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The present study explored the links of two workplace contextual variables – perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates – with job satisfaction and turnover intentions in a sample of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) employees. The theory of work adjustment (TWA) was used as the conceptual framework for the study, and as such, perceived person-organization (P-O) fit was tested as a mediator of the relations between the workplace contextual variables and job outcomes. Data were analyzed from 324 LGB employees. The results indicated that perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination were correlated negatively with P-O fit and job satisfaction and were correlated positively with turnover intentions. In addition, perceptions of LGB-supportive climates were correlated positively with P-O fit and job satisfaction and were correlated negatively with turnover intentions. However, when the workplace contextual variables were examined concurrently using structural equation modeling, only LGB-supportive climates (and not workplace heterosexist discrimination) yielded a unique direct positive link with P-O fit, and through the mediating role of P-O fit, had significant indirect positive and negative relations with job
satisfaction and turnover intentions, respectively. Implications for research and clinical practice with LGB employees are discussed.
CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND

Workplace heterosexist discrimination is a fairly common experience for lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) employees. In a review of 11 studies that focused on LGB employees, Croteau (1996) surmised that 25% to 66% of participants across studies reported having experienced workplace discrimination at some point in their lives, and 44% to 60% anticipated experiencing discrimination in the future. Research with LGB employees links such workplace discrimination with poor mental and physical health outcomes (e.g., Smith & Ingram, 2004; Waldo, 1999) and a parallel body of research links LGB-supportive workplace climates with positive mental health outcomes (e.g., Huffman, Watrous-Rodriguez, & King, 2008). Focusing on job outcomes, research with LGB samples has demonstrated that perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination correlate negatively with job satisfaction and positively with intentions to quit, whereas perceptions of LGB-supportive policies and climates correlate positively with job satisfaction and negatively with intentions to quit (e.g., Liddle Luzzo, Hauenstein, Schuck, 2004; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Waldo, 1999). Thus, positive and negative aspects of the workplace environment (e.g., heterosexist discrimination and supportive climate) have yielded meaningful links with job outcomes among LGB employees. But, studies typically focus on positive and negative aspects of workplace environments separately, leaving unclear whether such experiences have distinctive (or overlapping) relations with job outcomes. In order to inform research, practice, and policy efforts to improve workplace contexts for LGB employees, theoretically grounded research is needed to clarify the concomitant roles of negative and positive aspects of workplace environments for this population.
A theoretical framework that devotes substantial attention to the role of workplace environments in shaping job outcomes is the theory of work adjustment (TWA; Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1964; Dawis & Lofquist, 1984). The TWA contends that the degree of correspondence (or “fit”) between person (P) factors (e.g., employees’ skills, values, and goals) and environmental (E) factors (e.g., workplaces’ required skills, values, and goals) is related directly to job outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Furthermore, researchers have posited that group-specific workplace contextual variables, such as workplace discrimination and supportive climate, may play important roles in the application of the TWA model with minority populations (Dawis, 1994; Dawis & Lofquist, 1993; Rounds & Hesketh, 1994; Tinsley, 1993). The present study builds on this literature, as well as on research about LGB people’s workplace experiences, to examine experiences of negative and positive workplace environment concomitantly. Specifically, this study evaluates whether perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates have unique or overlapping associations with job outcomes. Moreover, on the basis of the TWA framework, this study tests whether person-environment fit mediates the relations of these negative and positive workplace environment variables with job satisfaction and turnover intentions for LGB individuals.

**The TWA and Job Outcomes**

Over the past five decades, the TWA has garnered substantial empirical support (Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1964; Taris & Feij, 2001; Tinsley, 1993). Three core tenets of this framework (Dawis, 2005) are that 1) the degree of correspondence (i.e., fit) between the needs or values of employees and those of their workplaces correlates with employees’ satisfaction with their jobs (i.e., job satisfaction); 2) the degree of
correspondence between employees’ abilities and workplaces’ skills requirements correlates with workplaces’ satisfaction with their employees (i.e., satisfactoriness); and 3) job satisfaction and satisfactoriness impact tenure, often operationalized as turnover intentions (i.e., workers’ intentions to quit). Various conceptualizations of P-E fit exist (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; Tranberg, Slane, & Ekeberg, 1993), including person-vocation fit (P-V; i.e., the congruence between employees’ vocational interests and their chosen vocations), person-job fit (P-J; i.e., the congruence between employees’ abilities or skills and those needed to successfully complete a job), and person-organization fit (P-O; i.e., the congruence between employees’ values or goals and those of the organization for which they work). Because the present study focuses on LGB employees’ perceptions of the values of the organizations for which they work (as expressed through heterosexist discrimination and supportive climates), P-O fit is the form of P-E fit examined. This approach is also consistent with prior research on the TWA with marginalized populations (e.g., Lyons, Brenner, & Fassinger, 2005; Lyons & O’Brien, 2006). Thus, in the present study, we focus on LGB employees’ perceptions of P-O fit, and examine job satisfaction and turnover intentions as the criterion variables.

