

IDENTITY AS A SEXUAL MINORITY IN THE WORKPLACE:
A LOOK AT PERSONALITY AND CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

by

SAMUEL RESENDE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of Science
in the Department of Psychology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Dr. Charles Negy:
Fall Term
2015

Abstract

Sexual identity in the workplace is an exploratory topic in an age when sexuality is becoming a topic of discussion. However, protection of sexual minorities (Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals) is not universal despite evidence that heterosexist climates are disadvantageous for employees. In this study, I examined if sexual minorities who perceive their place of employment to be relatively free of heterosexism would be more satisfied with their jobs, perceive more organizational fit, and report less work stress. In addition, I sought to determine if selected personality variables would mediate the relations among critical study variables. The personality variables were internalized homophobia, level of “outness,” and cynicism. Two samples of university students consisting of sexual minorities ($n = 43$) and heterosexuals ($n = 67$), completed questionnaires online. Results revealed a positive correlation for both groups between organizational climate (i.e., less perceived heterosexism) and job satisfaction, although the correlation for the sexual minority group did not achieve statistical significance, likely due to the small sample size. Due to statistical conditions not being satisfied, partial correlations were performed instead of mediational analyses. Internalized homophobia was found to partially account for the relations between perceived organizational climate and job satisfaction and perceived organizational climate and work stress, respectively. This study encourages further investigation into the role of sexual identity in the workplace, particularly the role of internalized homophobia as possibly influencing sexual minorities to perceive their workplace environment more pejoratively than necessary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Method	6
Participants.....	6
Measures.....	7
Demographic Information.....	7
Organizational Attitude Towards LGB Employees	7
Perceived Organizational Fit.....	7
Perceived Occupational Stress	8
Outness	8
Job Satisfaction	8
Cynicism	9
Internalized Homophobia	9
Results	10
Hypothesis Testing	10
Exploratory Comparative Analyses.....	11
Discussion	12
Summary and Conclusion	16
APPENDIX A: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON STUDY VARIABLES AS A FUNCTION OF POPULATION.....	18
APPENDIX B: SURVEYS.....	21
References	29

Introduction

Identification as a minority can be challenging. Minorities may experience discrimination in various aspects of their lives such as in social interactions, class standing, and even job opportunities. In some cases, people go to great lengths to submerge their minority status in order to appear like the majority. Although racism still exists, people tend to realize that people do not choose their race, and race tends to be more apparent. There are still some, though, who believe a homosexuality is a choice, which may be deeply rooted in religious beliefs. Currently, 29 states lack statewide laws protecting Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual (LGB) employees from discrimination or being fired due to sexual identity or perceived sexual orientation, making identification as a sexual minority at work a serious concern for some. As the nation is growing more supportive of LGB rights, such with national coverage of same-sex marriage and adoption, it is worth investigating the variables that influence how people identify as a sexual minority and the aspects that predict their well-being.

It has been found that minority employees who do not openly identify with a minority status are likely to perceive relatively more discrimination and thus be less satisfied with their jobs (Madera, King & Hebl, 2012). By contrast, employees who identify with their minority status are likely to be more satisfied with their job. This finding is consistent with past work on sexual minorities that has found that “outness” (the degree to which a person is open about their sexuality) in the workplace was negatively related to perceived incidents of heterosexism, or discrimination of homosexuals by heterosexuals

(Brenners, Lyon & Fassinger, 2010). Although it is unclear if heterosexist environments directly diminish the work performance of sexual minority employees, turnover intentions are higher in perceived hostile environments, which can be disadvantageous for employers.

The person-environmental fit model is the degree to which individual and environmental characteristics align (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). The extent to which individuals perceive fit in their job is a good indication of how they experience the job and how they feel about it. Discrimination, such as heterosexism, is perceived more frequently when the person perceives lower organizational fit (Lyons, Brenning, & Fassinger, 2005). Heterosexism in the workplace has shown to mediate the perceived fit model in LGB (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual) supportive climates, and is negatively and indirectly linked to job satisfaction and positively linked to turnover intentions (Velez & Moradi, 2012). For example, in interviews with sexual minorities in the police field, those in environments that supported them and their sexual identity were more satisfied with their careers and happier overall with their lives (Charles & Arndt, 2013). Self-satisfaction in general appears to be linked to an increased perceived fit, which also is indicative of increased happiness among employees (Park, Monnot, Jacob, & Wagner, 2011). In general, employees that perceived fit in an organization tend to be more satisfied with their jobs, making it an important factor consider.

Work stress is a concern regarding sexual minorities because of stress' impact on the quality of life. (Goldbach & Gibb, 2015). Minority stress theory has indicated that perceptions of sexual minority status can lead to higher levels of stress due to negative perceptions of social status and homosexuality. (Meyer, 2003). This information is relevant

to the workplace because employees that exhibit more stress are likely to perceive additional victimization and feel less satisfied with their jobs (Steiner & Wooldredge, 2015). Ethnic minorities are an example of how minority status has negatively affected perceived job satisfaction, as ethnic minority teachers in the UK experienced significantly more stress and poorer mental health when compared to their ethnic majority counterparts (Miller & Travers, 2005). Due to the effects of minority status on mental health and perceptions in the workplace, I believe it is worth exploring how these perceptions are affected specifically to sexual minorities and how organizational tolerance and personality factors may relate. Sexual minorities with higher levels of internalized homophobia, for example, were likely to have more negative perceptions. (Dispenza, 2015). While sexual identity, may account for stress experienced in the workplace, it appears individual differences, such as personality may also contribute.

