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Abstract

Minoritized employees are not protected from all forms of discrimination such as microaggressions. These are subtle discriminatory acts, with or without intent to harm, that target minoritized identities. Little research has investigated LGBTQ+ microaggressions even though the community is particularly at risk or tried to discern the unique nature of microaggressions when compared to other forms of subtle discrimination such as incivility. This study tested the relationship between LGBTQ+ microaggressions and job engagement, the roles of organizational trust and outness as moderators, as well as the unique contribution of microaggressions over and above incivility. LGBTQ+ microaggressions were not significantly related to job engagement in all but one tested model. Organizational trust and outness did significantly positively predict job engagement but did not moderate the relationship between LGBTQ+ microaggressions and engagement. Incivility was significantly negatively related to job engagement and was also highly correlated with LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions.
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Summary for Lay Audience

Overt discrimination against minoritized groups has become less common in workplaces. However, subtle forms of discrimination still exist and can impact workers. Microaggressions are a form of more subtle discrimination that harm the LGBTQ+ workforce. These acts are less obvious than bullying or harassment, but instead may take the forms of comments, or actions that undermine someone’s marginalized identity (i.e. not using someone’s chosen pronouns). Little research has tried to understand the impact microaggressions may have on LGBTQ+ employees and whether they impact how these employees engage with their job. It also remains to be seen whether microaggressions are truly different than other subtle forms of workplace discrimination like incivility. Acts of incivility include a general rudeness or a deviation from social norms in how one should be treated in the workplace (i.e. leaving someone out of a group lunch). This study examined whether LGBTQ+ microaggressions were related to workers feeling less engaged with their jobs. The study also looked at whether trusting one’s organization or having disclosed your LGBTQ+ identity (being “out”) to others in their lives helped to buffer the potential negative impact of microaggressions. Lastly, the study examined whether microaggressions negatively impacted workers above and beyond any impact that general acts of incivility had on them. The study did not find much support for microaggressions negatively affecting how engaged employees were at work, but this may be due to the measure or sample used in the study. Trust in one’s organization and being out did relate to employees feeling more engaged. Though, neither helped to buffer the impact LGBTQ+ microaggressions. On the other hand, acts of incivility were related to employees feeling less engaged. Notably, scores on the measures of incivility and microaggressions used in this study were highly related to one another. This could point to a potential overlap between the two and furthers the notion that more
research should be conducted to better understand the unique natures of each. Research should also investigate how LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions are measured and determine whether they are currently being accurately captured.
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Introduction

White, heteronormativity permeates the policies, practices, and cultures of North American workplaces. Embrick and colleagues (2007, p. 757) stated that: “[White, working class, heterosexual, males] have constructed and maintained a form of White male solidarity, a collective practice directed toward women, People of Color, and non-heterosexuals that maintains racism, sexism, and homophobia in the local, national, and global context”. Historically, this has yielded workplace environments rife with discriminatory attitudes and practices towards minority groups.

Though organizations continue to be led by Caucasian, cisnormative\(^1\) and heteronormative\(^2\) individuals, the working population reflects a wider set of identities that have more recently begun to find their voice through the rise of equity and diversity initiatives (Jones, 2021; Ellsworth et al., 2021). For example, many Fortune 500 companies voluntarily protected lesbian, gay and bisexual workers in the United States through non-discrimination policies or codes of conduct even though these groups were not yet formally protected by legislation at the federal level (Human Rights Campaign, 2003). More recently, the US Supreme Court has ruled that LGBTQ+\(^3\) employees cannot be discriminated against regarding their employment (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2021). Similarly, Section 15 of the Canadian

\(^1\) Cisnormativity consists of beliefs that reinforce gender-conformity and the male-female gender binary.

\(^2\) Heteronormativity is the presumption that individuals are heterosexual by default, and that sexual minority individuals are abnormal.

\(^3\) The LGBTQ+ community consists of anyone who deviates from heterosexual and/or cisnormative societal norms including Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer identities. The plus encompasses the wide spectrum of additional identities within the community. For simplicity, the term LGBTQ+ is used throughout the thesis. However, if a study mentioned used a particular configuration of the term, that acronym has been used instead.
Charter of Rights and Freedoms protects LGBTQ+ employees from discriminatory practices including, but not limited to, inequitable hiring practices, discriminatory compensation, inequal opportunities for employee advancement and inappropriate behaviour from their supervisors and coworkers (Government of Canada, 2018). In tandem with legislative protection, organizations are moving beyond non-discrimination policies to independently engage in more proactive equity and diversity initiatives. These take on many forms including diversity training for workers, mentorship opportunities, as well as the creation of equity and diversity offices to support minoritized workers (Scarborough et al., 2019). As a result of these legislative and organizational developments, minoritized workers can feel more secure being their true selves at work without fear of persecution for their identities.

While these protections represent a positive shift towards equity and diversity, it would be inaccurate to assume that all forms of discrimination against minoritized groups have been eliminated. Organizations now have a vested interest in appearing egalitarian in their practices and promoting equity and diversity-based initiatives (Jones et al., 2017). These practices address overt discrimination of minority groups but may result in more subtle forms of discrimination taking their place (Jones et al., 2017). These subtle discriminatory acts can take the form of microaggressions. Microaggressions were first conceptualized as subtly discriminatory acts enacted by white perpetrators toward black individuals (Pierce, 1970). In recent years, the definition of microaggressions has been expanded to include subtle discriminatory acts targeting minoritized and/or marginalized individuals, including but not limited to women, members of the disabled community and members of the LGBTQ+ community (Nadal et al., 2016). Specifically, microaggressions are subtle acts of interpersonal discrimination that are ambiguous in intent. They are perceived by the victim as discriminatory towards their (minoritized and/or
marginalized) identity group and the nature of the transgression directly relates to the victim’s group membership (Nadal et al., 2016). The subtle nature of microaggressions makes them harmful since they are less obvious to bystanders and, in the workplace, to managers or administrators. As such, protection from legislation as well as support from equity and diversity initiatives at the organizational level may not include protections from or reparations for microaggressions. This leaves minoritized employees feeling unsupported from legislation or policies that currently only protect them from larger-scale, overt forms of direct or systemic discrimination such as the use of slurs, targeted harassment, or discriminatory hiring practices.

In the workplace context, the LGBTQ+ community is in a highly precarious position with regards to microaggressions. Membership within the LGBTQ+ community is not immediately associated with visible cues unlike certain other marginalized groups such as racial minorities who may have features that distinguish them readily from the white majority. Thus, individuals may not immediately be able to identify other members of the community or potential allies to generate social support. As such, members may find themselves isolated from others within the community. To obtain support, they are forced to reveal their identities to others within various social spheres. The term LGBTQ+ combines a wide spectrum of identities. A member of the community can more generally be defined as an individual who deviates from heterosexual and/or cisnormative societal norms such as those who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, asexual, transgender or non-binary gender. The LGBTQ+ community comprises approximately 4% of the Canadian population, accounting for over one million individuals over the age of 15 (Statistics Canada, 2021). Notably, this may be an underestimation, particularly in representing the LGBTQ+ workforce. For instance, some employees may be unwilling to disclose this information in government population surveys. More generally, the data may not include
individuals who have yet to fully come to terms with their gender identity or sexuality (King et al., 2014).

The LGBTQ+ community is present in modern workforces. However, little is known about the impact of microaggressions and other discriminatory acts targeting sexual minority and gender minority employees (Resnick & Galupo, 2019; Nadal et al., 2016). This is important because LGBTQ+ employees find themselves in environments rooted in ideologies of heteronormativity and cisnormativity, which may stifle their ability to be their true selves. Heteronormativity has been upheld in organizations through the inherent presumption that individuals are heterosexual by default, and that sexual minority individuals are abnormal (Herek, 2007). Priola and colleagues (2014) have argued that heteronormativity in organizations inhibits sexual minority employees from fully embodying their whole selves at work, which includes their sexual identity. Having to conceal one’s identity and dedicating cognitive resources to avoiding “ outing” oneself in the workplace is cognitively and emotionally taxing. Similarly, cisnormativity in the workplace upholds practices that reinforce gender-conformity such as forcing employees to adhere to dress codes that deviate from their gender identity (Bender-Baird, 2011). These ideologies create an environment that is especially precarious for LGBTQ+ individuals wishing to feel comfortable being themselves at work without repercussions.

Consequently, in the presence of microaggressions, LGBTQ+ employees may feel isolated from support and unsafe within the corporate context. This could result in a decrease in positive work outcomes including their role engagement. Marginalization may result in role disengagement and prompt workers to reconsider what drew them to their positions initially.
The study of microaggressions among LGBTQ+ employees is relatively nascent. Existing literature has often focused on translating taxonomies related to racial microaggressions into taxonomies that could be applied to the lived experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals. Research has focused on gaining a nuanced perspective on LGBTQ+-specific experiences and identifying what may constitute a microaggression for this group (Nadal, 2016). It has used small scale quantitative analysis or exploratory qualitative analysis using interviews or focus groups (Wright & Wegner, 2012; Nadal et al., 2011; Platt & Lenzen, 2013). Utilizing the preliminary findings identified in the literature, Resnick and Galupo (2019) created the LGBT Microaggression Experiences at Work Scale (LGBT-MEWS), the first validated scale measuring the perception of LGBT-specific microaggressions tailored to an organizational context. This scale claims to allow researchers to empirically measure perceived microaggressions and understand how these may impact the personal and organizational outcomes of LGBTQ+ employees.

To address the lack of research about LGBTQ+ microaggressions and leverage the novel opportunity to measure workplace microaggressions, this study will examine work-related outcomes of LGBTQ+ microaggressions. This study seeks to demonstrate the potential negative impact of workplace microaggressions, provide managers with empirical evidence regarding the effect of microaggressions on their workforce and, finally, push the theoretical boundaries of the LGBTQ+ microaggression literature to include job outcomes. Specifically, this thesis will test the relationship between perceived microaggressions and job engagement and examine the role of organizational trust and ‘outness’ (the degree to which one has disclosed their sexual and/or gender identity) as potential moderators.

This thesis begins with a literature review that defines microaggressions and explores how they differ from existing constructs of subtle workplace discrimination such as workplace
incivility. Then, it explores the research on the impact of microaggressions on LGBTQ+ individuals, considers workplace microaggressions targeting other marginalized groups and, finally, outlines the variables of interest - job engagement, organizational trust and outness - and the study’s hypotheses. The methodology, including a three-tiered sampling procedure and multiple regression analyses, is provided followed by the presentation of results. The thesis concludes with a discussion of these results within the broader literature, reflection on the implications for management and theory, study limitations and considerations for future research.

The Diversity Movement Within Organizations

Organizations have not always upheld diversity as a priority within their structures. Power within organizations was often held by cisgender, heterosexual, white men who existed at the top of organizational hierarchies. Legislation did not serve to protect minoritized and marginalized workers, leaving them vulnerable to those who did hold social power. As such, workplaces were rampant with blatant instances of discrimination and workplace intolerance. This was the case until the early 1960’s in the United States, which constituted a turning point for what has come to be termed equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) in the workplace. During this time, legal protections for discriminatory hiring practices became part of legislation in 1964 with the Civil Rights Act (United States Department of Labour, n.d.). This act banned employers from discriminating based on race, sex, country of origin or religion during the selection process and served to form the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which in the coming years gained the ability to sue corporations who deviated from the practices upheld in the Civil Rights

---

4 Terminology has also been expanded to include alternate ordering of each word such as DEI as well as EDID (Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Decolonization) and EIB or DEIB (Equity, Inclusion and Belonging; Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging).
Act (United States Equal Employment Commission, n.d.). Lawsuits put forth during this period yielded important ramifications such as the formation of the first Employee Resource Group (ERG) in response to outcry for Black workers at Xerox (Bethea, 2020). These formal protections also developed in Canada, albeit two decades later, through the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 and the Employment Equity Act in 1986 (Canadian Heritage, 2022; Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2022).

In the coming decades, workplaces became increasingly invested in diversity initiatives and protections were extended to individuals from other marginalized and minoritized communities. In the mid-2000’s, workplace protections in Canada were extended to those with disabilities and LGBTQ+ partners were recognized as valid spouses through the Civil Marriage Act nationwide (Government of Canada, 2005). This period also marked the creation of internal leadership positions dedicated to upholding diversity and fostering inclusive practices, such as Chief Diversity Officers (Hewlett, 2014). Tolerance for workplace discrimination has diminished greatly compared to previous decades and workplaces have become more diverse through non-discriminatory hiring practices.

Legislative protection specifically for the LGBTQ+ community came more recently. The United States formally extended the Civil Rights Act’s protections in 2020 (Totenburg, 2020). Similar legislative protection through the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was established in Canada in 2018 (Government of Canada, 2018). As such, in North America, individuals are generally more aware of the negative social implications and personal consequences of overtly engaging in discriminatory acts. To note, in 2023, the rights of LGBTQ+ individuals in the United States have been the subject of political controversy at the state-level, with an emphasis on removing the rights of transgender individuals. Further, there has been a rise in violent
opposition towards Pride celebrations as of late that had been absent in previous years, indicating that anti-LGBTQ+ rhetoric is a consistent societal problem plaguing the community (Beckett, 2023). As evidenced by the consistently precarious position of LGBTQ+ members in the community and in the workplace, community members are still not in positions of power or even equivalence. Dominant in the workforce are ideals of cisnormativity and heteronormativity; members of the LGBTQ+ community rarely hold managerial positions. As such, even with protections from more overt acts, community members are often powerless to counter subtle acts of discrimination which may fall below the purview of managers or peers.

