

Appropriately Serving an Emerging Group: Educational Practices and Legal Implications for Gifted GLBT Students

Terry Friedrichs

Gifted gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) youth have been increasingly mentioned in recent years in gifted education presentations, publications, and position papers (Friedrichs, 2012; Hutcherson, 2012; National Association for Gifted Children [NAGC], 2001; Treat & Friedrichs, 2013). Yet, due to only recently-abating anti-GLBT bias in schools (Gay Lesbian Straight Educators Network [GLSEN], 2014), gifted GLBT students are just now emerging in significant numbers, a recent trend that has left their educational traits relatively unresearched. In turn, because of these students' "hidden" characteristics, educational recommendations on gifted GLBT youth seem almost as broadly and hazily written as they were 20 years ago (Friedrichs & Etheridge, 1995; Keener, 2013). With seldom-discussed traits and overly-general professional recommendations, many of these students remain unnoticed and inappropriately programmed for (Keener, 2013).

Not surprisingly, with the historically close relationship between educational progress and legal advancement for many of America's school-aged minority groups (Ravitch, 2000; Tyack, 2007), both the educational and the legal understandings of gifted GLBT youths' appropriate treatment are still progressing. This article strives to enhance the knowledge of teachers, counselors, and administrators about gifted GLBT students' educational needs. It also provides educators with recommendations on how to address those characteristics in school most constructively, in light of both legal incentives and disincentives for taking GLBT-supportive actions.

Definitions

Although educators may wish to expand their understanding of gifted GLBT students, current definitions of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender may preclude a full educational comprehension of these youth, since these definitions focus narrowly on students' sexual identities (Sears, 2005). Often, gay students are simply seen as males who are attracted to males. Lesbian students are described just

as young females attracted to other females. Bisexual youth are defined as students attracted to both genders. And transgender youth are explained as those who are born with the physical attributes of one gender but who come to identify as a member of the other gender. These limited definitions, unfortunately, obscure important information about gifted GLBT youths' intellectual, sexual, emotional, and artistic skills and sensibilities. It is these sometimes highly personal competencies and sensibilities that are associated with GLBT students' giftedness (Peterson & Rischar, 2000).

Prevalence

Partly because of gifted GLBT students' hidden natures, they may not reveal their sexual orientations and related sensibilities to teachers or even to other youth (Friedrichs, 2005). The theoretical percentage of high-potential GLBT youth, based simply on the overall sizes of populations considered to be GLBT and gifted, has been estimated at about 2.2% of the general student population, or approximately 300,000 youth (Cohn, 2002). However, the actual percentages of high-potential GLBT youth—at least when gifted education researchers ask GLBT students to self-identify as gifted—may be much higher. It may be well that, when gifted people reach psychologically safer places (such as GLBT youth groups, adult Internet forums, or higher education settings), these individuals are more likely to announce themselves as sexual minorities.

Gifted Gay and Bisexual Male Traits and Preferred Educational Approaches

Students who self-identify as both gifted and GLBT evidence a wide range of traits and prefer diverse programming methods. Clark (2008) noted a spectrum of areas of giftedness seen in gifted youth, prominently including intelligence, academic achievement, and metaphysical, social, physical, and emotional development. Distinctive gifted sexual-minority traits have been found within each of these areas. In a multiple-phase, 20-year study of

gifted GLBT youth, Friedrichs (2007) studied (a) historically eminent GLBT persons looking back on their teen years, (b) gifted college students reflecting on their high school careers, and (c) two groups of current high schoolers examining their recent educational experiences. Many of these distinctive characteristics have also appeared in biographical works by other gifted, sexual-minority, and gifted GLBT researchers, most prominently Tolan (1997), Peterson and Rischar (2000), Cohn, (2002), Treat (2006), and Wittenburg and Treat (2008).

Intellectual Aptitude. Gifted gay and bisexual (GB) males are interested in acquiring a broad range of knowledge that spans literature, social studies, humanities, the sciences, and math (Whittenburg & Treat, 2008). Teachers and parents may be aware of only part of these students' true intellectual range (Friedrichs, 2005). These young men may also seek academic acceleration, so that they can move away from places that confine their intellectual and social understandings of GLBT and other phenomena, to locations where they can greater develop their talent and interests (Shilts, 1982). They may also seek out culturally diverse persons, not only for friendship but also for these persons' ideas on surviving and thriving in marginalizing environments (Weatherby, 1989).