Certain personality variables may influence sexual minorities' job satisfaction. For example, cynicism is the negative view of people and social institutions and is a trait linked to low job satisfaction, which has been demonstrated cross-culturally (Leung, Ip & Leung, 2010). This personality aspect is important to consider because highly cynical sexual minorities may over-attribute their job dissatisfaction to heterosexism. Cynicism of an organization has been linked to lack of congruence between an employee's personal values and the perceived values of organization, along with the degree to which the job is autonomous. Cynicism likely extends to other aspects of life and may influence perceptions of discrimination due to the negative outlook on life.

Internalized homophobia is another personality variable that appears to contribute to sexual minorities' perceptions of the workplace due its potential to affect perceived discrimination in a work environment (Rostosky & Riggie, 2002). This variable has been found to be associated negatively with outness in the workplace, which in turn, was linked positively to job satisfaction and turnover rates. This variable is also significant because sexual minorities with a negative self-image of LGB identification are more likely to conceal their identity in all aspects of their lives and perceive more heterosexism (Moradi, et al., 2010). These findings suggest that life outside and inside the workplace for sexual minorities are likely related and can affect their quality of life across contexts.

Higher incidences of discrimination in general are linked to high turnover rates and lower job satisfaction (Madera, King & Hubl, 2010). This research demonstrates the significance of workplace discrimination in regards to the well-being of employees. Thus far, perceived heterosexism's role, specifically, in organizational fit has been inconclusive. When incidents of heterosexism were examined vis-a-vis employees' depiction of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), which are characteristic of hard working employees, evidence of a relation between these two variables was inconclusive (Brenner, Lyons, & Fassinger, 2010). Although evidence of their relation is ambiguous, distress as a minority facing discrimination is evident in the workplace, and higher incidences of heterosexism are linked to higher job burnout and job dissatisfaction. In fact, perceived fit has been found to be mediate the relation between a person's display of OCBs and the ethical culture of the workplace (Ruiz-Palomino & Martinez-Cañas, 2014). This finding suggests that a relation between the perceptions of the workplace interplay with the level

of fit and job satisfaction, sexual minorities are likely to enjoy a job that is perceived to be intolerant to heterosexism.

Personality's influence on organizational perceived fit is evident in certain contexts. However, little research has been done to show the role that sexual identity plays in perceived fit particularly when considering the work context's level of LGB culture support. By measuring participants' personalities on factors such as cynicism, internalized homophobia, and outness, along with workplace perceptions such as overall job satisfaction, work stress, and perceived fit in the organization, links may be observed to determine how personality may mediate these perceptions. The results of this study may have important implications for the well-being of LGB employees in work environments and in terms of how to increase fit perceptions of employees.

I hypothesize that sexual minority participants who perceive their workplace to have less LGB friendly environments will perceive less fit, more work stress and less job satisfaction than those who perceive their workplace to have LGB friendly environments. I also believe that personality factors of sexual minorities will likely mediate the relationship between organizational perceptions and job satisfaction, along with organizational perceptions and work stress respectively. Moreover, I hypothesize that these personality variables, such as high internalized homophobia and cynicism, will correlate with more perceived heterosexist climate, less perceived fit, less job satisfaction, and additional perceived work stress.

Method

Participants

Approximately 43 sexual minority students (14 males, 23 females, and 6 transgendered; M age = 20.59, SD = 2.68) were recruited from social media (UCF Official Facebook pages from classes of 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019) and from recruitment e-mails from UCF's Honors in the Major program. All non-heterosexuals were arbitrarily collapsed into the sexual minority category in an effort to increase the population size and have a better representative sample. Regarding sexual orientation, the sexual minority sample self-identified as the following: 32 as lesbian or gay, 5 as asexual, 2 as pansexual, 2 as "questioning," 1 as bisexual, and 1 as "does not label self." Regarding ethnicity, they self-identified as the following: 25 non-Hispanic Whites, 10 Hispanics/Latinos/as, six "Other," one African American, and one Asian American

An additional population of 67 heterosexual students (19 males, 48 females; M age = 21.66, SD = 5.50) served as a control group, and was gathered through the same means as the sexual minority group. Regarding ethnicity, they self-identified as the following: 51 non-Hispanic Whites, six Hispanics/Latinos/as, five African Americans, three as "Other," and two Asian Americans.

All participants had to be at least 18 years of age, attend the University of Central Florida, and be currently or recently employed as conditions for participation in the study. No restrictions were placed on number of hours per week, as many University students are not employed full-timed. Participation in the survey was voluntary and no compensation

for participation was provided. Prior to data collection, this study was reviewed and approved the university's institutional review board.

