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Abstract

Purpose – The inclusion of LGBTQ+ persons (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and having other sexual orientations and gender identities) is a crucial step in improving gender diversity in the workplace; however, till date, it remains a significant challenge for human resource management professionals. The current study critically examines this issue of an inclusive workplace for LGBTQ+ people through a systematic review of the existing research that has empirically studied their experiences at the workplace. It also examines the resistance and challenges organizations face in LGBTQ+ diversity training and provides future research avenues.

Design/methodology/approach – For systematically reviewing the literature, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) model has been used. A total of 101 empirical studies have been reviewed.

Findings – The result shows that LGBTQ+ people encounter multiple negative workplace experiences, including proximal (hiring discrimination and housing discrimination) and distal workplace discrimination (unsafe work climate, microaggressions and harassment). These aversive experiences lead to work stress while also mandating that people manage their sexual identity and style of dressing. This stress, in turn, impacts their work–family outcomes, job satisfaction and decision-making with regard to their careers.

Originality/value – The paper provides a holistic understanding of the aversive workplace experiences encountered by sexual minorities.
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A report by the International Labour Organization, “Women at Work: Trends 2016” shows a general inclination towards a reduced gender gap in the global workforce except for Eastern and Southern Asia. Higher inclusivity of women in organizations is undoubtedly an accomplishment for human resource management professionals (Hanappi-Egger, 2013; Klein, 2016). However, mainstream gender diversity programs and policies tend to be grounded in prevailing heteronormative assumptions that focus on the inclusion of cisgender and heterosexuals (Röndahl et al., 2007; Mizzi, 2013; Priola et al., 2018) while largely ignoring the inclusion issue of LGBTQ+ persons (Priola et al., 2018). In Spain, an analysis of the diversity policies of the corporate sector revealed that they were primarily focused on women, culture and work–life balance (Alonso, 2013); however, LGBTQ+ diversity remains taboo. The focus on women can be attributed to the fact that “they make up around 50% of the workforce; not considering them simply is not an option” (Alonso, 2013, p. 152). LGBTQ+ issues have barely reached the policy level since they grossly make up 6% of the employees in an organization, although there is no specific data regarding the real percentage. Nevertheless, a good diversity program must include sexual minorities since overemphasizing heterosexist discourse in organizational policies negatively alters their workplace experiences (Compton, 2020).

This lack of LGBTQ+ inclusion in organizations also finds reflection in academic research. In the academic arena, research on gender has somewhat been “constantly ignored and, at best, marginalized in separate chapters, special issues, separate tracks or divisions at conferences, footnotes or parenthetic observations” (Martin, 2000, p. 208). Research on gender
identity, sexuality and sexual orientation in organizations was even more neglected until the last few years (Köllen, 2021). This long absence of sexuality from management literature (Brewis and Sinclair, 2000; Colgan and Rumens, 2014) has been attributed to two major forces; a) perceived taboo and b) binary assumption of gender discourse in organizations (Köllen, 2021). Compton and Dougherty (2017), too, observed that a “process of silencing non-normative identities is an essential part of workplace experiences” (p. 875). However, after a long silence, in the last few years, the management literature has seen a surge in research exploring sexuality in organizations; notably, most of the research in this field has been conducted in the last five years (Köllen, 2021). This positive change might be attributed to

1) the recent legal formulations that have decriminalized homosexuality across countries (Byington et al., 2021), a phase often being referred to as “second wave” decriminalization (Perrin, 2022) and
2) growing size of LGBTQ+ identification (Badgett et al., 2021; Byington et al., 2021).

This growing research interest in sexual orientation in management has gained momentum in the last few years (McFadden, 2015; Hebl et al., 2016; Kalargyrou and Costen, 2017; Ng and Rumens, 2017; Webster et al., 2018; Byington et al., 2021).

In recent times, a few reviews have provided significant clarity in this field. For instance, Byington et al. (2021) provided a visual representation of the topic trend associated with sexual orientation in management literature using a science mapping framework. They observed that the state-of-the-art of sexual orientation in management literature is divided into individual perspective literature and organizational perspective studies. Ng and Rumens (2017) critically reviewed and reflected on the importance of workplace inclusion for LGBTQ+ people. Webster et al. (2018) focus their study on LGBTQ+ supportive workplaces. While most of the existing reviews have taken management and organizational perspectives, Velez et al. (2021) recently reviewed the psychological research on career issues experienced by sexual minorities by employing the content analysis method. Thus, whereas few recent reviews address LGBTQ+ issues in organizations, there exists a relative dearth of studies that systematically review the existing literature from a psychological perspective.

Thus, the current study aimed

1) to systematically review the state-of-the-art of literature that addresses workplace experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals.
2) to identify and critically examine the major psychological variables and processes associated with workplace experiences of LGBTQ+ persons.
3) to develop an integrative theoretical model that connects the existing variables.

### Method

Systematic reviewing “uses explicit, systematic methods that are selected to minimize bias, thus provide more reliable findings from which conclusions can be drawn and decisions made” (Green et al., 2011, p. 12). To ensure integrity, accountability and transparency in the analysis (Moher et al., 2015), the current study has followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (Page et al., 2021). The current study examines the critical issues related to the workplace experience of LGBTQ+ individuals by systematically reviewing the research.

### Search strategy

At first, a computerized search was conducted on Web of Science, ProQuest, EBSCOhost and Scopus using a combination of key terms, such as “LGBTQ+ AND Workplace,”
“Homosexuals AND Workplace”, “Gay AND Workplace”, “Lesbian AND Workplace”, “Transgender AND Workplace” and “Bisexual AND workplace” in the titles or the abstracts (search results are presented in Table 1). The first and second authors conducted this round of searching independently. This initial search (with the filters of inclusion and exclusion criteria) led to the identification of a maximum of 2,108 articles (ProQuest = 2,108, EBSCOhost = 146, ScienceDirect = 449 and Scopus = 1899). After removing the duplicate records, we conducted an initial round of screening with an emphasis on titles and keywords. At this phase, 760 articles were excluded as they were irrelevant to the current review. After this initial exclusion, 213 articles underwent a full review, and of these, only 102 articles were found relevant to the study. Because of the huge volume of articles, the first and the second author divided the screening task into equal halves for full review; however, they consulted each other in case there was any confusion regarding the inclusion/exclusion of any article. Articles were included/excluded from the list only when the first and second authors had a consensus. After the list was prepared, the first and second authors rechecked and re-reviewed all the articles included. This step was conducted to ensure that only relevant articles were included in the final list. Out of these 102 articles, one article was not accessible. Thus, in the end, 101 articles were used for the review. We prepared an excel sheet for all the articles with information on author names, year of publication, journal name, sample, method and major findings. The PRISMA result table is presented in Figure 1.

**Inclusion criteria**
For the current study, we have used the following inclusion criteria.

1. Study participants: LGBTQ+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer individuals)
2. All workplace settings (technology organizations, science and engineering sector, health organizations, etc.)
3. Peer-reviewed papers published in English. Book chapters, conference papers and theses are not included as there is no way to ensure the rigor of the peer-review process in these cases (Eva et al., 2020).
4. Papers published in the last twenty-five years (1997–2022)
5. Empirical papers that involve primary data through qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method research design.

We have excluded studies that deal with

1. cis-gendered and heterosexual persons as study participants
2. school or university settings
3. deals with students
4. deals with part-time employees
5. review papers