Academics. In their scholastic lives, some gifted GB males may demonstrate their spectrum of knowledge through a drive for excellence in all subjects (Cohn, 2002). A number of these young men seek this excellence as part of a "drive to hide" in their achievement (Kerr & Cohn, 2001). They may wish to spend their time safely doing their schoolwork, rather than in exploring their sexual orientations. Conversely, others of these young men, especially those who are harassed, may avoid stressful academic challenges, may miss much school, and may underachieve dramatically (GLSEN, 2014). Gifted and other transgender youth may also miss much school and underachieve (GLSEN, 2014).

Metaphysical Development. Gifted GB males, and gifted transgender youth identifying as male, may desire not only objective achievement but also may want more subjective, more spiritual figures and principles (Feinberg, 1997; Friedrichs & Etheridge, 1995). They often desire discussion of such persons and ideals but may lack the classroom safety or curricular opportunity to do so openly (Boyd, 1970). They also may wish to a publicly express their own beliefs (Clark, 2008) and their own thoughtful, moral, and spiritual values upon which their beliefs are based (Sears, 1991).

Social Growth. While gifted GB males can be solitary searchers and quiet "hoppers," they may also benefit from own-age peers who share their intellectually stimulating and GLBT-supportive natures (Friedrichs, 2007). These young men may or may not feel themselves to be a part of

the sometimes-homophobic schools in which they reside (Donaldson, 1988). High-potential GB males may desire peers in specialized social clubs or in other groups within their schools or communities, as other special gifted populations long have desired (Colangelo & Zaffran, 1979). By contrast, these young men, as with other gifted males before them, may also need to spend time away from their peers to process their real places in friendship groups or in society (Hébert & Olenchack, 2004). Unfortunately, through their solitary self-reflection, some of these gifted youth may draw the label of being "aloof" (Friedrichs, 1997).

Physical Development. High-potential GB males often need outlets for both their pent-up energy and their socially related tension (Hébert & Olenchack, 2004). They sometimes hide their stress because of the sexual-minority backgrounds that are foundational to that tension (Treat, 2006). As a result, many of these youth may take part in favorite sports or arts in which they can simultaneously work out their stress and find understanding allies (Clark, 2008). Sometimes, these boys may feel more at home in individual sports than in biased and highly stressful team athletics (Louganis, 1995).

Emotional Growth. Whether or not their physical needs are adequately met, gifted GB males may have emotional needs regarding stress management, sexual development, peer collaboration, and parent-child relationships. In stress management, these students may try to neutralize hidden stress by working on areas of strength (Tomkins, 1980). As they exercise these strengths, they may find their fears shrink somewhat through mentoring, artistic, and athletic outlets for excellence—outlets that might reside either outside or inside schools (Hutcheson, 2012). These males may enjoy counseling opportunities to talk in safe places about troublesome or unusual issues and feelings (Sanborn, 1979).

In their sexual development, gifted GB males may emerge their sexual activity either significantly earlier or substantially later than average males (Tolan, 1997). They may benefit from class discussions of various sexual behaviors and options (Rofes, 1993), although these dialogues may be discouraged in some schools (Mazza, 2009).

In discussions with peers, gifted GB males may also benefit from sensitive, stimulating, encouraged peer collaborations. These collaborations may involve participation in an increasing number of school-based Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs; GLSEN, 2014), in school workshops featuring GLBT peers (Jennings, 2003), and in community-based interactions with sexual-minority role models (Gonsiorek, 1993).

In parent-child relationships, as well as in peer collaborations, gifted GB males need to be active. These young

men need to search independently for happiness and for supportive careers (NAGC, 2001), since their parents are sometimes not aware that these youth are sexual minorities and thus cannot offer GLBT-sensitive advice (Sears, 2005). These students may benefit from attaining often hidden information on adult mentors (Friedrichs, 2005), gay role models (Sears, 1991), independence training (Gibson, 1989), and informational panels on homosexuality (Gonsiorek, 1993). An absence of parental acceptance may require GLBT-sensitive counseling opportunities, which may be very hard to find in some locations (Jennings, 2003). With limited parental acceptance, these exceptional males may need support from siblings and extended family members (Hébert & Olenchack, 2004), who themselves might require education about homosexuality and bisexuality (Treadway & Yoakam, 1996). Whether or not these males are accepted for their sexual orientation differences, they require support for their strengths. To keep alive these students' powerful dreams of better lives (Hunter, 1990), gifted GB males may benefit from parents' verbal and financial support of those strengths (Friedrichs, 2007).

