

1  
2  
3 **Associations between Workplace Characteristics and “Outness” in LGBTI Workers in**  
4  
5 **Austria**  
6  
7

8 Lovro Markovic<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Daniel Schönherr<sup>3</sup>, Martina Zandonella<sup>3</sup>, Alejandro Gil-Salmeron<sup>4</sup>, Lee Smith<sup>5</sup>,  
9 Daragh T. McDermott<sup>6</sup>, Lin Yang<sup>7,8</sup>, Thomas E Dorner<sup>1,9</sup>, Hanna M Mües<sup>10</sup>, Igor Grabovac<sup>1</sup>  
10  
11

12  
13 <sup>1</sup>Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, Centre for Public Health, Medical University of  
14 Vienna, Kinderspitalgasse 15, 1090 Vienna, Austria  
15  
16

17  
18 <sup>2</sup>Department of Physical Medicine, Rehabilitation and Occupational Medicine, Medical University of  
19 Vienna, Währinger Gürtel 18-20, 1090 Vienna, Austria  
20  
21

22  
23 <sup>3</sup>SORA Institute for Social Research and Consulting, Ogris & Hofinger GmbH, Bennogasse 8/2/16,  
24 1080 Vienna, Austria  
25  
26

27  
28 <sup>4</sup> International Foundation for Integrated Care, Annex offices, Linton Rd, Oxford, OX26UD, United  
29 Kingdom  
30  
31

32  
33 <sup>5</sup> Cambridge Centre for Sport and Exercise Sciences, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, United  
34 Kingdom  
35  
36

37  
38 <sup>6</sup> Department of Psychology, School of Social Sciences, Nottingham Trent University, 50  
39 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham, United Kingdom  
40  
41

42  
43 <sup>7</sup> Department of Cancer Epidemiology and Prevention Research, Cancer Care Alberta, Alberta Health  
44 Services, Calgary, Alberta, Canada  
45  
46

47  
48 <sup>8</sup> Departments of Oncology & Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine,  
49 University of Calgary, Hospital Drive NW, Calgary, Alberta, Canada  
50  
51

52  
53 <sup>9</sup> Social Insurance Fund for Public Service, Railway and Mining Industries, Health Promotion Facility  
54 Sitzenberg-Reidling, 3454 Sitzenberg-Reidling, Austria  
55  
56

57  
58 <sup>10</sup> Department of Clinical and Health Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna,  
59 Vienna, Austria  
60

1  
2  
3 \*Corresponding author's address and contact details:  
4

5  
6 Lovro Markovic  
7

8  
9 Department of Physical Medicine, Rehabilitation and Occupational Medicine  
10

11  
12 Medical University of Vienna  
13

14  
15 Währinger Gürtel 18-20  
16

17  
18 1090 Vienna, Austria  
19

20  
21 Email: [lovro.markovic@meduniwien.ac.at](mailto:lovro.markovic@meduniwien.ac.at)  
22

23  
24 Tel: +43 1 40400 43300  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

### Objectives

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) individuals are often subjected to negative attitudes in the workplace, which may lead to non-disclosure of their sexual orientation and/or gender identities. We aimed to determine the prevalence of workplace disclosure of sexual or gender identity (i.e., “outness”; being “out”) and to examine its associations with workplace characteristics in LGBTI workers in Austria.

### Methods

This cross-sectional study analyzed sociodemographic, work- and wellbeing-related data from self-identifying gender- and/or sexual minority participants elicited by an online questionnaire between February and June 2017. From the initial 1268 respondents, 1177 (93%) provided complete data and were included in the subsequent analyses.

### Results

The largest proportion of the sample were 26-35 years old (39.1%), cisgender gay men (40.0%) in full-time employment (63.9%). Overall, 51.7% of the sample were “out” at the workplace. Being bisexual (OR=0.46, 95%CI 0.27-0.81), the provision of anti-discrimination guidelines in the workplace (OR=0.53, 95%CI 0.32-0.90), living alone (OR=0.50, 95%CI 0.32-0.79) and in shared households (OR=0.49, 95%CI 0.25-0.96) were associated with a decreased likelihood of being “out” at work.

Factors associated with being “out” at work were being middle aged (36-45-year-olds; OR=1.74, 95%CI 1.07-2.85), having been in employment for >10 years (OR=2.03, 95%CI 1.08-3.81), a LGBTI-friendly work environment (OR 1.61, 95%CI 1.36-1.91), labor-

1  
2  
3 management anti-discrimination contract (OR=2.02, 95%CI 1.23-3.32), and work council  
4  
5 protections (OR=1.56, 95%CI 1.04-2.36).  
6  
7

## 8 **Conclusions**

9  
10  
11 Instating anti-discrimination protections might facilitate “outness” of LGBTI workers and lead  
12  
13 to a better promotion of diversity in the workplace.  
14  
15

## 16 **Keywords**

17  
18 labour policy; sexual orientation; gender identity; workplace characteristics; workplace  
19  
20 guideline; workplace health; workplace relations  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **Key messages**

26  
27  
28 What is already known about this subject?

- 29  
30  
31 • A high proportion of LGBTI people experience discrimination in the workplace, and as  
32  
33 a consequence conceal their sexual orientation and/or gender identity  
34  
35
- 36  
37 • Lower workplace outness is associated with decreased job satisfaction, poorer health  
38  
39 and work-related outcomes  
40

41  
42  
43 What are the new findings?

