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Abstract

Little is known about whether LBG individuals experience work-family conflict differently than heterosexual individuals. Because LGB individuals have been a silenced minority within the work-family conflict literature, the current study examined the extent to which work-family conflict is experienced within an LGB sample in order to generate an inclusive measure of work-family conflict. Within Study 1, 41 interviews were conducted with LGB individuals, resulting in the generation of 38 items for an initial scale of LGB work-family conflict, called “identity-based conflict”. Further, initial relationships between work-family conflict and potential antecedents were examined. In Study 2, these 38 items were retranslated into their intended category and rated on importance. Results suggest that generated scale items were viewed as important to the work-family conflict domain and that the LGB work-family conflict measure is likely to be a multi-dimensional stand-alone measure, as opposed to a unidimensional add-on measure to be used in addition to existing work-family conflict dimensions.
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"Two lesbians raising a son? That’s insane! Who’s the mother? Who’s the father? The poor kid’s gonna go through life having a complex over breasts and milk!"

- George, a sales manager at Whitebread, a baked goods company in the Midwest, when asked about the validity of lesbian families (taken from Embrick, Walther, & Wickens, 2007, pg. 763)

**Introduction**

In the industrial/organizational psychology literature, the construct of work-family conflict has been studied since the 1930s (Demerouti, Bakker, & Bulters, 2004). A vast amount of literature has proliferated over the past 80 years which pertains to the topic of work interfering with family life, as well as the ways in which family can interfere with work. However, the work-family conflict literature is not without limitations. The current work attempts to highlight the ways in which heteronormative assumptions (institutions that organize, make coherent, and privilege heterosexuality (Berlant & Warner, 1998)) may inform our conceptualization of the family as an object of study, which subsequently constrains the extent to which we fully capture the experience of work-family conflict for LGB families. As such, the current study will provide an evaluation of potential biases in the current work-family literature and measurement.

The most common definition of work family conflict is “a form of interrole conflict in which role pressures from work and family domains are incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). More recently, numerous researchers have created a divide between work-family conflict and family-
work conflict, producing two separate constructs – one which deals with the ways in which work demands interfere with family and the other examining the ways in which family interferes with work demands (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). The constructs of work-family conflict and family-work conflict have been historically measured using time, strain, and behavior-based dimensions (Carlson, Kacmar, & Williams, 2000). As such, organizational solutions meant to alleviate the stress which stems from work-family and family-work conflict have followed primarily from these three dimensions.

Further, in order to properly understand what is meant by work-family conflict, we need to understand what is meant by work and what is meant by family. In the current study, work will qualify as any context in which one is paid to perform some sort of labor. Guion (1965) defined industrial/organizational psychology as a relationship between humans and their work, or a way of making a living. As such, this study falls in line with seminal research which defines work as anything which contributes to making a living – or paid participation in the labor force. In terms of family, it has been noted that lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) families have promulgated an already existent push away from traditional family structures and towards family structures in which individuals create a family of choice (Cherlin, 2004). The family of choice is not necessarily biologically or legally related to one another, but the relationships are considered as close as relationships in which a blood or legal relationship is present (Weeks, Heaphy, & Donovan, 2001). For the purposes of this paper, family will fall in line with this definition, such that family can be anyone whom the participant identifies as family, regardless of blood or legal relationships (and participants were not guided to consider family in any sort of way, as questions were left to interpretation).
Taking these things together then, the current study will examine those in same-sex families of choice, who are participating in some kind of paid labor within the workforce. Putting this within a work-family framework, and in order to address the potential lack of consideration for LGB family issues in current work-family measures, the current study will propose that work-family conflict may be experienced differently by LGB individuals, as a result of the potential rejection of LGB families as a possible/acceptable family structure.

By expanding our definition of family, and by implication, work-family conflict, we have the potential to create a more inclusive measure which is less susceptible to heterosexual bias. In contrast, by ignoring heterosexual bias in our measurement of work-family conflict, we risk silencing and rendering invisible members of LGB families in future work-family studies. As such, as scientists, we gain from an increased understanding of the inherent biases which may exist within the current work-family conflict framework through the inclusion of more diverse populations and definitions of families. In this way, the goal of the current study is to decrease potential construct contamination and deficiency in our measures, while increasing the construct validity of work-family conflict overall.

In order to identify previously unexamined heterosexual biases within the work-family conflict literature, the current study seeks to examine how conceptualizing work-family conflict as an issue of time or role overflow only, without considering identity issues may constrain our definition of what a family can be and how families are envisioned in the workplace. Specifically, the current study examines the ways in which the framing of work-family conflict as an issue of simply “not having enough hours in the
day” contributes to a heteronormative view of the family. LGB experiences of work-family conflict may be very different from heterosexual experiences of conflict, which may have consequences for the effectiveness of potential solutions. For example, in a case study of a financial company which was considered “Best in Class” in terms of work-family policy, the inclusion of gay and lesbian families in work-family programs (such as on-site childcare) defied company norms about what constituted a family (Foldy & Creed, 2003). It is clear then that, even for companies which pride themselves on being more progressive in terms of family issues, the inclusion of LGB families at work is seen as something separate from existing work-family structures. Because LGB families may not be accepted in the workplace, work-family conflict may arise from the sheer fact that an LGB family exists, which produces a theoretically different set of problems to overcome and solutions to generate.

Finally, utilizing an interdisciplinary perspective, drawing from the field of women’s studies, the theory of intersectionality will be extended and tested within the work-family domain. Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) has been defined as the idea that social identities such as race, class, and gender interact to form qualitatively different meanings and experiences (Warner, 2008, pg. 454). Because intersectionality can create methodological issues for social scientists (Shields, 2008), this important theory has remained largely out of the scientific domain. In this case, the current study is examining how LGB family identities might create different meanings and experiences in the relationship between the work domain and family domain. LGB family identities in the work-family domain have not been previously explored. As such, the current work finds applications for intersectionality theory and creates the opportunity for researchers to
garner support for the idea that LGB family identity may have an impact on the work-family domain.

**Gender and Sexuality: The Roots of Homophobia**

In order to better understand why LGB individuals might face discrimination, we must first begin with an examination of gender and gender norms within society. While sex is determined by one’s biology, gender has been defined as “a general term encompassing all social relations that separate people into different gendered statuses” (Lorber, 1994, pg. 3). Thus, gender is not solely a reflection of biology, but rather a product of a complex and interwoven pattern of interactions, which constitutes and reconstitutes what it means to be “male” and “female” at a societal level. In this way, gender is socially constructed, such that we inscribe meaning to the possession of particular anatomical parts and utilize this meaning in creating prescriptions for ourselves and for others’ actions, words, and preferences.

Extending this assertion, Kessler and McKenna (1978) argued that gender and sex were in fact both socially constructed. Thus, there is neither a clear dichotomy between genders nor between sexes, although we, as a society, push to create the illusion of these perfect dichotomies for the purposes of oppression and domination of one sex/one gender (male) over another sex/gender (female) (Lorber, 1993, pg. 6) without any confusion as to who belongs to which group. Scholars such as Judith Butler (2004) and Anne Fausto-Sterling (2000) elaborated on this, suggesting that gender and sex are not dichotomies, but rather continuous constructs. For example, Fausto-Sterling (2000) pointed out that there is a wide range of variation in genital formation and that, for this reason, a two-sex system is nonsensical and limiting to the natural variation in biological sex. Additionally,
Butler (2004), in particular, linked these ideas to sexuality, questioning the extent to which gender, sex, and sexuality are purely performative. Butler (2004) stated that gender, as well as sexuality should not be thought of categorically, but rather as continuous states of being which can fluctuate over time. Butler (2004) also highlights that, as society currently stands, our construction of gender assumes that part of being male and part of being female is implicated in who we choose as a sexual partner (someone of the opposite sex). As such, our performances of sexuality assume that there is a “natural” sexual orientation (heterosexual) and that any other orientation is merely a poor imitation. Binaries between heterosexuality and all other forms of sexuality are created, along with a false sense of naturalness for heterosexuality and a false sense of abnormality for any form of sexuality that strays from heterosexuality (strictly defined). Because gender norms lay the framework for assumptions that individuals should prefer to engage in romantic behavior with a member of the opposite sex, the link between the false naturalization of gendered performance and of heterosexuality is made. As such, LGB individuals (or any sexuality which is not heterosexual) may be viewed negatively at a societal or individual level because they simultaneously break with strongly rooted gender norms and exhibit “unnatural” sexual behavior. As such, LGB individuals at work face discrimination which may be compounded, stemming from both gendered and sexuality-based domains.

**Homosexuality and “Natural” Sexuality**

In order to better understand why LGB employees might experience work-family conflict differently than heterosexual employees, it is particularly important to understand why LGB individuals may experience the workplace in general differently than their
heterosexual counterparts. The idea that LGB individuals are “unnatural” contributes to the idea that prejudice against LGB individuals is justified (similar to the ways in which working women were originally thought to be unnatural in the workplace and suffered discrimination as a result). The pathologizing of homosexuality and the view that LGB individuals are “sick”, or that they make the choice to be LGB (Sedgwick, 1991) shifts the blame from the discriminating entity to the victim of this discrimination. If the LGB subject is “ill”, then it is not discriminatory to be wary of offering a gay person a job or to think that an LGB individual cannot perform the job as well as a heterosexual individual. Although homosexuality has been removed from the DSM, the idea that mental instability and homosexuality are linked still pervades society.

In addition, the idea that LGB families do not promote “family values” and that, in order to have a moral society, we must cling to a traditional family structure, where heterosexual, nuclear families are superior, has made LGB families a subject of disgust and fear (Stacey, 1998). For example, The Family Research Council released the following statement in 1996: “What at first glance appears to be a harmless gesture of ‘tolerance’ toward gay individuals in the workplace actually is a mighty weapon to be used against employers, other employees who believe that homosexuality is wrong, and against the freedoms of association, religion, and speech” (Creed, Scully, & Austin, 2002, pg. 488). This statement clearly reveals the fear and hatred (as well as slippery slope logic) used to manipulate the general public into believing that granting equal rights to gay individuals in the workplace is just the first step in creating a chaotic world, which is devoid of morals and freedom for organizations. Finally, having a limited definition of
family, which is believed to be universal and heterosexual, justifies discrimination against LGB families (Collier, Rosaldo, & Yanagisako, 1998).

Colgan, Creegan, McKeary, & Wright (2008) demonstrated the inability for individuals to recognize the possibility of an LGB family in an interview with a lesbian from a local authority organization who disclosed that she was often assumed to be heterosexual because she had children and found that people were often confused when she revealed her lesbian identity. In this example, the presence of the markers of a nuclear family (e.g. children) made assumed heterosexuality a necessity and, once discovered, rendered homosexuality almost incomprehensible. Williams, Giuffre, & Dellinger (2009) highlight the “sexuality in organizations” theoretical approach, which runs counter to the assumption that the workplace is a sex-neutral domain. A reexamination of the workplace utilizing the assumption that the workplace is, in fact, full of sexuality-based assumptions, leads to the identification of at least three ways in which heterosexuality is maintained and normalized within organizations. These are: 1) through policies which favor nuclear families, 2) through the reinforcement of dating and marriage norms within the workplace without equal recognition of these rituals within the homosexual community, and 3) through interactions between coworkers and clients which assume, reinforce, and naturalize heterosexuality, while subsequently marginalizing, obscuring, and nativizing the possibility of an LGB identity (Williams et al., 2009).

One police officer noted after coming out the closet that he didn’t feel invisible any longer, as a result of being able to talk about his partner (Miller, Forest, & Jurik, 2003). This demonstrates that, for those who are unable to talk about their sexuality at
work, sexual (and, therefore, personal) identity within that space is essentially erased. Thus, if the language that we use when describing and defining “family” does not allow for the possibility of an LGB family, then LGB families are rendered invisible and impossible (Foucault, 1992).

**LGB Employees and Discrimination**

In order to demonstrate the importance of this study, it is important to recognize that workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian workers remains a pernicious issue. While workplace discrimination is a separate construct from work-family conflict, making clear the strife and struggle that LGB employees experience in the workplace contributes to a better understanding of why LGB individuals may experience work-family conflict differently than their heterosexual counterparts. Because organizations are not required to include sexual minority status within non-discrimination statements (the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which would add sexual minority status to the list of protected classes, has not yet been passed), LGB individuals can be fired at will without any legal protection (Van Den Bergh, 2004). Further, only 16 states have laws protecting against discrimination due to sexual minority status (Beatty & Kirby, 2006). Additionally, even within states which have laws protecting against LGB discrimination, these laws can be overturned at the federal level (Beatty & Kirby, 2006).

One possible result of the lack of legal protection for LGB individuals is that between 25 and 66% of LGB employees have experienced sexual orientation discrimination at work (Croteau, 1996). The lower end of this estimate falls in line with reports of gender and ethnic harassment, with 23.5% of women in male-dominated workplaces reporting discrimination and 20.8% of Blacks reporting racial discrimination.
from White supervisors, when working within diverse communities (Avery, McKay, & Wilson, 2008). These statistics are comparable, given that population estimates for LGB employees suggest that it’s likely that a majority of individuals within a workplace would be heterosexual, providing a similar context for a non-dominant LGB group as would be found within a male-dominated workplace or within a mixed race supervisor-supervisee pair.

An examination of LGB discrimination within a recent study by Hebl, Foster, Mannix, & Dovidio (2002) demonstrated that applicants who were portrayed as gay (wearing a hat which read “Gay and Proud”) when applying for a job at a local store, while not subject to greater direct discrimination (being offered a job application or being allowed to use the bathroom), were treated with greater indirect discrimination than their assumed heterosexual counterparts through the manager’s use of more verbally negative language, fewer total words, and by spending less time with candidates in general. Further, Ragins & Cornwell (2001) found that, within a sample of gay and lesbian professionals, one-third were verbally or physically harassed at work and 12% had left a previous job because of discrimination. Additionally, 37% experienced discrimination merely because they were suspected to be gay or lesbian.

The presence of homophobia may be heightened in roles with strong gender stereotypes or a strongly masculine culture. For example, in a sample of lesbian and gay police officers, 67% reported being exposed to homophobic talk and 22% reported barriers to promotion due to their LGB status (Colvin, 2008). In the same vein, male nurses experienced gay stereotyping, which led to avoidance of gay males by heterosexual males so that the latter were not viewed as “guilty by association” (Harding,
Further, the stereotype that male nurses are gay created an environment in which heterosexual males over-exerted their masculinity in order to separate themselves from their assumedly gay counterparts (Harding, 2007). Similarly, in professions such as education, where the artificial conflation of homosexuality and child molestation leads to fear and distrust of LGB individuals, it may be difficult to come out at work (Ferfolja, 2009). Overall, the persistence of LGB discrimination across professions may be due to continued social stigma associated with being gay, resulting in fear, ostracism, disregard, or even disgust towards LGB individuals at work (Embrick, Walther, & Wickens, 2007).

**Being Out at Work**

LGB employees may be aware of the risk for discrimination and decide to remain closeted in order to avoid backlash. Croteau (1996) found that fear of coming out was a major concern for LGB employees. Additional findings by Croteau (1996) demonstrate that this fear is not unfounded, as the more “out” the employee, the more likely they were to experience discrimination at work. In the same vein, Ragins, Singh, & Cornwell (2007) used stigma theory to examine fear and disclosure for LGB individuals in the workplace. The results demonstrated that fear of disclosure was positively related to psychological strain for LGB employees (as well as negatively related to attitudes, work environment, and career outcomes). On the other hand, actual disclosure was unrelated to all of these variables, including strain. Thus, gay individuals are aware of the inherent risk in revealing their true identity, which may encourage a constant state of “self-policing” at work. This is similar to the Foucaultian (Foucault, 1992) idea of the watchtower, in which the danger of being LGB at work is so ingrained that LGB individuals monitor their behavior at all times for fear of revealing salient clues about
their sexuality, even when those who wield organizational power over them may not be physically present.

The experience of invisibility and the impossibility of truly “being” at work may be stressful and both mentally and physically harmful for LGB individuals (McDermott, 2006). For example, Ellis and Riggle (1996) found that, while one’s degree of openness at work was positively related to job satisfaction, it was negatively related to satisfaction with pay and objective measures of salary. Thus, LGB individuals may be forced to choose between being happy and being objectively successful. Sometimes the strain of being “closeted” is associated with turnover. For example, a lesbian worker in the public sector noted that she would leave her workplace if she were forced to be closeted because it would be difficult to work under those constraints (Colgan et al., 2008).

Additionally, even in progressive workplaces which espouse positive views toward LGB individuals and thus have larger numbers of “out” LGB employees, LGB individuals may feel that they need to follow a particular script in order to “properly” portray their LGB identity (Williams et al., 2009). In these situations, gay employees may behave in accordance with stereotypes for gay males or lesbians in order to be accepted as authentically gay. This means that regardless of whether or not LGB individuals are out or closeted, they may follow particular prescriptions for behavior at work which indicates or is related to sexual identity. Consequently, being one’s true self may not be an option, regardless of how openly gay an employee is. Finally, even if individuals are out in the workplace and adhere to societal prescriptions for gay performance, they may need to work harder than their heterosexual counterparts in order to demonstrate their worth (similar to the ways in which women feel that they must work harder than their
male counterparts (Gorman & Kmec, 2007)). For example, Miller et al. (2003) found in a qualitative study of police officers that many reported feeling the need to go above and beyond the call of duty in order to ensure that they would be viewed as equal. One male officer noted that he felt that the gay police officers that he knew were more dedicated to the job because they had to outperform their colleagues in order to escape criticism. Therefore, sexuality-based discrimination continues to have a negative effect on LGB employees even in the face of more progressive attempts to create fair and equal workplaces for LGB employees and persists even when employees are performing as well or better than their counterparts.

In order to avoid taking a singular view of the closeted experience, it should be mentioned that there can be power in being closeted (Brown, 2000) and, in fact, that LGB individuals may choose to remain closeted for very specific reasons and prefer to remain “under the radar” for strategic purposes. Brown (2000) discusses the LGB communities which exist unbeknownst to heterosexual communities, drawing power from silently but effectively transgressing heteronormative boundaries. As such, remaining in the closet is not always indicative of a lack of power or an inability to be one’s authentic self, but can be a strategic and powerful choice which individuals willingly make. Issues may arise, however, if individuals actively wish to be out of the closet and are unable to do so because of a hostile environment or culture (as discussed in the previously cited literature (Croteau, 1996; Ragins et al., 2007; Ellis & Riggle, 1996)). As such, the current study will examine the relationships among being closeted and potential stressors that may arise as a result. In sum, it is important to note that for some individuals, being closeted may not be a stressor and, if chosen freely, may even be a source of power.
LGB Families and Organizational Policy

Finally, organizational policy and practice also plays a major role in the level of discrimination that LGB workers experience (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Button, 2001). However, because sexual orientation is not a protected class under Title VII, organizations are not required by law to provide safe spaces for LGB employees or to be LGB friendly within the United States. Many organizations do not have domestic partner benefits and will not extend the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) to domestic partners (Van Den Bergh, 2004). This is detrimental to LGB workers because organizational policy and practice has been demonstrated to be the best predictor of the frequency and severity of discrimination in the workplace (Button, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). While legislative policy was also a contributing factor to reported LGB discrimination, proximal policy within the organization is one of the most powerful predictors of workplace experiences for LGB individuals (Button, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001).

Similarly, Rosotsky and Riggle (2002) found when both members of a gay couple were working for companies which had non-discrimination policies, they were more likely to disclose their sexuality at work. Thus, because LGB individuals are not able to benefit from the presence of inclusive anti-discrimination policies, inconsistent and potentially damaging experiences for LGB workers and families are more likely to occur across the career span.

Organizations which do not espouse a friendly climate toward LGB individuals create spaces in which it is both frightening and detrimental for employees to reveal their “family of choice” (Van Den Bergh, 2004). Further, while it has been demonstrated that participation in a diversity training which includes information about sexuality may
increase positive attitudes toward LGB individuals (Probst, 2003), diversity training sessions (particularly those including sexuality) are not commonly offered within organizations. Therefore, because work-family conflict is a major issue in the workplace, and because members of LGB families may be discriminated against, it is necessary to examine the ways in which our measurement of and solutions for work-family conflict may be rooted in heterosexism. Importantly, the first step is to examine the measurement of work-family conflict in the context of LGB families.

**Heterosexual bias in Measurement**

Within the psychology literature, researchers are consistently concerned with the presence of bias within our measures and our studies. Measurement error, survey bias, and unfair testing practices are studied, examined, and avoided when possible. However, one type of bias which the psychology literature has not thoroughly examined is heterosexual bias. Heterosexual bias is a belief system that places more value on heterosexuality and/or perceives heterosexuality as being more ‘natural’ than homosexuality (Morin, 1977). Heterosexual bias is reinforced by systems and methodologies which assume heterosexuality as a given (heteronormativity), privileging heterosexual viewpoints and rendering other views unnecessary or invisible. Thus, psychological measures are constructed and tested within populations which are assumed a priori to be heterosexual. As such, heterosexuality becomes the normative vantage point from which psychologists study “natural” phenomenon. However, given that LGB individuals are estimated to make up anywhere from 4 to 17% of the workforce (Gonsiorek & Weinrich, 1991), our measures may prove insufficient for a substantial portion of our survey participants.
Because it has been determined that homosexuality is not in and of itself a mental illness, but rather that mental health issues can be caused by the experience of discrimination (Waldo, 1999; Smith & Ingram, 2004), it is not the goal of this study to highlight potential dissimilarities between heterosexual and LGB individuals on a variety of personality measures. In contrast, the current study strives to demonstrate that our work-family measurement tools may contain items which are differentially interpreted across heterosexual and LGB groups, introducing bias and inaccuracy into our research. Particularly, the current study seeks to highlight the ways in which our current measures may be potentially contaminated by heterosexism. While various forms of bias (gender bias, age bias, race bias) may also contaminate and/or make deficient constructs in a similar way, sexuality is an identity category which is often backgrounded. While this study does not purport to claim that heterosexual bias is the only type of bias that may exist in our measures, it does serve as a first look at the ways in which identity-based bias may contaminate our existing measures and provides insight into a generally understudied population. This study also highlights the possibility that the construct of work-family conflict is potentially deficient because it is not capturing the full range of ways in which work can conflict with family (and vice versa), particularly for LGB families. While it is certainly the case that for some LGB individuals, items will be interpreted in the same way as it would be for non-LGB counterparts (particularly for those who do not view being LGB as central to their identity (Creed & Cooper, 2008)), we cannot determine the extent to which our measures are accurately capturing the experiences of LGB individuals until we thoroughly examine these measures from an
LGB viewpoint. Thus, the burden lies with the researcher to build a better and more accurate form of measurement.

Figure 1 demonstrates the hypothesized overlap and differences between work-family conflict as it is currently measured and a more inclusive measure of work-family conflict. For example, there is the opportunity for overlap between LGB families’ and heterosexual families’ experiences where we would find the current measures to suffice (“I just don’t have enough hours in the day”, for example). However, there are also places where we might find contamination (“Being a part of my family is stressful at work” might mean something different to a heterosexual family member than an LGB family member) and deficiency (“I can’t even talk about my family at work, but there is not a place within this measure for me to report that experience”). The current measure contains the contamination and the overlap, but we have not yet explored its deficiencies.

*Figure 1. Conceptual Model of Current Work-Family Measures.*

**Heterosexual Bias and Invisible Identities**

It is likely that one reason heterosexual bias in measurement has not been closely examined within the psychology literature is because homosexuality is an invisible stigma (Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Badgett, 1996). Stigma is defined as the negative
discrepancy between actual or inferred attributes of an individual when compared to actual or inferred attributes of a typical individual in a particular setting (Goffman, 1963). In the case of sexuality, when sexual identity information is not readily offered, individuals are inclined to infer the attributes of others. Heterosexism is a direct result of the automatic inference that all individuals are heterosexual. However, when individuals display stereotypically gay or lesbian stereotypes, the opposite inference may be made (that the individual is LGB). This layer of invisibility makes sexuality different than gender or race, which are easily identifiable and are thus more heavily researched within empirical work. Because one cannot readily tell if an individual is LGB or not, sexual orientation often goes unmeasured and unexamined. In order for researchers to examine the construct validity of measures and outcomes among heterosexual and LGB populations, we must first ask the question of whether or not someone identifies as something other than heterosexual (for example, the current study asks whether someone identifies as gay, heterosexual, lesbian or bisexual and if there is a preferred term outside of these categories, in case none of these are accurate). The majority of psychological studies do not ask this question, and thus LGB individuals become a silenced minority.

Further, invisible stigmatized identities (such as sexual identity) are subject to a variety of different identity management strategies that are not necessary for visible stigmatized identities. For example, those with stigmatized identities may be aware of the stigma associated with their identity and, thus, are often vigilant in managing information that is provided about this identity within every social interaction, thereby producing a preoccupation or obsession with others’ potentially offensive thoughts and feelings regarding one’s social status (Goffman, 1963). Anticipated stigma is linked to identity
disclosure at work (Ragins & Cornwell, 1991). The more negative the anticipated reaction is, the less likely it is that individuals will disclose (Ragins & Cornwell, 1991). Beatty and Kirby (1996) suggest that there are a number of invisible stigmatized identities (religion, disability, mental illness, chronic illness), and then provide a list of specific dimensions which can be utilized in order to determine the severity of the stigma an individual possesses.

The first dimension is responsibility, which allows individuals to determine whether or not the stigma is the fault of the person who possesses the stigmatized identity. For LGB individuals, the debate about whether or not being gay is a choice is particularly salient for determining this stigmatized identity. Course is the second dimension, which refers to whether or not a stigmatized identity is seen as permanent. It is suggested that permanent identities are more stigmatized than those which are able to change. If sexuality is viewed as immutable, this is associated with greater stigma than if it is viewed as changeable. The third dimension is moral threat, which may be linked to perceived conflicts between religion and sexuality. Thus, the more morally reprehensible homosexuality is deemed to be, the more stigmatized the identity will be. Finally, performance is the fourth dimension, suggesting that the extent to which an individual’s invisible identity is viewed as potentially damaging to work performance, the higher the stigma. Thus, in workplaces where the climate is not accepting of LGB individuals, the stigmatization of this identity will be exacerbated. All four of these dimensions relate to LGB identity, creating a particularly difficult bind for LGB individuals at work. Finally, Goffman (1963) also makes it clear that the majority population and those who are considered “deviant” will actively (although discreetly) arrange social situations so that
uncomfortable or difficult dialogues do not occur. As such, it is likely that the work-family domain, while important to both LGB individuals and heterosexual individuals alike, is viewed as being potentially fraught with opportunities for placing one’s LGB or lesbian identity at the forefront. As such, these situations and important conversations regarding LGB work-family issues are avoided, both by LGB and heterosexual individuals within the organization. Taken as a whole, the literature suggests that revealing one’s identity as an LGB individual is a choice which involves deciding whether it is more important (or at least less harmful) to discontinue the use of stressful identity management strategies or to open one’s self up to potential stigma and stereotyping. Because neither of these options results in a positive outcome for LGB individuals, deciding which is the “lesser of two evils” may be the best strategy one can hope for.