Gifted Lesbian and Bisexual Female Traits and Preferred Educational Programming

Not surprisingly, consider the comparisons between gifted females and males as overall groups, high-potential LB females have characteristics that are somewhat the same and somewhat divergent from high-potential GB males.

Intellectual Development. Gifted sexual-minority females can be very inquisitive (Whittenburg & Treat, 2008). They have dreams and fantasies that they wish to be addressed through teaching approaches that nurture intuitiveness and dreams (Rich, 1976). They also must explore their environments, especially appreciating opportunities to investigate intellectually challenging settings. They enjoy exploring unorthodox ideas and feel especially stimulated by unusual mentors, new subject matters, and independent studies (Johnson, 1981). They often react to their environments through writing, and appreciate classroom climates in which students can share experiences and can exchange feelings on social issues, especially those involving GLBT women and racial minorities (Lorde, 1982).

Achievement. Intellectually acute gifted GB girls wish to excel academically, desiring accelerated coursework as well as other challenging school experiences (Whittenburg & Treat, 2008). They appreciate encouragement toward higher level goals and look forward to academic groupings with similarly achieving peers (Bunch, 1987; Caffrey, 1989).

Metaphysical Characteristics. Like high-potential GB males, gifted lesbian, bisexual, and transgender females have the need for religious explorations, as well as for

concrete academic achievements (Bunch, 1987; Feinberg, 1997). Unfortunately, those explanations are made difficult because they are not easily supported in schools (Johnson, 1981). These young women also need to help others through discussions in school activities outside of school and through community service (Kerr, 2000).

Social Development. As much as they need to assist others, gifted LB females also need thoughtful periods of separation (Friedrichs & Etheridge, 1995; McLean, 2001). Gifted lesbian, bisexual, and transgender females have a strong sense of fairness, as they evaluate the feelings and interpersonal relationships of others (Hutcheson, 2012). They can step outside traditional female roles and strive for high goals, drawing energy from a powerful internal focus of control (Kerr, 2000). As these young women step outside traditional roles, they benefit from observing strong female models (Piiro, 1998). In short, these young women may wish to fit into existing social frameworks and still be themselves.

Physical Growth. Not surprisingly, gifted LB females' needs for fitting in and simultaneously being upfront leaders can be a stressful combination (Peterson & Rischar, 2000). Physically, these young women may require outlets for aggression and anger (Friedrichs & Etheridge, 1995; King, 1974). One indirect way to lessen that frustration is through ample, varied, and regularly occurring neighborhood opportunities for desired activities (Griffin, 1994).

Emotional Development. In addition to their physical needs, higher potential LB females have several sets of emotional needs for self-image, sexual development, peer relationships, and parent-child interactions. First, they require clear and positive self-images, which teachers and mentors can encourage through instruction on historical contributions of sexual minorities (Jennings, 1994). These young women can move forward more easily with a clear sense of self and with strongly independent functioning (Treat, 2006). The functioning can best be established through training in decision-making (Kerr, 2000).

In their sexual development, LB females will have same-sex attractions in school environments. They benefit from support in curriculum and in teacher comments (NAGC, 2001). They also need information about sexual orientation and gender identities, especially in printed formats and in peer discussions (GLSEN, 2014). Also, like gifted GB males, high-potential LB females fundamentally benefit from approval for their sexual orientations—an approval traditionally in short supply in many American environments (Friedrichs & Etheridge, 1995; GLSEN, 2014).

In peer relationships, these girls may desire friendships with both boys and girls, a need often misunderstood in school environments where students are generally expected to be friends mostly with one gender or another (Kerr, 2000).

In parent-child relationships, gifted lesbian and bisexual females may also wish for more constructive relationships with their parents. Like some gifted transgender youth (Sedillo, 2013), these girls particularly wish to have the opening to discuss their sexual orientations and to make their own choices (Peterson & Rischar, 2000).

Legal Incentives

With recent social and legal progress for GLBT adults (DeMitchell & Fossey, 2008), it is not surprising that there are now various federal, state, and school-district legal incentives (as well as lingering disincentives) for schools to address some of the distinctive needs of gifted sexual-minority male and female students. Generally, the positive incentives exist mostly for addressing those students' social and emotional needs—usually the needs for social access and emotional safety. Conversely, there also are some pervasive legal disincentives for meeting these students' less-widely-known needs in the intellectual, academic, metaphysical, and physical realms.