- 44  
45 • Data from 1177 participants were analyzed concerning workplace characteristics and  
46  
47 outness for the first time in Austria  
48
- 49  
50 • Only half of surveyed participants were out about their sexual orientation and/or gender  
51  
52 identity in the workplace  
53
- 54  
55 • Workers who were middle-aged, employed for more than 10 years, worked in a LGBTI-  
56  
57 friendly environment, enjoyed legally binding anti-discrimination and work council  
58  
59 protections were more likely to be out at work  
60

1  
2  
3 How might this impact on policy or clinical practice in the foreseeable future?  
4  
5

- 6 • Policymakers should include legally binding anti-discrimination measures specifically  
7 targeting the LGBTI working population  
8
- 9 • Creating inclusive workplaces where people are able to be open about their sexual  
10 orientation and gender identity may increase productivity and improve health outcomes  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Introduction

Despite the improving legal situation and a more egalitarian societal climate in many countries<sup>1-4</sup> discrimination of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people persists with 58% of sexual and gender minority Europeans reporting experiences of discrimination in daily life<sup>3</sup>. LGBTI individuals are often confronted with people and workplace structures that condone negative attitudes in the workplace<sup>5</sup>. A recent report by the Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) of the European Union showed that 1 in 4 LGBTI individuals hide their identity at work, with 1 in 5 saying they felt discriminated against in the workplace<sup>3</sup>.

Discrimination of LGBTI workers may not always be overt<sup>6</sup>, and can have a range of consequences such as conflict with co-workers, career development problems, or economic inequity. Furthermore, LGBTI workers are exposed to hetero- and cis-normative work culture, meaning that being heterosexual and having a cisgender identity (i.e., that biological sex matches gender identity) are assumed applicable to all workers<sup>7</sup>. This creates further specific challenges where LGBTI workers may feel pressured to not disclose their identity or to “stay in the closet”<sup>8</sup>. For transgender people the assumption of cis-normativity may enforce stereotypical binary gender roles pressuring them to present as and perform gender roles based on their sex as assigned at birth, rather than their affirmed gender<sup>9</sup>.

Workers often ‘come out’ (i.e. disclose sexual or gender identity) to certain individuals at work and choose the extent to which they openly disclose their identity as a continuous process<sup>10</sup>. Hetero- and cis-normative working environments may lead to non-disclosure of sexual and gender identity, especially where discrimination goes unreported or unsanctioned. Extant literature demonstrates that less workplace outness<sup>11</sup> is associated with decreased job satisfaction<sup>12 13</sup>, poorer health (i.e., lower well-being and increased depressive symptoms<sup>14</sup>)

1  
2  
3 and work-related outcomes (such as lower productivity<sup>15</sup>). The potential for negative  
4 consequences may be the main reason why LGBTI workers choose not to disclose their  
5 identity<sup>16</sup>. Conversely, outness at work is associated with reductions in workplace  
6 discrimination<sup>3</sup> as well with improved job satisfaction, workplace commitment<sup>17</sup> and improved  
7 productivity of the whole work collective<sup>18</sup>.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 In Austria, legal protections for LGBTI individuals have been advancing and various  
13 reports indicate rising societal support for LGBTI equality<sup>3 4 16</sup>. However, there is a paucity of  
14 studies examining the LGBTI working population, with one 2015 report indicating that 48%  
15 of LGBTI people in Vienna are not open about their sexual orientation in the workplace<sup>19</sup> ,  
16 however this lacked any data on workplace characteristics or environment.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 The majority of the literature concerning LGBTI workers focuses on economic and  
29 corporate outcomes, as well as productivity<sup>17 20 21</sup>, overshadowing implications of workplace  
30 characteristics on workers' outness. However, results from few available studies highlight the  
31 importance of workplace characteristics that influence the level of outness of LGBTI workers<sup>7</sup>.  
32 For example, studies indicated that implementation of non-discrimination and supportive  
33 policies facilitate outness in LGBTI workers<sup>22</sup> but also lower discrimination, improve mental  
34 health outcomes, and positively affect performance at work<sup>23</sup>. However, there is a considerable  
35 paucity of studies investigating workplace outness and experiences of LGBTI workers.  
36 Therefore, we aimed to determine the prevalence of workplace outness among LGBTI workers  
37 in Austria and the associated workplace characteristics. To the best of our knowledge this is  
38 the first such study from Central Europe.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 53 **Methods**

54  
55 A cross-sectional study using an online-based questionnaire was conducted between  
56 February and June 2017. The study link was distributed among various LGBTI organizations  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in Austria, and the participants were asked to disseminate the link among their own networks.  
4  
5 The study was commissioned by the Vienna Chamber of Labour, who examined and approved  
6  
7 the questionnaire and methodology. Given that this paper presents a secondary analysis of data,  
8  
9 no other ethical approval was sought. Participants were anonymous, with no personal  
10  
11 information being asked, as well as no email or IP addresses being saved. Participation was  
12  
13 voluntary and was conducted in accordance with the Helsinki declaration in its current revision.  
14  
15  
16

### 17 *Study population*

18  
19  
20 Participants between 16 and 65 years of age, residing in Austria, who were in paid  
21  
22 employment and self-identify as a gender- and/or sexual minority were included in the study.  
23  
24  
25

### 26 *Questionnaire*

27  
28  
29 Overall, the questionnaire consisted of 50 questions, which were multiple and single  
30  
31 choice and were specifically designed for this study. The questionnaire addressed, outness at  
32  
33 the workplace, sociodemographic characteristics, workplace characteristics, and protections  
34  
35 against discrimination at the workplace and took roughly 10 minutes to complete.  
36  
37  
38

### 39 *Outness at the workplace*

40  
41  
42 Outness at the workplace was determined using the question “*Are you “out” as LGBTI*  
43  
44 *when it comes to the following persons in your private and professional environment:*  
45  
46 *immediate colleagues, other coworkers, superiors, and clients*”. For each category, participants  
47  
48 could choose from a Likert type scale (1-5) including (1) *Yes, with all;* (2) *Yes, with most;* (3)  
49  
50 *Yes, with some;* (4) *No,* and (5) *Not applicable*. Participants (n=16) who chose “not applicable”  
51  
52 across all categories or did not disclose any information about their outness status at the  
53  
54 workplace were excluded from analysis. We calculated a score based on the outcomes and  
55  
56 dichotomized the workplace outness based on a median split, with lower scores indicating  
57  
58 higher degrees of outness.  
59  
60



## Covariates

### Sexual- and gender identity

Sexual- and gender identity were ascertained with the following two questions; “*How would you describe your sexual orientation?*” (1) *Gay*; (2) *Lesbian*; (3) *Bisexual*; (4) *Heterosexual*; (5) *Other (please note)*; (6) *I don’t want to assign myself*, and “*How do you define your sex or gender self-image?*” (1) *born as a woman and living as a woman*; (2) *born as a man and living as a man*; (3) *born as a man and living as a woman*; (4) *born as a woman and living as a man*; (5) *born intersexual and living as a man*; (6) *born intersexual and living as a woman*; (7) *born intersexual and living neither as a woman nor as a man*; (8) *other*; (9) *I don’t want to assign myself*.