The lack of measurement regarding sexuality is in contrast to the fervent efforts to protect against adverse impact for gender or race (barring the necessity for these analyses because of legal implications). While interesting, it is not surprising that race and gender would be preferred demographic controls, given the visibility of both categories and the ease with which organizations can examine pass-fail rates for these groups. For example, if all of the men get a particular item on an ability test correct, but only a small percentage of women get the same item correct, we can determine that some degree of bias may exist within this item. However, when measures do not have a “correct” answer and when identities are not surface-level, it is much more difficult to infer where and how bias may be introduced. The fact that sexuality is rarely measured within psychological demographic questionnaires makes it difficult to decipher whether or not our measures
are providing an accurate assessment across groups. Further, as previously stated, LGB individuals are not protected under Title VII in a majority of states (Ragins, 2004; Beatty & Kirby, 2006; Colvin, 2009) and thus, organizations and applied researchers do not have an impetus to examine the effects of various measures on LGB populations.

The invisibility of LGB status in conjunction with the popular idea that homosexuality is a choice (Beatty & Kirby, 2006), may contribute to the belief that legal protection is unwarranted for sexual minorities. This distinction becomes clear when comparing legislation for those with mental illness to sexual minorities. While both statuses are often invisible, sexuality is seen as an option, whereas mental illness is seen as inborn (Beatty & Kirby, 2006). As a result, the mentally ill have formal legal protection in the workplace, while LGB individuals often lack these protections (Beatty & Kirby, 2006).

Finally, because of the formal lack of legal protection for LGB employees, society is more accepting of prejudice toward LGB individuals in general. For example, Colgan et al. (2008) interviewed fifty lesbians in the United Kingdom, with one woman noting that, while outward racism is no longer socially acceptable, LGB individuals continue to suffer from discrimination.

Given the previously discussed literature pertaining to discrimination, stigma, and a lack of solid measurement of the experiences of LGB individuals in the workplace, the current study attempts to 1) assess participants’ sexuality (making LGB participants visible), and then 2) assess whether or not our work-family conflict measures contain heterosexual bias (are contaminated or deficient) and, finally, 3) address this potential deficiency issue by generating items for a more inclusive work-family conflict measure.
LGB Employees and Disclosure Disconnects

Looking at the way in which behaving at home differs from the way in which one is able to behave at work provides a direct vantage point into the push and pull of work versus family domains for LGB individuals. This tension has been noted by Ragins (2004) who also highlights the likelihood that LGB individuals are “out” to differing degrees in work and family settings. The differing degrees to which LGB employees disclose to various constituents has been demonstrated in empirical work (Schope, 2002), showing that LGB employees disclose at different rates to parents, spouses, friends, schoolmates, and work colleagues. This variation in “outness” across groups creates a “disclosure disconnect” (Ragins, 2004) which is stressful for LGB employees. Thus, Ragins (2004) draws attention to the potential for exacerbated disconnects between work and family spheres for members of the LGB community, but does not explicitly test these assumptions (as the current study attempts to do).

Further, Hill (2009) notes that LGB families are often expected to leave their family lives at home, while heterosexual families may not have to worry about creating such high levels of separation between work and family life. This creates an important difference in the work-family conflict experienced by heterosexual families versus LGB families. It may in fact be the case that, for heterosexual families, separation between work and family domains leads to lower work-family conflict. However, it may also be the case that, when convenient, heterosexual employees are also able to effectively infuse work and family spheres (less separation between the two spheres, through on-site childcare, being able to bring family to work events, etc.) in order to decrease the amount of work-family conflict experienced. Thus, the impetus to separate work and family
domains (by choice) or to increase ways in which work and family time can be combined may be beneficial because these solutions involve a variety of potentially useful options which may be freely chosen by heterosexual employees. In contrast, for LGB families, the option to mix work with family may not be available, resulting in the forced building of barriers between work and family domains.

Thus, within organizations where employees do not accept LGB families as legitimate, the active separation between work and family domains is not done by choice, such that even speaking about one’s LGB relationship/family at work is considered taboo. Therefore, it may be that the separation of work and family domains is an issue of having options – an employee (no matter what their sexuality) benefits from the ability to choose to leave work at the office and family at home when it is convenient. However, for LGB families this decision is made a priori – the family domain is deemed unacceptable within the work domain. The conclusion here is that, while attempting to extricate work and family domains from one another may be a plausible solution for work-family conflict in heterosexual families, this very act may be creating work-family conflict for LGB families.

The implicit message when an organization allows for selective separation of work and family time is that the organization is cognizant of the presence of the heterosexual family and thus creates policy and practices which make it possible for employees to keep family time “sacred”. On the other hand, when LGB relationships/families are unable to be visible at work (forcibly separating the work and family spheres), it indicates that political decisions may have been made within the organization to promulgate the belief that the LGB family is, in fact, nonexistent. The
organization continues to propagate this idea by lacking fair and inclusive workplace policy. In effect, the decision to “allow” employees to keep work and family domains separate or integrated is quite different from the forcible separation of work and family realms through fear and lack of acceptability, particularly when this separation is not favorable or best for the employee.

This assertion is supported by empirical research by Day and Schoenrade (2000) which shows that higher levels of disclosure is associated with less perceived conflict between work and home domains (using a one-item measure of WFC). Further, when employees are unable to combine work time with family time when it is convenient, the practice of offering this option to some employees (heterosexual) and not others (LGB) becomes discriminatory and unequally privileges one group over another.

Therefore, current work-family measures may be insufficient for evaluating the level of work-family conflict present for all family types. The present study will attempt to demonstrate that, not only are current measures inaccurate, but that there is the possibility for a more inclusive (and thus, more accurate) form of work-family conflict measurement. The present research argues that by asking LGB individuals about the way in which they experience work-family conflict, we are better equipped to build an accurate measure for assessing the needs of this population. In the next section, the most common conceptualization of work and family conflict is presented. Further, the content or components for this conceptualization are identified and discussed in terms of potential for construct deficiency and contamination within an LBG population.
Work-Family Conflict and LGB Families: One Potential Missing Link

There are various ways in which work-family conflict has been conceptualized and measured within the psychology literature. One of the most popular definitions of work family conflict comes from Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). The three types of work-family conflict highlighted by Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) were 1) time-based conflict, which occurs when time devoted to one role makes it difficult to devote time to another role, 2) strain-based conflict, which transpires when strain experienced in one role interferes with strain in another role, and 3) behavior-based conflict, which occurs when behaviors required in order to fill one role are in competition with behaviors required to fill another role.

This three-pronged approach to work-family conflict has been utilized in a variety of studies pertaining to work-family conflict since its inception. As such, Carlson et al. (2000) used this framework in an attempt to create a synthesized measure which was centered on these three different conceptualizations of work-family (and family-work) conflict by validating items from eight existing measures, as well as adding original items in order to increase validity. Because these authors combined eight of the most popular existing measures (resulting in 18 non-redundant items), the current study utilizes their synthesized scale as its primary focus. While this scale is certainly not the only work-family scale in existence, because it statistically combines the most popular work-family measures in the literature, Carlson et al. (2000) is able to provide a concise, effective, and non-redundant measure of work-family conflict. Further, as Carlson et al. (2000) point out, it is difficult to find studies which utilize all six dimensions of work-family and family-work conflict. For this reason, the Carlson et al. (2000) measure is useful in that it
provides a complete measure of each dimension and a more accurate overview of the work-family construct as a whole. As such, the findings of this study can be used to critique and inform a variety of studies which use some or all of the six dimension work-family framework (time, strain, and behavior based items) and can provide guidance for the inclusion of additional unique items within existing work-family scales.

**Heterosexually Biased Items and the Opportunity for Differential Interpretation**

The Carlson et al. (2000) work-family conflict scale is composed of 6 different dimensions: time (work-family and family-work), strain (work-family and family-work), and behavior-based (work-family and family-work). Carlson et al. (2000) selected non-redundant items across 25 scales in the work-family literature, resulting in the inclusion of 31 individual items from 8 scales, which were in turn narrowed down to 18 final items. Carlson et al. (2000) then generated a group of original items before the scale was factor analyzed and validated against a variety of work-family outcomes.

For the purposes of the current study, the items within this scale are of interest due to the possibility of heterosexual bias. Again, because this scale represents a synthesis of twenty-five popular measures, it provides a starting point for identifying the potential pitfalls of various work-family scales within one singular measure. Thus, the current study used this particular measurement tool because it allows for the exploration of all of the existing dimensions of work-family conflict while providing a meta-analyzed version of many existing work-family conflict items. For the purposes of this study, it is important to examine work-family conflict items individually for potential heterosexual bias. As such, the items within the scale are listed below in Table 1.
Table 1. Carlson, Kacmar, and Williams (2000) Work-Family Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-based work interference with family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-based family interference with work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The time I spend on family responsibilities often interferes with my work responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain-based work interference with family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain-based family interference with work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior-based work interference with family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent or spouse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior-based family interference with work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be as effective at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The problem-solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These items, when viewed from a non-heterosexually biased viewpoint may highlight why current work-family measures are problematic. In order to assess each item
for heterosexual bias, individual items which may be differentially interpreted within this measure will be reviewed below. Again, it is important to note that, while this is not the only measure of work-family conflict available, it provides a sufficient framework for assessing the extent to which LGB individuals may experience similar/dissimilar work-family conflict and the extent to which unique issues may be identified with regards to the LGB population.

**Time-Based Work-Family and Family-Work Conflict.** Beginning with time-based work interference with family, items such as “my work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like” were retained in the final version of the Carlson et al. (2000) scale. From a heterosexual viewpoint, this item clearly relates to time. In contrast, from an LGB vantage point, this item may have a different interpretation. For example, being kept from family activities because of work could be due to a variety of circumstances which may have little to do with time. For instance, if one works in a small town and does not feel the need to reveal his/her LGB identity to an employer, then work may serve to keep LGB families away from taking part in activities where it is likely that they will be observed by a colleague, even if there is ample time to perform such activities. Further, being able to bring a spouse or significant other to work events has been noted as a major determinant of satisfaction in the workplace for LGB individuals (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Those who are unable to bring their spouse or family to work events may feel that they are missing family time because they are unable to combine work and family time, even when they are “off the clock.”

Authors have noted that those who hide their sexual orientation at work may find it stressful merely discussing summer vacations, weekend activities, or other occurrences
outside of work (Preston, Fredericksen, & Herrschaft, 2006; Gedro, 2007). Thus, the fear of revealing one’s sexual identity may keep employees from participating in activities through which they may be “outed”. Further, this is likely to vary along with level of outness. Those who are out to everyone at work would be unlikely to feel that they need to shield themselves from being seen at events outside of the workplace. However, for those who are out to only a few or to none, the consequences of being seen with one’s partner or family outside of the workplace are much greater. The other two items within time-based work interference with family are more clearly worded to be about time specifically and, as such, are unlikely to pose a problem in terms of heterosexual bias.

Time-based family interference with work also contains another potentially problematic item – “the time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.” When read in the context of a heterosexual family, the item reflects an issue of time – if you are spending lots of time with your family, there is not enough time to take part in work activities. However, members of an LGB family may feel as if spending time with their family is inextricably linked with being a part of a family structure which is not well accepted at work. Thus, for those who are “out” in the workplace, this item might read very differently, such that the interpretation may become “the fact that I am part of an LGB family causes me to be passed over when opportunities arise at work.” Further, if a closeted LGB employee is unable to take part in social gatherings where employees are expected to bring their partners or becomes involved in conversations surrounding weekend plans, vacations, and the like, he/she may feel disconnected from others in the workplace and thus less likely to receive rewards at work. Therefore, deciding whether or not to participate in
activities at work which could result in potential rewards for employees may not have anything to do with whether or not one has time to complete these activities and more to do with whether or not one feels comfortable participating in such activities.

It is important to mention that one of the most popular interventions to work family conflict stems from the time-based dimension of work-family conflict: flexible working arrangements. Flexible work arrangements (FWA) have been conceptualized as the ability to vary working hours and scheduling around one’s personal obligations and family needs (Rau & Hyland, 2000). For example, Shockley & Allen (2007) found that flexible work arrangements (FWA) were related to a decrease in the experience of work-family conflict for women who had high levels of family responsibility. Further, flexible working arrangements are becoming increasingly popular in organizations as effective interventions for work-family conflict. Yet, Rau & Hyland (2002) found that flextime only has positive effects for those who experience high levels of work-family conflict, as it is traditionally measured. It may be important to note, however, that time is only one determinant of work-family constraints and, while lack of time may be a primary facet of work-family conflict for LGB individuals, similarly to their heterosexual counterparts, there may be additional layers of work-family conflict that LGB individuals experience.

**Strain-Based Work-Family and Family-Work Conflict.** The strain-based items focus on a different facet of work-family conflict, such that the interpretation may be the same across heterosexual and LGB participants, yet antecedents may vary. For example, the strain-based work-family conflict scale includes the items, “When I get home from work, I am often too frazzled to take part in family activities/responsibilities, “I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing
to my family”, and “Due to pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.” While these items may be interpreted similarly by either heterosexual or LGB participants, the root cause for being frazzled, emotionally drained, or stressed may be different. For those who are part of an LGB family, stress and strain may be higher due to a need to hide one’s family identity at work. As such, LGB participants may score higher on these items than their heterosexual counterparts.

Similarly, the items within the strain-based family-work conflict scale that read “Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work”, “Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I often have a hard time concentrating on my work”, and “Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job”, may also receive a greater level of endorsement from LGB participants. Stress, tension and anxiety arising directly from family life may arise from the stress and strain of everyday living, but can also be compounded by the inability to reveal one’s family structure at work. Again, such items may be measuring a different kind of “strain” from an LGB versus a heterosexual position, given that emotional experiences and anxiety can arise when employees are discriminated against for being LGB in the workplace, or are “closeted” and find themselves in heterosexist work environments. Thus, for these items, we may find a higher level of endorsement (representing contamination) and a different set of antecedents for these items. As discussed previously, all of this may be due to overflow from other unmeasured domains of work-family conflict for LGB relationships/families, potentially demonstrating deficiency in the criterion.

For example, Button (2000) found that those who experienced higher levels of workplace discrimination due to LGB status were also more likely to use strategies such
as counterfeiting (pretending to be heterosexual) or avoiding (acting as if one has no sexuality at all) in the workplace. The use of these strategies may be stressful for members of the LGB community, particularly if they are utilized to avoid discriminatory behavior. Although being “closeted” is not equivalent to being dishonest (Chung, 2001), there are number of reasons that an LGB identified person may wish to remain closeted (and power may reside in the closet) (Brown, 2000; Ferfolja, 2009). For those individuals who do not wish to be closeted yet feel they have no other choice, choosing strategies of silence may cause anxiety. There is evidence to suggest that LGB individuals who work in gay-friendly environments and who are out in the workplace experience higher job satisfaction and lower anxiety (Griffith & Hebl, 2002). Further, lesbians in workplaces with a gay-friendly climate experience less stress in the workplace and also have higher levels of job satisfaction (Driscoll, Kelley, & Fassinger, 1996). Sheer amount of disclosure, however, had no effect on stress or job satisfaction (Driscoll et al., 1996).

It should be noted that coming out in the workplace is effective when top management and colleagues are supportive of LGB lifestyles (Day & Schoenrade, 2000). However, for heterosexual families, tensions may arise from family responsibilities only, while LGB families have these same responsibilities and in addition may experience intense emotionality and stress due to unfriendly work circumstances. Thus, the stress that stems from an anti-LGB family environment at work may be associated with higher ratings for stress-based items and the primary reason may be LGB relationship/family identity, not a stressful family or workload.

**Behavior-Based Work-Family and Family-Work Conflict.** Finally, heterosexist bias may exist in the behavior-based work-family conflict and family-work
conflict items. For behavior-based work-family conflict, the items read: “The problem solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in solving problems at home”, “Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home”, and “The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not make me a better parent and spouse.” These items may be both differentially interpreted as well as endorsed to a greater degree by LGB versus heterosexual participants. For example, the behaviors that may make one more “effective” at work (aka, denying one’s family, pretending to be heterosexual, etc.) would not contribute to being an effective member of an LGB family. While these behaviors are not the only behaviors which contribute to on-the-job performance, they represent a subset of activities which are not required of heterosexual employees and thus expand the requirements for what it takes to be “successful” on the job. Further, while faking or passing behaviors are not equivalent to actual job-related tasks (typing, answering phone calls, dealing with customers, etc.), they must be constantly monitored and, thus, have the potential to infringe upon or affect those behaviors which are directly job-related. Thus, it is possible that LGB individuals may be aware of the necessity of these behaviors at work and may interpret items in light of this range of seemingly “required” on-the-job behaviors.

Similarly, the behavior-based family work conflict items highlight these same themes. They read: “The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be effective at work”, “Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work”, and “The problem solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.” The behavior-based work-family and family-work conflict items may be differentially interpreted by LGB participants because
behaviors which are necessary at work and behaviors that “work” at home may not necessarily coincide for members of LGB families. In a heterosexist workplace, behaviors that occur at home (being affectionate towards one’s partner, talking freely about family structure, acknowledging one’s family at all) may be damaging when performed at work, and are most likely limited even in their discussion in the workplace.

Again, rather than highlight the differences between heterosexual and LGB family structures (certainly there are more similarities than differences between heterosexual and LGB families), the goal of the current study is to highlight the potential for differential interpretation and potentially inaccurate measurement when administering current work-family measures to members of the LGB community who may be working and living in heterosexist spaces. While heterosexual employees may be able to call attention to the differing behaviors required within work and family spaces at work, LGB individuals may feel uncomfortable speaking about these concerns – particularly if they are not yet “out” in the workplace.

**A More Inclusive Measure of Work-Family Conflict**

In order to verify the underlying structure of the inclusive work-family conflict measure that the current study proposes, it is important to assess work-family conflict at a basic level. Because the current literature does not yet contain information which would either support or deny similarities/differences between work-family conflict for LGB individuals versus a general (assumedly heterosexual, within the current literature) population sample, the current work attempts to develop a more inclusive measure. As such, the current work will begin qualitatively, asking questions about defining work-family conflict within LGB samples, as well as providing a preliminary quantitative
analysis of potential antecedents of work-family conflict for LGB individuals. In this way, we may come to better understand whether or not our current measures are “working” for LGB individuals and within the LGB community and which differences/similarities might exist across diverse identities (with regards to demographics and LGB identities). That is, in addition to asking LGB individuals how they experience work-family conflict as an LGB person and how they interpret current work-family conflict items, participants will be asked to respond to a number of traditionally used measures of antecedents, mediators or moderators and outcomes of work-family conflict.

**Potential Antecedents of LGB Work-Family Conflict**

In order to properly evaluate the conditions under which LGB individuals may experience work-family conflict to a greater or lesser degree, it is important to consider potential precursors to work-family conflict. Because there has not been any extensive work examining the relationships between potential antecedents and work-family conflict in an LGB sample, the current study will provide a preliminary analysis to lay the framework for studies which will examine these variables within this population.

**Social support.** First, work-family conflict has been found to be negatively related to social support (Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987; Schaubroeck, Cotton, & Jennings, 1989). This antecedent was tested in Carlson et al. (2000) in constructing their meta-measure of work-family conflict as well. Further, supervisor support was found to be linked to job satisfaction, coworker support was found to be linked to life satisfaction, and organizational support was found to be linked to being out at work in a sample of ninety-nine LGB individuals (Huffman, Watrous-Rodriguez, &
Thus, as social support increases (general social support, supervisor support, coworker support, and organizational support), it is likely that LGB work-family conflict will decrease.

**Level of outness.** In addition to examining relationships between work-family measures and various attitudinal and support-based outcomes, it is important to recognize the potential link between level of “outness” and work-family conflict. As previously discussed, work-family conflict may be higher for those who are not able to be out in the workplace, given that this is a key indicator that one’s LGB family is not considered “acceptable” at work. In this vein, it is hypothesized that degree of outness will be negatively related to experiences of work-family conflict. In order to assess level of outness, the current study will utilize Griffin’s (1992) four strategies for sexual identity management. Griffin (1992) demonstrated through qualitative work with LGB populations that employees may use passing, covering, being implicitly out, or being explicitly out at work. Passing involves attempting to create the illusion of heterosexuality, while covering is the active attempt to conceal information related to sexual identity. Being implicitly out involves providing information which may give clues to one’s sexual preferences without directly stating one’s sexuality. Being explicitly out involves clearly stating one’s sexual preferences to others.

Because degree of disclosure is a predictor of a variety of important workplace outcomes (see Ragins, 2004 for a review), it makes sense that those who are more “out” at work will experience less work-family conflict. Further, it has been suggested that “passing” creates dissonance between the “I” (self identity) and the “me” (interpersonal identity) (DeJordy, 2008). This dissonance leads to a high level of vigilance in
monitoring one’s identity across spaces, which leads to higher levels of boundary management (DeJordy, 2008) between “out” and “closeted” domains.

**Fear of disclosure and fear of negative evaluation.** Further, LGB individuals who are closeted may also experience higher levels of fear of disclosure than out LGB individuals (Ragins et al., 2007). Additionally, scholars have suggested that fear and shame play a role in disclosure decisions (Croteau, 1996). Fear of disclosure and a fear of negative self-evaluation may be related to work-family conflict. If LGB individuals are afraid to disclose their sexual orientation and are more focused on the opinions of others, it may be the case that they also perceive a greater clash between their work and family life (due to the possibility that these individuals are less willing to share personal information in a variety of settings and are more likely to actively attempt to please others).

**Centrality of sexual identity.** Finally, it is also likely that the more strongly one sees their sexual identity as being central to their overall identity, the more likely it is that they will report experiencing work-family conflict. Centrality of identity has been found to relate to identity salience (Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998) for race. It is possible, then, that this also holds for sexuality. The current work seeks to explore whether or not identity centrality plays a role in sexual identity as well.

**Perceived discrimination and presence of organizational policy.** Additionally, it is likely that (within the LGB sample) perceived discrimination will be related to work-family conflict. It is logical that some level of discrimination (whether explicit or implicit) would be underlying in workplaces in which LGB individuals feel that their family values clash with the values of the workplace. If the workplace does not explicitly
or implicitly value LGB families, LGB individuals may be more likely to perceive discrimination at work. Similarly, it has been demonstrated that organizational policy is the best predictor of discrimination for LGB employees at work (Button, 2001; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). As such, it is likely that those individuals working within organizations with better LGB policies will likely experience less work-family conflict.

**Gender.** Finally, while patterns of work-family conflict differ by gender in heterosexual samples (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991), this same pattern may not hold true for LGB couples. Gay and lesbian couples are found to split household chores and responsibilities for child care in a much more egalitarian fashion than heterosexual couples (Solomon, Rothblum, & Balsam, 2005). In fact, the strongest predictor of the division of household labor was found to be sexual orientation, which predicted over and above income differences in a mixed sample of heterosexual and LGB couples (Solomon et al., 2005). Because these findings are tentative, exploratory analyses will be conducted to examine the role of gender in relation to work-family conflict within the LGB sample. Additional demographic variables will be explored to the extent possible in order to better understand how intersectional identities may play a role in work-family conflict for LGB employees.

**Research Questions**

As highlighted in the previous literature review, the current study seeks to begin developing a more inclusive scale of work-family conflict, beginning from the perspective of LGB families/relationships. As such, the current work attempts to begin to understand whether or not work-family conflict is experienced differently or similarly by those in LGB relationships/families and, if it is experienced differently, to create a
measure which properly expresses those differences in an accurate way. The following sections will address how the current work fills a gap in the literature by beginning to answer the following questions: 1) How do LGB individuals experience work-family conflict?, 2) Are current work-family conflict measures deficient in capturing LGB family experiences?, 3) Are existing work-family conflict items interpreted the same way in LGB populations?, 4) What are some possible predictors of work-family conflict for those in LGB relationships/families using current work-family conflict scales? and 5) What might an inclusive measure of work-family conflict look like? The following sections will address how the current study attempted to answer these questions and the results of this process.
Methods and Results

Study 1 - Qualitative Interviews and Preliminary Quantitative Data Collection

Overall Goal of Study 1. Hinkin (1998) stated that in order to develop a psychometrically sound measure, researchers must conform to the following formula: 1) item generation, 2) questionnaire administration, 3) initial item reduction, 4) confirmatory factor analysis, 5) convergent and divergent validity, and 6) replication. Following this outline, there were two goals within Study 1. The first of these goals can be found within the first step outlined by Hinkin (1998): construct explication and item generation. In order to generate an inclusive set of items, individual, one hour-long (approximately) interviews were conducted by the primary researcher by phone with LGB individuals. Open-ended questions were administered (after initial demographics were collected) in order to assess unique work-family challenges that they may face at work. Next, to assess the level of outness and potential antecedents, mediators or moderators of work family conflict and outcomes within an LGB sample, scales were verbally administered after the open-ended portion of the interview. All items can be found in Appendix A. Thus, the goals of Study 1 were to ensure that the domain for an LGB work-family conflict scale was accurately captured (avoiding criterion contamination and deficiency) and to assess the empirical relationships (examine the nomological network) among traditional antecedents and outcomes associated with work-family conflict within an LGB sample. The interview involved the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. Interviews were conducted until the information obtained had reached saturation. Saturation is the point at which participants are no longer providing unique information and, for a small study attempting to make claims
about a specific subpopulation, the sample size is usually smaller than for a large scale study on a general population (Charaz, 2006). Further, Jett, Grover, and Keck (2003) suggest that if the researcher has expertise in the content domain, saturation is likely to be reached more quickly. While there are very few sources that have provided clear guidelines for sample size in qualitative research, some sources have provided the following guidelines: 30-50 interviews (Morse, 1994, pg. 225), 20-30 interviews (Creswell, 1998, pg. 64) and at least 15 interviews (Berteaux, 1981, pg. 35). Following these guidelines, interviews were no longer conducted when information across participants became highly redundant. Further, because the number of interviews falls within the recommended range according to the sources cited above, it was deemed appropriate to discontinue interviewing because the sample size was acceptable. The specific details of the interview process are discussed below.