The Role of Group-Specific Workplace Contextual Factors in the TWA

The exact role that demographic group-specific workplace environment variables play in the TWA model has been the subject of some debate. Dawis (1994) and Dawis and Lofquist (1993) argued that these variables would not affect the nature of (i.e., moderate) the relation of P-E fit with job outcomes; rather, they would impact P-E fit, which – in turn – would correlate with job outcomes; as such, the relation of group-specific workplace variables with job outcomes is mediated by P-E fit. Conversely, others (e.g, Rounds & Hesketh, 1994; Tinsley, 1993) have contended that group-
specific workplace variables change or moderate the nature (i.e., direction or magnitude) of the relation of P-E fit with job outcomes. Several studies with minority populations have tested these approaches to integrating workplace contextual variables into the TWA model. For example, in a series of regression analyses, Lovelace and Rosen (1996) found that differences in job satisfaction and turnover intentions between male and female African American managers and male European American managers were mediated by perceptions of P-O fit. In a test of the moderation model, Lyons and O’Brien (2006) found that African American employees’ perceptions of supportive workplace racial climates did not significantly moderate the links of perceptions of P-O fit with either job satisfaction or turnover intentions. Although these authors did not test the mediation model directly, consistent with such a model, they found that perceptions of P-O fit correlated positively with perceptions of supportive workplace racial climates and job satisfaction and correlated negatively with turnover intentions.

In a study with two separate samples of LGB employees, Lyons et al. (2005) tested the hypotheses that 1) P-O fit would mediate the link of experiences of workplace heterosexist discrimination with job satisfaction and 2) experiences of workplace heterosexism would moderate the link of P-O fit with job satisfaction. Lyons et al. found that P-O fit mediated (partially in one sample, fully in another) the discrimination-job satisfaction link. But, in their series of six regression analyses, workplace heterosexism failed to moderate the P-O fit-job satisfaction link in all but one case. Importantly, Lyons and O’Brien (2006) and Lyons et al. (2005) both found that P-O fit accounted for substantial variance in job satisfaction – 43% of variance among African American employees and 48% of variance among LGB employees. The authors noted that these
effect sizes were greater than those found in prior studies with predominantly European American or heterosexual participants. In sum, these studies suggest that, when examined separately, perceived discrimination and supportive workplace climates each are associated with job outcomes and that P-O fit may be an important mediator of these relations for individuals with socioculturally marginalized identities. However, the ability of workplace contextual variables to moderate the link of P-O fit with job outcomes has not evinced much support. For these reasons, the mediation model will be examined in the present study.

Prior Research on LGB Individuals’ Workplace Experiences

Although TWA-based research with LGB populations has been limited, tests of the model can also be informed by the broader literature on LGB individuals’ workplace experiences. Such research has examined the links of perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination experiences with job, mental health, and physical health outcomes. Specifically, perceived workplace heterosexist discrimination correlated negatively with job satisfaction and organizational and career commitment and correlated positively with job withdrawal (Lyons et al., 2005; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Waldo, 1999). Moreover, workplace heterosexist discrimination correlated negatively with life satisfaction and positively with psychological distress, depression, and poor physical health outcomes (Smith & Ingram, 2004; Waldo, 1999).

Although research focused on discrimination has enriched our understanding of the workplace experiences of LGB individuals, some scholars have argued that a narrow focus on discrimination ignores the full spectrum of LGB individuals’ workplace experiences, including potentially positive experiences (e.g., Chojnacki & Gelberg, 1994; Liddle et. al., 2004). Thus, some prior research has investigated the links of LGB-
supportive workplace climates with job outcomes, finding that perceptions of LGB-supportive workplace climates are correlated positively with job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Huffman et al., 2008; Liddle et al., 2004).

Notably, Liddle et al. (2004) found that perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive workplace climates yielded a correlation of -.52. The magnitude of this correlation suggests that perceived workplace discrimination and supportive climate reflect substantially overlapping, but perhaps non-identical constructs. However, Liddle et al. (2004) did not examine the relations of workplace discrimination and supportive climate with job outcomes concomitantly. Thus, it remains unclear whether discriminatory and supportive workplace climate variables yield unique or overlapping links with job outcomes. Clarifying the concomitant roles of these variables can elucidate the potential for an integrated conceptualization of workplace discrimination and supportive climates or support the continued conceptualization of these factors as distinctive aspects of workplace environments for LGB employees in research, practice, and organizational change interventions.

Importantly, we found one study that examined the concomitant links of workplace heterosexist discrimination and indicators of LGB-supportive workplace climates with job outcomes among LGB employees. Using a series of structural equation model comparisons, Ragins and Cornwell (2001) found that perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination did not fully account for the relations of workplace LGB climate indicators (e.g., nondiscrimination policy) with their set of job-related outcomes. Rather, workplace climate indicators yielded additional unique links with some workplace outcomes (e.g., turnover intentions) above and beyond the role of
perceived workplace discrimination. However, this study was not grounded in TWA, and therefore did not examine the potential mediating role of P-O fit in shaping indirect relations between workplace discrimination or supportive climate factors and job outcomes.