**Defining Microaggressions**

As a result of the contemporary diversity landscape within organizations, overt forms of discrimination have declined. Some might be led to believe that workplace discrimination has ceased to exist (Nadal, 2011). However, covert discrimination has become more commonplace. Microaggressions are a form of this covert discrimination. Generally, microaggressions are defined as behaviours of ambiguous intent, that may be rooted in unconscious bias, that are perceived by the victim as hostile or discriminatory towards a member of a marginalized group (Nadal et al., 2016). This unconscious bias refers to the implicit beliefs that an individual may hold about a particular marginalized or minoritized group. These underlying implicit biases (i.e., prejudice that exists below one’s level of consciousness) may hold alongside or even in the absence of more explicit biases (i.e., prejudice that is known and within the individual’s level of consciousness). Therefore, they continue to persist and manifest as subtle discrimination (Greenwald et al., 2009). This discrimination was first considered in relation to racialized communities.

Historically, the term microaggression was originally used to describe covert anti-black racism in black-white social interactions (Pierce, 1970). In their discussion of black experiences
within the United States, Pierce (1970), coined the term to describe the everyday experiences of insults and dismissals directed towards black Americans by non-black Americans. Pierce and colleagues (1978, pg. 66) then formally went on to define microaggressions as “everyday subtle, stunning, often automatic, and non-verbal exchanges which are ‘put downs’ of blacks by offenders. The offensive mechanisms used against blacks often are innocuous”. Davis (1989) furthered the definition to capture the social power difference within society between black and white individuals in America. In their definition, microaggressions were considered “stunning, automatic acts of disregard that stem from unconscious attitudes of white superiority and constitute a verification of black inferiority” (Davis, 1989, p. 1576). The definition zeroes in on the fact that the perpetrator of the microaggression held greater social power and engaged in this subtle act of discrimination towards the group which they believed, explicitly or implicitly, to be inferior.

In 1973, Mary Rowe recognized a similar form of discrimination being targeted towards women and expanded the definition of microaggressions to include acts that constitute “small events which are often ephemeral and hard-to-prove, events which are covert, often unintentional, frequently unrecognized by the perpetrator, which occur wherever people are perceived to be ‘different’” (Rowe, 2008, p. 45). Here, the concept of microaggressions was expanded to include groups who differed from the majority groups within society and focused on the insidious nature of implicit biases manifesting in potentially unintentional discriminatory acts. Groups that deviate from the societal norm could be subjected to this form of discrimination, intentionally or not, by groups who hold more social power.

As the construct began to be utilized within research and popular discourse, the principles of a microaggression were found to also coincide with the experiences of other marginalized and
minoritized groups. As a result, the concept has been expanded again to apply to subtle discriminatory acts in which a power imbalance exists between a majority and minority or marginalized group (Williams, 2020). Johnson and Johnson (2019) outlined several principals through which the current definition of microaggressions is upheld. Firstly, there is an underlying sentiment whereby the dominant culture is deemed normal and deviations from the dominant culture are considered, potentially subconsciously, to be pathological. Secondly, there is a generalization of the experiences of those in the minority group whereby all members are the same and their unique experiences are disregarded in favour of what the majority group considers typical for the entire group. Thirdly, the majority group member is uncomfortable with the identity of the minority or marginalized individual. Lastly, there is a lack of conscious awareness on the part of the perpetrator regarding the privilege afforded by their own social power, their resulting biases and their lack of awareness of the lived experiences of those who have less social power.

Sue (2010a, 2010b) further defined microaggressions as encapsulating three forms of acts: microassaults, microinsults and microinvalidations. These forms of microaggressions have largely been applied to the study of racial microaggressions but they can also be applied to delineate microaggressions against other marginalized groups such as the LGBTQ+ community. To note, the victim of any of the three forms of microaggressions could be a community member who is either directly experiencing the act at hand or is indirectly affected by the act by witnessing it occur within their space or to others within the community.

Microassaults are the most overt of the three forms of microaggressions. They consist of verbal or nonverbal behaviours that often come in the form of jokes or lighthearted statements but are still hurtful to the minority group. For example, the phrase “That’s so gay” in reference to
something odd may seem innocuous to the perpetrator but still harm the victim. Microinsults are acts that inadvertently undermine an individual’s identity as a member of a minority community. For example, implying that it is an accomplishment for a transgender person to ‘pass’ for cisnormative in the workplace context could undermine the transgerndered employee’s pride in being part of the LGBTQ+ community. In this instance, someone may compliment a female-to-male (FTM) transman on how surprisingly full their facial hair has become after starting hormones and how it makes them look like a real man. The focus of this remark on ideals of what true men look like and framing it as an accomplishment can undermine the unique identity of this transman. Finally, microinvalidations are behaviours that diminish the unique experiences or challenges faced by members of the minority group. This includes disbelieving that discrimination towards the minority group exists despite the lived experiences of the individual. For example, having a straight, cis-identifying co-worker remark that they are so fortunate to work in a place where discrimination does not seem to exist would invalidate the experiences of someone in the LGBTQ+ community who may have faced discrimination that is not widely acknowledged.

Microaggressions are not the sole form of covert discrimination that exist in the workplace, but they do represent a threat for LGBTQ+ members. In particular, they are unique from the other major forms of covert discrimination: incivility and selective incivility.

Incivility can be defined as a low-intensity behaviour which, while not necessarily intended to harm the victim of the act, goes against what is deemed to be acceptable behaviour given the context of the workplace (Pearson et al., 2005). This form of workplace deviance is distinct from other forms of interpersonal conflict such as workplace bullying (i.e., using slurs or making derogatory remarks) due to the relative level of intensity experienced. Acts of incivility
are deemed to be less intense and lack intentionality of harm. In these instances, the perpetrator may be acting out of ignorance, or may be unaware that their actions are hurtful to the victim (Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Cortina et al., 2001). Johnson and Indvick (2001) describe examples of incivility that include gossiping and inadvertently or purposefully undermining a colleague’s credibility in public settings, but the list is by nature non-exhaustive. A variety of behaviours can be classified as incivility as long as they are subtle and with ambiguous intent to harm.

This may sound quite a bit like microaggressions. A notable difference is that incivility can occur between any members of the organizational at any level; it is not linked explicitly to issues of power or dominance nested within the hierarchy of the organization or society. Any individual can be a victim or a perpetrator of an act of incivility (Cortina et al., 2001). While the ambiguous intent to harm and lower intensity of these acts are congruous with definitions of workplace incivility, microaggressions are unique in that they encapsulate a social power dynamic between the victim and the perpetrator that is rooted in the minority or marginalized individual’s identity. Microaggressions are also not bound by and can disregard organizational boundaries based on hierarchy, status or job role. For example, when considering a microaggression arising from an individual’s sexual orientation, a bisexual member of management could still be the victim of a microaggression coming from a heterosexual subordinate. While acts of incivility are also defined as being unconstrained by organizational power dynamics, the incivility literature does not account for the imbalance of power between, in this example, the historically oppressed LGBTQ+ community member and the cisnormative and/or heteronormative colleague. In this regard, acts of incivility can occur to anyone, for any reason, regardless of their social power or position in the organizational hierarchy. Acts of
incivility refer more to deviations in respect to behaviours considered normative – issues of
politeness, decorum, expectations for ‘respectful’ interaction – irrespective of and unrelated to
social power differentials regarding an individual’s identity (Smith & Griffiths, 2022).
Microaggressions can only be experienced by members of a marginalized group in relation to
members of the dominant group.

In more recent times, the incivility literature has specifically delineated the notion of
‘selective incivility’. This is an act of incivility that occurs between a perpetrator and a victim
whereby the act is a manifestation of conscious or unconscious bias towards the victim’s
marginalized group membership (Kabat-Farr et al., 2020). They are distinct from acts of general
incivility as they specifically involve targeting individuals from minority groups. An example of
selective incivility could be leaving someone out of a group lunch because the perpetrator
believes that the individual may not be a good fit with the group due to their minority group
status. While acts of selective incivility are discriminatory, covert and target members of
minority groups, they are still conceptually unique from microaggressions. The content of the
microaggressions themselves must directly relate to the victim’s identity within their
marginalized group. At their core, microaggressions generally come from a member of a
majority group and undermine or discriminate against a distinguishing feature of the victim’s
identity. For example, implying that a same-sex relationship is platonic in nature instead of a
long-term romantic relationship. This microaggression directly relates to an issue facing the
LGBTQ+ community where their partnerships are not viewed as serious romantic pursuits.
Contrastingly, an act of selective incivility does not need to undermine or discriminate against an
aspect of the minority group’s identity. It only needs to be targeted towards a member of that
minority group. Returning to the example of exclusion from an employee lunch, if directed
toward a transgender individual, this act does not have any particular tie to LGBTQ+ issues but instead just serves to leave out members of the minority group. Given their distinction from incivility and selective incivility, microaggressions are important to study in the workplace context as they directly harm LGBTQ+ members at the core of who they are: their identities.

The challenge in accounting for the theoretical and conceptual components of these constructs and reconciling the somewhat paradoxical nature of their similarities and differences (particularly selective incivility and microaggressions) is because they have emerged in parallel literatures. Microaggressions have been more often explored and examined in the sociological literature or with regard to psychological counselling contexts with a focus on understanding health and wellness-based outcomes (Smith & Griffiths, 2022). On the other hand, research on selective incivility has mostly been conducted within organizational contexts and published within the management and business literature (Smith & Griffiths, 2022). A recent meta synthesis conducted by Smith & Griffiths (2022), attempts to bridge the gap. They conclude that the constructs remain distinct in the way they create a violation towards an individual. They contend that microaggressions are rooted in the fact that the act violates an aspect of an individual’s identity regarding their community membership while an act of incivility is a violation of respect for an individual more generally within the context of workplace norms. Despite this distinction, the siloed approach to understanding subtle forms of discrimination has yielded conceptually similar constructs in the forms of microaggressions and selective incivility that may, in practice, be capturing very similar experiences at work. A consideration not readily examined within this synthesis is the lack of clarity regarding how these differences in construct definitions are reflected in measurement and how distinct these concepts truly are in the eyes of victims of subtle discrimination (Lilienfield, 2017). While the theoretical definitions of these
concepts do appear to have conceptual differences, there has been no effort within the literature to determine whether microaggressions predict workplace outcomes above and beyond acts of incivility, or to determine how these different forms of discrimination may impact LGBTQ+ workers.

**Microaggressions Among Sexual Minority Individuals**

There is a growing body of research about the prevalence and impact of microaggressions among the LGBTQ+ community. In a review, Nadal and colleagues (2016) identified 29 empirical studies focused on the topic of LGBTQ-specific microaggressions. The evidence suggests that microaggressions are quite prevalent compared to forms of overt discrimination experienced by the community. For instance, in a study of students on college campuses, Woodford and colleagues (2014) found that nearly all LGBT participants had experienced microaggressions while only 37% could identify an experience of overt discrimination. Further, perceived microaggressions have been associated with a gamut of negative outcomes across various LGBT populations and contexts. They have been associated with lower self-esteem, an increase in negative feelings about one’s queer identity and increased difficulty in accepting one’s queer identity (Wright & Wegner, 2012). Bisexual individuals have shown heightened feelings of identity confusion since they are often falsely perceived as straight; this serves as a microinvalidation of their lived experiences as an often-invisible member of the LGBTQ+ community (Sarno & Wright, 2013). Similarly, Woodford and colleagues (2015) found that LGBTQ+ individuals who had experienced microaggressions reported greater stress and lower levels of self-acceptance. However, high levels of initial self-acceptance were found to buffer the subsequent impact of microaggressions on self-acceptance (Woodford et al., 2015).

Further, the presence of microaggressions over time can impact mental health. In a series of focus groups conducted with LGBTQ+ people, Nadal and colleagues (2011) found that
microaggressions increased feelings of depression and anxiety, which are already disproportionally prevalent in the LGBTQ+ community (Meyer, 2003). Participants also experienced microaggressions from various sources within their lives; they cited their families, peers and even the media as sources of discrimination which accumulate and add to stress over time (Nadal et al., 2011).

There has been some research conducted on the impact of microaggressions on LGBTQ+ youth in academic settings. A common example of a non-targeted but impactful microaggression is the use of the statement “That’s so gay” to describe a person, act or object that is deemed to have odd or negative qualities. In a study conducted at a college campus, Woodford and colleagues (2012) found that participants who heard the phrase reported feeling alienated from others and had higher instances of physical symptoms such as headaches and stomach problems. Mathies and colleagues (2019) found that microaggressions (“That’s so gay” and “No homo”), were associated with a variety of negative developmental and achievement outcomes such as an inability to achieve personal academic goals and lower self-reported Grade Point Averages (Mathies et al., 2019). The authors discussed the implications of their findings within the minority stress theory which iterates that negative health outcomes are a result of the stress associated with discriminatory acts that build over time (Meyer, 2003). As such, being consistently exposed to microaggressions in day-to-day life could create an environment of constant stress and decreased performance over time (Mathies et al., 2019). Similarly, Ylioja and colleagues (2018) found that people who had experienced microaggressions had increased

---

5 “No homo” is a phrase that was popularized in the late 1990’s that heterosexual individuals used to describe acts of friendship or amicability between themselves but to ensure there was no homosexual intent behind their actions. It is often used to make light or downplay the legitimacy of homosexual relationships.
smoking habits over time after controlling for demographic factors and previous smoking
behaviour. This potentially indicates an increase in experienced stress.

Research has largely focused on the gay experience or sexual minority individuals in
general. Yet it is important to consider that the LGBTQ+ community is also home to gender
minorities who may have different experiences and outcomes. For example, transgender students
experienced greater psychological stress than peers who identified as a sexual minority, but were
not transgender (Seelman et al., 2016). This was measured in terms of self-esteem and feelings of
victimization. More studies are necessary to pull apart the nuances among LGBTQ+ identities
and the unique types of microaggressions faced.

Research on LGBTQ+ microaggressions in the workplace is more limited. This is
particularly troublesome as microaggressions in organizational and institutional contexts could
negatively impact employees’ wellbeing, their job and career outcomes and organizational
outcomes. In their development of a model theorizing the avenues by which microaggressions
could proliferate, Vaccarro and Koob (2019) highlighted the importance of environmental
contexts in which microaggressions could be endorsed or remediated. These include institutional
microclimates such as organizations or educational settings where the culture upheld by the
institution may determine the presence of microaggressions targeted towards the LGBTQ+
community. For example, they discuss how certain industries or organizations may have policies
in place such as strict dress codes which may uphold heteronormative, cisnormative societal
standards. In turn, these organizational climates then uphold an environment where
microaggressions are supported. Given this gap, it is useful to draw from research on the impact
of microaggressions on other marginalized groups within the workplace. A greater body of
research has focused on the racial microaggressions faced by Black Americans and gender-based microaggressions experienced by women.