Federal Education Law. Although education is mostly a state function, the federal government can, and occasionally does, involve itself in issues of access for gifted and other GLBT people. Recently the federal judiciary has struck down a barrier to GLBT service, embodied in the military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, and an obstacle to gay marriage, codified in Congress' Defense of Marriage law (Huffingtonpost.com, 2013). Regarding gifted and other GLBT students, Title IX of federal education law indicates sexual-minority youth must be treated equally in school environments, including on those occasions when educators and students perceive their behavior to be "too masculine" or "too feminine" (Weiner, 2005). These students must not be subject to sex-stereotyping (*Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, 1989) or to same-sex social harassment (*Oncale v. Sundowner*, 1998). Title IX law also provides an opportunity for those gifted GLBT students perceived to be androgynous to truly be themselves (Whittenburg & Treat, 2008).

Federal Court Rulings. As applied by federal courts, Title IX law has been used to support GLBT students' rights to social and emotional safety within school programs and buildings (Weiner, 2005). Federally rooted legal intervention in those programs came about from more than just planning or fiat. It occurred in reaction to long-standing, aggressive, sometimes violent, and still-largely-unaddressed anti-GLBT bias. This bias historically has been seen in secondary school verbal harassment figures of about 80% of the GLBT population and physical harassment statistics above 40% of that population (GLSEN, 2014; National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 1987). There have been increasing numbers of federal court rulings demanding that school administrators address harassment decisively when it is brought before them. In *Nobozny v. Podlesney*

(1996), for instance, a gay student who had been continually harassed told his principal about the harassment, only to subsequently suffer a near-fatal beating by perpetrators. The student sued using Title IX law, and won substantial damages from the school for its failure to act. A stream of similarly successful lawsuits immediately followed (*Henkle v. Gregory*, 2001; *Montgomery v. Independent School District 709*, 2000; *O.H. v. Oakland Unified School District*, 2000), setting a litigious, yet GLBT-supportive, trend for the next decade (Weiner, 2005). Recently, a Title IX suit was won on behalf of a group of GLBT students, including four youth who had committed suicide (some of whom were gifted). The students had committed suicide after extended administrative inaction against their bullying (*Doe v. Anoka-Hennepin School District 11*, 2012). The connection between gifted students and suicide came as no surprise to longtime gifted advocates (Cross, 2014).

State Law. Like federal education statutes, state education law has involved itself somewhat in programmatic access for GLBT youth. Four states (Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island) have long had civil rights laws and administrative regulations that sweepingly restrict harassment and/or discrimination in school (Bedell, 2003). Most often, these GLBT-supportive state education laws, like Federal Title IX law, focus on student safety. However, unlike Title IX law, new Safe Schools laws in 17 states and the nation's capital (Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, New York, Rhode Island, Oregon, and Washington) go somewhat beyond mere prescriptions for schools to remediate past wrongs (GLSEN, 2014). Most Safe Schools legislation mentions specifically what districts can do to enhance GLBT youth safety, as well as how these systems can fine-tune their after-the-fact measures to redress peers' anti-GLBT actions (GLSEN, 2014). For instance, these Safe Schools laws typically call for teachers, students, and communities to design specific school programs to educate students about widely diverse peers' similarities and differences, and ask for administrators to provide constructive responses to bias against those peers. Safe School laws have opened the door to whole-school curricular efforts to educate on sexual orientation and other key student differences (Dibble & Davnie, 2014). Gifted GLBT students may have the opportunities to both receive help and take leadership actions in such programs (Friedrichs, 2014).

Education Statutes. Six states and the District of Columbia also prevent anti-GLBT discrimination through their state education department statutes (Bedell, 2013). Unlike broadly written anti-discrimination laws, which call sweepingly for equal treatment of sexual-minority youth, these state statutes (in California, Connecticut, DC, Massachu-

setts, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin) appear open to addressing specific GLBT programmatic-access concerns. In Vermont, for example, local school boards are encouraged to tailor anti-harassment policies to fit local needs (Bedell, 2003). Such statutory provisions more fully allow GLBT students the right to the same curricular opportunities as other students, a right that may have been denied in the past by some punitive school officials (Sears, 2005).

Professional Organizations. Professional standards often find their way as "best practices" into those state educational laws and statutes covering GLBT student safety and security (Harbeck, 1997). Sexual-minority students have long had the general professional backing of the American Federation of Teachers (1974) and the National Education Association (1975), in terms of nondiscrimination and anti-bullying sentiment. More recently, within gifted education, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC, 1995) and NAGC (2001) have criticized anti-GLBT discrimination, and NAGC has explicitly called for the sensitive treatment of high-potential students. In doing so, NAGC (2001) has gone beyond the mere calling for emotional and social safety, and encouraged schools to provide intellectual, academic, aesthetic, and career opportunities that are specific to higher-potential GLBT students. Mostly recently, NAGC has also established a Gifted GLBT Special Interest Group (SIG) to spread information about, and to advocate for, high-potential social-minority students, their teachers, and their parents (NAGC GLBT-SIG, 2011).