**The Present Study**

The present study contributes to the literature by examining concomitantly the links of perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates with P-O fit, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions among LGB employees. On the basis of research on the TWA and on LGB people's workplace experiences, it is predicted that perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination will correlate negatively with P-O fit and job satisfaction (Hypotheses 1a and 1b) and positively with turnover intentions (Hypothesis 1c). In addition, it is predicted that perceptions of LGB-supportive workplace climates will correlate positively with both P-O fit and job satisfaction (Hypotheses 2a and 2b) and negatively with turnover intentions (Hypothesis 2c). Next, P-O fit is predicted to mediate the relations of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates with job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Specifically, through the mediating role of P-O fit, workplace heterosexist discrimination is predicted to have a significant negative indirect link with job satisfaction (Hypothesis 3a) and a significant positive indirect link with turnover intentions (Hypotheses 3b). Conversely, through the mediating role of P-O fit, LGB-supportive climates are predicted to have a significant positive indirect link with job satisfaction (Hypothesis 4a) and a significant negative indirect link with turnover intentions (Hypotheses 4b). In the tests of these hypotheses, full and partial mediation models are compared. Furthermore, perceived workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates are
examined concomitantly to examine whether these two workplace contextual variables function uniquely or redundantly in the TWA model.
CHAPTER 2
METHOD

Participants

Data from 324 participants were analyzed in this study. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 75 years old ($M = 38.42$, $SD = 12.11$, $Mdn = 37.00$). In terms of sexual orientation, approximately 62% of participants identified as exclusively lesbian or gay, 22% as bisexual, 13% as mostly lesbian or gay, and 3% as other sexual minority orientations (e.g., queer); one individual who identified as mostly heterosexual was retained because she reported moderate levels of same-sex physical and emotional attraction. With regard to gender, approximately 53% of respondents identified as women, 43% as men, 2% as transgender women, less than 1% as transgender men, and 2% as other genders (e.g., genderqueer, bigender). Approximately 80% of participants identified as White/Caucasian, 6% as African American/Black, 6% as Hispanic/Latina/o, 4% as Multiracial/Multiethnic, 2% as Asian American/Pacific Islander, 1% as American Indian/Native American, and 1% as other races or ethnicities.

With regard to employment status, approximately 79% of participants reported full-time employment, 19% reported part-time employment, and 2% reported that they were self-employed. As their highest level of completed education, approximately 50% of the sample reported a professional degree (e.g., MA, PhD), 33% reported a college degree, 14% reported some college education, 2% reported a high school degree, and less than 1% each reported less than a high school education, some high school education, and trade/vocational school training. Approximately 55% of the sample identified as middle class, 26% as working class, 15% as upper-middle class, 3% as lower class, and 1% as upper class. With regard to yearly household income,
approximately 3% reported less than $10,000 a year, 18% reported between $10,001 and $30,000, 21% reported between $30,001 and $50,000, 20% reported between $50,001 and $70,000, 13% reported between $70,001 and $90,000, 11% reported between $90,001 and $110,000, and 15% reported more than $110,001 a year.

Most participants reported residing in one of 32 states of the United States or in the District of Columbia (DC). Most participants resided in North Carolina (20%), New York (13%), Florida (12%), California (11%), Michigan (5%), Massachusetts (4%), and Pennsylvania (4%). Also, about 3% of the sample resided in Canada and less than 1% resided in Mexico. These few non-U.S. participants were retained in the sample because they did not emerge as outliers in the data set and because their responses to validity check questions (described below) indicated that they read and understood the survey. No participants reported residing outside of North America.

**Measures**

**Workplace Heterosexist Discrimination**

Perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination were measured using the 22-item Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire (WHEQ; Waldo, 1999). Participants were asked to rate the frequency with which they experienced incidences of heterosexist discrimination on a 5-point scale (0 = Never to 4 = Most of the time). The response stem for WHEQ items is “DURING THE PAST 24 MONTHS in your workplace, have you been in a situation where any one of your SUPERVISORS OR CO-WORKERS…” A sample item is “…told offensive jokes about lesbians, gay men, or bisexual people (e.g., “fag” or “dyke” jokes, AIDS jokes)?” Item responses were averaged to produce an overall score, with higher scores indicating more frequent occurrences of discrimination. In prior research with LGB employees, WHEQ items
have yielded Cronbach’s alphas of .92 and .93 (Smith & Ingram, 2004; Waldo, 1999). The Cronbach’s alpha for WHEQ items in the current sample was .94. With regard to validity, WHEQ scores were correlated positively with perceived workplace tolerance for heterosexism in a sample of LGB employees (Waldo, 1999).