### Sociodemographic characteristics

Eight questions concerned age, citizenship, migration background, level of education (based on the International Standard Classification of Education, ISCED), living situation, and postal code (to determine the degree of urbanization based on DEGURBA classification), and overall life and work satisfaction (based on agreement with the statements “*I am very satisfied with my life as it is now*” and “*I am happy at my work*” on a 1-4 scale; 1= “*does not apply at all*” and 4= “*applies fully*”).

### Workplace characteristics

Thirteen questions elicited participants’ employment status, working hours, type of employment contract and position level, monthly income from work, employment sector, company size, duration of employment, perceived job security (based on the question “*Do you consider your job as...*” with 1= “*very insecure*” and 4= “*very secure*”), general perceived attitude towards LGBTI persons at the workplace (based on agreement with the statement “*How would you assess the general mood and attitude towards LGBTI people and LGBTI*

1  
2  
3 *issues at your workplace/work location?"* on a 1-7 scale; 1="very negative" and 7="very  
4  
5 *positive*"), and presence of LGBTI supervisors and colleagues.

#### 6 7 8 Discrimination protections at the workplace

9  
10  
11 A further eight questions on discrimination protections at the workplace were included,  
12  
13 such as the presence of guidelines for dealing with LGBTI, presence of a workers' council (and  
14  
15 whether LGBTI interests are represented therein), presence of a diversity representative,  
16  
17 presence of a trusted person at work, presence of labor-management contracts to prevent  
18  
19 LGBTI-based discrimination, presence of support for LGBTI-networking within the company,  
20  
21 and presence of targeted diversity management.  
22  
23  
24

#### 25 26 *Statistical analysis*

27  
28  
29 Descriptive analyses included means and standard deviation for metric variables, and  
30  
31 categorical variables are presented as frequencies and percentages. To assess differences  
32  
33 between workers who were categorized as out at work and those who were not, we used *t*-test  
34  
35 and Mann-Whitney-U test, depending on data distribution with Chi-square test being used for  
36  
37 differences in categorical variables.  
38  
39  
40

41 We performed a multivariable logistic regression model (mutually adjusted, listwise  
42  
43 exclusion of cases) to assess which worker and workplace characteristics were associated with  
44  
45 workplace outness. Variables in the model were chosen based on the univariate analysis using  
46  
47 the cutoff point of  $p < 0.2^{24}$ , with the largest group chosen as the reference in the model.  
48  
49 Statistical analyses were done using SPSS for Windows v26.0, all tests were two tailed, with  
50  
51 *p*-values less than 0.05 denoting statistical significance.  
52  
53  
54

## 55 **Results**

### 56 57 58 *Sample characteristics*

1  
2  
3 A total of 1268 individuals participated in the study. Cases were excluded if data on  
4 sexual orientation or gender identity were missing or if there were more than 50% missing  
5 entries. Overall, 1177 (93%) participants were included in our analysis with 51.6% ( $n = 608$ )  
6 reporting being out at the workplace. Descriptive characteristics of the study sample and  
7 differences based on outness at the workplace are shown in Table 1. Most participants were  
8 sexual minority and cisgender (68.6%;  $n = 808$ ) young adults (39.1%; 26-35 years old), had  
9 tertiary level education (43.9%), were living with a partner (35.9%), had full-time employment  
10 (63.9%), held their current position for less than 3 years (44.3%), had LGBTI coworkers  
11 (56.5%), but no outed LGBTI superiors (69.2%), with the overall job perception as “safe” ( $M$   
12 =3.15) and their work environment as LGBTI-friendly ( $M = 5.14$ ; SD 1.45).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

#### 27 *Factors associated with outness: univariate analysis*

28  
29

30 The univariate analysis revealed significant differences between participants who were  
31 out at work and those who were not with respect to the following variables (Table 1): sexual  
32 and gender identity, age, migration background, living situation, managing responsibility,  
33 company size, duration of employment at current workplace, perceived job stability, perceived  
34 workplace LGBTI friendliness, happiness in life, happiness at work, having LGBTI coworkers  
35 or superiors, having a labor-management anti-discrimination contract, targeted diversity  
36 management, and worker council protections.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

#### 46 *Factors associated with outness: multivariate regression model*

47  
48

49 Associations between workplace outness, workplace and sociodemographic  
50 characteristics are presented in Table 2. Participants who self-identified as bisexual were 2.17  
51 times more likely to conceal their sexual orientation or gender identity at work. Presence of  
52 anti-discrimination guidelines in the workplace was associated with two times lower likelihood  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of being out at work. Those who reported living alone or living in shared accommodations  
4  
5 were also two times less likely to be out at work.  
6  
7

8  
9 Participants who were working for more than 10 years at the same workplace, middle-  
10 aged workers (35-50) had higher odds to be out at the workplace. Workplace characteristics  
11 significantly associated with higher likelihoods of workplace outness were: perceived LGBTI  
12  
13 friendliness, having a workers' council and a labor management anti-discrimination contract  
14  
15  
16  
17 (Table 2).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **Discussion**

