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ABSTRACT

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and questioning (LGBQ+) employees experience unique stress in the workplace due to their stigmatized concealable identity. This unique stress results in poor health outcomes, such as not feeling safe at work, decreased satisfaction with life, and increased emotional exhaustion. Research and theory have identified the importance of felt inclusion among employees. The purpose of this study was to test a model of how the intangible aspects of work (i.e., organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion, supervisor LGBQ+ inclusion, and felt inclusion) impact LGBQ+ employee job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management strategies. Additionally, two measures were created to measure organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion and felt inclusion. An online survey was distributed to LGBQ+ adults employed in the United States (N = 349). A path analysis conducted in LISREL showed that the hypothesized model was partially supported. Felt inclusion was shown to be the strongest and most important predictor of employee job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors. Additionally, supervisor inclusion had a direct and positive effect on felt inclusion. Lastly, organizational efforts were shown to positively predict supervisor inclusion directly, and positively predict felt inclusion indirectly. Furthermore, regression analyses showed that the newly created measure of felt inclusion was shown to be a stronger, yet unique predictor, of psychological safety compared to the widely used Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Climate Inventory.
(LGBTCI). These results provide support of measuring felt inclusion, rather than LGBT-supportive climate. This project also highlights the importance of measuring organizational efforts, supervisor inclusion, and felt inclusion when making decisions related to LGBQ+ inclusion. Additional theoretical and practical implications are discussed, as well as directions for future research.
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Felt inclusion Among LGBQ Employees: The Roles of the Organization and Supervisor

Research has documented the negative experiences (e.g., exclusion) of lesbian, gay, bisexual, questioning (LGBQ) employees at work, as well as the benefits of inclusion for LGBQ employees and organizations. Recently, exclusion for being LGBQ has been framed as a public health issue in need of addressing, correcting, and preventing in the future (Herek, 2017). Until June 15th, 2020 there was no federal protection for LGBQ employees from employment discrimination (Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia, 2020). However, even under federal protection, there is variation among states on how LGBQ employees are treated. Notably, organizations have made efforts in making LGBQ employees feel included while citing an ethical obligation to protect all employees (King & Cortina, 2010).

Research has identified that formal policies and procedures must be present in order to foster inclusion (Shore et al., 2018). Other research has identified support and inclusion efforts from co-workers and supervisors to foster an inclusive climate (Shore et al., 2011). However, no research to date has examined felt inclusion among LGBQ employees as an evaluation of their organizational efforts of LGBQ inclusion. Using frameworks of occupational health psychology, the current research investigates how organizational efforts of
LGBQ inclusion, as well as the role of the direct supervisor, foster feelings of inclusion.

**Inclusion and a Healthy Workplace**

Recent efforts have been made to create a safe and healthy workplace for all employees through an understanding of the healthy workplace framework from occupational health psychology (OHP). The primary focus of OHP is to investigate the intangible aspects of work and their effects on employees' psychological and physical health. OHP investigates how workplace procedures, policies, and leadership affect employee well-being, performance, and satisfaction (Barling & Griffiths, 2010; Blustein, 2008). With the additive values of OHP, there has been an increasing need to understand how the intangible aspects of the organization (e.g., culture, climate, and leadership) can impact employee performance, well-being, and other health outcomes. In turn, organizations are more likely to be successful due to this focus on these intangible aspects of work (Barling & Griffiths, 2010; Blustein, 2008; Grawitch et al., 2006; Macik-Frey et al., 2007).

OHP has also added to the understanding of what a “healthy” organization is. A healthy organization is one that is not only productive and adaptive, but one where employees feel satisfied, safe, and included at work (Cooper & Cartwright, 1994; Miles, 1965; Quick, 1999; Tetrick & Quick, 2010). The conceptualization of a healthy organization has evolved over the years, as maintaining a healthy...
workplace has become a priority, not only because it is good for the organization, but because a healthy workplace is innately good for employees.

It is also important to note that an organization is embedded in its larger community. Any community health issues from outside the organization have an opportunity to spill-over into the organization. To address this spill-over, it has been proposed that the definition of a healthy organization be extended to the community in which the organizations are located in (Tetrick & Quick, 2010). As Tetrick and Quick (2010) describe, "such an extension makes clear the public health perspective of occupational health psychology and its focus on prevention" (p.4).

To maintain a healthy organization, efforts have been adopted to focus on the intangible aspects of the workplace, such as policies, procedures, leadership, climate, and culture. One example of the benefits of the OHP healthy workplace framework is the advancement in the research and practice of employee inclusion by focusing on the intangible aspects of work. Having an inclusive organization not only improves the performance and health of an organization, but it also improves the performance and health of employees as well, because feeling included allows employees to feel a sense of purpose and meaning at work. For this reason, being effortful in achieving inclusion has been viewed as a social and economic imperative for organizations (King & Cortina, 2010).

This influence of OHP is also evident when observing the shift from managing workplace diversity to achieving inclusion in an organization. A recent
review discusses this shift and its importance by emphasizing the differences between diversity and inclusion (Shore et al., 2018). Diversity is defined as the differences in characteristics (e.g., race, sexual orientation, gender), visible and invisible, that influence how people think and behave (Shore et al., 2018). However, inclusion adds a focus on not only the characteristics of the employee, but those of the organization as well (e.g., organizational policies, practices, and procedures; supervisor behaviors) due to the direct influence organizational characteristics have on employees with diverse characteristics (Shore et al., 2018). As stated by Shore and colleagues (2018):

“Inclusion involves equal opportunity for members of socially marginalized groups to participate and contribute while concurrently providing opportunities for members of non-marginalized groups, and to support employees in their efforts to be fully engaged at all levels of the organization and to be authentically themselves.” (p. 177)

These efforts to focus on inclusion and support, rather than diversity and numbers, has allowed for employees to feel safe and be authentic about themselves, be involved in their work group, feel respect and valued, have influence on decision making, and be a part of an organization that recognizes, honors, and advances diversity (Ferdman, 2014). Although diversity may be easier to achieve than inclusion (Shore et al., 2018; Winters, 2014), having a diverse organization without fostering inclusion is unlikely to be beneficial for the employees or organization (Offerman & Basford, 2014; Shore et al., 2018).
Although it is important to foster health (e.g., inclusion) in a workplace, it is also important to understand when and why a workplace could be unhealthy. For example, the communities that an organization is embedded in may be biased towards certain marginalized groups. According to the healthy workplace framework, an organization is responsible for addressing these community issues (Tetrick & Quick, 2010).

LGBQ Mistreatment and Heterosexism as a Public Health Issue

Although inclusion is intersectional, in that it applies to all identities and experiences of diversity (Shore et al., 2018), the research regarding the inclusion of LGBQ employees is especially important, due to the LGBQ-identity being a concealable stigma that is present in all ethnicities, ages, and genders. Progress has been made over the last decade for LGBQ rights, as same-sex marriage has been legalized by the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) in 2016, as well as various states implementing anti-discrimination policies of their own to protect LGBQ individuals over the last decade. It was not until June 15th, 2020 when the SCOTUS ruled that LGBQ employees are protected from employment discrimination under the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia, 2020).

However, there is progress to be made, as research has shown that LGBQ employees continue to face discrimination at work even in the presence of anti-discrimination policies (Clair et al., 2005). Before this recent SCOTUS
decision, 22 state governments and Washington District of Columbia implemented laws, practices, and procedures that were intended to protect LGBTQ individuals from prejudice and discrimination (Human Rights Campaign, HRC, 2020a). However, religious institutions, private business, and small organizations (i.e., fewer than 15 employees) were exempt from these laws.

From a societal perspective, there has also been an increase in hate crimes against LGBTQ individuals (Herek, 2017; Herek et al., 2002; Human Rights Campaign, HRC 2020b). This societal bias towards LGBTQ individuals as a response to increased effort to achieve equality can be explained by heterosexism (Herek, 2007). Herek (2007) describes heterosexism as “a cultural ideology embodied in institutional practices that work to the disadvantage of sexual minority groups even in the absence of individual prejudice or discrimination” (p.2). Heterosexism is more prevalent in certain parts of the United States, as demonstrated by the amount of legislative protections and resources for LGBTQ individuals. It can be argued that heterosexism and LGBTQ exclusion are public health issues, given that exclusion can have prolonged effects on the health of LGBTQ individuals (Herek, 2017; Meyer, 2003). Herek (2017) states that hate crimes against sexual minorities as an extreme form of exclusion that is “a serious, widespread problem that warrant’s society’s attention” (p. 149).

I propose that LGBTQ exclusion be treated similarly to other public health issues by using the OHP healthy workplace framework to focus on the intangible
aspects of the workplace to diagnose and treat exclusion through a focus on prevention. Preventing exclusion can be created through organizational efforts to foster inclusion. This is related to the recommendation by Tetrick and Quick (2010) that there should be an extended focus on the environment in which the organization is located. Meaning that organizations located in communities that are exclusive towards LGBQ individuals should be effortful in preventing LGBQ exclusion in the workplace through inclusion efforts. Addressing LGBQ exclusion as a public health issue through the scope of OHP acknowledges that it is innately good for employees to feel included and that the intangible aspects of the workplace (i.e., culture, climate, leadership) have influences on inclusion. It is also important to understand the workplace experiences of LGBQ employees and how bad they could become.

**Workplace Experiences of LGBQ+ Employees**

Research has documented the prevalence and effects of LGBQ mistreatment at work. According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), the amount of social capital and influence an identity group has reflects their cognitions and behaviors (e.g., self-concept). Similarly, minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003) posits that LGBQ individuals live with disproportionate amounts of stress from society that is unique to their identity (e.g., experiences of heterosexism). This minority stress occurs due to the lack of social capital an LGBQ identity has in a social hierarchy that strongly favors heterosexism.
As a result of minority stress, LGBQ+ individuals suffer from psychological distress (Meyer, 2003) and low levels job satisfaction (Velez et al., 2013). These minority stressors include experiences of discrimination, expectations of stigma, internalized heterosexism, and concealment of LGBQ identity. Over the last two decades, research has demonstrated that LGBQ+ individuals experience these aforementioned minority stressors in the workplace (Clair et al., 2005; Croteau, 1996; Day & Schoenrade, 1997, 2000; Katz-Wise & Hyde, 2012; Ragins et al., 2007; Reed & Leuty, 2016; Velez et al., 2013).

One of the most researched stressors LGBQ employees face is managing a concealable and stigmatized identity in the workplace (i.e., deciding whether to disclose their sexual orientation). Because sexual orientation is an identity that is concealable, or invisible, the responsibility of disclosing one’s sexual orientation is on the individual (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001). This responsibility of disclosure is significant, since LGBQ employees could avoid negative outcomes, such as stereotyping and discrimination, by concealing their identity. However, disclosing a stigmatized identity can lead to benefits for the self, such as experiences of authenticity, self-congruence, and integrity (Goffman, 1963).

Stigma theory (Goffman, 1963) posits that individuals may have attributes or identities that are stigmatized according to society, and that these social biases can vary over time or context (Goffman, 1963). However, managing one’s LGBQ identity is uniquely stressfull in the workplace, due to lack of federal protections and the possibility that current protections may not be enforced (Clair
et al., 2005). This is similar to impression management theory (Goffman, 1959), which states that individuals may behave in certain ways in order to manipulate the attributions and impressions of another person. For example, a bisexual employee may make jokes or lie to co-workers about their bisexual identity in order for them to portray themselves as heterosexual. Additionally, a lesbian employee may not disclose their sexual orientation in order to avoid the risk of conforming to negative stereotypes towards lesbian individuals (i.e., stereotype threat, Steele & Aronson, 1995).

Sexual identity management has been identified as a relevant stressor in the workplace. Over the last two decades, research has investigated predictors (e.g., personality, internalized heterosexism, inclusive climate, and presence of protective policies) and outcomes (e.g., negative experiences, authenticity, social support) of identity management in the workplace (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001; Clair et al, 2005; Day & Schoenrade, 1997, 2000; King et al., 2017; Ragins et al., 2007; Reed & Leuty, 2016, Velez et al., 2013). Importantly, King and colleagues (2017) noted that certain sexual identity management strategies were predicted by the perception of LGBQ-related organizational climate (i.e., unsupportive to supportive), and the presence of protective policies. Specifically, when LGBQ employees perceived their organizational climate to be LGBQ-affirming, they were more likely to disclose and signal (i.e., “test the waters”) their sexual orientation (King et al., 2017). This is also consistent with a recent review that demonstrated that organizational climate was the strongest predictor of each of
the sexual identity management strategies (Reed & Leuty, 2016). Similar to stigma theory (Goffman, 1963) and the sexual identity management research, Chaudoir and Fisher (2010) state that “efforts to ‘pass’ as a nonstigmatized individual or suppress thoughts about the identity can create an additional cognitive load for people living with a concealable stigmatized identity” (p.16). In addition to cognitive load, the ambiguity from the environment in the organization (e.g., reactions after disclosure) can also foster stress.