**LGB-Supportive Workplace Climates**

Perceptions of LGB-supportive workplace climates were measured using the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Climate Inventory (LGBTCI; Liddle et al., 2004). The LGBTCI is a 20-item measure that assesses LGBT individuals’ evaluations of how supportive their workplaces are of their sexual orientation or gender identities. The response stem for the LGBTCI is “At my workplace...” A sample item is “LGBT employees feel accepted by coworkers.” Items were rated on a 4-point response scale (1 = Doesn’t describe at all to 4 = Describes extremely well). Appropriate items were reverse-scored and responses were averaged to derive an overall score. Higher LGBTCI scores indicate greater perceptions of supportive workplace environments. LGBTCI items have yielded Cronbach’s alphas of .96 in samples of LGB and LGBT employees (Huffman et al., 2008; Liddle et al., 2004). The Cronbach’s alpha for LGBTCI items in the current sample was .96. With regard to validity, LGBTCI scores correlated negatively with perceived experiences of LGB-related workplace discrimination in a sample of LGBT employees (Liddle et al., 2004).

**Person-Organization Fit**

Participants’ perceptions of the degree of correspondence between their personal values, beliefs, and personality and the values, beliefs, and norms of their workplace environments were measured with Saks and Ashforth’s (1997) 4-item P-O fit subscale. This measure assesses participants’ perceptions that their values correspond
to the values of their workplace organizations (e.g., “To what extent are the values of
the organization similar to your own values?”). Participants responded to each item
using a 5-point rating scale (1 = To a very little extent to 5 = To a very large extent).
Item ratings were averaged to derive an overall score, with higher scores indicating
greater perceptions of P-O fit. Items in this measure yielded Cronbach’s alphas of .92
with two separate samples of LGB employees (Lyons et al., 2005). Cronbach’s alpha in
the current sample was .94. In terms of validity, Saks and Ashforth (1997) reported that
P-O fit scores correlated positively with scores on another measure of P-O fit in a
sample of graduates from an undergraduate business program.

**Job Satisfaction**

Satisfaction with one’s job was assessed with the Minnesota Satisfaction
Questionnaire—Short Form (MSQ-SF; Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The
MSQ-SF measures individuals’ positive affective reactions to 20 facets of their job (e.g.,
independence, compensation, moral values). Participants were asked to rate their
satisfaction with each of the 20 dimensions of their job using a 5-point scale (1 = Very
dissatisfied to 5 Very satisfied). A sample item is “The feeling of accomplishment I get
from the job.” Item responses were averaged, with higher scores indicating greater
satisfaction with one’s job. In two separate samples of LGB employees, Lyons et al.
(2005) reported Cronbach’s alphas of .90 and .92 for MSQ-SF items. The Cronbach’s
alpha for MSQ-SF items in the current sample was .92. In terms of validity, MSQ-SF
scores correlated positively with other measures of job satisfaction in a sample of
predominantly White employees (e.g., Bizot & Goldman, 1993).
**Turnover Intentions**

Intentions to quit one’s job were assessed with Colarelli’s (1984) 3-items. Participants responded to each item (e.g., “I frequently think of quitting my job”) using a 5-point rating scale (1 = *Strongly disagree* to 5 = *Strongly agree*). One item is reverse-scored and item scores were averaged. Higher overall scores indicate greater intentions to quit one’s job. In a sample of African American employees, items in this measure yielded a Cronbach’s alphas of .83 (Lyons & Brenner, 2006). In the current sample, items in this measure yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .83. In terms of validity, scores on this measure correlated negatively with commitment to and identification with one’s workplace organization in a sample of graduates from an undergraduate business program (Saks & Ashforth, 1997).

**Procedures**

The data analyzed in this study were collected as part of a larger survey on the workplace experiences and well-being of LGB people. Participants were recruited from electronic mailing lists, discussion boards, and web communities (Yahoo or Google Groups) that catered to LGB individuals. Electronic fliers that included links to the survey were posted to these communities to solicit participation. Internet-based participant recruitment has proven to be a useful, cost-effective data collection strategy (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004; Hiskey & Troop, 2002) and has become increasingly popular in research with LGB populations. Internet recruitment may be particularly helpful in including participants who are not comfortable disclosing their sexual orientation identities publicly but may feel comfortable being “out” online (Mustanski, 2001). Finally, prior research has shown that Internet-based data collection
yields responses that are similar to data collected via traditional pen and paper methods (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004; Hiskey & Troop, 2002).

In order to participate, individuals had to 1) be 18 years of age or older 2) reside in North America (the United States, Canada, or Mexico), 3) identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or some other sexual minority status (e.g., queer, questioning), and 4) be currently employed. After reading the informed consent, if individuals affirmed that they met these criteria and agreed to participate, they were directed to the survey. Participants did not receive compensation for their participation. To promote participants’ attentiveness to the survey questions (and, by extension, to improve the validity of responses), four validity questions that prompted participants to choose specific responses (e.g., “Please select ‘Very Satisfied’”) were interspersed throughout the survey. A total of 478 individuals responded to at least one survey item, though 139 participants were removed because they were missing more than 20% of the items used in the present study’s analyses (of these, 122 were missing more than 50% of the items). Some of these individuals may have returned to complete the survey at a later time, but due to the anonymity of the survey, the proportion of these individuals who ultimately participated cannot be determined. In addition, given the focus of this study on current workplace experiences, two participants were removed because they indicated that they were currently unemployed. Lastly, 13 participants were removed because they responded incorrectly to at least three of the four validity questions in the entire data set, suggesting random or inattentive responding. These data cleaning procedures resulted in a final sample size of 324 participants. Of these participants, 281 (87%) had complete data, while the remaining 43 (13%) were missing between 1 and
10 items. In light of Schlomer and colleagues’ (2010) recommendations for handling missing data, NORM Version 2.02 (Schafer, 1997) was used to impute item-level missing data from Expectation Maximization parameters, prior to computing the scale or subscale scores that were used in analyses.
CHAPTER 3
ANALYSES

