

Pride, but is There Respect at Work? Survey Based Evidence from Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Workers in the United States

Do Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual (LGB) workers experience less workplace respect than heterosexual workers? To date, answers to this question have been limited; few studies have explicitly examined these outcomes for LGB workers. Research examining labor-related outcomes have found marked disadvantages for sexual minorities in the workplace. In a 2007 study Badgett and colleagues summarized findings from numerous U. S. based studies and reported that between 16 percent and 68 percent of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) persons experienced employment discrimination and between 12 percent and 30 percent of heterosexual coworkers of LGBT workers reported witnessing discrimination against LGBT peers. Gay males earned 10 percent to 32 percent less than their heterosexual counterparts.¹

Adverse labor outcomes for sexual minorities are also prevalent outside of the United States. For example, researchers Gocmen and Yilmaz conducted a study in Turkey which found LGBT people felt discriminated against in education, employment, and healthcare settings.² Studies focusing on the European Union found between 11 percent (in Denmark) to 30 percent (in Cyprus) of LGBT individuals reported perceptions of discrimination in the workplace.³ More recent studies have found that gay men and lesbians experience adverse outcomes, including discrimination in hiring, earning less than heterosexual counterparts, and perceiving discrimination in the workplace.⁴ As the abovementioned studies support, LGB workers face various challenges; as such, it is critical to understand the factors and how they influence workplace respect.

In light of the above findings regarding labor-related outcomes for sexual minorities, we address the following research questions:

- **Research Question 1:** Do LGB workers experience lower levels of workplace respect relative to heterosexual workers?
- **Research Question 2:** What factors account for workplace respect disparities in LGB workers?

The present study used data from the 2018 U.S. General Social Survey (GSS) data to examine workplace respect for LGB workers in the United States and the factors that influence these disparities. This study advances the literature on sexual minority discrimination in three ways. First, few studies have examined sexual orientation and labor-related outcomes. Specifically, this study focused on the understudied area of perceived workplace respect. Second, this study controlled for a variety of demographic and labor-related outcomes, which provide a broader understanding of the factors that influence workplace respect for sexual minorities. Third, prior studies have had relatively small sample sizes. The present study utilizes a larger sample size and utilizes data collected after same-sex marriage was legalized in the United States in 2015. The pages that follow present a review of key areas related to workplace respect for sexual minorities including an examination of empirical studies, followed by a presentation of methods and results, discussion of findings, and policy implications.

Literature Review

Lack of workplace respect has been found to lead to various adverse outcomes, including lower levels of job satisfaction, decreased commitment to an organization, and reduced trust in management.⁵ In order to effectively study workplace respect we need to first examine its conceptualization. As a concept, the idea of respect has changed over time. For example, in 1999 Heuer and colleagues defined respect as treatment that is polite and respectful,⁶ within a few years the definition of respect had evolved incorporating the wider constructs of having

positive social evaluations and enjoyable inclusive relationships.⁷ By 2010, the definition of respect had evolved, to one's attitudes towards people who they see a reason that by itself "justifies a degree of attention and a type of behavior that in return engenders in the target a feeling of being appreciated in important and worth as a person."⁸ For the purposes of this paper, workplace respect is defined as being treated in a polite and inclusive manner, which reflect the need for individuals to be treated with dignity, respect, and professional treatment in the workplace.

A key component of workplace respect is group membership.⁹ Members of stigmatized groups may be more negatively impacted by perceptions of disrespectful treatment relative to those in non-stigmatized groups.¹⁰ Members of stigmatized groups face threats to personal well-being and motivations in the workplace.¹¹ Further, by virtue of being a member of stigmatized groups, these individuals face the threat of prejudice, discrimination, and exclusion.¹²

These negative experiences may impede establishing social connections in the workplace.¹³ For example, in their 2007 study, Embrick, Weather, and Wilkens interviewed thirty-eight subjects at a baked-goods company based in the southwestern United States, finding that 90 percent of participants would not hire someone they perceived as homosexual. Further, those who did hire gays or lesbians in the past would not do so in the future as they felt it would harm the company image.¹⁴ More recently, a 2021 report by Sears, Mallory, Flores, and Conron examined the experiences of employment harassment and discrimination of LGBT adults and found almost 30 percent of LGBT employees in the study experienced being fired or not hired due to their sexual orientation or gender identity. In regards to harassment, almost 38 percent had experience at least one type of harassment, including physical violence, such as getting hit or beaten up at work due to their gender identity of sexual orientation.¹⁵ Findings like these

suggest that despite the development of more progressive attitudes towards LGB individuals in recent decades, being a member of a group that has historically been stigmatized can still impact workplace outcomes.