School District Regulations. Hundreds of U.S. school systems entirely prohibit anti-GLBT discrimination within their settings (GLSEN, 2014). These districts tend to emphasize social and emotional safety criteria (Bedell, 2003). However, some of these district policies hold open the possibility for broader interpretation, from the emotional and social areas to extended realms, such as curriculum and Gay-Straight Alliances (Bedell, 2003).

Legal Disincentives

In addition to being rooted in lingering biases against sexual-minority people, legal disincentives for serving gifted GLBT youth may be based in two other elements: (a) these students' small numbers, and (b) these youths' hidden rather than fully seen intellectual, academic, metaphysical, physical, and aesthetic characteristics (Eskridge, 1999). Other legal disincentives can be found in the same sources as the legal incentives for assisting these students: federal law and court rulings, state laws and education statutes, school district rules, and professional education standards (Eskridge, 1999).

Small Numbers of Youth. Because their numbers appear small, gifted GLBT students many not be seen as comprising a significant percentage of the population. It is easy to overlook the needs of such small-incidence populations,

especially if the school community regards these persons as morally suspect. Yet, gifted (and other) GLBT youth are still seen, even in many smaller, outlying, or conservative communities, and their needs must be addressed (Cohn, 2002; Cramond, 2006; DeMitchell & Fossey, 2008).

Hidden Characteristics. Even if educators see GLBT students as positive people, they may be uncertain about how high-potential GLBT students are different from other youth in their cognitive, scholastic, spiritual, aesthetic, and physical traits (Friedrichs, 2012). Further, when these educators do choose to address gifted sexual-minority students' characteristics openly, they may sometimes run strongly against the social and legal grain in communities and even in entire states (Cramond, 2006; DeMitchell & Fossey, 2008). For example, from an intellectual standpoint, GLBT youth may benefit from speaking openly on sexual-minority issues, as unpopular as those traits might be. Similarly, from an academic vantage point, these students may strongly wish to write papers on controversial GLBT topics. In aesthetics, they may long to produce art that reflects a sexual-minority sensibility. And, from a metaphysical outlook, they may actively seek, from their education, personal meaning in their lives (Friedrichs, 2012).

Free speech, expressive art, and searches for meaning may certainly help gifted GLBT students along paths of self-understanding. Unfortunately, educators who assist youth along these paths, especially through open full-classroom instruction and discussions, may be regarded as "trouble-making" employees, under some current federal, state, local, and professional guidelines. In some locations, open instruction and discussions on GLBT topics may quite simply be viewed as "offensive to the public" (Friedrichs, 2012).

Federal Law. Federal law does not generally deal with education, because education is mainly a state function in organization and funding (Harbeck, 1997). Thus, it is difficult for the federal government to sweepingly and directly prevent discrimination against gifted (and other) GLBT students (Wiener, 2005). Through Constitutional mandate or through federal legislation, the federal government has never called for basic equal rights for sexual-minority adults in voting, public accommodations, housing, or credit, as the government has done with other racial and religious groups (Bedell, 2003). With this longstanding lack of basic federal legal coverage, gifted GLBT youth must look elsewhere to protect their intellectual, academic, creative, and physical and metaphysical strengths. (They can draw some solace, however, from the aforementioned recent federal court extension of Title IX coverage to anti-GLBT harassment, and from the recent establishment of marriage and military service rights.)

Federal Court Rulings. Not surprisingly, given federal laws' lack of emphasis on GLBT (and other) students' edu-

education, federal courts have not often intervened on specific classroom issues of freedom of speech, curricular integration, and artistic freedom. However, there have been federal rulings about equal rights to extracurricular education. The Equal Access Act (1984) has repeatedly (DeMitchell & Fossey, 2008) been interpreted in recent years to indicate that GLBT students have the rights to congregate together in Gay-Straight Alliances and similar clubs, to develop both positive self-images and leadership skills (*Boyd County High School Gay Straight Alliance v. Boyd County Board of Education*, 2003; *Colin v. Orange Unified School District*, 2000; *Straight and Gays for Equality v. Osseo Area High School*, 2006).