Intercorrelations and descriptive statistics for the variables of interest appear in Table 3-1. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination correlated negatively with P-O fit and job satisfaction and correlated positively with turnover intentions. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, perceptions of LGB-supportive workplace climates correlated positively with P-O fit and job satisfaction and correlated negatively with turnover intentions. These correlations generally spanned the benchmark for a medium effect (Cohen, 1992).

To examine Hypotheses 3 and 4 regarding the mediating role of P-O fit, the data were analyzed using latent variable structural equation modeling (SEM). Amos 7.0 (Arbuckle, 2006) with maximum likelihood (ML) estimation was used for these analyses. First, a measurement model was examined to determine if the observed variables appropriately identified the latent constructs. Next, two structural models – one for job satisfaction and one for turnover intentions as the criterion variable – were constructed to test the mediating role of P-O fit in the relations of LGB-supportive climates and workplace heterosexist discrimination with the criterion variables. For the measurement model and both structural models, model fit was evaluated using the comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean residual (SRMR). Criteria for acceptable fit have ranged from CFI > .90 and RMSEA and SRMR ≤ .10 (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1995) to more conservative criteria of CFI > .95, RMSEA ≤ .06, and SRMR ≤ .08 (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1999; Quintana & Maxwell, 1999).
Additionally, when evaluating the structural models, nested model comparisons were performed to compare the full mediation models (i.e., direct predictor-criterion links constrained to zero) with partial mediation models (i.e., direct predictor-criterion links freely estimated) to determine which best fit the data. Upon identifying the best-fitting model, a bootstrap procedure with 1,000 bootstrap samples from the original data was performed to compute bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CI) to test the significance of the predicted indirect effects. If the 95% CI does not include 0, then the indirect effect is significant at \( p < .05 \) (Mallinckrodt, Abraham, Wei, & Russell, 2006; Shrout & Bolger, 2002).

**Measurement Model**

Three or more indicators were used to model each latent construct. Following recommendations for the creation of parcel indicators for latent constructs in SEM (Kline, 2005; Weston & Gore, 2006), item parcels were created from WHEQ, LGBTCI, and MSQ-SF item sets. To create these parcels, WHEQ, LGBTCI, and MSQ-SF item sets each were subjected to exploratory factor analyses using principle axis factoring. Items in each of these three scales were rank-ordered according to the magnitude of their factor loadings and assigned to three parcels in countervailing order to maximize the equality of average factor loadings across parcels. Items within each of these parcels were averaged to derive parcel scores. This procedure resulted in three item parcels each for the WHEQ, LGBTCI, and MSQ-SF. Because the measures of P-O fit and turnover intentions contained five and three items, respectively, each item was used as an indicator for the corresponding latent construct. Overall, the measurement model included 17 observed indicators (3 parcels each for the WHEQ, LGBTCI, MSQ-SF, and turnover intentions and 5 parcels for P-O fit) and five latent constructs (i.e.,
workplace heterosexist discrimination, LGB-supportive climates, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and P-O fit).

The observed indicators in the measurement model were evaluated for univariate normality (i.e., skewness \( < 3.0 \) and kurtosis \( < 10.0 \); Weston & Gore, 2006). In addition, cases were examined as multivariate outliers if they yielded significant (\( p < .001 \)) Mahalanobis distances (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Two observed indicators evinced somewhat elevated skewness and kurtosis values (WHEQ2: skewness = 3.38, kurtosis = 13.07; WHEQ3: skewness = 3.29, kurtosis = 12.23). The measurement model was rerun with square-root transformed WHEQ2 and WHEQ3 item parcels. The square-root transformations resolved the problems with univariate normality (WHEQ2: skewness = 1.60, kurtosis = 2.01; WHEQ3: skewness = 1.44, kurtosis = 1.60). However, 14 cases in this model were identified as multivariate outliers based on their Mahalanobis distances. An additional measurement model was run with the square-root transformed item parcels and the 14 multivariate outliers excluded from the data set; no multivariate outliers emerged for this model. However, the fit indices and parameter estimates for this revised model did not differ substantively from the original measurement model. Given the lack of substantive change between models and suggestions that ML estimation is robust to moderate violations of the normality assumption (Weston & Gore, 2006), the results of the original measurement model (without transformed variables and retaining multivariate outliers) are reported. This model provided good fit to the data: \( \chi^2[109, N = 324] = 331.20, p < .001, CFI = .96, \text{RMSEA} = .08 \) (90% CI: .07, .09), SRMR = .05. All standardized factor loadings were significant (\( ps < .001 \)) and ranged from .72 to .96 (Table 3-2). Correlations among latent variables were significant (.
.001) and consistent in magnitude and direction with zero-order correlations among observed variables (Table 3-1). Thus, we proceeded with the structural models to test the mediating role of P-O fit in the relations of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates with job satisfaction and turnover intentions.