**The Impact of Racial and Gender-based Microaggressions in the Workplace**

With regards to race in the workplace, Offerman and colleagues (2013) investigated microaggressions targeting Black American workers. A positive relationship was found between the severity of microaggressions perceived in the supervisor-employee relationship and work outcomes such as job satisfaction, motivation, commitment, and turnover intentions. The extent to which a leader was generally perceived as being fair could buffer these outcomes (Offerman et al., 2013). Further, in a qualitative study of racial microaggressions in educational contexts, black academics identified common experiences of microaggressions from their white peers (Holder et al., 2015). The presence of these microaggressions created emotional and cognitive labour on the part of the victim as they became burdened with deciphering the intent of the perpetrator. Further, they had to evaluate whether there would be negative consequences associated with this microaggression including alienation from their peers. This additional stress and cognitive load can contribute to an impaired ability to perform to the best of these employees’ abilities.

Microaggressions can also manifest based on implicit biases associated with gender, and those in the majority group may not be capable of identifying the appropriateness of their behaviour. In a study of third-person perceptions of gender-based workplace microaggressions, Bassford and colleagues (2013) found that men and women agreed that instances of discrimination would be associated with negative work outcomes for the victim. Yet, women were more likely than men to identify a microaggression against another woman. In a qualitative study of women in academic positions, Blithe and Elliott (2020) found that informal meetings between male professors, while not exclusionary in nature, kept female professors out of the
general conversation regarding the University and workplace politics. Additionally, a dismissal of the structural challenges faced by women in the workplace, such as maternity leave and balancing motherhood and career ambitions, were considered by women to be microaggressions on the part of their male colleagues (Blithe & Elliott, 2019). These comments were deemed to be a dismissal of women’s struggles in the workplace and left women feeling isolated in their experiences.

Given their negative impact on other marginalized and minoritized communities, such as black Americans and women respectively, microaggressions have the potential to impact LGBTQ+ employees. This impact could exist on an individual level and influence work outcomes related to performance and perceptions of the organization. However, LGBTQ+ employees may be more susceptible to victimization and isolation at the hand of microaggressions because sexual minority and/or gender minority status is not necessarily instantly identifiable. There are no definable physical characteristics that disclose group membership status to others in the workplace whereas for race and gender, there may be more salient cues. Sexual or gender minority employees may choose or not choose to disclose their identities depending on whether they feel that they would be accepted as their true selves. This invisibility of group status may place sexual or gender minority employees in a particularly precarious position in interpersonal situations. A co-worker or supervisor may engage in microaggressions unknowingly due to their ignorance towards the victim’s identity or experiences or a lack of awareness of what may be deemed appropriate. Sexual or gender minority employees may also be unaware of others who have chosen not to disclose their identity and may not be able to identify allies in the organizational community without outing themselves.
To address these research gaps, this thesis measures the relationship between perceived LGBTQ+ microaggressions and employees’ levels of job engagement. The following section will outline the construct of job engagement as well as two moderators, organizational trust and outness, which may help to buffer the negative impact of microaggressions.

**Organizational Outcomes and Moderators**

**Job Engagement.** Job engagement is conceptualized as employees’ investment of their entire selves into their work whereby they bring their whole physical, cognitive, and emotional resources to work (Kahn, 1990). Three main conditions are required to establish job engagement (Kahn, 1990). Firstly, psychological meaningfulness should be established whereby a person feels rewarded when they invest energy into their work and where work conditions which foster dignity and respect afford workers meaning in completing their work. Secondly, psychological safety must be met whereby a person feels as though they can bring their whole selves to work without the fear of consequence or social stigma. Khan (1990) argued that interpersonal relationships, group dynamics, management interactions and organizational norms can influence one’s ability to feel psychologically safe within an organization. Thirdly, psychological availability must be achieved whereby an individual has the physical, emotional, and cognitive resources to be fully present in their work. When resources are being allocated to deal with situations outside of work, such as dealing with interpersonal conflict, this may impede the individual’s ability to dedicate those resources to reaching optimal levels of engagement with the task at hand.

Research examining the relationship between LGBTQ+ microaggressions and job engagement does not currently exist, but it has been studied among other groups. In a study of women, Kim and colleagues (2014) found a negative relationship between discrimination and job engagement as conceptualized as a form of subjective well-being in the workplace. While
they did not utilize a scale measuring job engagement in particular, their measure of subjective well-being at work included a component of work engagement which overlapped the formal construct of job engagement as proposed by Khan (1990). It captured the aspect of feeling invested in their job since the job gave them worth. Perceived discrimination was found to have a stronger negative effect on job engagement than objective measures of discrimination (Kim et al., 2014). In this way, perceptions of microaggression may be as or more important in producing negative outcomes than objective accounts.

Perceived microaggressions targeting sexual minority employees may impact two of the conditions necessary for job engagement: psychological safety and lack of cognitive resources (Khan, 1990). Firstly, the presence of discrimination in the form of microaggressions may directly impede an individual’s ability to be themselves in the workplace. Specific to LGBTQ+ employees, they may not feel safe being out regarding their sexual orientation or gender expression and choose to hide their full identity in the workplace. The inability to disclose identity in the LGBTQ+ community has been associated with negative outcomes (Watson et al., 2014). As noted above, the LGBTQ+ community is a unique minority group in that there are no outward distinguishable characteristics that completely confirm their minority status to perceivers. This could hinder the ability to identify other community members, allies, or mentors, leaving LGBTQ+ employees feeling isolated from their work community and, ultimately, less engaged.

Secondly, microaggressions may cause an individual to allocate resources to understanding the perpetrator’s role, intent or relationship and deciding if action must be taken to educate or remedy the situation (Vaccarro & Koob, 2019). Qualitative research examining the experience of racialized American professors has demonstrated that they feel a cognitive burden
associated with discrimination among their peers. It is an effort to navigate the climate, discern
the intent of their colleagues and supervisors and be the source of awareness or re-education
(Holder et al., 2015). Given a likely decrease in available cognitive resources, it is also likely that
there are fewer resources available to engage meaningfully with the job, leaving targeted workers
less engaged at work overall. This leads to the first hypothesis:

_Hypothesis 1:_ There will be a negative relationship between the frequency of perceived
microaggressions encountered and job engagement scores among LGBTQ+ workers.

**Organizational Trust.** Organizational trust is a form of trust whereby an individual
makes themselves vulnerable to the organization with the expectation that the organization will
protect the interests of the individual (Mayer et al., 1995). An individual may choose to trust an
organization when they believe that the organization upholds morals and values that are
important to the individual such as fairness and honesty in their business practices. In essence, an
individual holds strong organizational trust when they believe the organization is reliable in
following through on their word and upholding the values they claim to have. While little
research has investigated the role of trust within the context of perceived microaggressions,
organizational trust has been considered as a mediator of incivility behaviours and job outcomes.
Specifically, Miner-Rubino and Deed (2010) found that organizational trust mediated the
relationship between perceived work group incivility and job satisfaction, turnover intentions,
and burnout. Specifically, organizational trust fully mediated the relationships involving burnout
and turnover intention and partially mediated the relationship between incivility and job
satisfaction. Further, significant main effects were found. Organizational trust was positively
associated with job satisfaction and negatively associated with turnover intentions and burnout.
Given the role of organizational trust in maintaining job satisfaction and explaining increased
turnover in the face of incivility, organizational trust may help individuals cope in the face of microaggressions as well.

Organizational trust has also been associated with job engagement. For example, Ugwu and colleagues (2014) demonstrated that organizational trust was positively related to work engagement as well psychological empowerment. These two constructs combined hold conceptual similarity to the measures of job engagement conceptualized through Khan’s (1990) definition of job engagement. Hough and colleagues (2015) also demonstrated a positive relationship between organizational trust and job engagement. They found that the relationship between behaving morally and job engagement could be fully explained by high levels of organizational trust. If individuals trusted in their organizations, those who demonstrated moral workplace behaviours would be highly engaged in the workplace. This implies that organizational trust may play a large role in explaining levels of employee engagement when it comes to moral decisions, such as their potential stance on the protection of minoritized groups. While studies have examined organizational trust in a mediating role, the role of organizational trust as a moderator has been limited. This study considers the potential for organizational trust to moderate the hypothesized negative effect of perceived microaggression on employee engagement.

Conceptually, organizational trust is rooted in an employee’s belief that the organization will protect their interests even when the organization may not have a beneficial reason for doing so. When considering this level of vulnerability in the context of microaggressions, one could postulate that organizations that make efforts to support minoritized employees may better allow employees to feel that vulnerability. As such, when faced with perceived microaggressions, the trust of LGBTQ+ employees that their organization will do right by them might buffer the
impact of interpersonal discrimination and allow employees to still feel psychologically safe enough to fully engage in their roles. While it is unlikely that this level of trust can fully explain why individuals who are the victims of microaggressions are engaged, it is realistic to believe that those who benefit from greater organizational trust may experience those microaggressions differently. As such, they may not be as severely impacted in terms of their engagement. This leads to hypothesis 2:

**Hypothesis 2:** The negative relationship between perceived microaggressions and job engagement will be moderated by organizational trust, whereby LGBTQ+ workers who experience microaggressions but who experience high organizational trust will have higher job engagement scores than those who experience low organizational trust.

**Degree of Outness.** Outness is a characteristic that is largely unique to the LGBTQ+ community as it speaks to their level of identity disclosure in various contexts. Regardless of support extended in those contexts, outness can be considered the degree to which an individual is honest and open about their gender identity and/or sexuality in a particular context. Unlike visible minority communities such as racioethnic minorities whose identities can generally be interpreted through identifiable physical characteristics or other cues, sexuality and/or gender identity are not always evident to others. As such, LGBTQ+ members are often required to consistently go through the process of disclosing their identity to their peers as they enter new contexts or making reminders to remain visible if their identity salience wanes.

While disclosure itself can generally be a tumultuous internal process for members of the LGBTQ+ community, the subsequent effects of disclosing one’s identity have generally been demonstrated to be positive. One of the benefits of disclosing identity comes in the form of buffering the negative impacts of discrimination. For instance, in an academic setting, students
who self-disclosed their LGBT status within their academic network and felt supported socially were better able to adjust to their college, above and beyond their levels of perceived discrimination on campus (Schmidt et al., 2010). Further, social support regarding LGBT identity has been demonstrated to buffer the negative impact of discrimination and bullying among youth and limit negative outcomes such as depression, victimization, and a lack of pride in one’s own identity (Chang et al., 2021; Trujillo et al., 2017).

As such, having disclosed their identity in one or more facets of their life, an LGBTQ+-employee could benefit from not having to hide their true selves within the workplace context. The potential for social support and the identification of allies in a variety of contexts could be emblematic of the buffering effect seen with other forms of discrimination in minimizing potentially harmful negative outcomes for the employee. Employees may be out in a variety of contexts, such as to their family and friends, but may not be out in the workplace context. In the case of microaggressions, being out in other contexts may allow the individual to perceive the interpersonal microaggression as containing less harm and subsequently allow them to remain engaged in the workplace. Further, in line with Khan’s (1990) conceptualization of psychological safety as a core component of job engagement, those who are out may feel as though they can bring their whole selves to work, including their sexual orientation and/or gender identity, even in the presence of a perceived LGBTQ+-specific microaggression. This leads to hypothesis 3:

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between perceived microaggressions and job engagement will be moderated by degree of outness, whereby LGBTQ+ workers who experience microaggressions but who are out in more contexts will have higher job engagement scores than those who are less open about their identities.
Incivility. Given the lack of research delineating microaggressions from incivility in the workplace, the final hypothesis involves determining the unique impact of microaggressions over and above acts of selective incivility targeted towards LGBTQ+ workers.

Hypothesis 4: LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions will predict lower job engagement above and beyond the variance attributable to acts of workplace incivility about their identities.

The following section outlines the research plan utilized to test these hypotheses. It outlines a three-tiered recruitment plan to obtain a sample of LGBTQ+ employee participants, the procedure employed during the online survey given to participants and describes the measures and analyses.

Method

Participants

Given the potential challenge of recruiting participants from among a small subset of the population and who may not be readily identifiable, this study utilized a three-tiered recruitment effort to obtain a sufficient sample of LGBTQ+ workers. A total of 354 participants were recruited to participate in the study. For inclusion, participants were required to self-identify as a sexual minority individual (gay, lesbian, bisexual, asexual, pansexual, etc.) and/or as a gender minority individual (transgender, gender non-binary, gender non-conforming, etc.) and have worked full-time or part-time in the past 12 months.

The first stage of recruitment utilized a student participation pool. This pool consisted of Undergraduate students largely in their first or second years of university who were enrolled in an introductory management course offered within an Ontarian University. The participants were given research credit as part of their course requirements in exchange for their participation in
the survey. Recruitment for this sample was launched twice, once at the beginning of the Fall 2022 semester and once at the beginning of the Winter 2023 semester, with data collection concluding in March 2023.

The second stage of recruitment occurred simultaneously through the period of November 2022 to March 2023. This stage consisted of three word-of-mouth approaches to contact members of the LGBTQ+ community. First, notices were posted on Facebook groups specializing in LGBTQ+ topics, advocacy, and business networks, Reddit community threads focusing on similar topics and relevant LinkedIn pages. Second, community groups which focus on LGBTQ+ issues were contacted and asked to circulate information about the study to their communities and networks. Third, the personal and professional networks of the student researcher and their supervisor were leveraged by contacting individuals who are part of the LGBTQ+ community or who may have access to their own network of LGBTQ+ community members. Participants recruited from these sampling methods were entered in a draw to win one of two $50 VISA Gift-Cards as a token of gratitude for their participation.