Respectful treatment is an essential component of the workplace. It can help reassure those in stigmatized groups of their inclusion by other groups in society.¹⁶ Scholars such as Bergsieker, Shelton, and Richeson¹⁷ have stated that due to the implications for social inclusion, those in stigmatized groups have a strong preference for respect, even if it impedes financial advancement.¹⁸ Those concerned about being treated with respect, such as LBGT workers, may be particularly sensitive to, and affected by, workplace treatment.¹⁹

Explaining Inequality & Workplace Respect in LGBT Individuals

In order to empirically study workplace respect in LGB populations, we need to understand why these groups may receive less respect in the workplace than heterosexual individuals. Legislation and labor laws in the United States have contributed considerably to the marginalization of LGBT individuals. Historically, LGBT individuals faced unequal social and legal standing, including criminalizing same-sex relationships, lack of marital rights, and unequal protection against employment discrimination. In 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court legalized same-sex marriage, increasing the overall rights of LGBT persons. However, it was not until 2020 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the 1964 Civil Rights Act protected LGBT rights in the workplace.²⁰ Prior to 2020, employment protections were primarily driven by state and local governments, creating a patchwork of protections that were a challenge for legal compliance in organizations that operated in multiple locations.²¹ Protections offered by the Supreme Court ruling expanded legal protections for LGBT employees, at least on paper. However, employee

experience goes beyond basic legal protections. LGBT persons may still face issues of workplace hostility or bullying, which may negatively influence perceptions of workplace respect.²²

Many studies have found that LGBT employees face hostile workplace conditions.²³ Hostile environments, which undermine workplace respect for LGBT workers, may come in a variety of forms including, demeaning comments, “jokes,” and verbal or physical abuse.²⁴ LGBT individuals subjected to these behaviors often report feeling victimized²⁵ and that feeling of victimization may negatively impact perceptions of workplace respect.²⁶

Workplace harassment may be rooted in inherent workplace biases.²⁷ Status inequality theory helps explain how LGBT identity may affect workplace experiences. Status inequality theory argues that interpersonal inequalities are grounded in broadly shared cultural attitudes and beliefs about the “types” of people in different status categories (such as sexual orientation, race, gender, age).²⁸ LGBT identity has been identified as a devalued status similarly to race and gender.²⁹ The status inequalities of LGBT persons have been characterized by common negative beliefs, including heteronormativity (the normative assumptions about the normality heterosexuality),³⁰ negative stereotypes of LGBT persons as aloof, incompetent, or untrustworthy,³¹ and perceptions of LGBT individuals as irresponsible, lazy, deviant, and immoral.³²

Prior studies, such as Smith and Son, have found that more than half of Americans have some disapproval toward non-heterosexual sexuality;³³ these beliefs are spread across various social and institutional contexts.³⁴ Though it should be noted more recent Gallup data suggests there are greater levels of acceptance of same sex marriage in the United States and more people find same sex relations more acceptable than in the past.³⁵ However, these recent trends may not

necessarily translate to the experiences of LGBT persons in the workplace. To contextualize this for the present study, workplace respect (or lack thereof) may be rooted in larger social biases.

Despite cultural shifts and legal victories in recent years for LGBT persons, many people may still hold negative stereotypes of LGBT persons. As such, LGBT persons may still experience lower levels of workplace respect, relative to heterosexual colleagues. In light of historically widespread and consistent disparities in for LGBT workers, as well as other disadvantages in society, we expect that LGBT employees will have lower levels of workplace respect.

LGBT persons have experienced a variety of disparities, and some scholars have associated these with differences in demographics such as family structure, marital status, and level of education.³⁶ As such, we would expect that demographic characteristics may predict whether a person feels respected in the workplace.