**Structural Model and Tests of Mediation for Job Satisfaction**

Standardized regression weights for the job satisfaction structural models are presented in Figure 3-1. The fit indices for the full mediation model (i.e., with the direct paths from the predictors to the criterion constrained to zero) suggested a good fit to the data: $\chi^2[73, N = 324] = 240.59, p < .001$, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .08 (90% CI: .07, .10), SRMR = .05. The fit indices for the partial mediation model (i.e., with the direct paths from the predictors to the criterion freely estimated) also indicated a good fit to the data: $\chi^2[71, N = 324] = 235.36, p < .001$, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .09 (90% CI: .07, .10), SRMR = .04. A nested model comparison indicated that there was not a significant chi-square difference between the full and partial mediation models, $\Delta \chi^2(2, N = 324) = 5.24, p = .07$. Thus, the additional predictor-criterion paths did not substantively improve model fit and the more parsimonious full mediation model was retained. This model accounted for 26% of the variance in P-O fit and 64% of the variance in job satisfaction. As depicted in Figure 3-1, the unique link between workplace heterosexist discrimination and P-O fit was not significant ($\beta = -.06, ns$). This indicates that the significant relation between workplace heterosexist discrimination and P-O fit that was evinced in the zero-order correlations is attenuated when controlling for the link between LGB-supportive climates and P-O fit. By contrast, LGB-supportive workplace climates yielded a significant unique positive link with P-O fit ($\beta = .46, p < .001$). The direct link between P-O fit and job satisfaction was significant and positive ($\beta = .80, p < .001$).
Results of the 1,000 sample bootstrap procedure to test the significance of indirect effects in the full mediation model indicated that the indirect link of workplace heterosexist discrimination with job satisfaction posited in Hypothesis 3a was not significant ($B = -.06$ [95% CI: -.24, .07], $\beta = -.06 \times .80 = -.05$). However, consistent with Hypothesis 4a, LGB-supportive climates had a significant indirect positive link with job satisfaction ($B = .34$ [95% CI: .22, .49], $\beta = .46 \times .80 = .37$) through the mediating role of P-O fit.

**Structural Model and Tests of Mediation for Turnover Intentions**

Standardized regression weights for the turnover intentions structural models are presented in Figure 3-2. The fit indices for the full mediation model indicated a good fit to the data: $\chi^2[73, N = 324] = 209.43$, $p < .001$, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .08 (90% CI: .06, .09), SRMR = .06. The fit indices for the partial mediation model also suggested a good fit to the data: $\chi^2[71, N = 324] = 205.66$, $p < .001$, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .08 (90% CI: .07, .09), SRMR = .06. A nested model comparison indicated that there was not a significant chi-square difference between the full and partial mediation models, $\Delta \chi^2[2, N = 324] = 3.78$, $p = .15$. Thus, the more parsimonious full mediation model was retained. This model accounted for 24% of the variance in P-O fit and 52% of the variance in turnover intentions. As indicated in Figure 3-2, the unique link between workplace heterosexist discrimination and P-O fit was not significant ($\beta = -.06$, ns). Thus, the significant zero-order correlation between workplace heterosexist discrimination and P-O fit was subsumed by the link between LGB-supportive climates and P-O fit. By contrast, LGB-supportive workplace climates yielded a significant unique positive link with P-O fit ($\beta = .45 \ p < .001$). The direct link between P-O fit and turnover intentions was significant and negative ($\beta = -.72$, $p < .001$).
Results of the 1,000 sample bootstrap procedure to test the significance of indirect effects in the full mediation model indicated that the indirect link of workplace heterosexist discrimination with turnover predicted in Hypothesis 3b was not significant ($B = .11$ [95% CI: -.12, .45], $\beta = -.06 \times -.72 = .04$). However, consistent with Hypothesis 4b, LGB-supportive climates had a significant negative link with turnover intentions ($B = -.61$ [95% CI: -.84, -.37], $\beta = .45 \times -.72 = -.32$) through the mediating role of P-O fit.
Table 3-1. Correlations, descriptive statistics, and internal consistency reliabilities for variables and correlations of latent constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Heterosexist Discrimination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.73*</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LGB-Supportive Climates</td>
<td>-.69*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>-.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.63*</td>
<td>-.67*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Range</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .001

Note. Values above the diagonal are correlations among latent constructs whereas values below the diagonal are correlations among observed variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized loading</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Standardized loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace heterosexist discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 1</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>23.18*</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>21.88*</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 3</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>21.92*</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGB-Supportive Climates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 1</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>23.03*</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>22.14*</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 3</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>23.09*</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>19.35*</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>17.94*</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>18.34*</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>19.73*</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>21.85*</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 1</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>20.42*</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 2</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>22.34*</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>19.90*</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>19.22*</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>14.25*</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>15.19*</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001.
Figure 3-1. Structural model for job satisfaction. Values reflect standardized coefficients. Dashed lines indicate nonsignificant paths; all other depicted paths are significant at * $p < .001$.