**Procedure for Study 1.** Within the hour-long interview, participants were first asked a number of demographic questions as well as qualitative and quantitative measures of sexual identity. Next, participants were provided with the definition of work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) and each dimension (e.g., strain, time and behavior based conflict) and were asked an open-ended question about what work-family conflict meant for them and what each dimension meant individually. After administering these initial open-ended questions, another series of open-ended questions were administered, which assessed the main ways in which participants experienced work-family conflict, about the extent to which strain, behavior, and time-based conflict were experienced, and the extent to which participants felt that conflict had to do with their personal values and identity (Appendix A).
After the administration of these open-ended questions, Carlson et al.’s (2000) scale was administered. After responding numerically using the Likert scale to the Carlson et al. (2000) items, individuals were asked to provide a qualitative rationale for their scale responses. This qualitative data was intended to determine whether or not LGB individuals were interpreting traditional work-family items (originally developed using heterosexual samples) differently or responding for different reasons than assumed within heterosexual samples. This methodology also provided item level data, so that each individual item could be analyzed for its potential for differential interpretation across groups. The content from these interviews were analyzed in order to generate items for a potential LGB work-family conflict scale.

Following the demographics, open-ended items, and Carlson et al.’s (2000) work-family conflict survey, a variety of scales which were potential antecedents for work-family conflict were administered and answered quantitatively. The content of these scales is described below. Verbally administered quantitative scales were also scored and analyzed. All items can be found in Appendix A. Interviews were conducted individually, as opposed to being conducted in a focus group setting, so as not to force the “outing” of individuals. The results of Study 1 are described below, following the order in which the information was obtained in the one-hour long interview: demographics, open ended questions, and verbally administered quantitative scales.

**Subject Selection and Procedure.** In order to locate interviewees, a call for participants was issued using snowball sampling. Additionally, the call for participants was sent to national LGBT listservs and posted on LGBT-related social media outlets. Specifically, the call for participants was sent to the Society for Industrial/Organizational
Psychology LGBT Committee listserv, as well as the Pennsylvania State University Commission for LGBT Equity. Further, the call for participants was posted on a Facebook page, titled LGBT News, and a LinkedIn page, titled LGBT Professional Network. Because of the reach of LGBT-related social media outlets and the size of the various listservs, it is estimated that thousands of people were able to view the call for participants. The number of people whom actually viewed the call for participants, because of the nature of the social media outlets, is unknown. Further, some participants also contacted those they knew within the LGBT community or passed along the call for participants to their friends and family on their own volition. Finally, participants were solicited through flyers which were placed in LGBT-friendly locations within the city of Philadelphia (businesses can sign up to be placed on a map which indicates that they are LGBT-friendly). Participants were included if they were over the age of 18, identified as LGB, were full or part-time employed, and were partnered/considered themselves part of an LGB family. Data was collected from 41 participants.

**Results for Study 1**

**Demographics.** Demographic information collected included categorical measures as well as more continuous scale assessments. Categorical demographic measures included gender (male or female), age (open-ended), race (open-ended), sexuality (gay, lesbian, bisexual, heterosexual), preferred term for sexuality (open-ended), company (open-ended), job title (open-ended), industry (open-ended), location of company (open-ended), location of home (open-ended), personal income (using salary range brackets), partner income (using salary range brackets, continuous scale), number and ages of children (open-ended), whether or not they were legally married (yes or no),
whether or not they were cohabitating with their partner (yes or no), who they serve as caretaker to (who would you miss a day of work for if they fell ill or became injured – open-ended), gender of sexual partners and gender of those sexually attracted to (only men, mostly men, some men and some women, mostly women, only women, and neither for both items), level of education (open-ended), and whether or not they were transgender (yes or no).

In addition to these measures, LBG identity was measured using a continuous measure. Participants were also asked to rate how male and how female they considered themselves to be using a 5-point scale ranging from “not at all like me” to “completely like me” for both items. In addition, they were asked how gay and how straight they considered themselves to be, again using a 5-point scale ranging from “not at all like me” to “completely like me” for both items. All demographic items can be found in Appendix A.

14 participants self-identified as male (34.1%) and 27 participants self-identified as female (65.9%). Of the 41 participants, 18 self-identified as lesbian, 11 self-identified as gay, 11 self-identified as bisexual, and one did not wish to formally identify with any category. When asked about what term they preferred to use to describe themselves (open-ended), 11 participants reported they would prefer to be categorized as “queer” rather than lesbian, gay, or bisexual. All of the participants were in a same-sex relationship at the time of the interview or recently enough to the time of the interview that information could be accurately recalled (two participants had partners who recently passed away and one bisexual individual was currently in an opposite-sex relationship, but had recently been in a same-sex relationship while in the same work setting).
Racially, the sample predominantly self-identified as White, with only 6 participants (14.6%) self-identifying as Black, Hispanic or Mixed Race. The age of the participants ranged from 19 to 66 years old, with a mean age of 39.71 years old. Table 2 summarizes participants’ location, role title, industry, and level of education. For income, participants ranged from $0-10,000 to greater than $200,000 a year (participants chose from a variety of salary ranges, which can be found in Appendix A). On average, participants made between $51,000-60,000. Participants’ partners’ income ranged from $0-10,000 to greater than $200,000 a year as well. On average, participants’ partners made $40,000-50,000 a year. Household income was calculated by taking the income range of each partner and adding them together. Household income ranged from $0-20,000 up to greater than $350,000. On average, the household income fell in the $100,000-150,000 range.

In terms of relationship/family variables, 9 participants (22%) were legally married and 31 participants (75.6%) were currently cohabitating. 12 participants had children (29.3%), while the remainder of the sample did not. For those who had children, the mean number of children was 2.4 (ranging from 1 to 4).

It is also interesting to note that this particular study measured gender both categorically (e.g. Are you male or female?) and continuously (e.g. How male are you? How female are you?). This represents an alternative way of exploring gender identity that is more post-modern in nature and provides participants a way to properly record their experience of gender separately from biological sex. Within this sample, categorical males rated themselves continuously on average as a 3.7 on a 5-point scale for maleness and 1.93 on a 5-point scale for femaleness. Further, categorical females rated themselves
continuously on average as a 3.63 for femaleness and a 2.19 for maleness. The data demonstrated that, while males and females were likely to rate themselves higher within the continuous variable that matches their categorical gender variable, they were not likely to rate themselves as having 0 of the other category. This data suggests that traditional, categorical gender variables may be missing some information for LGB participants. It is yet to be determined whether this measurement issue holds true within heterosexual samples as well.

Similarly, sexual orientation was assessed both categorically (e.g. Are you gay, lesbian, straight, or bisexual?) and continuously (e.g. How straight are you? How gay are you?). The goals for these items were similar to the goals for the continuous measurement of gender identity. Participants may feel more comfortable expressing their sexuality outside of a categorical box and, instead think about and discuss the extent to which each individual sexual identity fits with their conceptualization of their overall sexuality. The data demonstrates that, while LGB individuals were likely to rate themselves as more gay than straight, they were not likely to rate themselves as having 0 of the other category. Lesbians rated themselves as being 4.5 on gayness and 1.63 on straightness on average. Gay males rated themselves as being 4.18 on gayness and 1.45 on straightness on average. Finally, bisexual individuals rated themselves as being 3.27 on gayness and 2.64 on straightness on average. The results demonstrate that there was more central tendency in terms of sexuality for bisexual participants (as would be expected) as well as some amount of straightness experienced by lesbians and gay males. The data suggest that there may be a reason to use continuous variables instead of
categorical variables when measuring sexuality, in order to get a more accurate picture of overall sexual identity in the future.

**Qualitative results: Construct explication and item generation.** Because the current work focused on understanding of work-family conflict for LGB individuals, the most substantive data is located in the qualitative findings from the 41 interviews that were conducted with LGB individuals. As a result of these interviews, 38 items were generated as potential items for a new scale of work-family conflict specifically geared toward LGB individuals. Each individual item either received direct support from quotes in the interviews (which will be outlined below) or followed logically from support within the interviews and were generated in order to avoid criterion deficiency. Interviews were examined for content which indicated a conflict between work and family which stemmed from LGB identity. Further, some general themes emerged from the data which provide support for the existence of a different kind of work-family conflict. As a result of the interviews, it was determined that the best term for this kind of conflict is “identity-based work-family conflict.” This terminology and definition stemmed directly from the data gathered within the interviews (representative quotes are presented in Table 3 and all quotes supporting the generation of items are presented in Appendix B). At the beginning of the interview phase, the author generated survey items based on the idea that LGB work-family conflict was rooted in a values-based conflict (e.g. my workplace values different things than I do). However, the responses to this question provided very mixed responses, many of which did not have to do with LGB status. For example, a gay male in the sample working for a large corporation discussed his conflict with working in a very capitalist setting while he personally disagreed with
these beliefs. Other participants discussed religious beliefs clashing with their coworkers or a more general sense of clashing with the corporate vision and the way they personally would run a company. While this may be another interesting avenue to study, it appears that values-based conflict calls to mind more a person-job fit response than a work-family conflict response. However, when asked about the extent to which conflict was due to personal identity, participants provided information about LGB status and the hardships that are endured when LGB identity is not fully accepted within the work space. As such, the term “identity-based work-family conflict” was retained for the purposes of this study and was defined as “the extent to which one’s relationship/family identity clashes with the range of acceptable relationship/family identities at work.”

Procedure for Generating Items. The items generated as a result of the interviews are outlined below. Each item is listed and quotes or information which support the generation of that item are explained and discussed beneath their corresponding item. Before discussing the items themselves, it is important to outline the process that was used in order to generate these items. Each interview was examined for quotations which suggested a clash of (or an explanation for a lack thereof) LGB relationship/family identity and the work environment. Each instance of a quote which related to LGB identity in relation to work-family conflict was highlighted within each interview. After each interview, transcripts were examined for LGB relationship/family identity-related content and individual quotes across interviews were grouped by theme. Then, each group of individual quotations was examined and an item which accurately captured that set of quotes was generated. Two SMEs (Ph.D. candidates) reviewed the
interview evidence and the generated items and provided feedback for item edits and updates to quote groupings.

While some items received more support from the interview data than others, an item was generated even when a very small amount of support was found (for example, if only one participant mentioned an incident pertaining to a particular facet of identity conflict) in order to avoid criterion deficiency. All redundant or unnecessary items were deleted in Study 2, so capturing the criterion fully was the focus of Study 1.

In some cases, there are two items which followed from a set of information or quotes pertaining to a particular topic. In these cases, some items were generated because they logically flowed from the discussion even though it was not mentioned in the interview content. For example, one interviewee indicated that her partner had turned down job offers because of their LGB relationship status. However, no one mentioned that they personally had turned down job offers because of their LGB relationship status. While support was not found in the interviews themselves for the generation of an item about personally turning down a job offer due to LGB relationship status, it logically follows that if a participant’s partner turned down an offer, it is possible that a potential survey participant may have done so themselves (for example, if that individual’s partner had also been interviewed). So, in that case, two items were generated: one pertaining to personally turning down job offers due to LGB status and one pertaining to one’s partner turning down job offers due to LGB status, despite the fact that interview data only demonstrated the presence of one of these conditions. Likewise, some quotes were closely related enough to be grouped together but sparked the generation of a couple of
closely related items. These items will be grouped together and explained overall in order to denote their relationship to one another.

The full list of items and direct quotes which provide evidence for their generation is listed below in Table 3. Each item is listed along with several representative quotes which support the generation of each item. Further, the number of unique participants who provided a quote which was related to each item’s or grouping of items’ generation is listed in parentheses after each item or grouping of items.

Finally, the quotes in Table 3 have been arranged according to potential theme (family resources/tension, coworker issues, and job-related outcomes) in order to provide a guiding structure for the data. These themes have been determined by the primary researcher and require future assessment. The narrative from the interviews, which contains the full set of interview quotes for each item (placed in context) can be found in full within Appendix B. Appendix B provides more information about each quote and gives a more detailed outline of how each item was generated.

Table 3 – Generated Items and Interview Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Resources/Tension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Discussing my LGB relationship/family at work creates tension between my partner/family and me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel tension when my partner/family asks about my level of “outness” about being LGB at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My partner and I argue about whether or not I am “out” about being LGB at work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes = 5)
a) “I guess that work did come into the house because for a good month it was a big controversy talking about what happened at work...that was emotionally draining. Whenever we are discussing what happens at work, it still comes up. It's very draining.” (Participant 12)

b) “Sometimes it’s hard to snap out of my closeted mode” (Participant 17)

c) “I felt like I was doing him [his partner] a disservice because I was out everywhere else and I felt two-faced. But I had to do it. And as soon as I got tenure I came out.” (Participant 37)

d) “I’m the president of the campus’ only LGB club. I have responsibility towards that club of making people feel comfortable and planning events. But, I also have 3 teenage daughters though, for whom I was a straight woman for a long time. So I have to take into consideration their feelings as well. I need to take into consideration their feelings when their friends are seeing me march in a gay pride parade.” (Participant 39)

e) “Sometimes having a dispute with my partner can be stressful. There was a time when my girlfriend was here and she wanted to visit my office and that stressed me out. I didn’t mind that people would see her and it’s just the questions that would come after. I feel like she is obviously gay, so people would ask questions. I don’t want to lie to people.” (Participant 40)

4. My LGB partner/family does not have equal access to policies/benefits at my work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =15)

a) “This may sound really strange but one thing that would make me very comfortable would be partner benefits. When an organization offers
benefits for domestic partners, to me that says that the organizational
culture is accepting of LGB individuals. It may not be the case, but to me
for some reason in my mind that seems like the organization is accepting.”
(Participant 11)

b) “I particularly sought out an employer who had strong value statements
that aligned with mine in terms of supporting work-family balance and LGB
employees.” (Participant 38)

c) “The forms are all very gender neutral for spouses and I’ve been at other
employers where that wasn’t the case. So I think that gender neutral
paperwork is actually welcoming. This is one of the first things that you do
at an employer so if you have to modify it by crossing out ‘husband’ to
make it work for your family, well, that kind of sucks.” (Participant 25)

d) “Well if I could fantasize - DPBs, health care in particular, parenting issues
[they did not openly include same sex partners despite the fact that there
were multiple same sex partnered faculty]. They would say – ‘we will take
care of you’ but we can’t take a stance on this. In my fantasies they would
support my family and use the language to show it. They would have a
non-discrimination policy that would include me. But that won’t happen.
When I think about leaving those are the things that I look for.”
(Participant 32)

e) “I don’t think that there are any concrete policies or practices at the state
level here. But the federal government doesn’t recognize our marriage. So
I’m single according to the national level. HR has to abide by that. So,
sometimes I can’t take advantage of things that other people can take
advantage of. And that’s not the [organization’s] fault.” (Participant 41)

f) “They could recognize my partner’s and my marriage. That has some real life implications as we are nearing retirement and would like to have the same benefits that straight couples have.” (Participant 9)

g) “They have diversity policy and groups for LGB awareness, which I like. But, I think that the practice of it isn’t as good. People aren’t always aware that they are there.” (Participant 40)

h) “I think that work and family conflict definitely relates to whether or not an institution offers partner benefits.” (Participant 24)

5. It is difficult for me to find LGB family-friendly resources within my organization.

6. I do not believe my LGB relationship/family is given the same considerations as more traditional relationships/families at work.

7. I do not use certain workplace policies/benefits available to me because I don’t want coworkers to know my relationship/family is LGB.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =7)

   a) “Travel would be easier if I could talk about the fact that I have to coordinate with someone else. But they don’t know that.” (Participant 14)

   b) “My partner would be eligible for benefits. I could bring it up, but all of those little things that other people don’t think about.” (Participant 11)

   c) “Even figuring out who to ask for these things…do I ask my immediate supervisor? The chancellor? How do we make work and family fit together in the same way?” (Participant 3)

   d) “The environment is pretty open, so we have an LGB center and there are
a lot of different programs that run through that center that I'm aware of so I don't have anything that I could think of right now [that would improve policy in the organization].” (Participant 21)

e) “I would definitely like to see an all-inclusive policy. Something that addresses discrimination and employment issues. I am the assistant to the CEO and I believe right now that our policy is based on gender, religion, and race but nothing says sexual orientation. I came from a company that was very liberal, so to come to this company was like a shock to the system. I mentioned it at one point and was completely shut out. They definitely do not include same sex partners on benefits either. I think that would be helpful. We have to list emergency contacts and it's alluded to that you could keep them confidential and only have them opened in an emergency. That is out there for the people who are not openly out in that atmosphere. It's like a DADT environment.” (Participant 35)

8. I feel uncomfortable bringing my LGB partner to my organization’s social events.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =6)

a) “I could see having trouble getting off work for family activities is the main one. Being invited to something without my partner being included. Those are the two main ones.” (Participant 19)

b) “I'm unable to talk sometimes about my partner or if I could bring my partner to a work party.” (Participant 20)

c) “Well I'm naturally a social person and at home I'm very social. But, at work I don't go to company get-togethers. I go to my partner's company get-togethers. But I don't really have that relationship with any coworkers. I can't
bring her with me. So those behaviors are different.” (Participant 14)

d) “Christmas is difficult – I can’t bring my partner to family events. They have family holiday parties, but I didn’t want to go through the trouble of bringing my partner.” (Participant 40)

e) “I have been discouraged from bringing my partner to work events and they said it was because I wasn’t married.” (Participant 35)

9. Because we’re LGB, my partner feels uncomfortable attending my organization’s social events.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes = 5)

a) “It might be that he would have to conform more than I would if he came to visit me at work. I don’t really feel like there is a place for him in my work environment such that he could come visit me. I know everyone here really well and so I’m able to navigate the sensitivities of the people here. I know there are a couple of people who would make it uncomfortable that he is gay. Nothing bad would happen but if he randomly appeared here, he would have to reserve himself. That’s a terrible way of saying it. But I could imagine that being the case. I did my education in a conservative discipline so I’m used to it, but he is not.” (Participant 22)

b) “Will we go to an event together? Or will we be seen as a couple on a particular campus or within an institution?” (Participant 24)

c) “For example, is my girlfriend welcome at company social events? Well, I can bring my girlfriend to social events but it depends on how you define “welcoming.” She can come to it, but it would be weird and awkward for
“She probably wouldn't want to go because she would say things to people...she would be kicked out (laughing)!" (Participant 35)

e) “Usually, I try to go and be present at work activities. I try not to let my partner interfere with that.” (Participant 40)

10. Because I’m LGB, I feel uncomfortable having a picture of my family/partner on my desk at work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =1)

a) “What pictures do you put on your desk at work? It’s the details that matter.”

(Participant 11)

11. If my partner/family member was sick, I could not take a leave of absence from work because our relationship/family is LGB.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =3)

a) “…my coworkers pitched in to help me. He was about an hour away so it was a decent commute to his place of care. In the environment, I encountered multiple problems from being a same-sex couple. The stresses that I encountered there, made it difficult to juggle my responsibilities. One nurse, for example, banned me from his room even though he was there on my insurance. If that individual had happened to be the head of nursing, I would have had a real problem. That kind of stress I’m sure showed in my face and in my productivity. Another example after he died, the local funeral home that helped with the arrangements (the largest one in the county), the contact person excused himself and the head of the firm dealt
with my case. They said that they had never had a domestic partner serving in this role before. After that, there was no problem. He had to deal with it because no one else was comfortable.” (Participant 18)

b) “I don’t know if we had kids, if I’d have a hard time taking off if they were sick. I don’t know how that gets treated.” (Participant 34)

c) “There are very few ways – there are some but they are few and far between. They are mostly positive. The first thing that comes to mind is working for the State – they recognize my spouse as my spouse. There is a fairly significant amount of time that can be taken for family illness as well.” (Participant 41)

12. Because my relationship/family is LGB, I couldn’t talk about it at work if my partner/a family member and I got into a fight.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =0)

13. Because I am LGB, I have to pretend that my relationship/family does not exist at work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =2)

a) “At my work, it’s as if my partner doesn’t exist, which is unfortunate”

(Participant 2)

b) “People at the top have to make clear on a regular basis that the normative, conformist, there is only one set of families that will be tolerated just isn’t acceptable…it could have a lot of impact. They don’t mean to hurt us. I think they just don’t know we’re here.” (Participant 5)
14. My organization has made it clear that my LGB relationship/family is accepted at work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =1)

a) “We don’t have any programs to make it clear that our family is part of the organization too.” (Participant 2)

15. My workplace is not a safe space for me to talk about LGB relationship/family concerns.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =1)

a) “Work is not always a safe space for me to be open about my family life or about my gendered sexual identity.” (Participant 3)

16. I cannot discuss LGB-related hobbies/activities that my partner or I participate in outside of work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =2)

a) “It’s not that I can’t come out...but it is those pursuits outside of work that threaten on some level, even in a subtle way” (in reference to participating in local theater). (Participant 3)

b) “My family and my partner are very liberal and while aspects of this are clear at work - I don’t talk about marching the gay pride parade at work.” (Participant 16)

Coworker Issues

17. Talking about my LGB relationship/family at work creates tension among my coworkers and me.
18. My coworkers would be uncomfortable if I talked about my LGB relationship/family at work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =8)

a) “Not being able to talk about your family adds another layer of stress that can impact well-being.” (Participant 8)

b) “I would consider it work-family conflict if I couldn’t talk about my family at work – a BIG one.” (Participant 9)

c) “Most of my coworkers have never met a gay person before, but they really did accept me….But, I would definitely consider not being able to talk about those things as a form of work-family conflict.” (Participant 10)

d) “This is the first year that I am finally realizing myself that I’m actually gay and not just in a gay relationship. At home, there is a lot of stuff going on that is centered around that. I honestly can’t let any of that out at work. I channel my high school self at work. This is the first and foremost thing that I think of when I think of conflict at work. I am struggling with keeping it all in.” (Participant 17)

e) “Definitely the only real conflict that I have is talking about my partner at work. I don’t feel any other demands. This is THE work-family conflict issue for me.” (Participant 14)

19. I would not be accepted by my coworkers if I talked about my LGB relationship/family at work.

20. I am afraid to discuss my LGB relationship/family at work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =10)

a) “There is a general sentiment that different is bad…any kind of different behavior is seen as potentially risky. I can’t talk about my home life issues because, although my supervisor knows and is supportive, a lot of people I
work with would just view different as bad.” (Participant 5)

b) “There are a few people in my work environment who are extremely religious and they will sometimes start talking about their religious views, so our lifestyle right there is a direct conflict. If they ever talk about politics or religion, everyone talks about marriage equality and they say their personal opinion and I need to walk out of the room. They have different views of the world in general.” (Participant 35)

c) “There is definitely a family-centered environment as well, which sometimes comes out at work. I work with a lot of ‘family-centered people’ (sarcastically) and this can be promoted as an agenda from time to time.” (Participant 22)

d) “But, in our last job, we worked together but we weren’t out...we didn’t trust the coworkers very much. They thought that we were cousins or something because we were always hanging out.” (Participant 27)

e) “Yes, they are incompatible. I always feel like I can’t talk about it at work without having something come along with it. Judgment or mistreatment, not sure. I feel that if I was in a straight relationship I wouldn’t have to deal with those things.” (Participant 40)

21. I feel tension when coworkers ask about my LGB partner/family at work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =3)

a) “In those situations where we have to discuss relationships at work, it can be stressful. I keep it very vague, which can be stressful. I’m more comfortable being around my peers, but even sometimes with peers,
people can be taken aback when I say 'girlfriend'.” (Participant 40)

b) “It is this kind of day by day, you never really notice but after a while it wears on you.” (Participant 5)

c) “Being closeted at work is also very stressful and that puts pressure on me as well.” (Participant 17)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td><strong>I could not behave the same way with my LGB partner at work as I can at home.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td><strong>I feel uncomfortable showing affection towards my LGB partner in my work setting.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td><strong>My LGB partner and I avoid being seen together by colleagues/coworkers.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =5)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>“I have a picture of my partner on my desk and I’m out to everyone at work, but I feel like if she walked into my office, I couldn’t kiss her hello. We don’t walk around holding hands. Straight pairs can do this, but we just don’t go there.” (Participant 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>“Being LGBT is a problem. I don’t feel comfortable hugging [my partner] at work. My home life definitely affects my work life. I can’t show her any kind of affection.” ( Participant 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>“I wouldn’t be able to treat my partner the same way at work because I can’t talk about her at work at all.” (Participant 40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| d) | “It would be really nice to be in a place where my partner and I could walk in without enduring any problems. We deliberately leave town in order to have fun. We’re not talking about wild, fetish sex clubs here – we’re just
worried about being a couple.” (Participant 5)

e) “…but I think that my partner felt a little dissident about visiting me at the
office as often as he might have if we had been a different sort of family.
None of my coworkers got to know him very well.” (Participant 18)

25. If a coworker said/did something harmful to my partner/family because we’re LGB, my
workplace would support me.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =1)

a) “There was also a coworker who was very anti-gay that I had a series of
negative events with. It almost got to the point of physical violence but
someone walked in the room thankfully. I put in a formal complaint about it
and it was ignored entirely. Also, people sometimes leave religious materials
in my mailbox...I wish they would just come talk to me in person!” (Participant
35)

26. Because my relationship/family is LGB, I could not talk about it at work if my partner became
ill/injured.

27. If I had a family emergency, coworkers would be willing to help me, regardless of my LGB
status.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =2)

a) “Then, when he became ill, individual coworkers were as good as gold
about helping me keep up with work and family obligations. There wasn’t
any institutional obstacle to care for him but I wouldn’t say it was
facilitated either. I don’t know if it was because we are gay.” (Participant
18)

b) “That there are less conservative policies (like who can bereave who and
28. **People at work assume that my family is heterosexual.**

29. **I feel that I have to teach my colleagues about LGB relationships/families.**

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =3)

a) “In reference to assumptive comments that people would make, one time a coworker said ‘My cousin finally got married!’ and I wanted to say ‘Finally? What does that mean? Did that person have no value without marriage?’ These happen infrequently but they do happen.” (Participant 22)

b) “I don’t feel like that’s a huge issue but I do feel like people tend to make certain assumptions and they will relate to you in terms of those assumptions. However, I’m pretty out in the workplace so I’ll just let them know. But, at first, it definitely does make a difference. People will say ‘oh when you get married to some guy and have kids’ and you have to correct them. But I’ve never felt like...where I do feel people assume straightness, I’ve never felt like I couldn’t tell them otherwise” (Participant 33)

c) “I wear a wedding ring so people assume I have a husband. People will ask if my husband wants to come golfing with me and I have to say ‘I don’t have a husband.’ But they don’t ask for more clarification.” (Participant 36)

30. **People at work often ask uncomfortable questions about my LGB relationship/family.**

31. **People at work often ask offensive questions about my LGB relationship/family.**

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =1)

a) “Anytime people talk about relationships, I am thinking about what to say. I don’t want to lie. I try to be honest without giving too much information.”
Job-Related Outcomes

32. I would face negative job-related consequences if I discussed my LGB relationship/family at work.

33. I feel more at risk for career consequences when talking about my LGB relationship/family at work.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes = 9)

a) “I would most definitely see not being able to talk about my identity being part of work-family conflict. I don’t talk about my identity because I can’t risk losing a job.” (Participant 11)

b) “I definitely have a huge work family conflict. I am not out at work and I fear for my job at times.” (Participant 14)

c) “I think that has a disparate impact on LGBT people. We are always asking ourselves if they are not talking to us because of who we are or is it something else. This is definitely the case for positions of management. Being an LGBT manager here is not an easy matter. I have watched a number of them be completely undermined by the people who work for them. It was never that they would explicitly say it, but they would blame them much faster and gang up on them. I have seen people literally driven out of their management positions. Employees would never admit even to themselves that they did it because they were gay, but you know they never would have done that to a straight person. The lack of career guidance has a disproportionate impact on LGBT folks. I don’t know how you would ever get promoted as an LGBT person here. I have been told not to dress too butch. Those shoes are scary for
example, things like that.” (Participant 5)

d) “At one job that I had, I was not out and I found that to be very stressful. I was so much more reserved and I wasn't as good of a communicator in that role as I would have been if I could have been more open about my relationship. I believe that I was fired from that job because they found out that I was gay.” (Participant 23)

e) “It's more of a cultural thing in the company...I don't see a lot of willingness or acceptance from management to change, but individuals that I work with might be more accepting. I just don't want my personal life to become an issue because I'm in education. I don't want them to focus on anything other than my work. I don't want to put my family situation in that light to see if they would change because I don't want to take that chance.” (Participant 36)

34. I am unable to talk about my LGB relationship/family with clients, customers, and/or students.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =9)

a) “We have a lot of highly educated and open-minded people in my company...but we can’t always ensure this with clients, which is why I’m not out with most of them.” (Participant 4)

b) “Every organization is different, but when to talk about my family with customers or clients...that’s something that a straight person wouldn’t have to think about.” (Participant 8)

c) “I can’t really answer residents’ questions as honestly as I wish I could or as I would like to. They sometimes want to know about my family. When I
bring my partner to things, they will ask why I have brought her.”