Methodology

Data

Data from the 2018 General Social Survey (GSS) was used in this analysis. The GSS began in 1972 and is the largest project funded by the Sociology Program of the National Science Foundation. The GSS is conducted every two years by the University of Chicago, Social Science Research Center.³⁷ The GSS program has two goals: to study the structure, development, and changes facing American society and to collect and distribute current, high-quality data to social scientists.³⁸ The GSS has provided crucial data to study social changes and the issues facing American society for nearly fifty years and has provided data for over 14,000 papers, presentations, books, and dissertations.³⁹

GSS data were used in this study for several reasons. First, the data contains demographic information regarding age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, income, and measures related to

employment outcomes (e.g., variables measuring respondents' views on fairness at work, taking part in decisions at work, and being treated with respect). Second, the GSS is a nationally representative study with a probability design that allows for greater generalizability of findings. Finally, prior studies have utilized the GSS that examined labor-related outcomes, including job satisfaction,⁴⁰ and economic insecurity for sexual minorities.⁴¹

The 2018 GSS data included 1,271 heterosexuals (94 percent of the analytic sample) and 82 LGB individuals (6 percent of the analytic sample). The popular perception that LGBT individuals are 10 percent of the population is based on the work of Alfred Kinsey in the 1940s.⁴² However, recent estimates of the number of LGBT persons in the U.S. conducted by Gallup estimate the number to be 5.6 percent of the U.S. population.⁴³ The 6 percent represented in the analytic sample approximate the current population estimates of LGBT persons in the United States. It should be noted that GSS sexuality variable only included measures of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual individuals. However, given the similar social experiences, types of discrimination, and likely similar experiences in the workplace, Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual persons (LGB) are acting as a proxy for the wider Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Questioning, Transgendered, Asexual, plus populations. It is expected results of the present study will reflect what would likely be found in LGBTQIA+ population, though future studies, especially those collecting primary data are advised to use the more inclusive LGBTQIA+ focus. Studies including the wider LGBTQIA+ focus are more limited, though the existing literature (e.g., Badgett et al., 2009)⁴⁴ suggest the experiences across these populations would be similar.

Outcome Variable

In order to capture various dimensions of workplace respect, a series of variables in the GSS were reviewed and subjected to reliability analysis to test viability in capturing this concept.

The first question gauging workplace respect, measured by, "respondent is treated with respect at work," coded on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = disagree, 4 = strongly disagree). The second variable was "proud to work for the employer" was originally coded on a 4-point scale (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = disagree, 4 = strongly disagree).

The next variable measured "promotions are handled fairly" and was coded on a four-point scale (1 = very true, 2 = somewhat true, 3 = not too true, and 4 = not at all true). The fourth variable measured use of skills through "job allows the use of skills" and was measured on a four-point scale (1 = very true, 2 = somewhat true, 3 = not too true, and 4 = not at all true). The next variable examined fairness of earnings ("earnings are fair") and was coded on a four-point scale (1 = very true, 2 = somewhat true, 3 = not too true, and 4 = not at all true). The sixth question gauged perceived job security, on a four-point scale (1 = very true, 2 = somewhat true, 3 = not too true, and 4 = not at all true). The final variable examined was work satisfaction ("how satisfied is the respondent at work") and was coded on a four-point scale from: "very satisfied," to "not at all satisfied."

All variables were originally coded so that a higher score reflected less satisfaction; variables were reverse coded so that a higher score reflected a greater level of satisfaction with employment. The scale items were subject to reliability analysis and produced an $\alpha = .716$. Based on the reliability analysis results, construction of the survey, and theoretical conceptualizations, an outcome scale was created.

Predictor Variable

Sexual orientation, was measured using the question, "What is your sexual orientation?" Responses included: "Gay, Lesbian, or Homosexual," "Bisexual," "Heterosexual or Straight," or "Don't Know." During the period from 2008 through 2018, the GSS did not include transgender

as a response category in the responses to sexual orientation survey. Also, prior studies such as Chai and Maroto⁴⁵ and Alden et al.⁴⁶ that have examined related outcomes (economic insecurity and job satisfaction respectively) have focused on LGB populations, the present study will be doing the same. The sexual orientation variable was recoded into a dichotomous variable with 0= heterosexual or straight; 1 = LGB.

Control Variables

Prior studies exploring labor market outcomes with LGB populations have included a variety of control variables such as age, gender, and race. The present study does the same. Age was a continuous variable measured on a scale from 18 to 89 or older. Race was coded as a dichotomous variable with White coded as 1 and Non-White coded as 0. Sex was a dichotomous variable coded with female coded as 1 and male coded as 0. Given the history of workplace discrimination against women, we would expect that women would have lower levels of workplace respect compared to men. As in prior studies using GSS such as Brooks 2018,⁴⁷ categories of respondents who responded as non-white were small and unable to be further specified.

Mediating Variables

Prior studies examining labor-related outcomes for LGB populations have included a series of mediating variables. The present study does the same, including several variables to specifically test the second hypothesis.