**Synthesis of the papers**
For managing the huge number of papers, at first, we took the help of tabulation (Petticrew and Roberts, 2005). For synthesizing the findings, the three-step approach (Petticrew and Roberts, 2005) has been followed. This involves
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyseni F., Myderrizi A., Blanck P</td>
<td>Diversity and inclusion in the legal pro</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Journal of Cancer Survivorship</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>N = 3590 bank employ</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Disability disclosure; Future of labour; Inclusive workplaces; Workplace accommodations; Workplace discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, RL; Sendroiu, I; Dinovitzer, R; Dawe, M</td>
<td>Perceiving discrimination: Race, gender and sexual orientation in the legal workplace</td>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Law and Social Inquiry</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5,399 attorneys</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughgood, C. N., Sawyer, K.B; Sawyer, K.B</td>
<td>What lies beneath: How paranoid cogn</td>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Journal of Vocational Behaviour</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>N = 165 transgender individuals</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workplace discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoder, J. B.; &amp; Mattheis, A</td>
<td>Queer in STEM: Workplace experiences reported in a national survey of LGBTQA individuals in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics careers</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Journal of homosexuality</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>N = 1,427 STEM professionals</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Professional environment and experience in STEM among queer-identified individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliason, M. J.; Streed, C.; Homme, M</td>
<td>Coping with stress as an LGBTQ + health care professional</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Journal of homosexuality</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>N = 277 health care professionals</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Being out as LGBTQ resulted in a lack of promotions, gossip, and similar discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giwa, S., Colvin, R. A., Ricciardelli, R., &amp; Warren, A. P</td>
<td>Workplace Experiences of Lesbian and Bisexual Female Police Officers in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary</td>
<td>Lesbian, bisexual</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Women and Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Initiative interview</td>
<td>N = 3 active duty police officers</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Latent stereotyping exists in otherwise supportive work environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, M., &amp; Kentlyn, S</td>
<td>Older lesbians and work in the Australian health and aged care sector</td>
<td>lesbians</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Journal of lesbian studies</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 4, health care sector</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Negotiating coming out in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel, T; Bettergarcia, JN; DeLucio, K; Avellar, TR; Harkness, A; Goodman, JA</td>
<td>Reactions of law enforcement to LGBTQ diversity training</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Human Resource Development Quarterly</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 120 law enforcement officials</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Responses toward LGBTQ diversity training characterized by both resistance and receptiveness Career decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, H. Z., Brenner, B. R., &amp; Lipman, J</td>
<td>Patterns of career and identity interference for lesbian, gay, and bisexual young adults</td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Journal of Homosexuality</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Sensemaking workplace allyship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minei, EM; Hastings, SO; Warren, S; Goodwin, JA</td>
<td>LGBTQ + sensemaking: The mental load of identifying workplace Allies</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>International Journal of Business Communication Journal of Homosexuality</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>35 interviews, lawyers</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Sensemaking workplace allyship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizzi, R. C</td>
<td>“There aren’t any gays here”: encountering heteronormativity in an international development workplace</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Journal of Homosexuality</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>8 gay male aid workers</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>heteronormativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon, S</td>
<td>Surviving the Landings: An Autoethnographic Account of Being a Gay Female Prison Officer (in an Adult Male Prison in England)</td>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Women and Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Qualitative autoethnography</td>
<td>N = 1 Gay female prison officer</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Sexual objectification, homophobia and workplace incivility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paceley, M. S., Keene, L. C., &amp; Lough, B. J</td>
<td>Barriers to involvement in nonmetropolitan LGBTQ organizations</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 16</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Individual, organizational, and community-based factors function as barriers to involvement in LGBTQ organizations LGBTQ diversity training experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Intergroup relations in action: Questions asked about lesbian, gay and bisexual issues in diversity training</td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 13 diversity trainers</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>LGBTQ diversity training experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip, J., &amp; Soumyaja, D</td>
<td>Workplace diversity and inclusion: policies and best practices for organisations employing transgender people in India</td>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><em>International Journal of Public Policy</em></td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>$N = 15$ diversity trainers</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Well-being in workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Röndahl, G., Innala, S., &amp; Carlsson, M</td>
<td>Heterosexual assumptions in verbal and non-verbal communication in nursing</td>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td><em>Journal of Homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>Homosexual nursing staff ($n = 21$)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Fear of being excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Röndahl, G., Innala, S., &amp; Carlsson, M</td>
<td>To hide or not to hide, that is the question! Lesbians and gay men describe experiences from nursing work environment</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td><em>Journal of Homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>$N = 21$ homosexual nursing stuffs</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Negligence, harassment, social exclusion faced by LGBTQ employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saeed, A., Mughal, U., &amp; Farooq, S</td>
<td>It's complicated: Sociocultural factors and the disclosure decision of transgender individuals in Pakistan</td>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td><em>Journal of Homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>16 transsexuals</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Disclosure decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer, K. B., Thoroughgood, C., &amp; L</td>
<td>Invisible families, invisible conflicts: E</td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><em>Journal of Vocational Behav</em></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>53 LGB employees</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Work–family conflict, identity management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soeker S., Born G-L., De Vos Z., Golbazi T., Pape C., Ribando S</td>
<td>Not STRAIGHT forward for gays: A look at the lived experiences of gay men, living in Cape Town, with regard to their worker roles</td>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td><em>Work</em></td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>$N = 13$</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Ex-offenders; Homosexuality; Occupation; Occupational therapy; Qualitative research; Vocational rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Laer, K</td>
<td>The role of co-workers in the production of (homosexuality at work: A Foucaulitan approach to the sexual identity processes of gay and lesbian employees</td>
<td>Gay, lesbian</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><em>Human Relations</em></td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>$N = 31$ gays and lesbians</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Sexual identity management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voima A., Pavelea A., &amp; Vacariu C</td>
<td>Identity-Based Workplace Discrimination in Romania: Experiences of LGBTQ Community Members</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td><em>Psihologia Resurselor Umane</em></td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>$N = 10$</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Gender identity; LGBTQ; Romania; sexual orientation; Workplace discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willis, P</td>
<td>Connecting, Supporting, Colliding: The Work-Based Interactions of Young LGBTQ-Identifying Workers and Older Queer Colleagues</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Journal of LGBT Youth</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 34</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Workplace discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willis, P</td>
<td>Witnesses on the periphery: Young lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer employees witnessing homophobic exchanges in Australian workplaces</td>
<td>lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Witnessing homophobic commentary determines expression of one's sexuality in workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpalB.S.</td>
<td>Motives in creating an LGBTQ inclusive work environment: a case study</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal</td>
<td>Qualitative Case study</td>
<td>N = 32 interviews</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>LGBTQ inclusive work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton, CA; Dougherty, DS</td>
<td>Organizing sexuality: Silencing and the push–pull process of co-sexuality in the workplace</td>
<td>Sexual minorities</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Journal of Communication</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Maintaining sexual &quot;norms&quot; at work through silencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noronha, E, Bisht, N.S., &amp; D'Cruz P</td>
<td>From Fear to Courage: Indian Lesbians' and Gays' Quest for Inclusive Ethical Organizations</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 40, LG employees</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>N = 40, LG employees Micro-disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvik, E</td>
<td>Purple-collar labor: Transgender workers and queer value at global call centers in the Philippines</td>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Gender and Society</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>41 Filipino BPO worker</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Affective labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulaş-Kılıç, Ö, Bayar, O., &amp; Koç, M</td>
<td>The career stories of LGQ in Turkey</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Journal of homosexuality</td>
<td>Qualitative life story method</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Career stories and aspirations among LGBTQ individuals Management of performance of gender in workplace among gay men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speice, T</td>
<td>The “okay” gay guys: Developing hegemonic sexuality as a tool to understand men’s workplace identities</td>
<td>Gays</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Journal of homosexuality</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 30 gay men</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sexual minority subsection</td>
<td>Year of publication</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Key variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ueno, K., Jackson, T. M., Ingram, R, Grace, J., &amp; Saras, E. D.</td>
<td>Sexual minority young adults’ construction of workplace acceptance in the era of diversity and inclusion</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Social Currents</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 50</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workplace acceptance among LGBTQ individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Dixon and Debbie S. Doughert</td>
<td>A language convergence/meaning divergence analysis exploring how LGBTQ and single employees manage traditional family expectations in the workplace</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Journal of Applied Communication Research</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Othering, traditional family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfrey, L; Twine, FW</td>
<td>Gender-fluid geek girls: Negotiating inequality regimes in the tech industry</td>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Gender and Society</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>LGBTQ women have higher belongingness to the workplace sexual orientation discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilgehan Ozturk, M</td>
<td>Sexual orientation discrimination: Exploring the experiences of lesbian, gay and bisexual employees in Turkey</td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilimoria, D., &amp; Stewart, A. J</td>
<td>“Don’t ask, don’t tell”: The academic climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty in science and engineering</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>NWSA Journal</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 14</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Hostility, experienced discomfort in workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalier, E. S</td>
<td>Men at sport: Gay men’s experiences in the sport workplace</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Journal of Homosexuality</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Sports experience, locker room experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton, C. A</td>
<td>The master narrative of “normal” sexuality in the Midwestern workplace</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Perceived normal sexuality and workplace experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Marco D., Hoel H, Averas A., Manduata L</td>
<td>Workplace Incivility as Modern Sexual Prejudice</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 39</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Inclusive organizations; LG; discrimination; modern sexual prejudice; workplace incivility; anti-homosexuality; bullying; discrimination; harassment; LGBs; selective incivility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einarsdottir A., Hoel H., Lewis D</td>
<td>“It’s Nothing Personal”: Anti-Homosexuality in the British Workplace</td>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 50</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sexual minority subsection</td>
<td>Year of publication</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Key variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrick D.G., Walther C.S., Wickens C.M. Giuffre, P., Dellinger, K., &amp; Williams C. L</td>
<td>Working class masculinity: Keeping gay men and lesbians out of the workplace</td>
<td>gay, lesbian</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Sex roles</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Heteromasculinity; Homosexuality; Stratification Even in the gay-friendly organizations, there are instances of harassment, discrimination, and stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giuffre, P., Dellinger, K., &amp; Williams C. L</td>
<td>“No retribution for being gay?” Inequality in gay-friendly workplaces</td>
<td>gay</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sociological spectrum</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
<td>N = 32</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel J.K., Flexman A.M., Cygler J., Kirkham K.R., Lorello G.R.</td>
<td>Standing out or fitting in: A latent projective content analysis of discrimination of women and 2SLGBTQ+ anesthesiologists and providers</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Journal of Clinical Anaesthesia</td>
<td>Qualitative survey</td>
<td>171 respondents</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Butler; Discrimination; Gay; Gender; Lesbian; Performativity; Qualitative; Queer; Sexuality Safety and security threats Safety and security threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Sj, Lucas, K</td>
<td>Is it safe to bring myself to work? Understanding LGBTQ experiences of workplace dignity</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences</td>
<td>Qualitative survey</td>
<td>N = 36 LGBTQ working adults</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Safety and security threats Dignity related aspects including autonomy violation, career harm, and physical harm sexual harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassel, ST; Settles, IH; Buchanan, NT Blmck, P; Hyseni, F; Wise, FA</td>
<td>Lay (mis) perceptions of sexual harassment toward transgender, lesbian, and gay employees</td>
<td>Transgender, lesbian, gay</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Sex Roles</td>
<td>Quantitative study experiment</td>
<td>N = 279</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>subtle and overt discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blmck, P; Hyseni, F; Wise, FA</td>
<td>Diversity and inclusion in the American legal profession: discrimination and bias reported by lawyers with disabilities and lawyers who identify as LGBTQ+</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>American Journal of Law and Medicine</td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>3,590 lawyers</td>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capell, B; Tzafrir, SS; Enosh, G; Dolan, SL</td>
<td>Explaining sexual minorities’ disclosure: The role of trust embedded in organizational practices</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Organization Studies</td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>431 sexual- and gender-minority employees</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Trust in organizational policies as a predictor of disclosing LGBTQ identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nittouer, C. L.,</td>
<td>orientation in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump-Steele, R. C.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Hebl, M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow S.M, Fok L.Y.,</td>
