration ("gay") across domains. In contrast, a trans man (FtM) may choose to pass as cisgender in the workplace to achieve identity integration ("male") across domains. Over time, these new developments will help to identify HRM challenges and best practices for respecting transgender employees and their choices to disclose or conceal their trans identity. Much work remains to be done in the meantime on improving acceptance of more visible trans individuals, who are less able to "pass" as their affirmed gender. Greater inclusion of these trans employees would enable them to serve as role models or advocates for other trans individuals, thereby promoting greater awareness of trans issues and subsequently greater acceptance.

Conclusions for practice

Bell et al. (2011) argue that increasing workforce diversity necessitates new and different voice mechanisms, which can enable previously silenced LGBT employees to express themselves more freely in the workplace and thus create a culture of inclusion. This would appear to be particularly crucial for businesses situated in the UK, where protective legislation for transgender individuals is very progressive compared to many other countries, and may breed an attitude of complacency among top firms with regard to developing their own trans-supportive initiatives when they can rely upon the legislation instead. This inference is consistent with findings from Ozturk and Tatli (2015) identifying gender identity diversity as a "blind spot" in HRM practice within the UK. According to Wilkinson and Fay (2011), participation, engagement, involvement, and empowerment are key components of employee voice; there is little evidence as yet that FTSE 100 companies are engaging specifically with transgender employees on these elements.

The absence of employee voice can be conceptualized as a means of organizational control, a device by which minority groups are silenced by organizational norms and practices (Wilkinson, Gollan, Kalfa, & Xu, 2015). Earlier in

this paper, we discussed the potential for employers to interpret a lack of transgender voice as evidence that trans employees have nothing to say with regard to their experience within the organization. A more sinister notion is that employers may use a dearth of transgender-specific policies to deliberately silence trans employees, similar to the U.S. military's former "don't ask, don't tell" policy regarding LGB service personnel. Media coverage of the controversy over bathroom rights for transgender individuals in workplaces, schools, and public venues has increased considerably in recent years (Thorn, 2016; Tonkin, 2016). Employers wishing to avoid involvement in issues such as these may prefer to keep trans voices unheard, simply for the sake of convenience.

In the US, there is no federal law designating gender identity or expression as a protected category, and protective legislation varies by state (Transgender Law and Policy Institute, 2015). Large employers have therefore picked up the slack by instituting organizational protection of and support for transgender individuals; 66% of Fortune 500 companies in the United States have instituted a gender identity non-discrimination policy, a sharp rise from only 3% of companies in 2002 (Zillman, 2015). So in the UK, national legislation protecting transgender individuals from discrimination has been accompanied by low levels of organizational support, while in the US, a lack of protective legislation has been accompanied by high levels of organizational support. This state of affairs runs counter to established research findings on how employers often create programs to address the needs of an increasingly diverse workforce (e.g., maternity leave, affirmative action) largely in response to government mandates (Kelly & Dobbin, 1998, 1999). The inference here is that the role of legislation in shaping organizational efforts may be stronger for some dimensions of diversity, perhaps those that are more visible (e.g., race), or perceived as more socially acceptable (e.g., employed mothers).

Notwithstanding the response of top US firms to the lack of legislation protecting transgender employees, the limited legal protection afforded to LGBT individuals in many other countries around the world (Cage, Herman, & Good, 2014) is likely to have repercussions for expatriation opportunities for trans employees in large multinational corporations. Trans individuals may not wish to take up roles in countries where workplace discrimination against transgender individuals is permissible by law, where HR support will be limited due to national regulations and

societal norms, and where access to health care may be restricted (McPhail, McNulty, & Hutchings, 2014).