State Laws. Most states' education laws do not prohibit GLBT discrimination at all. Further, across 10 states, there are school laws that GLBT issues should not be "promoted" (GLSEN, 2014). In fact, according to some state education laws, educators who are viewed as promoting homosexuality might be guilty of personal turpitude and might be subject to dismissal (Harbeck, 1997). These laws may strongly discourage normally courageous gifted educators from trying to make history, science, arts, and other curricula personally applicable to gifted GLBT youth (Friedrichs, 2012).

Professional Educational Organizations. A few state laws and some professional organizational statements may be fairly sweeping in their support, as they reach out to protect and nurture these students' intellectual, academic, aesthetic, physical, social, and emotional needs. However, organizational positions generally are not as extensive in their support of intellectual, academic, aesthetic, and physical needs as they are in the backing of social and emotional needs. Most strikingly, many professional education groups do not advocate for GLBT topics to be included in curricular standards. Without stimulating and relevant curricula, gifted GLBT students may not do as well in school (NAGC, 2001).

Local Districts. Although hundreds of local districts do have anti-GLBT harassment policies, most districts do not (GLSEN, 2014). In fact, some of these districts have rules that explicitly prevent several elements: the discussion of GLBT intellectual and curricular issues, the portrayal of explicitly GLBT art, and the existence of Gay-Straight Alliances (GLSEN, 2014). The absence of sexual-minority discussions, products, and people make it difficult for gifted GLBT youth to learn who they are and to understand how to get by in life (Friedrichs, 2012).

Recommendations

The following are some general guidelines for courageous teachers who wish to help GLBT youth, in spite of today's only somewhat-supportive laws and educators affecting these youth:

- Educators may need to come to understand themselves and their past GLBT-related actions before they move decisively forward to help gifted GLBT students (Friedrichs, 2013; Treat, 2003).
- These educators would be wise to review applicable federal laws, state laws and statutes, professional standards, and school district policies in their areas before they start pro-GLBT in-school efforts (Harbeck, 1997).
- They may wish to discuss with their building principals the unwritten but facilitative traditions that might support GLBT-sensitive efforts (Pace, 2009).
- In most states, educators may find greater protection for their efforts to emotionally protect GLBT students than for their attempts to address these youths' intellectual, academic, physical, and metaphysical needs. Educators should know, however, that these "other" areas are ones in which teacher initiatives actually may be most impactful to some GLBT students'—and their schools'—futures. These are the areas in which dynamic educators may best serve as change agents for today's gifted GLBT youth (Friedman-Nimz, 2001).

Conclusion

Thus, there remains a patchwork of legal support for dedicated educators who wish to act on behalf of gifted GLBT youth, to protect these students' social and emotional well-being, and to grow their intellectual, creative, and other gifted abilities. However, there also lays available to these educators a generation of affirmed educational traits and helpful educational approaches that have helped such youth across a variety of contexts. Although there are still few guarantees for professional colleague support of pro-GLBT educators, there is always the opportunity to answer the call of gifted GLBT students. There is also the knowledge that, in doing so, responsive educators have America's cultural winds at their backs.

References

- American Federation of Teachers. (1974). *Non-discrimination statement on gay and lesbian students and staff*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Bedell, J. (2003). Personal liability of school officials who ignore peer harassment of gay students. *University of Illinois Law Review*, 2003, 829–861.
- Boyd Century High School Gay Straight Alliance v. Boyd County Board of Education. (2003). Civil Action 03-17-DLB.
- Boyd, M. (1970). *As I live and breathe: Stages of an autobiography*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Bunch, C. (1987). *Passionate politics*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