Measures

Demographic Information

On a demographic page, participants were asked to indicate age, gender, race/ethnicity, and type of sexual identification.

Organizational Attitude Towards LGB Employees

The Organizational Tolerance for Heterosexism Inventory (OTHI; Waldo, 1999) was designed to measure organizational context in regards to perceived heterosexist discrimination. Five generic stories of heterosexism (See APENDIX B) to be applied within the participant's respective organization were provided to respondents and participants rated three variables: the risk of registering a complaint (1 being very risky and 5 being little risk); likelihood a complaint would be taken seriously (1 being very serious and 5 being not very serious [reversed scored]); and likelihood of punishment for employee committing heterosexism (1 = very likely; 5 = not very likely). The scores were averaged to form an overall mean of the organization's tolerance of discrimination to LGB employees, with higher scores reflecting more tolerance. Based on the present sample of participants, this scale demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach alpha = .97)

Perceived Organizational Fit

The Person-Organization scale (P-O; Saks & Ashforth, 1997) measured the degree to which respondents perceive that they belong or fit within their organization. This scale contained one item to which respondents indicate their agreement with the statement. Response option range from 1 (to a very little extent) to 5 (to a very large extent). Scores

could range from 1 to 5, with higher scores reflecting more perceived fit with the organization.

Perceived Occupational Stress

The Workplace Stress Scale (AIS, n.d.) measured the degree to which respondents perceive stress due to their place of employment. This scale contains 8 items to which participants would indicate the frequency of the statements, with a 1 meaning “Never Occurring” and a 5 meaning ‘Always Occurring.’ Higher scores on this scale indicated higher perceived stressors in their respective workplace. Based on the current sample of participants, this scale demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach alpha = .83)

Outness

Openness about sexual orientation was measured using the Outness Indicator scale (Mohr & Fassinger; 2000). This scale contains ten items that assess whether participants are “out” to the world and family, based on a 7-point response option. Participants indicated if they were out to the types of people indicated in each item, with 1 = definitely does not know about sexual orientation, and 7 = sexual orientation is known and openly talked about (the midpoint of 4 = probably knows about my sexual orientation, but rarely discussed). Scores are summed and averaged and can range from 1 to 7, with higher scores reflecting a greater degree of being open about one’s sexual orientation. Based on the present sample of participants, this scale demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach alpha = .89)

Job Satisfaction

Perceived job satisfaction was measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The MSQ contains 20 items

that display different dimensions of job satisfaction. Respondents indicate their level of agreement to each item using a 5-point scale, with 1 = very dissatisfied, and 5 = very satisfied. Items were summed and averaged to derive a total score, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of job satisfaction. Based on the present sample of participants, this scale demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach alpha = .89).

Cynicism

Social cynicism was measured with four items taken from the Leung and Bond (2004) Cynicism scale. Respondents indicate their agreement with statements that were designed to assess cynicism. Response options range from 1 (highly disagree) to 5 (highly agree). Item scores are summed and averaged to derive a total score, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of cynicism. Based on the present sample of participants, this scale demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach alpha = .77).

Internalized Homophobia

Internalized homophobia was measured with the Internalized Homophobia Scale (IHP; Meyer, 1995). This scale contains nine items to which respondents indicate their level of agreement using a 5-point response option (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Item scores are summed and averaged and can range from 1 to 5, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of internalized homophobia. This scale is widely used for measuring internalized homophobia. Based on the present sample of participants, this scale demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach alpha = .91).

Results

Hypothesis Testing

The table contained in Appendix A shows the means and standard deviations for study variables as a function of sexual orientation. To test the first hypothesis, that participants who perceived their organizational climate (i.e., work environment) to be more tolerant toward LGB employees and customers would report relatively higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of work stress, a series of zero-order correlational analyses were performed for each population separately. For sexual minorities, although in absolute terms perceived organizational climate correlated positively with job satisfaction, the correlation was not statistically significant ($r [38] = .21, ns$). There was a trend toward organizational climate correlating negatively with work stress, although the correlation approached, but did not achieve statistical significance ($r [35] = -.33, p = .05$). For heterosexuals, perceived organizational climate correlated significantly with job satisfaction ($r [56] = .33, p < .05$). Perceived organizational climate correlated negatively with work stress, although the correlation approached, but did not achieve statistical significance ($r [52] = -.25, p = .07$).

It was not possible to test the second hypothesis as specified—that select personality variables (e.g., cynicism, internalized homophobia, and level of “outness”) would mediate any observed relations between organizational climate and job satisfaction and work stress—because conditions for conducting mediational analyses were not satisfied (Baron & Kenny, 1986). More specifically, cynicism and level of outness failed to correlate significantly with organizational climate, job satisfaction, or work stress (all $ps > .05$). Also, although internalized homophobia correlated significantly with organizational climate ($r [26] = -.62, p < .001$), internalized

homophobia did not correlate significantly with job satisfaction or work stress ($r_s [26] = -.10$ and $.24$, $p_s > .05$, respectively). Thus, I elected to examine the role of internalized homophobia using partial correlation analyses. Among sexual minorities, with internalized homophobia controlled for, the correlation between organizational climate and job satisfaction declined from $.21$ to $.01$, and the correlation between organizational climate and work stress declined from $-.33$ to $-.07$. These findings suggest that internalized homophobia accounted for a portion of the observed variance between organization climate and job satisfaction and between organizational climate and work stress, respectively.