The third stage of recruitment took place after beginning the first and second stages. This stage used the Prolific online platform to recruit the remainder of the participants required to complete the desired sample of 300. Prolific hosts participants in the UK and US and differentiates itself from other platforms by paying equitable wages for participants’ time. It also allows for very specific sample requirements including the selection criteria set for this study (LGBTQ+ status and work experience). To note, the study will only be utilizing the US-based pool to maintain consistency with workplace regulations and norms that are more similar across Canada and the United States but may not fully translate to European standards. Participants recruited from this sampling method were compensated $12.44 CAD per hour of their time.
The final sample included 314 participants. From the total of 354 recruited participants, 31 participants were removed because they did not continue the survey beyond consenting to the study and providing information that met the inclusion criteria detailed above. Another five participants were removed for failing both attention checks presented in the online survey. Finally, two participants were removed as they indicated they were residing outside of Canada and the United States.

Of the final sample, 150 participants (32%) came from the DAN Management participant pool, 65 from the word-of-mouth sample (21%) and 99 from the Prolific platform (48%). Participants ranged in age between 17 and 68 ($M_{Age} = 25.99$, $SD_{Age} = 10.95$). Further, they ranged in years of work experience between 1 and 46 years ($M = 8.18$, $SD = 9.06$). To note, the three sampling methods did yield participants who differed in how far along they were in their careers. A one-way between-subjects ANOVA was run with each sampling method serving as a categorial variable and years of work experience serving as the dependent variable. There was a significant effect of method of completion on years of work experience across the three conditions, $F(1, 270) = 57.55$, $p < .001$. Post-hoc analyses utilizing Tukey’s HSD test indicated that the mean score for years of work experience was higher for participants from the word-of-mouth sample ($M = 10.66$, $SD = 9.06$) than the DAN Management Participant Pool sample ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 2.12$), $p = .02$. Further, the mean score of years of work experience reported was also higher for the Prolific ($M = 13.53$, $SD = 10.54$) than for the DAN Management Participant Pool sample ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 2.12$), $p < .001$. There was no significant difference between the mean years of work experience reported by those in the Prolific and word-of-mouth samples.
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Workforce</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants largely identified as a sexual minority (79%) with the next highest demographic consisting of individuals who identified as both a sexual and gender minority (16%). A small percentage of participants were exclusively gender minority individuals (5%).

A majority of the sample indicated that they currently resided in Canada (66%) with the remainder currently living in the United States of America. The sample was predominantly white (59%) with East Asian (18%) as the next most frequent racioethnic category.

Procedure

Once screened for the eligibility criteria noted above, recruited participants were invited to complete an online survey that took approximately 30 minutes. Once they arrived at the link, participants were asked to give consent for their participation in the survey and were assured of the anonymity of their answers considering the sensitive nature of the subject matter. The online survey included questions regarding their level of work experience measured in years, their age and racioethnicity, as well as the specific study measures outlined below. After completing the survey, participants were debriefed as to the purpose of the study and given a list of LGBTQ+-friendly online resources in case they experienced any form of trauma or heightened sensitivity regarding their past lived experiences due to their participation in the study (Appendix A). They were also invited to reach out to the researcher if they were interested in receiving updates about the publication of the study results.
Measures

Participants were asked to complete a series of measures as part of the online survey. The full measures are included in Appendix B and descriptive statistics are included in Tables 1 and 2.

**LGBT-MEWS.** The LGBT Microaggression Experiences at Work Scale (LGBT-MEWS) captures perceived microaggressions centering around the unique experiences of sexual minority workers. This scale was the first attempt to study LGBT microaggressions in an applied workplace settings using items specifically tailored to capture employee perspectives (Resnick and Galupo, 2019). The scale includes 27 items which present different scenarios depicting microaggressions in the workplace across three factors: workplace values, heteronormativity and cisnormativity. Workplace values items measure the overall value system of the organization as captured by considering the nature of different interpersonal reactions, how secure an individual feels and how they feel their compensation has been impacted by their identity. For example, “*Not being paid as much because of my LGBT identity*”. Heteronormativity items describe the everyday heterosexism employees experience in the workplace. For example: “*Having colleagues or customers assume your sexual orientation based on your appearance.*” Cisnormativity items describe the everyday cisnormativity employees experience in the workplace, which include instances where the gender binary may be inadvertently enforced or the experiences of gender minority individuals are ignored. For example, “*Having people address you using incorrect pronouns.*” Participants were asked to identify the frequency of their exposure to these items within the past 12 months by a colleague, client, or the organization. The items were rated on a scale of 1 (“*never experienced*”) to 5 (“*experienced a great deal*”). The scale demonstrated strong internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = .95).
Selective Incivility. There is not a specific measure for selective incivility. In line with the definition as incivility where the target is a member of a marginalized group, researchers simply utilize the global measure of incivility (Kabatt-Farr et al., 2020). As such, incivility in the workplace was measured using the Workplace Incivility Scale (Cortina et al., 2001). The scale consists of 12 items that serve as examples of incivil acts in the workplace (i.e., “Ignored or excluded you from professional camaraderie”). Each item was rated on a scale of 1 (“never occurs”) to 5 (“occurs many times”). The scale demonstrated high levels of internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = .93).

Job Engagement. Job engagement was measured using the short form version of the Job Engagement Scale, originally put forth by Rich and colleagues (2010) but more recently updated by Houle and colleagues (2022). The scale is comprised of three sub-scales measuring physical engagement (i.e., “I try my hardest to perform well on my job”), emotional engagement (i.e., “I am enthusiastic about my job”), and cognitive engagement (i.e., “At work, I am absorbed by my job”) across 18 items. Items were rated by participants on a scale of 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”). The scale demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = .96).

Organizational Trust. Organizational trust was measured with a short form version of the Organizational Trust Inventory (Cummings & Bromiley, 1995). The measure consists of 12 items (i.e., “I feel that ___ will keep their word”, “In my opinion, ___ is reliable”), whereby the blank will represent their organization’s name. The items were rated on a scale of 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 7 (“strongly agree”). The scale demonstrated acceptable levels of internal consistency (Cronbach’s α = .70).

Outness Inventory. Degree of outness was measured using a modified version of the Outness Inventory (Mohr & Fassinger, 2000). The scale consists of three sub-scales: out to
world, out to family and out to religion. Participants considered 11 individuals and groups within the three different contexts and rated their degree of outness with that person or group on a scale of 1 to 7; 1 being “the person definitely does not know about your sexual orientation status” and 7 being “the person definitely knows about your sexual orientation status, and it is openly talked about”. This scale captures the totality of LGBTQ+ outness and accounts for individuals being out in certain contexts, but not others. For example, an individual may be out to their friends and family but may keep their identity hidden within their religious circle. Alternatively, an individual may only be out to their family and not to any other peers.

As members of the LGBTQ+ community may be any combination of sexual minority identity and gender minority identity, the scale was given twice with a modifier to replace “sexual orientation status” with “gender minority status”. Participants had the option of selecting 0 to indicate any items that did not apply to them. Both versions of the scale had high internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .90$ for outness regarding sexuality; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .96$ for outness regarding gender identity).

**Other Measures.** The study included questions on demographic information, occupational experience, and participant’s propensity for answering questions in a socially desirable way. Specifically, participants were asked to indicate their age and work experience. These were open-ended questions measured in years. Participants who entered non-integer values for either question had their responses rounded to the nearest year, with values of .5 and higher rounded to the next highest year. Participants reported their racioethnicity by selecting from the following options: Indigenous, Black, East Asian, South Asian, Southeast Asian, West Asian/Arab, or White. They also had the ability to choose an “Other” option, which allowed them to self-describe. Social desirability was measured using a short form of the Crowne and Marlowe Social Desirability Scale which consists of 13 items designed to capture individuals’
tendency to want to answer questions in a way they perceive to be acceptable to others (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960; Reynolds, 1982). Lastly, while not explicitly asked of participants, the method of recruitment (i.e., student participant pool, word of mouth recruitment or Prolific) was collected through survey link identifiers. As such, data from each individual sample could be isolated and identified.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Measures Included in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Engagement</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>68.65</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>45.81</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivility</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>51.02</td>
<td>9.509</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outness</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>42.99</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

All statistical analyses outlined in the following section utilized IBM’s SPSS Statistics Version 28. To parse out variance that may be attributable to other variables, demographic and occupational information were collected and entered into each model as possible covariates. The study included six potential covariates. However, to avoid artificially inflating the power of the analysis, not all potential covariates were entered. Based on the intercorrelations between variables, only predictors that were significantly related to the outcome variable of interest, job engagement, were included: age, social desirability, and method of recruitment (Table 3). These variables explained meaningful variance attributable to differences in job engagement in the sample and entering them as controls allowed for the isolation of the unique variance attributable to LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions.
Table 3. Correlation Matrix for All Potential Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. LGBTQ+ Microaggressions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Engagement</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Trust</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Degree of Outness</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Incivility</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.85****</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Method - DAN</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Method – Prolific</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Country of Residence</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.81***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Racioethnicity</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *= p < .05, **= p < .01, and ***= p < .001. Method of completion was dummy coded and the Prolific group used as the reference group. Method – DAN is coded as 1 being the DAN Management Participant Pool, and 0 being the Prolific and Word of Mouth groups. Method – Word of mouth is coded as 1 being the Word-of-Mouth group, and 0 being the DAN and Prolific groups. Method – Prolific is coded as 1 being the Prolific sample, and 0 being the DAN and Word of Mouth groups. Country of Residence was coded as 0.00 for the United States and 1.00 for Canada. Racioethnicity was coded as 0.00 for non-white participants and 1.00 for white participants.

Firstly, age was positively correlated with job engagement. As participants increased in age they were more likely to indicate that they were highly engaged with their jobs ($r = .15, p = .01$). Older workers may be further along in their careers and have responsibilities and relationships that make their jobs more engaging than an individual who is beginning their career.
Thus, age was entered as a covariate in all analyses to parse out this portion of variance within job engagement scores.

Secondly, participants’ social desirability scores were moderately positively correlated with job engagement ($r = .16, p = .01$). Participants who had higher social desirability tendencies were more likely to report that they were highly engaged with their job. As such, social desirability scores were entered as a covariate to remove variance associated with participants wanting to seem more engaged with their work than they truly are.

Lastly, there was a significant positive relationship between method of completion and job engagement ($r = .15, p = .01$). Method of completion was initially coded utilizing the following values to correspond to a particular sample of recruitment. The sample recruited from the DAN Management Participant Pool was coded as “1”. The sample recruited from the Prolific platform was coded “2”. Finally, the word-of-mouth sample was coded as “3”. Dummy variables were subsequently created to utilize these variables as controls within the subsequent regression analyses. In order to decide upon the reference group, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of method of completion on job engagement across each of the three methods of completion. There was a significant effect of method of completion on scores of job engagement across the three conditions, $F(2, 299) = 4.24, p = .02$. Post-hoc analyses utilizing Tukey’s HSD test indicated that the mean score for job engagement was higher for participants from the word of mouth sample ($M = 72.89, SD = 11.23$) than the Prolific sample ($M = 66.97, SD = 14.78$), $p = .02$ Further, the mean score for job engagement was also higher for the word of mouth sample ($M = 72.89, SD = 11.23$) than for the DAN Management Participant Pool ($M = 67.82, SD = 13.42$), $p = .03$. As the Prolific sample was the most generic and reported being the least engaged, they were chosen as the reference group. A dummy variable was created with
the Prolific sample and DAN Management Participant Pool sample coded as “0” while the word-of-mouth sample was coded as “1”. Another dummy variable was created with the Prolific sample and the word-of-mouth sample coded as “0” while the DAN Management Participant Pool sample was coded as “1”. These two variables were entered into the subsequent models as a control for method of completion.

**Preliminary Univariate Analyses**

Correlations were run to better understand the relationships between predictor variables as displayed in the correlation matrix in Table 3. The relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and incivility scores were strongly, positively correlated with one another, \( r(292) = .64, p < .001 \). This relationship is visually represented in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Correlation between LGBT-MEWS Scores and Incivility Scores](image)

In addition, differences in experienced LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions were compared among racioethnic participants. Due to small sample sizes for non-white racialized groups, these groups were collapsed into one category for the analyses. Additionally, given the power dynamic at the core of microaggressive acts, white participants cannot experience racial
microaggressions given their standing within societal power structures. This makes a binary comparison appropriate. A new binary variable was coded to perform analyses comparing white and non-white participants. Non-white participants were coded as “0” and white participants were coded as “1”. Racioethnicity was significantly negatively related to the experience of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions, $r(293) = -0.17, p = 0.004$ and to scores of incivility, $r(305) = -0.12, p = 0.03$. To better understand these relationships, independent samples t-tests were run to determine the differences between white and non-white experiences. On average, non-white participants ($M = 49.95, SD = 22.90$) were more likely to report experiencing LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions than white participants ($M = 43.35, SD = 16.47$), $t(291) = 2.87, p = 0.004$. Similarly, on average, non-white participants ($M = 24.50, SD = 10.25$) were more likely to report experiencing workplace incivility than white participants ($M = 22.12, SD = 9.00$), $t(303) = 2.15, p = 0.03$.

Intercorrelations between variables indicated that country of residence and scores on the LGBT-MEWS were negatively related, $r = -0.13, p = 0.03$. To note, country of residence was dummy coded whereby the United States was coded as “0” and Canada was coded as “1”. Independent samples t-tests were utilized to compare group means. On average, participants in Canada reported significantly greater LGBT-MEWS scores ($M = 47.70, SD = 20.88$), than participants in the United States ($M = 42.53, SD = 15.97$), $t(290) = 2.15, p = 0.03$.