<td>Who is at greatest risk of work-related discrimination - women, blacks,</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td><em>Canadian Journal of Administrative services</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>N = 548</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Affirmative action; Employment discrimination; Homosexuals; Minorities; Women; Workplace discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartman S.J.</td>
<td>or homosexuals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, G. B</td>
<td>The LGBT advantage: Examining the relationship among sexual orientation</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td><em>Journal of homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>senior-level administrative employees</td>
<td>Sexual orientation diversity, commitment to diversity, creative work environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, A. L., &amp;</td>
<td>gay, lesbian</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td><em>Journal of homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Openness about sexual orientation in workplace and job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riggle, E. D</td>
<td>The relation of job satisfaction and degree of openness about one's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holman, EG; Fish,</td>
<td>sexual orientation for lesbians and gay men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JN; Oswald, RF;</td>
<td>Reconsidering the LGBT climate inventory: Understanding support and</td>
<td>LGBTQQ</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td><em>Journal of Career Assessment</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>LGBTQ employees</td>
<td>Work climate for LGBTQ employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldberg, A</td>
<td>hostility for LGBTQ employees in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kattari, SK;</td>
<td>Policing gender through housing and employment discrimination:</td>
<td>LGBQ</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><em>Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>N = 3838</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Housing and employment discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield, DL;</td>
<td>comparison of discrimination experiences of transgender and cisgender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls, NE; Langenderfer-Magruder, L; Ramos, D; Mooij, T</td>
<td>School indicators of violence experienced and feeling unsafe of Dutch LGB versus non-LGB secondary students and staff, 2006–2010</td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><em>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>N = 18,300 teaching and support staff</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>The feeling of lack of safety among LGBTQ employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. (continued)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith, RW; Baranik, LE; Duffy, RD</td>
<td>Psychological ownership within psychology of working theory: A three-wave study of gender and sexual minority employees</td>
<td>sexual minorities</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Journal of Vocational Behavior</td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>240 adults employees</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>psychological ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargas, EA; Brassel, ST; Perumalswami, CR; Johnson, TRB; Jagai, R; Cortina, LM; Settles, IH</td>
<td># MedToo: a large-scale examination of the incidence and impact of sexual harassment of physicians and other faculty at an academic medical center</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Journal of Women’s Health</td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>705 faculty (25.9% of the targeted sample) and 583 trainees (32.0% of the targeted sample)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Hereroexist harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield, DL; Kattari, SK; Langenderfer-Magruider, L; Walls, NE; Ramos, D</td>
<td>The crossroads of identities: Predictors of harassment among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer adults. lesbian, gay, bisexual, and 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research</td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>N = 3690</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Racial identity, age, and level of education as additional predictors of LGBTQ harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witte, TK; Kramper, S; Carmichael, KP; Chaddock, M; Gorczyca, K</td>
<td>A survey of negative mental health outcomes, workplace and school climate, and identity disclosure for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, and asexual veterinary professionals and students in the United States and United Kingdom</td>
<td>LGBTQIA+</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association</td>
<td>Quantitative study survey</td>
<td>440 LGBTQ+ veterinary professionals</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mental health, disclosure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lim A.C., Trau R.N.C., Foo M.-D</td>
<td>Task interdependence and the discrimination of gay men and lesbians in the workplace</td>
<td>Gay, lesbian</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>Quantitative study (conjoint experiment + survey)</td>
<td>N = 113 hiring professionals</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>discrimination; gay and lesbian; occupational segregation; sexual orientation; stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baert, S</td>
<td>Hiring a gay man, taking a risk?: A lab experiment on employment discrimination and risk aversion</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Journal of homosexuality</td>
<td>Quantitative study (experiment)</td>
<td>N = 222</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Hiring discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehliason, M-J, DefJoseph, J; Dibble, S; Deveey, S; Chinn, P</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer/questioning nurses’ experiences in the workplace</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Journal of Professional nursing</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 261, nurses USA</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Discriminatory behavior, verbal harassment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrantes R.J., Eaton A.A.</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation and Leadership Suitability: How Being a Gay Man Affects Perceptions of Fit in Gender-Stereotyped Positions</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Sex Roles</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>439 adults</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Leadership; Sexual orientation; Stereotypes, managerial roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein, M., &amp; Swartwout, P</td>
<td>Gay officers in their midst: heterosexual police employees’ anticipation of the consequences for coworkers who come out</td>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>journal of homosexuality</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>249 sworn officers and 144 civilian respondents</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>tolerance of discrimination, homophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell C.W.</td>
<td>Belief in the “free choice” model of homosexuality: A correlate of homophobia in registered nurses</td>
<td>Gay, lesbian</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Journal of LGBT Health Res</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Discrimination; Free choice model of homosexuality; Gay; Homophobia; Lesbian; Nurse; Nursing hiring decision, gay persons, orthodoxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breder-Ilan Y., Kay A</td>
<td>Individual and situational predictors of intention to hire gay male and ultra-orthodox male job applicants</td>
<td>gay</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (survey)</td>
<td>Quantitative study</td>
<td>N = 942</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>LGBT employees have worse workplace experience as compared to their heterosexual counterparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cech, E. A., &amp; Rothwell, W. R</td>
<td>LGBT workplace inequality in the federal workforce: Intersectional processes, organizational contexts, and turnover considerations</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>ILR Review Work and Occupations</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 392,752 federal employees, 28 organizations</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Traditional work structure leads to lesser marginalization of LGBTQ professionals as compared to dynamic project-based work teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cech, E. A., &amp; Waidmann, T</td>
<td>LGBTQ@NASA and Beyond: Work Structure and Workplace Inequality among LGBTQ STEM Professionals</td>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Sexuality Research and Social Policy</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 594 LGBTQ STEM professionals</td>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, CYC, Hernando, MM; Panebianco, A</td>
<td>Sexual minority school psychologists’ perceptions of school climate and professional commitment</td>
<td>sexual minorities</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>88 school psychologists</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Experience of homophobia/transphobia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook, A., &amp; Glass, C</td>
<td>Do women advance equity? The effect of gender leadership composition on LGBT-friendly policies in American firms</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>Fortune 500 firms over a 10-year period</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Gender-diverse boards are more supportive for LGBTQ inclusive workplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dos Santos Lira Soares Pereira A, Da Silva Dias S.M.P., De Lima T.J.S., De Souza L.E.C.</td>
<td>Beliefs about homosexuality and the prejudice against homosexuals in the workplace [As crenças sobre a homossexualidade e o preconceito contra homossexuais no ambiente de trabalho]</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Journal of homosexuality Human Services Organizations: Management, Leadership and Governance</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 169 heterosexual persons</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Beliefs; Homosexuality; Prejudice; Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, T. G., Rich, T., &amp; Blackwood, R</td>
<td>Workplace friendships among social work, counseling, and human service educators: Exploring the impact of sexual orientation and friendships in workplace empowerment</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 69 gay and straight persons</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Low tolerance to homosexuality in the health and human services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, T. G., Rich, T., &amp; Blackwood, R</td>
<td>Workplace friendships among social work, counseling, and human service educators: Exploring the impact of sexual orientation and friendships in workplace empowerment</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 69 gay and straight persons</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workplace friendship positively affects the workplace experience of LGBT individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götz, S., Blanz, M</td>
<td>Hidden discrimination in front of social work's own door: the case of homosexual employees at Christian social services in Germany</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>European Journal of Social</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 200 LGB and Non-LGB educators</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Workplace friendship positively affects the workplace experience of LGBT individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, T. G., Rich, T., &amp; Blackwood, R</td>
<td>Workplace friendships among social work, counseling, and human service educators: Exploring the impact of sexual orientation and friendships in workplace empowerment</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 69 gay and straight persons</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Low tolerance to homosexuality in the health and human services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, T. G., Rich, T., &amp; Blackwood, R</td>
<td>Workplace friendships among social work, counseling, and human service educators: Exploring the impact of sexual orientation and friendships in workplace empowerment</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 69 gay and straight persons</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workplace friendship positively affects the workplace experience of LGBT individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götz, S., Blanz, M</td>
<td>Hidden discrimination in front of social work's own door: the case of homosexual employees at Christian social services in Germany</td>
<td>homosexuals</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>European Journal of Social</td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 200 LGB and Non-LGB educators</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Homosexuality; outing of sexual orientation; Social discrimination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huebner, David M.; Davis, Mary C</td>
<td>Gay and bisexual men who disclose their sexual orientations in the workplace have higher workday levels of salivary cortisol and negative affect</td>
<td>gay, bisexual</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td><em>Annals of Behavioral Medicine</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>73 gay and bisexual men</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Concealing sexual orientation leading to high cortisol level in the working hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, E. B., Reilly, C., &amp; Hebl, M</td>
<td>The Best of Times, the Worst of Times: Exploring Dual Perspectives of “Coming Out” in the Workplace</td>
<td>lesbian, gay</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td><em>Group and Organization Management</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 314 LG persons</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Supportive work environment as more critical in coming out than disclosure method or timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köllen, T.</td>
<td>Bisexuality and diversity management—Addressing the B in LGBT as a relevant “sexual orientation” in the workplace</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td><em>Journal of Bisexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 77 bisexual employees</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>diversity management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lall, M.D., Billimoria K.Y., Lu D.W., Zhan T., Barton M.A., Hu Y.-Y., Beeson M.S., Adams J.G., Nelson L.S., Baren J.M.</td>
<td>Prevalence of Discrimination, Abuse, and Harassment in Emergency Medicine Residency Training in the US</td>
<td>lesbian, gay</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td><em>JAMA Network Open</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>7680 emergency medi</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>discrimination; gay and lesbian; occupational segregation; sexual orientation; stigma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myers, K. A., Forest, K. B., &amp; Miller S. L.</td>
<td>Officer friendly and the tough cop: Gays and lesbians navigate homophobia and policing</td>
<td>Gay, lesbian</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td><em>Journal of Homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>gay and lesbian officers (n = 17) as well as heterosexual male and female officers (n = 54)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Sexuality as occupational asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newheiser, A. K., Barreto, M., &amp; Tiemersma, J.</td>
<td>People like me don't belong here: Identity concealment is associated with negative workplace experiences</td>
<td>Bisexuals</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td><em>Journal of Social Issues</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 95 LGBT employees</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Concealing identity inside organization leads to reduced job satisfaction, collective self-esteem, and work-related commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddy-Best, KL</td>
<td>LGBTQ women, appearance negotiations, and workplace dress codes</td>
<td>LGBTQ women</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td><em>Journal of Homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 24 LGBTQ women</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Appearance and dress code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears J. T.</td>
<td>The institutional climate for lesbian, gay and bisexual education faculty: What is the pivotal frame of reference?</td>
<td>LGB</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td><em>Journal of Homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>n = 104 education faculty</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Institutional climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargas, E. A., Brassel, S. T.</td>
<td>Incidence and group comparisons of harassment based on gender</td>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td><em>Journal of Women’s Health</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 2,723 medical faculties, fellows residents</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Heterosexist harassment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sexual minority subsection</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Key variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waite, S</td>
<td>Should I stay or should I go? Employment discrimination and workplace harassment against transgender and other minority employees in Canada's federal public service</td>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td><em>Journal of homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative study (survey)</td>
<td>N = 235 public service professionals</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Employment harassment and workplace discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed, L., &amp; Leuty, M. E</td>
<td>The role of individual differences and situational variables in the use of workplace sexual identity management strategies</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td><em>Journal of homosexuality</em></td>
<td>Quantitative survey</td>
<td>135, employed, lesbian and gay individuals</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Workplace sexual identity management, perception of workplace climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source(s): Table by authors
(1) organization of studies into logical categories: At first, an excel table was developed with the key descriptions, i.e. populations, methods and results (key variables). From this table, the authors could categorize the relevant variables in the field. A second table was developed where variable-wise articles were clubbed, and major themes were identified (Table 2). The table shows that the majority of the literature (more than 60%) dealt with negative workplace experiences. However, these discriminatory experiences come from multiple sources, i.e. hiring discrimination, harassment, bullying, exclusion and so on.