Exploratory Comparative Analyses

To compare sexual minorities and heterosexuals on relevant study variables, I conducted a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on the data. The independent variable (IV) was population (sexual minority vs. heterosexual). The dependent variables (DVs) were age, organizational climate, job satisfaction, work stress, cynicism, and P-O fit (defined by the statement: “To what extent does your organization measure up to what you were seeking?”).

Overall, population was associated with a significant effect on the DVs (using Wilks’ Lambda, $F [6, 78] = 3.09$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .19$). The variables that achieved significance were organizational climate and job satisfaction. Specifically, on average, heterosexuals were significantly more likely to perceive their work environment as more hospitable to sexual minorities than were sexual minorities ($M_s = 3.63$ and 3.02 , $SD_s = .79$ and 1.11 , respectively; $F [1, 83] = 8.71$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .10$). Also, heterosexuals reported significantly more job satisfaction than sexual minorities ($M_s = 3.90$ and 3.65 , $SD_s = .45$ and $.65$, respectively; $F [1, 83] = 4.42$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$).

Discussion

It was hypothesized that participants who perceived their organization climate to be tolerant toward LGB employees and customers would report higher levels of job satisfaction and less work stress. In a qualified way, LGB tolerance in the workplace was associated with increased job satisfaction among both sexual minority and heterosexual participants. It bears noting that the correlation between workplace tolerance and job satisfaction did not achieve statistical significance among sexual minorities. In all likelihood, the non-significance of the finding is an artefact of the small sample size of sexual minorities in my study ($n = 43$) (Kalla, 2009). With that caveat in mind, my results are similar to the results of other studies, such as how participants internalized homophobia accounted for some of the negative perceptions about their organization and their level of stress (Dispenza, 2015) and participants in organizations with higher tolerance to LGB were more satisfied with their place of employment (Velez & Moradi, 2012). It seems logical that for sexual minorities, the more they perceive their workplace environment to be tolerant toward LGB individuals, the more satisfied they would feel with their jobs. Perhaps more interesting was that this correlation between perceived tolerance in the workplace and job satisfaction also was observed among the heterosexual participants. One possible explanation for this is that the heterosexuals who participated in my study were supportive of equality for sexual minorities; thus, having supportive views of LGB individuals, the heterosexual participants felt more satisfied with their jobs the more they perceived that their place of employment nurtured an atmosphere of acceptance for sexual diversity. Participants were not asked of their stance on LGB rights, however it is possible that their participation in a study on sexual identity indicates at least some degree of tolerance to the subject. Another

possible explanation of this finding among the heterosexual participants is that perceived tolerance for LGB individuals in the workplace—although possibly not affecting heterosexual employees directly—possibly symbolized the type of company and management they desired. Specifically, heterosexuals who perceived that their place of employment was tolerant toward sexual minorities likely perceived that their place of employment was an employee-friendly environment in a broad way.

The second component of the first hypothesis also was supported in a qualified way. Perceived tolerance for LGB individuals at the workplace did correlate inversely with work stress for both sexual minority and heterosexual participants. However, again, likely due to small sample sizes, the correlation only approached significance for sexual minorities, and did not achieve statistical significance for heterosexuals. I can only speculate that with a larger sample size of sexual minorities, the observed correlation between perceived organizational climate and work stress would have achieved significance. Although the non-significant correlation for heterosexuals may also be due to their relatively small sample size, I speculate that the non-significant correlation may also reflect the possibility that as heterosexuals, they would be less affected directly by an intolerant workplace for sexual minorities (given they are the majority), and consequently may feel less stress in relation to a perceived intolerant workplace environment. The directions of these correlations were in accordance with my hypothesis and are consistent with findings from other studies (e.g., Dispenza, 2015; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2015).

In light of this finding among my heterosexual participants, I wish to note that the heterosexuals in my sample tended to perceive less heterosexism in their organizational climate compared to the sexual minorities. Because of limitations of the data, it is difficult to know with

certainty the meaning of these findings. For example, the heterosexuals in my study neither worked at the same place of employment nor worked at the same places of employment as the sexual minorities. Consequently, in unknown ways the comparison of perceived organizational climates between the sexual minorities and heterosexuals was an “apples and oranges” comparison. Moreover, it is possible that heterosexuals fail to fully notice heterosexism when it occurs compared to sexual minorities. It equally is possible that sexual minorities may overestimate the prevalence of heterosexism in their places of employment possibly due to heightened sensitivities or expectancies related to heterosexism. My data do not clarify these questions.