Educational attainment was measured in the GSS with a higher score reflecting a greater level of educational achievement (0 = less than high, 1= high school, 2 = junior college, 3 = bachelors, 4= graduate). Prior studies have argued education provides social capital, higher occupational prestige, and commands respect in the workplace, which may moderate the

expected lack of workplace respect with LGB individuals. It is expected that those with higher levels of education would have greater levels of workplace respect.

The next variable, Occupational Prestige was included because that many LGB persons work in jobs with lower levels of occupational prestige and be occupationally segregated from the mainstream.⁴⁸ In addition, other studies using GSS to examine labor-related outcomes such as job satisfaction have included occupational prestige.⁴⁹ The occupational prestige variable was coded, so a higher score reflected higher occupational prestige. The updated 1989 occupational prestige score⁵⁰ was used for this study. It was expected that those with higher occupational prestige will have higher scores on the workplace respect scale.

Workplace Characteristics

A series of variables gauging workplace characteristics were included in some models. These variables have either been used in prior studies using GSS data or in other studies that have examined labor-related outcomes for LGBT populations. These variables included economic insecurity and job satisfaction (see Henry 2011, Brooks, 2018; Pink- Harper et al., 2020). These variables were included, "coworkers can be relied on to help respondent" and "coworkers take a personal interest in respondent." Responses for both measures were captured on a four-point scale (1 = very true, 2= somewhat true, 3 = not too true, and 4 = not at all true). These variables were reverse coded so that higher values reflected higher levels of coworker reliance and interest in the respondent. It was expected that those with higher levels of coworker reliance and coworker interest would report being treated with greater respect.

Inclusive decision making ("how often the respondent takes part in work decisions" was coded on a four-point scale (1= often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = rarely, and 4 = never). This variable was reverse coded so that higher values reflected greater perceptions of inclusion in workplace

decision-making. Workplace freedom was measured by, "respondent has a lot of freedom on how to do the job," all of these variables were originally coded measured on a four-point scale (1 = very true, 2= somewhat true, 3 = not too true, and 4 = not at all true). It was expected that higher levels inclusive decision making and freedom at work would be associated with greater workplace respect.

Family Structure

In order capture the potential influence of the legalization of same-sex marriage and the legitimizing influence of additional family support, a series of variables were included in some models to capture family structure. Marital Status was recorded to Married = 1 and Not Married = 0. The number of children a respondent had was captured as a continuous variable. It was hypothesized that having children legitimizes LGB workers in the eyes of coworkers and therefore, having children may increase perceptions of workplace respect. A final indicator, total household income, was included (higher score= higher income). The hypothesize is that those with higher household incomes may perceive greater workplace respect (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Descriptives of Dependent, Control, Mediating, and Independent Variables*

Variable	Frequency	Perc ent	Min/Max	Mean/SD
Workplace Respect Scale	1298		8.14//24.71	19.97 (SD 2.89)
Sexual Orientation				
Heterosexual	1291	94		
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual	82	6		
Age			18/89	48.97 (SD 18.06)
Gender				
Males	640	45.8		
Females	758	54.2		
Race				
Non-White	655	27.9		
White	1693	72.1		
Education			0/4	1.68 (SD 1.21)
Occupational Prestige			5/97	49.44 (SD 26.03)
Coworkers Help			1/4	3.40 (SD .733)
Coworkers Interested			1/4	3.24 (SD .794)
Proud to Work			1/4	3.25 (SD .605)
Takes Part in Workplace Decisions			1/4	3.22 (SD .725)
Marital Status				
Not Married	700			
Married	816			
Number of Children			0/8	1.86 (SD. 1.67)
Total Family income			1/26	17.73 (S.D. 5.94)

Analytic Strategy

The analysis begins with a description of the variables included. Next, correlation analyses were conducted to examine the direction and strength of the relationships between the outcome variable and the predictor, mediator, and independent variables. Finally, a series of stepped regression models were specified to explore the differential impact of key concepts.

All regression models were unweighted to avoid biasing coefficients due to the GSS sample weights being largely drawn from demographic variables used in the study.⁵¹ Prior studies examining labor-related outcomes using GSS data (see Brooks, 2018) have also conducted analyses without weighing data. All models were estimated using SPSS version 26. Correlational analyses suggested that multicollinearity would not inhibit further analyses.

Results

Results show partial support for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual individuals experiencing lower levels of workplace respect relative to heterosexual individuals. Correlational analysis indicated a significant relationship between workplace respect and sexual orientation. It was also correlated with additional control, mediating, and independent variables. These were generally in the expected direction, with lower levels of respect reported by LGB respondents (Table 2). The results of the correlational analysis provided support for the hypothesis and justification to continue to the next stage of the analysis.