24  
25  
26 Our study explored workplace and workers' characteristics and their associations with  
27 being out in the workplace among a sample of LGBTI workers in Austria. Overall, 1177  
28 workers were analyzed with half of our participants reporting being out in the workplace. In  
29 our model we found higher likelihoods of outness at work among workers aged 36-50, who  
30 had worked for more than 10 years at the same workplace, that positively perceived LGBTI  
31 workplace friendliness, had a presence of work council protections, and a labor-management  
32 anti-discrimination contract. The opposite was found for those who identified as bisexual, had  
33 anti-discrimination guidelines at work, were living alone, or in shared households without a  
34 partner (Table 2).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 There is a lack of literature examining the prevalence of workplace outness and  
49 workplace characteristics. However, a recent report by FRA stated that EU-wide around 26%  
50 of participants hid their sexual orientation at work<sup>3</sup>. A study by Lloren and Parini in a Swiss  
51 sample of LGBTI workers reported overall outness of 87%<sup>25</sup>, with only 42% of workers being  
52 out to everyone. The difference in the reported prevalence of workplace outness most likely  
53 stems from the way outness was conceptualized and measured in our respective studies.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our sample included 808 (68.6%) gay lesbian participants and 221 (18.8%) bisexual  
4 respondents who were more frequently identified as “not out” (13.5% vs 24.4%) and were  
5 found to be 2.17 times more likely to conceal their identity at the workplace. These findings  
6 are consistent with other studies <sup>10 26 27</sup>. Bisexual individuals are widely exposed to both  
7 biphobia and homophobia, leading to a unique form of minority stress in bisexual individuals  
8 <sup>28</sup>. Bisexual people thus face double stigmatization by being discriminated not only by the  
9 heterosexual majority but also by other sexual minorities <sup>28</sup> often by denying the existence or  
10 legitimacy of a bisexual identity <sup>29</sup> or being ascribed bi-negative stereotypes such as being  
11 untrustworthy or promiscuous <sup>30</sup>. Such attitudes seem to stem most from non-bisexual men <sup>29</sup>  
12 <sup>31</sup>. Due to these circumstances, bisexual employees are often silenced or invisible due to  
13 discrimination from other sexual minorities but also the heterosexual majority <sup>26 28</sup>, which may  
14 lead to internalized biphobia <sup>27</sup> that appears to be more detrimental if associated with  
15 discrimination from gay and lesbian peers <sup>32</sup>. In order to increase the level of outness at  
16 workplaces it is important to acknowledge the double stigma experienced by bisexual  
17 employees by actively increasing awareness of bisexual identities and their explicit inclusivity  
18 in anti-discriminatory policies, in turn leading to higher levels of perceived safety <sup>33</sup>.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 Even though gender minority groups share some discriminatory experiences with  
42 sexual minority groups, they are likely to be faced with distinct and unique challenges in the  
43 workplace <sup>34 35</sup>. There is a general lack of studies specifically examining non-cis gender  
44 participants of the workforce <sup>36</sup>, possibly due to the relatively lower visibility under the LGBTI  
45 identity umbrella. However, the second EU-wide LGBTI survey in 2019 showed a rise in  
46 perceived workplace discrimination in trans-respondents (36%) compared to the first survey in  
47 2012 (22%), whereas the rise was notably lower for lesbian, gay, and bisexual respondents  
48 (21% vs. 19%) <sup>3 16</sup>. Transgender workers made up 7.5% of our study sample with differences  
49 among sexual orientation and gender identity groups being significant vis-à-vis workplace  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 outness, however a non-cis gender identity was not found to be significantly associated with  
4 workplace outness in the regression model. Moreover, in absolute numbers, trans and intersex  
5 respondents were more commonly out (9.7%, n=59) than not (5.1%, n=29). The long and  
6 complicated process of gender transitioning and recognition (including medical, social, and  
7 legal procedures) might force non cis-gender workers to come out at work, which combined  
8 with social and legal identity recognition issues might lead to greater vulnerability. It has been  
9 reported that trans-employees face more physical violence in the workplace than sexual  
10 minority employees <sup>9</sup>. Even though Austrian and EU law prohibits workplace discrimination  
11 based on gender identity, these protections lose their meaning when one is unable to legally  
12 change the gender assigned to them at birth. Negative consequences of “forced” outing in trans  
13 workers could be improved by targeted anti-discrimination measures and wider legal change.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Interestingly, our results also showed that the presence of anti-discrimination guidelines  
30 at the workplace was associated with less outness. Even though these may have been  
31 introduced to reduce discrimination at work, or to mitigate against problematic workplace  
32 circumstances, they are nevertheless a “softer” form of protection and thus their efficacy  
33 depends on how seriously employees and supervisors take them, and the extent to which they  
34 may not be uniformly interpreted and applied throughout all parts of the same organization <sup>37</sup>.  
35 This was seen in our study where labor-management contracts with discrimination protections,  
36 were found to be associated with two times higher odds of outness at work. Studies have shown  
37 that organizations, with enacted workplace protections, also enjoy higher outness levels in  
38 LGBTI employees <sup>22</sup>, which is consistent with our findings. Also, it is important to note that  
39 our study focused on measures specifically targeting discrimination against sexual and/or  
40 gender minorities. Non-discriminatory measures that are not specifically focusing on LGBTI  
41 discrimination might not achieve the same results. The difference may also be explained by the  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 top-down nature of guidelines, as opposed to horizontal impact of anti-discrimination  
4 contracts.  
5  
6