**Multiple Regression Predicting Job Engagement**

To test the first hypothesis, a hierarchal multiple regression was conducted utilizing the following procedure and as demonstrated in Table 4. In the first step, the control variables of age, method of completion and social desirability were entered as predictors of job engagement. In the second step, scores on the LGBT-MEWS were entered as a predictor of job engagement.
The hierarchal multiple regression indicated that the model did significantly predict job engagement during the first step, \( F(4, 279) = 5.94, p < .001 \), and explained 8% of the variation in job engagement scores. When LGBT-MEWS scores were added to the model during the second step, the model remained significant, \( F(5, 279) = 5.49, p < .001 \). LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions, however, did not explain a significant amount of additional variance in job engagement scores (\( \Delta R^2 = 0.01, F(1, 274) = 3.46, p = .06 \)). LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions were not a significant predictor of job engagement scores (\( \beta = -.11, p = .06 \)). This is consistent with the non-significant correlation between the two variables (Table 3; and presented visually in Figure 2).

Table 4. Microaggressions Predicting Job Engagement After Controlling for Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Change in ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.004*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.006*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \( \beta \) = standardized regression coefficient. Sample size = 279.*
Moderated Multiple Regressions

To test organizational trust and degree of outness as moderators of the relationship between LGBTQ+-specific workplace microaggressions and job engagement, two moderated hierarchal multiple regressions were conducted. The first examined the relationship between perceived microaggression and job engagement with organizational trust as a moderator. The second examined the relationship between perceived microaggressions and job engagement with outness included as a moderator. Both analyses utilized the Hayes Process Macro that was installed to be utilized with IBM’s SPSS Statistics Version 28 (Hayes, 2013). This tool allows for the computation of interaction products utilizing centered values for predictors and an analysis of the interaction effect on the outcome of interest. In doing so, the Hayes Process Macro employs an approach in which all predictors are entered into the model. Then, the additional variance explained by the inclusion of the interaction term between the two predictors of interest is considered by testing the unconditional interaction effect. The process macro also
enables a correction to be applied for not meeting assumptions of heteroscedasticity of variance with predictor variables in the model. In both analyses, the Davidson-MacKinnon heteroscedasticity-consistent inference was used to estimate standard errors assuming that homoscedasticity conditions were not met as recommended by Hayes and Cai (2007).

The results for the moderating role of organizational trust are presented in Table 5. The model was significant in predicting job engagement, \( F(7, 266) = 6.96, p < .001 \). LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions did not significantly predict job engagement \( (b = -.07, p = .25) \). However, organizational trust was a significant positive predictor of job engagement \( (b = .52, p < .001) \). The interaction between the two predictor variables did not explain a significant portion of unexplained variance in job engagement scores \( (\Delta R^2 = .003, F(1, 266) = 0.21, p = .65) \). Further, the interaction term did not significantly predict job engagement scores \( (b = -.003, p = .65) \).

Table 5. Microaggressions Predicting Job Engagement and The Interaction of Organizational Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>Change in ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgTrust*Micro</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( b \) = unstandardized regression coefficient. Sample size = 274.

The same process was employed to examine degree of outness regarding sexual minority status and/or gender minority status as a moderator. Recall that the Outness Inventory was
adapted and given to participants to measure how “out” they were regarding their sexual minority identity and their gender minority identity separately. If a participant identified as a sexual minority individual, only their score for the Outness Inventory capturing sexuality-related “outness” was used. If a participant identified as a gender minority individual, only their score for the Outness Inventory capturing gender identity was used. If a participant identified as both a gender minority and a sexual minority individual, their scores on both Outness Inventories were averaged and this mean was utilized as their score for the subsequent analyses.

Once again, the three aforementioned control variables were entered into the model alongside scores on the LGBT-MEWS, scores on the appropriate Outness Inventory depending on the participant’s identity within the LGBTQ+ community as well as the interaction term created by the product of these two scores. The model significantly predicted job engagement, $F(7, 259) = 7.60, p < .001$. In this model, LGBTQ+-specific microaggressions did significantly predict job engagement scores ($b = -.10, p = .02$). Degree of outness as measured by the Outness Inventory was a significant predictor of job engagement ($b = .24, p < .001$). The interaction between LGBTQ+-specific workplace microaggressions and outness was not found to be a significant predictor of job engagement scores ($b = .001, p = .60$). The interaction term did not explain a significant portion of unexplained variance in job engagement scores ($\Delta R^2 = 0.001$, $F(1, 259) = 0.27, p = .60$).
### Table 6. Microaggressions Predicting Job Engagement and The Interaction of Outness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outness</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outness*Micro</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. Sample size = 267.*

### Three-Step Hierarchal Multiple Regression

The fourth hypothesis was tested utilizing a hierarchal multiple regression that examined the unique variance attributable to the presence of perceived LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions on job engagement. Predictors were entered in three steps as demonstrated in Table 7. Control variables were entered into the model during the first step. Selective incivility was entered in the second step. The LGBT-MEWS was entered in the third step, which enabled an examination of the unique variance explained by the presence of perceived microaggressions above and beyond acts of selective workplace incivility.

As before, the model including only control variables significantly predicted job engagement scores in the first step, $F(4, 271) = 5.74, p < .001$). The model continued to predict job engagement in the second step when incivility scores were entered, $F(5, 270) = 6.17, p < .001$). In this model, incivility significantly negatively predicted job engagement ($\beta = -.16, p = .007$). Adding incivility to the model explained a small, but significant portion of unexplained
variance in job engagement ($\Delta R^2 = 0.02$, $\Delta F(1, 270) = 7.32, p = .01$). The model continued to predict job engagement in the third step with the addition of the LGBT-MEWS, ($F(6, 269) = 5.13, p < .001$). Once entered alongside LBGTQ+-specific microaggressions, incivility remained a significant predictor of job engagement ($\beta = -.15, p = .05$). The newly entered scores on the LGBT-MEWS were not a significant predictor of job engagement scores ($\beta = -.02, p = .78$).
Table 7. Microaggressions in Predicting Job Engagement After Accounting for Incivility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivility</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivility</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microaggressions</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $\beta$ = standardized regression coefficient. Sample size = 275.*

**Additional Analyses**

Given the significant relationship between incivility and job engagement demonstrated in the three-step hierarchical multiple regression, ad hoc analyses were conducted to consider the
potential buffering impacts of organizational trust and outness on that relationship as well. A
similar pattern was identified when considering these constructs as moderators of incivility and
job engagement, albeit incivility was a significant predictor of job engagement while LGBTQ+
workplace microaggressions was not.

Specifically, a moderated multiple regression approach was used to test organizational
trust as a moderator to the relationship between incivility and job engagement. The model
included the control variables of age, method of completion and social desirability. As seen in
Table 8, the model was significant in predicting job engagement, $F(7, 276) = 7.79, p < .001$.
Incivility was a significant negative predictor of job engagement ($b = -.20, p = .04$).
Organizational trust was a significant positive predictor of job engagement ($b = .49, p = .001$).
The interaction between the two variables did not explain a significant portion of unexplained
variance in job engagement scores ($\Delta R^2 = 0.004, F(1, 276) = 0.50, p = .48$). Further, the
interaction term did not significantly predict job engagement scores ($b = -.01, p = .48$).

Table 8. Incivility Predicting Job Engagement and The Interaction of Organizational Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>$&lt;.001^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$&lt;.001^*$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.007*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.004*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivility</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgTrust*Incivility</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. Sample size = 284.
Outness was also considered as a moderator of the relationship between incivility and job engagement following the same procedure. As represented in Table 9, the model was significant in predicting job engagement, $F(7, 269) = 8.09, p < .001$. Incivility was a significant negative predictor of job engagement ($b = -.21, p = .02$). Outness was a significant positive predictor of job engagement ($b = .22, p < .001$). The interaction between the two variables did not explain a significant portion of unexplained variance in job engagement scores ($\Delta R^2 = 0.003, F(1, 269) = 0.55, p = .46$). Further, the interaction term did not significantly predict job engagement scores ($b = .004, p = .46$).

Table 9. Incivility Predicting Job Engagement and The Interaction of Outness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Change in $R^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method - DAN</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method – Word of Mouth</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incivility</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outness</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outness*Incivility</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $b$ = unstandardized regression coefficient. Sample size = 277.

Discussion

Microaggressions have been demonstrated to be a form of insidious, covert discrimination that impacts the lived experiences of people in marginalized and minoritized groups. While microaggressions have been conceptualized and their negative effect demonstrated among various groups and within different contexts, very little research has
investigated the experiences of LGBTQ+ workers. This study used the newly introduced LGBT-MEWS scale (Galupo and Resnick, 2019) to assess the relationship between workplace microaggressions and job engagement among workers who identified as sexual and/or gender minorities.

Overall, this study did not support the hypothesized relationship of LGBTQ+ microaggressions and job engagement amongst members of the LGBTQ+ community. The relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement, both before and after controlling for potential covariates, was only found to be significant in one of the models tested. The effect remained non-significant when each of organizational trust and incivility were entered into the models. Only when considered alongside outness as a potential moderator was the relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement found to be significant, albeit with a weak effect. As such, the results largely allude to the lack of a meaningful relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement in this study. It is entirely possible that LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions are not related to job engagement and instead may be related to other workplace outcomes.

However, other potential explanations do exist for the lack of meaningful relationship identified between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement in this study. The following discussion explores these potential explanations for these findings and discusses the potential conceptual overlap between the constructs of microaggressions and incivility.

One potential explanation for the lack of the relationship found between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement involves construct measurement. The current study opted to utilize a short form version of the Job Engagement Scale (JES). This is rooted in Khan’s conceptualization of engagement through understanding a global level of job engagement
by measuring cognitive, emotional and physical aspects of engagement (Khan, 1990). The short form JES has systematically demonstrated strong internal consistency (Houle et al., 2022) and is the most consistent definition of job engagement in the literature. Definitional consistency has been a challenge regarding this construct (Carney, 2021). However, the relationship between job engagement and the presence of microaggressions towards other marginalized communities has been examined in other studies using different measures of job engagement.

Carney (2021) demonstrated the adverse impact of racial workplace microaggressions (using the Racial Microaggressions at Work Scale) on job engagement scores as measured with the Psychological Engagement Measure (PEM). The PEM is less commonly used, but it focuses on the safety element of job engagement. It measures job engagement in three forms: meaningfulness, safety and availability (May et al., 2004). This measure has strong theoretical ties to Khan’s initial conceptualization of job engagement whereby psychological safety, in which an individual feels safe to be themselves at work, is fundamental and explicitly captured through the safety sub-scale. Carney (2021) acknowledged that the PEM has not been utilized often within the literature and Houle and colleagues (2022) noted that they believe the PEM has failed to demonstrate evidence of construct validity. While this may be true, Carney (2021) was able to demonstrate strong internal consistency with the measure and its subscales.

Given the differences between the PEM and JES, there is a possibility that the safety aspect of engagement that was postulated to be impacted by LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions is more accurately measured through the explicit line of questioning demonstrated in the PEM (“I am not afraid to be myself at work”). As such, having the ability to measure safety as a subscale of engagement and correlate these scores with scores on the LGBT-MEWS may have allowed the study to target the particular aspect of engagement that the
hypotheses hinged upon. A stronger relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and the psychological safety aspect of job engagement may have been apparent.

Measurement concerns also relate to the utilization of the LGBT-MEWS in assessing LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions. In this study, the LGBT-MEWS does not seem to adequately capture the experiences of both sexual and gender minority members of the LGBTQ+ community. The measure of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions (LGBT-MEWS) is a relatively new measure. It has been utilized in only one empirical study since its initial validation and may not fully capture the construct in question. The initial article demonstrated a three-factor structure fitting the 27 items and categorized these items into microaggressions surrounding workplace values, heteronormative assumptions and cisnormative culture (Resnick & Galupo, 2019). This factor structure did not re-emerge when another confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by Richard (2021) utilizing a different sample in their examination of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and workplace outcomes. Instead, in their dissertation, Richard (2021) opted to solely utilize items within the heteronormative assumptions subscale. Richard argues that these items best captured the construct since the study focused on the experiences of sexual minority individuals explicitly. With this subscale, Richard (2021) demonstrated an adverse relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job satisfaction, stress symptoms, depression, and anxiety. In the current study, however, a wider demographic of LGBTQ+ employees participated, which meant that all three subscales in the LGBT-MEWS were given to participants. As such, it is quite possible that the effect found by Richard (2021) is exclusive to the heteronormativity subscale and not the scale as a whole. Given the lack of evidence supporting the validity of the scale, it is possible that LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions were not fully captured as a construct by the LGBT-MEWS.
Initially, the full measure was chosen as the study set out to understand the broader realities of all members of the LGBTQ+ community instead of just sexual or gender minority employees. However, this might have resulted in methodological complications. The scale reflects a similar structure and content as has been used to measure microaggressions in other contexts, specifically racial microaggressions. The LGBT-MEWS measures community-relevant examples of microaggressions in the workplace context. The frequently employed Racial Microaggressions Scale (RMAS) identifies common racial microaggressions and similarly asks participants to identify the frequency with which they were encountered (Torres-Harding et al., 2012). However, the LGBT-MEWS differs in that its structure includes items that may be exclusively relevant to certain aspects of its intended audience. The first factor of the LGBT-MEWS applies more broadly as it includes items that focus on workplace values towards the entire LGBTQ+ community. The other two factors are rooted in the, perhaps exclusive, experiences of sub-groups of the broader community. Heteronormative assumptions speak to the experience of sexual minority workers while cisnormative culture speaks to the experience of gender minority workers. The scale is comprised by adding scores on each of the 27 items. As such, the scale assumes that a sexual minority individual who witnesses or experiences an environment in which a cisnormative-based microaggression takes place would be negatively impacted. Similarly, the scale assumes that gender minority individuals would be adversely impacted by items that capture heteronormativity-based microaggressions in the workplace. The rationale for this assumption may be rooted in the idea that even the presence of anti-LGBTQ+ sentiment in the form of microaggressions, regardless of one’s own specific identity within the community, can feel like a microaggression towards a community member. Thus, it assumes that the individual, regardless of their identity within the LGBTQ+ community, would perceive the
act to be a microaggression. This assumption rests upon sexual minority and gender minority individuals being aware of and invested in the unique experiences of one another in the workplace. This assumption may not be accurate given the unique experiences of different members of the LGBTQ+ community.