(Participant 15)

d) “Let me just throw this out and see if it applies - I used to be on an online
dating service but I had to stop because I didn't want my students to see
me online. It wasn't a racy thing or anything but it was just the
straightforward nature of it - I felt that I didn't want that to come up
especially because I'm new in the job and I didn't want it to cause
problems. I would say this was about 70% because I'm gay and I don't want
people to know.” (Participant 11)

e) “It is a constant worry though in a Catholic university about the ways that
the Catholic Church teaches. Sometimes what I face are the assumptions of
my students. That I run into from time to time.” (Participant 32)

35. If one of my clients, customers, and/or students said/did something harmful to my
partner/family because we’re LGB, my workplace would support me.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =4)

a) “I had a really uncomfortable situation where a student called me a fag....and I
followed him into the hallway and asked ‘Did you just call me a fag?’...And I was
terrified that I would be fired because I had confronted the student. And
afterwards one of the people in student services said that I was becoming
"unglued." I had to say to the associate provost - it didn’t even occur to you to say ‘Are you ok?’ That my mental well-being would be on their horizon would
be nice. It felt to me like there was almost a kind of equivalence that my
touching someone’s arm and saying something was somehow equivalent to
him having called me a fag. I was told to apologize to this student....you know,
let’s not have more disclosure, let’s have more concern about lawsuits.”

(Participant 3)

b) “We started a club on campus that [my partner] and I cofounded for LGBT individuals. We made shirts that say “Bi, Straight or Gay, we’re all ok”. Everyone comes to this community day and [my partner] wore her shirt so that someone might see her and know that it would spread acceptance. She came to my work to see me later that day and was told that her shirt was inappropriate by my boss. She was on the verge of tears and said that she was leaving. She told me what had happened and I was livid. Two people had complained about her shirt and he took their side. That was a huge issue. My boss and I were not on very good terms for about two months. He had always been ok with us and he knew that he was in the wrong. He ended up apologizing to me, but [my partner] was pissed.” (Participant 12)

c) “My partner is a bit more obvious in being gay and so I was nervous when he went there. The inmates know better than to do anything because the staff watches out for each other. Sometimes people will say things but for the most part he has had no problem whatsoever. An inmate who made a comment was “swiftly dealt with” so the guards look out for him.” (Participant 16)

d) “Students are saying “that’s so gay” all the time. It’s not like the other faculty support it. But I feel like I have to tiptoe to get the students to be more open minded, not even about the gay issue. Just generally it’s not as open minded of a setting as I would like.” (Participant 17)

36. I have turned down job offers/promotions because my LGB relationship/family would be an issue.
37. My partner has turned down job offers/promotions because our LGB relationship/family would be an issue.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =1)

a) “My partner has turned down two tenure track jobs because they were in places worse than here on LGBT issues. She has completely changed her job trajectory because there aren’t enough places where an LGBT family with children could live. And many places aren’t open to thinking about partner hires for LGBT and we can’t live on one income.” (Participant 5)

38. Because I can’t talk about my LGB relationship/family at work, I am currently looking for another job.

(Number of unique participants generating relevant quotes =2)

a) “It is THE thing that makes me think I would take a pay cut to take a job somewhere else. That’s partially workplace and partially local community environment. But of course that influences how desirable a workplace is.” (Participant 5)

b) “I’m looking for another job because I am uncomfortable with this. There are other benefits that allow me to accept it in the short-term. Salary, company car, flexible schedule, it’s a family oriented business in the sense that I can work from home if I’m sick or something, but it’s uncomfortable for me. It’s family oriented but just not for gay families. We do a lot of charity work with the community but you need to fit a certain mold. People wouldn’t think twice to volunteer to help a needy family but not at an HIV clinic for example.” (Participant 14)
Work-Family Conflict among LBG: Emerging dimension. Overall, participants shared stories, facts, and opinions about how LGB family/relationship-friendly their organizations were. Overall, the data suggest that LGB individuals (no matter whether they classified themselves as lesbian, gay, or bisexual) appear to experience unique family-related challenges at work. However, the majority of participants also experienced work-family conflict in previously conceptualized ways as well. Many mentioned stress and time-based issues when initially asked to describe how they experienced work-family conflict. However, twelve participants (29.26% of the sample) mentioned something about LGB identity or an identity-based conflict in the initial questioning about work-family conflict, before being provided information about the various dimensions and before any probing about potential identity-based conflict.

It was hypothesized that LGB participants would differentially interpret items (include information or instances that relate specifically to being LGB when asked about existing dimensions of work-family conflict). Differential interpretation was supported most strongly for the behavioral dimension of work-family conflict. For the other dimensions, time and stress-based conflict, responses that related specifically to being LGB were fewer and further between. For example, when asked an open-ended question about how time spent at work took away time spent with family, only one participant mentioned an LGB-related issue, citing that he felt he had to work harder than his counterparts because he was gay (in order to prove himself).

Similarly, when asked about whether or not time with family interfered with time spent at work, only one participant cited that if her partner could have visited her in the office at times, that would have helped to combine family and work time. Overall,
however, participants reported time-based conflict consistently with its previous definition. In the individual item feedback, the same participant interpreted time-based questions in a way that had to do with LGB-identity for 3 of the 6 items. Other participants did not include LGB identity in this interpretation. Similarly, when asked how stress at work can exacerbate stress at home, only one participant mentioned the stress of being closeted at work. Additionally, another participant mentioned being out at work as a way in which stress from home did not interfere with stress at work. Two participants mentioned LGB identity playing a role in stress when asked for rationale for individual questions (one of the participants included this rationale for one question, the other participant included it for two questions). Generally, however, as with time-based conflict, participants generally reported incidents that aligned well with the previous definition of stress-based work-family conflict.

In contrast, for behavior-based conflict, a larger number of participants mentioned an issue related to their LGB identity. Nine participants mentioned an identity-based conflict when asked about how behaviors differ at work compared to behaviors at home. Further, six participants mentioned an identity-based conflict when asked how behaviors at home differ from behaviors at work. Interestingly, there was no overlap between these participants, so fifteen unique participants (36.59% of the sample) overall mentioned identity-based conflicts when asked about differences between behaviors at home and at work. For individual item rationale, twelve participants either paused to make general notes about being LGB at this time or provided direct rationale for answering a particular question by using LGB-identity related information. In all of these instances, something about the behaviorally-based questions sparked some thought or
discussion of LGB identity, indicating that this dimension may have some overlap with identity-based conflict or the potential for differential interpretation within an LGB sample. This data indicates that the existing dimension of behavior-based conflict and its definition may be interpreted in a different way than was originally intended within LGB populations. By providing an outlet for LGB individuals to report identity-based work-family conflict, it may be possible to cut down on this contamination and to more accurately capture the work-family conflict construct within an LGB population.

Additionally, thirteen participants (31.70% of the sample) mentioned a conflict with their family/relationship identity when asked about the main ways in which work and family conflict at the end of the open-ended portion of the interview. While many participants mentioned stress and time as major conflicts, demonstrating that 31.70% of the sample considered identity-based conflict not just a part of work-family conflict, but one of the sole drivers of work-family conflict, provides support for a new measure of work-family conflict which includes this dimension for LGB individuals. As previously mentioned, twelve participants mentioned identity-based conflict at the start of the interview when asked for initial reactions to ways in which work and family might conflict (after being provided with the definition of work-family conflict). Again, the overlap between these categories is small, with only six participants mentioning an identity-based conflict both as a first reaction and as a main source of conflict. While examining which dimensions participants report as main sources of conflict may be more impactful, it is also of interest to examine first reactions, since these are often what dictate how one fills out a paper and pencil or online scale (most participants don’t have the opportunity to be guided through the scale with definitions in an interview format.
such as this one). In conclusion, when counting overlapping participants only once, nineteen individuals total (46.43% of the sample) mentioned identity-based conflict either initially or as a main source of conflict at the end of the interview. This is nearly half of the sample and, thus, provides a rationale for measuring identity-based conflict within LGB populations.

**Quantitative Interview Findings: Potential antecedents, correlates and outcomes.** In order to examine patterns of relationships among potential antecedents for work-family conflict and the existing work-family conflict scale in an LGB population, quantitative scales were verbally administered during the interview phase (N=41). The following section describes the demographic variables and scales which were used in the quantitative portion of the interview and discusses the results of the preliminary analysis of these relationships. All reported alphas are sample-specific.

**Measures.**

**Work-Family Conflict.** Carlson et al.’s (2000) final scale was used to measure work-family conflict (α = .87). Responses were recorded using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). As discussed previously, the scale can be evaluated overall and broken into 6 subdimensions (time-based work-family (α = .85) and family-work conflict (α = .75), strain-based work-family (α = .77) and family-work conflict (α = .90), and behavior-based work-family (α = .69) and family-work conflict (α = .68)). While all of the alpha coefficients fall within the acceptable range, it is worthwhile to note that the lowest alphas were found in the behavior-based scales which were found to have the highest possibility for differential interpretation both across participants and in comparison to their originally intended content.
Social support: Organizational, Family, Supervisor and Coworker.

Organizational support was measured using a 16-item scale from Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) ($\alpha = .95$). For the family domain, the same scale, which was adapted for the family domain in Carlson et al., (2000) was used to measure family support ($\alpha = .92$). Example items are “My organization tries to make my job as fulfilling as possible” and “The organization cares about my opinions” for the organizational scale and “My family tries to make my life as fulfilling as possible” and “My family cares about my opinions” for the family scale.

Further, supervisor and coworker support was measured using a scale for Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors developed by Hammer, Kossek, Yragui, Bodner, & Hanson (2009) ($\alpha = .95$). This scale was used because it relates to supervisory support on a family-related level. The scale utilizes 4 subdimensions: emotional support (alpha = .92; “My supervisor is willing to listen to my problems in juggling work and nonwork life.”), role modeling (alpha = .98; “My supervisor is a good role model for work and nonwork balance”), instrumental support (alpha = .73; “I can depend on my supervisor to help me with scheduling conflicts if I need it”), and creative work-family management (alpha = .88; “My supervisor asks for suggestions to make it easier for employees to balance work and nonwork demands.”). The scale uses a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This scale is preferable to general supervisor/coworker support within the context of this study because it was found to predict work-family conflict over and above general supervisor support (Hammer et al., 2009). Because of the high levels of intercorrelation between the subscales, the scale was collapsed into one overall scale for the purposes of this study.
For coworker support, “supervisor” was replaced with “coworkers.” The reliability for the coworker support scale overall was .93. Reliabilities for the subscales for the adapted coworker support scale were within the acceptable range as well (α = .93 for emotional support, α = .96 for role modeling, α = .84 for instrumental support, and α = .81 for creative work-family management). Because of the high levels of intercorrelation between the subscales, the scale was also collapsed into one overall scale for the purposes of this study.

**Level of outness.** Griffin’s (1992) conceptualization of outness uses four dimensions: passing strategies, covering strategies, being implicitly out, and being directly out. Outness was measured within both the work and the family spheres for each of the four dimensions. For the work sphere, items assessed the extent to which participants were passing, covering, or being implicitly or explicitly out at work. For the family sphere, items assessed the extent to which participants were passing, covering, or being implicitly or explicitly out with friends and family (with regards to extended family and not one’s partner/children). The items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Reliability for the work scales were in the acceptable range (α = .64 for passing, α = .92 for covering, α = .72 for being implicitly out, and α = .89 for being explicitly out). Reliability for some of the family scales were in the acceptable range, while others were low (α = .44 for passing, α = .88 for covering, α = .53 for being implicitly out, and α = .70 for being explicitly out). These reliabilities may have been low because it seemed that participants had a difficult time determining which family and friends to think about when answering the questions. It is not clear why this did not equally affect all of the subscales, but there did seem to be
some struggle on the part of participants to parse out old friends from new friends and extended family from immediate family. This may be driving the low reliability within the passing and implicit scales.

**Fear of disclosure.** Ragins et al. (2007) provided a scale which measures fear of disclosure within LGB populations. The scale consisted of 12 items which were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Example items are: “If I disclosed my sexual orientation to everyone at work, I would lose my job” and “If I disclosed my sexual orientation to everyone at work, I would not get a raise”. The coefficient alpha for this scale was .95.

**Fear of negative evaluation.** Fear of negative evaluation was measured using a short form scale of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale (Leary, 1983). The scale consists of 12 items, measuring the extent to which other’s evaluations of one’s self are personally important. Items were administered using a 5-point Likert scale format, with scale responses ranging from “not at all characteristic of me” (1) to “extremely characteristic of me” (5). Example items are “I am frequently afraid of other people noting my shortcomings” and “I am afraid that people will find fault with me.” Coefficient alpha for this scale was .89.

**Centrality of sexual identity.** Centrality of sexual identity was measured using Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous (1998) (α = .86). This scale was adapted from the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity, Racial Identity, Centrality scale. An example item from this scale is “Overall my sexual identity has very little to do with how I feel about myself” and “In general, my sexual identity is an important part of my
self-image.” Responses were recorded using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

**Perceived discrimination.** Perceived discrimination was measured using the Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire, which was developed in Waldo (1999) ($\alpha = .87$). The scale consists of 22 items which ask LGB individuals the extent to which they encountered a variety of heterosexist experiences at work with the last 24 months. The measure includes 7 items that reflect more indirect discrimination (feeling the need to monitor one’s sexuality or dress at work) to more direct discrimination (the use of verbal or written slurs). Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale determining the frequency with which particular events occurred (never, once or twice, sometimes, very often, all the time).

**Organizational Policy.** The presence of organizational policy was measured using a 6-item scale from Ragins and Cornwell (2001). Example items include “Does your organization have a written nondiscrimination policy that includes sexual orientation?” and “Does your organization offer same-sex partner benefits?” The item responses include “yes”, “no”, and “I don’t know.” The responses are coded as 0 for “no” and 1 for “yes.” Responses of “I don’t know” were dropped from analysis. The coefficient alpha for this scale was .82.

**Relationships among Study 1 Quantitative Variables.** In order to provide a preliminary examination of which variables might impact work-family conflict within an LGB sample (a previously unexamined set of relationships within the LGB literature), correlations among the quantitative scales administered in Study 1 were examined. These findings will help to provide a potential backdrop for future studies which examine these
relationships within a larger sample. Because this sample is small (N=41), the .10 level of significance was used to highlight potential relationships (r >=.26). All of the means and standard deviations for study variables can be found in Table 4 and all of the correlations can be found in Table 5.

**Relationships of Study Variables with Existing Work-Family Conflict Items.**

Within this sample, gender was not significantly related to the traditional measure of overall work-family conflict or to any of the subdimensions of work-family conflict. However, despite the small sample size, many significant relationships did emerge in the expected direction.

**Level of outness.** For level of outness at work, passing was significantly related to work-family conflict overall (r = .46, p<.01), work-family strain (r = .40, p<.01), family-work strain, (r = .31, p<.05), work-family behavior (r = .34, p<.05), and family-work behavior (r = .47, p<.01). Covering at work was significantly related to work-family conflict overall (r = .31, p<.05), work-family time (r = .31, p<.05), work-family strain (r = .26, p<.10), and family-work behavior (r = .32, p<.05). Surprisingly, being implicitly out at work was positively related to family-work time-based conflict (r = .29, p<.10). Being explicitly out at work was negatively related to work-family strain-based conflict (r = -.27, p<.10). Overall, these findings suggest that those who attempt to pass for heterosexual or cover their sexuality at work, experience more work-family conflict (both at the overall level and at the subdimension level). Additionally, it appears that attempting to hide one’s sexuality may have a greater effect on increasing work-family conflict than being out at work has on decreasing work family-conflict.
For level of outness at home, passing was related to work-family conflict overall ($r = .27, p<.10$), work-family behavior ($r = .30, p<.10$), and family-work behavior ($r = .30, p<.10$). Covering at home was related to work-family conflict overall ($r = .36, p<.05$), family-work strain ($r = .39, p<.05$), work-family behavior ($r = .27, p<.10$), and family-work behavior ($r = .47, p<.01$). Being implicitly out at home was not significantly related to any of the work-family conflict variables. Being explicitly out was significantly and negatively related to overall work-family conflict ($r = -.33, p<.05$), family-work time ($r = -.38, p<.05$), and family-work strain ($r = -.28, p<.10$). It is important to remember, however, that both covering and being implicitly out with friends and family had unacceptably low reliability and, thus, these correlations should be interpreted in light of these findings. Generally, however, these results follow a similar pattern to being out at work. Passing and covering have a larger positive effect on whether or not one experiences work-family conflict (at the overall and subdimension level) than being out at work has a negative effect on work-family conflict. Compared to being explicitly out at work however, being explicitly out at home had a greater effect on work-family conflict.

**Social support.** The organizational support scale was significantly and negatively related to overall work-family conflict ($r = -.41, p<.01$), work-family time ($r = -.36, p<.05$), work-family strain ($r = -.34, p<.05$), and work-family behavior ($r = -.30, p<.10$). The family support scale was significantly and negatively related overall work-family conflict ($r = -.43, p<.01$), work-family time ($r = -.27, p<.10$), family-work strain ($r = -.39, p<.05$), and family-work behavior ($r = -.45, p<.01$). Thus, it may be the case that individuals who have higher levels of organizational and family support are less likely to experience work-family conflict at the overall level and at the subdimension level.
Overall supervisor support was negatively and significantly related to overall work-family conflict (r = -.38, p<.05), work-family time (r = -.27, p<.10), work-family strain (r = -.49, p<.01), and work-family behavior (r = -.27, p<.10). Thus, it appears that those individuals with higher levels of overall supervisor support also experience lower levels of work-family conflict at the overall level and (largely) at the work-family subdimension level.

Overall coworker support was significantly and negatively related to overall work-family conflict (r = -.48, p<.01), work-family time (r = -.30, p<.10), work-family strain (r = -.41, p<.05), work-family behavior (r = -.47, p<.01), and family-work behavior (r = -.48, p<.01). Taken together, coworker support also decreased work-family conflict overall. Most of the relationships were with work-family subdimensions except for relationships with family-work behavior dimensions, which are unique to coworker support when compared with supervisor support.

Perceived discrimination, fear of disclosure, presence of policy, centrality, and fear of negative evaluation. Experiences of discrimination was positively and significantly related to overall work-family conflict (r = .28, p<.10), work-family time (r = .37, p<.05), and work-family strain (r = .45, p<.10). Fear of being out at work was positively and significantly related to overall work-family conflict (r = .29, p<.10) and work-family time (r = .27, p<.10). Thus, for those who experience discrimination at work, it may be the case that work-family conflict is increased. Further, those who have a higher fear of being out at work also have increased work-family conflict. Presence of policy was only related to work-family time (r = -.33, p<.05). Centrality of sexual identity and fear of negative evaluation were not found to be significantly related to
overall work-family conflict or any of the dimensions of work-family conflict. As such, it
may be the case that the importance of LGB identity has less of an effect on work-family
conflict than more concrete, behavioral variables like outness, support, and
discrimination.

Work and family conflict within an LGB sample. The means for the work-family
variables were higher than the means for the family-work variables (for work-family
time, $x = 2.78$; for family-work time, $x = 2.08$; for work-family strain, $x = 2.64$; for
family-work strain, $x = 2.01$; for work-family behavior, $x = 2.51$; for family-work
behavior, $x = 2.28$). The highest mean was for work-family time and the lowest mean was
for family-work strain. This demonstrates that time-based concerns remain a work-family
issue within an LGB sample. Further, it demonstrates that LGB samples find stress
stemming from the family domain to be the lowest source of conflict. Finally, it is also
important to note that the means are low overall, with the average for each dimension of
work-family conflict falling below the midpoint of the scale.

Relationships among Demographic Variables within Nomological Network.
Additionally, a variety of other interesting correlations emerged within the dataset.

Sexuality. Because sexuality was measured categorically, correlations with this
variable are not reported. However, it is important to examine mean differences between
participants on work-family conflict by sexuality. As such, ANOVAs were conducted to
identify potential group differences on the work-family conflict variables. No significant
differences were found between lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals on any of the
work-family conflict variables (overall work-family conflict, $F(2, 37)=.09, p>.05$; time-
based work-family conflict, $F(2, 37)=.14, p>.05$; time-based family-work conflict,
F(2, 37)=.44, p>.05; strain-based work-family conflict, F(2, 37)=.73, p>.05; strain-based family-work conflict, F(2, 37)=.78, p>.05; behavior-based work-family conflict, F(2, 37)=.53, p>.05; behavior-based family-work conflict, F(2, 37)=.13, p>.05).

**Age.** Age was significantly related to time-based family-work conflict (r = -.27, p<.10), passing at work (r = -.26, p<.10), covering at work (r = -.30, p<.10), covering at home (r = -.34, p<.05), and being explicitly out at home (r = .36, p<.05). Further, age was positively related to overall coworker support (r = .35, p<.05). This suggests that as participants got older, they were more likely to experience support from their colleagues at work, as well as being less likely to attempt to pass or cover at work, and more likely to be explicitly out at home. This makes sense given the likelihood that participants may become more comfortable with their LGB identity over time.

**Children.** Number of children was found to be related significantly and negatively to work-family strain-based conflict (r = -.60, p<.05), but was not significantly related to other variables of interest within this sample.

**Gender.** As previously mentioned, gender was not significantly related to the variables of interest within this study. However, this non-finding is important, given the gender differences that are found on these variables within (assumedly) heterosexual samples. In considering gender, however, it was demonstrated that considering oneself more male was significantly and positively related to overall coworker support (r = .32, p<.05). Considering oneself more female was positively related to centrality of LGB identity (r = .27, p<.10). It is worth noting that gender itself (as a categorical variable) was not related to any variables of interest. Also interestingly, the more straight one considered themselves to be, the more household income they had (r = .35, p<.05). While
considering oneself more gay was not significantly related to household income (r = -.25, p=.13), the correlation is in the expected direction and may have reached significance within a larger sample.

Further, considering oneself straight was positively and significantly related to passing and covering at home (r = .34, p<.05; r = .28, p<.10) and negatively and significantly related to being implicitly out at work and at home (r = -.35, p<.05; r = -.43, p<.01). Considering oneself more straight was significantly and negatively related to centrality of LGB identity (r = -.58, p<.01). As would be expected, considering oneself more gay was positively and significantly related to centrality of LGB identity (r = .57, p<.01). Overall, those who considered themselves more straight were more likely attempt to pass or to cover at home and those who considered themselves more gay and less straight were more likely to view their LGB identity as important to their overall identity.

**Relationships among Level of Outness within Nomological Network.** For the passing, covering, implicitly out, and explicitly out scales, there were several interesting relationships (outside of the work-family conflict relationships highlighted above) that emerged from the data.

**Out at work.** Passing at work was negatively and significantly related to family support (r = -.33, p<.05) and overall coworker support (r = -.40, p<.05), and positively related to fear of disclosure (r = .32, p<.05). Covering at work was negatively and significantly related to overall coworker support (r = -.59, p<.01), presence of policy (r = -.50, p<.01), and fear of negative evaluation (r = -.30, p<.10). As such, it appears that those who attempt to pass or to cover their sexuality at work may experience less support
from coworkers. They may also find themselves in organizations with less LGB-friendly policy.

Conversely, being implicitly out at work is significantly and positively related to overall coworker support \((r = .56, p<.01)\), centrality of LGB identity \((r = .30, p<.10)\), and the presence of policy \((r = .51, p<.01)\). Being explicitly out at work was significantly and positively related to overall coworker support \((r = .62, p<.01)\) and presence of policy \((r = .57, p<.01)\). Further, being explicitly out at work was significantly and negatively related to experiences of discrimination \((r = -.27, p<.10)\) and fear of disclosure \((r = -.46, p<.01)\). Thus, in contrast to those who attempt to pass or to cover their sexuality at work, those who are implicitly and explicitly out may be in environments where they experience more support from coworkers, have better organizational policy, and have experienced less discrimination.

**Out at home.** Within the home domain, passing at home was significantly and negatively related to family support \((r = -.35, p<.05)\). Covering at home was also significantly and negatively related to family support \((r = -.37, p<.05)\). Being implicitly out at home was significantly and positively related to family support \((r = .28, p<.10)\). Being explicitly out at home was significantly and positively related to family support \((r = .33, p<.05)\). While level of outness at home demonstrated fewer patterns of relationships with study variables than level of outness at work, it does appear that those who have lower levels of family support are more likely to attempt to pass or to cover their sexuality with family and friends and may be less likely to be implicitly or explicitly out.
Relationships with Support (Organizational, Supervisor, Family, Coworker).

Organizational support was, as would be expected, significantly and positively related to overall supervisor support (r=.50, p<.01). It was not, however, related to the coworker support variable. Organizational support was negatively related to experiences of discrimination (r = -.58, p<.01) and fear of disclosure (r = -.36, p<.05) and positively related to presence of policy (r = .38, p<.05). Taken together, this information may indicate that supervisors are vessels of organizational policy and that organizational support also affects level of disclosure and amount of discrimination.