It is therefore an apposite time for large firms, such as those included in the FTSE 100, to take the lead in this issue and model progressive HRM policies and practices that improve opportunities for voice among transgender employees. Irrespective of population group size, there is a moral and ethical obligation to listen to transgender employees and promote prosocial voice, which expresses ideas and information in constructive ways to improve work and organizations (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Trans employees may have valuable ideas about how to effect positive social change in the workplace, but their power as changemakers is curbed by organizational norms and limited by traditional voice mechanisms that are designed in a generic way for mainstream employees (Bell et al., 2011; Syed, 2014). Greater use of social media could serve as a new voice mechanism that enables trans employees to engage with their organizations, and vice versa (Wilkinson et al., 2015). Social media channels such as Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook and Instagram may increase the ways in which trans employees are able to feed back information informally to their employers, on an ad hoc and voluntary basis, and thereby strengthen their collective voice without the pressures associated with participation in formal committees or face-to-face meetings. Given the strong online presence of the transgender community (Rosser, Oakes, Bockting, & Miner, 2007), this could serve as a particularly relevant and effective vehicle for voice.

As transgender voices make themselves increasingly heard in popular culture, the time is right for more organizations worldwide to follow the lead of Fortune 500 companies in rejecting the status quo and carving a path toward more progressive policies and practices concerning trans individuals, in order to improve their workplace experiences and enable them to more fully contribute their talents and skills to their work. As Syed (2014) argues, the philosophy of listening to the missing voices of diverse employees is underpinned by the pursuit of both social justice and efficiency. The challenge for organizations in doing so is to be inclusive of all trans individuals: those who choose to remain silent and not disclose their gender identity or previous gender presentation, those who are visible through no choice of their own, and those who are voluntarily 'out' and ready for their voices to be heard.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2012). Guidelines for psychological practice with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *American Psychologist*, 67, 10–42.
- Armstrong, D., Gosling, A., Weinman, J., & Marteau, T. (1997). The place of interrater reliability in qualitative research: An empirical study. *Sociology*, 31, 597–606.
- Barbour, R. (2001). Checklists for improving rigour in qualitative research: A case of the tail wagging the dog? *British Medical Journal*, 322, 1115–1117.
- Barclay, J. M., & Scott, L. J. (2006). Transsexuals and workplace diversity – A case of “change” management. *Personnel Review*, 35, 487–502.
- Beaumont-Thomas, B. (2016, April 9–15). Human nature. *The Guardian Guide* (pp. 8–11). London: The Guardian.
- Bell, M. P., Özbilgin, M. F., Beauregard, T. A., & Sürgevil, O. (2011). Voice, silence and diversity in 21st century organizations: Strategies for inclusion of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender employees. *Human Resource Management*, 50, 131–146.
- Bender-Baird, K. (2011). *Transgender employment experiences: Gendered perceptions and the law*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bentley, N. (2015, August 18). Are businesses really flying the flag for LGBT inclusion? *Huffington Post UK*. Retrieved October 27, 2015, from http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/neil-bentley/businesses-lgbt-inclusion_b_8004434.html?utm_hp_ref=tw
- Berry, P. E., McGuffee, K. M., Rush, J. P., & Columbus, S. (2003). Discrimination in the workplace. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 8, 225–239.
- Bockting, W., Huang, C. Y., Ding, H., Robinson, B., & Rosser, B. S. (2005). Are transgender persons at higher risk for HIV than other sexual minorities? A comparison of HIV prevalence and risk. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 8, 123–131.
- Bockting, W. O., Miner, M. H., Swinburne Romine, R. E., Hamilton, A., & Coleman, E. (2013). Stigma, mental health, and resilience in an online sample of the US transgender population. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103, 943–951.
- Bowen, F., & Blackmon, K. (2003). Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 1393–1417.
- Bryson, A., Willman, P., Gomez, R., & Kretschmer, T. (2007). *Employee voice and human resource management: An empirical analysis using British data*. PSI Research Discussion Paper 27. London: Policy Studies Institute. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from <http://www.psi.org.uk/pdf/rdp/rdp-27-employee-voice.pdf>
- Budge, S. L., Adelson, J. L., & Howard, K. A. (2013). Anxiety and depression in transgender individuals: The roles of transition status, loss, social support, and coping. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 81, 545–557.