This methodological issue seems to be unique to the LGBTQ+ community. For example, the Racial Microaggressions Scale uses general wording such that each respondent can impute their own racial identity into the question stem and interpret the microaggression directly as it relates to them (Torres-Harding et al., 2012). Contrastingly, in the LGBT-MEWS, items exist to capture realities that exist for either sexual minority or gender minority employees exclusively. Sexual minority individuals and gender minority individuals have experiences and challenges within the workplace that differ in nature. For example, a cisgender, lesbian women may not consider the enforcement of a dress code that reinforces the gender binary to be a microaggression because it may not impact them directly. Additionally, sexual minority and gender minority individuals are not exempt from being potential perpetrators of microaggressions towards one another. For example, a gay cisgender man could utilize the wrong pronouns to address a straight, transgender woman in a team meeting. This experience could uniquely happen to someone who identifies as transgender and could not occur to someone who identifies as straight. This poses potential issues when the scale is utilized with a sample that consists of both gender and sexual minority employees. Gender and sexual minority employees may only relate to items in each of their respective subscales, which would impact their overall score on the MEWS.

As such, the LGBT-MEWS itself may require further validation to focus in on sexual minority and gender minority experiences in mutually exclusive measures. Currently, the scale
suggests aggregating a global score from each of its subscales to capture LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions. However, the scale may benefit from instruction to utilize one particular subscale as a measure of LGBTQ+ microaggressions depending on how each participant identifies. Additionally, each subscale should be validated with another sample that consists of either gender or sexual minority employees exclusively, depending on the subscale in question.

Alternatively, if the purpose of the scale is to better understand global LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and their potentially negative relationships with workplace outcomes for this community, the scale may benefit from focusing on more generalized LGBTQ+ workplace experiences. This is currently done to some degree with the workplace values subscale in the LGBT-MEWS as it includes items to speak to both facets of the LGBTQ+ community equally and captures how anti-LGBTQ+ sentiments more broadly may impact them at work. Validation of this subscale on its own would be required to better understand whether these items successfully capture a more general approach to LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions within a sample of both gender minority and sexual minority employees.

This measurement quandary surrounding the LGBT-MEWS coupled with the notion that job engagement could potentially be measured in a manner that more explicitly aligns with safety, make it difficult to interpret the findings surrounding the how LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions relate to workplace outcomes. The current study found only a small, but meaningful effect, in one of the models tested. It is possible that utilizing more apt measures could better isolate the relationship between LGBTQ+ microaggressions and job engagement.

Next, the study considered the potential of two moderators influencing the relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement: degree of outness and organizational trust. With regards to the outlined hypotheses, neither moderator yielded a
significant interaction effect. However, both degree of outness and organizational trust had significant main effects on job engagement.

Specifically, organizational trust was a significant positive predictor of job engagement within the model. This is consistent with findings that an individual’s trust in the organization to do right by them can leave an employee feeling more engaged with their role in the company (Dalay, 2007). However, organizational trust did not moderate a relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement. Workers who experienced microaggressions but who also had strong trust in the organization did not report lower mean levels of job engagement than those with low trust in the organization.

It is possible that the focal point of organizational trust is not well placed for a study of microaggressions. Organizational trust may be conceptualized at a higher level than where LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions occur. Many of the microaggressions listed in the LGBT-MEWS situate transgressions within interpersonal interactions between employees. Few items deal with structural, organizational-level transgressions towards LGBTQ+ employees (i.e., “Not having a bathroom at work that you feel comfortable using”). As such, a more proximate measure of trust geared towards an employee’s immediate team or supervisor may be more appropriate. Employees who are victims of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions may find more supportive value in trusting those who are in their immediate work context and who may be able to buffer the impact of subtle discrimination. Future research could explore an interaction effect using a more proximal, managerial or interpersonal, level of trust.

In the study, it does appear that being out in various contexts was positively related to an employee’s level of job engagement. However, without greater context surrounding outness, the rationale driving this relationship remains unclear. Degree of outness was not identified as a
significant moderator of the relationship between LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and job engagement. Similarly, degree of outness did not moderate a relationship between workplace microaggressions and job engagement. Being out in more contexts did not yield higher engagement scores from those who identified a high number of microaggressions compared to those who were not out in as many contexts.

It was hypothesized that being out in many different contexts could provide greater social support when dealing with the ramifications of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions. It is possible that, even though a participant reported they were out in a given context, there may be a lack of support for their identity within that context. For example, while a participant may be out to various individuals in their family, this does not guarantee support of their sexuality and/or gender identity. Given this, it is possible that two alternative additional measures may have provided more meaningful information within the model.

First, including a general measure of perceived social support could indicate how supportive an individual’s networks are. In this case, the measure need not be explicitly related to the individual’s sexuality or gender identity to signal the degree to which an individual may be able to rely on their support networks as they navigate workplace microaggressions. For example, employing the Multidimensional Scale of Social Support, which measures social support within familial, friendship and romantic contexts, could provide richer information regarding how participant networks may help to buffer workplace LGBTQ+ microaggressions (Zimet et al., 1988).

Second, it could be useful to include a specific measure of support which is rooted in knowledge of an individual’s identity. For each context in which a participant reports being out, they would use a Likert scale to indicate how supportive the individual or group was regarding
their sexuality and/or gender identity. This new measure indicating social support regarding the participant’s identity could provide a stronger and more precise indication of how support may help to buffer the negative relationship workplace microaggressions may have with job engagement.

The results of this study also allude to a negative relationship between incivility and job engagement. In both the model testing incivility prior to adding microaggressions as a predictor as well as in models utilizing incivility as a main predictor of job engagement, incivility was significantly negatively related to job engagement. This result is consistent with other incivility research. For example, Wang and Chen (2020) found that incivility from coworkers negatively predicted work engagement for participants in the hospitality industry. In a longitudinal study utilizing daily diaries to track reactions to experiences of workplace incivility, Beattie and Griffin (2014) demonstrated that there was a negative relationship between episodes of incivility and daily measures of job engagement. While the relationship between incivility and job engagement remains clear, the differential impact of LGBTQ+ microaggressions on job engagements remains muddled.

This is highlighted through a complicated relationship between the constructs of incivility and microaggressions. This study served as the first to examine incivility alongside workplace microaggressions to determine their differential relationships with workplace outcomes. As demonstrated by the strong positive intercorrelation between the two measures, LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and incivility are highly related. Furthermore, in the model testing whether LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions accounted for any additional variance above and beyond incivility in the relationship to job engagement (Table 7), the constructs seem to account for similar variance in predicting job engagement. In step two, incivility is a significant negative
predictor of job engagement. However, this unique association with incivility moves towards non-significance when LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions are entered into the model in the final step. Incivility narrowly retains significance within the model while LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions enters the model without any significant relationship to job engagement. Thus, this study supports the theoretical proposition that the two constructs are highly similar in their status as forms of subtle discrimination.

What remains unclear is whether these two constructs are highly related because they share a common nature as forms of subtle discrimination or if they are instead overlapping constructs. Theoretically, the constructs differ in the emphasis they place on social power differences between the victim and the perpetrator; microaggressions can only be enacted by the individual whose identity has historically held more social power. In practice, it remains unclear whether participants perceive incivility and microaggressions as unique forms of subtle discrimination, or whether microaggressions are just a form of incivility towards marginalized groups. When examining items from the LGBT-MEWS alongside items from the Workplace Incivility Scale, one could argue that certain items from the LGBT-MEWS may be highly specific examples of the general incivility behaviours outlined in the Workplace Incivility Scale. For example, the item “Hearing a colleague or a customer being called names such as “fag,” “dyke,” or “tranny,” may yield a similar response from a participant as “...Yelled, shouted or swore at you,” from the Workplace Incivility Scale (WIS). As such, a participant responding to both scales may provide similar answers to the WIS items based on their experiences with LGBTQ+ discrimination. They may not consciously be processing these acts as microaggressions-specific and may simply consider them to be acts of incivility. This notion has been addressed to a degree by the incivility literature with the sub-definition of selective
incivility, which are acts of general incivility that are occurring to a member of a marginalized or minoritized group (Kabat-Farr et al., 2020). Incivility researchers have attempted to fit the power dynamic into the existing construct simply by asking marginalized community members to fill out the more general Workplace Incivility Scale. This approach assumes that the root of the incivil act towards a marginalized community member is due to their community membership, but the act itself manifests in a way that is more general (i.e., leaving someone out). This seems to be conceptually inadequate.

Rather, LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions should be conceptually unique from selective incivility since the nature of the microaggression should be rooted in the individual’s identity as a minoritized or marginalized community member and the historical power differential they experience. Thus, the items listed in the LGBT-MEWS should be instances of subtle discrimination that are uniquely attributable to this community and the power differential between the LGBTQ+ community and cis-gender, heteronormative individuals. In this vein, the LGBT-MEWS does include items that are conceptually distinct from items on the WIS. For example, “Having a colleague presume you are heterosexual by asking about your ‘wife or girlfriend’ or ‘husband or boyfriend,’” may be a unique discriminatory act that would only be consciously noticed as discriminatory by someone from the LGBTQ+ community. As such, it is truly unique from a more general act of incivility. If the constructs of incivility and microaggressions can be conceptually and operationally disentangled through a deeper understanding of how members of the LGBTQ+ community may view them, researchers may find that the constructs are not so highly intercorrelated nor overlapping in their ability to predict unique variance in workplace outcomes. Given that incivility seems to be related to job engagement, while microaggressions are not, it is also possible that the constructs are highly
related but may relate differently to workplace outcomes based on the way each construct is theorized to affect the individual.

**Implications**

The study offers both practical and theoretical implications for the study of microaggressions within the workplace. In terms of managerial considerations and applications, the study provides additional evidence that subtle forms of discrimination may yield negative workplace outcomes. In this instance, members of the LGBTQ+ community who experience incivility in their workplace may become less engaged with their jobs. As such, managers should be encouraged to consider discrimination beyond the more recognizable and overt instances of bullying or aggression. The establishment of internal processes within organizations to ensure there are clear communication channels whereby employees can report instances of incivility and see appropriate response is vital to signal that organizations do not tolerate discrimination in any form. Furthermore, organizations should consider education to raise awareness around how subtle discrimination may manifest and the forms it may take. Incivility, as well as microaggressions, do not hinge upon the perpetrator having dubious intent. Managers should focus on identifying acts of subtle discrimination, providing individual and group education in a non-confrontational context, and then proceeding to disciplinary action. This could establish a workplace environment where subtle forms of discrimination are identified, educated upon and eradicated. Simultaneously, encouraging these practices could be a gateway for organizations to establish trust with their employees. LGBTQ+ employees who see that their organizations do not tolerate subtle discrimination may be more inclined to believe that the organization, and those within it, foster an environment where they will be protected. In turn, this trust may also promote job engagement from employees.
While LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions were not always linked to job engagement in this study, managers should not take this as definitive. The study did find a negative relationship between incivility and job engagement and therefore provides evidence that subtle acts of discrimination among employees can relate to negative workplace outcomes. It is one of the first studies to utilize the LGBT-MEWS in relation to workplace outcomes and raises points of consideration in utilizing this scale in future studies. LGBTQ+ microaggressions have been associated with negative wellbeing and achievement-based outcomes in other research (Mathies et al., 2019; Woodford et al., 2012; Ylioja et al., 2018). As such, it is likely that LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions relate to negative work and health related outcomes for LGBTQ+ employees and negative organizational outcomes such as turnover intentions or employee well-being. Managers should act pre-emptively to curb all forms of subtle discrimination in their workforce, including microaggressions, as their relation to negative workplace outcomes, such as lower engagement, remain largely unknown.

This study also has theoretical implications. It serves as a preliminary attempt to consolidate different forms of subtle discrimination. Much more attention needs to be given to the reconciliation of the incivility, selective incivility and microaggression streams of research. They have emerged from different academic perspectives and this study is the first to unite the literature and empirically consider microaggressions alongside incivility. This study also highlights the challenges in measuring workplace microaggressions and the utilization of the LGBT-MEWS among both sexual and gender minority individuals. Additional research is needed to further parse the constructs of microaggressions and incivility as well as validate that any scale utilized to measure LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions captures this unique form of subtle discrimination. Thus, while the relationship between LGBTQ+ microaggressions and job
engagement was not demonstrated in this study, this may be attributable to methodological challenges. As such, the study opens the door to addressing measurement-related concerns and flags the importance of reconciling these two forms of subtle discrimination.

**Limitations**

While effort was made to control for potential confounds, the study was limited by its sampling technique. The sample included students working in summer jobs or alongside their studies, full and part-time employees collected through the Prolific platform, and participants who were recruited through word-of-mouth. Each group’s working background may have influenced their potential engagement in their jobs.

For instance, participants from the DAN Management Participant Pool sample were currently completing their undergraduate degrees and likely were working in early-stage career jobs. Job engagement may not be as much of a concern for employees at this stage in their careers, as they may not be inclined or required to bring their full selves to work in order to perform their role. On the other hand, the word-of-mouth sample likely consisted of individuals who were motivated by the study topic and were perhaps polarized in their work experiences. Participants could have experienced an extremely supportive and non-discriminatory workplace and were inclined to share their positive experiences about their engagement in the role. Alternatively, participants could be in a negative workplace environment and motivated to share their unpleasant experience in their current role. Also, this sample was found largely through a snowball technique whereby participants were encouraged to share the study information with friends or colleagues who may be interested in participating themselves. As such, it may be likely that participants shared similar work environments and this may have influenced the data. Participants within the same team or organization may have had similar experiences due to their
shared workplace experiences, which yields methodological challenges when interpreting the data.

Finally, the Prolific sample was also subject to limitations. Participants recruited from this panel method consisted of individuals who are compensated directly for the time they spend completing various online surveys. As such, they may be motivated by financial compensation rather than intrinsic interest in the research at hand. This may be reflected in the quality of their responses and may also not generalize more broadly. In all, convenience sampling was utilized to recruit participants across all three methods instead of obtaining a truly randomized sample of working LGBTQ+ individuals. As such, generalizability of the study beyond this context cannot be established.