Also of interest, overall supervisor support was negatively related to the experience of discrimination (r = -.43, p<.01) and was positively related to the presence of policy (r = .50, p<.01). Again, these findings may demonstrate that supervisors are representatives of the organization or seen as symbols of the organizations’ view on LGB issues. Those with more supportive supervisors were less likely to experience discrimination and more likely to have positive policy in place.

With regards to coworkers, overall coworker support was negatively related to the experience of discrimination (r = -.45, p<.01) and fear of disclosure (r = -.45, p<.01), while being positively related to the presence of policy (r = .51, p<.01). Taken together, it appears that those employees with supportive coworkers are less likely to experience discrimination and to fear disclosure and are more likely to be located within organizations with LGB-friendly policy.

As would be expected, experiences of discrimination were significantly and positively related to fear of disclosure (r = .42, p<.01) and negatively related to the
presence of policy ($r = -.52, p < .01$). Finally, the presence of policy was negatively and significantly related to the fear of disclosure ($r = -.48, p < .01$).

**Study 2**

Within Study 2, the newly generated items were retranslated and rated for importance. This study will determine the extent to which items fit within the dimension of “identity-based work-family conflict” and the extent to which participants view the items as important. Items were evaluated for retention based on these criteria.

**Methods.**

*Procedure of Study 2.* In order to ensure that the items were content valid and reflect their original dimension, a Q-sort was conducted by SMEs. The sample included 28 individuals at the graduate level and included members of the LGB population as well as non-members. The sample was not restricted only to LGB individuals because the task required participants to read definitions of each dimension of work-family conflict and then place each item into the category that it best corresponded to. Because this task is more about clarity of the item and the definition, knowledge of the content area was not deemed necessary in order to properly complete the task.

Participants were provided with the following instructions: “Please choose the category which best describes each work-family conflict item. Work-family conflict is defined as a "form of interrole conflict in which role pressures from work and family domains are incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role." There are 5 categories of work-family conflict which you can choose from to classify each item. Remember that items may be positively or negatively worded, but still assess a particular
dimension. For example, an item which says that a person is able to effectively combine work and family is giving us a measure of work-family conflict in that it tells us that they are lacking conflict in that area. Similarly, an item which says that a person is unable to effectively combine work and family also gives us a measure of work-family conflict in that it tells us that they are experiencing conflict in that area.

The definitions for each category are as follows:

1) Time-Based Work-Family Conflict - when time devoted to one role makes it difficult to devote time to another role.

2) Strain-Based Work-Family Conflict - when strain experienced in one role interferes with strain in another role.

3) Behavior-Based Work-Family Conflict - when behaviors required in order to fill one role are in competition with behaviors required to fill another role.

4) Identity-Based Work-Family Conflict - when one's relationship/family identity is in conflict with the range of acceptable/recognized relationship/family identities at work.

5) None of these categories.

Instructions. Please select the best category for each item below.” The participants were then provided with each newly generated identity-based work-family conflict item interspersed with the existing 18 items from the Carlson et al. (2000) scale. These items were added so that participants would not begin placing items into other categories simply because they had been using the same category for the entirety of the survey.

Sample. Within the sample of 28 SMEs, 57.1% were female and 39.3% were male. The sample was predominantly White with 1 participant identifying as Black and 2 participants identifying as Latino or Hispanic. 71.4% of the sample identified as
heterosexual, 17.9% as gay, 3.6% as lesbian, and 3.6% as bisexual. The majority of the sample identified as being involved in education, either as a faculty, graduate student, or researcher. 10.8% of the sample were in HR or consulting roles and another 3.6% were in a retail setting. The average age of the sample was 31 years old. In terms of the sample’s knowledge of LGB populations, 35.7% of the sample rated themselves as being somewhat familiar 17.9% said that they were familiar, 14.3% reported that they were very familiar, and 7.1% reported being extremely familiar with LGB populations. Only one person (3.6%) stated that they were not at all familiar with LGB populations.

**Results of Study 2.**

**Emerging dimensions.** The results of the content sort demonstrated that the majority of newly generated items did not frequently reach 70% agreement for one particular category. The results for each item are presented in Table 6 (listed from highest percentage placed in identity category to lowest percentage placed in identity category). The 6 items with 70% or greater agreement were “I would not be accepted by my coworkers if I talked about my LGB relationship/family at work”, “I am afraid to discuss my LGB partner/family at work”, “I am unable to talk about my LGB relationship/family with clients, customers, and/or students”, “I feel uncomfortable bringing my LGB partner to my organization’s social events”, “Because I’m LGB, I feel uncomfortable having a picture of my family/partner on my desk at work”, and “Because I am LGB, I have to pretend that my relationship/ family does not exist at work.” There were, however, 6 items with the lowest agreement (less than 50%) including: “Discussing my LGB relationship/family at work creates tension between my partner/family and me”, “My LGB partner/family does not have equal access to policies/benefits at my work”, “I could
not behave the same way with my LGB partner at work as I can at home”, “If a coworker said/did something harmful to my partner/family because we’re LGB, my workplace would support me”, “If one of my clients, customers, and/or students said/did something harmful to my partner/family because we’re LGB, my workplace would support me”, and “If I had a family emergency, coworkers would be willing to help me, regardless of my LGB status.” The remaining 26 items (those which had less than 70% but more than 50% agreement) were consistently and most frequently placed into the identity-based work-family conflict category, but were also frequently placed into other categories. In most cases, the item was placed in the identity-based category most frequently, followed by the “none of these” category. Interpretation of these findings will be provided below in the discussion section. However, this finding suggests that there may be multiple dimensions within the LGB work-family scale which may fall outside of the realm of existing dimensions in the work-family literature and the newly defined identity-based dimension.

The second piece of information collected through the content validity survey included importance ratings. Participants were asked to rate each item on a scale of 1 to 5 in terms of importance to the scale that they placed it in, with 1 being “not important at all” and 5 being “extremely important”. A total of 23 participants filled out this section of the survey (5 participants only completed the category questions but stopped before filling out the importance ratings). The results are presented in Table 6.

None of the items fell below a 3 in terms of importance, so items were not grouped according to level of importance due to lack of variability. However, the high levels of importance for individual item ratings adds an interesting and necessary piece of information for interpreting this data because, while participants were not always in
agreement on which category an item should fall into, they felt that each item was important overall. Further, importance means were examined for heterosexual (N=17) versus LGB participants (N=5). Two items showed significant differences in importance, with LGB samples rating them as less important than heterosexual samples. The first item was “People at work often ask offensive questions about my LGBT relationship/family” with LGB individuals assigning this item a 2.8 on importance on average and heterosexual individuals rating it a 4.2 on average (t(20)= -2.09, p<.05). The second item was “My organization has made it clear that my LGBT relationship/family is accepted at work” with LGB individuals assigning this item a 3.6 on importance and heterosexual individuals rating it a 4.6 on importance (t(20)= -2.11, p<.05). The former item is concerning because LGB individuals assigned it lower than a 3 in importance. As such, this item should be given careful consideration when moving forward with future research regarding this measure.

Retranslation of Current (Heterosexually-based) Work-family conflict scale.

Further, the existing work-family conflict items (Carlson et al, 2000) mapped well onto their intended content areas. This provides support for their intended mapping and provides preliminary information about how the LGB measure operates in comparison. The retranslation information for existing items is presented in Table 7 (sorted in order from highest to lowest levels of agreement for retranslation). All of the items reached the 70% agreement level and received importance ratings over 3.0, with the exception of one item from the behavior family-work scale (“The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be as effective at work”), which received a 2.91.
Discussion

Overall, the results of the current study highlight the need for further exploration of the work-family domain for LGB individuals. The objectives of this project were to address the following research questions: 1) How do LGB individuals experience work-family conflict?, 2) Are current work-family conflict measures deficient in capturing LGB family experiences?, 3) Are existing work-family conflict items interpreted the same way in LGB populations?, 4) What are some possible predictors of work-family conflict for those in LGB relationships/families using current work-family conflict scales?, and 5) What might an inclusive measure of work-family conflict look like? This discussion will address each of these questions and future directions for research on work-family conflict among LGB populations.

Experiences of work-family conflict among LBG individuals: Construct deficiency?

Beginning with research questions 1 and 2, the current work utilized data collected in 41 in-depth interviews to assess how LGB individuals experience work-family conflict and whether there were additional experiences stemming from membership in an LGB family/relationship that heterosexual employees may not experience. Within Study 1, LGB individuals reported that they saw LGB relationship/family identity clashes to be a part of the work-family domain. Many participants mentioned LGB relationship/family clashes when asked questions about ways in which work and family might conflict generally, as well as when asked about more specific ways in which work and family might conflict. Almost half of the sample mentioned their LGB identity or outness either initially as one of the first areas of work-family conflict that came to mind after being provided with the definition or at the end of the interview when asked about the main
ways in which work and family conflict. While it is difficult to know the prevalence of LGB identity-based conflict, results show that some families may experience work-family conflict in additional ways stemming from LGB identity that we have not previously considered. Future research should further examine the determinants of identity-based work-family conflict within LGB populations.

While LGB individuals also reported experiencing time, strain, and behavior-based work-family conflict, evidence for an additional layer of work-family conflict was supported. These findings provide some rationale for continuing to study identity-based conflict as a part of work-family conflict for LGB individuals. Further, support for an additional strain on LGB families/relationships which has not yet been considered within the work-family literature will allow for a more nuanced understanding of work-family conflict for families with stigmatized identities.

In order to address research question 3, interviewee reactions to existing work-family conflict items were collected within the Study 1 interviews. Results demonstrated that individual items were, at times, interpreted differently (responses contained LGB-related content) within LGB populations than the originally intended content. LGB individuals voiced concerns about identity-based conflicts when considering the ways in which existing dimensions of work-family conflict play a role in their working lives. Reactions related to the behavioral dimension of work-family conflict were the most likely to contain identity-related concerns, with 15 individuals (37%) within the sample mentioning LGB identity-related information when asked generally about ways in which behaviors at work conflict with behaviors at home. At the individual item level, across the 6 questions about behavioral work-family conflict, 12 participants utilized identity-
based content to rationalize their responses. The current study demonstrates that the behavioral dimension of the existing work-family conflict scale may be interpreted differently within LGB populations compared to general populations. However, the differential interpretation of the behavioral dimension of the work-family scale was not demonstrated by a majority of the sample. Thus, the possibility for differential interpretation suggests that it may be important to develop alternate dimensions in order to properly measure work-family conflict within an LGB sample.

Overall, examining research questions 1, 2, and 3 allowed us to create an initial foundation upon which to build an inclusive work-family conflict scale and to expose potential flaws in current measures’ lack of inclusivity. By creating an outlet for LGB individuals to specifically report identity-based work/family conflict, it may be possible to more accurately estimate work-family conflict overall and each dimension of work-family conflict (particularly for behavior-based conflict, where the highest levels of contamination, or differential interpretation, were found).

In terms of item generation, individuals participated in in-depth interviews pertaining to the experiences of work-family conflict for LGB individuals. As such, 38 individual items for an inclusive scale of work-family conflict were generated as a result of these interview findings. This topic has been previously unexamined within the work-family conflict literature and is valuable in and of itself. Conducting in-depth interviews with LGB individuals also allowed for a rigorous and comprehensive way in which to generate scale items – a step which is often overlooked by researchers when creating item content. Because the current study was focused on examining and overcoming previous assumptions about families within the work-family literature, allowing potentially
silenced participants to share their unique work-family experiences was deemed the most appropriate methodology for this project.

**Interpretation of current work-family conflict items**

As mentioned above, LGB individuals experienced work-family conflict in many ways that were similar to the original dimensions of work-family conflict. Time and strain-based conflict were most frequently interpreted in terms of their intended content. Many LGB individuals mentioned being unable to spend time with their families/partners as a major source of work-family conflict, suggesting that these individuals may benefit from time-based work-family conflict solutions equally. Similarly, many LGB individuals experience stress as a result of their job duties or as a result of family stressors. As such, stress-relieving activities at work may equally benefit LGB individuals.

However, within behavior-based conflicts, LGB individuals experienced the most overlap with identity-based conflicts. This suggests that initiatives to allow employees to be their true selves (the way one behaves at home is not in direct conflict with the way one behaves at work) may benefit LGB individuals specifically, particularly if there is a focus on inclusivity. This finding also suggests that an additional dimension(s) of work-family conflict may be necessary for LGB individuals when determining actual levels of experienced work-family conflict. As stated above, one participant mentioned that identity-based conflict was the only thing that determined their level of work-family conflict. For these individuals, a separate place to report this conflict may cut down on potential contamination or deficiency within the behavioral dimension and allow organizations to directly measure identity-based work-family conflict within LGB
populations at work. If an organization chooses to directly measure this construct and discovers negative sentiment surrounding identity-based conflict, it will be possible to create more targeted and streamlined approaches to reducing this conflict. Further, packaging LGB identity-based conflict as part of the work-family domain may allow organizations to fold these solutions either into existing work-family programs or into existing diversity-related initiatives.

**Relationships among antecedents, mediators and outcomes of conflict within an LGB sample**

In order to answer research question 4, quantitative interview data was collected. Using correlational analyses, work-family conflict was significantly related to many of the study variables of interest in the expected direction, including level of outness at work and at home, supervisor support, coworker support, organizational support, presence of policy, fear of disclosure, and experiences of discrimination. Those who were more out at work tended to experience lower levels of work-family conflict overall. Further, those who found themselves in environments which had higher levels of support from the organization, coworkers, and supervisors were less likely to report work-family conflict. Further, those who had fewer experiences of discrimination also reported lower work-family conflict. Taken together, these findings reinforce the importance of creating an inclusive workplace for LGB individuals. Researchers have previously examined relationships between discrimination and turnover (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001), identity and barriers to promotion (Colvin, 2008), fear of coming out and experiences of discrimination (Croteau, 1996), fear of disclosure and psychological strain, attitudes, and work outcomes (Ragins et al., 2007), policy and discrimination (Button, 2001; Ragins &
Cornwell, 2001) and outness and satisfaction with subjective and objective work outcomes (Ellis & Riggle, 1996). However, little research to date has examined work-family conflict as a variable of interest within LGB populations.

While work-family conflict was significantly correlated with study variables, the correlations within this particular sample were not so high as to cause concern that work-family conflict may be collinear with discrimination, policy, outness, or support within an LGB sample. However, these results do support the idea that work-family conflict may be another part of the complicated web of variables that are affected by lack of LGB inclusivity within organizations. Although research by Day & Schoenrade (2000) demonstrated relationships between a 1-item measure of work-family conflict and disclosure, the present study determines potential relationships between a larger number of variables and uses a more comprehensive measure of work-family conflict. Even within a small sample, the magnitude of hypothesized study correlations were strong overall, reaching significance in the expected direction. This preliminary examination of relationships with work-family conflict in an LGB sample provides a backdrop for future research in this area and for further examination of the newly drafted identity-based conflict measure.

**Emerging dimensions**

Finally, in order to examine research question 5, retranslation and importance data were collected for each of the newly generated items for the inclusive work-family conflict scale. Within Study 2, the retranslation results were mixed. While individuals reported that all of the items were important, they were unable in many cases to distinguish them from existing work-family dimensions. While these findings were not
expected, they are useful and could have multiple interpretations in terms of next steps for creating a measure of work-family conflict for LGB individuals. The first interpretation may be that this measure is actually multi-dimensional. Originally, identity-based work-family conflict was conceptualized as a unidimensional construct which could be used in addition to existing work-family conflict dimensions. However, because individuals reported uncertainty in categorizing items using existing dimensions and identity-based work-family conflict, this data may suggest that the scale items that were generated represent multiple dimensions of a larger construct and that there may be some overlap with existing dimensions of work-family conflict, but with a more targeted LGB focus.

For example, the item pertaining to behaving differently with one’s LGB partner at home compared to work might be a specific issue to LGB individuals within an organization, but also indicates behavior-based work-family conflict more broadly. Thus, participants experienced difficulty in determining whether or not this item related to behavior or identity. In reality, it may be that this item related to both dimensions and should be placed into a behavioral subdimension of a separate LGB work-family conflict scale.

Alternatively, it may be the case that the definition of identity-based work-family conflict needs to be revisited in order to more accurately reflect the interview findings. While the findings were carefully examined in order to determine the best label and definition for the new construct, it may be that participants were unable to determine the proper category for each item because the definition is unclear. However, all of the items were rated as important. Further, participants saw these items as part of the work-family
domain. As such, instead of asking participants to distinguish between time, strain, behavior, and identity-based conflict, it may be more beneficial to ask whether each item falls into the work-family domain more broadly and then proceed with a factor analysis to determine the dimensionality of a new overall measure of LGB work-family conflict. In this way, we allow for a more direct examination of whether or not these items truly belong within the work-family domain. Once this is determined it will be possible to analyze whether or not this domain has multiple dimensions (which may or may not mirror the existing work-family dimensions) through structural equation modeling.

Because the current work addresses step 1 in Hinkin’s (1998) six-step process of scale development, additional steps must be completed before a final measure is developed.

**Future Research Directions**

First, one direction for future research is to continue examining the work-family domain for LGB individuals. It is necessary to determine whether or not each item belongs to the work-family domain more generally and then to administer the new scale of LGB work-family conflict to a larger population of LGB individuals in order to examine the dimensionality of this measure. Following Hinkin’s (1998) phases of scale development, it is necessary to re-examine the results of the current study variables to the existing dimensions of work-family conflict as well as to the new measure of LGB work-family conflict within a larger sample of LGB individuals. It is the hope that this new measure will assist researchers and practitioners more fully in addressing work-family conflict in an inclusive way. A recent review of the work-family conflict literature by Chang, McDonald, and Burton (2010) issued a call for an examination of the work-family domain for LGB individuals. The current study addresses this call and
demonstrates that there is a rationale for beginning to create more inclusive work-family measurement for LGB populations.

Second, the results serve as a call to re-examine the assumptions of current measures of work-family conflict which have not been tested in an LGB sample. Thinking more inclusively about who generated our existing items, which groups were included in the samples that our measures were validated within, and which groups our existing scale validation research includes and does not include, allows us to examine existing work-family conflict measures from new perspectives. The current work suggests that LGB family issues have not been considered to the extent that they should be within the existing work-family literature, despite the long-standing history of this literature within the psychology and business domains. This is a primary example of the ways in which we can benefit from viewing our constructs through an inclusive lens. This is not the first study to demonstrate similar bias, but it adds to a growing body of literature which requires researchers to question their assumptions. For example, Cole and Sabik (2009) pointed out that racial bias in the measurement of women’s self-esteem about appearance may be driving differences between White and ethnic minority women. The idea of viewing our measurement tools from a minority perspective is not particularly difficult to grasp, but it remains a rarity within the psychological research. The growth in understanding which results from thinking about “for whom” our constructs work is a worthwhile endeavor if we truly want to understand the complexities of the phenomena we study. As such, this study can serve as a model for generating research which re-examines long-standing constructs within the field and asks whether or not these constructs hold in a more diverse population.
Third, this study provides justification for the conceptualization of gender and sexuality as continuous, rather than categorical variables. As mentioned in the introduction, feminist scholars have encouraged thinking about sexuality and gender as continua (Butler, 2004; Fausto-Sterling, 2000). The current study demonstrates that (within an LGB population) participants viewed both their sexuality and their gender as being more complex than was reflected in a categorical variable. The variability in item responses for how male and how female participants considered themselves and in how gay and straight participants considered themselves, suggests that we might begin measuring gender and sexuality as continua. Participants readily identified themselves as male or female or as lesbian, gay, or bisexual categorically. However, they frequently reported having at least some of the category that was not chosen in the categorical identity question when asked the same question in a continuous format. For example, within this sample, how male or how female one considered themselves to be was a stronger predictor than gender itself. It may be the case that this holds within heterosexual samples as well and, as such, should be examined more closely in future research. Further, the current study provides an impetus for researchers to measure sexuality as part of a standard set of demographics measured within psychological research. Although measures of gender or race are staples in demographic information, measures of sexuality are not commonly collected. In order to understand the experiences of LGB individuals at work, we need to begin measuring sexuality in a more standardized way.

Fourth, this research highlights the need to examine alternative family structures more in-depth. It may be the case that families who experience other stigmatized
identities (disability, size, religion, socioeconomic status, single parent status, etc.) may experience similar identity-based work-family conflict. This research demonstrates that the examination of unique family experiences may lead us to a more complete and complex conceptualization of the work-family domain. The definition of identity-based work-family conflict may relate to a range of families with stigmatized identities. However, the examination of LGB families is a logical first step since there appears to be both a stigma attached to LGB identity (Ragins et al., 2001) and also a visceral, negative reaction associated with the realization of this identity for some individuals (Stacey, 1998). For this reason, there may be something particularly unique about the LGB identity that affects work and family domains in a harsher or condemning way than other families might experience. It is possible, then, that this difference drives a greater level of conflict, because the stakes for “coming out” about the stigmatized identity might be higher. For example, while there may be a stigma associated with having a child with a disability, it may not evoke the same visceral response towards the parent of that child as would an identity which is seen as controllable or as determined by the choices of an individual (as LGB status is often seen to be). For this reason, starting with LGB families might give us some insight into the more extreme cases in which work and family can conflict on the basis of identity. Future work should examine how other stigmatized family identities might play a role in increasing work-family conflict. As such, it is the hope that the current measure of identity-based work-family conflict will be viewed as a starting point for examining this complex and currently incomplete area of research.

Fifth, this research lends support to the theory of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), which stemmed from the women’s studies domain. By examining family identity
as a layered construct, with multiple pieces, instead of assuming a unified definition for the word “family”, we open the door to realizing how multiple layers of family identity may impact outcomes of interest in unique ways. By beginning to expand our definition of family and becoming cognizant of the multitude of ways that individuals might define family (aka family of choice (Cherlin, 2004)), we better understand how multiple family identities might combine and then, as a result, have a differential impact on variables that are meaningful for families, their quality of life, and their quality of work.

Finally, many participants shared stories and examples of instances in which their family or relationship was viewed differently (and often negatively) by coworkers or within the organization as a whole. This is in alignment with research which has examined perceived negative reactions to LGB identities individually (and not with reference to relationship/family issues) (Button, 2001; Ellis & Riggle, 1996; Hebl et al., 2002; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Ragins et al., 2007, Waldo, 1999). However, this study specifically measures perceived negative reactions toward LGB individuals at the family/relationship level using both a qualitative and an empirical approach. Motivation, performance, and productivity may all be affected by these negative experiences within the workplace, but empirical data has not yet been collected. Demonstrating a clear link between discriminatory environments or practices and objective performance may help to make the business case for LGB inclusivity more broadly. Further, the current study also demonstrated that, for the most part, participants expressed a desire to be out at work and actively sought out workplaces which allowed for the free expression of LGB identity. Results demonstrated that there was a link between outness and work-family conflict, specifically; the degree of outness at work was negatively related to work-family conflict.
This finding supports previous research suggesting that individuals experience stress as a result of being closeted (Croteau, 1996; Ragins et al., 1997; Ellis & Riggle, 1996) as opposed to power (Brown, 2000). However, this may be sample-specific and due to the majority of the sample being “out” at work. Future research should examine the extent to which individuals have made a decision to be closeted, the rationale for this decision and the effects of actively making this decision (as opposed to being forced into deciding) on outcomes of interest.

**Practical Implications**

Currently, many organizations are actively trying to promote a work-family friendly environment, with large numbers of organizations offering various family friendly benefits (SHRM, 2010). However, the current measures of work-family conflict only allow organizations to envision work-family conflict in terms of time, stress, and behavior. As such, organizations have implemented programs which allow for flexible scheduling, on-site childcare, on-site workout facilities, laundry services, and discounts on family-related services (SHRM, 2010). The current work highlights the potential need for organizations to examine which families are benefitting from these services and if there are additional services that are necessary in order to achieve work-family balance for all families within the organization. It is possible that organizations could measure work-family conflict both generally and more specifically as it relates to identity. This way, the organization may be able to more easily and effectively remedy the root cause of work-family issues, as opposed to assuming that all families are facing the same set of issues.
Further, LGB affinity groups may be able to utilize this information to push for better policies within organizations regarding LGB benefits, same-sex partner recognition, and an overall LGB friendly environment. Including organizational identity politics in a work-family framework may be an effective way for affinity groups to work towards better policies for LGB families in a way that fits with existing organizational goals.

Finally, organizational consultants or HR professionals may be able to use this information to make recommendations for inclusive work-family policy at the organizational level. Many HR practitioners and industrial/organizational psychology consultants are using survey methodologies to better understand the experiences of employees within particular organizational contexts. A specific measure of LGB work-family conflict could be used in conjunction with a larger plan for work-family conflict (which often falls under the wellness and employee benefits umbrella) or within an organizational diversity initiative. Creating awareness of LGB work and family issues amongst those who are responsible for talent management strategies and solutions within organizations may help to spearhead inclusive family practices on a broader scale.

Limitations

As a primary examination of a new construct, this study reflects a point of departure for future research. However, there are some limits to generalizing the findings. First, the sample included more lesbians and women than gay men and bisexual individuals. Future research should attempt to have a more balanced sample in terms of sexuality and gender. In addition, this sample was predominantly White. Future research should also attempt to garner a more racially diverse sample. Additionally, this sample
did not contain any transgender individuals. There may be significantly different identity issues that transgender individuals may face at work and future research should include a sample of transgender individuals in order to examine differences and similarities in experiences when compared to a non-transgender sample. Finally, the sample sizes for both Study 1 and Study 2 were small. While the threshold for participants when conducting in-depth interviews as well as when doing a content sort is traditionally lower than it would be for an empirical study, the items generated from these initial steps need to be tested for content and dimensionality within a larger sample.

Additionally, it is important to note that it is possible that heterosexual employees also experience work-family conflict differently than a “general population” might with regards to social identities other than sexuality. For example, a member of a very religious family working in an organization which espouses anti-religious views may experience work-family conflict. Similarly, a very conservative employee may feel out of place in a very liberal workplace. Future studies may be able to utilize the resulting LGB work-family conflict measure to better understand and measure the experiences of relationship/families with stigmatized identities other than an LGB identity.

Further, it may be the case that the retranslation results for the newly generated items were skewed in comparison to the results for the existing work-family conflict items because of the wording of the items. The existing items more frequently contain the name of the dimension in the wording of the item (containing “time” for time-based items, “stress” for strain-based items, and “behavior” for behavior-based items). The identity-based items did not frequently contain the word “identity”, although they did mention LGB status within the item. Because the newly generated items did not contain
wording that would clearly lead participants to categorize the items within an identity-based dimension, retranslation results may be skewed when compared to existing items. Future research should attempt to determine the dimensionality of items in order to determine if there is a more clear and apparent way to define the newly generated set of items.