Table 2. *Correlations with Workplace Respect Scale*

	Workplace Respect Scale	Sexual Orientation	Age	Race	Sex	Ed. Attainment	Occ. Prestige	Coworkers Help	Coworkers Interest	Take Part in Work Decision	Work Freedom	Marital Status	Number of Children	Family Income
Workplace Respect Scale	1.0	-.113**	.088* *	.053	-.008	.116**	.180**	.463**	.450**	.174**	.386**	.002	.027	.160**

In the regression models, Model 1 included sexual orientation only, Model 2 accounts for demographics and other characteristics, Model 3 added mediating variables, Model 4 added workplace characteristics, and Model 5, the fully specified model, incorporated measures of family structure. Sexual minorities reported lower levels of workplace respect in Models 1, 2, 3, and 5. A variety of factors were found to be predictors of workplace respect including age, occupational prestige, several workplace characteristics, and family income.

Table 3. *Results of Linear Regression Models*

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Sexual Orientation	-1.38***	-.880*	-.78*	-.687	-1.58**
Age		.023***	.019**	-.011	-.055
Race		.306	.197	.160	.084
Sex		.036	.042	-.035	.006
Educational Attainment			-.007	-.099	-.238*
Occupational Prestige			.019***	.009**	.004
Coworkers Help				1.13***	.913***
Coworkers Interested				.774***	1.105***
Take Part in Workplace Decisions				.381**	.538**
Workplace Freedom				.877***	.585***
Marital Status					-.294
Number of Children					.024
Family Income					.065**

*p<.01, **p<.05, ***p<.10

Sexual orientation was generally negatively associated with perceptions of respect. LGB individuals were associated with a 1.58-unit reduction in perceived respect (Model 5) relative to their heterosexual counterparts. This effect was relatively stable across models, except in Model 4 where the inclusion of other workplace characteristics (e.g., inclusive decision making) washed out the association between sexual orientation and perceived respect. However, in the fully

specified model, that included control for income, sexual orientation was again significantly related to perceived workplace respect.

Age, race, and sex had inconsistent relationships with perceptions of workplace respect. Although age was significantly associated with perceptions of respect (with increased age associated with increased respect) this effect was mediated by other workplace and person-level characteristics. Irrespective of model specification, race and sex were not associated with reported respect.

Table 4. *Fully Specified Final Model*

	B	SE	T	Sig
(Constant)		1.12	9.61	< .01
Sexual Orientation	-.14	.61	-2.61	< .01
Age	-.02	.01	-.41	.69
Race	.01	.32	.26	.79
Sex	.00	.28	.02	.98
Educational Attainment	-.11	.14	-1.71	.09
Occupational Prestige	.04	.01	.56	.58
Coworkers Help	.23	.22	4.22	< .01
Coworkers Interested	.31	.20	5.68	< .01
Take Part in Workplace Decisions	.11	.27	1.99	.05
Workplace Freedom	.17	.19	3.04	< .01
Marital Status	-.06	.28	-1.06	.30
Number of Children	.01	.10	.24	.81
Family Income	.12	.03	2.04	.04

Educational attainment and occupational prestige were inconsistently related to perceptions of workplace respect. Under partially specified models (model 3 and 4) educational attainment was not significantly related to perceptions of workplace respect while increased occupational prestige *was* associated with perceived workplace respect. However, in the fully specified model (model 5), increased educational attainment was associated with *lower* levels of perceived workplace respect. Under the fully specified model, occupational prestige was no longer associated with perceived workplace respect.

Other dimensions of workplace environment were consistently related to perceptions of workplace respect. Increased coworker helpfulness, coworker interest, participatory decision making, and workplace freedom were all associated with greater degrees of perceived workplace respect. These relationships were stable in both partially (model 4) and fully specified (model 5) models.

Marital status and number of children were not associated with perceptions of workplace respect. Family income, however, was associated with perceptions of respect. Greater income was associated with greater levels of perceived respect, controlling for other person and workplace characteristics (model 5).