7  
8 While our Austria-based LGBTI sample predominantly consists of gay men, one of the  
9 strengths of the study include a large sample of bisexual and transgender individuals, who are  
10 more commonly underrepresented in this type of research. To our knowledge, this is one of the  
11 largest samples of LGBTI individuals focusing on workplace outness, and the first study  
12 exploring these issues in a central European context. Further, the use of an extensive  
13 questionnaire covering different areas of workplace characteristics provides a robust and in-  
14 depth picture of the experiences of LGBTI workers. This study was open to workers from a  
15 variety of occupational sectors and workplace sizes, further underpinning the variety of work-  
16 based experiences captured. However, our study results need to be viewed in light of some  
17 inherent limitations. An important limitation was the recruitment strategy with self-selection  
18 of the study participants. Data collection occurred online, which might have led to  
19 overrepresentation of younger, more educated, urban and affluent participants, causing an  
20 overestimation of outness at work. Furthermore, the questionnaire was propagated through  
21 personal contacts of already recruited individuals, which might have further contributed to the  
22 selection bias by oversampling similar participants. For the purposes of our analysis, our  
23 characterization of outness at work was dichotomized via a median split, which can be argued  
24 dilutes inherent sample heterogeneity and inevitably this prevented us from stratifying degrees  
25 of outness (and related characteristics) among respondents. This may lead to an  
26 overrepresentation of risk as indicated by the odds ratio. However, recent evidence does  
27 provide a defense of this analytical technique<sup>38</sup>. Further, outness as a construct is multifarious  
28 and non-uniformly described in the literature with a range of antecedents and individual  
29 consequences. Even though a worker was considered out, their disclosure might not have had  
30 an impact on the way they were perceived by their employer or their perceptions of their  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 workplace. Indeed, in our analysis happiness at work and happiness with life did not predict  
4  
5 employee outness which may, in part, be attributable to workplace happiness being understood  
6  
7 by respondents as reflecting their own workplace self-efficacy and career development  
8  
9 opportunities. As this is the first such analysis in an Austrian context to our knowledge, this  
10  
11 study provides a useful benchmark for future, more nuanced assessments of this issue. Also,  
12  
13 discrimination often starts before employment, with LGBTI individuals facing employment  
14  
15 issues due to their identity<sup>39</sup>. It could therefore be that an a priori selection occurred, where  
16  
17 LGBTI employees from organizations already providing a friendly workplace environment  
18  
19 were more likely to respond. The sample consisted mostly of middle-aged employees.  
20  
21 Considering the rapid development of legislative protections of LGBTI individuals in general,  
22  
23 younger individuals may have had more protections than their older counterparts<sup>1</sup>. Moreover,  
24  
25 social attitudes are rapidly improving across countries<sup>4</sup>, with rising numbers of young people  
26  
27 being open about their identity at school and at work<sup>3</sup>. Increased visibility and decreased  
28  
29 stigma of younger LGBTI workers might translate to a more accepting workplace culture.  
30  
31 Moreover, given the low representation of trans and intersex participants in our study we were  
32  
33 unable to investigate the specific aspects of their experiences. The overall lack of literature on  
34  
35 the experiences of trans workers has been noted<sup>36</sup>.

36  
37  
38 This study employed a cross-sectional design, making it impossible to investigate  
39  
40 causal links between workplace characteristics and outness, with a probability of reverse  
41  
42 causation that cannot be definitively excluded. For example, , important associations were  
43  
44 found that require further exploration in longitudinal designs. Finally, an intersectional  
45  
46 approach would be needed to identify specific challenges faced by the various LGBTI  
47  
48 subgroups<sup>40</sup>. Taking into account the interplay of participants' sociodemographic, workplace,  
49  
50 and identity characteristics in a longitudinal study design might provide further insights into  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 how to increase visibility and provide support for the most marginalized members of the  
4  
5 workforce, in a rapidly changing societal and legal climate.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **Conclusions and relevance**

12  
13  
14 In our study on 1177 participants, we found that 52% of LGBTI participants were out  
15  
16 at the workplace. Our analysis showed that participants who identified as bisexual and those  
17  
18 living alone had the lowest levels of outness, and those enjoying longer duration of  
19  
20 employment and binding internal non-discrimination contracts had the higher odds of being  
21  
22 out at the workplace. In terms of managerial workplace intervention, we saw that more  
23  
24 elaborate labor management contracts of non-discrimination were found to be associated with  
25  
26 higher odds of outness at work. An overall accepting workplace culture was also associated  
27  
28 with higher odds of workplace outness. Changes in these workplace characteristics would  
29  
30 increase visibility of LGBTI workers and lead to a better promotion of diversity in the  
31  
32 workplace.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 **Statements**

### 39 40 41 a. Contributorship

42  
43  
44 L.M., I.G. conceived the study and did a formal analysis. D.S. and M.Z. data curation. L.M.  
45  
46 original manuscript draft. All authors made considerable contributions in the final manuscript  
47  
48 draft and approved it for submission.  
49  
50  
51

### 52 53 54 b. Funding

55  
56 This secondary analysis did not receive any third-party funding. Data collection and primary  
57  
58 analysis were financed by the Vienna Chamber of Labour, who had no involvement with this  
59  
60 analysis, its interpretation, or manuscript preparation. Funding number - Not Applicable.

1  
2  
3 c. Competing interests  
4  
5

6 The authors declare no conflict of interest.  
7  
8

9 d. Data Sharing/Data availability  
10  
11

12 Data will be available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author.  
13  
14

15 e. Ethics Approval Statement (Applicable for Research/Original Articles)  
16  
17

18 This is a secondary analysis of previously gathered and available data. The study protocol  
19 was approved by the Vienna Chamber of Labour. Ethics approval number - Not Applicable.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1. Sociodemographic and work-related characteristics of the study population stratified by outness status