Arguably, the most dramatic findings from this study were related to the link between internalized homophobia and the three critical study variables (organizational climate, job satisfaction, and work stress). Because personality variables often influence how people interact with the world (e.g. Dispenza, 2015; Moradi, et al., 2010; Rostosky & Riggie, 2002), I had included measures of a select set of personality variables that I had deemed relevant to this study. They were cynicism, internalized homophobia, and level of outness. However, among sexual minority participants, all three variables did not correlate significantly with the critical study variables with one exception: internalized homophobia correlated significantly with perceived organizational climate. As a result, I was unable to examine if these variables mediated any of the observed relations between critical study variables. However, given that internalized homophobia correlated significantly with perceived organizational climate, I elected to conduct partial correlation analyses between perceived organizational climate and job satisfaction and work stress, respectively, controlling for internalized homophobia.

Among sexual minority participants, when internalized homophobia was controlled for statistically, the previously obtained correlations between perceived organizational climate and job satisfaction and work stress were reduced dramatically. In fact, the correlation between perceived organizational climate and job satisfaction almost became non-existent when controlling for internalized homophobia. These findings highlight the power of perceiving the world through our own idiosyncratic filters (Friedman & Schustack, 2003; Murray, 1962). More specifically, I cautiously interpret these results in the following: the more sexual minorities struggled to accept their own sexual minority status, the more they perceived that their places of employment to be less tolerant of sexual minorities; and in turn, their own lack of self-acceptance tended to account for the observed relation between their perceptions of organizational tolerance of sexual minorities and their own job satisfaction.

Summary and Conclusion

Many of the present findings must be interpreted with caution given that some of the reported findings did not achieve statistical significance. As discussed, in all likelihood, some of the non-significant findings may have been due to the small sample sizes of the participants, particularly sexual minorities. With that caveat in mind, I found that, for both sexual minorities and heterosexuals, the more they perceived their places of employment to be tolerant of sexual minorities, the more satisfied they were at their jobs, and for sexual minorities, the less stress they reported related to their jobs. Overall, my findings suggest that companies might promote better employee morale—which might translate into enhanced productivity—if they were to actively strive to create work environments that are accepting of sexual diversity. Moreover, such work environments might reduce subjective work stress among their sexual minority employees.

My findings also suggest that the reality of the workplace is not the sole variable that influences people's job satisfaction and work stress. Employees bring their own variables to the workplace that may interact with the work environment. These variables are based on their own history of experiences, personality traits, expectations, and so on. Based on my results, it seemed that sexual minorities who have not fully accepted their sexual orientation may unwittingly perceive their workplace environments as less tolerant of sexual diversity than they may be (by contrast, sexual minorities who accept their sexual orientation may perceive their workplace environments as more accepting). My results highlight the importance of considering idiographic variables when examining people's perceptions of situations, such as workplace climate.

As indicated, these data and the conclusions made from them must be viewed with caution. A major study limitation was the small sample sizes of the two groups, particularly the sexual minorities. Small sample sizes increase the possibility of spurious findings (in either direction). Also, the participants were college students who, compared to the general population, tend to be relatively homogenous on multiple dimensions (e.g., being more socially liberal). This may have skewed the findings to some degree. Finally, there may have been other personality variables that may have influenced the observed relations among study variables that were not included in this study. Variables such as self-esteem, sociability, and self-efficacy are some examples. Future studies should be conducted with larger sample sizes, community populations, and with additional personality variables that may shed more light on the meaning of the present findings.

**APPENDIX A: MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON STUDY
VARIABLES AS A FUNCTION OF POPULATION.**

Means and Standard Deviations on Study Variables as a Function of Population

VARIABLES	POPULATION	
	Sexual Minorities (<i>n</i> = 43)	Heterosexuals (<i>n</i> = 67)
Organizational Climate		
<i>M (SD)</i>	3.02 (1.10)	3.63 (.79) **
Job Satisfaction	3.65 (.65)	3.90 (.45) *
Work Stress	2.36 (.74)	2.24 (.69)
P-O Fit	3.36 (1.27)	3.33 (1.13)
Cynicism	3.58 (.71)	3.29 (.77)

** *p* < .01; **p* < .05

APPENDIX B: SURVEYS.

Surveys Used:

Demographic Data

1. Your Gender: Male Female Transgendered
2. Your age: _____
3. Your ethnicity:
 - White American (non-Hispanic)
 - African American/Black
 - Asian
 - Hispanic (see below)
 - Other
5. Highest level of education:
 - Elementary
 - Secondary (Junior High)
 - High School
 - Vocational School/Community College
 - College/University
6. Sexual orientation:
 - Heterosexual (Straight)
 - Homosexual (Gay/Lesbian)
 - Bisexual
 - Other (please indicate) _____

Organizational Tolerance to LGB

One of the COWORKERS in your department continually makes many negative comments about lesbian, gay, and bisexual co-workers and calls them “sinners” and “perverted” to their faces.

- 1) How RISKY would it be for a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department to complain to someone in charge about this person?
 - a. Extremely risky; she or he would almost certainly create serious problems for herself/himself.
 - b. Very risky.
 - c. Somewhat risky.
 - d. Slightly risky.
 - e. No risk; she would not create any problem for herself/himself.
- 2) How LIKELY is it that a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department would be TAKEN SERIOUSLY if she complained to someone in charge about this person?
 - a. Almost no chance he/she would be taken seriously.
 - b. Little chance.
 - c. Some chance.
 - d. Good chance.
 - e. Very good chance that he/she would be taken seriously.