- Budge, S. L., Tebbe, E. N., & Howard, K. A. S. (2010). The work experiences of transgender individuals: Negotiating the transition and career decision-making processes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*, 377–393.
- Cage, F., Herman, T., & Good, N. (2014, May). Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights around the world. *The Guardian*. Retrieved October 4, 2015, from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/ng-interactive/2014/may/-sp-gay-rights-world-lesbian-bisexual-transgender>
- Chapman, D. D., & Gedro, J. (2009). Queering the HRD curriculum: Preparing students for success in the diverse workforce. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*, 95–108.
- Clements-Nolle, K., Marx, R., & Katz, M. (2006). Attempted suicide among transgender persons: The influence of gender-based discrimination and victimization. *Journal of Homosexuality, 51*, 53–69.
- Colgan, F., & McKearney, A. (2012). Visibility and voice in organisations: Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered employee networks. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 31*, 359–378.
- Collins, J. C., McFadden, C., Rocco, T. S., & Mathis, M. K. (2015). The problem of transgender marginalization and exclusion: Critical actions for human resource development. *Human Resource Development Review, 14*, 205–226.
- Conway, L. (2002). *How frequently does transsexualism occur?* Retrieved April 18, 2016, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/TSp prevalence.html>
- Curry, T. (2014, February 17). Why gay rights and trans rights should be separated. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/tyler-curry/gayrights-and-trans-rights_b_4763380.html
- Danielle, K. (2013, July 11). *Stealth, the closet, passability, and being clocked*. Retrieved April 20, 2016, from <http://dudeimachick.blogspot.co.uk/2013/07/stealth-closet-passability-andbeing.Html>
- Davis, D. (2009). Transgender issues in the workplace: HRD's newest challenge/opportunity. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*, 109–120.
- De Cuyper, G., Van Hemelrijck, M., Michel, A., Carael, B., Heylens, G., Rubens, R., ... Monstrey, S. (2007). Prevalence and demography of transsexualism in Belgium. *European Psychiatry, 22*, 137–141.
- Denny, D. (2013, July 22). *Stealth is soul-destroying*. Retrieved April 20, 2016, from <http://www.tgforum.com/wordpress/index.php/stealth-is-soul-destroying/>
- Department of Business, Innovation & Skills. (2015, March 25). Women on boards numbers almost doubled in last 4 years. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/women-on-boards-numbers-almost-doubled-in-last-4-years>
- Dietert, M., & Dentice, D. (2009). Gender identity issues and workplace discrimination: The transgender experience. *Journal of Workplace Rights, 14*, 121–140.

- Dispenza, F., Watson, L. B., Chung, Y. B., & Brack, G. (2012). Experience of career-related discrimination for female-to-male transgender persons: A qualitative study. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *60*, 65–81.
- Dozier, R. (2005). Beards, breasts, and bodies: Doing sex in a gendered world. *Gender & Society*, *19*, 297–316.
- Drop the T. (2015). Online petition hosted at Change.org. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from <https://www.change.org/p/human-rights-campaign-glaad-lambda-legal-the-advocate-outmagazine-huffpost-gay-voices-drop-the-t>
- Dundon, T., & Gollan, P. J. (2007). Re-conceptualizing voice in the non-union workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *18*, 1182–1198.
- Dundon, T., Wilkinson, A., Marchington, M., & Ackers, P. (2004). The meanings and purpose of employee voice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *15*, 1149–1170.
- Gates, G. J. (2011, April). How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender? UCLA School of Law: The Williams Institute. Retrieved April 18, 2016, from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gates-How-Many-People-LGBT-Apr-2011.pdf>
- Grant, J. M., Mottet, L. A., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J. L., & Keisling, M. (2011). *Injustice at every turn: A report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. Washington: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.
- Harrison, J., Grant, J., & Herman, J. L. (2012). A gender not listed here: Genderqueers, gender rebels, and otherwise in the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. *LGBTQ Policy Journal*, *2*, 13–24.
- Hewlin, P. F. (2003). And the award for best actor goes to ...: Facades of conformity in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *28*, 633–642.
- Hewlin, P. F. (2009). Wearing the cloak: Antecedents and consequences of creating facades of conformity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*, 727–741.
- Hills, J., Brewer, M., Jenkins, S., Lister, R., Lupton, R., Machin, S., ... Riddell, S. (2010). An anatomy of economic inequality in the UK: Report of the National Equality Panel. *LSE STICERD Research Paper No. 60*. Retrieved December 14, 2015, from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/28344/1/CASereport60.pdf>
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*, 1277–1288.
- Human Rights Campaign. (2009). *Degrees of equality: A national study examining workplace climate for LGBT employees*. Washington, DC: Human Rights Campaign.
- Human Rights Campaign. (2015). *Reporting about transgender people? Read this*. Retrieved December 4, 2015 from <http://www.hrc.org/resources/reporting-about-transgender-peopleread-this>
- International Labour Organization. (2013). Discrimination at work on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity: Results of pilot research. Retrieved