Additionally, it is important to note that, while some participants reported identity-based work-family conflicts (almost half of the sample), many of them did not. This means that the current work only extends to a subpopulation of the LGB population. While it is important to determine how work-family conflict can be remedied for all families, future work should determine the base rate of identity-based work-family conflict in a larger sample. It may be the case that the current sample is skewed because of the methodology utilized, and as such, certain subsets of the LGB population may have been filtered out. As stated previously, this study is intended to serve as a first step toward determining how work-family conflict is experienced within LGB populations, but more research needs to follow this work in order to fully support the ideas presented.

Finally, while the current study examines work-family conflict, it may also be of interest in the future to examine the ways in which work and lifestyle conflict for those LGB individuals who do not consider themselves a part of a family. For example, for individuals who are not partnered, nor part of an LGB family, the survey might be administered with the words “life” or “lifestyle” substituted for “family.” This newly constructed measure of work-family conflict will be made more complete through the ability to compare and contrast responses of those who are currently in an LGB family/relationship with those who are not. It may be the case that issues are similar for
those who are in a family and for those who are not. For example, it may be stressful not to be able to talk about going on a date over the weekend with a same-sex individual, regardless of whether or not the employee considers that person their partner.

Future work may attempt to disentangle the domains of family and life by collecting data within both populations and examining differences and similarities between both. Although much of the literature talks about work-life balance conceptually, items still reflect a family focus (as demonstrated in Carlson et al. (2000)’s meta-measure). Although only those who are partnered/consider themselves to be a part of an LGB family were included in this study, non-partnered individuals may be included in future research to determine whether or not it is necessary to consider additional issues when measuring work-life conflict as opposed to work-family conflict.

Conclusions

The current study attempted to demonstrate that current work-family scales may be deficient for LGB families. The current study generated 38 items for an inclusive measure of work-family conflict for LGB families. By providing an outlet for members of LGB families or relationships to discuss work-family conflict as they experienced it, the current study was able to begin to examine previously held assumptions about family structure and work-family needs. Organizations may identify antecedents of work-family conflict within each particular workplace and provide practical and tailored solutions for LGB employees who are actively experiencing conflict between work and family domains. Finally, this study was able to demonstrate the potential for differential interpretation of the behavior-based conflict scale within LGB populations, calling for a separate scale for identity-based concerns. By identifying potential bias in work-family
conflict measurement, future industrial-organizational psychologists and HR professionals will be better equipped to provide useful and fair programs and interventions for all working families, regardless of sexual orientation.
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Table 2. Study 1 Demographics: Education, Industry, Role Title, and Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Education</strong></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Industry</strong></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Consulting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling/Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Reduction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Healthcare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit; personal care home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Consulting Firm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Chemicals Manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant/Support Staff Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender/Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Telemedical Interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing Faculty/Co-Course Faculty Lead in the College of Social/Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Instructional Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator-Talent Acquisition/Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the University Fellowships Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Women's and Diversity Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director and Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Exchange Compliance and Risk Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder/Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Account Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Government Info and Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor and Sales Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Data Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse for Disability Services/Assistant at Polycom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Division Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Underwriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials Cataloguing Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-study Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Study Variable Means and Standard Deviations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>39.71</td>
<td>12.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.7073</td>
<td>1.24988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>11.1026</td>
<td>6.02099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Male</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Female</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Straight</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Gay</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC Overall</td>
<td>2.3847</td>
<td>.65961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC Time WF</td>
<td>2.7805</td>
<td>1.16574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC Time FW</td>
<td>2.0813</td>
<td>.87490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC Strain WF</td>
<td>2.6423</td>
<td>1.02575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC Strain FW</td>
<td>2.0081</td>
<td>1.04213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC Behavior WF</td>
<td>2.5122</td>
<td>.98910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC Behavior FW</td>
<td>2.2846</td>
<td>.90235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Work</td>
<td>1.3951</td>
<td>.62368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Work</td>
<td>1.9951</td>
<td>1.25498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Work</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>.94552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Work</td>
<td>4.3122</td>
<td>1.08632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Home</td>
<td>1.2402</td>
<td>.43692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering Home</td>
<td>1.4488</td>
<td>.88066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Home</td>
<td>4.5220</td>
<td>.62109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Home</td>
<td>4.8850</td>
<td>.28961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Support</td>
<td>3.6703</td>
<td>.93509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support</td>
<td>4.6230</td>
<td>.47099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1.4171</td>
<td>.47629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality of Identity</td>
<td>3.1732</td>
<td>.94293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>3.5591</td>
<td>1.00231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Support</td>
<td>3.8368</td>
<td>.74760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>.7242</td>
<td>.33504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Evaluation</td>
<td>2.9229</td>
<td>.86012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Disclosure</td>
<td>2.1854</td>
<td>1.11060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Age | Number of Children | Household Income | Gender | How Male | How Female | How Gay | WFC Overall | WFC Time/Work | WFC Stress/Strain | WFC Behaviors & Work | WFC Strain & Work | WFC Time & Work | Overall SS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Correlation Table for Study Variables of Interest (**p<.10, ***p<.05, ****p<.01.)**
Table 6. Retranslation Item Level Data – Identity-Based Items Only (N=28 for retranslation, N=23 for importance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time-Based WFC</th>
<th>Strain-Based WFC</th>
<th>Behavior-Based WFC</th>
<th>Identity-Based WFC</th>
<th>None of These</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would not be accepted by my coworkers if I talked about my LGB relationship/family at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable bringing my LGB partner to my organization’s social events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I’m LGB, I feel uncomfortable having a picture of my family/partner on my desk at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid to discuss my LGB partner/family at work.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unable to talk about my LGB relationship/family with clients, customers, and/or students.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I am LGB, I have to pretend that my relationship/family does not exist at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would face negative job-related consequences if I discussed my LGB relationship/family</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because we’re LGB, my partner feels uncomfortable attending my organization’s social events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not use certain workplace policies/benefits available to me because I don’t want coworkers to know my relationship/family is LGB.</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>67.90%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner and I argue about whether or not I am “out” about being LGB at work.</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My coworkers would be uncomfortable if I talked about my LGB relationship/family at work.</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more at risk for career consequences when talking about my LGB relationship/family at work.</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe my LGB relationship/family is given the same considerations as more traditional relationships/families at work.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People at work assume that my family is heterosexual.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>64.30%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workplace is not a safe space for me to talk about LGB relationship/family concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have turned down job offers/promotions because my LGB relationship/family would be an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I can’t talk about my LGB relationship/family at work, I am currently looking for another job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my relationship/family is LGB, I could not talk about it at work if my partner became ill/injured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my relationship/family is LGB, I couldn’t talk about it at work if my partner/a family member and I got into a fight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People at work often ask uncomfortable questions about my LGB relationship/family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about my LGB relationship/family at work creates tension among my coworkers and me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tension when my partner/family</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asks about my level of “outness” about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being LGB at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner has turned down job offers/</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promotions because our LGB relationship/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family would be an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has made it clear that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my LGB relationship/family is accepted</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>57.10%</td>
<td>39.30%</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tension when coworkers ask about</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my LGB partner/family at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult for me to find LGB</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>39.30%</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family-friendly resources within my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have to teach my</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues about LGB relationships/families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot discuss LGB-related hobbies/</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities that my partner or I participate in outside of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable showing affection</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>towards my LGB partner in my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28.60%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My LGB partner and I avoid being seen together by colleagues/coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If my partner/family member was sick, I could not take a leave of absence from work because our relationship/family is LGB.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People at work often ask offensive questions about my LGB relationship/family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing my LGB relationship/family at work creates tension between my partner/family and me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a coworker said/did something harmful to my partner/family because we’re LGB, my workplace would support me.</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If one of my clients, customers, and/or students said/did something harmful to my partner/family because we’re LGB, my workplace would support me.</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had a family emergency, coworkers would be willing to help me, regardless of</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
my LGB status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My LGB partner/family does not have equal access to policies/benefits at my work.</th>
<th>7.10%</th>
<th>3.60%</th>
<th>39.30%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>3.87</th>
<th>1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I could not behave the same way with my LGB partner at work as I can at home.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Retranslation of Existing Work-Family Items (N=28 for retranslation, N=23 for importance).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time-Based WFC</th>
<th>Strain-Based WFC</th>
<th>Behavior-Based WFC</th>
<th>Identity-Based WFC</th>
<th>None of these</th>
<th>Importance Mean</th>
<th>Importance SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time-Based WFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.</td>
<td>92.90%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time I spend on family responsibilities often interferes with my work responsibilities.</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time I spend with my family often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities.</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strain-Based WFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/responsibilities.</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I am often stressed from family responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension and anxiety from my family life often weakens my ability to do my job.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior-Based WFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at work.</td>
<td>78.60%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better partner or spouse.</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem-solving behavior that works for me at home does not seem to be as useful at work.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be as effective at work.</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A – Interview Script

Katina Sawyer

Dissertation Project

Hello,

My name is Katina Sawyer and I’m a PhD student at The Pennsylvania State University conducting a research study for my dissertation examining the effects of work life on family/social life and vice versa. This study has been approved by Penn State’s Institutional Review Board (IRB # 38344). During the course of our discussion, I will be asking you a variety of questions related to your demographic information, your work life, and your family life. The interview will last about an hour. All of the information that you provide today will be kept completely confidential and I will never use your name with reference to any of the information that you choose to provide. The purpose of this study is to better understand work-family conflict in alternative family structures, in order to better inform policy and practices for organizations. This study intends to make the working lives of LGB individuals better and, as such, I am seeking to receive the most accurate information possible. So, please try to be as accurate and clear as possible in your responses. That being said, if at any point you feel uncomfortable with any of the information that you have been asked to provide, please let me know that you do not wish to answer the question(s) and we will move on to the next question. I thank you in advance for providing this valuable information. Your participation will contribute to a body of research which intends to make the workplace more friendly and beneficial for those who identify as LGB. If you have any questions or concerns after this interview is over, you may contact the primary investigator (Katina Sawyer) at katina.sawyer@gmail.com or at 215-850-9861. Thank you very much for your time and we will begin the interview now.

First, do you have any questions for me before we begin? (Pause for questions)

Now that you have had the opportunity for questions, we will begin the interview. If at any point, you have further questions, don’t hesitate to ask. Let’s get started.

1. What is your age?

2. Do you have someone who you consider to be your partner?

3. Are you legally married?
4. Are you currently cohabitating with a partner?

5. Do you have any children? If so, how many and what are their ages?

6. For which individuals in your life might you miss a day or days of work should they fall ill or injured?

7. What is the highest degree that you have attained thus far?

8. Whom are you employed by?

9. What industry sector is your company in?

10. What is the size of your company?

11. What location is your company in?

12. What city/town do you live in?

13. What is your role title?

14. What is your average yearly income?
   a. 0-$10,000, $11,000-20,000, $21,000-30,000, $31,000-40,000, $41,000-50,000, $51,000-60,000, $61,000-70,000, $71,000-80,000, $81,000-90,000, $91,000-100,000, Between $100,000 and 150,000, Between $150,000 and $200,000, Greater than $200,000

15. What is your partner’s average yearly income?
   a. 0-$10,000, $11,000-20,000, $21,000-30,000, $31,000-40,000, $41,000-50,000, $51,000-60,000, $61,000-70,000, $71,000-80,000, $81,000-90,000, $91,000-100,000, Between $100,000 and 150,000, Between $150,000 and $200,000, Greater than $200,000, Don’t know
16. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

17. On a scale of 1 to 5, how male would you say you are (1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=don’t know, 4=mostly, 5=completely)?

18. On a scale of 1 to 5, how female would you say you are (1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=don’t know, 4=mostly, 5=completely)?

19. What is your race?

20. How do you identify your sexuality?
   a. Heterosexual/straight
   b. Gay
   c. Lesbian
   d. Bisexual

21. Is there a particular term that you prefer to identify your sexuality other than straight, gay, lesbian, or bisexual?

22. On a scale of 1 to 5 how straight would you say you are (1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=don’t know, 4=mostly, 5=completely)?

23. On a scale of 1 to 5 how gay would you say you are (1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=don’t know, 4=mostly, 5=completely)?
24. People are different in their sexual attraction to other people. Which best describes your feelings? Are you:

   a. Only attracted to females?
   
   b. Mostly attracted to females?
   
   c. Equally attracted to males and females?
   
   d. Mostly attracted to males?
   
   e. Only attracted to males?
   
   f. Not sure?

25. Are you transgender?

26. Who have you had sex with (both partners in the past and partners you are currently engaging in sexual activity with)?

   a. Men only
   
   b. Women only
   
   c. Both men and women
   
   d. I have not had sex

27. Now I am going to ask some questions about the ways in which work and family (life) conflict. Work family conflict has been traditionally defined as “a form of interrole conflict in which role pressures from work and family domains are incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role.” If you had to come
up with a complete definition, how would you define work-family conflict as it pertains to you?

a. For example, do you feel that your work and family domains are incompatible? How so?

b. Do you find that participating fully in your family is more difficult because of your work role?

c. Do you find that participating fully in your work role is more difficult because of your family? In what ways?

28. Do you feel as if time devoted to your work role makes it difficult to devote time to your family role? If so, in what ways?

a. For example, do you feel that the time you devote to work takes away from the time you devote to your family?

29. Do you feel as if time devoted to your family role makes it difficult to devote time to your work role? If so, in what ways?

a. For example, do you feel that the time you devote to your family takes away from the time you devote to your work?

30. Do you feel as if the stress you experience in your work role exacerbates the stress experienced in your family role? In what ways?

a. For example, do you feel that your stress from work is brought home with you?
31. Do you feel as if the stress you experience in your family role exacerbates the stress experienced in your work role? In what ways?
   a. For example, do you feel that your stress from your family is brought to work with you?

32. Do you feel as if the necessary behaviors you perform at work are in conflict with the necessary behaviors you perform at home? In what ways?
   a. For example, do you feel as if you are forced to behave differently at work than you do at home?

33. Do you feel as if the necessary behaviors you perform at home are at odds with the necessary behaviors you perform at work? In what ways?
   a. For example, do you feel that you are forced to behave differently at home than you do at work?

34. Do you feel as if the values that you teach/hold in your family are in conflict with the values your workplace espouses? In what ways?
   a. For example, do you think that the personal/political values that you hold/would teach at home are different than the values you hear/observe at work?
      i. How does this relate to your personal identity?

35. Do you feel as if the values that your workplace teaches/holds are in conflict with the values your family espouses? In what ways?
a. For example, do you think that the personal values that your workplace passes on to its employees are different than the values you would like to uphold at home?

b. How does this relate to your personal identity?

36. To what extent do you feel that your workplace would be willing to change its values to better match those of your family/your lifestyle?

37. To what extent do you feel that you would be willing to change the values of your family/your lifestyle to match your workplace?

38. What could your workplace do to make its values better aligned with the values of your family/your lifestyle, if anything?

39. Are there concrete ways in which your workplace might be able to better suit the needs of your family/your lifestyle?

40. Are there particular programs or policies which you would find particularly helpful or useful in decreasing your work/family conflict?

41. If someone were to ask you the main ways in which your work and family conflict, what would you say?

   a. In what ways does your job make your life outside of work more difficult?

   b. In what ways does your life outside of work make your job more difficult?

42. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = Not at all, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Most of the time, 5 = All the time) to what extent do your work and family currently conflict?
43. Your previous response seems to demonstrate that you believe your level of work-family conflict is (high/medium/low). Are there particular experiences that you have had at work which lead to you believe you have high/medium/low levels of work family conflict? What are they?

44. Administration of work-family and family-work conflict scales – item by item, with each item followed by “What is the rationale for the answer you provided?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-based work interference with family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My work keeps me from my family/life activities more than I would like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rationale:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household/life responsibilities and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rationale:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have to miss family/life activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rationale:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-based family interference with work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The time I spend on family/life responsibilities often interferes with my work responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rationale:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The time I spend with my family/ in my life outside of work often causes me not to spend time in activities at work that could be helpful to my career.
   
   a. **Rationale:**

6. I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family/life responsibilities.
   
   a. **Rationale:**

**Strain-based work interference with family**

7. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family/life activities/responsibilities.
   
   a. **Rationale:**

8. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family/life.
   
   a. **Rationale:**

9. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.
   
   a. **Rationale:**

**Strain-based family interference with work**

10. Due to stress at home/in my life, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.
   
   a. **Rationale:**
11. Because I am often stressed from family/life responsibilities, I have a hard time concentrating on my work.
   
   a. Rationale:

12. Tension and anxiety from my family/life often weakens my ability to do my job.
   
   a. Rationale:

Behavior-based work interference with family

13. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home/in life.
   
   a. Rationale:

14. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home/in my lifestyle.
   
   a. Rationale:

15. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse/friend, partner, or family member.
   
   a. Rationale:

Behavior-based family interference with work

16. The behaviors that work for me at home do not seem to be as effective at work.
   
   a. Rationale:

17. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at home would be counterproductive at
45. Please answer the following items about the extent to which you are out at work and at home.

*Outness (Items derived from Griffin, 1992)*

Please rate the extent to which you would endorse the following items using the following 5-point scale: Strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, strongly agree.

**With regards to your work:**

**Passing**

1. At work, I often make references to my partner as if I was in a heterosexual relationship.

2. I pretend that I am heterosexual at work.

3. I make up stories that would lead others at work to believe that I am heterosexual at work.
4. I often tell people directly that I am heterosexual at work.
5. Everyone at work thinks that I am straight.

Covering
1. I attempt to conceal the fact that I am gay from everyone at work.
2. I never talk about my sexuality at work.
3. If other people at work assume that I am heterosexual, I never correct them.
4. I omit information from conversations that would lead anyone to believe that I am gay at work.
5. I never talk about any romantic relationships at work.

Being Implicitly Out
1. At work, I use the proper pronouns when describing people whom I am having relationships with.
2. I have worn gay pride symbols or clothing to work.
3. I can think of colleagues at work who I would invite to my home to have dinner with myself and a partner.
4. I never directly lie about my identity at work.
5. I would talk about plans to vacation with a partner at work.

Being Explicitly Out
1. I have told people at work that I am gay.
2. There are certain colleagues at work who know that I am gay.
3. I am not concerned about people at work knowing that I am gay.
4. I have chosen trustworthy individuals at work to share my gay identity with.
5. I would feel comfortable having a picture of myself and my partner on my desk at work.

With regards to your family and friends:

Passing

1. When I am with family and friends, I often make references to my partner as if I was in a heterosexual relationship.

2. I pretend that I am heterosexual with family and friends.

3. I make up stories that would lead friends and family to believe that I am heterosexual.

4. I often tell friends and family directly that I am heterosexual.

5. All of my friends and family think that I am straight.

Covering

1. I attempt to conceal the fact that I am gay from friends and family.

2. I never talk about my sexuality with friends and family.

3. If my friends and family assume that I am heterosexual, I never correct them.

4. I omit information from conversations that would lead friends and family to believe that I am gay.

5. I never talk about any romantic relationships with friends or family.

Being Implicitly Out

1. I use the proper pronouns when describing people whom I am having relationships with when I am around friends and family.

2. I have worn gay pride symbols or clothing around friends and family.

3. I can think of friends and family who I would invite to my home to have dinner with myself and a partner.

4. I never lie about my identity to my friends and family.
5. I would talk about plans to vacation with a partner with my friends and family.

Being Explicitly Out

1. I have told friends and family that I am gay.
2. There are certain friends and family who know that I am gay.
3. I am not concerned about friends and family knowing that I am gay.
4. I have chosen trustworthy friends and family to share my gay identity with.
5. I would feel comfortable having a picture of myself and my partner at home where my friends and family could see it.

46. Please answer the following questions on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree.

Organizational Support

1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being.
2. If the organization could hire someone to replace me at a lower salary, it would do so. (R)
3. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort by me. (R)
4. The organization strongly considers my goals and values.
5. The organization would ignore any complaint from me. (R)
6. The organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me. (R)
7. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.
8. The organization really cares about my well-being.
9. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice. (R)
10. The organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor.
11. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
12. If given the opportunity, the organization would take advantage of me. (R)

13. The organization shows very little concern for me. (R)

14. The organization cares about my opinions.

15. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

16. The organization tries to make my job as interesting as possible.

*Family Support (Adapted)*

1. My family values my contribution to our well-being.

2. If my family could replace me with someone else easily, they would do it. (R)

3. My family fails to appreciate any extra effort by me. (R)

4. My family strongly supports my goals and values.

5. My family would ignore any complaint from me. (R)

6. My family disregards my best interests when they make decisions that affect me. (R)

7. Help is available from my family when I have a problem.

8. My family really cares about my well-being.

9. Even if I did the best job possible, my family would fail to notice. (R)

10. My family is willing to help me if I need a special favor.

11. My family cares about my general satisfaction at home.

12. If given the opportunity, my family would take advantage of me. (R)

13. My family shows very little concern for me. (R)

14. My family cares about my opinions.

15. My family takes pride in my accomplishments.

16. My family tries to make my life as fulfilling as possible.
Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors (Hammer et al., 2009)

Please rate the extent to which you endorse the following statements using the following 5 options: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

Emotional Support

1. My supervisor is willing to listen to my problems in juggling work and nonwork life.
2. My supervisor takes time to learn about my personal needs.
3. My supervisor makes me feel comfortable talking about my conflicts between work and nonwork.
4. My supervisor and I can talk effectively to solve issues between work and nonwork issues.

Instrumental Support

1. I can depend on my supervisor to help me with scheduling conflicts if I need it.
2. I can rely on my supervisor to make sure my work responsibilities are handled when I have unanticipated nonwork demands.
3. My supervisor works effectively with workers to creatively solve conflicts between work and nonwork.

Role Model

1. My supervisor is a good role model for work and nonwork balance.
2. My supervisor demonstrates effective behaviors in how to juggle work and nonwork balance.
3. My supervisor demonstrates how a person can be jointly successful on and off the job.

Creative work-family management
1. My supervisor thinks about how the work in my department can be organized to jointly benefit employees and the company.

2. My supervisor asks for suggestions to make it easier for employees to balance work and nonwork demands.

3. My supervisor is creative in reallocating job duties to help my department work better as a team.

4. My supervisor is able to manage my department as a whole team to enable everyone’s need to be met.

*Family Supportive Coworker Behaviors (adapted from Hammer et al., 2009)*

Please rate the extent to which you endorse the following statements using the following 5 options: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree.

**Emotional Support**

1. My coworkers are willing to listen to my problems in juggling work and nonwork life.

2. My coworkers take time to learn about my personal needs.

3. My coworkers make me feel comfortable talking about my conflicts between work and nonwork.

4. My coworkers and I can talk effectively to solve issues between work and nonwork issues.

**Instrumental Support**

1. I can depend on my coworkers to help me with scheduling conflicts if I need it.

2. I can rely on my coworkers to make sure my work responsibilities are handled when I have unanticipated nonwork demands.

3. My coworkers work effectively with each other to creatively solve conflicts between work and nonwork.

**Role Model**
1. My coworkers are a good role models for work and nonwork balance.

2. My coworkers demonstrate effective behaviors in how to juggle work and nonwork balance.

3. My coworkers demonstrate how a person can be jointly successful on and off the job.

Creative work-family management

1. My coworkers think about how the work in my department can be organized to jointly benefit employees and the company.

2. My coworkers create suggestions to make it easier for employees to balance work and nonwork demands.

3. My coworkers are creative in reallocating job duties to help my department work better as a team.

4. My coworkers are able to help my department function as a whole team to enable everyone’s needs to be met.

47. Please answer the following questions about the extent to which you agree with the following statements with regards to your feelings about yourself and your workplace.

_Fear of Disclosure (Ragins et al., 2007)_

Please determine the extent to which you agree with the following items using the scale anchors from 1-5 (completely disagree = 1, disagree = 2, neither agree or disagree =3, agree = 4, strongly agree = 5).

**IF I DISCLOSED MY SEXUAL ORIENTATION TO EVERYONE AT WORK:**

1. I would lose my job.

2. I would be excluded from informal networks.

3. I would not be promoted.

4. My prospects for advancement would be stifled.
5. My mobility would be restricted.
6. I would not get a raise.
7. I would be ostracized.
8. My career would be ruined.
9. People would avoid me.
10. I would be harassed.
11. I would lose the opportunity to be mentored.
12. Coworkers would feel uncomfortable around me.

_Fear of Negative Evaluation (Leary, 1983)_

Read each of the following statements and indicate how characteristic it is of you according to the following scale: 1=Not at all characteristic of me, 2= Slightly characteristic of me, 3= Moderately characteristic of me, 4 = Very characteristic of me, 5= Extremely characteristic of me.

1. I worry about what other people will think of me even when I know it doesn’t make any difference.
2. I am unconcerned even if I know people are forming an unfavorable impression of me. ( R )
3. I am frequently afraid of other people noticing my shortcomings.
4. I rarely worry about what kind of impression I am making on someone. ( R )
5. I am afraid that others will not approve of me.
6. I am afraid that people will find fault with me.
7. Other people’s opinions of me do not bother me. ( R )
8. When I am talking to someone, I worry about what they may be thinking about me.
9. I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make.
10. If I know someone is judging me, it has little effect on me. ( R )
11. Sometimes I think I am too concerned with what other people think of me.
12. I often worry that I will say or do the wrong things.

_Centrality of Sexual Identity (adapted from Sellers et al., 1998)_

1. Overall, my sexual identity has very little to do with how I feel about myself. (R)
2. In general, my sexual identity is an important part of my self-image.
3. My destiny is tied to the destiny of other people who share my sexual identity.
4. My sexuality is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am. (R)
5. I have a strong sense of belonging with people who share my sexual identity.
6. I have a strong attachment to others who share my sexual identity.
7. My sexual identity is an important reflection of who I am.
8. My sexual identity is not a major factor in my social relationships. (R)

_Perceived Discrimination (adapted from Waldo, 1999)_

Below are some questions about your experiences in your workplace. Some of the questions may apply to you more than others, but please try to respond to each item whether you are gay, lesbian, or bisexual or not. Please remember that your answers are COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS in your workplace, have you been in a situation where any of your supervisors or co-workers: Never, Once or Twice, Sometimes, Often, Most of the Time.

a) . . .told offensive jokes about lesbians, gay men or bisexual people (e.g., "fag" or "dyke" jokes, AIDS jokes)?

b). . . made homophobic remarks in general (e.g., saying that gay people are sick or unfit to be parents)

c). . . ignored someone in the office/in a meeting because they are gay/lesbian/bisexual?

d). . . made crude or offensive sexual remarks about gay people either publicly (e.g., in the office) or to you privately?
e). . . made homophobic remarks about someone personally because of their sexual orientation (e.g., saying they were sick or unfit to be a parent)

f). . . called someone a "dyke," "faggot," "fence-sitter" or some similar slur?

g). . . avoided touching someone (e.g., shaking your hand) because of their sexual orientation?

h). . . denied someone a promotion, raise or other career advancement because of their sexual orientation?

i). . . made negative remarks based on someone’s sexual orientation to other co-workers?

j). . . tampered with someones’ materials (e.g., computer files, telephone) because of their sexual orientation?

k) . . . physically hurt (e.g., punched, hit, kicked or beat) someone because of their sexual orientation?

l). . . set someone up on a date with a member of the other sex when he/she did not want it?

m). . . left someone out of social events because of their sexual orientation?

n). . . asked questions about someone’s personal life that may have made them uncomfortable (e.g., why you don't ever date anyone or come to office social events)?

o). . . displayed or distributed homophobic literature or materials in your office (e.g., electronic mail, flyers, brochures)?

p). . . made someone afraid that they would be treated poorly if they discussed their sexual orientation?

q). . . implied faster promotions or better treatment if employees kept quiet about their sexual orientation?

r). . . made it necessary for someone to pretend to be heterosexual in social situations (e.g., bringing an other-sex date to a company social event, going to a heterosexual "strip" bar for business purposes)?

s). . . made it necessary for someone to lie about their personal life (e.g., saying that they went out on a date with a person of the other sex over the weekend or that they were engaged to be married)?

t). . . discouraged someone’s supervisors from promoting them because of their sexual orientation?
u). . . made it necessary for someone to "act straight" (e.g., monitor their speech, dress, or mannerisms)!

v). . . made someone feel as though they had to alter discussions about their personal life (e.g., referring to their partner as a "roommate")?