- Caffrey, M. (1989). *Ruth Benedict*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Clark, B. (2008). *Growing up gifted* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Cohn, S. (2002). Gifted students who are gay, lesbian, and bisexual. In M. Neihart, S. M. Reis, N. M. Robinson, & S M. Moon (Eds.), *The social and emotional development of gifted children: What do we know?* (pp. 125–136). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Colangelo, N., & Zaffran, R. T. (1979). *New voices in counseling the gifted*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Colin v. Orange Unified School District. (2000). 83F 2nd 1135.
- Council for Exceptional Children. (1995). CEC establishes GLB Caucus. *Exceptional Pride*, 1–2.
- Cramond, B. (2006, September). Differences can be benefits. *Parenting for High Potential*, 18–25.
- Cross, T. L. (2014). *Suicide in gifted adolescents*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- DeMitchell, T. A., & Fossey, R. (2008). Student speech: School boards, gay/straight alliances, and the Equal Access Act. *BYU Education and Law Journal*, 1, 89–124.
- Dibble, S., & Davnie, J. (2014). *Minnesota Safe Schools Bill*. St. Paul, MN: State of Minnesota.
- Doe v. Anoka-Hennepin School District 11. (2012).
- Donaldson, S. (1988). *John Cheever*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Equal Access Act (1984). 20 U.S.C. 4071 (a) (Updated in 2000).
- Eskridge, J. (1999). *Gaylaw*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Feinberg, L. (1997). *Transgender warriors: Making history from Joan of Arc to Dennis Rodman*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Friedman-Nimz, R. (2001). Creating a context: Education against oppression. *Advocating for Gifted Gay & Lesbian Youth*, 3(2), 4, 7.
- Friedrichs, T. P. (1997). Understanding the educational needs of gifted gay and bisexual males. *National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) Counseling and Guidance Newsletter*, 6(3), 3, 8.
- Friedrichs, T. P. (2005). *Contextual social and emotional needs, and preferred instructional approaches, for gifted gay and bi-sexual male adolescents*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.
- Friedrichs, T. P. (2007, Spring). Social and emotional needs, and preferred educational approaches, for gifted gay and bisexual males. *SIGNificance*, 3–4, 7.
- Friedrichs, T. P. (2012). Counseling gifted GLBT students along paths to freedom. In T. L. Cross & J. R. Cross (Eds.), *Handbook for counselors serving students with gifts and talents: Development, relationships, school*

- issues, and counseling, needs/interventions* (pp. 153–178). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Friedrichs, T. P. (2013). The fighter. In P. C. Miller & H. Endo (Eds.), *Queer voices in the classroom* (pp. 195–202). Charlotte, NC: IAP.
- Friedrichs, T. P. (2014, February). *Safe school laws: Benefits to gifted GLBT students (and others)*. Session presented at the Minnesota Educators of the Gifted and Talented Conference, Brainerd, MN.
- Friedrichs, T. P., & Etheridge, R. L. (1995). Gifted and gay—Reasons to help. *The Association for the Gifted Newsletter*, 17(1), 4–5.
- Gay Lesbian Straight Educators Network. (2014, April). *Research*. Retrieved from <http://glsen.org/research>
- Gibson, P. (1989). Gay and lesbian youth suicide. In M. Feinlab (Ed.), *Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide* (pp. 110–142). Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.
- Gonsiorek, J. (1993). *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Griffin, P. (1994). Homophobia in sport: Addressing the need of lesbian and gay high school athletes. *High School Journal*, 77, 80–87.
- Harbeck, K. H. (1992). Gay and lesbian educators: Past history/future prospects. In K. H. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula* (pp. 121–140). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.
- Harbeck, K. H. (1997). *Gay and lesbian educators: Personal freedoms, public constraints*. Malden, MA: Amethyst.
- Hébert, T., & Olenchack, R. (2004). Mentors of gifted underachieving males: Developing potential and realizing promise. In S. Moon & S. Reis (Eds.), *Social/emotional issues, underachievement, and counseling of the gifted* (pp. 157–180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Henkle v. Gregory. (2001). 150 F. Supp. 2d 1067. District of Nevada.
- Hunter, J. (1990). Violence against lesbian and gay male use. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 295–300.
- Huffingtonpost.com. (2013, July 1). *Of DOMA, defense, duplicity, and diligence*. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry35192021/>
- Hutcheson, V. (2012). *Dealing with dual differences: Social coping strategies of gifted lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender, and queer adolescents*. (Unpublished master's thesis). The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
- Jennings, K. (1994). *One teacher in ten*. Boston, MA: Alyson.