LGBQ employees have significant amounts of stressful experiences in the workplace. These stressful experiences have detrimental effects on their health and well-being. It is a moral obligation for organizations to adhere to these stressful experiences, mitigate them, and foster inclusion (King & Cortina, 2010). One of the best ways for organizations to mitigate this stress and foster inclusion is to implement and enforce LGBQ-protective policies, as well as foster an inclusive climate (King et al., 2017, Reed Leuty, 2016). However, in order to further the research and practice to improve the workplace experiences of LGBQ employees, two current pitfalls need to be identified: (1) the measurement of “supportive” instead of “inclusive” LGB climate and (2) operationalizing an inclusive climate as a molar climate instead of a focused climate. I intend to address these pitfalls in hopes to improve the science and practice regarding inclusive organizations for LGBQ employees (e.g., measurement, recommendations, theoretical contributions).
Pitfall # 1: Supportive vs. Inclusive Climate. Organizational climate and culture have been studied extensively over the last century. Schneider and colleagues (2013; 2017) reviewed the importance of these constructs, as most studies agree that climate and culture are predictors of employees’ perceptions and behaviors. Indeed, these perceptions and behaviors influence employee and organizational outcomes such as job attitudes (e.g., satisfaction, turnover intentions, commitment), health and well-being, and organizational performance (Schneider et al., 2013; 2017).

Schneider and colleagues (2017) define organizational climate as:

“A summary perception derived from a body of interconnected experiences with organizational policies, practices and procedures (e.g., from leadership and HR practices, and so forth) and observations of what is rewarded, supported, and expected in the organization with these summary perceptions becoming meaningful and shared based on the natural interactions of people with each other. (p. 468)"

They also define organizational culture as:

“The shared values and basic assumptions that explain why organizations do what they do and focus on what they focus on; it exists at a fundamental, perhaps preconscious, level of awareness, is grounded in history and tradition and is a source of collective identity and commitment." (p. 468-469)

Over the last two decades, research has demonstrated the importance of how LGBQ employees assess their climate in organizations (Clair et al., 2005;
Griffith & Hebl, 2002; King & Cortina, 2010, Liddle et al., 2004; Lloren & Parini, 2017; Ragins, 2004; 2008; Waldo, 1999; Webster et al., 2017). Research has also aimed to measure LGBQ employees’ climate perceptions (e.g., LGBQ-supportive climate, Liddle et al., 2004). Liddle and colleagues (2004) define LGB-supportive climate as a unidimensional evaluation of the “formal and informal organizational aspects of an institutional environment that affect employees’ experience on the job” that ranges from “actively supportive to openly hostile” (p. 33). Given this definition, LGB-supportive climate is identical to diversity climate. As described by Nishii (2013, p.1760), diversity climate refers to the fairness of organizational practices on the treatment of minority employees.

However, it is important to note that supportive/diversity climate and inclusion climate are not the same (Nishii, 2013). According to Nishii (2013, p. 1760), inclusion climate encompasses a focus on the minority employees being able to engage as their “whole selves” as the others learn from the perspectives of these minority employees. Nishii (2013) demonstrated that climate for inclusion is also predictive of job attitudes (e.g., satisfaction, commitment) and behaviors (e.g., turnover, organizational citizenship behaviors). Researchers have encouraged the science to go beyond the effects of diversity, fairness, supporting, equal opportunity, and absence of discrimination to a focus on inclusion (Dwertmann et al., 2016; Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2011; 2018). Doing so would gain more valuable insights, lead to more valid conclusions, and also
generate new research questions, thus benefiting individuals, marginalized groups, and organizations.

Although there is not a validated measurement of felt inclusion related to LGBQ employees specifically, LGB-supportive climate is predominantly measured with the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Climate Inventory (LGBTCI, Liddle et al., 2004). However, recent research has critiqued the scoring of this measure (Holman et al., 2018), proposing that LGBQ-supportive climate should be described as “the overall level of support or hostility towards LGBQ people that is present” (Holman, 2016, p.252). It is important to note that Holman’s (2016) definition is significantly different than the conceptualization and measurement posed by Liddle and colleagues (2004). Therefore, some researchers have utilized the LGBTCI as a measurement of workplace hostility and workplace support (i.e., separating the LGBTCI into two-subscales; Brewster et al., 2012; Holman, 2016; Holman et al., 2018). Indeed, this utilization is supported by the minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003). As stated by Holman and colleagues (2018):

“In the face of hostility, positive reactions from colleagues following sexual orientation disclosure minimized negative outcomes. Thus, minority stress theory does not position hostility and support as opposing factors but as two separate constructs, each of which has a potential impact on the lived experience and health of LGBQ people and thus should be measured as such.” (p.5)
Holman and colleagues (2018) conducted a latent class analysis including 442 LGBQ employees and found support for a four-class model fit. These four classes include: (1) a supportive work climate (i.e., high support, low hostility); (2) a tolerant work climate (i.e., moderate support, low hostility); (3) an ambiguous work climate (i.e., low support, moderate hostility); and (4) a hostile work climate (i.e., low support, high hostility).

The measurement and conceptualization of LGBQ organizational climate has advanced over the last two decades. Research has transitioned from holding the perspectives of organizational tolerance of heterosexism (Waldo, 1999), to LGB-supportive climate as a singular dimension (Liddle et al., 2004), to a two-dimensional perception of LGB-supportive climate (i.e., supportive and hostile, Brewster et al., 2012; Holman, 2016; Holman et al., 2018) that has further been conceptualized as having four distinct classes (Holman et al., 2018). However, one important gap in the research regarding LGBQ inclusion is the lack of integration of inclusion. As previously described, the distinction between a supportive climate and an inclusive climate is notable (Nishii, 2013). Therefore, this study will test a measurement of felt inclusion among LGBQ employees in an effort to address this pitfall in the research and improve the science and practice of inclusive organizations for LGBQ employees (Dwertmann et al., 2016; Nishii, 2013; Shore et al., 2011; 2018).

**Pitfall #2: Molar vs. Focused Climate.** Research in organizational climate has recently reviewed the important distinction between molar climate and
focused climate (Schneider et al., 2013; 2017). Molar climate is the traditional approach to climate that is in reference to a broad or generic evaluation of the organization (Schneider et al., 2017). In contrast, focused climate refers to a climate that is specific to a “climate for something”, in that it is related to a specific evaluation of an organization (e.g., climate for safety, climate for innovation; Schneider et al., 2017).

This emphasis on specific climate perception has been argued since the near inception of organizational climate (Schneider, 1975). Arguments have been made for focused climates to relate to the focused organizational culture (e.g., policies, practices, and procedures; Schneider, 1975; Schneider et al., 2013; 2017; Zohar, 2000; Zohar & Luria, 2005). Meaning, it is best practice to pair organizational-levels of culture (e.g., efforts, policies, practices, and procedures of a specific organization) with organizational-levels of the focused climate. For example, Zohar and Luria (2005) conducted a study on organizational safety climate, which measured employee perceptions of safety climate in one organization, given that all employees are exposed to the same organizational safety culture, yet could have different perceptions of how that culture relates to safety climate.

Dwertmann and colleagues (2016) identify this lack of match between research design and analysis has led to a pitfall in climate research. However, when collecting data from employees that are not in the same organization (i.e., psychological level of a focused climate), it would be important to also measure
the focused organizational culture of the specific employee. For example, if Zohar and Luria (2005) sampled employees from various organizations, it would be recommended to measure organizational safety culture of that particular employee along with their psychological climate perceptions of their individual organization.

These distinctions between molar and focused climate identify two important gaps in the current research regarding felt inclusion. The first being that the most commonly used measure of climate perceptions among LGBQ employees, the LGBTCI (Liddle et al., 2004), is a measure of supportive climate rather than inclusive climate. This distinction is important as LGB-supportive climate refers to the fairness and equality of the treatment of LGBQ employees, whereas felt inclusion possesses a focus on LGBQ+ employees being able to be their true selves, while being integrated into the organization (Nishii, 2013). This is similar to the distinction between the fairness and discrimination perspective (i.e., climate perceptions are based on being treated fairly and not experiencing discrimination) and the synergy perspective (i.e., climate perceptions that are based on the benefits of diversity) of diversity climate (Dwertmann et al., 2016). This is also similar to the distinction for an organization to be oriented towards avoiding exclusion and discrimination, by complying with the law, compared to the orientation of fostering inclusion because the organization values diversity and inclusion. Therefore, a measure of felt inclusion is more appropriate than a measure of LGB-supportive climate.
The second gap in the research with the predominant use of the LGBTCI is that, although it is a measure of a focused climate, it is not in a response to organizational culture (i.e., efforts, policies, practices, and procedures related to LGBQ+ inclusion). This leads to limitations in the research and practice of LGBQ+ inclusion. In a recent review, Webster et al. (2017) called for the advancement to identify specific LGBQ-related organizational policies, practices, and procedures to better predict outcomes. Without the measurement of organizational culture or efforts towards LGB inclusion, the theoretical inferences drawn from felt inclusion measures are limited, as there is no advancement in the theory. Nor does this strategy address the call for research to identify best practices for organizations to cultivate felt inclusion among LGBQ+ employees.

This also limits the practical implications of felt inclusion. For example, if organizations were to assess their inclusive climate, without also measuring efforts, policies, or practices related to inclusion, the recommendations for how to improve said organizational policies, practices, and procedures are limited. This is because there is no linkage between the existing practices of inclusion (or lack thereof) and the assessment of felt inclusion. Therefore, it should be considered best practice to measure climate at the organization-level whenever possible, in that it is an outcome of specific efforts, policies, practices, and procedures.

The term felt inclusion will be used in the current study as an integration and advancement of LGBT-supportive climate (Liddle et al., 2004) and climate for inclusion (Shore et al., 2018). Felt inclusion is defined as equal opportunity for
LGBQ employees to participate and contribute while concurrently providing opportunities for non-LGBQ employees, and to support employees in their efforts to be fully engaged at all levels of the organization and to be authentically themselves. Additionally, the current study will measure felt inclusion in response to LGBQ-related organizational efforts. This specification holds value in the application and science of inclusion, as specific efforts can be evaluated in terms of not only how they impact felt inclusion, but the other outcomes as well (e.g., job attitudes, health and well-being, sexual identity management).

**The Benefits of Felt Inclusion.** Similar to LGB-supportive climate, felt inclusion is proposed to be predictive of beneficial outcomes for both LGBQ+ employees and their organizations. King and Cortina (2010) have called for the implementation and improvement of policies and practices that support LGBQ+ inclusion efforts in organizations. This call was in response to the lack of federal protections for LGBQ+ employees, the negative health outcomes associated with discrimination, and the ethical imperative for organizations to promote the good of their employees and their communities (King & Cortina, 2010). This focus is similar to that of the OHP healthy workplace framework, in that a healthy workplace focuses on the health and well-being of their employees through an effort on improving the intangible aspects of the workplace (e.g., culture, climate, and leadership; Cooper & Cartwright, 1994; Miles, 1965; Quick, 1999; Tetrick & Quick, 2010). It is also equally important to address the needs of the community that the organization is embedded in (Tetrick & Quick, 2010).
Perceptions of inclusion are predictive of a variety of outcomes for employees. Shore and colleagues (2011) proposed a model that contains organizational antecedents (i.e., climate, leadership, practices) and outcomes of perceptions of inclusion. Perceptions of inclusion are related to job attitudes, job performance, and employee health (Shore et al., 2011). I propose that this model generalizes to the current study. As noted by Webster and colleagues (2017), LGBQ+ employees create their perceptions of inclusion through contextual supports in the organization (e.g., policies and practices, climate, and supportive relationships at work).

The theoretical explanations on the benefits of inclusion for LGBQ+ employees can be explained by psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999), minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003), stigma theory (Goffman, 1963), impression management (Goffman, 1959), stereotype threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995), and sexual identity management (Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001).

Psychological safety is the assessment that it is safe for employees to take interpersonal risks in their interactions with their work team, supervisor, or other members of the organization (Edmondson, 1999). Psychological safety is as an important component of inclusion (Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2018), because research has demonstrated that the presence of psychological safety allows employees to feel secure when taking interpersonal risks at work (Bradley et al., 2012).
Minority stress theory (Meyer, 2003) describes the unique stressors LGBQ+ individuals face in society and the workplace (Velez et al., 2013). However, in organizations that have an inclusive climate towards LGBQ+ employees, this stress is buffered (Meyer, 2007; Velez et al., 2012). Inclusive climates also allow LGBQ+ employees to be authentic about their identity, which is another important component of inclusion (Ferdman, 2014, Shore et al., 2018). This relates to stigma theory (Goffman, 1963), as LGBQ+ individuals that feel included do not have to experience an internal conflict in deciding whether to disclose their stigmatized identity or to conceal and hinder feelings of authenticity. An inclusive climate also allows LGBQ+ employees to feel no need to engage in impression management (Goffman, 1959), not have to worry about stereotype threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995), and engage in healthy sexual identity management strategies (i.e., disclosing their sexual orientation Chrotbot-Mason et al., 2001).

In summary, felt inclusion fosters a healthy workplace for LGBQ+ employees. Healthy workplaces benefit both the employees and the organization, in terms of health and well-being, job satisfaction, and performance (Barling & Griffiths, 2010; Blustein, 2008). However, as emphasized by King and Cortina (2010), inclusion efforts towards LGBQ+ employees are needed to not only increase organizational efficiency, but as an ethical obligation to the organization’s community, stakeholders, and employees. Research has recently theorized how an organization’s orientations (i.e., motivations) for achieving
inclusion can produce different employee and organizational outcomes (Shore et al., 2018).

Organizational Orientations and Practices of LGBQ Inclusion

Shore and colleagues (2018) theorized a model of inclusive organizations that contains two orientations or motivational pathways in fostering perceptions of organizational inclusion among employees: 1) management prevention orientation and 2) management promotion orientation (i.e., prevent exclusion and promote inclusion).