Figure 3-2. Structural model for turnover intentions. Values reflect standardized coefficients. Dashed lines indicate nonsignificant paths; all other depicted paths are significant at * $p < .001$. 
CHAPTER 3
DISCUSSION

Using the TWA as a grounding framework, the present study examined concomitantly the links of perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates with LGB employees’ job satisfaction and turnover intentions. In addition, building on prior research grounded in the TWA (e.g., Lyons et al., 2005), the mediating role of P-O fit was tested in the associations of the workplace contextual variables with the job outcome variables.

Consistent with prior literature (e.g., Huffman et al., 2008; Liddle et al., 2004; Lyons et al., 2005; Waldo, 1999) and with the hypotheses, the present data indicated that perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates correlated in the expected directions with job outcomes; these correlations approximated medium effect sizes. Specifically, perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination were correlated negatively with job satisfaction and positively with turnover intentions. Moreover, perceptions of LGB-supportive climates were correlated positively with job satisfaction and negatively with turnover intentions. Building on prior findings, these results support the contention that workplace contextual variables may play a role in LGB employees’ job functioning.

Also consistent with conceptual and empirical literature on the TWA (Dawis, 1994; Dawis & Lofquist, 1993; Lyons et al., 2005), zero-order correlations in the present study indicated that perceptions of workplace discrimination correlated negatively with P-O fit whereas perceptions of LGB-supportive climates correlated positively with P-O fit. However, when examined concomitantly in structural equation models, perceptions of LGB-supportive climates – but not workplace heterosexist discrimination – yielded a
significant (positive) direct link with P-O fit. Moreover, LGB-supportive climates yielded a significant positive indirect link with job satisfaction and a significant negative indirect link with turnover intentions through P-O fit. Again, this pattern of results was not mirrored with perceptions of workplace heterosexist discrimination; that is, the indirect links of workplace discrimination with job outcomes through P-O fit were nonsignificant. Thus, beyond the direct links of P-O fit with job outcomes, perceptions of LGB-supportive climates, but not workplace heterosexist discrimination, explained additional variance in job outcomes through the mediating role of P-O fit.

These results advance prior findings on the separate relations of workplace discrimination and support with job outcomes (e.g., Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). Specifically, the present results suggest that although workplace heterosexist discrimination is correlated with job satisfaction and turnover intentions, these links are subsumed by the overlapping relations of LGB-supportive climates and P-O fit with job outcomes. A notable caution is that this pattern of findings does not mean that workplace discrimination is unimportant to LGB employees’ perceptions of fit or job outcomes. Rather, there may be overlap in LGB employees’ perceptions of LGB-supportive climates and workplace heterosexist discrimination. This interpretation is consistent with the -.73 correlation between the latent workplace heterosexist discrimination and LGB-supportive climates variables, which reflects a large effect size according to Cohen’s (1992) benchmarks. The cross-sectional nature of the present data precludes interpretations of whether perceived workplace heterosexist discrimination shapes or is shaped by LGB-supportive climate. However, a fruitful direction for future research may be to employ longitudinal and experimental designs to
elucidate the direction of causality, or recursive nature, of the relations between these two workplace contextual variables.

In this regard, it is important to note that LGB-supportive environments are first and foremost those that do not discriminate against LGB individuals. As such, the absence of discrimination may be a necessary but not sufficient condition for having an LGB-supportive environment. This echoes some scholars' lament that a narrow focus on negative, discriminatory circumstances – although important to the LGB vocational literature – neglects the full spectrum of LGB employees' workplace experiences (e.g., Chojnacki & Gelberg, 1994; Liddle et. al., 2004). As well, the present findings do not preclude the possibility that workplace heterosexist discrimination may be related uniquely, above and beyond the role of LGB-supportive climates, to job outcomes that were not examined in the present study (e.g., pay and promotion discrimination or satisfaction). Thus, future research could build on the present results to examine how positive and negative workplace contextual factors function together in relation to other job outcomes.

Another important conclusion that may be drawn from this study is that, consistent with the tenets of TWA (Dawis, 1994; Dawis & Lofquist, 1993), P-O fit plays an important role in linking LGB employees' perceptions of supportive workplace climates with job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Notably, in the present sample, P-O fit yielded a .74 correlation with job satisfaction and a -.63 correlation with turnover intentions. These large effect sizes point to the salience of perceptions of P-O fit for LGB individuals. The previously noted possibility that P-O fit plays a greater role in the workplace experiences of populations with socioculturally marginalized identities relative
to those without marginalized identities (Lyons et al., 2005; Lyons & O’Brien, 2006) could be tested in future research that directly compares the role of P-O fit in structural models such as that tested in the present study across groups. Furthermore, in addition to the role of P-O fit, it may be fruitful to examine LGB-specific intraindividual factors (e.g., internalized heterosexism, identity management strategies) that may moderate or mediate the links of workplace contextual variables with P-O fit or job outcomes for LGB individuals.