48. Please answer the following questions about the extent to which your organization has or does not have the following:

*Organizational Policy (Ragins & Cornwell, 2001)*

Please respond yes, no, or I don’t know to the following statements with reference to your workplace.

Does your organization….

1. Have a written nondiscrimination policy that includes sexual orientation?
2. Include sexual orientation in the definition of diversity?
3. Include awareness of gay/lesbian/bisexual issues in diversity training?
4. Offer same-sex domestic partner benefits?
5. Offer gay/lesbian/bisexual resources or support groups?
6. Welcome same-sex partners at company social events?
Appendix B – Full Interview Narrative

1. Discussing my LGB relationship/family at work creates tension between my partner/family and me.

2. I feel tension when my partner/family asks about my level of “outness” about being LGB at work.

3. My partner and I argue about whether or not I am “out” about being LGB at work.

These items were generated based on support for the idea that the politics of being out about one’s relationship at work was sometimes a point of contention for participants at home. For example, a lesbian woman who worked as a bartender described an incident during which her partner came into work wearing a Gay Pride t-shirt. When a customer realized that they were together, they began harassing both her and her partner. Instead of asking the customer to leave, management took the side of the customer and asked the interviewee’s partner to leave instead. When discussing the implications of the incident, she stated “I guess that work did come into the house because for a good month it was a big controversy talking about what happened at work…that was emotionally draining. Whenever we are discussing what happens at work, it still comes up. It's very draining.” In this way, LGB individuals may be responsible for monitoring their language and behavior at work and simultaneously held responsible for how they go about doing this when they are at home with their partner.

Participants also noted a conflict between being closeted at work and being out at home. Specifically, participants noted the ways in which they felt like
closeted behaviors either made them feel guilty when they were around their partner or created conditions in which they acted differently around their partner than they would otherwise because of working conditions. For example, one interviewee stated “sometimes it’s hard to snap out of my closeted mode” when asked about the extent to which behaviors at home conflicted with behaviors at work. Another participant felt guilty about being closeted at work, saying “I felt like I was doing him [his partner] a disservice because I was out everywhere else and I felt two-faced. But I had to do it. And as soon as I got tenure I came out.” For this participant, being unable to talk about his partner at work created tension and guilt in their relationship.

In a more complicated way, it also appears that participants had a hard time talking about the trials and tribulations of being gay at work to extended or immediate family members. In these cases, the family was not accepting of an LGB relationship/family status and was unable to provide support when the workplace was either putting their LGB identity at the forefront or abstracting it into the background. For example, one gay male participant, after working in a university setting for many years, realized that he was being paid less than his heterosexual counterparts. When he decided to fight the discrimination, his family was not very understanding. He stated that “[he] sued the University for sexual orientation discrimination which was very misunderstood by [his] own brothers.” Similarly, one lesbian woman spoke about the high level of acceptance that her workplace had for LGB individuals. However, the local community was not always so accepting – including her own daughters. She explained the situation,
saying “I’m the president of the campus’ only LGB club. I have responsibility towards that club of making people feel comfortable and planning events. But, I also have 3 teenage daughters though, for whom I was a straight woman for a long time. So I have to take into consideration their feelings as well. I need to take into consideration their feelings when their friends are seeing me march in a gay pride parade.” Later in this same interview, the participant reiterated, “I have to be their mom first, but sometimes that doesn’t allow me to take part in the LGB activities on the campus.”

Finally, one participant spoke about an incident in which she felt uncomfortable having her coworkers meet her partner. The lack of introduction caused some tension in her relationship with her partner. She stated “sometimes having a dispute with my partner can be stressful. There was a time when my girlfriend was here and she wanted to visit my office and that stressed me out. I didn’t mind that people would see her and it’s just the questions that would come after. I feel like she is obviously gay, so people would ask questions. I don’t want to lie to people.” In this case, this participant felt like her lesbian relationship would spur potentially stressful conversations at work and, ultimately, she had to tell her partner that she could not visit her at work as she had wished to. In this way, a lack of acceptance at work created issues at home for this participant, as well as for the other participants listed above.

4. *Talking about my LGB relationship/family at work creates tension among my coworkers and me.*
5. My coworkers would be uncomfortable if I talked about my LGB relationship/family at work.

Similarly, talking about being LGB with coworkers caused stress for participants, both at home and with organizational members. This item received much evidentiary support throughout the interview process. Participants often mentioned a heightened level of stress which comes along with the process of being closeted to some degree at work, particularly when coworkers ask questions about one’s home life. For example, one participant stated that, when talking about relationships at work, “there is always emotional stress in watching what you say and how you say it.” Similarly, another participant noted, “not being able to talk about your family adds another layer of stress that can impact well-being.”

Additionally, participants who were currently out felt that being unable to talk about their family at work would be a huge burden on their working lives. For example, an out employee said, “I would consider it work-family conflict if I couldn’t talk about my family at work – a BIG one.” Further, another out employee mentioned that, while she did not experience identity-based conflict firsthand, she would consider it a form of work-family conflict if she had. This participant stated that “most of [her coworkers] had never met a gay person before, but they really did accept [her]….But, [she] would definitely consider not being able to talk about those things as a form of work-family conflict.”

For participants who were closeted, being unable to talk about their family or partner was a real source of conflict at work. For example, one lesbian woman noted that her boss was very religious as well as a long-term family friend. This
made things awkward when this particular participant was determining how to talk about her personal life. She noted that, in this particular case, “she has to think it's weird that I never talk about relationships, but it's just not talked about. She tried to set me up on dates, but finally got the hint that I wasn't interested.” Similarly, an interviewee noted that, “I can't really discuss things with colleagues about my personal life.” In the same vein, another participant who was new in the coming out process noted that she finally felt able to be herself with family and friends at home, but was unable to feel the same way at work. She stated, “this is the first year that I am finally realizing myself that I'm actually gay and not just in a gay relationship. At home, there is a lot of stuff going on that is centered around that. I honestly can't let any of that out at work. I channel my high school self at work. This is the first and foremost thing that I think of when I think of conflict at work. I am struggling with keeping it all in.” Most intensely, one participant asserted that, “definitely the only real conflict that I have is talking about my partner at work. I don't feel any other demands. This is THE work-family conflict issue for me.” This particular participant highlights the extent to which identity-based conflict, here encapsulated in this one item, can constitute the entirety of work-family conflict for an LGB individual.

6. **I would not be accepted by my coworkers if I talked about my LGB relationship/family at work.**

7. **I am afraid to discuss my LGB relationship/family at work.**

   This item is similar to the previous item, but implies that there has been some sort of exposure to thoughts or feelings of coworkers about LGB families/
relationships in general. While the previous item implies that an LGB employee might cause some discomfort with coworkers, this item implies that there is a sense that an LGB employee would experience outright rejection. For example, one participant explained that within their organization, “there is a general sentiment that different is bad…any kind of different behavior is seen as potentially risky. I can’t talk about my home life issues because, although my supervisor knows and is supportive, a lot of people I work with would just view different as bad.” Similarly, even in environments where it appears that coworkers might accept their LGB relationship/family, one participant noted that while “people seem very open and accepting…you just never know.”

Other participants provided direct examples of language used or from discussions they have had with coworkers about their LGB relationships/families to provide support for this item. For example, one participant noted, “I can’t talk about my personal life at all. You know, because all gay people are pedophiles (laughing).”

Amongst these participants were also those who felt that openly expressed religious views often conflicted with the status of their families/relationships as LGB individuals. One participant discussed this religious culture as one in which the assumption that every employee adheres to the same religious beliefs dictates the culture surrounding LGB acceptance. This participant said, “there are a few people in my work environment who are extremely religious and they will sometimes start talking about their religious views, so our lifestyle right there is a direct conflict. If they ever talk about politics or religion, everyone talks about
marriage equality and they say their personal opinion and I need to walk out of the room. They have different views of the world in general.” While another participant felt that there was no evidence that their LGB family values were viewed negatively by coworkers, being new on the job made it impossible to take the risk of discussing these values. This participant stated: “I really haven’t heard anything specific that would lead me to believe that…but I’m new, so I don’t want to take any chances.” Another participant who worked on a political campaign trail, felt that it had been explicitly stated that her family would be welcome at work and that feeling discomfort or fear surrounding these issues was not necessary. She stated: “I feel like the controller has an elected office and so he does a lot to try to make sure that there is an inclusive atmosphere and visibly participates in the gay pride parade and multicultural events, etc. Although not everyone feels that same way, it is a culture where the values that I hold are at least part of the conversation. It would be very frowned upon for someone to be negative about my values. Everyone has to keep it very above board. He is trying to run for mayor, so that's why.” Overall, participants provided support for the idea that coworker support is important and that even subtle hints at possible rejection while discussing family were recognized. In this vein, one participant noted that “there is definitely a family-centered environment as well, which sometimes comes out at work. I work with a lot of ‘family-centered people’ (sarcastically) and this can be promoted as an agenda from time to time.”

When coworker acceptance is not a given, participants seemed to mention the role of trust in determining whether or not to talk about their families at work.
One participant who identified as queer and had a transgender partner discussed being out at her current job, although she was closeted in a recent job due to issues with trust in her coworkers’ acceptance of their relationship. In reference to her current job, she states, “my supervisor is gay, the guy who works behind me is queer, my partner is in the cubicle next to me and I think that my supervisor’s supervisor is queer. My partner works in a different job but we work right next to each other.” However, with reference to her previous job, she noted, “but, in our last job, we worked together but we weren't out…we didn't trust the coworkers very much. They thought that we were cousins or something because we were always hanging out.” Similarly, when asked about the extent to which work and family conflict generally, one participant stated that these domains were “very incompatible.” When pressed further, this participant stated, that “where I work isn't openly accepting of alternate lifestyles so I don't talk about my family other than my children. I don't talk about my partner except for with a few people I trust.” Finally, when asked the same question, another participant answered “yes, they are incompatible. I always feel like I can’t talk about it at work without having something come along with it. Judgment or mistreatment, not sure. I feel that if I was in a straight relationship I wouldn’t have to deal with those things.”

In this way participants demonstrated that there is something about being in an LGB relationship/family that conjures up the need for trust and the possibility for a lack of acceptance and subsequent fear of rejection, which may result in a risky environment for LGB employees when discussing their family lives.
8. *I would face negative job-related consequences if I discussed my LGB relationship/family at work.*

9. *I feel more at risk for career consequences when talking about my LGB relationship/family at work.*

This item stems directly from participants’ experiences in which they felt that their LGB relationship/family identity put their jobs (or job related outcomes) at risk. On a positive note, one participant said that talking about LGB family/relationship status was not an issue at work, despite a lack of protection at the state level. This participant stated that a lack of work-family conflict would involve “…being able to talk about personal life and not being judged. VA is a state where you could be openly gay and get fired for it, but my current company would never put that fear in me.” Similarly, another participant stated that identity doesn’t matter at work, because of a strict culture of high performance. This participant made it clear that “At [this company] it’s ALL about performance. It doesn't matter who you are. If you make the numbers, you're golden. No one cares about identity, just performance.” In the opposite way, one participant stated that discussing LGB identity would result in possible termination. This participant noted, “I would most definitely see not being able to talk about my identity being part of work-family conflict. I don't talk about my identity because I can't risk losing a job.” Similarly, another participant said “I definitely have a huge work family conflict. I am not out at work and I fear for my job at times.”

Another participant discussed in detail the extent to which LGB individuals were held to different standards at work, stating: “I think that has a disparate
impact on LGB people. We are always asking ourselves if they are not talking to us because of who we are or is it something else. This is definitely the case for positions of management. Being an LGB manager here is not an easy matter. I have watched a number of them be completely undermined by the people who work for them. It was never that they would explicitly say it, but they would blame them much faster and gang up on them. I have seen people literally driven out of their management positions. Employees would never admit, even to themselves that they did it because they were gay, but you know they never would have done that to a straight person. The lack of career guidance has a disproportionate impact on LGB folks. I don't know how you would ever get promoted as an LGB person here. I have been told not to dress too butch. Those shoes are scary for example, things like that.” Similarly another participant discussed the extent to which working in a religious environment changed the level of support for LGB individuals in comparison with racial/ethnic groups. She explained: “It's layered. There is a lot of support to a degree but I don't think anyone is going to be doing any kind of - I think people are quietly supportive. No one is taking on the Catholic Church any time soon. There won't be a lot of public support for me. Even around issues of race, people are more publicly supportive. If someone did something to denigrate people of color, people within the university would take a stance on that. It's not that they wouldn't want to but they wouldn't risk the political fallout of that.”

While these quotes are more directly tied to LGB identity in general, one participant echoed a similar sentiment, fearing performance decrements as a result
of having to be closeted about her relationship. This participant asserted that “at one job that I had, I was not out and I found that to be very stressful. I was so much more reserved and I wasn't as good of a communicator in that role as I would have been if I could have been more open about my relationship. I believe that I was fired from that job because they found out that I was gay.”

One participant also mentioned that corporate culture dictates the extent to which negative outcomes at work were a real consequence based on LGB relationship/family identity. While individuals at work might be accepting of LGB coworkers’ lifestyles, this participant felt that “it's more of a cultural thing in the company…I don't see a lot of willingness or acceptance from management to change, but individuals that I work with might be more accepting. I just don't want my personal life to become an issue because I'm in education. I don't want them to focus on anything other than my work. I don't want to put my family situation in that light to see if they would change because I don't want to take that chance.” In the same vein, another participant lost time with his family because he felt that pouring all of his energy into work was the only way to keep his job. This participant shared his story, saying: “I felt that because I was gay, I needed to be perfect at work. So that I would be above any qualms that anyone might have about me. So I did things at work 110% percent and I didn't spend enough time with my brothers or my partner. I was robbing Peter to pay Paul.” In both of these cases, participants noted that they wanted the focus to be solely on their work, so much so that they sacrificed talking about family or spending time with family outside of work. As such, the threat of losing one’s job or experiencing
performance decrements/negative consequences at work may be related to the extent to which LGB individuals can discuss their relationship/family.

10. My LGB partner/family does not have equal access to policies/benefits at my work.

This item received overwhelming support from participants. Participants often talked about the presence of domestic partner benefits or LGB-related policies as being a primary indicator of whether or not the organization was LGB-family friendly. Although some participants noted that the organization did not always have jurisdiction over the legal aspects of inclusively recognizing all families, they did point out areas where organizations could do more to demonstrate an LGB family-friendly culture. A perfect example of this sentiment was expressed by one participant when asked about ways that her organization could improve in terms of work-family conflict. She stated: “This may sound really strange but one thing that would make me very comfortable would be partner benefits. When an organization offers benefits for domestic partners, to me that says that the organizational culture is accepting of LGB individuals. It may not be the case, but to me for some reason in my mind that seems like the organization is accepting.” Similarly, other participants said, “I am in a minority seeking out a company that is so open and supportive. I really wanted DPBs and FMLA leave for same-sex partners. I know that's unusual” as well as “I particularly sought out an employer who had strong value statements that aligned with mine in terms of supporting work-family balance and LGB employees.”
Although these participants may have seen their responses as being potentially “strange”, seeking out employers who offer LGB family-friendly benefits was certainly not an aberration within this sample.

Other participants discussed the direct role that the presence of domestic partner benefits had in choosing a particular organization or, on the other hand, in avoiding them. One participant working in an academic setting mentioned, “I took a proactive role towards trying to finesse questions before accepting employment. I told them that I wouldn't come if I couldn't get DPBs. I made a campus visit before committing to assess the local atmosphere with regards to diversity. I would have seen that as a conflict if those things had not existed. I came in 2005 and we did have DPBs for current employees but in my division, they had never before used it in recruitment. And they felt very brave.” Another participant noted that the ways in which paperwork is structured can give a subtle hint as to whether or not the environment is LGB family-friendly or not. She stated that “the forms are all very gender neutral for spouses and I've been at other employers where that wasn't the case. So I think that gender neutral paperwork is actually welcoming. This is one of the first things that you do at an employer so if you have to modify it by crossing out ‘husband’ to make it work for your family, well, that kind of sucks.” One participant, who has considered leaving his job due to LGB-related conflict, reiterated that LGB family-friendly policies help to attract LGB employees. He stated: “Well if I could fantasize - DPBs, health care in particular, parenting issues [they did not openly include same sex partners despite the fact that there were multiple same sex partnered faculty]. They would say –
‘we will take care of you’ but we can't take a stance on this. In my fantasies they would support my family and use the language to show it. They would have a non-discrimination policy that would include me. But that won't happen. When I think about leaving those are the things that I look for.”

Other participants were more unclear about whether or not benefits were offered equally or if their family’s experience was the same as their heterosexual counterparts’. One lesbian woman questioned the similarity between her and her coworkers’ experiences, saying “I do wonder if I had ended up with a man, at least that stress would not be part of the challenge.” Another participant working in academe told a story about when he first started in his tenure-track role and relocated with his partner. He said: ‘I'll raise one issue: there is an office here in the HR division that is ostensibly supposed to facilitate spousal hires. We listed with them as soon as I came and they went through the motions of trying to secure a job for him. He filed more than 300 job applications, usually without a courtesy of acknowledgement. It became hard to avoid the suspicion that it was because we were gay. We didn't get a lot of support from HR either but again I can't prove for sure that it has to do with identity.” While these participants asserted that they were unsure about whether or not their experiences stemmed from their LGB relationship status, questioning whether or not their sexuality was the root cause may have been enough to create conflict.

Many participants noted that state or federal law mandated certain pieces of legislation that the organization couldn’t change. While it affected their working lives, they were not quick to blame the organization for their
shortcomings. For example, one participant discussed the differing taxation for LGB families versus heterosexual families, saying “I get benefits for my partner and the kids are on my benefits. I wish that I didn't have to pay taxes on the money that [my company] would normally pay for families. So heterosexual families get the family rate but I also have to pay taxes on what [my company] is paying to cover my partner. It goes into taxable income. I am thankful that they can all be on the same insurance, but I just wish that we weren't penalized for that. It makes it look like I make more than I do and plus I'm getting taxed on it. But, I'm getting taxed on money that heterosexual couples don't get taxed on.”

Additionally participants discussed benefits at a state level, explaining “well - I don't know if there is a possibility because [our state] has a law against offering health benefits and DPBs to same sex couples. I think that some anti-discrimination language would be a good thing though. Hiring is already in the language so they can't discriminate based on that. They can't ask marital status and they don't know anything until after they have hired you. They shouldn't be able to use that later on.” Another participant added, “I don’t think that there are any concrete policies or practices at the state level here. But the federal government doesn’t recognize our marriage. So I’m single according to the national level. HR has to abide by that. So, sometimes I can’t take advantage of things that other people can take advantage of. And that’s not the [organization’s] fault.” In these cases, the policies and practices of the organization were causing some hardship for LGB families, but participants understood that the organization was not the root cause.
Overall, the LGB individuals within this sample felt that organizations that demonstrated their commitment to enforcing policies and had clear non-discrimination statements created a more positive environment for LGB families. Many participants felt that their organization was lacking here, however, or that change was impossible. For example, one participant wished that her organization would “recognize [her partner’s] and [her] marriage. That has some real life implications as [they are] nearing retirement and would like to have the same benefits that straight couples have.” Other participants also commented on the ignorance of organizations toward these issues, stating, “We don't really have any strict policies. I think that any adoption would be difficult. I don't really see that happening. Even in instances where we should have a written policy, we don't. We operate on the handshake principle, nothing is written in stone. A policy wouldn't be followed if it was there.” Or, from another participant, “they have diversity policy and groups for LGB awareness, which I like. But, I think that the practice of it isn’t as good. People aren’t always aware that they are there.” Many of the issues highlighted pertaining to organizational practice dealt with benefits, placement, or policies. These issues were noted by a gay male participant, stating that the most important things for him were “being able to provide opportunities or benefits for a "trailing spouse" or providing assistance for a partner to find something in the broader community. And having an accurate non-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation.” The need for well-enforced policies in order to create a comfortable environment for LGB individuals was echoed by other interviewees as well. For example, participants wished for “better policies -
if I want to put her on my insurance, as long as we are legally married, I could do that. We don't have a non-discrimination clause, so they could fire me for being gay if they wanted” and noted the lack of awareness of policies, stating for example, “there are diversity policies but I don’t think that anyone knows about them.” Additionally, participants noted the lack of adoption of existing policies that would make it easier for LGB families to thrive. For example, another participant, working in a school setting stated, “in terms of healthcare, I know that I pay more than heterosexual couples and I think that's ridiculous. I feel as though sometimes the staff should be taught to be a little bit more open and there isn't enough training for gay bullying or even just teaching about openly gay people. So that is my big thing. I know that's tricky, but legally we're allowed to, so I wish that people would be a little more open to that.”

In sum, it seems clear that the presence of good benefits and policies for LGB families attracts LGB individuals to organizations and helps to retain them once they are a part of the organization. While the examination of the presence of benefits and friendly policies is not a new frontier in LGB research, this is the first time that the presence of these policies and benefits has been framed as a work-family conflict issue. However, it appears that this might be the correct way to categorize this set of issues, given that policies and benefits offerings are able to be controlled by organizations (for the most part) and have a direct impact on the working lives of LGB families. One participant provided support for this categorization, stating “I think that work and family conflict definitely relates to whether or not an institution offers partner benefits.”
11. It is difficult for me to find LGB family-friendly resources within my organization.

12. I do not believe my LGB relationship/family is given the same considerations as more traditional relationships/families at work.

13. I do not use certain workplace policies/benefits available to me because I don’t want coworkers to know my relationship/family is LGB.

Several participants felt that the presence of LGB family-friendly policies was ambiguous or unknown. A few of these participants felt that they were unable to locate family-friendly resources, either because policies were unclear or because they were afraid to be outed in the process of discovering useful information. For example, one participant stated that “travel would be easier if I could talk about the fact that I have to coordinate with someone else. But they don't know that.” Similarly, a participant discussed partner benefits, stating: “My partner would be eligible for benefits. I could bring it up, but all of those little things that other people don't think about.” Another participant spoke about the difficulties in knowing who to ask, both in terms of safety and in getting clear answers, saying: “even figuring out who to ask for these things…do I ask my immediate supervisor? The chancellor? How do we make work and family fit together in the same way?” A lesbian woman discussed the difficulties in determining policies for adoptive parents (particularly for LGB individuals) in comparison to heterosexual, “natural” parents. She elaborated on this topic by saying, “my wife and I are thinking of becoming foster parents. And if we do, that would create a lot of new work-family conflicts. I am uncertain about talking with
my supervisors about it. Like asking for an earlier schedule or some time off at the beginning of a placement or something like that. People are used to this when people get married and have a kid. I don't see a lot of structure for that conversation. So that would be one area where I have recently been looking into it and I haven't found the structure that I would like to. [My organization] tends to promote foster parenting but it's not part of the literature.” Based on these participants’ comments, the emerging theme appears to be that LGB friendly policies and practices, while they may be present in an organization, are not always transparent and individuals may not be willing to put themselves in a precarious position in order to learn the details.

Participants also cited the existence of LGB friendly groups within their organizations as being a (mostly) positive thing, given that they provide a more clearly supportive environment for garnering information. One participant stated that “the environment is pretty open, so we have an LGB center and there are a lot of different programs that run through that center that I'm aware of so I don't have anything that I could think of right now [that would improve policy in the organization].” However, the same participant stated later in the interview, “we also had a meeting about being an ally that I was chosen to participate in. There were about 7 or 8 of us in the training. It was for diversity and inclusion and it was for a student LGBT group. There are 40 people in the department though, and they only chose 8 of us. Overall, though, it was a positive experience. The director of the program is a lesbian and has a transgender partner and I am able to talk to her about things and feel more comfortable. But there are always other
experiences that make me want to revert back into my shell.” This suggests that even in what appears to be a very supportive environment, employees may feel uncertain about when and where to discuss LGB issues and may have some negative experiences in conjunction with positive ones. Another participant highlighted a lack of real action from the LGB group in their organization, stating that “they have a new LGBT faculty and staff group. I have gone to 1 or 2 of the meetings but they aren’t much about action. They talk about a lot of things, but not a lot gets done. I want them to have events and host them on campus so that people can get a feel for the group and see that we’re not a bunch of crazy weirdos.” Finally, another participant, finding themselves in a less open organization, discussed the ways in which a lack of policy and benefits can create a “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” environment. This participant said: “I would definitely like to see an all-inclusive policy. Something that addresses discrimination and employment issues. I am the assistant to the CEO and I believe right now that our policy is based on gender, religion, and race but nothing says sexual orientation. I came from a company that was very liberal, so to come to this company was like a shock to the system. I mentioned it at one point and was completely shut out. They definitely do not include same sex partners on benefits either. I think that would be helpful. We have to list emergency contacts and it's alluded to that you could keep them confidential and only have them opened in an emergency. That is out there for the people who are not openly out in that atmosphere. It's like a DADT environment.” Overall, it appears that companies which are unclear in their policy or do not take a strong stance on LGB issues can create uncertainty
for LGB employees. Seemingly minor organizational operations, like emergency contact information or making travel arrangements, can cause added stress for LGB employees with regards to their family life (particularly closeted ones). These participants underscored the subtle politics involved in organizational policy and practice and highlight areas in which organizations may (sometimes unknowingly) cause discomfort for those in LGB relationships/families.