Furthermore, participants were not asked to indicate the type of job they held. Thus, it is impossible for the study to determine whether the sampling method yielded a systematic bias for a certain type of job or industry. Workers in differing contexts may be subjected to microaggressions in different forms or may be differentially engaged with their jobs due to the nature of their responsibilities. The study may have benefited from a standardized recruiting approach and questions to control for job and industry type. Alternatively, the study could have identified an industry of interest and only sampled participants from this job context as this would have allowed for greater external validity within this context. This approach, while methodologically sound, does have practical limitations because it is difficult to find enough LGBTQ+ participants to power a study considering they make up a small subset of the population.

Another limitation was the study’s use of a cross-sectional design over a longitudinal approach. In line with the original conceptualization of microaggressions, they are “everyday”
acts of subtle discrimination (Pierce, 1970). As such, they likely do not take the form of uniquely occurring, large-scale acts of discrimination, but occur often throughout an individual’s tenure at a company. In accordance with the minority stress theory, microaggressions may be considered distal stressors, which exist external to the minority individual (Meyer, 2003). These may in turn cause victims to develop internal, proximal stressors such as negative feelings towards their own identity as an LGBTQ+ community member. The theory postulates that the accumulation of these forms of stressors yields negative health outcomes among minority group members. The accumulation of stress associated with LGBTQ+ microaggressions over time may result in outcomes that may only become apparent later in one’s career. For instance, a student working part-time in retail may demonstrate resiliency in the face of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and not demonstrate any adverse impacts immediately. However, 5 years into working full-time, they may begin to disengage from their workplace if they continue to experience LGBTQ+ microaggressions. The stress associated with the discrimination, as well as the negative feelings one may develop towards themselves, begin to accumulate. A longitudinal approach would allow for statistical parsing of within-person differences with regards to the impact of microaggressions as an employee’s change in engagement could be followed over time as LGBTQ+ microaggressions accrue.

A final limitation of the study involves the utilization of the newly validated LGBT-MEWS measure. Resnick and Galupo (2019) demonstrated strong internal consistency and convergent validity in the initial validation, but few studies have recreated the factor structure or utilized the measure to predict workplace outcomes. It is possible that the measure failed to capture the specific nuance of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions for both the gender minority and sexual minority employees that participated in the sample.
Future Directions

The study offers a needed investigation of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and their potential relationships with workplace outcomes. Additional research is needed to build an understanding of the construct, disentangle it from other measures of subtle discrimination and determine its impact.

There is emerging theoretical postulation as to the differences between forms of subtle discrimination such as incivility and microaggressions (Smith & Griffiths, 2022). However, the constructs were developed in different academic silos (psychology and sociology, respectively) and there has been little effort made to consider their relation to one another. There is a possibility that microaggressions remain a form of incivility, that microaggressions should replace what is currently considered to be selective incivility, or that microaggressions and incivility are truly unique constructs.

Some qualitative work has been conducted to better understand each construct and create appropriate measures (Nadal et al., 2011). However, there is an opportunity to merge the study of subtle discrimination into a line of research that compares each construct. For example, additional qualitative research with a sample of LGBTQ+ workers could better reveal their perspectives on the experience and definition of each construct, better examine the nature of items in the LGBT-MEWS and WIS and help to better understand the delineation between each construct. Such research could also provide insight into the modification of existing measures, including the LGBT-MEWS. Future research may want to investigate other items alongside existing LGBT-MEWS items and determine which items best theoretically load onto the construct. As previously discussed, Sue (2007) identified three forms of microaggressions among racial minority group members: microinsults, microassaults and microinvalidations. This has not been taken up in the existing scale. Further, the factor structure of workplace values,
heteronormativity and cisnormativity in the LGBT-MEWS did not reappear in a second study conducted by Richard (2021). Future research could consider items that fall into the three forms of microaggressions identified by Sue (2007) and systematically evaluate this revised measure’s structure.

There is also a need to better understand how LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions relate to workplace outcomes concerning LGBTQ+ employees. Researchers should consider re-evaluating whether LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions are related to job engagement once the measure has been revisited. Researchers may also want to consider well-being and health-related outcomes. Given the minority stress theory, it is likely that LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions contribute to stress, which may in turn relate to other negative outcomes that accrue over time (Meyer, 2003).

Lastly, future researchers should consider incorporating elements of racial intersectionality into both their research design and measures. As evidenced by descriptive analyses of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions between white and non-white groups, non-white LGBTQ+ employees may be disproportionally subject to subtle forms of discrimination compared to white members of the community. Race may intersect with their gender and/or sexual minority identities to create highly precarious environments for LGBTQ+ employees of colour. As such, it would be worthwhile to qualitatively assess the unique experiences of LGBTQ+ employees of colour to understand whether there are intersecting microaggression experiences that are not yet being measured in existing scales such as the LGBT-MEWS. Furthermore, future quantitative studies should ideally aim to recruit a large enough sub-sample of LGBTQ+ employees from various racioethnic backgrounds to be able to statistically compare their experiences with microaggressions to those of white LGBTQ+ community members.
Conclusion

In all, LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions are a reality that harm LGBTQ+ workers in their day to day lives, but they are still a novel construct within the field of psychology. This study investigated the relationship between scores of the LGBT-MEWS and job engagement scores among sexual minority and gender minority employees. The results of the study did not support the hypothesis that LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions are related to job engagement. The study did demonstrate support for the negative relationship between workplace incivility and job engagement as well as the positive relationships between organizational trust and outness on job engagement. However, the results do suggest that evidence of a negative relationship between microaggressions and job engagement could emerge with a more robust methodological approach, including a better measure of LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions. The study provided a forum for considering the structure of the measure utilized to measure LGBTQ+ workplace microaggressions and avenues by which the measure may be improved. The LGBT-MEWS should be revisited to explore items and a factor structure that better suit sexual and gender minority employees, respectively. Additionally, the study provoked a needed discussion surrounding the unique facets of microaggressions and incivility. In order to bridge the silos between the fields of study in which each construct originated, it is vital to better understand how similarly or differently members of marginalized and/or minoritized communities view and experience these discriminatory acts.
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Letter of Information and Consent – Prolific Platform

**Project Title:** The Impact of LGBTQ+-specific Microaggressions in the Workplace

**Principal Investigator:** Dr. Johanna Weststar, Associate Professor at the DAN Department of Management & Organizational Studies at the University of Western Ontario, (redacted)

**Student Researcher:** Vishal Sooknanan, Graduate Student at the University of Western Ontario, (redacted)

**Purpose of Study & Study Procedures**
You are invited to participate in a study investigating the impact of LGBTQ+-specific microaggressions in the workplace. This portion of the study involves rating the frequency of different microaggressions one may have experienced in the workplace and completing other items related to workplace outcomes.
If you agree, you will participate in a 30-minute survey. The survey will be administered online using Qualtrics and you will complete the survey on your own computer in the setting of your choice.
You are eligible to participate in the study if you:
- Identify as part of the LGBTQ+ community (are a gender minority and/or sexual minority).
- Have worked part or full-time at any point in the last 12 months.

**Voluntary Participation**
Your participation in this study is voluntary. Even if you consent to participate you have the right to not answer individual questions or to withdraw from the study at any time. Once you have submitted your survey responses you cannot withdraw your participation in the study because your responses are anonymous, and it is not possible to locate them in the final dataset. You do not waive any legal rights by consenting to this study.

**Compensation**
You will be paid through the Prolific platform a total of 3.00 pounds for completing the survey. There is no penalty for withdrawing from the study.

**Benefits and Risks**
The study includes questions regarding your past experiences involving the potential impact of microaggressions and may resurface negative emotions and hurtful memories. If this is the case, we encourage you to reach out to the following support resources available to you:

Trans Lifeline (https://translifeline.org). Trans Lifeline provides trans peer support for our community that’s been divested from police since day one. We’re run by and for trans people. (Canada and the United States)

LGBT National Hotline (https://www.lgbthotline.org). We provide a safe space that is anonymous and confidential where callers can speak on many different issues and concerns including, but limited to, coming out issues, gender and/or sexuality identities, relationship concerns, bullying, workplace issues, HIV/AIDS anxiety, safer sex information, suicide, and much more. (United States)

Talk Suicide (https://talksuicide.ca). You deserve to be heard. We’re here to listen. Connect to a crisis responder to get help without judgement. (Canada)

The benefits of this study include a contribution to society’s understanding of the nature of microaggressions among the LGBTQ+ workplace community and how they impact employees.

**Confidentiality**

We will act to protect your confidentiality in this research. Your Prolific ID will only be used to ensure that you receive the appropriate compensation amount when you complete the survey. It is not connected to your survey responses in any way which are anonymous. No personal identifying information will be used in publications or presentations related to this research. We will securely store all study materials for a minimum of 7 years. Study materials will be stored on the computers of the research team using encryption and password protection. These study materials will be stored at Western University. Representatives of Western University’s Non-Medical Research Ethics Board may require access to your study-related records to monitor the conduct of the research.

Your survey responses will be collected anonymously through a secure online survey platform called Qualtrics. Qualtrics uses encryption technology and restricted access authorizations to protect all data collected. In addition, Western’s Qualtrics server is in Ireland, where privacy standards are maintained under the European Union safe harbour framework. The data will then be exported from Qualtrics and securely stored on Western University's server. To learn more about Qualtrics privacy policy, please visit: https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/.

You do not waive any legal rights by consenting to this study.

**Questions**

If you have questions about this research study or want to obtain the results of this research, please contact Dr. Johanna Weststar (redacted).

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or the conduct of this study, you may contact The Office of Human Research Ethics (519) 661-3036, 1-844- 720-9816, email: ethics@uwo.ca. This office oversees the ethical conduct of research studies and is not part of the study team. Everything that you discuss will be kept confidential.

Q1 - Prior to consenting to participate, we must ensure that you are eligible to participate in this study. Please answer the following three questions to determine your eligibility in the study.

- I do not wish to continue. (if chosen, end survey)
- I wish to continue to the eligibility questions.

Q2 - I attest that I have worked part-time or full-time in the past 12 months.
- Yes
- No (if chosen end Survey)

Q3 - I attest that I identify as a sexual minority individual and/or a gender minority individual.
- Yes
- No (if chosen end survey)

[FOR ONLINE SURVEY– IMPLIED CONSENT]
If you consent to participate, please choose the “Yes, I do provide my consent and wish to participate in this study” option. By clicking this option and proceeding to the survey, you are providing implied consent to participate.
Letter of Information and Consent – DAN Management Participant Pool

Western

Letter of Information and Consent – DAN Management Pool

Project Title: The Impact of LGBTQ+-specific Microaggressions in the Workplace

Principal Investigator: Dr. Johanna Weststar, Associate Professor at the DAN Department of Management & Organizational Studies at the University of Western Ontario,

Student Researcher: Vishal Sooknanan, Graduate Student at the University of Western Ontario,

Purpose of Study & Study Procedures
As a student in MOS 1021/1023, you are invited to participate in a study investigating the impact of LGBTQ+-specific microaggressions in the workplace. The study involves rating the frequency of different microaggressions you may have experienced in the workplace and completing other questions related to workplace outcomes.

If you agree, you will participate in a 30-minute survey. The survey will be administered online using Qualtrics and you will complete the survey on your own computer in the setting of your choice.

You are eligible to participate in the study if you:
- Identify as part of the LGBTQ+ community (are a gender minority and/or sexual minority).
- Have worked part or full-time at any point in the last 12 months.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. Even if you consent to participate you have the right to not answer individual questions or to withdraw from the study at any time. Once you have submitted your survey responses you cannot withdraw your participation in the study because your responses are anonymous, and it is not possible to locate them in the final dataset. You do not waive any legal rights by consenting to this study.

Completing this research study will fulfill the research component requirement of the MOS 1021/1023 course. As noted above, you will receive this credit whether or not you finish the study.

Compensation
You will receive 0.5 research credit in MOS 1021/23 as compensation for your participation. There is no penalty for withdrawing from the study; you will still receive research credit.

Benefits and Risks
The study includes questions regarding your past experiences involving the potential impact of microaggressions and may resurface negative emotions and hurtful memories. If this is the case, we encourage you to reach out the following support resources available to you:

Trans Lifeline (https://translifeline.org). Trans Lifeline provides trans peer support for our community that’s been divested from police since day one. We’re run by and for trans people. (Canada and the United States)

LGBT National Hotline (https://www.lgbthotline.org). We provide a safe space that is anonymous and confidential where callers can speak on many different issues and concerns including, but limited to, coming out issues, gender and/or sexuality identities, relationship concerns, bullying, workplace issues, HIV/AIDS anxiety, safer sex information, suicide, and much more. (United States)

Talk Suicide (https://talksuicide.ca). You deserve to be heard. We’re here to listen. Connect to a crisis responder to get help without judgement. (Canada)

The benefits of this study include a contribution to society’s understanding of the nature of microaggressions among the LGBTQ+ workplace community and how they impact employees.

**Confidentiality**

Your survey responses are anonymous. While we do collect personal identifying information such as your age, sexual orientation and gender identity, this information will not be attached to their identity in any way or revealed in publications or presentations resulting from this study. We will securely store all study materials for a minimum of 7 years. Study materials will be stored on the computers of the research team using encryption and password protection. These study materials will be stored at Western University. Representatives of Western University’s Non-Medical Research Ethics Board may require access to your study-related records to monitor the conduct of the research.

Your survey responses will be collected anonymously through a secure online survey platform called Qualtrics. Qualtrics uses encryption technology and restricted access authorizations to protect all data collected. In addition, Western’s Qualtrics server is in Ireland, where privacy standards are maintained under the European Union safe harbour framework. The data will then be exported from Qualtrics and securely stored on Western University's server. To learn more about Qualtrics privacy policy, please visit: https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/.

You do not waive any legal rights by consenting to this study.