- 3) What do you think **WOULD BE DONE** if a woman in your department complained to someone in charge of this person?
- Probably nothing would be done.
 - Very little; maybe someone would talk to him.
 - The man would be told to stop.
 - The man would be given a formal warning.
 - There would be a very serious punishment.

A male **COWORKER** in your department repeatedly asks a female employee why she isn't married. In addition, he has tried to set her up on a date with a man several times even though she has said "no" each time. She doesn't want to confront the co-worker directly because she is afraid of letting him know she is a lesbian.

- 1) How **RISKY** would it be for a woman in your department to complain to someone in charge about this man?
 - Extremely risky; she would almost certainly create serious problems for herself.
 - Very risky.
 - Somewhat risky.
 - Slightly risky.
 - No risk; she would not create any problem for herself.
- 2) How **LIKELY** is it that a woman in your department would be taken **SERIOUSLY** if she complained to someone in charge about this man?
 - Almost no chance she would be taken seriously.
 - Little chance.
 - Some chance.
 - Good chance.
 - Very good chance that she would be taken seriously.
- 3) What do you think **WOULD BE DONE** if a woman in your department complained to someone in charge of this man?
 - Probably nothing would be done.
 - Very little; maybe someone would talk to him.
 - The man would be told to stop.
 - The man would be given a formal warning.
 - There would be a very serious punishment.

A **SUPERVISOR** in your department talks a lot about how he thinks it's "disgusting that homosexuals are asking for special rights" and that "they should just keep quiet about what they do in their bedrooms." He says this in front of his subordinates whom he knows are lesbian, gay and bisexual, generally making them all feel disliked, unwanted, and concerned about keeping their jobs.

- 1) How RISKY would it be for a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department to complain to someone in charge about this man?
 - a. Extremely risky; he/she would almost certainly create serious problems for herself/himself.
 - b. Very risky.
 - c. Somewhat risky.
 - d. Slightly risky.
 - e. No risk; he/she would not create any problem for herself.
- 2) How LIKELY is it that a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department would be TAKEN SERIOUSLY if she complained to someone in charge about this man?
 - a. Almost no chance he/she would be taken seriously.
 - b. Little chance.
 - c. Some chance.
 - d. Good chance.
 - e. Very good chance that he/she would be taken seriously.
- 3) What do you think WOULD BE DONE if a woman in your department complained to someone in charge of this man?
 - a. Probably nothing would be done.
 - b. Very little; maybe someone would talk to him.
 - c. The man would be told to stop.
 - d. The man would be given a formal warning.
 - e. There would be a very serious punishment.

A SUPERVISOR in your department has said several times that lesbian, gay, or bisexual employees should be stay quiet about their “personal lives” when people who don’t work at the company (e.g clients, customers) are around. At the same time, he encourages married heterosexual employees to discuss their families and display family pictures at their workplace because he wants to highlight the organization’s “family values.”

- 1) How RISKY would it be for a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department to complain to someone in charge about this man?
 - a. Extremely risky; he/she or he would almost certainly create serious problems for herself/himself.
 - b. Very risky.
 - c. Somewhat risky.
 - d. Slightly risky.
 - e. No risk; he/she would not create any problem for herself.
- 2) How LIKELY is it that a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department would be TAKEN SERIOUSLY if she complained to someone in charge about this man?
 - a. Almost no chance he/she would be taken seriously.

- b. Little chance.
 - c. Some chance.
 - d. Good chance.
 - e. Very good chance that he/she would be taken seriously.
- 3) What do you think **WOULD BE DONE** if a woman in your department complained to someone in charge of this man?
- a. Probably nothing would be done.
 - b. Very little; maybe someone would talk to him.
 - c. The man would be told to stop.
 - d. The man would be given a formal warning.
 - e. There would be a very serious punishment.

A male SUPERVISOR in your department always tells stories about the women he dates. He keeps asking one of his male subordinates to also tell him about his dates with women. The man tries to avoid the topic, but the supervisor persists and continues to ask him about his dating life. The man does not want to tell his supervisor about his dates because he is gay and he fears that disclosing this would lead to discrimination.

- 1) How **RISKY** would it be for a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department to complain to someone in charge about this man?
- a. Extremely risky; he/she or he would almost certainly create serious problems for herself/himself.
 - b. Very risky.
 - c. Somewhat risky.
 - d. Slightly risky.
 - e. No risk; he/she would not create any problem for herself.
- 2) How **LIKELY** is it that a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person in your department would be **TAKEN SERIOUSLY** if she complained to someone in charge about this man?
- a. Almost no chance he/she would be taken seriously.
 - b. Little chance.
 - c. Some chance.
 - d. Good chance.
 - e. Very good chance that he/she would be taken seriously.
- 3) What do you think **WOULD BE DONE** if the subordinate in your department complained to someone in charge of this man?
- a. Probably nothing would be done.
 - b. Very little; maybe someone would talk to him.
 - c. The man would be told to stop.
 - d. The man would be given a formal warning.
 - e. There would be a very serious punishment.