Variable % (n)	Total	Out	Not out	p
	100% (N=1177)	51.66% (608)	48.34% (569)	
<b>Sexual and gender identity</b>				<0.001
Gay men	40.0% (471)	44.1% (268)	35.7% (203)	
Lesbian women	28.6% (337)	28.9% (176)	28.3% (161)	
Bisexual men/women	18.8% (221)	13.5% (82)	24.4% (139)	
Trans* and Intersex people	7.5% (88)	9.7% (59)	5.1% (29)	
Other sexual and gender identity	5.1% (60)	3.8% (23)	6.5% (37)	
<b>Age</b>				<0.001
16-25	15.5% (182)	12.3% (75)	18.8% (107)	
26-35	39.1% (460)	33.7% (205)	44.8% (255)	
36-50	35.4% (417)	42.4% (258)	27.9% (159)	
51-65	10.0% (118)	11.5% (70)	8.4% (48)	
<b>Austrian citizenship</b>				0.280
Yes	70.6% (831)	69.6% (423)	71.7% (408)	
No	8.2% (97)	9.0% (55)	7.4% (42)	
<b>Migration background</b>				0.021
Yes	22.9% (270)	25.5% (155)	20.2% (115)	
No	55.9% (658)	53.1% (323)	58.9% (335)	
<b>Education</b>				0.081
Primary / vocational (ISCED 2-3)	13.9% (164)	15.8% (96)	12.0% (68)	
Secondary (ISCED 4-5)	21.1% (248)	20.9% (127)	21.3% (121)	
Tertiary (ISCED 6-8)	43.9% (517)	42.1% (256)	45.9% (261)	
<b>Living situation</b>				<0.001
Alone	26.9% (317)	22.0% (140)	31.1% (177)	
With partner	35.9% (422)	40.5% (246)	30.9% (176)	
With partner and child(ren)	4.2% (50)	5.6% (34)	2.8% (16)	
Other (flat sharing, with parents, etc.)	11.6% (137)	9.4% (57)	14.1% (80)	
<b>Urbanisation</b>				0.626
Cities (densely populated)	53.8% (633)	53.0% (322)	54.7% (311)	
Towns and suburbs (intermediate)	10.3% (121)	11.0% (67)	9.5% (54)	
Rural areas (thinly populated)	11.0% (130)	10.7% (65)	11.4% (65)	
<b>Employment status</b>				0.433
>35h/week (full time)	63.9% (752)	62.8% (382)	65.0% (370)	
<35h/week (part time)	36.1% (425)	37.2% (226)	35.0% (199)	
<b>Managing responsibility</b>				<0.001
No	81.6% (960)	468 (77.0%)	86.5% (492)	
Yes	18.4% (216)	139 (22.9%)	13.5% (77)	
<b>Monthly income (after tax)</b>				0.01
up to 1000 EUR	14.2% (167)	12.0% (73)	16.5% (94)	

up to 2000 EUR	44.3% (521)	44.2% (269)	44.3% (252)	
up to 3000 EUR	29.8% (351)	30.1% (183)	29.5% (168)	
more than 3000 EUR	9.4% (111)	11.5% (70)	7.2% (41)	
<b>Company size</b>				0.003
1-10 employees	20.6% (242)	22.7% (138)	18.3% (104)	
11-50 employees	26.8% (315)	26.8% (163)	26.7% (152)	
51-250 employees	20.6% (242)	18.1% (110)	23.2% (132)	
251 and more employees	26.4% (311)	23.2% (141)	29.9% (170)	
<b>Duration of employment at current workplace</b>				<0.001
Up to 3 years	44.3% (521)	35.9% (218)	53.3% (303)	
4-10 years	32.7% (385)	34.2% (208)	31.1% (177)	
more than 10 years	22.9% (269)	29.6% (180)	15.6% (89)	
<b>Perceived job stability, mean (SD)</b>	3.15 (0.69)	3.21 (0.68)	3.10 (0.69)	0.006
<b>Perceived workplace LGBTI friendliness, mean (SD)</b>	5.14 (1.45)	5.69 (1.28)	4.58 (1.40)	<0.001
<b>Happiness in life, mean (SD)</b>	3.24 (0.74)	3.34 (0.72)	3.12 (0.74)	<0.001
<b>Happiness at work, mean (SD)</b>	3.21 (0.88)	3.31 (0.87)	3.11 (0.88)	0.001
<b>LGBTI coworkers</b>				<0.001
Present	56.5% (665)	60.7% (369)	52.0% (296)	
Not present	34.4% (405)	27.6% (168)	41.7% (237)	
<b>LGBTI superiors</b>				<0.001
Present	21.0% (247)	26.8% (163)	14.8% (84)	
Not present	69.2% (814)	60.9% (370)	78.0% (444)	
<b>Anti-discrimination guidelines</b>				0.144
Present	24.6% (290)	25.7% (156)	23.6% (134)	
Not present	65.3% (769)	61.7% (375)	69.2% (394)	
<b>Diversity representative</b>				0.408
Present	25.6% (301)	25.8% (157)	25.3% (144)	
Not present	64.4% (758)	61.5% (374)	67.5% (384)	
<b>Labor-management anti-discrimination contract</b>				0.008
Present	31.8% (374)	34.2% (208)	29.2% (166)	
Not present	58.2% (685)	53.1% (323)	63.6% (362)	
<b>Targeted diversity management</b>				0.031
Present	16.8% (198)	18.6% (113)	14.9% (85)	
Not present	73.2% (861)	68.8% (418)	77.9% (443)	
<b>Work council protections on LGBTI matters (if work council present)</b>				<0.001
Present	25.5% (300)	27.6% (168)	23.2% (132)	
Not present	31.9% (376)	24.2% (147)	40.2% (229)	

Table 2. Variables associated with outness status at work. All variables with a  $p < 0.2$  in the univariate analysis were added to the model and are listed below. All variables were entered into the model simultaneously.