- Jennings, K. (2003). *Always our children*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Johnson, S. (1981). *From housewife to hectic*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Keener, A. G. (2013, November). G-squared: Supporting your gifted LGBT student. *SENGvine*, 1–2.
- Kerr, B. (2000). *Smart girls*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Kerr, B., & Cohn, S. (2001). *Smart boys: Talent, manhood, and the search for meaning*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- King, B. J. (1974). *Billie Jean*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Lorde, A. (1982). *Zami: A new spelling of my name*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.
- Louganis, G. (1995). *Breaking the surface*. New York, NY: Harper/Collins.
- Mazza, M. J. (2009). *This fierce geometry: Uses of the Judeo-Christian Bible in the anti-abolitionist and anti-gay rhetoric of the United States* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh). (ATT 337531)
- McLean, K. (2001). Living life in the double closet: Young bisexuals speak out. *Hecate*, 27(1), 109–118.
- Montgomery v. Independent School District 709. (2000). 109F Supp:2d 1081.
- National Association for Gifted Children. (2001). *Appropriate education of gifted GLBT students*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Association for Gifted Children GLBT Special Interest Group. (2011, February 14). *Application for Special Interest Group membership*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Education Association. (1975). *Non-discrimination statement on GLBT students and staff*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. (1987). *Statistics on hate crimes and secondary school harassment*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nobozny v. Podlesny. (1996). 92F. 3d 446. Court of Appeals, 7th Circuit.
- Oncale v. Sundowner. (1998). 52 US 75.
- O.H. v. Oakland Unified School District. (2000). C-99-51 23 JCS
- Pace, N. (2009). *The principal's challenge: Learning from gay and lesbian students*. New York, NY: IAP.
- Peterson, J. S., & Rischar, S. (2000). Gifted and gay: The adolescent experience. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 43, 430–444.
- Piirto, J. (1998). Themes in the lives of successful contemporary US women creative writers. *Roepers Review*, 21, 60–70.
- Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins. (1989). 490 US 228
- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of battles over school reform*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rich, A. (1976). *Of women born: Motherhood as experience and institution*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Rofes, E. E. (1993). *I thought people like that killed themselves*. San Francisco, CA: Grey Fox.
- Sanborn, M. (1979). Career development. In N. Colangelo & R. T. Zaffran (Eds.), *New voices in counseling the gifted* (pp. 154–164). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Sears, J. T. (1991). *Growing up gay in the South*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sears, J. T. (2005). Introduction. In J. T. Sears (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of youth, education, and sexualities* (pp. xvii–xxxviii). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Sedillo, P. J. (In preparation). The “T” is missing from “gifted”: Transgender gifted individuals.
- Shilts, R. (1982). *The major of Castro Street: The life and times of Harvey Milk*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Straight and Gays for Equality v. Osseo Area High School. (2006). 54 of 3d 911(MN).
- Tolan, S. (1997, Winter). Sex and the highly gifted adolescent. *National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC Counseling and Guidance Newsletter*, 6(3), 2, 5, 8.
- Tompkins, C. (1980). *Off the wall: Robert Rauschenberg and the art world of our time*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Treadway, L., & Yoakam, J. (1996). Creating a safer school environment for lesbian and gay students. *Journal of School Health*, 62, 361–365.
- Treat, A. R. (2003). Yikes! She's a dyke!: A lesbian gifted teacher's reflections. *Advocating for Gifted Gay & Lesbian Youth*, 6(1), 1–4.
- Treat, A. R. (2006). Overexcitability in gifted sexually diverse populations. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 17, 244–257.
- Treat, A. R., & Friedrichs, T. P. (2013, November). *Addressing the needs of gifted GLBTQ youth*. Session presented at the National Association for Gifted Children Annual Convention, Indianapolis, IN.
- Tyack, D. (2007). *Seeking common ground: Public schools in a diverse society*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Weatherby, W. J. (1989). *James Baldwin*. New York, NY: Donald I. Fine.
- Weiner, C. (2005). Sex education: Recognizing anti-gay harassment as sex discrimination under Title IV and Title IX. *Columbia Human Rights Legal Review*, 37, 189–234.
- Whittenburg, B., & Treat, A. R. (2008). Shared characteristics of gifted and sexually diverse youth. In N. Hafenstein (Ed.), *Perspectives in gifted education: Diversity* (pp. 140–176). Denver, CO: Institute for Gifted Child Development.

About the Author

Terry Friedrichs, Ph.D., Ed.D., has served for more than 30 years as a teacher, researcher, advocate, and high school and college youth group leader for gifted GLBT youth, and has published extensively on their education. Currently, he directs Friedrichs Education, a one-on-one assessment, tutoring, and school counseling center serving many high-potential youth with significant differences and challenges. He also coordinates NAGC's new Gifted GLBTQ Special Interest Group. Terry can be reached at terry@friedrichseducation.com.

Permission to photocopy, reprint, or otherwise reproduce copyrighted material published in this journal by The Association for the Gifted should be submitted by email to the editors at edge.tag.editors@gmail.com.

Copyright © 2014 *Excellence and Diversity in Gifted Education (EDGE)*

Volume 1 Number 1

Spring 2014

Hosted at <http://cectag.org>