The orientation to prevent exclusion is demonstrated when an organization is committed to complying with laws to avoid lawsuits (Shore et al., 2018). Organizations that hold this orientation focus on preventing exclusion by implementing practices and policies to prevent lawsuits and other damages by complying with the law. For example, organizations that hold this orientation are effortful in recruiting those with marginalized identities, managing claims of harassment and discrimination, as well as implementing diversity trainings in order to abide by laws and prevent exclusion. Shore and colleagues (2018) state that this orientation to prevent exclusion and abide by laws is important to achieve an inclusive climate, but it is not enough in itself to foster employee perceptions of inclusion.

Conversely, organizations that promote inclusion do so because they are committed to diversity and inclusion (Shore et al., 2018). Through this
commitment, the organization focuses on enhancing inclusion efforts throughout the hierarchy of the organization, by ensuring that employees with marginalized identities are represented in all levels of the organization. In these organizations, policies and practices are not only lawful, but are effortful in enhancing Ferdman’s (2014) six themes of inclusion (i.e., psychological safety, involvement in work group, feeling respected and valued, influence on decision-making, authenticity, and recognizing, honoring, and advancing diversity). Through this orientation, the organization creates not only an inclusive climate, but also fosters employee perceptions of inclusion, thus leading to more benefits for the organization and marginalized employees (Shore et al., 2018). However, Shore and colleagues (2018) call for research to empirically test their model: “There is a need for validated, conceptually grounded measures for each of these inclusion foci. At present, there are many different measures available in the literature, but there is a lack of clarity about which may best reflect a particular inclusion theme or how valid each of the existing measures is.” (p. 186)

In terms of inclusion towards LGBQ+ employees, such a measure would be useful in understanding the impact of specific organizational practices on LGBQ+ employee perceptions of inclusion and outcomes (e.g., health- and work-related). LGBQ+ employment protection laws and resources vary among states, due to the lack of federal protections. Likewise, organizations looking to prevent exclusion and promote inclusion of LGBQ+ employees, may struggle in finding empirical evidence to guide them when adopting policies and practices. What
efforts can organizations make to make their LGBQ+ employees feel included? By integrating theory and empirical evidence, the current study aims to demonstrate effective organizational efforts that promote inclusion and prevent exclusion towards LGBQ+ employees. These efforts will allow organizations to improve felt inclusion among LGBQ+ employees.

**Organizational Efforts Towards Inclusion**

When organizations implement policies and practices that protect LGBQ+ employees, LGBQ+ employees experience more positive job attitudes, engage in more proactive workplace behaviors, have better health and well-being, and disclose their sexual orientation at work more frequently (Brewster et al., 2012; Chrotbot-Mason et al., 2001; Clair et al., 2005; Griffith & Hebl, 2002; King & Cortina, 2010; Lloren & Parini, 2017; Ragins, 2004, 2008; Tejada, 2006; Velez et al., 2013; Waldo, 1999; Webster et al., 2017). However, practices that protect LGBQ+ employees from exclusion are not always enough to foster employee perceptions of inclusion (Shore et al., 2018). For example, there could be a lack of enforcement from supervisors, insufficient employee knowledge of the policy, or continued negative experiences for LGBQ+ employees (e.g., mistreatment, discrimination, stereotyping, etc.; Clair et al., 2005; Dwertmann et al., 2016; Webster et al., 2017). Therefore, organizations may need to implement different types of practices to foster Ferdman’s (2014) six themes of inclusion. For example, some organizations have increased their efforts through implementing diversity statements, offering same-sex benefits coverage, creating resource
groups, and encouraging employees to invite their same-sex partners to company-wide social events (Button, 2001; Pizer et al., 2012; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Tejada, 2006). Although LGBTQ+ employees may vary in how useful they view the effort, a common outcome in organizations being effortful is institutional support. The presence of LGB-related practices and policies can lead to employees’ perceptions of support from their organization (Ragins, 2008).

Organizational climate and culture perceptions are often created through the presence of policies, enforcement from management, and the attitudes and perceptions of the employees (Schneider et al., 2017). In short, organizations need to show an effort towards achieving inclusion through implementing and enforcing policies and practices. However, not all efforts equally express the goals or culture of an organization. Using a multilevel approach, Zohar and Luria (2005) proposed that organizations implement practices that are categorized into three domains of organizational efforts: (1) those meant to declare or inform (i.e., declarative practices), (2) those that focus on monitoring or enforcing (i.e., active practices), and (3) those that promote learning and development (i.e., proactive practices).

Declarative practices are those that espouse an organization’s commitments through assertions to employees (Zohar & Luria, 2005). For example, an organization would be implementing a declarative practice if information was provided to employees on the organization’s philosophy of inclusion towards LGBTQ+ employees and how it is achieved (i.e., through a
mission statement, employee handbook, or resources given to LGBQ+ employees). Organizations could also demonstrate support of their LGBQ+ employees by displaying LGB-related artifacts in an organization that promote inclusion and equality (e.g., SafeZone stickers, rainbow flags, pictures of same-sex couples, etc.).

Although declarative practices ensure that employees are aware and knowledgeable of the organization’s espoused commitment toward inclusion, there is potential for differentiation in espoused action (i.e., what the organization envisions or says) and what the organization does to achieve their goals (i.e., enacted action). This relates to what Clair and colleagues (2005) describe as “empty promises” from an organization. Enacted action can be achieved using active and proactive practices. It is important that organizations not only inform employees on the importance of inclusion, they also need to show effort in achieving inclusion.

Active practices are enacted by organizations to enforce employee compliance with organizational policies through frequent monitoring and control (Zohar & Luria, 2005). For example, a responsive reporting system for LGBQ+ employees to submit claims of discrimination and exclusion is considered an active practice in achieving inclusion. The important aspect of these types of practices are that they work towards compliance with organizational policies and espoused views (i.e., declarative practices). However, actively managing harassment and discrimination claims made by LGBQ+ employees, may not be
enough for employees to foster felt inclusion, as it may not address the underlying issue of harassment and discrimination. This is similar to the OHP healthy workplace framework in focusing on preventing future health issues, in addition to reacting to existing issues (Tetrick & Quick, 2010). This is also similar to the model of inclusive organizations. Organizations cannot foster employee perceptions of inclusion, solely by ensuring compliance with organizational practices and managing harassment and discrimination as it occurs (Shore et al., 2018). Rather, organizations need to foster inclusive climates and employee perceptions of inclusion, by being proactive in their efforts.

Proactive practices are those that promote learning and development to enhance employee capacities and competencies related to organizational goals (e.g., achieving inclusion; Zohar & Luria, 2005). These practices work towards enhancing employee learning and development to avoid future risks. For example, organizations that hold frequent organization-wide inclusion trainings for employees are proactively working to ensure employees are acquiring skills to achieve organizational inclusion. Similarly, organizations could foster perceptions of inclusion through Ferdman’s (2014) six themes of inclusion by implementing formal practices like LGBQ+ mentorship programs, allyship training for employees, and a performance appraisal system that assesses employees on their inclusive behaviors.

In addition to organizational practices, Zohar and Luria (2005) identify the supervisor as an important source of culture and climate perceptions. They
explain that supervisors can enforce organizational policies (e.g., safety procedures) or use their discretion to make exceptions to policies or to not enforce specific policies. This multilevel conceptualization of climate and culture is similar to the concept of supervisor's organizational embodiment (SOE, Eisenberger et al., 2010). According to Eisenberger and colleagues (2010), “employees form a perception concerning the extent of their supervisor’s shared identity with the organization” (p. 2). Therefore, based on the multilevel framework of organizational climate and culture (Zohar & Luria, 2005) and SOE (Eisenberger et al., 2010), supervisors have a predominant role in both the enforcement of organizational practices and felt inclusion among LGBQ+ employees.

The Role of Supervisor Inclusion

Because supervisors serve as representatives of organizational culture (Eisenberger et al., 2010) and have the opportunity to give immediate and frequent feedback on employee performance and behaviors (Zohar & Luria, 2005), employee perceptions of organizational climate are in large part formed by interactions with their supervisor. For example, supervisors have the opportunity to enforce the organizational efforts related to inclusion, thus making these practices more salient and effective. Supervisors can also demonstrate their own competency for inclusion, or how well supervisors endorse inclusive ideologies and exhibit skills related to fostering inclusion (i.e., supervisor competency of
inclusion, SCI, Nishii, 2013). SCI shares some of the same processes and outcomes as positive treatment, which is an important component in many leadership theories (Avolio et al., 2004; Ilies et al., 2005).

Research has demonstrated that respectful and supportive supervisors encourage open and honest communication that allows their subordinates to share their values, opinions, and information (Avolio et al., 2004). This relates to SCI, as supervisors need to demonstrate positive behaviors (e.g., being respectful, supportive, honest, authentic) to allow their subordinates to be honest, authentic, and feel psychologically safe in their workplace – all being key components of inclusion (Ferdman, 2014).

Positive behaviors from the supervisor can also directly influence the health and well-being of their subordinates. For example, research has identified the importance of authentic leadership behaviors (e.g., Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Boekhorst, 2015; Ilies et al., 2005; Jensen & Luthans, 2006). Authentic leaders have a deep awareness of their own thoughts and actions, as well as their subordinates’ perspectives, knowledge, and strengths. Through this awareness, authentic leaders lead with confidence, hope, optimism, resiliency, and morality (Avolio et al., 2004).

Ilies and colleagues (2005) theorized a model and proposed that supervisors with an authentic leadership style have followers that (1) identify more strongly with both their supervisor and organization; (2) experience more positive emotional states and higher levels of self-realization; (3) demonstrate
more authentic behaviors and; (4) have an increase in intrinsic motivation, self-esteem, and creativity. Indeed, authentic leadership behaviors is similar to SCI, in that both can foster inclusion (Boekhorst, 2015), and promote their subordinates to be authentic and inclusive (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Ilies et al., 2005).

Positive supervisory behaviors are also linked to higher job satisfaction, and performance under positive supervision, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Avolio et al., 2004; 2009; Jensen & Luthans, 2006). This can be explained by positive psychology’s broaden-and-build theory (Fredrickson, 2001) – which states that individuals who have positive psychological resources grow more effectively and feel encouraged to experience new, varied, and exploratory cognitions and actions. In summary, it is proposed that SCI is one such positive psychological resource that is similar to authentic leadership but fosters Ferdman’s (2014) six themes of inclusion. Supervisors are a vital part of climate perceptions (Zohar & Luria, 2005), as they are embodied in their organization’s culture (Eisenberger et al., 2010). However, through the use of discretion, supervisors may not always behave in accord with their organization’s culture (Zohar & Luria, 2005). The importance of inclusive supervisors is noteworthy. However, no research to date has specifically examined the competencies of inclusion towards LGBQ+ individuals. Because LGBQ+ identity is a concealable identity (Goffman, 1963), supervisors may need
to utilize different competencies than they would for employees with non-concealable identities.

The Interaction of Supervisor Inclusion and Organizational Efforts

Although an organization may make efforts to be inclusive, direct supervisors can be exclusive due to their attitudes towards LGBQ+ individuals. For example, although an organization has inclusion towards LGBQ+ employees as part of their culture through the presence of inclusive policies and practices, a supervisor may not enforce them as a result of their own prejudice, lack of awareness, or because they lack the competency to be inclusive towards their LGBQ+ subordinates. Exclusion from a supervisor can hinder employee perceptions of the organization’s culture (Eisenberger et al., 2010), as well as lead to negative climate perceptions because of the feedback and power of the supervisor (Zohar & Luria, 2005). However, supervisors can also demonstrate competencies of inclusion as an extra-role behavior in organizations that are exclusive or do not have resources or protective practices for LGBQ+ employees. King and Cortina’s (2010) argument that organizations are ethically obligated to promote inclusion for the betterment of their employees can also be translated to supervisors. Using this argument, supervisors should be inclusive towards LGBQ+ employees because it is innately good for employees and should not exclude their LGBQ+ employees which would cause great harm to them.

In summary, because employee climate perceptions are formed from both the organization’s culture and the supervisor’s actions, the interaction between
the two are important to consider when evaluating felt inclusion among LGBQ+ employees and its outcomes. Therefore, the current study will test a comprehensive model that includes this interaction.

Outcomes and Antecedents of Felt Inclusion

Felt inclusion is proposed to be predicted by the organization’s efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion and SCI. The presence of declarative, active, and proactive organizational efforts that promote inclusion are proposed to predict positive perceptions of felt inclusion (Chorbot-Mason et al., 2001; King et al., 2017; Ragins, 2008, Reed & Leuty, 2016). However, the following conditions must be met for these efforts to have influence: (1) information regarding these practices must be shared with employees to ensure familiarity; (2) employees must have reactions of usefulness, safety, or protection regarding the practices; and (3) these practices must be robust in terms how seriously this practice is enforced, who the practice is useful for (i.e., organization, LGBQ+ employees, or both), and whether the effort is meant to foster felt inclusion or prevent exclusion. Conversely, when employees do not believe that their organization’s efforts satisfy these three conditions, felt inclusion will be adversely impacted. However, certain practices are proposed to carry more weight in predicting felt inclusion (i.e., proactive > active > declarative).
Hypothesis 1: Organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion positively predicts felt inclusion. When organizations show greater effort to achieve inclusion, LGBQ+ employees will experience more felt inclusion.

Hypothesis 2: Organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion positively predicts for supervisor competency of LGB inclusion. Organizations that show greater effort to achieve inclusion also foster more inclusive supervisors.

Supervisor competency of LGB inclusion is also proposed to predict felt inclusion. This is due in part to supervisors being embedded in their organization’s culture (Eisenberger et al., 2010). Research has shown that supervisor actions promote subordinate climate perceptions (Zohar & Luria, 2005). Conversely, supervisors that do not demonstrate competencies of LGB inclusion will foster negative perceptions felt inclusion among LGBQ+ employees.