(2) analyzing the findings within categories: there are many subthemes within the same category (Table 2).

(3) synthesizing findings across studies: In addition to the theme-based organization of the studies, we have further categorized the literature based on some criteria, i.e. journal-wise (Table 3), year-wise (Figure 2), LGTQ + category-wise (Figure 3), country-wise (Figure 4) and methodology-wise distribution (Figure 5).

Since the current study has a descriptive aim (i.e. exploring the negative workplace experiences of sexual minorities) rather than an evaluative one, the study did not formally assess the quality of the included studies (Chilton et al., 2015). Focusing on homogeneity in terms of sample or design was difficult since we did not have a “large enough pool of
Major themes identified | Subthemes and the related literature
--- | ---
**Discrimination** | *Hiring discrimination*
Baert (2018a, b)
Bailey *et al.* (2013)
Binder *et al.* (2016)
Brender-Ilan and Kay (2021)
Bryant-Lees and Kite (2021)
Crow *et al.* (1998)
Kattari *et al.* (2016)
Lim *et al.* (2018)
Mishel (2016)
Soeker *et al.* (2015)
*Promotional discrimination*
Eliason *et al.* (2018)
*Subtle discrimination*
Blanck *et al.* (2020)
Di Marco *et al.* (2018)
Embrick *et al.* (2007)
Giwa *et al.* (2022)
Gordon and Pratama (2017)
Götz and Blanz (2020)
*Prejudice against homosexuals*
Pereira *et al.* (2017)
Guiffre *et al.* (2008)
Waite (2021)
*Anti-homosexuality*
Einarsdóttir *et al.* (2015)
*Overt discrimination*
Eliason *et al.* (2011)
Gordon and Pratama (2017)
*Unfavorable attitude towards homosexuality*
Estrada and Weiss (1999)
Gates (2015)
Blackwell (2008)
Mizzi (2013)
Myers *et al.* (2004)
*Hostility*
Bilimoria and Stewart (2009)
Nixon (2022)
*Harassment*
Brassel *et al.* (2019)
Vargas *et al.* (2021)
Vargas *et al.* (2020)
Whitfield *et al.* (2019)
Lall *et al.* (2021)
Nelson *et al.* (2019)
*Othering*
Dixon and Doughert (2014)
*Bullying*
Day *et al.* (2022)
Willis (2010)
*Exclusion*
Röndahl *et al.* (2006)
Röndahl *et al.* (2007)

Table 2: Theme-wise distribution of the reviewed articles (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major themes identified</th>
<th>Subthemes and the related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsafe climate</strong></td>
<td>Holman <em>et al.</em> (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jiang <em>et al.</em> (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mooij (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sears (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smith <em>et al.</em> (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yoder and Mattheis (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive work environment</strong></td>
<td>Opall (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peel (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook and Glass (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cunningham (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paceley <em>et al.</em> (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gates <em>et al.</em> (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Israel <em>et al.</em> (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microaggression</strong></td>
<td>Resnick and Galupo (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ueno <em>et al.</em> (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voina <em>et al.</em> (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ozturk (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>Capell <em>et al.</em> (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cavalier (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliason <em>et al.</em> (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hughes and Kentlyn (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyseni <em>et al.</em> (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jiang <em>et al.</em> (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King <em>et al.</em> (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law <em>et al.</em> (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newheiser <em>et al.</em> (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noronha <em>et al.</em> (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ragins <em>et al.</em> (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Röndahl <em>et al.</em> (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saeed <em>et al.</em> (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willis (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cech and Waidzunas (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bernstein and Swartwout (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing identity in organization</strong></td>
<td>Compton and Dougherty (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Köllen (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reddy-Best (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peel <em>et al.</em> (2023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reed and Leuty (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sawyer <em>et al.</em> (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speice (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Laer (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compton (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Ellis and Riggle (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newheiser <em>et al.</em> (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williamson <em>et al.</em> (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. (continued)
homogeneous, robust studies to draw upon” (Petticrew and Roberts, 2005). Moreover, it would lead to the loss of a significant amount of papers or limit the range of studies (McColl et al., 2009; Njelesani et al., 2011).

**Result**

To address the aims of the study, the result section is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the first aim and it discusses on the state-of-the-art of the literature based on journal-wise, year-wise, LGBTQ+ category-wise, country-wise and methodology-wise distribution. The second part deals with the theme-wise discussion of the existing literature leading to an integrative model (Figure 6). Section 1 details the discriminatory workplace experiences of LGBTQ+ people. Section 2 explores the consequences of these negative experiences on mental health, career decisions, job satisfaction and gender management strategies.

**Distribution of the literature**

The final list of empirical articles consists of a total of 101 articles which are drawn from 61 different academic journals. The most frequently published papers are identified in the following journals: *Journal of homosexuality* (24), *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (6), *Human Relations* (4) and *Sex Roles* (3). Journal of Homosexuality has published a maximum of 24 papers in this domain. This might be attributed to this journal’s dedication to shaping knowledge production in LGBTQ+ related areas.