P-O Fit:

To what extent does your new organization measure up to the kind of organization you were seeking?

1. To a very little extent.
2. To somewhat of an extent.
3. Neither to an extent nor to no extent.
4. To a somewhat large extent.
5. To a very large extent.

Outness:

How open about your sexuality are you to each of these parties?

Heterosexual friends

1. Definitely does not know about your sexual orientation status.
2. Probably does not know about your sexual orientation status.
3. Definitely may not know about your sexual orientation status.
4. Definitely may/may not know about your sexual orientation status.
5. Definitely may know about your sexual orientation status.
6. Probably does know about your sexual orientation status.
7. Definitely knows about your sexual orientation status.

Work peers

1. Definitely does not know about your sexual orientation status.
2. Probably does not know about your sexual orientation status.
3. Definitely may not know about your sexual orientation status.
4. Definitely may/may not know about your sexual orientation status.
5. Definitely may know about your sexual orientation status.
6. Probably does know about your sexual orientation status.
7. Definitely knows about your sexual orientation status.

Work Supervisors

1. Definitely does not know about your sexual orientation status.
2. Probably does not know about your sexual orientation status.
3. Definitely may not know about your sexual orientation status.
4. Definitely may/may not know about your sexual orientation status.
5. Definitely may know about your sexual orientation status.
6. Probably does know about your sexual orientation status.
7. Definitely knows about your sexual orientation status.

Strangers

1. Definitely does not know about your sexual orientation status.
2. Probably does not know about your sexual orientation status.

3. Definitely may not know about your sexual orientation status.
4. Definitely may/may not know about your sexual orientation status.
5. Definitely may know about your sexual orientation status.
6. Probably does know about your sexual orientation status.
7. Definitely knows about your sexual orientation status.

Job Satisfaction:

On a 1-5 scale.

1. Being able to keep busy all the time.
2. The chance to work alone on the job.
3. The chance to do different things from time to time.
4. The chance to be “somebody” in the community.
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
7. Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.
9. The chance to do things for other people.
10. The chance to tell people what to do.
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
12. The way company policies are put into practice.
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.
14. The chances for advancement on this job.
15. The freedom to use my own judgment.
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
17. The working conditions.
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
19. The praise I get for doing a good job.
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.

Work Stress:

Never Rarely Sometimes Often Very Often

- A. Conditions at work are unpleasant or sometimes even unsafe. 1 2 3 4 5
- B. I feel that my job is negatively affecting my physical or emotional well being. 1 2 3 4 5
- C. I have too much work to do and/or too many unreasonable deadlines. 1 2 3 4 5
- D. I find it difficult to express my opinions or feelings about my job conditions to my superiors. 1 2 3 4 5
- E. I feel that job pressures interfere with my family or personal life. 1 2 3 4 5
- F. I have adequate control or input over my work duties. 5 4 3 2 1
- G. I receive appropriate recognition or rewards for good performance. 5 4 3 2 1
- H. I am able to utilize my skills and talents to the fullest extent at work. 5 4 3 2 1

Cynicism:

Scale of 1-5 to the degree participant agrees with statement.

1. Power and status makes people arrogant.
2. Kind-hearted people are easily bullied.
3. Powerful people tend to exploit others.
4. Kind-hearted people usually suffer losses.

Internalized homophobia:

1-5 point scale.

I have tried to stop being attracted to the same-sex in general.*

If someone offered me the chance to be completely heterosexual, I would accept the chance.*

I wish I weren't homosexual/bisexual.*

I feel that being homosexual/bisexual is a personal shortcoming for me.*

I would like to get professional help in order to change my sexual orientation from homosexual/bisexual to straight.*

I have tried to become more sexually attracted to the opposite sex.

I often feel it best to avoid personal or social involvement with other homosexual/bisexual same-sex people.

I feel alienated from myself because of being homosexual/bisexual.

I wish that I could develop more erotic feelings about the opposite sex.

References

- American Institute of Stress, (n.d.). *Workplace Stress Scale*. Retrieved from <http://www.stress.org/>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.
- Button, S. B. (2004). Identity management strategies utilized by lesbian and gay employees: A quantitative investigation. *Group & Organization Management, 29*, 470-494. doi:10.1177/1059601103257417
- Brenner, B. R., Lyons, H. Z., & Fassinger, R. E. (2010). Can heterosexism harm organizations? Predicting the perceived organizational citizenship behaviors of gay and lesbian employees. *The Career Development Quarterly, 58*, 321-335.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Charles, M. W., & Arndt, L. R. (2013). Gay- and lesbian-identified law enforcement officers: Intersection of career and sexual identity. *The Counseling Psychologist, 41*, 1153-1185. doi:10.1177/0011000012472376
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor (NEO-FFI) Inventory professional manual*. Odessa, FL: PAR.