Hypothesis 3: Supervisor competency of LGB inclusion positively predicts felt inclusion. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to greater felt inclusion.

Organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion and supervisor competency of LGB inclusion will also interreact to influence felt inclusion. The best condition to foster felt inclusion is when there are high levels of organizational efforts and high levels of supervisor inclusion. The worst conditions to fostering a felt inclusion should be when the organization does not make efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion and when supervisors are exclusive. However, low organizational efforts and an inclusive supervisor is proposed to
foster better perceptions of felt inclusion, due to the frequent interaction employees have with their direct supervisors (Zohar & Luria, 2005).

Hypothesis 4: Organizational efforts and supervisor inclusion will interact to predict felt inclusion. High effort organizations with inclusive supervisors will have the highest levels of felt inclusion. Low effort organizations with inclusive supervisors will have moderately high levels of felt inclusion. High effort organizations with exclusive supervisors will have moderately low levels of felt inclusion. Low effort organizations with exclusive supervisors will relate to the lowest levels of felt inclusion.

**Felt Inclusion and Job Attitudes**

Overall job satisfaction and turnover intentions are two of the most common indicators of job attitudes (i.e., one’s overall appraisals of their job and the subsequent behaviors in the workplace, Triandis, 1992). Job satisfaction is essentially one’s appraisal of their overall job (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998) and can range between positive and negative evaluations. Colarelli (1984) defines turnover intentions as the intention to quit one’s job. Job satisfaction has consistently been shown to negatively correlate with turnover intentions (Colarelli, 1984; Whitman et al., 2010), and satisfaction and intention to quit are both consistently predictive of quitting one’s job (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Whitman et al., 2010). Job attitudes have also been shown to be correlated with job performance ($r = .30$, Judge et al., 2001), job behaviors (e.g., turnover, withdrawal, citizenship behaviors, and counterproductive behaviors; Organ &
Ryan, 1995), and employee health (e.g., Semmer, 2010). Specifically, employees who have positive job attitudes are more likely to be better performers, engage in positive job behaviors (e.g., organizational citizenship behaviors – OCBs), less negative behaviors (e.g., turnover/withdrawal, counterproductive work behaviors – CWBs) and are more likely to have better health than employees with negative job attitudes.

Job attitudes are proposed to be predicted by organizational efforts towards inclusion, supervisory competency of LGB inclusion, as well as felt inclusion. Specifically, organizational efforts towards LGBQ inclusion is hypothesized to predict high levels of job satisfaction and low levels of turnover intentions. Previous research has demonstrated that the presence of policies fosters these positive job attitudes (e.g., Lloren & Parini, 2017; Tejada, 2006). Similarly, felt inclusion is proposed to predict positive job attitudes. This is also based on previous findings demonstrating that when LGBQ employees view their climate as supportive or inclusive, they have more positive job attitudes (Liddle et al., 2004, Webster et al., 2017). Lastly, previous research has indicated how supervisor behaviors can predict job attitudes (Avolio et al., 2004; Chiaburu et al., 2011). It is also hypothesized that supervisor competency of LGB inclusion positively predicts job satisfaction and negatively predicts turnover intentions.

In summary, organizational efforts towards inclusion is proposed to predict job attitudes through three pathways: (1) directly from organizational efforts towards inclusion; (2) through the process of felt inclusion and; (3) through the
process of supervisor competency of LGB inclusion. It is hypothesized that organizational efforts, felt inclusion, and supervisor competency of LGB inclusion A) positively relates to job satisfaction and B) negatively relates to turnover intentions. Meaning, the more inclusive LGB employees assess their organization, the more positive appraisals LGBQ employees will have towards their jobs.

Hypothesis 5a: Organizational efforts will positively predict job satisfaction. More organizational efforts will relate to higher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5b: Felt inclusion will positively predict job satisfaction. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict job satisfaction. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to higher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict turnover intentions. More organizational efforts will relate to lower intention to quit.

Hypothesis 6b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict turnover intentions. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower intention to quit.

Hypothesis 6c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict turnover intentions. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to lower intention to quit.

Felt Inclusion, Health, and Well-Being

Stress, emotional exhaustion, psychological safety, and life satisfaction are common indicators of employee health and well-being (see Ganster &
perceptions of an event or environment and their coping abilities (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983; Lazarus, 1991). According to Lazarus (1991), perceptions of stress are manifested as a result of a two-step process where 1) an event is perceived as a threat to well-being (i.e., a stressor), and 2) individuals evaluate their options for coping as ineffective to handling the stressor. In terms of inclusion, perceived stress would occur when 1) LGBTQ employees appraise their workplace as exclusive and a threat to their well-being (i.e., as a stressor) and, 2) LGBTQ employees believe they do not have the ability to cope or alleviate this stressor. Physiological responses to perceived stress include increases in blood pressure, heart rate, and cortisol, and decreases in oxytocin, and immune system effectiveness (Heaphy, 2007; Heaphy & Dutton, 2008; & Sonnentag & Frese, 2003).

Emotional exhaustion is described as one of the most important symptoms of burnout. As emotional exhaustion increases and emotional resources are depleted, employees are less able to be psychologically healthy at work (Maslach & Jackson, 1986). For LGBTQ+ employees, emotional exhaustion could manifest as an antecedent of minority stress. For example, LGBTQ+ employees in organizations that have an unsupportive climate may need to engage in greater emotional regulation and use more psychological resources to monitor their behavior and thoughts at work to avoid harassment and discrimination (Androsiglio, 2009). Additionally, LGBTQ+ employees working with unsupportive
and exclusive supervisors may also need to engage in more of this regulation and experience greater emotional exhaustion (Rabelo & Cortina, 2014).

Psychological safety refers to the degree to employees feel safe in taking interpersonal risks in their interactions with others at work (e.g., co-workers, a supervisor, Edmondson, 1999). Psychological safety has been identified as a critical component in feeling included (Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2018). When employees feel secure in taking interpersonal risks at work, employees feel more comfortable discussing sensitive topics (e.g., group conflict and performance, Bradley et al., 2012). Psychological safety has also been linked with psychological distress, emotional exhaustion, and employee engagement, such that when an environment is not perceived as psychologically safe, psychological health problems occur and employees become less engaged in their work (Dollard & Bakker, 2010).

Lastly, life satisfaction is the cognitive appraisal process where one judges their own life circumstances to what they believe is an appropriate standard (Diener et al., 1985). Life satisfaction has been labeled an important construct in public health research, as it is a summary of various parts of life, including health and well-being (Strine, et al., 2008). Through an archival data analysis of the 2005 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, Strine and colleagues (2008) found that life satisfaction was negatively related to poor mental health (i.e., depression, and anxiety) and poor physical health (sleep insufficiency, plain, and limitations in activity).
Employee health and well-being is a critical outcome in OHP research, as the focus is to see how the intangible aspects of the workplace (i.e., culture, climate, leadership) impact employee health and well-being. Although healthy employees benefit organizational performance, organizations also have an ethical obligation to do no harm and promote health and inclusion in the workplace (King & Cortina, 2010), especially in communities that need it most (Tetrick & Quick, 2010).

Stress and emotional exhaustion are proposed to be negatively predicted by organizational efforts towards inclusion. Psychological safety and life satisfaction are proposed to be positively predicted by organizational efforts towards LGB inclusion. This prediction is based on the research that demonstrates the impact the presence of supportive and inclusive organizational practices predicts health and well-being (Lloren & Parini, 2017; Shore et al., 2011). Similarly, felt inclusion is proposed to negatively predict stress and emotional exhaustion, as well as positively predict psychological safety and life satisfaction. This prediction is based on the research that demonstrates the importance of supportive and inclusive organizational climates on health and well-being (Shore et al., 2011; Velez et al., 2013). Lastly, supervisor competency of LGB inclusion is proposed to negatively predict stress and emotional exhaustion, as well as positively predict psychological safety and life satisfaction. This prediction is based on the leadership research that demonstrates the
importance of leadership style on subordinate health and well-being (Gyu Park et al., 2017; Macik-Frey et al., 2007).

In summary, organizational efforts towards inclusion is proposed to predict health and well-being through three pathways: (1) directly from organizational efforts of LGB inclusion; (2) through the process of felt inclusion and; (3) through the process of supervisor competency of inclusion. It is hypothesized that organizational efforts, felt inclusion, and supervisor competency of LGB inclusion A) negatively relates to perceptions of stress, B) negatively relates to emotional exhaustion, C) positively relates to psychological safety and, D) positively relates to life satisfaction. Meaning, the more inclusive LGB employees appraise their organization to be, the better their health and well-being will be.

Hypothesis 7a: Organizational efforts towards LGB inclusion will negatively predict stress perceptions. More organizational efforts will relate to lower stress.

Hypothesis 7b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict stress perceptions. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower stress.

Hypothesis 7c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict stress perceptions. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to lower stress.

Hypothesis 8a: Organizational efforts will positively predict psychological safety. More organizational efforts will relate to higher psychological safety.

Hypothesis 8b: Felt inclusion will positively predict psychological safety. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher psychological safety.
Hypothesis 8c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict psychological safety. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to higher psychological safety.

Hypothesis 9a: Organizational efforts will positively predict life satisfaction. More organizational efforts will relate to higher satisfaction with life.

Hypothesis 9b: Felt inclusion will positively predict life satisfaction. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher satisfaction with life.

Hypothesis 9c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict life satisfaction. Higher levels of supervisor inclusion will relate to higher satisfaction with life.

Hypothesis 10a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict emotional exhaustion. More organizational efforts of inclusion will relate to lower emotional exhaustion.

Hypothesis 10b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict emotional exhaustion. Felt inclusion will relate to lower emotional exhaustion.

Hypothesis 10c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict emotional exhaustion. Higher levels of supervisor inclusion will predict lower emotional exhaustion.

Felt Inclusion and Sexual Identity Management

The research on sexual identity management strategy at work has demonstrated its integral role in the workplace experiences of LGBQ employees. Three identity management strategies have been theorized and empirically tested: counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating (Button, 2004; Woods, 1993).
According to Woods (1993) counterfeiting is a strategy in which LGBQ employees actively create a fake heterosexual identity in order to seem more socially desirable. The avoidance strategy is utilized when LGBQ employees want to appear asexual by avoiding questions and conversations regarding one’s personal life and romantic interests. In these situations, they do not attempt to portray themselves as either heterosexual or LGBQ, but rather set a precedent that they are reserved and cultivate an image as being “strictly business” (Woods, 1993). Lastly, Woods (1993) states that integrating strategy behaviors are used when LGB employees disclose their sexual orientation in various situations. This can be done explicitly (i.e., verbally stating there are LGBQ) or indirectly (i.e., showing interest in addressing LGBQ issues).

In terms of health, the integrating strategy is the most beneficial, whereas the counterfeiting and avoiding strategies are detrimental to LGBQ employee health (Holman 2018; Jackson & Mohr, 2016; Velez et al., 2013). This is consistent with the negative effects of impression management (Goffman, 1959) and stereotype threat (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Research has also demonstrated the importance of identity management on job performance and attitudes, where LGBQ employees utilizing healthy identity management strategies having better job performance and more positive job attitudes (e.g., Velez et al., 2013). Indeed, healthy identity management strategies have been shown to be predicted by the presence of LGBQ protective practices (Lloren & Parini, 2017; Webster et al., 2017), as well as positive perceptions of LGB-
supportive climate (Velez et al., 2013). Likewise, research has indicated the importance of support from co-workers and supervisors in utilizing healthy identity management strategies (Webster et al., 2017).

In summary, organizational efforts towards LGBQ inclusion is proposed to predict sexual identity management through three pathways: (1) directly from organizational efforts; (2) through the process of felt inclusion and; (3) through the process of supervisor competency of inclusion. It is hypothesized that organizational efforts, felt inclusion, and supervisor competency of LGB inclusion A) negatively relates to the use of counterfeiting, B) negatively relates to the use of avoiding and, C) positively relates to the use of integrating. Meaning, the more inclusive LGBQ employees appraise their organization to be, the healthier their sexual identity management is at work.

Hypothesis 11a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict counterfeiting behaviors. More organizational efforts will relate to lower counterfeiting.

Hypothesis 11b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict counterfeiting behaviors. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower use of counterfeiting behaviors.

Hypothesis 11c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict counterfeiting behaviors. Higher levels of supervisor inclusion will relate to lower use of counterfeiting.
Hypothesis 12a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict avoiding behaviors. More organizational effort will relate to lower avoidance behaviors at work.

Hypothesis 12b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict avoiding behaviors. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower avoidance behaviors at work.

Hypothesis 12c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict avoiding behaviors. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to lower avoidance behaviors.

Hypothesis 13a: Organizational efforts will positively predict integrating behaviors. More organizational efforts will relate to higher integration behaviors at work.

Hypothesis 13b: Felt inclusion will positively predict integrating behaviors. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher integration behaviors.

Hypothesis 13c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict integration behaviors. Higher levels of supervisor inclusion will relate to higher integration behaviors.