In terms of year-wise distribution of the publication, a maximum of fourteen papers were published in 2020, and no papers were published in 2000, 2001 and 2003. If we distribute the entire timeline of twenty-five years in five different categories with a five-year range, the highest number of publications (48) is observed in the last five years (2018–2022). The year-range-wise publication shows a progressive pattern. The number of empirical papers published in 1998–2002, 2003–2007, 2008–2012, 2013–2017 and 2018–2022 is 4, 6, 15, 28 and 48, respectively. This trend is in line with the recent findings of Köllen (2021).
### Table 3.
Journal-wise distribution of the articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of journal</th>
<th>Number of articles published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Homosexuality</em></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex roles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Vocational Behaviour</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality, Diversity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and Criminal Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Women’s Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Labor research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Society</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWSA Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Sex Research</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of LGBT Health Research</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Law and Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality Research and Social Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Occupations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Communication</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temas em Psicologia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Professional nursing</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership and Governance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Spectrum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Journal of Social Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Career Assessment</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of Behavioral Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of lesbian studies</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Cancer Survivorship</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development Quarterly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Applied Communication Research</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Employment Counseling</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group and Organization Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Bisexuality</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of LGBT Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psihologia Resurselor Umane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Currents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Counseling Psychology</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of applied psychology</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Public Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Clinical Anesthesia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Figure 4 shows that the listed articles are based on nineteen different countries. Seventy-one articles (70%) are based in the US, while four studies are based in Australia and the United Kingdom (3.9%). The Asian countries (Pakistan, India, Singapore, Philippines, and Indonesia) have comparatively lesser representation of literature (one article from each country), and all these articles are published after 2017. This recent contribution of Asian countries might be related to the recent trend of legal reforms in several Asian countries.

The higher representation of literature based on the US might be attributed to its long decriminalization history. Also, US organizations are found to pursue both the expressive goals (involve changes in attitudes at a cultural level) and instrumental goals (involving legal formulations, inclusive policy, and structural changes in organization) (Ghosh, 2020) for a considerable period in order to make organizations more LGBTQ+ inclusive.

In terms of methodology, 55 articles (56.43%) have employed a quantitative method (survey and experiment), 41 articles (40.59%) have used qualitative method (in-depth interview, autoethnography, and case study), and five are based on mixed-method research.

In terms of a subsection of the LGBTQ+ spectrum, although most studies (46.5%) have addressed LGBTQ+ persons, the representation of all the sub-sections is far from equal.
While gay and lesbian individuals are studied more frequently, studies with bisexual and transgender individuals are somewhat less frequent (Figure 3).

**LGBTQ + experiences**

*Discrimination*

Discrimination is a behavior characterized by treating someone differently from others primarily based on the person’s group identity (Kite and Whitley, 2016). However, this definition of discrimination is way too broad; discrimination in the context of the workplace is often defined as “any distinction, exclusion or preference made on the basis of race, colour, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation” (International Labour Office, 2015). Dipboye and Colella (2013) categorized workplace discrimination into two broad categories:
Discrimination

a) Formal discrimination
  i) Hiring discrimination
  Taste-based discrimination
  Statistical discrimination
  ii) Wage discrimination
  iii) Promotion delay

b) Interpersonal discrimination
  i) Subtle discrimination
     Micro assaults
     Micro insults
     Micro-invalidations
  ii) Unsafe work climate
  iii) Bullying
  iv) Harassment
  v) Othering

Mental health outcomes
Identity management
Disclosure decision
Dress code

Career-related outcomes
a) Career selection
b) Career growth
c) Career/sexual identity interference
d) Productivity

Job-related outcomes
Job satisfaction
Job insecurity

Source(s): Figure by authors

Figure 5. Method-wise distribution of published empirical research

Figure 6. Integrated model of workplace experiences of sexual minorities
LGBTQ+ in workplace
EDI

(1) Proximal discrimination: This type of discrimination is overt and “occurs when members of disadvantaged groups are recruited, selected, and placed” (Dipboye and Collella, 2004, p. 426).

(2) Distal discrimination: This type of discrimination “occurs in the organizational structures, systems, policies, and practices that can have the unintended effect of perpetuating inequalities” (Dipboye and Collella, 2004, p. 426).

Similarly, Hebl et al. (2002) categorized workplace discrimination against LGBTQ+ people into formal and interpersonal discrimination. Similar to proximal discrimination, formal discrimination is “discrimination in hiring, promotions, access, and resource distribution” (p. 816). Interpersonal discrimination can be understood as “nonverbal, paraverbal and even some of the verbal behaviors that occur in social interactions” (p. 816). Existing literature shows that both formal and interpersonal forms of discrimination against LGBTQ+ employees are rampant and that gender-diverse employees are 2.2 times more vulnerable to workplace discrimination (Waite, 2021) than their cisgender colleagues. A 2016 study (Kattari et al., 2016) shows that 25.1% of cisgender LGBQ individuals and 50% of transgender people encountered workplace discrimination. Another study reported 33.3% of employees experienced workplace discrimination (Sears and Mallory, 2011).

1. Formal discrimination

- The commonest form of formal discrimination is hiring discrimination, which is abundantly observed through less positive call-backs of LGBTQ+ persons across countries (Drydakis, 2009, 2014; Tilcsik, 2011; Ahmed et al., 2013; Patachini et al., 2015; Moya and Moya-Garófano, 2020). Baert’s (2018a, b) exhaustive review of hiring discrimination concludes that “a minority sexual orientation, revealed by means of mentioning membership in a rainbow organization or the name of one’s (same-sex) marital partner in the resume, has a non-positive effect on employment opportunities” (p. 11). However, the frequency of hiring discrimination against LGBTQ+ persons varies across cultures based on existing heterosexism in a society; in Cyprus, 73% fewer positive call-backs are reported, while in Italy, the less favorable call-back statistics are 30%. Hiring discrimination against LGBTQ+ persons is consistent with major theories of economic discrimination, i.e. i) taste-based discrimination (Becker, 1957) and ii) statistical discrimination (Arrow, 1973).

- Taste-based discrimination is conceptualized as a form of discrimination where the employer is blinded “to the (true) monetary costs associated with engaging a minority worker” (Baert, 2018a, b, p. 2) resulting from their distaste towards LGBTQ+ individuals and the emerging experienced disutility. Prejudice is at the core of this type of hiring discrimination and it leads heterosexual employees to show distaste towards coming in proximity with homosexuals (Pereira et al., 2017). The prejudice and the resulting motivation of maintaining a distance from sexual minorities is at the core of hiring discrimination, and this explains why hiring discrimination is a more predominant problem in task-interdependent professions, i.e. tasks requiring more team activities and interactions (Lim et al., 2018). This distasteful attitude towards LGBTQ+ persons might originate from diverse factors, including one’s belief in traditional gender roles, social dominance orientation, risk-avoidance, religious attendance, less contact with sexual minorities, belief in homosexuality as a choice and conservatism (Estrada and Weiss, 1999; Blackwell, 2008; Baert, 2018a, b; Bryant-Lees and Kite, 2021; Brender-Ilan and Kay, 2021). Negative health-related prejudice, too, determines the hiring of transgender women (Van Borm and Baert, 2018).
Statistical hiring discrimination is driven by perceived group differences in productivity, “where the employer relies on group-level productivity information to estimate the productivity of an individual employee in the absence of perfect information about the true productivity of that employee” (Lippens et al., 2022, p. 4245). While taste-based discrimination has prejudice at its base, statistical discrimination builds on stereotypes (the belief that all the members of a social group have shared psychological traits). The stereotypical belief that homosexuals are less competent than heterosexuals and perceiving gays as “bad business” often impacts the hiring decision-making processes (Mize and Manago, 2018). This theory explains why sexual minorities experience more hiring discrimination in gender-typed work (Tilcsik, 2011). Based on the implicit inversion hypothesis (Kite and Deaux, 1987), employers might have a stereotypical belief that homosexual individuals possess traits similar to their heterosexual opposite genders. Thus, gay persons' experience hiring discrimination in male-typed professions (such as leadership positions) resulting from a lack of perceived fit (Heilman, 1983; Liberman and Golom, 2015; Barrantes and Eaton, 2018; Clarke and Arnold, 2018). Also, lesbians are judged as less competent than heterosexual women in the presence of a gender-stereotypical cue (Niedlich et al., 2015). Similarly, gender-fluid women engineers experience fewer aversive experiences in the technology industry as compared to cis women (Alfrey and Twine, 2017).

However, the implicit inversion mechanism might not always be helpful for lesbians in male-typed jobs since status beliefs might overpower some hiring decisions (Ridgeway, 2001). Status beliefs lead to lower expectations of competence from lesbians (Fasoli and Hegarty, 2020), leading to their lower hiring chances in male-typed jobs. The perceived fit to a job is undoubtedly determined by the stereotypes associated with a job and one's congruity with that. In a study with a fictitious low-skill occupation, transgender individuals faced discrimination in predominantly male-dominated and female-dominated professions compared to nearly equal representation domains of both sexes (Granberg et al., 2020). Since hiring discrimination emerges from stereotyping, application signaling LGBTQ+ identity aggravates discrimination and blocking the path of stereotyping effectively reduces hiring discrimination. In an experiment, exposure to heterosexist music lowered the evaluation scores of gay applicants (Binder and Ward, 2016) since it might have activated the stereotypes. In an Indian study, a transgender woman reported difficulty finding a job after including her sexual identity in her resume (Palo and Jha, 2020). No significant hiring discrimination has been observed in the internet-based hiring process where the employer did not have face-to-face contact with the applicants (Bailey et al., 2013). A 2007 William Institute report indicated that 9.2% of LGBT employees who “came out” in their organization lost their jobs (Sears and Mallory, 2011).