December 4, 2015, from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/-ed_norm/-relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_221728.pdf

- Jay, J. K. (2014, September 5). Why most leadership development programs for women fail and how to change that. *Fast Company*. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from <http://www.fastcompany.com/3035263/strong-female-lead/why-most-leadership-developmentprograms-for-women-fail-and-how-to-change>
- Johnston, M. P., & Nadal, K. L. (2010). Multiracial microaggressions: Exposing monoracism in everyday life and clinical practice. In D. W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and impact* (pp. 123–144). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1998). How affirmative action became diversity management: Employer response to antidiscrimination law, 1961 to 1996. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *41*, 960–984.
- Kelly, E., & Dobbin, F. (1999). Civil rights law at work: Sex discrimination and the rise of maternity. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*, 455–492.
- Kenagy, G. P. (2005). The health and social service needs of transgender people in Philadelphia. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, *8*, 49–56.
- Keuzenkamp, N. (2015). *Know your rights! An overview of current EU law covering gender reassignment, gender identity and gender expression*. Berlin: Transgender Europe.
- Knoll, M., & van Dick, R. (2013). Authenticity, employee silence, prohibitive voice, and the moderating effect of organizational identification. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *8*, 346–360.
- Kopelman, R. E., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1990). The role of climate and culture in productivity. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 282–318). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kwon, P. (2013). Resilience in lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *17*, 371–383.
- Law, C. L., Martinez, L. R., Ruggs, E. N., Hebl, M. R., & Akers, E. (2011). Transparency in the workplace: How the experiences of transsexual employees can be improved. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *79*, 710–723.
- Levitt, H. M., & Ippolito, M. R. (2014). Being transgender: Navigating minority stressors and developing authentic self-presentation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *38*, 46–64.
- Lewis, S., Stumbitz, B., Miles, L., & Rouse, J. (2014). *Maternity protection in SMEs: An international review*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Lombardi, E. L., Wilchins, R. A., Priesing, D., & Malouf, D. (2002). Gender violence: Transgender experiences with violence and discrimination. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *42*, 89–101.
- Lonardi, C. (2007). The passing dilemma in socially invisible diseases: Narratives on chronic headache. *Social Science & Medicine*, *65*, 1619–1629.
- MacDonnell, J. A., & Grigorovich, A. (2012). Gender, work, and health for trans health providers: A focus on transmen. *ISRN Nursing*, *2012*, 1–12. doi:10.5402/2012/161097

- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–253.
- Mayson, S., & Barrett, R. (2006). The ‘science’ and ‘practice’ of HRM in small firms. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 447–455.
- McFadden, C. (2015). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender careers and human resource development: A systematic literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14, 125–162.
- McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. (2015). Diversity climate in organizations: Current wisdom and domains of uncertainty. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 33, 191–233.
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., Liao, H., & Morris, M. A. (2011). Does diversity climate lead to customer satisfaction? It depends on the service climate and business unit demography. *Organization Science*, 22, 788–803.
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2008). Mean racial-ethnic differences in employee sales performance: The moderating role of diversity climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 349–374.
- McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., & Morris, M. A. (2009). A tale of two climates: Diversity climate from subordinates’ and managers’ perspectives and their role in store unit sales performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 767–791.
- McPhail, R., McNulty, Y., & Hutchings, K. (2014). Lesbian and gay expatriation: Opportunities, barriers and challenges for global mobility. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27, 382–406.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. London: Sage.
- Mitchell, M., & Howarth, C. (2009). *Trans research review* (Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report 27). London: EHRC.
- Morrison, E. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 373–412.
- Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 706–725.
- Morrison, E. W., & Rothman, N. B. (2009). Silence and the dynamics of power. In J. Greenberg & M. S. Edwards (Eds.), *Voice and silence in organizations* (pp. 111–133). Bingley: Emerald.
- Morton, J. (2008). *Transgender experiences in Scotland*. Research Summary. Edinburgh: Scottish Transgender Alliance.
- Mottet, L., & Tanis, J. E. (2008). *Opening the door to the inclusion of transgender people: The nine keys to making lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender organizations fully transgenderinclusive*. Washington, DC: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.
- Nadal, K. L., Davidoff, K. C., & Fujii-Doe, W. (2014). Transgender women and the sex work industry: Roots in systemic, institutional, and interpersonal discrimination. *Journal of Trauma Dissociation*, 15, 169–183.

- Nadal, K. L., Wong, Y., Griffin, K., Sriken, J., Vargas, V., Wideman, M., & Kolawole, A. (2011). Microaggressions and the multiracial experience. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1, 36–44.
- National Center for Transgender Equality. (2014). *Transgender terminology*. Retrieved May 20, 2016, from <http://www.transequality.org/issues/resources/transgender-terminology>
- Office for National Statistics. (2014). *Integrated household survey, January to December 2013: Experimental statistics*. Retrieved April 18, 2016, from http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20160105160709/http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_379565.pdf
- Olyslager, F., & Conway, L. (2007, September). *On the calculation of the prevalence of transsexualism*. Paper presented at the WPATH 20th International Symposium, Chicago, Illinois. Retrieved October 27, 2015, from <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/Prevalence/Reports/Prevalence%20of%20Transsexualism.pdf>
- Operario, D., Soma, T., & Underhill, K. (2008). Sex work and HIV status among transgender women: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 48, 97–103.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (2015, December). *Cisgender*. Retrieved December 3, 2015, from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/cisgender>
- Ozturk, M. B. (2011). Sexual orientation discrimination: Exploring the experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual employees in Turkey. *Human Relations*, 64, 1099–1118.
- Ozturk, M., & Tatli, A. (2015). Gender identity inclusion in the workplace: Broadening diversity management research and practice through the case of transgender employees in the UK. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27, 781–802.
- Pepper, S. M., & Lorah, P. (2008). Career issues and workplace considerations for the transsexual community: Bridging a gap of knowledge for career counselors and mental health care providers. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 56, 330–343.
- Perkins, R. (1983). *The 'drag queen' scene: Transsexuals in Kings Cross*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.
- Pinder, C., & Harlos, K. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. In G. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 20, pp. 331–369). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Priola, V., Lasio, D., De Simone, S., & Serri, F. (2014). The sound of silence: Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender discrimination in 'inclusive organizations'. *British Journal of Management*, 25, 488–502.
- Ragins, B. R. (2008). Disclosure disconnects: Antecedents and consequences of disclosing invisible stigmas across life domains. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 194–215.

- Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1244–1261.
- Reback, C., Simon, P., Bemis, C., & Gatson, B. (2001). *The Los Angeles transgender health study: Community report*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles.
- Reed, B., Rhodes, S., Schofield, P., & Wylie, K. (2009). *Gender variance in the UK: Prevalence, incidence, growth and geographic distribution*. Gender Identity Research and Education Society (GIRES). Retrieved September 30, 2015, from <http://www.gires.org.uk/assets/Medpro-Assets/GenderVarianceUK-report.pdf>
- Richard, O. C., & Johnson, N. B. (2001). Strategic human resource management effectiveness and firm performance. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*, 299–310.
- Richardson, D., & Monro, S. (2012). *Sexuality, equality and diversity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roberts, M. (2013, July 11). *Stealth doesn't help the trans community*. Retrieved April 20, 2016, from <http://ransgriot.blogspot.co.uk/2013/07/stealth-doesnt-help-trans-community.html>
- Rosser, B. S., Oakes, J. M., Bockting, W. O., & Miner, M. (2007). Capturing the social demographics of hidden sexual minorities: An internet study of the transgender population in the United States. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy, 4*, 50–64.
- Rudin, J., Yang, Y., Ruane, S., Ross, L., Farro, A., & Billing, T. (2016). Transforming attitudes about transgender employee rights. *Journal of Management Education, 40*, 30–46.
- Rundall, E. C. (2010). *'Transsexual' people in UK workplaces: An analysis of transsexual men's and transsexual women's experiences* (PhD thesis). Oxford: Oxford Brookes University.
- Rundall, E., & Vecchietti, V. (2010). (In)Visibility in the workplace. In S. Hines & T. Sanger (Eds.), *Transgender identities: Towards a social analysis of gender diversity* (pp. 127–152). Abingdon, OX: Routledge.
- Rupp, L., & Taylor, V. (2004). *Drag queens at the 801 cabaret*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Sabharwal, M. (2014). Is diversity management sufficient? Organizational inclusion to further performance. *Public Personnel Management, 43*, 197–217.
- Sangganjanavanich, V. F. (2009). Career development practitioners as advocates for transgender individuals: Understanding gender transition. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 46*, 128–135.
- Schilt, K. (2006). Just one of the guys?: How transmen make gender visible at work. *Gender & Society, 20*, 465–490.
- Schilt, K., & Connell, C. (2007). Do workplace gender transitions make gender trouble? *Gender, Work and Organization, 14*, 596–618.

- Schilt, K., & Wiswall, M. (2008). Before and after: Gender transitions, human capital, and workplace experiences. *B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 8, 1–26.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437–453.
- Schneider, M. S., & Dimito, A. (2010). Factors influencing the career and academic choices of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 57, 1355–1369.
- Schrock, D. P., Boyd, E. M., & Leaf, M. (2009). Emotion work in the public performances of male-to-female transsexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 702–712.
- Statistics Canada. (2015, November 5). *Same-sex couples and sexual orientation ... by the numbers*. Retrieved April 18, 2016, from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/dai/smr08/2015/smr08_203_2015
- Sunak, R., & Rajeswaran, S. (2014). *A portrait of modern Britain*. London: Policy Exchange.
- Syed, J. (2014). Diversity management and missing voices. In A. Wilkinson, J. Donaghey, T. Dundon, & R. Freeman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on employee voice* (pp. 421–438). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Thanem, T. (2011). Embodying transgender in studies of gender, work and organization. In E. Jeanes, D. Knights, & P. Yancey Martin (Eds.), *Handbook of gender, work and organization* (pp. 191–204). Chichester: Wiley.
- Thorn, R. (2016, June 8). Why toilets are a battleground for transgender rights. *BBC News Online*. Retrieved August 15, 2016, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-36395646>
- Tonkin, S. (2016, May 25). Transgender woman wins landmark discrimination case forcing ferry firm to remove the words ‘ladies’ and gents’ from toilets after she was told to use the disabled loo. *Mail Online*. Retrieved August 15, 2016, from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3609515/Transgender-woman-wins-landmark-discrimination-case-forcingferry-firm-remove-words-ladies-gents-toilets-told-use-disabled-loo.html>
- Transgender Law and Policy Institute. (2015). Non-discrimination laws that include gender identity and expression. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from <http://www.transgenderlaw.org/ndlaws/index.htm>
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 1359–1392.
- Vijayalakshmi, V., & Bhattacharyya, S. (2012). Emotional contagion and its relevance to individual behavior and organizational processes: A position paper. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27, 363–374.
- Ward, B. W., Dahlhamer, J. M., Galinsky, A. M., & Joestl, S. S. (2014). *Sexual orientation and health among U.S. adults: National Health Interview Survey, 2013* (National Health Statistics Reports No. 77). Hyattsville, MD: National

Center for Health Statistics. Retrieved April 18, 2016, from <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr077.pdf>