Discussion and Conclusion

Scholarship in recent years has examined labor market outcomes related to sexuality, often finding mixed results regarding the influence of sexual orientation on employment-associated characteristics.⁵² Studies have found that members of sexual minority groups earn less,⁵³ and have lower job satisfaction than their heterosexual peers.⁵⁴ This paper expands the labor market literature by examining if the apparent disparities in employment characteristics extends to workplace respect. Results suggest that there was support for the idea of LGB

individuals report lower levels of perceived workplace respect compared to heterosexual counterparts. It identified several key factors, including age, educational attainment, occupational prestige, coworker's help, coworker's interest, taking part in workplace decisions, level of freedom at work, and family income as factors that influence reported workplace respect.

Prior studies have found that differences in labor-related outcomes like earnings are related to discrimination against sexual minorities,⁵⁵ variations in family structure,⁵⁶ and social capital.⁵⁷ This study examined if those factors could explain differences in perceived workplace respect for sexual minorities relative to heterosexual individuals. Results show that differences in demographic characteristics such as occupational prestige may play a role in how sexual minorities are perceived in the workplace. Interestingly, educational attainment was not a factor found to influence workplace respect in most models, though it was a significant factor in the full model, the same model in which occupational prestige was not significant. These findings may suggest that factors like family income may interact with variables like educational attainment and moderate the influence of occupational prestige, perhaps greater levels of income mediates the role of occupational prestige.

One of the most interesting findings of the present study was in Models 4 and 5 where workplace characteristics and family income mediates the role of sexual orientation on workplace respect. It is possible that these factors are moderating, or at least partially moderating, the impact of sexual orientation on perception of workplace respect. Workplace characteristics, such as having coworkers who are interested and helpful, having freedom at work, and participatory decision making reflect greater inclusion and appreciation of diversity that workplaces have attempted to develop in recent years. These characteristics may make sexual minority status less of a factor influencing perceived respect in the workplace.

Despite the contributions of this study, there are limitations. First, no single survey question may completely describe a person's sexual orientation. Second, the currently available GSS data do not capture the impact of the 2020 ruling from the U.S. Supreme Court, which banned employment discrimination based on sexual orientation. As future waves of the GSS are collected, a replication of this analysis could capture the potential impact of the 2020 Supreme Court ruling that outlawed discrimination in the workplace based on sexuality. Next, the present study only includes data looking at Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual (LGB) persons in the United States, instead of the more inclusive LGBTQIA+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Questioning, Transgendered, plus). Like similar national surveys (e.g., National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent and Adult Health) GSS data were limited to the LGB populations. However, future national surveys (e.g., GSS, Add Health) will likely include LGBTQIA+ populations to more fully capture these populations, rather than utilizing the more limited LGB populations as a proxy for LGBTQIA+ populations. Finally, as with any quantitative study, findings, relationships are identified, but the 'why' of these relationships is limited by the nature of the data. Qualitative studies can provide a deeper look into the role sexual orientation plays in the workplace. Open-ended questions could allow participants to identify and discuss factors not included in the GSS or similar surveys. Alternative approaches, such as observation-based studies, could provide an opportunity to examine workplace dynamics, which could reveal situational factors that impact respectful behaviors. These observations could include microaggressions in the workplace that may not be captured in the quantitative questions in surveys like the GSS.

Understanding disparities in perceived workplace respect is key to understanding the well-being of sexual minorities both nationally and internationally. While the rights and protections of sexual minorities have made great strides in recent years, workplace inequality

may impact financial wellbeing, mental and physical health, and the lives of partners and other family members. If workplace respect is in fact, becoming less of a challenging area for sexual minorities, employers may want to consider what is 'working' and apply these strategies to other minority groups and challenge areas in the workplace (e.g., disparities in pay based on minority status).

ENDNOTES

¹ M.V.Lee Badgett, Holning Lau, Brad Sears, and Deborah Ho. *Bias in the Workplace: Consistent Evidence of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Discrimination*. (2007) Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law, University of California Press, Chicago. Accessed January 25, 2022 at: <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/bias-in-the-workplace/>

² Ipek Göçmen, and Volkan Yılmaz. "Exploring Perceived Discrimination Among LGBT Individuals in Turkey in Education, Employment, and Health Care: Results of an online survey," *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64 no. 8(2017):1052-1068.

³ European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. *EU LGBT Survey: European Union Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Survey. Results at a glance*. (2013). Vienna. Accessed January 29, 2022 at: <https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2013/eu-lgbt-survey-european-union-lesbian-gay-bisexual-and-transgender-survey-results>.

⁴ Lina Alden , Mats Hammarstedt, and Hanna Swahnberg. "Sexual Orientation and Job Satisfaction: Survey Based Evidence from the United States," *Journal of Labor Research*, 41 (2020):69-101.