Since the literature unevenly represents different genders and sexualities, it is difficult to compare different sections of LGBTQ+ persons on hiring discrimination. However, some studies indicate that it is higher toward gays than lesbians and toward bisexual males than bisexual females (Corrington et al., 2019; Flage, 2019). Discrimination against transgender persons is rampant; i.e. 47% of transgender persons experienced discrimination in hiring, promotion and job retention in their workplace (Grant et al., 2011).

In addition to hiring discrimination, LGBTQ+ employees are victims of wage penalties (Carpenter, 2005; Mize, 2016). After accounting for human capital factors, it is observed that discrimination and perceived prejudice are crucial contributors to this wage gap (James et al., 2016; Mize, 2016). In a meta-analysis, Klawitter (2015) found that homosexual/bisexual male employees earned 11 percent less than their heterosexual counterparts.
Tenure refusals, delayed promotion (Gordon and Pratama, 2017; Eliason et al., 2018) and lower odds of housing grant approval (Abramovich, 2012; Shelton et al., 2018; Blanck et al., 2020) are experienced by LGBTQ+ individuals. Stigma (Goffman, 1963) associated with homosexual identity might lead to a perception of lack of fit to a job resulting from the negative stereotypes. This perception of lack of fit is negatively linked with the promotability of sexual minority candidates (Pichler and Holmes, 2017).

In addition to the above-mentioned types of discrimination, several occupation-specific forms of formal discrimination are evident (Carmichael, 1996; Button, 2001; Herek, 2009). Lesbian, gay and bisexual physicians (Eliason et al., 2011), for instance, encounter discrimination in terms of being denied referrals from their heterosexual colleagues. In comparison, LGBTQ+ attorneys (Nelson et al., 2019) are discriminated against when their clients refuse to take legal help from them and appeal for cis-male attorneys.

2. Interpersonal workplace discrimination

Interpersonal discrimination can take the following forms.

**Subtle discrimination**

Dual-attitude theory (Wilson et al., 2000) suggests that people tend to alter their behavior (including discriminatory behavior towards others) based on experience and situation (Dovidio, 2001). Thus, even when anti-discriminatory legislation in the workplace leads to a reduction in old-fashioned, discriminatory behaviors towards LGBTQ+ employees (Badgett et al., 2013; Israel et al., 2017), it is possible that “the original attitude is not replaced, however, but rather is stored in memory and becomes implicit” (Dovidio, 2001, p. 839). These implicit attitudes lead to subtle and hidden forms of discrimination (Götz and Blanz, 2020). This theory explains why the contemporary form of subtle discrimination (Basford et al., 2014) is more common in the workplace than overt discrimination. In a study with lawyers, “subtle and unintentional” biases were found to be the commonest form of discrimination and 47.1% of the LGB persons experienced it (Blanck et al., 2020). LGBQ lawyers experienced “subtle-only” discrimination 26.88% of the time, while 12.75% experienced “overt-only” discrimination (Blanck et al., 2020). Embrick et al. (2007), too, have noted a shift from “overt disgust” to more “progressive” methods of discrimination. Workplaces might be considered to be friendly (Eliason et al., 2011), well-meaning (Einarsdottir et al., 2015) and “otherwise supportive” even when LGBTQ+ employees experience subtle discrimination (Ueno et al., 2020; Giwa et al., 2022).

The existing literature has explored the subtle workplace discrimination against LGBTQ+ persons in different forms. One of the major forms of interpersonal workplace discrimination against sexual minorities emerges from microaggression (Francis and Reygan, 2016; Galupo and Resnick, 2016; Voina et al., 2022); i.e. “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative” insults toward members of marginalized groups (Nadal, 2008, p. 23). Sue et al. (2007) microaggression theory classified microaggression into three categories.

1. Microinsults are “unintentional behaviours or verbal comments that convey rudeness or insensitivity or demean” a person’s identity (Torino et al., 2019, p. 4) and they lie at the level of conscious awareness. LGBTQ+ employees’ encounters of passive
mistreatment through verbal discomforts regarding homosexuality and insensitive/indecent conversations (such as hearing others’ sexual fantasies) (Röndahl et al., 2006, 2007) and remarks (Baker and Lucas, 2017) are common forms of microinsults.

(2) Micro assaults are “explicit and conscious exchanges that are often intended to hurt target groups but are often dismissed as being innocuous, harmless, or unrelated to bias” (David et al., 2019, p. 123). Name-calling, innuendos and homophobic jokes (Ozturk, 2011; Di Marco et al., 2018) are commonly experienced forms of micro-assaults in the workplace. Misidentification through wrong pronouns is also one usual form of micro-aggression experienced by transgender employees (Gordon and Pratama, 2017).

(3) Microinvalidations are “characterized by communications that exclude, negate, or nullify the thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of a person and their social group” (David et al., 2019, p. 123). Devaluing non-heterosexuals’ experience inside the workplace (Di Marco et al., 2018) and othering the non-heterosexuals’ family structure through invisibility and hypervisibility (Dixon and Dougherty, 2014) might be considered mechanisms of microinvalidations.

Unsafe work climate
Organizational climate is defined as “a set of measurable properties of the work environment, based on the collective perceptions of the people who live and work in the environment and demonstrated to influence their behavior” (Litwin and Stringer, 1968, p. 1). Work climate is especially relevant in the context of the workplace experience and well-being of LGBTQ+ individuals (Liddle et al., 2004) since climate also incorporates the culture of the acceptance of a stigma in the organization (Holman et al., 2019). For instance, Ueno et al. (2020) observed that LGBTQ+ people construct workplace acceptance based on their existing knowledge of the organization’s climate, along with the experience of other sexual minority employees.

A safe space for LGBTQ+ individuals must ensure an anti-bullying environment (Sadowski and Jennings, 2016). However, workplace bullying (Gordon and Pratama, 2017; Day et al., 2022), hostility (Bilimoria and Stewart, 2009; Nixon, 2022) and harassment (Brassel et al., 2019; Whitfield et al., 2019; Vargas et al., 2020, 2021) are encountered at a regular basis by the sexual minorities.

(1) Relational powerlessness theory (Hodson et al., 2006) suggests that employees who are in a lower position in social status inside the organization (due to insecure jobs or minority status) are more likely to experience workplace bullying. This explains why LGBTQ+ employees are vulnerable to workplace bullying and why most of the discriminatory and heterosexist experiences come from people in power (such as supervisors) (Nelson et al., 2019). Not only LGBTQ+ persons but people whose sexual orientation is perceived as non-conforming to the gendered expectations are also bullied in the workplace (GLAAD, 2011). In Willis’ (2010) study, young LGBQ employees have experienced severe workplace bullying through the mechanisms of intimidation, holding back someone in the office after the stipulated hours and criticism. There exists a lack of anti-bullying policies to safeguard LGBTQ+ employees in organizations (Hollis and McCalla, 2013).

(2) Safety in workplace climate is determined by two major dimensions; i.e. support and hostility (Holman et al., 2019). Depending on these dimensions, workplace climate is of four categories:

- Supportive work climate (high support, low hostility),
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- Tolerant work climate (high workplace support, low awareness of LGBTQ + issues),
- Ambiguous work climate (moderate/low workplace support, moderate discrimination) and
- Hostile work climate (low workplace support, high workplace discrimination).

According to Holman et al. (2019), 56% of LGBTQ + employees experienced a supportive work climate at their organizations, and 21%, 17% and 6% experienced a tolerant work climate, ambiguous work climate and hostile work climate, respectively. However, tolerance in the workplace is not merely the middle ground between support and discrimination. Instead, it is characterized by a sense of limited support while making LGBTQ + individuals uncomfortable about their sexual orientation. Similarly, an ambiguous work climate provides mixed signals and creates conflicts regarding their decision to disclose their LGBTQ + identity in the workplace. Some sectors, nevertheless, might be safer for LGBTQ + individuals than others; in a study, 92% of LGBTQ + STEM professionals rated their workplace to be a safe one (Yoder and Mattheis, 2016).

(1) A work environment might involve different forms of harm (physical, social and career) (Baker and Lucas, 2017) and harassment (heterosexist, gender policing and sexual) (Brassel et al., 2019; O’Brien, 2020) towards LGBTQ + employees. Heterosexist harassment is the most common form of harassment faced by LGBTQ + employees; i.e. around 25–66% experienced heterosexist harassment at their workplace (Rabelo and Cortina, 2014; Vargas et al., 2020, 2021). Heterosexist harassment involves “insensitive verbal and symbolic (but non-assaultive) behaviors that convey animosity toward nonheterosexuality” (Silverschanz et al., 2008, p. 180).

(2) Sexual harassment towards LGBTQ + people is also frequent (Brassel et al., 2019). In a study (Giuffre et al., 2008; Konik and Cortina, 2008; Lall et al., 2021), 40% of LGBTQ + employees reported encountering sexualized harassment (involving attempts to sexual contact), and 77% experienced gender harassment (gender-based rejection/hostility). Sexual harassment is an instrument of gender policing. Masculine females and effeminate males are sexually harassed more frequently since the perpetrators often use sexual harassment as a punishment for defying heteronormativity (Berdahl, 2007; Konik and Cortina, 2008).