The Current Study

Research and theory suggest that inclusion, a key component to the healthy workplace framework, is beneficial for employees and organizations. LGBQ employees experience minority stress because of societal heterosexism and oftentimes having to choose between being inauthentic and experiencing
stigma (Meyer, 2003). Organizations need to be properly oriented to be motivated to prevent exclusion and foster inclusion (Shore et al., 2018). Organizations need to create and enforce policies and practices that protect LGBQ employees from discrimination, as well as implement those that foster inclusion. In short, organizations need to adopt a culture for LGB inclusion through the efforts to avoid exclusion and promote inclusion. An organization’s culture can be displayed through declarative, active, and proactive practices (Zohar & Luria, 2005). Presence and orientations of these practices are proposed to foster perceptions of felt inclusion, thus leading to beneficial outcomes regarding employee job attitudes, health and well-being, proactivity behaviors, and sexual identity development among LGBQ employees. Likewise, inclusive behaviors from the direct supervisor are proposed to add unique predictive ability to these outcomes. This is due to the supervisor’s organizational embodiment (Eisenberger et al., 2010), frequent interactions with their LGBQ subordinates (Zohar & Luria, 2005), and their own competency of inclusion (Nishii, 2013). Therefore, this study will test a model that describes how organizational efforts and felt inclusion, coupled with the supervisor’s competency of LGB inclusion predicts LGBQ employee’s job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management (see Figure 1 and Figure 2).
Figure 1. Proposed Conceptual Model.
Figure 2. Hypothesized Analytical Model.
Additionally, a measure of felt inclusion will be developed for the current study. To empirically test the effectiveness of this measure, the LGBTCI (Liddle et al., 2004) will be used as a way demonstrate content validity and construct validity, but to also investigate the value added when using this measure to predict job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management (i.e., criterion validity). Therefore, this project tests the propositions that 1) the newly constructed measure of felt inclusion correlates with LGBTCI and 2) the felt inclusion measure demonstrates unique value added over the LGBTCI in predicting job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

In order to participate in the study, participants needed to be employed adults that identify as LGBQ+. In addition to using community and snowball sampling methods, Mechanical Turk (MTurk) was used to recruit 439 participants. However, respondents that did not complete over 30% of the survey were removed \( N = 56 \). Additionally, respondents that identified as heterosexual/straight \( N = 21 \) or were self-employed or unemployed \( N = 38 \) were also removed. After removing those responses, the final sample size was \( N = 324 \). The 50 participants sampled using MTurk received monetary compensation for their participation.

Table 1 (see Appendix M) shows the frequencies of demographic variables of the 324 participants. The ages of participants ranged from 18-71 years old \( (M = 33.50, SD = 11.24) \). The majority of participants were gay (40.7%), male (50.6%), white (78.7%), and categorized themselves as middle-class (29.9%). In terms of their jobs, most participants worked at least 40 hours per week (75.0%) in health care/social assistance (16.0%) and educational services (15.7%). The majority of the participants were employed at their organization for 1-5 years (49.4%) while having their current supervisor for 1-5 years (51.5%).
Measures

Organizational Efforts Towards LGBQ Inclusion

Organizational efforts related to LGBQ inclusion was measured using a newly created 9-item measure. These nine items were created to reflect the three types of organizational practices described by Zohar and Luria (2005) as well as the two orientations of inclusion described by Shore et al. (2018). These nine statements also included employee perceptions of utility, purpose, and familiarity. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a 0-10 sliding scale (0 = completely disagree, 10 = completely agree), with the option to indicate they were “unsure”. The complete list of items is shown in Appendix C. The measure demonstrated excellent reliability (α = .93).

Felt Inclusion

A measure of felt inclusion was developed for the current study. This 25-item measure (see Appendix D) was developed as a unique extension of the LGBTCI (Liddle et al., 2004), in that it was intended to measure the degree to which LGBQ+ employees assess their organization as inclusive in response to their organization’s efforts. This measure was developed from Ferdman’s (2014) six themes of inclusion (i.e., psychological safety, involvement in work group, feeling respected and valued, influence on decision-making, authenticity, recognizing, honoring, and advancing diversity). Participants were instructed to indicate their level of agreement with each of the items on a 7-point Likert scale.
(1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree). The measure demonstrated excellent reliability in the current study (α = .97).

**Supervisor Inclusion**

Six items were used to measure supervisor’s competency of inclusion towards LGBQ+ employees. These six items were created through adapting an existing measure of supervisor inclusion (Zheng et al., 2017) to specify inclusion towards LGBQ+ employees. Previous research has noted this measure to have excellent internal consistency (α = .93; Zheng et al., 2017). This was also the case in the current sample (α = .97).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS; Judge et al., 1998). This is a 5-item measure where participants are asked to indicate their level of agreement on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Sample items include, “I feel enjoyment in my work”, and “I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job”. This measure was shown to have good reliability in a sample of LGB employees (α = .90, Kim et al., 2019). The reliability coefficient in the current study was also acceptable (α = .88).

**Turnover Intentions**

Intentions to quit one’s job was measured using a three-item scale developed by Colarelli (1984). Each item (e.g., “I frequently think of quitting my job”) will be rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating greater turnover intentions. This measure
has been shown to have good reliability in a sample of LGB employees (α = 0.83, Velez & Moradi, 2012). This measure demonstrated acceptable reliability in the current sample as well (α = .86).

**Life Satisfaction**

Quality of life was measured using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS, Diener et al., 1985). This 5-item measure asks participants to indicate their level of agreement on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Examples items include “I am satisfied with my life” and “in most ways, my life is close to my ideal”. The SWLS has been shown to have excellent reliability in a sample of LGB employees (α = .92, Kim et al., 2019). In this sample, good reliability was demonstrated (α = .88).

**Perceived Stress**

A shortened version of the Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen et al., 1983) was used to measure perceived stress over the last month. Participants were asked to respond to four items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = never, 5 = very often). Sample items include “how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?” and “how often have you felt that things were going your way?” (reverse-scored). This shortened version of the scale has shown good reliability in a sample of LGB adults (α = .82, Rostosky et al., 2009). This measure demonstrated similar reliability in the current study (α = .80).
**Psychological Safety Climate**

Perceptions of psychological safety were measured using an adapted version of Edmondson’s (1999) 6-item measure of team psychological safety. Baer and Frese (2003) revised this measure to capture psychological safety perceptions at the organizational level. Participants rated these seven items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = doesn’t apply at all, 5 = entirely applies). Sample items include “in our organization, some employees are rejected for being different” (reverse coded) and “in our organization one is free to take risks”. This measure has been shown to have good reliability in a sample of employees from German organizations (α = .82, Baer & Frese, 2003). In the current study, this measure also demonstrated good reliability (α = .89).

**Emotional Exhaustion**

To examine negative health outcomes, emotional exhaustion was measured using Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (MBI, Maslach et al., 1986). Participants are first asked to respond to three items to identity the frequency of feelings they experience at work (e.g., “I feel emotionally drained from work”) on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = never , 7 = everyday). If participants indicated that they experienced a particular item, they are then instructed to identity the severity of that feeling on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = very mild, barely noticeable, 7 = major very strong ). These severity scores are then averaged together, with higher scores indicating greater emotional exhaustion. Previous research has found that
using this subscale demonstrated good reliability, $\alpha = .89$ (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). In my study, the three-item measure showed excellent reliability ($\alpha = .91$).

**Sexual Identity Management**

LGB employees’ strategies of managing their identities at work was assessed using the Identity Management Strategies Scale (Button, 2004). This 23-item measure has three subscales based on Woods’ (1993) conceptualization of identity management: Counterfeiting (six items), Avoiding (seven items), and Integrating (10 items). Participants respond to items on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). As done in previous research, modifications were made to be inclusive towards bisexual respondents by changing statements that included “gay/lesbian” to “LGB” (Velez et al., 2013). Sample items include: “I make sure that I don't behave in the way people expect LGB people to behave” (Counterfeit); “I avoid coworkers who frequently discuss sexual matters” (Avoidant); “I look for opportunities to tell my coworkers that I am LGB” (Integrating). Scores from each subscale were averaged, with higher scores indicating a greater usage of that strategy. Previous research has demonstrated the reliability for the Concealing ($\alpha = .85$), Avoiding ($\alpha = .90$), and Integrating ($\alpha = .92$) subscales to range from good to excellent. (Velez et al., 2013). The current study showed that each subscale demonstrated excellent reliability; concealing ($\alpha = .91$), avoiding ($\alpha = .92$), integrating ($\alpha = .91$).
Covariates and Control Variables

The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Climate Inventory (LGBTCI; Liddle et al., 2004) was used to measure employee perceptions of a LGB-supportive workplace climate. This 20-item measure that instructs LGB employees to indicate how well each statement describes their workplace atmosphere using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = doesn’t describe at all, 7 = describes extremely well). These scores were then averaged together to assess the LGB-supportive climate of an organization. Lower scores indicate a hostile climate, whereas higher scores indicate a supportive climate. This measure has been shown to have excellent reliability (α = .96, Liddle et al., 2004). This project used the LGBTCI to conduct a dominance analysis with the newly created felt inclusion measure, to test the differences in prediction of psychological safety.

The LGBTCI demonstrated excellent reliability in the current study (α = .97). Participants’ age, gender, race, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, hours worked per week, tenure with organization and supervisor, were also used as control variables.

Procedure

First, using convenience and snowball sampling methods, an online Qualtrics survey was distributed to various LGBTQ+ employee resource groups on social media (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn, Reddit). In addition to the survey link, these posts included a brief message that described the purpose of the study,
how long it took to complete, as well as who was qualified to participate. After clicking on the link, interested participants had the opportunity to review the informed consent and participate in the survey. Then, participants completed demographic questions, followed by the rest of the measures previously mentioned. The online survey took participants about 20 minutes to complete. Upon completion of the survey, participants were thanked and debriefed. After about a month of data collection, more responses were needed. I decided to use MTurk to sample 50 participants to complete data collection. These 50 responses were collected in less than a week. It is important to note here that data collection occurred before the *Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia (2020)* SCOTUS decision.
CHAPTER THREE
RESULTS

Data Screening

Descriptive statistics of the main study variables including means, standard deviations, reliability estimates, and correlations, can be found in Table 2 (see Appendix N). The dataset ($N = 439$) was first downloaded from Qualtrics and exported into IBM’s SPSS (version 26). However, respondents that did not complete over 30% of the survey were removed ($N = 56$). Additionally, respondents that identified as heterosexual/straight ($N = 21$) or were self-employed or unemployed ($N = 38$) were also removed. After removing those responses, the total sample size was $N = 324$. This dataset was then screened and analyzed for outliers and normality of the main variables using SPSS. Afterwards, the hypothesized path model was tested using LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2012).

Outliers

The presence of univariate outliers was tested by using the standard of $z > \pm 3.33$ ($p < .001$). One potential univariate outlier was found in the counterfeiting identity management strategy ($z = 3.40$) with a raw score of 7.00. However, this case was not deleted, as this score was not viewed as a practical outlier. Multivariate outliers were tested among the 12 main variables using a Mahalanobis criteria of $\chi^2(11) = 31.26$ ($p < .001$). Five potential multivariate
outliers were identified with Mahalanobis distance scores ranging from 31.99 to 44.94. However, because there appeared to be no significant gap in the distribution of Mahalanobis distance scores, those five cases were preserved and not classified as true outliers.

**Normality**

The normality of the distribution of the main variables were tested using the standard of $z > \pm 3.33 \ (p < .001)$. Of the 12 main variables, five had distributions that were skewed; four variables were negatively skewed, and one variable was positively skewed. None of the variables had distributions that were kurtotic. However, transformations of variables were unnecessary, as all main variables were centered using z-score transformations in LISREL.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis: Measurement of Felt Inclusion**

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to test the factor structure of the newly developed felt LGB inclusion measure. This was done using a principle factor extraction with oblique rotation (direct oblimin, delta = 0). The maximum number of factors (eigenvalues > 1) was three. The three eigenvalues were 14.20, 1.70, and 1.05, with the next closet eigenvalue being 0.79. However, given the large gap between the first and second eigenvalue, it is more likely that this is one factor being measured. Also, according to the rotated factor loadings of each of the 25 items, it appeared that none of the items loaded onto the second or third factor, as those loadings were less than .50 (see Table 3.
in Appendix O). Lastly, the one factor solution accounted for 55.46% of the variance, the second and third factor only each added an additional 5.52% and 2.26% respectively. Therefore, it appears that this new measure of felt inclusion is measuring one factor.

Examination of Hypothesized Effects

Model Estimation

The hypothesized model was tested using maximum likelihood estimation procedures used in LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2012). In order to input the data, correlations were zero-order and partial correlations were conducted in SPSS. These correlations were among all main variables, while controlling for the following variables: age, gender, race, sexual orientation, social class, hours worked per week, organizational tenure, and supervisor tenure. After, this correlation matrix was inputted into LISREL via syntax. The number of observations for the path analysis was \( N = 249 \).

Model Evaluation

By reviewing the indices of absolute fit, the hypothesized model showed strong fit as the minimum fit function chi-square was non-significant, \( \chi^2(10) = 16.58, \ p = .084 \). Similarly, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) and root mean square residual (RMR) indicated adequate fit, RMSEA = .050, RMR = .010. According to the indices of relative fit, normed fit index (NFI) = .997, non-normed fit index (NNFI) = .989, comparative fit index (CFI) = .999, adjusted
goodness of fit index (AGFI) = .910, the hypothesized model showed ideal fit.
See Figure 3 for the analyzed model with beta coefficients representing direct effects.
Figure 3. Computational Model with Coefficients. All coefficients represent direct effects (\(\beta\)).
Organizational Effort, Supervisor Inclusion, and Felt Inclusion

Figure 4 depicts the effects between organizational efforts of LGB inclusion, supervisor LGB inclusion, and felt LGB inclusion, and significant effects were determined using \( z > 3.33 \) \((p < .001)\). It was hypothesized that (1) organizational efforts would positively predict felt inclusion; (2) organizational effort would positively predict supervisor inclusion; and (3) supervisor inclusion would positively predict felt inclusion. Hypothesis 1 was not supported, as organizational efforts were shown to negatively predict felt inclusion \((\beta = -.67, p < .001)\). However, Hypothesis 2 and 3 were each supported; as organizational efforts positively predicted supervisor inclusion, \((\beta = .68, p < .001)\), and supervisor inclusion positively predicted felt inclusion \((\beta = .62, p < .001)\).