⁵ Jason A. Colquitt, Donald E. Conlon, Michael J. Wesson, Christopher O.L.H. Porter, and K. Y. Ng. "Justice and the Millennium: A Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 no.3(2001), 425-445.

⁶ Larry Heuer, Eva Blumenthal, Amber Douglas, and Tara Weinblatt. A deservingness approach to respect as a relationally based fairness judgment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25 no.10 (1999): 1279–1292.

⁷ David De Cremer, D. Noneconomic Motives Predicting Cooperation in Public Good Dilemmas: The Effect of Received Respect on Contributions. *Social Justice Research* 16 no. 4 (2003): 367–377 (2003).

⁸ Nicholas Clarke. "An Integrated Conceptual Model of Respect in Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22 no.4. (2011):316-327.

⁹ P.J. Henry. "The Role of Group-Based Status in Job Satisfaction: Workplace Respect Matters More for the Stigmatized," *Social Justice Research*, 24 no. 3(2011): 231-238.

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Margaret E. Hampson, Bruce D. Watt, and Richard Hicks. "Impacts of Stigma and Discrimination in the Workplace on People Living with Psychosis," *BMC Psychiatry*, 20 no.1(2020): 2-11.

¹² Richman Smart an, Laura. and Mark R. Leary. "Reactions to Discrimination, Stigmatization, Ostracism, and Other Forms of Interpersonal Rejection: A Multi-level Model." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 116 no. 2 (2009): 365-383.

¹³ Henry. *Role*.

¹⁴ David G. Embrick, Carol S. Walther, and Corrine M. Wickens. "Working Class Masculinity: Keeping Gay Men and Lesbians Out of the Workplace," *Sex Roles*, 56 no.11-12 (2007), 757-766.

¹⁵ Brad Sears, Christy Mallory, Andrew R. Flores, and Keith J. Conron. "LGBT People's Experiences of Workplace Discrimination and Harassment," "UCLA Williams Institute School of Law. Accessed November 22, 2022 at: <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Workplace-Discrimination-Sep-2021.pdf>

¹⁶ Henry. *Role*.

¹⁷ Hillary B. Bergsieker, J. Nicole Shelton, and Jennifer A. Richeson. "To Be Liked Versus Respected: Divergent Goals in Interracial Relations," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99 no.2 (2010): 248-264.

¹⁸ J Davis, and P. J. Henry. "Low Status Compensation Theory and the Justice Preference Scale." Poster Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Tampa, Florida. 2009.

¹⁹ Henry. *Role*. p. 232.

²⁰ Adam Liptak. "Civil Rights Law Protects Gay and Transgender Workers, Supreme Court Rules," The New York Times, Access 12/7/2022

at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/15/us/gay-transgender-workers-supreme-court.html>

²¹ Michael T. Zugelder, and Paul J. Champagne. "A Management Approach to LGBT Employment: Diversity, Inclusion and Respect," *Journal of Business Diversity*, 18 no.1(2018): 40-50.

²² Elizabeth Grace Holman, Jessica N. Fish, Ramona Faith Oswald, and Abbie Goldberg. 2019. "Reconsidering the LGBT Climate Inventory: Understanding Support and Hostility for LGBTQ Employees in the Workplace," *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27no.3 (2019):544-559.

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Ibid

²⁵ Brandon L. Velez, Bonnie Moadi, and Melanie E. Brewster. "Testing the Tenets of Minority Stress Theory in Workplace Contexts," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60 no. 4 (2013): 532-542.

²⁶ Gregory B. Lewis, and David W. Pitts. "LGBT–Heterosexual Differences in Perceptions of Fair Treatment in the Federal Service." *American Review of Public Administration* 47 no. 5(2017): 574–87.

²⁷ Erin A. Cech, and William R. Rothwell. "LGBT Workplace Inequality in the Federal Workforce: Intersectional Processes, Organizational Contexts, and Turnover Considerations" *ILR Review*, 73 no.1(2020): 25–60

²⁸ Cecilia Ridgeway. "Why Status Matters for Inequality," *American Sociological Review* 79(1)(2014): 1–16.

²⁹ Cathryn Johnson, Barry Markovsky, Michael Lovaglia, and Karen. "Sexual Orientation as a Diffuse Status Characteristic: Implications for Small Group Interaction" *Advances in Group Processes* 12 (1995):115–137.

³⁰ Gregory M. Herek. "Confronting Sexual Stigma and Prejudice: Theory and Practice.," *Journal of Social Issues*, 63 no.4 (2007): 905–25.