- Whittle, S., Turner, L., Al-Alami, M., Rundall, E., & Thom, B. (2007). *Engendered penalties: Transgender and transsexual people's experiences of inequality and discrimination*. Wetherby: Communities and Local Government Publications.
- Whittle, S., Turner, L., Coombs, R., & Rhodes, S. (2008). *Transgender Eurostudy: Legal survey and focus on the transgender experience of health care*. Brussels: ILGA Europe.
- Wilkinson, A., & Fay, C. (2011). Guest editors' note: New times for employee voice? *Human Resource Management, 50*, 65–74.
- Wilkinson, A., Gollan, P., Kalfa, S., & Xu, C. (2015). Special issue of international journal of human resource management : Voices unheard? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26*, 1913–1915.
- Witten, T. M. (2008). Transgender bodies, identities, and healthcare: Effects of perceived and actual violence and abuse. *Research in the Sociology of Health Care, 25*, 225–249.
- Mercer. (2011). *ERGs come of age: The evolution of employee resource groups. A study by Mercer's Global Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Practice*. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from http://www.orcnetworks.com/system/files/story/2011/5849/ergs_come_of_age_2011_study_pdf_30909.pdf
- Stonewall. (2015). *Stonewall top 100 employers: The definitive guide to the best places to work for lesbian, gay, and bisexual staff 2015*. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from http://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/top100_2015.pdf
- Zillman, C. (2015, July 13). Changing genders at work: The Fortune 500's quiet transgender revolution. *Fortune*. Retrieved October 27, 2015, from <http://fortune.com/2015/07/13/transgender-fortune-500/>

Appendix 1: FTSE 100 companies that referred to transgender individuals either directly or indirectly

	COMPANY NAME	SECTOR	REFERENCE	CONTEXT OF REFERENCE
1	Reed Elsevier	Media	"Gender identity and/or expression".	Employment procedures and practices.
2	WPP	Media	"Gender identity and/or expression".	Employment procedures and practices.
3	GlaxoSmith Kline	Pharmaceuticals and Biotechnology	"Gender identity and/or expression".	Employment procedures and practices.
4	Pearson	Media	"Gender identity or re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
5	Vodafone Group	Mobile Telecommunications	"Gender identity".	Employment procedures and practices.
6	Direct Line Insurance group	Nonlife Insurance	"Gender identity".	Employment procedures and practices.
7	Sage Group	Software and Computing	"Gender identity".	Employment procedures and practices.
8	Johnson Matthey	Chemicals	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
9	SSE	Electricity	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
10	3i Group	Financial Services	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
11	ITV	Media	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
12	British Land Co.	Real Estate Investments Trusts	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
13	Hammerson	Real Estate Investments Trusts	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
14	Travis Perkins	Support Services	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
15	Carnival	Travel and Leisure	"Gender re-assignment".	Employment procedures and practices.
16	Aggreko	Support Services	"Re-assignment of gender".	Employment procedures and practices.
17	Diageo	Beverages	"Transgender groups".	Employee network.
18	Lloyds Banking Group	Banking	"LGBT".	Employee network.
19	Barclays	Banking	"LGBT".	Employment procedures and practices.
20	SAB Miller	Beverages	"LGBT".	Employee network.
21	Tesco	Food and Drug Retailers	"LGBT".	Employee network.
22	Sainsbury	Food and Drug Retailers	"LGBT".	Employment procedures and practices.
23	Aviva	Life Insurance	"LGBT".	Employee network.
24	Legal & General Group	Life Insurance	"LGBT".	Employee network.
25	Prudential	Life Insurance	"LGBT".	Employee network.
26	Standard Life	Life Insurance	"LGBT".	Employee network.
27	BG Group	Oil and Gas Producers	"LGBT".	Employee network.
28	BP	Oil and Gas Producers	"LGBT".	Employee network.
29	Royal Dutch Shell A and B	Oil and Gas Producers	"LGBT".	Employee network.
30	International Consolidated Airlines	Travel and Leisure	"LGBT".	Employee network.
31	Royal Bank of Scotland	Banking	"LGBTI".	Award.