Figure 4. The Effects of Organizational Efforts and Supervisor Inclusion on Felt Inclusion. Total effects are in parentheses if applicable.
One important thing to note is that, although organizational efforts significantly predicted felt inclusion directly, the total effect was non-significant, ($\beta = -0.24, p > .05$). This indicates that there was a positive indirect effect between organizational efforts and felt inclusion ($\beta = 0.42, p < .001$). This significant indirect effect shows that the relationship between organizational efforts and felt inclusion is mediated through felt inclusion and the interaction of felt inclusion and organizational efforts. In short, this means that the negative direct effect between organizational efforts and felt inclusion may be due to a suppressor effect.

It was hypothesized that there would be an interaction of organizational efforts and supervisor inclusion such that, (1) greater organizational efforts and supervisor inclusion would predict high felt inclusion, (2) greater organizational efforts and lower supervisor inclusion would predict moderate felt inclusion, (3) lower organizational efforts and greater supervisor inclusion would predict moderate felt inclusion, and that (4) lower organizational efforts and lower supervisor inclusion would predict lower felt inclusion. There was a significant interaction effect ($\beta = 1.01, p < .001$). However, the worst condition for felt inclusion was when organizational efforts were high and supervisor inclusion was low (see Figure 5). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported.
Figure 5. The Interaction Effect Between Organizational Efforts and Supervisor Inclusion on Felt Inclusion. Values are z-scores.

**Job Attitudes**

Organizational effort, supervisor inclusion, and felt inclusion were each hypothesized to positively predict job satisfaction and negatively predict turnover intentions (see Figure 6). Organizational effort did not predict job satisfaction ($\beta = .05, p > .05$) or turnover intentions ($\beta = -.08, p > .05$). Supervisor inclusion also failed to directly predict job satisfaction ($\beta = -.06, p > .05$) or turnover intentions ($\beta = .06, p > .05$). However, supervisor inclusion had a significant total effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = .36, p < .001$) and turnover intentions ($\beta = -.30, p < .001$), indicating a large indirect effect through felt inclusion. Lastly, felt inclusion
predicted both job satisfaction ($\beta = .68$, $p < .001$) and turnover intentions ($\beta = -.48$, $p < .001$). Therefore, Hypotheses 5b and 6b were supported and Hypothesis 5a, 6a, 5c, and 6c were not supported.

---

**Figure 6.** The Effects of Felt Inclusion, Organizational Efforts, and Supervisor Inclusion on Job Attitudes. Total effects are in parentheses if applicable.

---

**Health and Well-Being**

In terms of health and well-being outcomes, organizational effort was proposed to positively predict psychological safety and life satisfaction, as well as negatively predict perceived stress and emotional exhaustion (see Figure 7).

Organizational effort failed to predict any of the health and well-being outcomes;
psychological safety ($\beta = .04, \ p > .05$), life satisfaction ($\beta = .12, \ p = .07$),
perceived stress ($\beta = .09, \ p > .05$), emotional exhaustion ($\beta = .01, \ p > .05$).
Therefore, Hypotheses 7a, 8a, 9a, and 10a were not supported.

Figure 7. The Effects of Organizational Efforts on Health and Well-Being Outcomes. Total effects are in parentheses.

Supervisor inclusion was also hypothesized to positively predict
psychological safety and life satisfaction, as well as negatively predict perceived stress and emotional exhaustion (see Figure 8). Similarly to job attitudes, supervisor inclusion failed to directly predict psychological safety ($\beta = .05, \ p >$
life satisfaction ($\beta = .00, p > .05$), perceived stress ($\beta = -.03, p > .05$), or emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.03, p > .05$). However, significant total effects indicated that supervisor inclusion significantly predicts these health and well-being outcomes indirectly through felt inclusion. Therefore, Hypotheses 7c, 8c, 9c, and 10c were not supported.

Figure 8. The Effects of Supervisor Inclusion on Health and Well-Being Outcomes. Total effects are in parentheses.
Felt inclusion was also hypothesized to positively predict psychological safety and life satisfaction, as well as negatively predict perceived stress and emotional exhaustion (see Figure 9). As predicted, felt inclusion successfully predicted psychological safety ($\beta = .70$, $p < .001$), life satisfaction ($\beta = .39$, $p < .001$), perceived stress ($\beta = -.41$, $p < .001$), and emotional exhaustion ($\beta = -.43$, $p < .001$). Therefore, Hypotheses 7b, 8b, 9b, and 10b were supported.

Figure 9. The Effects of Felt Inclusion on Health and Well-Being Outcomes.
Sexual Identity Management

Regarding sexual identity management strategies, it was predicted that organizational effort, supervisor inclusion, and felt inclusion would each negatively predict both counterfeiting and avoiding behaviors, as well as positively predict integrating behaviors (see Figure 10). Although organizational effort failed to predict counterfeiting behaviors ($\beta = .09, p > .05$), it marginally predicted avoiding ($\beta = .15, p = .02$), and integrating behaviors ($\beta = .14, p = .018$). Supervisor inclusion also showed no significant direct effects on counterfeiting ($\beta = .03, p > .05$), avoiding ($\beta = -.01, p > .05$), or integrating behaviors ($\beta = .03, p > .05$). However, supervisor inclusion was shown to have significant total effects in the hypothesized direction, indicating a significant indirect effect through felt inclusion. Lastly, felt inclusion was shown to negatively predict counterfeiting ($\beta = -.64, p < .001$) and avoiding behaviors ($\beta = -.73, p < .001$), as well as positively predict integrating behaviors ($\beta = .54, p < .001$). Therefore, Hypotheses 11b, 12b, and 13b were supported, whereas, Hypotheses 11a, 11c, 12a, 12c, 13a, and 13c were not supported.
Figure 10. The Effects of Felt Inclusion, Organizational Efforts, and Supervisor Inclusion on Sexual Identity Management Behaviors. Total effects are in parentheses if applicable.
Supplemental Dominance Analysis

A secondary goal of this project was to implement a measurement of felt LGB inclusion and compare it to the existing measure of LGBT-supportive climate (Liddle et al., 2004). To do this, a dominance analysis was conducted in SPSS. First, correlations among felt inclusion, supportive climate, and the dependent variables were conducted and are displayed in Table 4 (see Appendix P). The correlations between felt inclusion (new measure) and outcomes were similar to those between supportive climate (existing measure) and outcomes. The next step of this analysis required conducting a series of regression analyzes with felt inclusion, supportive climate, and the interacting between the two predicting a heavily correlated dependent variable (i.e., psychological safety).

First, a regression analysis was conducted with felt inclusion predicting psychological safety. As expected, felt inclusion predicted psychological safety ($R = .78$, $R^2 = .61$, $b = 0.85$, $p < .001$). This process was repeated for supportive climate predicting psychological safety. Also as expected, supportive climate predicted psychological safety ($R = .76$, $R^2 = .58$, $b = 0.74$, $p < .001$). This regression analysis shows that the new measure of felt inclusion was a stronger predictor of psychological safety than the existing measure of supportive climate.

Next, a regression analysis was conducted where felt inclusion and supportive climate were entered in the same step predicting psychological safety. This was done to account for the shared variance between the new and existing measures. Entering both measures in the same step predicting psychological
safety removes the shared variance and results in each measure serving as a statistical control for the other. As expected, both variables predicted psychological safety ($R = .78$, $R^2 = .62$, $p < .001$). When included in the same step, felt inclusion was a stronger predictor of psychological safety ($b = .56$, 90% CI [.34, .77], $r_{\text{partial}} = .32$, $r_{\text{part}} = .21$) than supportive climate ($b = .29$, 90% CI [.10, .48], $r_{\text{partial}} = .19$, $r_{\text{part}} = .12$).

An additional regression analysis predicting psychological safety was conducted, where supportive climate was entered as Step 1, followed by felt inclusion in Step 2. Model 1 demonstrated the same results from the first regression analysis of supportive inclusion predicting psychological safety. However, adding felt inclusion to Step 2 improved the prediction of psychological safety, $R = .79$, $R^2 = .62$, $p < .001$. In Step 2, felt inclusion was a stronger predictor of psychological safety ($b = .56$, 90% CI [.34, .77], $r_{\text{partial}} = .32$, $r_{\text{part}} = .21$) than supportive climate ($b = .29$, 90% CI [.10, .48], $r_{\text{partial}} = .19$, $r_{\text{part}} = .12$). Because the new measure of felt inclusion was included in Step 2, the fact that it accounted for more variance and resulted in a change in $R^2$ shows that the new measure of felt inclusion improves the prediction of psychological safety, above and beyond the existing measure of supportive climate.

This regression analysis was repeated, except felt inclusion was entered as Step 1, followed by supportive climate in Step 2. Model 1 demonstrated the same results from the first regression analysis of felt inclusion predicting psychological safety. Likewise, adding supportive climate to Step 2 improved the
Felt inclusion was also a stronger predictor of psychological safety ($b = .56$, 90% CI [.34, .77], $r_{partial} = .32$, $r_{part} = .21$) than supportive climate ($b = .29$, 90% CI [.10, .48], $r_{partial} = .19$, $r_{part} = .12$). These results show that the new measure of felt inclusion is a better predictor of psychological safety than the existing measure of supportive climate.

A final regression analysis predicting psychological safety was conducted. Felt inclusion and supportive climate were entered into Step 1, and the interaction between felt inclusion and supportive climate was entered in Step 2. As expected, Model 1 in predicting psychological safety was statistically significant, $R = .79$, $R^2 = .62$, $p < .001$. Likewise, adding the interaction term significantly improved the prediction of psychological safety, $R = .79$, $R^2 = .63$, $p < .001$. However, once the interaction term was entered into Step 2, felt inclusion no longer predicted psychological safety, $b = .26$, 90% CI [-.06, .57], $r_{partial} = .11$, $r_{part} = .06$. This also happened to supportive climate, $b = -.07$, 90% CI [-.41, .27], $r_{partial} = -.03$, $r_{part} = -.02$). However, the interaction term was a statistically significant predictor of psychological safety, $b = .07$, 90% CI [.02, .13], $r_{partial} = .16$, $r_{part} = .10$.

Overall, these findings show evidence that the new measure of felt inclusion is measuring something different than supportive climate. The fact that felt inclusion and supportive climate interact is also interesting, given that they each account for psychological safety in similar ways. These analyses also found evidence of incremental prediction, meaning that the new felt inclusion measure
adds to the prediction of psychological safety above the existing supportive climate measure.
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

General Discussion

The purpose of this project was to test a model of felt inclusion in predicting job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors in a sample of LGBQ+ employees. Felt inclusion was proposed to be predicted by the perceived effort of one’s organization as well as the competency of inclusion demonstrated by their supervisor.

LGBQ+ employees experience a disproportionate amount of stress at work compared to their heterosexual peers, due to their stigmatized identity (Meyer, 2003; Velez et al., 2012). Due to sexual orientation being an identity that is concealable and invisible, LGBQ+ employees often worry about whether their sexual orientation is safe to discuss at work. Oftentimes, this results in LGBQ+ employees having to choose between being authentic about their LGBQ+ and risking discrimination and mistreatment or concealing their sexual orientation and experiencing the psychological distress (Goffman, 1963). However, organizations can address this issue by creating inclusive environments that allow LGBQ+ employees to be authentically themselves, without a risk of mistreatment or discrimination. It is crucial for employees to feel included at work, for both employee health and well-being and organizational performance. Furthermore, with the recent SCOTUS decision to include sexual orientation as a protected
identity from workplace discrimination (Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia, 2020), many organizations will be legally responsible for adopting policies and practices that protect LGBQ+ employees. However, if organizations want to achieve inclusion, it is important for organizations to be effortful in doing so, rather than comply with the law and focus on mitigating exclusion (Shore et al., 2018).

The results of this study provide evidence that organizations can impact key work outcomes related to job attitudes, employee health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors by being effortful in making LGBQ+ employees feel included at work. This project also shows that supervisors can demonstrate competencies of inclusion towards their LGBQ+ subordinates to enhance felt inclusion at work. In turn, felt inclusion elicits enhanced job satisfaction, psychological safety, life satisfaction, and healthy sexual identity management behaviors at work. Similarly, felt inclusion was shown to decrease turnover intentions, perceived stress, emotional exhaustion, and unhealthy sexual identity management behaviors at work. Although the hypothesized model was not completely supported, it does show that the combination of organizational efforts and supervisor inclusion predicts felt inclusion and influences key outcomes such as job attitudes, employee health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors.

An additional goal of this project was to test a measure of felt inclusion to better demonstrate the importance of measuring felt inclusion, rather than
supportive climate (i.e., the LGBTCI, Liddle et al., 2004). The new measure of felt inclusion improves the prediction of psychological safety after accounting for the existing measure of supportive climate. However, it also appears that the new measure of felt inclusion is measuring something unique to supportive climate, adding empirical support to the previous research that made theoretical distinctions between feeling supported and feeling included at work (Dwertman et al., 2016; Nishii, 2013).