Power and prejudice are also crucial factors behind workplace harassment among LGBTQ + people, and the intersectionality of multiple marginalized identities is also evident in this context (Whitfield et al., 2019). When a person experiences harassment, bullying and discrimination at the workplace, it eventually increases the risk of internalizing heterosexism, leading to psychological distress and internal conflict (Deitz, 2015).

Outcomes of discriminatory experiences

Identity

Identity management of sexual minorities incorporates “adaptive career behavior” where they decide on “whether and how to disclose personal details about their sexual orientation due to the work-related consequences of these disclosures” (Tatum et al., 2017, p. 108). Disclosure is a crucial component of the organizational experience of LGBTQ + individuals since “standing out” from the expected performance of gender and sexuality often aggravates one’s vulnerability to workplace discrimination (Peel et al., 2023). Omarzu’s (2000) disclosure decision model suggests that the decision to disclose varies in terms of breadth (the extensiveness of the identity-related information shared), duration (time spent on disclosure)
and depth (the extent to which intimate information has been shared), and it depends on an assessment of subjective risk and subjective utility; i.e. ‘cost-benefit calculations’ (Creed and Cooper, 2008, p. 494).

(1) The subjective utility is the “perceived value of the desired outcome to the individual disclosing” (Omarzu, 2000, p. 179). Self-disclosure in a relationship might be motivated by the need to enhance one’s self-esteem, have honesty in relationships, seek accommodation of one’s identity and social exchange (Worthy et al., 1969; Clair et al., 2005; King et al., 2008). Combining self-verification theory (Swann, 1983) and identity theories, Ragins (2008) suggested that when the stigmatized identity is at the center of one’s existence, it might intrinsically motivate one to disclose in order to receive congruence between personal self-views and other’s perception about the person. While expected approval determines disclosure, LGBTQ+ persons recalled/imagined lowered sense of belongingness after their identity concealment in their workplaces (Newheiser et al., 2017).

(2) The subjective risk experienced through fear of stigma, discrimination and social exclusion (Ragins et al., 2007; Röndahl et al., 2007; Hughes and Kentyn, 2015; Hyseni et al., 2022) is a significant predictor of disclosure decisions. Heteroprostheticism leads to three types of fear among gay employees; i.e. relational fear (fear of losing workplace relationships), institutional fear (fear of systematic disadvantages from the institution) and isolation fear (fear of social exclusion) (Mizzi, 2013). A safe and ethical organizational climate, tolerance, positivity (of receiving disclosure), trust in the organization and supportiveness are positively associated with disclosure in the workplace (Sears, 2002; King et al., 2008; Bernstein and Swartwout, 2012; Köllen, 2013; Jiang et al., 2019; Noronha et al., 2022). Since the employees are socio-cultural beings, the fear of stigma inside the organization is not independent of one’s sociocultural standings. Disclosure of one’s sexual identity at workplace is rare among sexual minorities when they lived with their parents and perceived their home environment as hostile. In family-centric cultures, disclosure inside the organization is also determined by the fear of losing family honor, the obligation to commit to heterosexual marriage and maintaining relationships with family members (Saeed et al., 2018).

While Omarzu (2000) argued that assessment of subjective utility and risk determines a person’s decision on the breadth, duration and depth of disclosure, many LGBTQ+ persons have chosen a path of “passive disclosure” (Cavalier, 2011) or “micro-disclosure” to balance the fear of stigma and the reward of authenticity and social exchange (Noronha et al., 2022).

In addition to disclosure, gender management might take diverse forms, most commonly in terms of workplace dressing. Workplace dress code is integral in the production of a “compulsory order of sex” (Butler, 1990) in organizations as they are typically based on stereotypical gender norms (Zalesne, 2007), and heterosexual identity is attributed based on how one “looks” (Soeker et al., 2015). A handful of existing studies propagate in favor of workplace dress code since it cultivates a positive organizational culture (Woodard, 1999).

In a study conducted by Reddy-Best (2018), out of 24 LGBTQ+ women participants, five (22.7%) explicitly mentioned gender-separated dress codes at their offices, whereas 19 participants (86.36%) reported subtle and unwritten dress codes. In both cases, the expression of sexual identity was challenging. When the organization provides the dress codes formally or subtly, LGBTQ+ individuals experience pressure to conform to the heteronormative script. In a study, lesbian employees felt pressure to look feminine since dressing in a non-feminine attire made their differences from cis women even more salient.
However, these women were neither confident nor comfortable in a feminine aesthetic inside the office as they did not dress similarly outside the work environment.

In addition to organizational dress codes, there are verbal (suggestion of dressing more sex-appropriate, commenting on one’s dressing as “too aggressive,” “too masculine”) and nonverbal cues (double-take, staring) from the colleagues that often function as a feedback system for conforming to the gendered dressing.

Since dressing functions as a crucial component of gender construction and performance (Simmel, 1957; Butler, 1990), LGBTQ + individuals are required to reconsider their dressings before visiting their workplace. Socially appropriate dressing is often synonymous with professional dressing (Speice, 2020). Heterosexual individuals do not encounter this additional pressure of their dressing style filtered for gender appropriateness. Also, dressing like heterosexual individuals is often used as a gender management strategy to hide one’s LGBTQ + identity and avoid the discrimination evident in the hiring and promotion process (Speice, 2020).

**Mental health**

Minority stress, which refers to the “excess stress to which individuals from stigmatized social categories are exposed as a result of their social, often a minority, position” (Meyer, 1995, p. 675), increases one’s vulnerability to mental health issues. This explains why sexual minorities are more vulnerable to mental health issues across the world (Meyer, 1995; Cyrus, 2017; Fulginiti et al., 2021). Testa et al. (2015) expanded the minority stress theory and developed a gender minority stress model specific to LGBTQ + persons. This model suggests that distal stressors (gender-based victimization, rejection and discrimination) lead to proximal stressors (negative future expectations, internalized transphobia and nondisclosure of identity), which in turn, is associated with mental health issues such as depression, anxiety (Meyer, 1995; Warner et al., 2004; Kuyper and Fokkema, 2011; Levavot and Simoni, 2011; Bostwick et al., 2014; Ploderl et al., 2014; Mongelli et al., 2019; LeBlanc and Frost, 2020) and substance use (including smoking, alcoholism and drug use) (Lehavot and Simoni, 2011).

The gender minority stress model is found to be applicable to the context of experience in an organization, i.e. heightened mental health issues are associated with exposure to multiple distal and proximal stressors in the organization (Bliese et al., 2017; Witte et al., 2020).

Bruce et al. (2015) found that experience of sexual orientation stigma (distal stressor) leads to internalized homophobia (proximal factor); which in turn determines major depressive symptoms among gay and bisexual individuals. Similarly, unsupportive social interactions (distal stressor) are negatively associated with one’s depressive symptomatology and global mental health through the mechanism of minimizing (defined by the downplay of one’s stressor) (Smith and Ingram, 2004). Lesbian and gay employees find their job significantly more stressful and mentally straining than their heterosexual counterparts (Aldén et al., 2020). Another study showed that LGBTQ + identity significantly determines job discrimination (distal stressor), which leads to job stress, ultimately leading to common mental disorders (Moya and Moya-Garófano, 2020). Workplace bullying is found to be associated with PTSD (Post-traumatic stress disorder) symptoms among LGB workers (Day et al., 2022). Stigma leads to socio-structural burden (such as financial insecurity resulting from hiring discrimination) leading to sleep disorders (Layland et al., 2022).

While the minority stress model suggests that distal stressors (discrimination) lead to a proximal stressor (non-disclosure of identity), Corrington et al. (2020) observed that disclosure/outrness (proximal stressor) determines perceived workplace discrimination (a distal stressor); this in turn affects psychological distress and substance abuse through minority stress (a proximal stressor).
Another source of psychological distress lies in the mental load and emotional labor that LGBTQ+ individuals experience when they cannot disclose their sexual identity at the workplace. This mental load can be reduced by developing an ally-ship with heterosexual co-workers (Minei et al., 2020). The stress caused by the concealment of one’s sexual orientation at workplaces often results in low self-esteem, self-confidence and energy; this is, in turn, disseminated into personal relationships causing strain between same-sex couples (Williamson et al., 2017). However, the connection between disclosure of sexual identity, stress and health status is not consistent. Huebner and Davis (2005) observed higher cortisol levels among gay and bisexual men who had disclosed their sexual orientation at the workplace, leading to a higher level of stress.