Variable	OR	95% CI	p
<b>Sexual and gender identity (Ref: Gay men)</b>			
Lesbian women	0.87	0.54 - 1.42	0.585
Bisexual men/women	0.46	0.27 - 0.81	0.007
Trans* and Intersex people	1.33	0.51 - 3.50	0.561
Other sexual and gender identity	0.27	0.06 - 1.16	0.079
<b>Age (Ref: 26-35)</b>			
16-25	1.33	0.63 - 2.84	0.456
36-50	1.74	1.07 - 2.85	0.027
51-65	1.36	0.64 - 2.88	0.426
<b>With managing responsibility</b>	1.10	0.64 - 1.90	0.721
<b>Monthly income (Ref: up to 2000 EUR)</b>			
up to 1000 EUR	0.70	0.28 - 1.75	0.445
up to 3000 EUR	0.86	0.54 - 1.37	0.523
more than 3000 EUR	0.57	0.27 - 1.22	0.145
<b>Company size (Ref: 11-50 employees)</b>			
1-10 employees	1.22	0.57 - 2.61	0.601
51-250 employees	1.27	0.73 - 2.23	0.401
251 and more employees	0.83	0.49 - 1.41	0.485
<b>Duration of employment at current workplace (Ref: Up to 3 years)</b>			
4-10 years	1.26	0.77 - 2.06	0.355
more than 10 years	2.03	1.08 - 3.81	0.027
<b>Perceived job stability</b>	0.84	0.62 - 1.15	0.289
<b>Perceived workplace LGBTI friendliness</b>	1.61	1.36 - 1.91	<0.001
<b>LGBTI coworkers not present</b>	0.73	0.45 - 1.19	0.202
<b>LGBTI superiors present</b>	1.57	0.97 - 2.54	0.068
<b>Anti-discrimination guidelines present</b>	0.53	0.32 - 0.90	0.018
<b>Labor-management anti-discrimination contract present</b>	2.02	1.23 - 3.32	0.005
<b>Targeted diversity management present</b>	0.96	0.57 - 1.61	0.880
<b>Work council protections present</b>	1.56	1.04 - 2.36	0.033
<b>Happiness in life</b>	1.03	0.75 - 1.40	0.877
<b>Happiness at work</b>	1.18	0.92 - 1.52	0.203
<b>With migration background</b>	1.52	0.96 - 2.39	0.073
<b>Education (Ref: Tertiary. ISCED 6-8)</b>			
Primary and vocational. ISCED 2-3	1.63	0.91 - 2.91	0.102
Secondary. ISCED 4-5	0.99	0.61 - 1.62	0.969
<b>Living situation (Ref: With partner)</b>			
Alone	0.50	0.32 - 0.79	0.003
With partner and child(ren)	1.57	0.59 - 4.18	0.365
Other (flat sharing. with parents. etc.)	0.49	0.25 - 0.96	0.039

## References

1. Pew Research Center. A survey of LGBT Americans. Attitudes, Experiences and Values in Changing Times Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center; 2013 [updated 2013/06/13/. Available from: [https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2013/06/SDT\\_LGBT-Americans\\_06-2013.pdf](https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2013/06/SDT_LGBT-Americans_06-2013.pdf) accessed 13/12/2020 2020.
2. Kent NO, Poushter J. The Global Divide on Homosexuality Persists: Pew Research Center, 2020:27.
3. Fundamental Rights Agency. A long way to go for LGBTI equality: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2020:72.
4. European Commission. Discrimination in the European Union. Special Eurobarometer. Brussels, Belgium, 2019.
5. Priola V, Lasio D, De Simone S, et al. The Sound of Silence. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Discrimination in 'Inclusive Organizations': The Sound of Silence. *Brit J Manage* 2014;25(3):488-502. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12043
6. Resnick CA, Galupo MP. Assessing Experiences With LGBT Microaggressions in the Workplace: Development and Validation of the Microaggression Experiences at Work Scale. *J Homosex* 2019;66(10):1380-403. doi: 10.1080/00918369.2018.1542207
7. Bauer GR, Hammond R, Travers R, et al. "I Don't Think This Is Theoretical; This Is Our Lives": How Erasure Impacts Health Care for Transgender People. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care* 2009;20(5):348-61. doi: 10.1016/j.jana.2009.07.004