**Theoretical Implications**

This project adds to the understanding regarding minority stress experienced at work among LGBQ+ employees. Specifically, organizational efforts and supervisor inclusion can be key predictors on whether LGBQ+ employees feel included at work and mitigate the harmful effects of the minority stress experienced in work and personal life. This project helps understand the experiences of minority employees and the need for inclusion. Specifically, this contributes to the existing research that shows that LGBQ+ employees experience unique stressors in the workplace (Velez et al., 2012) and that organizations can mitigate such stress by focusing on contextual aspects of work (Webster et al., 2017).

This project also adds to the theoretical link between organizational culture (e.g., policies, practices, efforts) and organizational climate perceptions. According to Schneider (1975), organizational climate perceptions should be
measured as a response to something (i.e., measured as a molar climate). From a practical perspective, having an organization’s efforts analyzed in relationship to the feelings of inclusion provide space for recommendations and improvements that an organization can make when evaluating their efforts of inclusion. Doing so adds to an understanding of which parts of the organization’s culture are important for climate perceptions. These theoretical investigations between the intangible aspects of an organization and employee perceptions are a key component of occupational health psychology’s healthy workplace initiative (Tetrick & Quick, 2010). In this project, organizational efforts, climate, leadership were evaluated to foster health and well-being in the workplace toward LBQ+ employees.

The presence of organizational efforts significantly correlated with supervisor inclusion and felt inclusion, as well as all of the outcomes of job attitudes, employee health and well-being, as well as sexual identity management behaviors. However, the results of the path analysis show that organizational efforts failed to predict any of the outcomes related to job attitudes, health and well-being, or sexual identity management behaviors in a model that includes supervisor inclusion and felt inclusion. This shows that the presence of organizational efforts is not enough to influence LGBQ+ employee job attitudes, health and well-being, or sexual identity management. Although organizational efforts are necessary to foster felt inclusion, they are insufficient by themselves to foster desirable outcomes for organizations and their
employees. Although these results are not what was hypothesized, it could be explained by the measure of organizational efforts. The items for the newly created organizational efforts towards LGB inclusion measure was based on a model of inclusive organizations (Shore et al., 2018) as well as an existing measure of organization-level safety climate (Zohar & Luria, 2005).

First, the model of inclusive organizations (Shore et al., 2018) describes that organizations need to (1) show commitment to diversity and inclusion by focusing on enhancing inclusion as well as to (2) show commitment to compliance by focusing on preventing exclusion. When constructing items for this measure, I included two items; one to measure the commitment to diversity and inclusion (i.e., “My organization tries to make LGB employees feel included.”) and one to measure commitment to compliance and prevention (i.e., “My organization tries to avoid LGB discrimination lawsuits.”). Both are needed to achieve inclusion, however, when employees perceive their organization to be committed to only preventing exclusion, they may not feel included (Shore et al., 2018).

Additionally, the organizational efforts measure included items meant to measure three types of efforts: declarative, active, and proactive. Zohar and Luria (2005) created a measure of organizational-level safety climate that included three types of practices to predict safety climate perceptions. However, similar to safety climate perceptions, each of these three efforts may influence felt inclusion differently (Zohar & Luria, 2005).
Supervisor inclusion significantly correlated with organizational efforts and felt inclusion, as well as all the indicators of job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors. The results of the path analysis showed that supervisor inclusion directly predicted felt inclusion. This is consistent with the main notion of supervisor-organizational embodiment theory (Eisenberger et al., 2010) as well as the benefits of positive and inclusive leadership (Avolio & Gardner, 2004; Zheng et al., 2017).

Felt inclusion was significantly correlated with organizational efforts, supervisor inclusion, and all of the outcomes related to job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors. This is consistent with the previous research that demonstrates the benefits of inclusion. Inclusive organizations are better able to retain their employees and foster satisfaction among their employees (Shore et al., 2018). For LGBQ+ employees in inclusive organizations, minority stress is mitigated to a greater extent as they are able to be authentically themselves without fear (Velez et al., 2012).

Lastly, the new measure of felt inclusion was shown to improve the prediction of psychological safety when accounting for the variance shared with the existing measure of LGBT-supportive climate. Indeed, psychological safety is one of the most important facets of inclusion (Ferdman, 2014; Shore et al., 2018) as well as an important predictor of employee attitudes, behaviors, and health (Bradley et al., 2012; Donald & Bakker, 2010). This adds to the importance and
distinction of measuring inclusion, rather than supportive climate (Dwertman et al., 2016; Nishii, 2013).

Practical Implications

The results of this project apply to organizations looking to achieve felt inclusion among their employees. Organizations have an ethical obligation to promote inclusion for their LGBQ+ employees (King & Cortina, 2010). Likewise, organizations should be focusing on the intangible aspects of the workplace in order to promote employee health and well-being (Tetrick & Quick, 2010). Organizations can do this is by creating declarative, active, and proactive efforts that are enforced and publicized to the employees in the organization. Likewise, organizations should show a commitment to diversity and inclusion as well as a commitment to preventing exclusion. This can be done by proactively training and educating employees to be inclusive as well as actively monitoring claims of exclusion and discrimination.

This project adds support for the importance of inclusive supervisors. Inclusive behaviors and competencies should be reviewed when selecting supervisors. Supervisors should also complete inclusivity trainings that not only provide knowledge, but also behaviors on how to be inclusive. Organizations should ensure that supervisors are knowledgeable of organizational policies and practices, so that LGBQ+ employees have a resource available to them.
Additionally, this project contributes to the importance of measuring organizational efforts, supervisor inclusion, and felt inclusion together when making decisions. The hypothesized model predicted the outcomes because all three were measured and analyzed collectively. When organizations make decisions while evaluating their inclusion among LGBQ+ employees, it would be beneficial to measure and evaluate those three aspects to make effective changes. For example, organizations that evaluate all three aspects may find that their absence of supervisor inclusion is the cause of the lack of felt inclusion among LGBQ+ employees. This allows for organizations to select and train supervisors to be more competent in being inclusive towards LGBQ+ employees. Conversely, organizations may also find that their LGBQ+ employees do not view their organization as resolute in creating an inclusive environment. Effortful. This could be due to their orientation towards compliance and mitigating exclusion, rather than proactively fostering inclusion. In short, measuring all three helps organizations evaluate and develop inclusion more effectively.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This project had some notable limitations that need to be addressed. Most evident are the limitations regarding the generalizability of this model. Due to the characteristics of the sample, as well as the data collection method, more diverse samples and experiences are needed in future research. Doing so will generate more valid and generalizable conclusions regarding the relationships between
organizational efforts, supervisor inclusion, felt inclusion, and outcomes related to job attitudes, health and well-being, and sexual identity management behaviors.

First, over two-thirds of the sample were White/Caucasian. Research has shown that LGBQ+ people of color experience more microaggressions and are at greater risk towards minority stress than their White/Caucasian peers (Balsam et al., 2011; Ragins et al., 2003). Although the current study had a similar sample with other previous research regarding minority stress at work (e.g., Velez et al., 2013), research needs to investigate the intersectionality of inclusion in the workplace.

Second, half of the sample identified as male, 37.7% identified as female, whereas nearly 13% of the sample identified as non-binary or transgender. This study measured the experiences of inclusion among LGBQ+ (i.e., sexual minority) employees because transgender employees experience significantly different, and more often worse, conditions than LGBQ+ employees. The amount of state legislation that protects transgender and non-binary employees from discrimination and harassment is less than that of the legislation that protect LBGQ+ employees (HRC, 2020a). Likewise, the interpersonal treatment of transgender and non-binary individuals has been documented as unique, and oftentimes worse, than that of their LGBQ+ peers (Breslow et al., 2015). Similar to race, the interaction between sexual orientation and gender identity needs future research.
Third, the majority of participants in this study were employed in their organizations (49.4%) and under the direction of their current supervisor (51.5%) for one to five years. However, research and practice would benefit from a longitudinal approach to get a better understanding of perceptions of felt inclusion over time. For example, employees may have infrequent interactions with their supervisor and may require some time before they are able to accurately assess whether their supervisor is inclusive. Similarly, employees may not be knowledgeable of their organization’s endeavors to achieve inclusion, until they are aware of or experience mistreatment from their co-workers. Understanding the process for which felt inclusion occurs would add great benefit to the science and practice of inclusion.

Lastly, the current study used Ferdman’s (2014) six themes of inclusion and Shore et al’s (2018) model of inclusive organizations to create the new measure of felt inclusion. However, this measure could be refined using qualitative methods and item writing techniques. For example, qualitative interviews could be conducted with subject matter experts (e.g., LGBQ+ employees) to get a better sense of what inclusion at work feels like to them. However, these interviews with subject matter experts should be conducted using a diverse group to get a better sense of generalizability and intersectionality. Additionally, these qualitative interviews could take place over time to also address the limitations regarding the cross-sectional and qualitative design of this project.
Future research should be conducted to further refine the measurement of organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion and felt inclusion. Regarding the organizational efforts measure, qualitative data should be collected to gain more valuable information on how organizations can make an effort to foster LGBQ+ inclusion. For example, having an understanding on the declarative, active, and proactive efforts implemented form an organization would greatly benefit the practice and research of inclusion among LGBQ+ employees.

After the recent SCOTUS decision classifying sexual orientation as a protected identity from employment discrimination, one important thing to investigate is how this ruling will influence felt inclusion. Before *Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia* (2020), only 22 states and Washington D.C. had state-wide employment discrimination protections for LGBQ+ employees. It would be interesting to track the change in felt inclusion over time.

**Conclusion**

Feeling included is critical for employees, as it is a key predictor of job attitudes and health and well-being. This is especially true for socially marginalized groups, such as LGBQ+ employees, that experience unique stress in their daily lives. The values of some organizations and practitioners have evolved from an emphasis on diversity and numbers, to ensuring that employees feel included. Likewise, researchers and practitioners have begun to investigate how organizations can not only increase diversity, but also how to make
employees feel included by focusing policies, practices, leadership, and other intangible aspects of the workplace.

The healthy workplace framework has been essential in advancing the scientific understanding of how intangible aspects of the workplace impact employee outcomes, and in turn, organizational effectiveness. Organizations that strive to make their employees feel included are healthier places to for LGBQ+ employees to work. Additionally, supervisors that are inclusive are healthier for their LGBQ+ subordinates to work for. Through this, organizations should understand that their efforts –policies, practices, procedures, etc. –are essential in cultivating a healthy workplace for their employees. Similarly, supervisors should understand that their actions as a leader hold power in fostering inclusion and making employees healthy. Achieving inclusion should be a common goal across all levels of an organization in order to foster a healthy workplace and truly experience the benefits of diversity.
APPENDIX A

HYPOTHESIS OF THE CURRENT STUDY
Hypothesis 1: Organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion positively predicts felt inclusion. When organizations show greater effort to achieve inclusion, LGBQ+ employees will experience more felt inclusion.

Hypothesis 2: Organizational efforts towards LGBQ+ inclusion positively predicts for supervisor competency of LGB inclusion. Organizations that show greater effort to achieve inclusion also foster more inclusive supervisors.

Hypothesis 3: Supervisor competency of LGB inclusion positively predicts felt inclusion. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to greater felt inclusion.

Hypothesis 4: Organizational efforts and supervisor inclusion will interact to predict felt inclusion. High effort organizations with inclusive supervisors will have the highest levels of felt inclusion. Low effort organizations with inclusive supervisors will have moderately high levels of felt inclusion. High effort organizations with exclusive supervisors will have moderately low levels of felt inclusion. Low effort organizations with exclusive supervisors will relate to the lowest levels of felt inclusion.

Hypothesis 5a: Organizational efforts will positively predict job satisfaction. More organizational efforts will relate to higher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5b: Felt inclusion will positively predict job satisfaction. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict job satisfaction. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to higher job satisfaction.
Hypothesis 6a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict turnover intentions. More organizational efforts will relate to lower intention to quit.

Hypothesis 6b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict turnover intentions. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower intention to quit.

Hypothesis 6c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict turnover intentions. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to lower intention to quit.

Hypothesis 7a: Organizational efforts towards LGB inclusion will negatively predict stress perceptions. More organizational efforts will relate to lower stress.

Hypothesis 7b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict stress perceptions. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower stress.

Hypothesis 7c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict stress perceptions. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to lower stress.

Hypothesis 8a: Organizational efforts will positively predict psychological safety. More organizational efforts will relate to higher psychological safety.

Hypothesis 8b: Felt inclusion will positively predict psychological safety. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher psychological safety.

Hypothesis 8c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict psychological safety. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to higher psychological safety.
Hypothesis 9a: Organizational efforts will positively predict life satisfaction. More organizational efforts will relate to higher satisfaction with life.

Hypothesis 9b: Felt inclusion will positively predict life satisfaction. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher satisfaction with life.

Hypothesis 9c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict life satisfaction. Higher levels

Hypothesis 10a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict emotional exhaustion. More organizational efforts of inclusion will relate to lower emotional exhaustion.

Hypothesis 10b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict emotional exhaustion. Felt inclusion will relate to lower emotional exhaustion.

Hypothesis 10c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict emotional exhaustion. Higher levels of supervisor inclusion will predict lower emotional exhaustion.

Hypothesis 11a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict counterfeiting behaviors. More organizational efforts will relate to lower counterfeiting.

Hypothesis 11b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict counterfeiting behaviors. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower use of counterfeiting behaviors.

Hypothesis 11c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict counterfeiting behaviors. Higher levels of supervisor inclusion will relate to lower use of counterfeiting.
Hypothesis 12a: Organizational efforts will negatively predict avoiding behaviors. More organizational effort will relate to lower avoidance behaviors at work.

Hypothesis 12b: Felt inclusion will negatively predict avoiding behaviors. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to lower avoidance behaviors at work.