Job-related outcomes
The aversive workplace experience leads to diverse job-related outcomes. Research shows mixed findings regarding job satisfaction among LGBTQ+ employees. Disclosure is found to be a crucial mediating variable in this context. Aldén et al. (2020) find that gay men are generally more satisfied with their job compared to the heterosexual men, while lesbians are less satisfied than heterosexual women. Most studies report that disclosure is associated with lower job satisfaction (Carpenter, 2008; Drydakis, 2015; Kuyper, 2015; Newheiser et al., 2017; Williamson et al., 2017). Not only disclosure, but the fear of having negative outcomes after disclosure negatively affect one’s job satisfaction (Ragins et al., 2007). However, some studies show higher job satisfaction after disclosure (Ellis and Riggle, 1996; Leppel, 2014). To further complicate the dynamic, disclosure of identity at different levels has been found to have different experiences for different genders. GBQ males have been found to have higher levels of job satisfaction than LBQ females at lower levels of disclosure. However, both males and females have similar job satisfaction levels at higher levels of disclosure (Williamson et al., 2017). Moya and Moya-Garófano (2020) identified many stressors associated with the workplace for LGBTQ employees. Factors such as lack of preferred job, work hours, workload and less participation in the organizational decision, hostility from co-workers and less support in personal development negatively affect job satisfaction while instigating job insecurity.

Career-related outcomes
Social cognitive career theory (SCCT) (Lent et al., 1994) suggests that “person inputs (including predispositions such as personality traits) and background contextual affordances affect occupationally relevant self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations by shaping occupationally relevant learning experiences (performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and physiological states and emotional arousal)” (Schaub and Tokar, 2005, p. 305). Thus environmental supports and barriers encountered by LGBTQ+ individuals create a unique career pattern among them. Because of the overly present discrimination in the workplace, more than three-fourths of LG youth have experienced career barriers (Keeton, 2002). Because of a lack of gender-neutral policies and organizations’ inability to foster a positive and inclusive work environment, too, career growth suffers (Philip and Soumyaja, 2019).

Among adolescents, factors like lack of social support, internalized homophobia, victimization, identity confusion, stereotyping and bias are found to be crucial barriers to career development and exploration (Chen and Keats, 2016). Ulaş-Kılıç et al. (2021) conducted a life story inquiry on seven participants in Turkey and found that sexual orientation plays a role in their career development and the fulfillment of their career aspirations. Based on psychology of working theory, Smith et al. (2020) found that an unsupportive work climate negatively influenced decent work (characterized by “safe working conditions, adequate
compensation, allowance for free time and rest, access to health care, and values consistent with one’s personal”, p. 103374) through the negative mediating effect of work-volition (one’s belief in the ability to take effective career-decision even in the face of constraints).

LGBTQ + employees tend to fall into the trap of occupational stereotyping due to social and environmental barriers they encounter. Instead of exploring all the available career options based on their preferences and interests, they prefer to opt for “stereotypical” careers, for instance, males opt for traditionally feminine professions and become hairdressers, florists and fashion designers; the women, on the other hand, opt for the more masculine roles like drivers and athletes. Also, Ng and Feldman (2012) suggest that LGBTQ + employees have lower career and compensation aspirations and higher “altruistic” work values than their heterosexual counterparts, most likely because of their quest for “social justice.”

Lyons et al. (2010) observed that LGB individuals experienced both career-to-sexual identity and sexual identity-to-career interference; however, the first type of interference was higher as compared to the second one. Factors like interest, self-efficacy and support were negatively correlated with sexual identity-to-career interference and career-decidedness negatively correlates with career-to-sexual identity interference.

McFadden (2015) finds that acceptance of their identity is a greater priority for LGBTQ + employees than their careers. LGBTQ + employees believe that they would have had different career aspirations based on their “interests” had they been heterosexual. However, many career options become “unattainable” for them simply because of their sexual orientation.

LGBTQ + individuals’ performance and work role are also found to be affected by their experienced homo-prejudice (Soeker et al., 2015). An inclusive workplace and opportunity for workplace friendship increase one’s productivity, retention (Opall, 2021) and workplace empowerment (Gates et al., 2019) while an unsafe work climate has deteriorated productivity (Chen and Li, 2020).

While most of the literature has emphasized an affected career growth and productivity among sexual minorities, some studies show the opposite. The unique experiences of working for social movement, developing affective skills, and even encountering harassment and marginalization make queer employees better organizers (O’Brien, 2020). Similarly, LG police officers have perceived themselves as “good cops” and their sexualities as occupational assets (Myers et al., 2004). In a Philippines-based study, the affective labour and queer values of transgender call-center employees were useful for reducing stress and fostering productivity (David, 2015).

Discussion
Over the last decade, the world has been witnessing a progression in providing equal space for sexual minorities. This is evident through a second wave of decriminalization of homosexuality across countries. Organizations must also speed up in providing an equal and inclusive space to sexual minorities. The current study was an attempt to help in this matter by providing a detailed picture of the state-of-the-art literature related to the workplace experiences of LGBTQ + persons. The study has the following takeaways.

(1) This study shows stark cross-cultural differences in the publication of empirical research that deals with the workplace experiences of sexual minorities. Most empirical studies are based on western societies (Refer to Figure 4), especially US. The studies published in Asian countries are fewer in number, and the available publications are relatively new. This might be associated with the fact that homosexuality is still considered a criminal act in many Asian countries (Al Mamun et al., 2016). While in some Asian countries like India, Thailand, Taiwan, Philippines,
Nepal, and Bhutan, homosexuality has been recently decriminalized, there still exists a dearth of academic literature based on these countries. The highly skewed representation of the countries in terms of scholarship is indicative of the lack of urgency and seriousness with which they have been dealing with LGBTQ+ inclusion in their corporations. It could also be related to some reluctance and taboo among the researchers to conduct research in the area of sexuality in the workplace. Since the representation of the countries is far from equal, it might be erroneous to generalize the theories and models developed in US-based studies to other countries. While workplace discrimination has been found to be universally observed across studies, there is a need for multi-country research to get a clearer understanding of the cross-cultural patterns of different forms of discrimination. Based on dual attitude theory, it is possible that the subtle forms of aggressions are more common in countries with long history of egalitarian legislations and non-discriminatory policies and overt discriminations are more common in countries where homosexuality is still a taboo.

(2) The current study also reveals a stark unevenness in the representation of separate sections of LGBTQ+ persons, i.e. lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer persons. Figure 3 shows that some of the subsections of sexual minorities are represented in a skewed way in literature. Seven out of 101 articles (6.9%) have addressed transgender-only samples, while only two studies were dedicated to (1.9%) lesbian-only employees. Twenty-two studies (21.8%) have addressed homosexuals (lesbians and gays), whereas work on bisexual and queer persons is relatively rare. Most studies have used inclusive terms such as LGBTQ+ or sexual minorities, but the inner representation of the subsections within these studies is far from even. Intricacies might exist in the experience across genders and sexualities, hence generalizing findings drawn from one gender to other sections might be problematic. Most of the studies have addressed gay persons (85.14%). There is a need to conduct more studies on bisexual and transgender persons as they are found to be underrepresented in the literature. Also, it is important to test whether the theories developed in one subsection of sexual minorities are applicable to others.

(3) The journal-wise distribution is also indicative of the fact that there is a lack of dedicated journals and issues addressing this important domain of diversity management. Other than Journal of homosexuality, no journal is found to contribute significantly to the field. The absence of mainstream organizational psychology and management journals (except for Journal of Vocational Behaviour) in the list shows that research on sexuality in workplace is still not considered as an important part of the mainstream organizational research.

(4) Based on the integration of the existing empirical literature, an integrative model has been developed (Figure 6) in the current study. This model suggests that LGBTQ+ persons encounter both formal and interpersonal discrimination. Formal discrimination emerges through hiring biases, promotion delays and wage gaps. Interpersonal discrimination occurs through microaggression, heterosexist harassment and workplace bullying. Most of the studies are indicative of a higher frequency of subtle discrimination over overt forms of discrimination. The direct or secondary experience of discrimination and fear of encountering discrimination affect the disclosure decision of LGBTQ+ employees. In addition to developing an integrative model based on the existing literature, the current study makes a contribution by looking at these processes through multiple theoretical lenses. For instance, we have attempted to look at the empirical findings on LGBTQ+ individuals’ disclosure decisions through Omarzu’s (2000) model. Future research can
aim at quantitatively testing how one assesses subjective risk and benefits while deciding on the breadth, duration and timing of disclosure in an organization.

(5) The integrative model further shows that workplace discrimination tends to impact career outcomes among sexual minorities. The gender typing of jobs and internalization of the implicit inversion hypothesis often provide a more restricted choice of occupations for LGBTQ + persons; this effectively leads to horizontal occupational segregation (Anker, 1997). We could not identify any study or intervention programs related to how organizations and diversity management professionals have been addressing this issue.

(6) The literature is consistent in concluding that the negative work experience of sexual minorities can only be pacified by providing a safe work climate through effective diversity management programs. However, most corporations are found to be more concerned with the reduction of explicit/overt discrimination even when in reality, the occurrences of subtle discrimination are higher. This shows that corporations have been taking a symptom-reduction technique by pursuing only instrumental goals (Ghosh, 2020) where the focus is on legislation and policies. A greater emphasis on expressive goals is needed. Few studies have recommended some effective techniques to make the workplace safe for sexual minorities. Lim et al. (2019) recommend the development of an LGBTQ + employee resource group (ERG) that celebrates diversity by recognizing the contributions of LGBTQ + employees and openly advertising LGBTQ + diversity programs, along with educating and training staff for successful diversity inclusion at the workplace. Having a gender-diverse organizational board might also promote LGBTQ + diversity in organizations (Cook and Glass, 2016).
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