**Implications for Practice**

Although the cross-sectional nature of this study precludes causal interpretations of the findings, the results may nevertheless provide useful information for clinical practice and advocacy. The associations among the contextual variables, P-O fit, and job outcomes observed in this study suggest the utility of attending to LGB clients’ perceptions of workplace climate and fit with workplace values. Attending to these factors may facilitate useful dialogues between client and therapist in the process of choosing a job, career, or organization or when working on maintaining or improving current work experiences. For example, the mediating role of P-O fit in the link between perceptions of LGB-supportive workplace climates and job outcomes suggests that, in addition to considering career counseling staples such as vocational interests, clients may benefit from exploring the LGB-supportiveness of various career fields or workplaces. It may also be helpful to identify aspects of clients’ current workplace environments that are particularly affirming or harmful to the client’s job (and personal) functioning. Similarly, an exploration of clients’ personal values could be complemented by information gathering about workplace values and reflection on P-O fit.
Such discussions could set the stage for considering internal and external resources and strategies that may improve the client’s experiences – whether it be discussions with coworkers, supervisors, and human resource professionals, employing different sexual orientation identity management strategies (e.g., Anderson et al., 2001; Button, 2001; Chrobot-Mason, Button, DiClementi, 2001), or identifying and pursuing workplaces with more affirming environments. In this regard, it is important for clinicians to be aware of relevant workplace policies as well as local, state, and federal laws regarding LGB issues and employees so that they may best support and advocate for their clients. This is particularly the case because only 21 states and Washington D.C. prohibit employment discrimination based on sexual orientation (Human Rights Campaign, 2011). Thus, although it may seem beneficial to encourage a client to confront anti-LGB discrimination or advocate for LGB-supportive climates in their workplaces, if such employees are not protected by non-discrimination policies or laws, they may face unfavorable reviews, demotion, or even termination for such actions. As always, clinicians must be cognizant of clients’ contexts before suggesting particular interventions.

Limitations and Future Directions

The implications of the present findings should be considered in light of several limitations. First, the study used Internet-based data collection. Although this method provides numerous advantages (e.g., access to participants from diverse geographical areas, recruitment of individuals who are not “out” in their everyday lives), it may also have limited the generalizability of our findings to people with the economic resources, time, and ability to access a computer and the Internet and those who are familiar and comfortable with navigating LGB-related online communities. The generalizability of the
findings may also be impacted by the demographics of the study’s sample. For example, 80% of the participants self-identified as White and 50% had acquired some sort of professional degree (e.g., MA, Ph.D). Thus, the applicability of the study’s findings to LGB employees of color or LGB employees with different levels of education is unknown. Future research in this area may expand the generalizability of the results by using different sampling methods, such as community sampling or focusing on recruitment from Internet groups that cater to LGB people of color (DeBlaere et al., 2010).

Another limitation worth repeating is that the cross-sectional nature of the data does not warrant causal interpretations of the results. For example, although the theoretical underpinnings of this study assume that workplace contextual factors affect P-O fit, which in turn affects job outcomes, these causal chains cannot be confirmed with the present data. Future experimental and longitudinal studies are needed to provide evidence of causation or temporal precedence.

In addition, the measures used in this study assess participants’ perceptions of discrimination and supportive climates. Individuals’ perceptions of discrimination may be affected by factors such as affect, knowledge of prejudice and discrimination, and characteristics of the perpetrator (e.g., Barret & Swim, 1998; Sechrist, Swim, & Mark, 2003). Such findings do not negate the value of studying targets’ perceptions; in fact, such perceptions are frequently the primary sources of data in clinical work. However, research using other indicators of discrimination and supportive climates, such as managers’ reports, organizations’ records of harassment claims, and the presence or absence of LGB-affirmative organizational policies (e.g., non-discrimination policies,
provision of medical benefits to same-sex partners) can be an important complement to studies focusing on targets’ perceptions.

Despite these limitations, the present results provide further support for the TWA’s proposition that workplace contextual factors are associated with the job functioning of LGB employees through the mediating role of P-O fit. One important qualification to this conclusion is that LGB-supportive workplace climates may subsume the links of perceived heterosexist discrimination with P-O fit and job outcomes. This finding calls for further attention to workplace contextual variables that bolster – rather than compromise – LGB employees’ workplace experiences. Indeed, the present findings suggest that understanding and improving LGB employees’ perceptions of P-O fit, and in turn, job satisfaction and turnover intentions cannot focus only on reducing discrimination, but should also involve creating climates that are actively supportive of such employees.
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