Hypothesis 12c: Supervisor inclusion will negatively predict avoiding behaviors. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to lower avoidance behaviors.

Hypothesis 13a: Organizational efforts will positively predict integrating behaviors. More organizational efforts will relate to higher integration behaviors at work.

Hypothesis 13b: Felt inclusion will positively predict integrating behaviors. Higher levels of felt inclusion will relate to higher integration behaviors.

Hypothesis 13c: Supervisor inclusion will positively predict integration behaviors. Higher levels of supervisor LGB inclusion will relate to higher integration behaviors.
APPENDIX B

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFORTS OF INCLUSION MEASURE
**Instructions:** This next set of questions asks about your organization's efforts. When you see the term organization, refer to the company or business you work for.

For the following items, use the sliding bar scales to indicate your level of agreement.

0 = Strongly Disagree
10 = Strongly Agree
If you are unsure, click the box for "Unsure"

1. My organization shows their support for LGB employees.

2. My organization has an active reporting system to report LGB discrimination/harassment claims.

3. My organization offers things like LGB diversity and inclusion training/workshops for all employees.

4. My organization proactively works to make LGB employees feel inclusion before issues occur.

5. My organization appropriately responds to reports of LGB discrimination.

6. My organization tries to make LGB employees feel included.

7. My organization tries to avoid LGB discrimination lawsuits.

8. My organization takes LGB inclusion seriously.

9. I am familiar with my organization’s LGB-related policies.
APPENDIX C

FELT INCLUSION MEASURE
Instructions: For the following items, use the sliding scales to indicate your level of agreement on a 0 (strongly disagree) to 100 (strongly agree) scale.

“Because of my organization’s efforts…”

1. The workplace is oppressive for me. *
2. I feel comfortable displaying a rainbow flag.
3. I feel comfortable displaying pictures of my same-sex relationship.
4. I feel safe at work.
5. I feel as if I am part of the group.
6. It is easier for me to work with others.
7. I feel like I don't belong here. *
8. People at work accept me.
9. I feel respected.
10. I feel appreciated.
11. People at work value me for who I am.
12. My LGB identity is not an issue.
13. People at work don't take me seriously. *
14. People at work care about my opinion.
15. I can share my ideas at work.
16. I can be myself at work.
17. I can’t act “too gay” at work. *
18. I feel pressured to stay closeted at work (i.e., conceal my sexual orientation). *
19. I am protected from mistreatment if I disclose my sexual orientation at work.
20. I can be authentic at work (e.g., talk about my LGB identity).
21. I can talk about my personal life with others at work (e.g., same-sex relationships).
22. I don't believe my organization cares about LGB issues. *
23. I am treated fairly by my work peers.
24. I can share my experiences of being LGB with others at work.
25. I have just as many opportunities as my coworkers (e.g., promotion, pay raise, etc.).

* = Reverse coded item.
APPENDIX D

LGB-SUPPORTIVE CLIMATE MEASURE
### LGB-Supportive Climate (20-item measure from Liddle et al 2004 – LGBTCI)

“Please rate the following items according to how well they describe the atmosphere for lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) employees in your workplace, using the following scale:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LGB employees are treated with respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LGB employees must be secretive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coworkers are as likely to ask nice, interested questions about a same-sex relationship as they are about a heterosexual relationship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LGB people consider it a comfortable place to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-LGB employees are comfortable engaging in gay-friendly humor with LGB employees (e.g., kidding them about a date).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The atmosphere for LGB employees is oppressive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. LGB employees feel accepted by coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Coworkers make comments that seem to indicate a lack of awareness of LGB issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employees are expected to not act “too gay”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. LGB employees fear job loss because of sexual orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My immediate work group is supportive of LGB coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. LGB employees are comfortable talking about their personal lives with coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There is pressure for LGB employees to stay closeted (i.e., conceal their sexual orientation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Employee LGB identity does not seem to be an issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. LGB employees are met with thinly veiled hostility (e.g., scornful looks or icy tone of voice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The company or institution as a whole provides a supportive environment for LGB people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. LGB employees are free to be themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. LGB people are less likely to be mentored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. LGB employees feel free to display pictures of a same-sex partner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The atmosphere for LGB employees is improving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 = Slightly Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree
APPENDIX E

SUPERVISOR COMPETENCY OF INCLUSION MEASURE
**Supervisor Competency of LGB Inclusion** (6-item revised measure from Zheng et al., 2017)

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

“My supervisor … “

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shows respect and recognition towards LGB employees.</td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shows appreciation for LGB employee voices.</td>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourages open and frank communication with LGB employees.</td>
<td>3 = Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cultivates participative decision making and problem-solving processes for LGB employees</td>
<td>4 = Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shows integrity and advanced moral reasoning towards LGB employees.</td>
<td>5 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Uses a cooperative leadership style among LGB employees.</td>
<td>6 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Slightly Disagree  
4 = Slightly Agree  
5 = Agree  
6 = Strongly Agree
APPENDIX F

JOB SATISFACTION MEASURE
Using the 1 – 10 scale, indicate your agreement with each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.</td>
<td>0 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Each day of work seems like it will never end.</td>
<td>1 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I find real enjoyment in my work.</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I consider my job rather unpleasant.</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 = Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

TURNOVER INTENTIONS MEASURE
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements regarding your current organization/company:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 If I have my own way, I will be working for this organization one year from now.</td>
<td>1 = strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I frequently think about quitting my job.</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months.</td>
<td>3=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

LIFE SATISFACTION MEASURE
**Instructions:** Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale, indicate your agreement with each item. Please be open and honest with your responding.

The 7-point scale is: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In most ways, my life is close to my ideal.</td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Slightly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = Slightly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 = Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If I could live my life over, I would change nothing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

PERCEIVED STRESS MEASURE
Instructions: The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during the last month. In each case, you will be asked to indicate how often you felt or thought a certain way. Although some of the questions are similar, there are differences between them, and you should treat each one as a separate question. The best approach is to answer each question fairly quickly. That is, don’t try to count up the number of times you felt a particular way, but rather indicate the alternative that seems like a reasonable estimate.

For each question, choose from the following alternatives: 0 = never, 1 = almost never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, 4 = very often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the last month, how often have you felt that you were able to control the important things in your life?</td>
<td>0 = never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = fairly often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?</td>
<td>0 = never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = fairly often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way?</td>
<td>0 = never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = fairly often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = very often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?</td>
<td>0 = never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = fairly often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = very often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Instructions: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSY</th>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | In my company, some employees are rejected for being different. | 1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 = Slightly Agree
6 = Agree
7 = Strongly Agree |
| 2   | When someone in my company makes a mistake, it is often held against them. |                             |
| 3   | No one in my company would deliberately act in a way that undermines others’ efforts. |                             |
| 4   | It is difficult to ask others for help in my company.         |                             |
| 5   | In my company, one is free to take risks.                     |                             |
| 6   | The people in my company value others’ unique skills and talents. |                             |
| 7   | As an employee in my company, one is able to bring up problems and tough issues. |                             |
APPENDIX K

EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION MEASURE
Instructions: Please indicate how often each statement describes the way you feel about your work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMO</th>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from work.</td>
<td>A: Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7* = Everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday.</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>I feel burned out from my work.</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items (above) that are more frequent than “never” are shown to also measure severity (below)*

Instructions: Please indicate the intensity of the feelings you’ve experienced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMO</th>
<th>Question/Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b*</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from work.</td>
<td>B: Severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = very mile, barely noticeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 = major, very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b*</td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b*</td>
<td>I feel burned out from my work.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

SEXUAL IDENTITY MANAGEMENT MEASURE
Instructions: Indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements on a 1-7 scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly Disagree; 4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 5 = Slightly Agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = Strongly Agree

Counterfeiting:
1. To appear heterosexual, I sometimes talk about fictional dates with members of the opposite sex
2. I sometimes talk about the opposite-sex relationships in my past, while I avoid mentioning more recent same-sex relationships
3. I sometimes comment on, or display interest in, members of the opposite sex to give the impression that I am straight
4. I have adjusted my level of participation in sports to appear heterosexual
5. I make sure that I don't behave in the way people expect gays or lesbian to behave
6. I sometimes laugh at jokes about LGB people to fit in with my straight coworkers

Avoiding:
1. I avoid coworkers who frequently discuss sexual matters
2. I avoid situations (e.g., long lunches, parties) where heterosexual coworkers are likely to ask me personal questions
3. I let people know that I find personal questions to be inappropriate so that I am not faced with them
4. I avoid personal questions by never asking others about their personal lives
5. In order to keep my personal life private, I refrain from "mixing business with pleasure"
6. I withdraw from conversations when the topic turns to things like dating or interpersonal relationships
7. I let people think I am a "loner" so that they won't question my apparent lack of relationship

Integrating:
1. In my daily activities, I am open about my LGB identity when it comes up
2. Most of my coworkers know that I am gay/lesbian/bisexual
3. Whenever I'm asked about being gay/lesbian/bisexual, I always answer in an honest and matter-of-fact way
4. It's okay for my gay, lesbian, and bisexual friends to call me at work
5. My coworkers know of my interest in LGB issues
6. I look for opportunities to tell my coworkers that I am gay/lesbian/bisexual
7. When a policy or law is discriminatory against LGB people, I tell people what I think
8. I let my coworkers know that I'm proud to be gay/lesbian/bisexual
9. I openly confront others when I hear a homophobic remark or joke
10. I display objects (e.g., photographs, magazines, symbols) which suggest I am LGB
APPENDIX M

DEMOGRAPHICS TABLE (TABLE 1)
### TABLE 1 DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES (N = 342)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Missing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td>N (9.3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>132 (40.7%)</td>
<td>(29.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>97 (29.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>52 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>26 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning/Unsure</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>164 (50.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>122 (37.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24 (7.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Male</td>
<td>7 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender Female</td>
<td>6 (1.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>255 (78.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>35 (10.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-racial/Multi-racial</td>
<td>15 (4.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>9 (2.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian-American</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>68 (21.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school / GED</td>
<td>23 (7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>109 (33.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>76 (23.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>14 (4.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td>28 (8.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6 (1.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(22.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-middle class</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>(29.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle class</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(13.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weekly Hours Worked**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (&lt; 20 hours)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (20-39 hours)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (40 hours)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>(43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (&gt; 40 hours)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>(31.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job Industry/Field**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare and Social Assistance</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(15.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Industry</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomodation and Food Services</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate, Rental, and Leasing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil/Gas Extraction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship Status**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

115
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>(36.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a relationship</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic partnership / Living together</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(15.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>(26.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Tenure</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>(49.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Tenure</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>(34.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>(51.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

CORRELATION TABLE (TABLE 2)
### TABLE 2. CORRELATION TABLE OF MAIN VARIABLES (NO CONTROL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Efforts</td>
<td>5.79 (2.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Felt Inclusion</td>
<td>5.26 (1.28)</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisor Inclusion</td>
<td>5.30 (1.65)</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>6.19 (2.42)</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>2.62 (1.38)</td>
<td>- .43**</td>
<td>- .52**</td>
<td>- .44**</td>
<td>- .77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Psychological Safety</td>
<td>4.72 (1.42)</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>- .56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.40 (1.48)</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>- .36**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stress</td>
<td>1.62 (0.81)</td>
<td>- .26**</td>
<td>- .38**</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>- .35**</td>
<td>- .65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>4.14 (1.61)</td>
<td>- .36**</td>
<td>- .46**</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>- .60**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>- .53**</td>
<td>- .31**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Counterfactual</td>
<td>2.25 (1.10)</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Avoiding</td>
<td>4.05 (1.71)</td>
<td>- .38**</td>
<td>- .63**</td>
<td>- .53**</td>
<td>- .43**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>- .49**</td>
<td>- .33**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Integrating</td>
<td>4.80 (1.49)</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>- .26**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>- .23**</td>
<td>- .16**</td>
<td>- .40**</td>
<td>- .49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Values in parentheses are Cronbach Alpha reliability estimates. *p < .05, **p < .001
APPENDIX O

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF FELT INCLUSION (TABLE 3)
### TABLE 3. ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX OF FELT INCLUSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The workplace is oppressive for me.*</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I would feel comfortable displaying a rainbow flag at work.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I would feel comfortable displaying pictures of my same-sex relationship at work.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I feel safe at work.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I feel like I am part of my work group.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) It is easy for me to work with others.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I feel like I don’t belong here.*</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) People at work accept me for being LGB.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I feel respected.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I feel appreciated.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) People at work value me for who I am.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) My sexual orientation is not an issue.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) People at work don't take me seriously.*</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) People at work care about my opinion.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) I feel like I can share my ideas at work.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I can be myself at work.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I can't act &quot;too gay&quot; at work.*</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) I feel pressured to stay closeted at work (i.e., conceal my sexual orientation).*</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) I am protected from mistreatment if disclose my sexual orientation at work.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) I feel comfortable talking about my sexual orientation at work.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) I can talk about my personal life with people at work.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) I don't believe my organization cares about their LGB employees.*</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) I am treated fairly people at work.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) I can share my experiences of being LGB at work.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) I have just as many opportunities as my co-workers (e.g., promotion, pay raise, etc.)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reverse coded item. Three factors were extracted using principal axis factoring.
APPENDIX P

CORRELATION TABLE FOR DOMINANCE ANALYSIS (TABLE 4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Felt Inclusion</th>
<th>Supportive Climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Felt Inclusion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supportive Climate</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Psychological Safety</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stress</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Life satisfaction</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Counterfeiting</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Avoiding</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integrating</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. *p < .05, **p < .001
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