14. *I am unable to talk about my LGB relationship/family with clients, customers, and/or students.*

One of the more unexpected findings of the current study was the extent to which participants discussed the divide between coworkers and clients, customers, and/or students (this clearly depends upon profession, but generally pertains to an organizational outsider/end-user of the organization’s product or service). In many instances when asked about whether or not they felt comfortable being out at work, participants inquired if the items were referring to being out with coworkers or with clients/customers/students. The extent to which this divide was highlighted necessitated the creation of items pertaining to organizational outsiders. For example, a participant working on military contracts mentioned, “well one of the reasons I stopped being involved with data collection in the military is because the ‘kids’ would use a lot of homophobic slurs. I also have clients who have political or religious differences from me, so I’m not necessarily out to my clients.” Similarly, another participant noted, “we have a lot of highly educated and open-minded people in my company…but we can’t always ensure this with clients, which is why I’m not out with most of them.” Yet
another participant highlighted the differential burden that LGB individuals must bear in comparison to their heterosexual counterparts when determining how to talk about family and to whom, stating: “Every organization is different, but when to talk about my family with customers or clients…that’s something that a straight person wouldn’t have to think about.” Another participant, who worked in a nursing home, mentioned that dealing with older clientele was a source of conflict. She explained: “I can't really answer residents’ questions as honestly as I wish I could or as I would like to. They sometimes want to know about my family. When I bring my partner to things, they will ask why I have brought her.” When asked about discussing her family, she also noted that “around my residents I can't be out of the closet. Some of the donors, it's dicey as well. I might have to avoid talking about my partner or be oblique in answers.” For some participants, it may be the case that relationships with customers and clients are the sole cause of work-family conflict. For example, the participant who recounted the incident in which her partner was harassed by a patron while visiting her at the bar she worked in, offered that her work-family conflict increased severely after that incident. She said: “The sad thing is that before that whole thing happened in June it would have been like a 2 [on a scale of 1 to 5]. But now it's off the charts. I would give it a 6 if I could.” Finally, a gay male participant working at a liquor store, mentioned that customers would sometimes share their political opinions and assume that he shared them. This caused discomfort for him, but he couldn’t do anything about it. He stated: “At the liquor store, sometimes customers will come in and I have to bite my tongue...but, you have to keep your mouth shut in
that job because they are customers.” Overall, these participants make clear that careful consideration is given to whether or not to come out to clients and customers, as well as providing insight into the negative consequences that might occur when they are not LGB friendly.

It is worth separately highlighting the politics involved in coming out to students as opposed to clients and customers. Many participants in the education industry mentioned the difficulty in determining how much to reveal to students. A new gay male faculty mentioned an instance where he had to delete an online dating profile, for fear that his students would see him and realize his sexuality. He said, “let me just throw this out and see if it applies - I used to be on an online dating service but I had to stop because I didn’t want my students to see me online. It wasn’t a racy thing or anything but it was just the straightforward nature of it - I felt that I didn’t want that to come up especially because I’m new in the job and I didn’t want it to cause problems. I would say this was about 70% because I’m gay and I don't want people to know.” Another participant mentioned that he left information about his personal life out when teaching, stating. “when I am teaching a particular class, I generally don't volunteer that I'm gay. But everyone at work knows that I'm gay, so for the place that I work at and the people I work with the answer is no, but I end up having to deal with faculty members and students where I don't think it's appropriate for me to bring up that I'm gay.” In contrast to a university setting, a participant working in a high school setting discussed the complications involved when dealing with parents of students as well. She stated: “I am not able to be out with students because of
parents, etc. so I can't wear LGBT clothes. Our training is reactive in terms of being in response to a particular incident as well. So we don't have anything proactive. There was one issue where a new kid who was trans was going to high school and they spoke with the staff on how to handle it and it was really the only proactive thing that I've heard of. We don't have anything where the teachers get taught about how to deal with homophobic slurs, etc.” Finally, a participant mentioned (as other participants mentioned in slightly different ways) how religious differences can create difficult situations for LGB employees. She stated that “it is a constant worry though in a Catholic university about the ways that the Catholic Church teaches. Sometimes what I face are the assumptions of my students. That I run into from time to time.” In sum, it appears that LGB employees have a hard time reckoning work and family, not only with coworkers but also with end-users (clients, customers, or students). The politics of coming out with organizational outsiders may be quite different than with coworkers because these individuals are not beholden to organizational policy and are viewed as important stakeholders for organizational success. If the organization views the customer as “always being right” (as in the case of the lesbian participant who was not supported by management when her partner was harassed at work), LGB employees may either have to lie about their families/relationships or stay quiet about these relationships altogether. These are certainly nuances and politics that heterosexual families do not have to think about and which may cause an undue burden for the work-family conflict of LGB individuals.

15. *I feel tension when coworkers ask about my LGB partner/family at work.*
Similarly, a few participants mentioned the stress and tension involved when coworkers ask about relationships, whether the questions have malicious intent or not. For example, one lesbian participant said, “in those situations where we have to discuss relationships at work, it can be stressful. I keep it very vague, which can be stressful. I’m more comfortable being around my peers, but even sometimes with peers, people can be taken aback when I say ‘girlfriend’.” Another participant noted that having to monitor language when talking about relationships can wear on an individual after a while, stating “it is this kind of day by day, you never really notice but after a while it wears on you.” Similarly, another participant echoed this sentiment, stating: “Being closeted at work is also very stressful and that puts pressure on me as well.” In conclusion, these participants indicated that there is a certain level of stress and tension that results even from innocuous questioning about families or relationships from coworkers.

16. I feel uncomfortable bringing my LGB partner to my organization’s social events.

Many participants also discussed the ability to bring their partner to organizational events or functions. One participant mentioned this as being one of the main ways that work and family conflicted in general, stating: “I could see having trouble getting off work for family activities is the main one. Being invited to something without my partner being included. Those are the two main ones.” It is interesting to note that this participant made this statement at the beginning of the interview, after being provided with the general definition of work-family conflict and being asked how work and family conflict generally. This denotes that, for this participant, LGB family issues were the first issues that came to mind.
when thinking about work-family conflict, providing more evidence for the need to delve further into the idea that work-family conflict may generally be experienced differently by LGB individuals. Reiterating this point, the same question yielded a similar result from another participant who said: “I'm unable to talk sometimes about my partner or if I could bring my partner to a work party.” When asked about how behaviors differ at work compared to at home (one of the previously defined and measured dimensions of work-family conflict), a lesbian participant stated: “Well I'm naturally a social person and at home I'm very social. But, at work I don't go to company get-togethers. I go to my partner's company get-togethers. But I don’t really have that relationship with any coworkers. I can't bring her with me. So those behaviors are different.” Similar to the previous quote, this quote highlights not only the need for a consideration of how partners are (or are not) inclusively welcomed within organizations but also of the potential for differential interpretation of the term “behaviors” within the LGB community versus the heterosexual community. Examining the ways in which identity-related conflict can creep into various dimensions of work-family conflict, or even define it fully helps to give insight into what changes or considerations need to be taken when creating inclusive measurement tools.

Still other participants discussed the inability to bring their partner to work events, either because the company was not friendly towards same-sex partners or because they were not yet out at work. Participants stated: “So I don’t bring my partner to company events [because I can’t talk about her at work].” “Christmas is difficult – I can’t bring my partner to family events. They have family holiday
parties, but I didn’t want to go through the trouble of bringing my partner.”, “I have been discouraged from bringing my partner to work events and they said it was because I wasn't married.”, and “When there are things that I could involve my partner in, it’s a tricky situation. Everyone else can bring kids or a heterosexual partner and I would be the one with a same-sex partner.” These quotes demonstrate that a lack of clear communication about policy or fear of being outed at work keep participants from fully participating in organizational activities and, thus, from being able to fully mesh work and family when it would be convenient to do so.

17. Because we’re LGB, my partner feels uncomfortable attending my organization’s social events.

Participants also mentioned more specifically that their partner felt uncomfortable attending events and that this drove their decision not to include them in work-related functions. A gay male participant mentioned that he felt his partner would have to change his behaviors if he came to work because he was more stereotypically gay than might be acceptable in his work space. He said: “It might be that he would have to conform more than I would if he came to visit me at work. I don’t really feel like there is a place for him in my work environment such that he could come visit me. I know everyone here really well and so I’m able to navigate the sensitivities of the people here. I know there are a couple of people who would make it uncomfortable that he is gay. Nothing bad would happen but if he randomly appeared here, he would have to reserve himself.
That's a terrible way of saying it. But I could imagine that being the case. I did my education in a conservative discipline so I'm used to it, but he is not.”

Similarly, when asked about how behaviors at home differ from behaviors at work, one participant brought up the issue of discomfort in deciding whether or not to be seen at work as a couple, stating “will we go to an event together? Or will we be seen as a couple on a particular campus or within an institution?” Other participants highlighted the awkward nature of bringing same-sex partners to events, even if they are technically welcome. One participant said: “For example, is my girlfriend welcome at company social events? Well, I can bring my girlfriend to social events but it depends on how you define "welcoming." She can come to it, but it would be weird and awkward for her.” Another participant alluded to the potential for aggression from her partner towards other workers (given the hardships that they had endured as a lesbian couple through her workplace), saying: “She probably wouldn't want to go because she would say things to people...she would be kicked out (laughing)!” Finally, another participant discussed the need to attend work events, regardless of whether or not same-sex partners were welcome, explaining: “Usually, I try to go and be present at work activities. I try not to let my partner interfere with that.” Through these quotes, we can see that LGB individuals are dealing not only with whether or not their company is outwardly welcoming towards same-sex couples but also whether or not this level of welcome is sufficient for their partners to actually feel at ease attending events.

18. I could not behave the same way with my LGB partner at work as I can at home.
19. I feel uncomfortable showing affection towards my LGB partner in my work setting.

20. My LGB partner and I avoid being seen together by colleagues/coworkers.

The next set of items stemmed from conversations surrounding the ways in which LGB partners were able to express their partnership in a work setting. It could be argued that, in some instances, the workplace may not be a friendly place for couples to show affection towards one another, regardless of sexual orientation. However, these quotes hint at the comparative discomfort with affection that LGB individuals feel with regards to heterosexual couples. For example, one lesbian participant stated: “I have a picture of my partner on my desk and I’m out to everyone at work, but I feel like if she walked into my office, I couldn’t kiss her hello. We don’t walk around holding hands. Straight pairs can do this, but we just don’t go there.” For the participant whose partner was involved in the harassment incident at the bar, any kind of affection was viewed as a threat from that point on. She stated: “Being LGBT is a problem. I don't feel comfortable hugging [my partner] at work. My home life definitely affects my work life. I can't show her any kind of affection especially after that incident.”

Other individuals discussed erasing romance from the equation altogether, particularly through language. One participant noted: “I am unable to be "with" my partner. There is a lack of communication at work. I call her my friend sometimes (laughing).” Similarly, a closeted individual stated that: “I wouldn’t be able to treat my partner the same way at work because I can’t talk about her at work at all.” These quotes provide evidentiary support for a difference in
experience in terms of being able to talk about partners romantically or to be able to act in affectionate ways with them in a work setting. While none of the interviewees expected that they would be able to act inappropriately with their partners at work, they generally expected to be able to show the same level of affection or recognition to their partner as they felt non-LGB employees would be able to.

Finally, a couple of participants discussed the ability to be seen by coworkers at all. While the above quotes dealt more directly with affection, these quotes dealt with the sheer notion of “being” a couple in the eyes of coworkers. For example, one participant said: “It would be really nice to be in a place where my partner and I could walk in without enduring any problems. We deliberately leave town in order to have fun. We’re not talking about wild, fetish sex clubs here – we’re just worried about being a couple.” Another participant discussed avoidant behaviors of his partner (similar to the quotes which addressed partner discomfort in attending company events), stating: “…but I think that my partner felt a little dissident about visiting me at the office as often as he might have if we had been a different sort of family. None of my coworkers got to know him very well.” In this way, LGB employees might be uncomfortable not only expressing affection but also being visible at all, whether at work or even in a space outside of work where one might be potentially spotted by coworkers.

21. Because I’m LGB, I feel uncomfortable having a picture of my family/partner on my desk at work.
While participants were asked directly in the quantitative portion of the interview whether or not they had a picture of their partner on their desk, one participant mentioned this earlier in the open-ended portion of the interview, stating “What pictures do you put on your desk at work? It's the details that matter.” Because the act of placing a picture on one’s desk was mentioned as a type of work-family conflict and because it has been utilized previously in the literature to measure how out someone is at work, it is important to include an item pertaining to this issue in a new scale of LGB work-family conflict. In this way, the true domain for this item can be assessed and we can potentially begin to view the presence of a picture as a symbol not just of outness but also a lack of work-family conflict.

22. *If a coworker said/did something harmful to my partner/family because we’re LGB, my workplace would support me.*

While almost all of the participants mentioned more subtle ways in which their LGB relationship/family status was viewed in a negative light, one participant did recall a time when a coworker almost became violent with her at work. While this event did not have much to do with her partner (although she was out about her LGB relationship), it may be worthwhile to include an item that accounts for coworkers attempting to either verbally or physically hurt another coworker or their partner as a result of LGB family status. This particular participant stated, that “there was also a coworker who was very anti-gay that I had a series of negative events with. It almost got to the point of physical violence but someone walked in the room thankfully. I put in a formal complaint about it
and it was ignored entirely. Also, people sometimes leave religious materials in my mailbox...I wish they would just come talk to me in person!” Again, while this is not directly linked to family status and more generally linked to LGB status overall, it is plausible that, in a larger sample, there may be a larger number of stories similar to this one, potentially linked to one’s relationship/family status more directly.

23. If one of my clients, customers, and/or students said/did something harmful to my partner/family because we’re LGB, my workplace would support me.

Not surprisingly, there was a greater proliferation of stories about clients/customers/students saying and doing harmful things towards LGB employees than about coworkers engaging in similar behaviors. As previously discussed, end users are not held to the same standards that employees are and, thus, are more free to express themselves in whatever way they see fit when dealing with employees. For example, a gay male faculty member recounted a story about a time when he was harassed by a student. The students were aware of his LGB relationship status and he never felt any negativity from them until this point. However, he ended up having an incident with a student partway through the semester, stating: “I had a really uncomfortable situation where a student called me a fag….and I followed him into the hallway and asked ‘Did you just call me a fag?’…And I was terrified that I would be fired because I had confronted the student. And afterwards one of the people in student services said that I was becoming "unglued." I had to say to the associate provost - it didn't even occur to you to say ‘Are you ok?’ That my mental well-being would be on
their horizon would be nice. It felt to me like there was almost a kind of equivalence that my touching someone's arm and saying something was somehow equivalent to him having called me a fag. I was told to apologize to this student….you know, let's not have more disclosure, let's have more concern about lawsuits.”

As previously discussed, one lesbian female participant, discussed a time in which a customer harassed her partner while at the bar she worked in. She recalled: “We started a club on campus that [my partner] and I cofounded for LGB individuals. We made shirts that say "Bi, Straight or Gay, we're all ok". Everyone comes to this community day and [my partner] wore her shirt so that someone might see her and know that it would spread acceptance. She came to my work to see me later that day and was told that her shirt was inappropriate by my boss. She was on the verge of tears and said that she was leaving. She told me what had happened and I was livid. Two people had complained about her shirt and he took their side. That was a huge issue. My boss and I were not on very good terms for about two months. He had always been ok with us and he knew that he was in the wrong. He ended up apologizing to me, but [my partner] was pissed.” Further, she noted that her ‘out’ status was causing some customers discomfort: “There are a few customers who don't come in anymore because of me. But we were happy to get rid of them. Until this incident, we were all about freedom of speech and they frowned on her t-shirt for some reason. It was a learning lesson for everyone…because the majority of the people do feel that men
and women are equal and that gays and straights should be able to exist, but they aren't on board with equal rights.”

Another participant outlined the initial fear that he had when his partner went to work as a nurse in a prison. He stated: “My partner is a bit more obvious in being gay and so I was nervous when he went there. The inmates know better than to do anything because the staff watches out for each other. Sometimes people will say things but for the most part he has had no problem whatsoever. An inmate who made a comment was "swiftly dealt with" so the guards look out for him.” Luckily for this participant, his partner was protected from the “clients” (prisoners, in this case) by other staff.

Finally, more subtle forms of environmental harassment of LGB individuals were noted, and a few participants echoed a similar sentiment to the following quote: “Students are saying "that's so gay" all the time. It's not like the other faculty support it. But I feel like I have to tiptoe to get the students to be more open minded, not even about the gay issue. Just generally it's not as open minded of a setting as I would like.” While this, again, is not directly tied to family/relationship status, it certainly creates a certain tone within the environment, providing clues about how inclusive organizational outsiders might be if an LGB employee was to discuss their family/relationship. The main point is that, while clients, customers, and students don’t have to follow organizational rules, they can play an important role in setting the tone for an LGB family-friendly climate (or lack thereof), often with little pushback from organizational members.
24. I have turned down job offers/promotions because my LGB relationship/family would be an issue.

25. My partner has turned down job offers/promotions because our LGB relationship/family would be an issue.

While none of the participants mentioned personally turning down a job offer/promotion, one participant did mention her partner turning down offers due to LGB family climate. This participant said: “My partner has turned down two tenure track jobs because they were in places worse than here on LGBT issues. She has completely changed her job trajectory because there aren't enough places where an LGBT family with children could live. And many places aren't open to thinking about partner hires for LGBT and we can't live on one income.” As a result of this quote, these two items were generated, because it is plausible that either of these scenarios might occur within a larger sample (as stated before, if her partner had been interviewed, for example). Further, this quote is particularly notable because LGB families are not only looking to features of the organization for work-family conflict but also to features of the environment outside of work that might cause undue conflict for their family as a result of job location. This added layer of complexity is something that heterosexual families might consider on other levels (Does it have the kind of atmosphere I like? Are there cultural activities available?, etc.) but they may not fear for their family’s ability to exist in the public eye in the same way that LGB families might.

26. Because I can’t talk about my LGB relationship/family at work, I am currently looking for another job.
While participants didn’t mention turning down job offers or promotions personally, they did mention actively looking for another job as a result of identity-based work-family conflict. One participant strongly asserted that: “It is THE thing that makes me think I would take a pay cut to take a job somewhere else. That's partially workplace and partially local community environment. But of course that influences how desirable a workplace is.” This hearkens back to the previous statements about job location playing a role in LGB relationship/family viability as well. Another participant, who was closeted, also mentioned being open to taking other job opportunities, saying: “I'm looking for another job because I am uncomfortable with this. There are other benefits that allow me to accept it in the short-term. Salary, company car, flexible schedule, it's a family oriented business in the sense that I can work from home if I'm sick or something, but it's uncomfortable for me. It's family oriented but just not for gay families. We do a lot of charity work with the community but you need to fit a certain mold. People wouldn’t think twice to volunteer to help a needy family but not at an HIV clinic for example.” Overall, in the same way that an LGB family-friendly atmosphere may draw LGB individuals to organizations, a negative climate may actively drive them away.

27. *Because my relationship/family is LGB, I could not talk about it at work if my partner became ill/injured.*

28. *If I had a family emergency, coworkers would be willing to help me, regardless of my LGB status.*
One gay male participant, whose partner had very recently passed away, discussed the hardships involved in dealing with a sick loved one while still maintaining composure at work. “Then, when he became ill, individual coworkers were as good as gold about helping me keep up with work and family obligations. There wasn’t any institutional obstacle to care for him but I wouldn’t say it was facilitated either. I don't know if it was because we are gay.” Another participant, when asked how to improve upon the workplace policies, suggested “that there are less conservative policies (like who can bereave who and for how long) politically.” These quotes demonstrate that there may be some need to address the role of coworkers and organizational policy in sick leave/bereavement policy pertaining to LGB relationships/families within the work-family conflict realm.

29. If my partner/family member was sick, I could not take a leave of absence from work because our relationship/family is LGB.

The same gay male participant who recently had his partner pass away discussed the role of environmental unfriendliness towards him and his partner. This took an extra toll on his working life, as he tried to cope with his partner’s illness and additional caretaking obstacles that he faced. While this is not something that the organization can control, it does demonstrate the extent to which LGB families might suffer more work-family conflict in unfriendly environments outside of work, creating more conflict for these employees in effectively performing work duties. He explained: “…my coworkers pitched in to help me. He was about an hour away so it was a decent commute to his place of care. In the environment, I encountered multiple problems from being a same-sex
couple. The stresses that I encountered there, made it difficult to juggle my responsibilities. One nurse, for example, banned me from his room even though he was there on my insurance. If that individual had happened to be the head of nursing, I would have had a real problem. That kind of stress I'm sure showed in my face and in my productivity. Another example after he died, the local funeral home that helped with the arrangements (the largest one in the county), the contact person excused himself and the head of the firm dealt with my case. They said that they had never had a domestic partner serving in this role before. After that, there was no problem. He had to deal with it because no one else was comfortable.”

Another participant noted that there was some uncertainty surrounding sick leave policy for children of LGB parents, saying: “I don't know if we had kids, if I'd have a hard time taking off if they were sick. I don't know how that gets treated.” Finally, one participant mentioned that a reason that their company was attractive was because they got sick leave for their family members, regardless of LGB status. When originally asked for the first things that came to mind when thinking about how work and family might conflict, this participant said: “There are very few ways – there are some but they are few and far between. They are mostly positive. The first thing that comes to mind is working for the State – they recognize my spouse as my spouse. There is a fairly significant amount of time that can be taken for family illness as well.” As a result of these quotes, it seems that the ability to take leave when a family member becomes ill is an issue of concern for LGB families (as it would be with any family). However
the ambiguity surrounding this topic could potentially create conflict for those in LGB relationships/families who are unsure how welcoming their workplace would be in this scenario.

30. *Because my relationship/family is LGB, I couldn’t talk about it at work if my partner/a family member and I got into a fight.*

This item was generated in conjunction with the items about discussing a family member who had fallen ill. While there weren’t any participants who specifically mentioned not being able to talk about conflict with their partner at work, it is a potentially stressful situation that could not be discussed with coworkers if an LGB employee felt uncomfortable discussing his/her relationship in general. This may be a topic that is not often breached in the workplace, regardless of structure, but it will be included in the initial generation phase to avoid criterion deficiency.

31. *People at work assume that my family is heterosexual.*

32. *I feel that I have to teach my colleagues about LGB relationships/families.*

Generally, participants seemed to share a sentiment that coworkers were not malicious in their ignorance of LGB families/relationships. Instead, many participants discussed the seemingly innocent assumptions that coworkers would make about their family/relationship structures. While these assumptions tended to be viewed negatively, participants generally seemed to recognize that they were not stemming from a purposefully angry or hateful place. One participant recalled: “In reference to assumptive comments that people would make, one time a coworker said ‘My cousin finally got married!’ and I wanted to say ‘Finally?”
What does that mean? Did that person have no value without marriage?’ These happen infrequently but they do happen.” Another participant opted to allow people to assume she was heterosexual, stating: “I got roses for Valentine’s but I never said anything about who the person was.” Yet another participant joked about a time when a coworker uncovered her personal assumptions about her sexuality, saying: “There was one time recently where we had a departmental meeting and I was on my computer looking at email and there was someone who stood behind me and saw an LGBT email. She said “Oh [name], you’re gay!” in a disapproving way. It was like I was a murderer (laughing).”

Another participant made a more active attempt to break down assumptions about her sexuality, stating: “I don't feel like that's a huge issue but I do feel like people tend to make certain assumptions and they will relate to you in terms of those assumptions. However, I'm pretty out in the workplace so I'll just let them know. But, at first, it definitely does make a difference. People will say "oh when you get married to some guy and have kids" and you have to correct them. But I've never felt like...where I do feel people assume straightness, I've never felt like I couldn't tell them otherwise.” Similarly, another participant discussed how traditional markers of a heterosexual relationship (a wedding ring) create assumptions that she has a husband. She said: “I wear a wedding ring so people assume I have a husband. People will ask if my husband wants to come golfing with me and I have to say "I don't have a husband." But they don't ask for more clarification.” One participant summed it up best saying: “I think the traditional family is valued at work where I work. This assumption is made, you
just assume everyone is heterosexual and they would never come out and ask if they think otherwise.” Overall, participants were aware that they were assumed heterosexual unless proven otherwise. While some participants felt comfortable telling coworkers directly that their assumptions were untrue, others did not feel comfortable taking that action. Generally, there was a sense of annoyance with these assumptions but, at the same time, an understanding that they did not imply hatred or malicious intent.

33. *People at work often ask uncomfortable questions about my LGB relationship/family.*

34. *People at work often ask offensive questions about my LGB relationship/family.*

While participants did not directly mention offensive questions, one person did mention that coworkers asking questions about family in general, was uncomfortable. This participant stated: “Anytime people talk about relationships, I am thinking about what to say. I don’t want to lie. I try to be honest without giving too much information.” As a result, these two items were generated in order to cover a range of questions that might cause discomfort or anger for those in LGB relationships/families.

35. *Because I am LGB, I have to pretend that my relationship/family does not exist at work.*

A couple of participants used language to suggest that their families were, in essence, invisible at work. This wording is slightly different (and potentially more extreme) than some of the wording in preceding items, so a new item was generated to address this language. For example, one participant stated: “At my
work, it’s as if my partner doesn’t exist, which is unfortunate” Another participant hinted at a culture of invisibility, noting: “People at the top have to make clear on a regular basis that the normative, conformist, there is only one set of families that will be tolerated just isn't acceptable…it could have a lot of impact. They don't mean to hurt us. I think they just don't know we're here.” Invisibility of LGB families/relationships is an overarching issue that could result in some of the other issues covered by preceding items. However, including this exact language maybe important to capture the higher level cause for more specific LGB climate characteristics.

36. My organization has made it clear that my LGB relationship/family is accepted at work.

One participant mentioned that there is no language or program within the organization to promote inclusiveness for LGB families at work. This quote was the direct driver for the generation of this item. The participant stated: “We don’t have any programs to make it clear that our family is part of the organization too.”

37. My workplace is not a safe space for me to talk about LGB relationship/family concerns.

This item was also driven by a single participant, who stated “Work is not always a safe space for me to be open about my family life or my gendered identity.” Because “safe space” is a particular language to imply an overall climate for LGB family-friendliness, this item was generated to capture that particular sentiment.
38. I cannot discuss LGB-related hobbies/activities that my partner or I participate in outside of work.

Finally, a couple of participants noted that they were unable to talk about activities that they participated in outside of work because they pertained to being LGB. For example, one participant stated, “It’s not that I can’t come out…but it is those pursuits outside of work that threaten on some level, even in a subtle way” (in reference to participating in local theater). Another participant focused on the inability to talk about LGB activism, stating: “My family and my partner are very liberal and while aspects of this are clear at work - I don't talk about marching the gay pride parade at work.” Overall, while heterosexual counterparts may not feel sexual identity-based constraints on discussing activities that they participate in outside of work, LGB employees may have to monitor how much information to provide about their lives outside of work, even when it doesn’t directly relate to their relationship/family.
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