**Questions**

If you have questions about this research study or want to obtain the results of this research, please contact Dr. Johanna Weststar (redacted).

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or the conduct of this study, you may contact The Office of Human Research Ethics (519) 661-3036, 1-844- 720-9816, email: ethics@uwo.ca. This office oversees the ethical conduct of research studies and is not part of the study team. Everything that you discuss will be kept confidential.

Q1 - Prior to consenting to participate, we must ensure that you are eligible to participate in this study. Please answer the following three questions to determine your eligibility in the study. Please click "I wish to continue to the eligibility questions." if you wish to continue.

- I do not wish to continue. (if chosen, end survey)
- I wish to continue to the eligibility questions.

Q2 - I attest that I have worked part-time or full-time in the past 12 months.

- Yes
- No (if chosen end Survey)

Q3 - I attest that I identify as a sexual minority individual and/or a gender minority individual.
- Yes
  - No (if chosen end survey)

[FOR ONLINE SURVEY – IMPLIED CONSENT]
If you consent to participate, please choose the “Yes, I do provide my consent and wish to participate in this study” option. By clicking this option and proceeding to the survey, you are providing implied consent to participate.
Letter of Information and Consent – Word of Mouth Sample

Project Title: The Impact of LGBTQ+-specific Microaggressions in the Workplace

Principal Investigator: Dr. Johanna Weststar, Associate Professor at the DAN Department of Management & Organizational Studies at the University of Western Ontario, (redacted)

Student Researcher: Vishal Sooknanan, Graduate Student at the University of Western Ontario, (redacted)

Purpose of Study & Study Procedures
You are invited to participate in a study investigating the impact of LGBTQ+-specific microaggressions in the workplace. This portion of the study involves rating the frequency of different microaggressions one may have experienced in the workplace and completing other items related to workplace outcomes. If you agree, you will participate in a 30-minute survey. The survey will be administered online using Qualtrics and you will complete the survey on your own computer in the setting of your choice.
You are eligible to participate in the study if you:
- Identify as part of the LGBTQ+ community (are a gender minority and/or sexual minority).
- Have worked part or full-time at any point in the last 12 months.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. Even if you consent to participate you have the right to not answer individual questions or to withdraw from the study at any time. Once you have submitted your survey responses you cannot withdraw your participation in the study because your responses are anonymous, and it is not possible to locate them in the final dataset. You do not waive any legal rights by consenting to this study.

Compensation
Fulfilling the eligibility requirements, consenting to participate and partially completing this research study will enter you into a draw to win one of two $50.00 CAD Amazon Gift Cards. For fully completing the study, you will be given two entries into this draw. To enter into the draw, you will have to enter your email address at the end of the survey.

Benefits and Risks
The study includes questions regarding your past experiences involving the potential impact of microaggressions and may resurface negative emotions and hurtful memories. If this is the case, we encourage you to reach out the following support resources available to you:
Trans Lifeline (https://translifeline.org). Trans Lifeline provides trans peer support for our community that’s been divested from police since day one. We’re run by and for trans people. (Canada and the United States)

LGBT National Hotline (https://www.lgbthotline.org). We provide a safe space that is anonymous and confidential where callers can speak on many different issues and concerns including, but limited to, coming out issues, gender and/or sexuality identities, relationship concerns, bullying, workplace issues, HIV/AIDS anxiety, safer sex information, suicide, and much more. (United States)

Talk Suicide (https://talksuicide.ca). You deserve to be heard. We’re here to listen. Connect to a crisis responder to get help without judgement. (Canada)

The benefits of this study include a contribution to society’s understanding of the nature of microaggressions among the LGBTQ+ workplace community and how they impact employees.

**Confidentiality**

We will act to protect your confidentiality in this research. If you choose to provide your email address to enter yourself into the draw for the Amazon Gift Cards, the email address you provide will only be used to enter you in the draw. The email address provided will only be used to contact participants who win the gift card to administer the gift card to them. It is not connected to your survey responses in any way which are anonymous. No personal identifying information will be used in publications or presentations related to this research.

We will securely store all study materials for a minimum of 7 years. Your email address will be removed immediately after the draw for the Amazon Gift Cards. Study materials will be stored on the computers of the research team using encryption and password protection. These study materials will be stored at Western University. Representatives of Western University’s Non-Medical Research Ethics Board may require access to your study-related records to monitor the conduct of the research.

Your survey responses will be collected anonymously through a secure online survey platform called Qualtrics. Qualtrics uses encryption technology and restricted access authorizations to protect all data collected. In addition, Western’s Qualtrics server is in Ireland, where privacy standards are maintained under the European Union safe harbour framework. The data will then be exported from Qualtrics and securely stored on Western University's server. To learn more about Qualtrics privacy policy, please visit: https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/.

You do not waive any legal rights by consenting to this study.

**Questions**

If you have questions about this research study or want to obtain the results of this research, please contact Dr. Johanna Weststar (redacted).

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or the conduct of this study, you may contact The Office of Human Research Ethics (519) 661-3036, 1-844-720-9816, email: ethics@uwo.ca. This office oversees the ethical conduct of research studies and is not part of the study team. Everything that you discuss will be kept confidential.

Q1 - Prior to consenting to participate, we must ensure that you are eligible to participate in this study. Please answer the following three questions to determine your eligibility in the study.

Please click "I wish to continue to the eligibility questions," if you wish to continue.

- I do not wish to continue. (if chosen, end survey)

- I wish to continue to the eligibility questions.

Q2 - I attest that I have worked part-time or full-time in the past 12 months.
- Yes
- No (if chosen end Survey)

Q3 - I attest that I identify as a sexual minority individual and/or a gender minority individual.
- Yes
- No (if chosen end survey)

[FOR ONLINE SURVEY—IMPLIED CONSENT]
If you consent to participate, please choose the “Yes, I do provide my consent and wish to participate in this study” option. By clicking this option and proceeding to the survey, you are providing implied consent to participate.
Debriefing Form

Western

DEBRIEFING FORM

Project Title: The Impact of LGBTQ+-specific Microaggressions in the Workplace

Principal Investigator: Dr. Johanna Weststar, Associate Professor at the DAN Department of Management & Organizational Studies at the University of Western Ontario, (redacted)

Student Researcher: Vishal Sooknanan, Graduate Student at the University of Western Ontario, (redacted)

Thank you for your participation in this study. The purpose of this study was to better understand how LGBTQ+-specific microaggressions may impact LGBTQ+ community members in their workplace. We predicted that LGBTQ+-specific workplace microaggressions may negatively impact how engaged LGBTQ+ members feel with their jobs. We also believed that organizational trust and whether individuals were “out” in various contexts may also play a role in how microaggressions are impacting the job engagement of LGBTQ+ members.

To investigate these research questions, we conducted this online survey with various scales intended to measure microaggressions, engagement, organizational trust and outness. Once this stage of data collection is complete, we will analyze the data to draw conclusions about our research questions.

If you would like to receive a copy of the research results at a later date, please email Vishal Sooknanan (redacted) to express your interest.

We understand that answering questions regarding your past experiences involving the potential impact of microaggressions may have resurfaced negative emotions and triggered hurtful memories. If this is the case, we encourage you to reach out the following support resources available to you:

- Trans Lifeline (https://translifeline.org). Trans Lifeline provides trans peer support for our community that's been divested from police since day one. We're run by and for trans people.

- LGBT National Hotline (https://www.lgbthotline.org). We provide a safe space that is anonymous and confidential where callers can speak on many different issues and concerns including, but limited to, coming out issues, gender and/or sexuality identities,
relationship concerns, bullying, workplace issues, HIV/AIDS anxiety, safer sex information, suicide, and much more.

- Talk Suicide (https://talksuicide.ca). You deserve to be heard. We’re here to listen. Connect to a crisis responder to get help without judgement.

Here are some references if you would like to read more about microaggressions among the LGBTQ+ community.


Thank you,

Vishal Sooknanan, the University of Western Ontario, (redacted)
Appendix B

Scales in Online Survey

LGBT-MEWS

Instructions:

The following is a list of experiences that LGBT people sometimes have in the workplace. Please read each one carefully, and then respond to the following question:

During the past 12 months in your workplace, how often have the following experiences occurred with a colleague, clientele, or your work environment?

1. Not getting paid as much because of your LGBT identity.
2. Being overlooked for a promotion based on your LGBT identity.
3. Not being given credit for an idea because of your LGBT identity.
4. Having it implied that you were only given your position because of your LGBT identity.
5. Having your job security threatened because of your LGBT identity.
6. Having your job duties adjusted because of your LGBT identity.
7. Having a colleague, who knows the status of your significant other, refer to them as a ‘friend’.
8. Hearing a colleague or a customer being called names such as “fag,” “dyke,” or “tranny.”
9. Having your behaviors mimicked in a joking way due to your LGBT identity or expression/presentation.
10. Being accused of being attracted to a colleague because of your LGBT identity.
11. Having a colleague ask you about your sex life (e.g., How do you have sex?) because of your LGBT identity.
12. Having a harassment complaint ignored because of your LGBT identity.
13. Having colleagues or customers assume your sexual orientation based on your appearance.
14. Having a colleague presume you are heterosexual by asking about your “wife or girlfriend” or “husband or boyfriend.”
15. Disclosing your LGBT identity to colleagues and having them respond in a surprised manner.
16. Being asked to provide an opinion on behalf of other LGBT people.
17. After disclosing your LGBT identity, being told you do not conform to cultural stereotypes of LGBT people.
18. Hearing the phrase “That’s so gay!” at work to describe something or someone.
19. Not fitting in at work because of your LGBT identity.
20. Being “tokenized” at work on the basis of your LGBT identity.
21. Having no one on your organization’s leadership team who identifies as LGBT.
22. Having your name assigned at birth and not your own name appear on official office documents such as a nametag, e-mail address, or nameplate.
23. Having people address you using incorrect pronouns.
24. Having people make comments about the clothing you wear because it does not conform to gender norms.
25. Not having a bathroom at work that you feel comfortable using.
26. Being addressed using gendered language that is not aligned with your gender identity such as “ma’am” or “mister.”
27. Being expected to wear clothing that does not align with your gender identity or gender expression.

Note. Items should be randomized for presentation in a survey.

Recommended response scale: 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = occasionally, 4 = a moderate amount, 5 = a great deal.

Subscale scores are computed by averaging subscale item ratings: Workplace Values (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12), Heteronormative Assumptions (13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21), and Cisnormative Culture (22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27).

Possible ranges for each subscale are as follows: Workplace Values (12 to 60), Heteronormative Assumptions (9 to 45), and Cisnormative Culture (6 to 30).
Job Engagement Scale – Short Form

The following questions are a series of statements regarding how you invest your energies at work. Please read each statement carefully. Then, indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work with intensity at my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exert my full effort at my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I devote a lot of energy to do my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try my hardest to perform well on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strive as hard as I can to complete my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I exert a lot of energy on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel energetic at my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive about my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am excited about my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, my mind is focused on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, I pay a lot of attention to my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, I focus a great deal of attention on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, I am absorbed by my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, I concentrate on my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work, I devote a lot of attention to my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational Trust Inventory

Please choose the number that most closely describes the opinion of members in your department or unit towards the organization. Interpret the blank spaces as referring to the organization about which you are commenting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that people in ______ tell the truth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that _____ meets its negotiated obligations to our department/unit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion, _____ is reliable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the people in _____ succeed by stepping on other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We feel that _____ tries to get the upper hand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that _____ takes advantage of our problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that ______ negotiates with us honestly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that _____ will keep it’s word.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that _____ does not mislead us.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that _____ tries to get out of its commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that _____ negotiates joint expectations fairly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that _____ takes advantage of people who are vulnerable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outness Inventory – for Sexual Minority Participants

Use the following rating scale to indicate how open you are about your sexual orientation to the people listed below. If an item refers to a group of people (e.g., work peers), then indicate how out you generally are to that group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person definitely does NOT know about your sexual orientation status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT applicable to your situations; there is not such person or group of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people in your life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person probably knows about your sexual orientation status, but it NEVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person probably knows about your sexual orientation status but it is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarely talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person definitely knows about your sexual orientation status, and it is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarely talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person definitely knows about your sexual orientation status, and it is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family/Relatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My new straight friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work peers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work supervisor(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my religious community (e.g. church, temple)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of my religious community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. church, temple)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers, new acquaintances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My old heterosexual friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outness Inventory – for Gender Minority Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable to your situations; there is not such person or group of people in your life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person definitely does NOT know about your gender identity status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person might know about your gender identity status, but it NEVER talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person probably knows about your gender identity status, but it NEVER talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person definitely knows about your gender identity status, but it is rarely talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person definitel y knows about your gender identity status, and it is sometimes talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person definit ely knows about your gender identity status, and it is openly talked about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family/Relatives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My new straight friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work peers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work supervisor(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my religious community (e.g. church, temple)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders of my religious community (e.g. church, temple)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangers, new acquaintances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My old heterosexual friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workplace Incivility Scale

During the PAST YEAR, were you ever in a situation in which any of your supervisors or co-workers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>A Moderate Amount</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid little attention to your statements or showed little interest in your opinions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubted your judgment on a matter over which you had responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave you hostile looks, stares, or sneers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressed you in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted or “spoke over” you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated you lower than you deserved on an evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelled, shouted or swore at you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made insulting or disrespectful remarks about you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored you or failed to speak to you (e.g., gave you “the silent treatment”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused you of incompetence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted you with anger outbursts or “temper tantrums”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made jokes at your expense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Desirability Scale – Short Form

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide how it pertains to you.

Please respond either TRUE (T) or FALSE (F) to each item. Indicate your response by circling the appropriate letter next to the item. Be sure to answer all items.

- It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. T F
- I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way. T F
- On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. T F
- There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. T F
- No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener. T F
- There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. T F
- I’m always willing to admit to it when I make a mistake. T F
- I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. T F
- I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. T F
- I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. T F
- There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. T F
- I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. T F
- I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings. T F
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