- Dispenza, F. (2015). An exploratory model of proximal minority stress and the work–life interface for men in same-sex, dual-earner relationships. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 93*, 321-332. doi:10.1002/jcad.12030
- Ellis, A. L., & Riggle, E. B. (1996). The relation of job satisfaction and degree of openness about one's sexual orientation for lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 30*, 75-85. doi:10.1300/J082v30n02_04.
- Friedman, H. S., & Schustack, M. W. (2003). *Personality: Classic theories and modern research*. Allen & Bacon: Boston.
- Gardner, W. L., Reithel, B. J., Coglisier, C. C., Walumbwa, F. O., & Foley, R. T. (2012). Matching personality and organizational culture: Effects of recruitment strategy and the five-factor model on subjective person–organization fit. *Management Communication Quarterly, 26*, 585-622. doi:10.1177/0893318912450663
- Goldbach, J. T., & Gibbs, J. (2015). Strategies employed by sexual minority adolescents to cope with minority stress. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation And Gender Diversity, 2*, 297-306. doi:10.1037/sgd0000124
- Hardin, E. E., & Donaldson, J. I. (2014). Predicting job satisfaction: A new perspective on person–environment fit. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 61*, 634-640. doi:10.1037/cou0000039
- Kalla, S. (Jun 18, 2009). Statistical significance and sample size. Retrieved Oct 17, 2015 from: Explorable.com: <https://explorable.com/statistical-significance-sample-size>.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individual's fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization,

- person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342.
doi:10.1111/j.1744- 6570.2005.00672.x
- Leung, K., I., O. K., & Leung, K. (2010). Social Cynicism and Job Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59, 318-338. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00392.x
- Lyons, H. Z., Brenner, B. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (2005). A Multicultural Test of the Theory of Work Adjustment: Investigating the Role of Heterosexism and Fit Perceptions in the Job Satisfaction of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Employees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 537-548. doi:10.1037/0022-
- Madera, J. M., King, E. B., & Hebl, M. R. (2012). Bringing social identity to work: The influence of manifestation and suppression on perceived discrimination, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18, 165-170. doi:10.1037/a0027724
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P.T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52, 509–516.
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 674 –697.
- Miller, G. F., & Travers, C. J. (2005). Ethnicity and the experience of work: Job stress and satisfaction of minority ethnic teachers in the UK. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 17, 317-327. doi:10.1080/09540260500238470

- Mohr, J., & Fassinger, R. E. (2000). Measuring dimensions of lesbian and gay male experience. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 33, 66–90.
- Moradi, B., Wiseman, M. C., DeBlaere, C., Goodman, M. B., Sarkees, A., Brewster, M. E., & Huang, Y. (2010). LGB of color and white individuals' perceptions of heterosexist stigma, internalized homophobia, and outness: Comparisons of levels and links. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 38, 397-424.
doi:10.1177/0011000009335263
- Muchinsky, P. M., & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 268-277. doi:10.1016/0001-8791(87)90043-1.
- Murray, H. A. (1962). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Science Editions.
- Naus, F., van Iterson, A., & Roe, R. A. (2007). Value incongruence, job autonomy, and organization-based self-esteem: A self-based perspective on organization cynicism. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16, 195-219. doi:10.1080/13594320601143271
- Park, H. I., Monnot, M. J., Jacob, A. C., & Wagner, S. H. (2011). Moderators of the relationship between person-job fit and subjective well-being among Asian employees. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 18, 67-87.
doi:10.1037/a0021854

- Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29, 363–377.
- Rabelo, V. C., & Cortina, L. M. (2014). Two sides of the same coin: Gender harassment and heterosexist harassment in LGBTQ work lives. *Law and Human Behavior*, 38, 378-391. doi:10.1037/lhb0000087
- Rostosky, S. S., & Riggle, E. B. (2002). 'Out' at work: The relation of actor and partner workplace policy and internalized homophobia to disclosure status. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 411-419. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.49.4.411
- Ruiz-Palomino, P., & Martínez-Cañas, R. (2014). Ethical culture, ethical intent, and organizational citizenship behavior: The moderating and mediating role of person–organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120, 95-108. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1650-1
- Russo, G. (2012). Job and life satisfaction among part-time and full-time workers: The “identity” approach. *Review of Social Economy*, 70, 315-343. doi:10.1080/00346764.2011.632323
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 395– 427.
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2015). Individual and environmental sources of work stress among prison officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42, 800-818. doi:10.1177/0093854814564463

- Szymanski, D. M., & Ikizler, A. S. (2013). Internalized heterosexism as a mediator in the relationship between gender role conflict, heterosexist discrimination, and depression among sexual minority men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*, 211-219. doi:10.1037/a0027787
- Velez, B. L., & Moradi, B. (2012). Workplace support, discrimination, and person–organization fit: Tests of the theory of work adjustment with LGB individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*, 399-407. doi:10.1037/a0028326
- Velez, B. L., Moradi, B., & Brewster, M. E. (2013). Testing the tenets of minority stress theory in workplace contexts. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*, 532-542. doi:10.1037/a0033346
- Waldo, C. R. (1999). Working in a majority context: A structural model of heterosexism as minority stress in the workplace. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 218–232.
- Ward, J., & Winstanley, D. (2005). Coming out at work: Performativity and the recognition and renegotiation of identity. *The Sociological Review, 53*, 447-475. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.2005.00561.x
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Work Adjustment Project Industrial Relations Center.