- 1  
2  
3 8. Einarsdóttir A, Hoel H, Lewis D. Fitting the bill? (Dis)embodied disclosure of sexual  
4  
5 identities in the workplace. *Work, Employment and Society* 2016;30(3):489-505. doi:  
6  
7 10.1177/0950017014568136  
8  
9
- 10 9. Bachmann CL, Gooch B. LGBT in Britain - Work Report, 2018.  
11
- 12 10. Dewaele A, Van Houtte M, Buysse A, et al. What Predicts Visibility Management at  
13  
14 Work? A Study of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Flemish Government Employees.  
15  
16 *PSYCHOL BELG* 2019;59(1):78. doi: 10.5334/pb.443  
17  
18
- 19 11. Brenner BR, Lyons HZ, Fassinger RE. Can Heterosexism Harm Organizations?  
20  
21 Predicting the Perceived Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of Gay and Lesbian  
22  
23 Employees. *Career Dev Q* 2010;58(4):321-35. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-  
24  
25 0045.2010.tb00181.x  
26  
27
- 28 12. Lyons HZ, Brenner BR, Fassinger RE. A Multicultural Test of the Theory of Work  
29  
30 Adjustment: Investigating the Role of Heterosexism and Fit Perceptions in the Job  
31  
32 Satisfaction of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Employees. *J Couns Psychol*  
33  
34 2005;52(4):537-48. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.537  
35  
36
- 37 13. Parnell MK, Lease SH, Green ML. Perceived Career Barriers for Gay, Lesbian, and  
38  
39 Bisexual Individuals. *J Career Dev* 2012;39(3):248-68. doi:  
40  
41 10.1177/0894845310386730  
42  
43
- 44 14. Riggle EDB, Rostosky SS, Black WW, et al. Outness, concealment, and authenticity:  
45  
46 Associations with LGB individuals' psychological distress and well-being. *Psychol*  
47  
48 *Sex Orientat Gen Divers* 2017;4(1):54-62. doi: 10.1037/sgd0000202  
49  
50
- 51 15. Waldo CR. Working in a majority context: A structural model of heterosexism as  
52  
53 minority stress in the workplace. *J Couns Psychol* 1999;46(2):218-32. doi:  
54  
55 10.1037/0022-0167.46.2.218  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 16. Fundamental Rights Agency. European Union lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender  
4  
5 survey: results at a glance, 2013.  
6  
7
- 8 17. Badgett MVL, Durso LE, Kastanis A, et al. The Business Impact of LGBT-Supportive  
9  
10 Workplace Policies: UCLA: The Williams Institute; 2013 [Available from:  
11  
12 <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3vt6t9zx> accessed 14.12. 2020.  
13  
14
- 15 18. Everly BA, Shih MJ, Ho GC. Don't ask, don't tell? Does disclosure of gay identity affect  
16  
17 partner performance? *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2012;48(1):407-10. doi:  
18  
19 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.08.005  
20  
21
- 22 19. Studies IfH. Queer in Wien: Stadt Wien Studie zur Lebenssituation von Lesben,  
23  
24 Schwulen, Bisexuellen, Transgender und Intersex Personen (LGBTIs). Vienna, 2015.  
25
- 26 20. McFadden C. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Careers and Human Resource  
27  
28 Development: A Systematic Literature Review. *Hum Resource Dev Rev*  
29  
30 2015;14(2):125-62. doi: 10.1177/1534484314549456  
31  
32
- 33 21. Hossain M, Atif M, Ahmed A, et al. Do LGBT Workplace Diversity Policies Create  
34  
35 Value for Firms? *J Bus Ethics* 2020;167:775–91. doi: 10.1007/s10551-019-04158-z  
36  
37
- 38 22. Rostosky SS, Riggle EDB. "Out" at work: The relation of actor and partner workplace  
39  
40 policy and internalized homophobia to disclosure status. *J Couns Psychol*  
41  
42 2002;49(4):411-19. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.49.4.411  
43  
44
- 45 23. Webster JR, Adams GA, Maranto CL, et al. Workplace contextual supports for LGBT  
46  
47 employees: A review, meta-analysis, and agenda for future research. *Hum Resour*  
48  
49 *Manage* 2018;57(1):193-210. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21873  
50  
51
- 52 24. Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, et al. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic  
53  
54 regression. *Source Code Biol Med* 2008;3(1):17. doi: 10.1186/1751-0473-3-17  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 25. Lloren A, Parini L. How LGBT-Supportive Workplace Policies Shape the Experience of  
4  
5 Lesbian, Gay Men, and Bisexual Employees. *Sex Res Soc Policy* 2017;14(3):289-99.  
6  
7 doi: 10.1007/s13178-016-0253-x  
8  
9
- 10 26. Bell MP, Özbilgin MF, Beauregard TA, et al. Voice, silence, and diversity in 21st century  
11  
12 organizations: Strategies for inclusion of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender  
13  
14 employees. *Hum Resour Manage* 2011;50(1):131-46. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20401  
15  
16
- 17 27. Hoang M, Holloway J, Mendoza RH. An Empirical Study into the Relationship between  
18  
19 Bisexual Identity Congruence, Internalized Biphobia and Infidelity among Bisexual  
20  
21 Women. *J Bisex* 2011;11(1):23-38. doi: 10.1080/15299716.2011.545285  
22  
23
- 24 28. Barker M, Richards C, Jones R, et al. The bisexuality report: Bisexual inclusion in LGBT  
25  
26 equality and diversity: Milton Keynes, UK: Centre for Citizenship, Identities and  
27  
28 Governance, Faculty of Health and Social Care, The Open University, 2012.  
29
- 30 29. Köllen T. Bisexuality and Diversity Management—Addressing the B in LGBT as a  
31  
32 Relevant ‘Sexual Orientation’ in the Workplace. *J Bisex* 2013;13(1):122-37. doi:  
33  
34 10.1080/15299716.2013.755728  
35  
36
- 37 30. Zivony A, Lobel T. The Invisible Stereotypes of Bisexual Men. *Arch Sex Behav*  
38  
39 2014;43(6):1165-76. doi: 10.1007/s10508-014-0263-9  
40  
41
- 42 31. Yost MR, Thomas GD. Gender and Binegativity: Men’s and Women’s Attitudes Toward  
43  
44 Male and Female Bisexuals. *Arch Sex Behav* 2012;41(3):691-702. doi:  
45  
46 10.1007/s10508-011-9767-8  
47  
48
- 49 32. Arriaga AS, Parent MC. Partners and prejudice: Bisexual partner gender and experiences  
50  
51 of binegativity from heterosexual, lesbian, and gay people. *Psychol Sex Orientat*  
52  
53 *Gend Divers* 2019;6(3):382-91. doi: 10.1037/sgd0000337  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 33. Green HB, Payne NR, Green J. Working Bi: Preliminary Findings from a Survey on  
4  
5 Workplace Experiences of Bisexual People. *J Bisex* 2011;11(2-3):300-16. doi:  
6  
7 10.1080/15299716.2011.572007  
8  
9  
10 34. Brewster ME, Velez B, DeBlaere C, et al. Transgender individuals' workplace  
11  
12 experiences: The applicability of sexual minority measures and models. *J Couns*  
13  
14 *Psychol* 2012;59(1):60-70. doi: 10.1037/a0025206  
15  
16  
17 35. Sangganjanavanich VF, Headley JA. Facilitating Career Development Concerns of  
18  
19 Gender Transitioning Individuals: Professional Standards and Competencies. *Career*  
20  
21 *Dev Q* 2013;61(4):354-66. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-0045.2013.00061.x  
22  
23  
24 36. Law CL, Martinez LR, Ruggs EN, et al. Trans-parency in the workplace: How the  
25  
26 experiences of transsexual employees can be improved. *J Vocat Behav*  
27  
28 2011;79(3):710-23. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.018  
29  
30  
31 37. Ragins BR, Singh R, Cornwell JM. Making the invisible visible: Fear and disclosure of  
32  
33 sexual orientation at work. *J Appl Psychol* 2007;92(4):1103-18. doi: 10.1037/0021-  
34  
35 9010.92.4.1103  
36  
37  
38 38. Iacobucci D, Posavac SS, Kardes FR, et al. Toward a more nuanced understanding of the  
39  
40 statistical properties of a median split. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*  
41  
42 2015;25(4):652-65. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.12.002>  
43  
44  
45 39. Sears B, Mallory C. Employment Discrimination against LGBT People: UCLA: The  
46  
47 Williams Institute 2014.  
48  
49 40. McGarrity LA. Socioeconomic status as context for minority stress and health disparities  
50  
51 among lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals. *Psychol Sex Orientat GenD Divers*  
52  
53 2014;1(4):383-97. doi: 10.1037/sgd0000067  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60