³¹ John Dovidio, and Susan T Fiske. "Under the Radar: How Unexamined Biases in Decision-Making Processes in Clinical Interactions can Contribute to Health Care Disparities," *American Journal of Public Health*, 102 no.5 (2012): 945–952.

-
- ³² Belle Rose Ragins. "Disclosure Disconnects: Antecedents and Consequences of Disclosing Invisible Stigmas Across Life Domains," *Academy of Management Review*, 33 no.1(2008): 194–215.
- ³³ Tom W. Smith, and Jaseok Son. Trends in Attitudes towards Sexual Morality. Chicago, IL: NORC.(2013).
- ³⁴ Cech and Rothwell. LGBT.
- ³⁵ Gallup. LGBT Rights. Accessed November 23, 2022 at: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/1651/gay-lesbian-rights.aspx>
- ³⁶ Lei Chai, and Michelle Maroto. "Economic Insecurity among Gay and Bisexual Men: Evidence from the 1991-2016 U.S. General Social Survey," *Sociological Perspectives* 63no.1(2020): 50-68 & Megan S. Schuler, Dana M. Prince, and Rebecca L. Collins. Disparities in Social and Economic Determinants of Health by Sexual Identity, Gender, and Age: Results from the 2015–2018 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. *LGBT Health* 8 no.5 (2021):330-339.
- ³⁷ General Social Survey/GSS/National Data Program. "The National Data Program for the Social Sciences," 2012. Accessed November 15, 2022 at: <http://www3.norc.umd.edu/GSS+Website/About+GSS/National+Data+Program+for+Social+Sciences>
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰ Jennifer D. Brooks. "Just a Little Respect: Differences in Job Satisfaction Among Individuals With and Without Disabilities," *Social Science Quarterly*, 11 no.1(2018): 379-388.
- ⁴¹ Chai and Maroto. Economic.
- ⁴² Gary Gates. "Gay People Count, So Why Not Count Them Correctly." Washington Post. (2011) Accessed on December 1, 2021 at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/gay-people-count-so-why-not-count-them-correctly/2011/04/07/AFDg9K4C_story.html/
- ⁴³ Jeffrey Jones "LGBT Identification Rises to 5.6 percent in Latest Estimate." (2021). Accessed on January 2, 2022 at: <https://news.gallup.com/poll/329708/lgbt-identification-rises-latest-estimate.aspx>
- ⁴⁴ M. V. Lee Badgett; Brad Sears; Holning Lau; Deborah Ho, "Bias in the Workplace: Consistent Evidence of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Discrimination 1998-2008," *Chicago-Kent Law Review* 84, no. 2 (2009): 559-596.
- ⁴⁵ Chai and Maroto. Economic.
- ⁴⁶ Alden et al. Sexual.
- ⁴⁷ Brooks. Just.
- ⁴⁸ Andras Tilcsik, Michel Anteby, and Carly R. Knight. "Concealable Stigma and Occupational Segregation: Toward a Theory of Gay and Lesbian Occupations," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 60no.3 (2015): 446-481.
- ⁴⁹ Brooks. Just.
- ⁵⁰ K. Nakoa, and J. Treas. "Updating Occupational Prestige and Socioeconomic Scores: How the New Measures Measure Up," *Sociological Methodology* 24(1994):1-72./
- ⁵¹ Christopher Winship and Larry Radbil. "Sampling Weights and Regression Analysis." *Sociological Methods & Research*, 23 no.2(1994):230-257.
- ⁵² Stephanie A. Pink-Harper, Randall S. Burnside, and Randolph Davis. "Justice for All: An Examination of Self-Identified LGBT Job Satisfaction in the U.S. Federal Workplace," *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*. 34 no.2 (2016):183-197.

⁵³ Sylvia A. Allegretto, and Michelle M. Arthur. "An Empirical Analysis of Homosexual/Heterosexual Male Earnings Differentials: Unmarried and Unequal?" *Industrial Labor Relation Review* 54 no.3(2001): 631-646.

⁵⁴ Badgett et al. Bias.

⁵⁵ Nick Drydakis. "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the Labour Market," *Labour Economics* 16 no.4(2009): 364-372.

⁵⁶ Allegretto and Arthur. Empirical.

⁵⁷ Koji Ueno, Teresa A. Roach, and Abraham E. Pena-Talamantes. "The Dynamic Association between Same-Sex Contact and Educational Attainment." *Advances in Life Course Research* 18 no.2(2013): 127-140.