

An Inquiry to the Working Environment Inclusivity among LGBTQ Members: A Multi-Level Mixed Design Models

Bhrendelyn B. Navales¹, Elizabeth R. Dumlao², Nerisa B. Abug³

¹Coordinator, International and Local Collaboration and Linkages Office

²Director, Administrative, and Financial Management Services

³Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation
Cavite State University - CCAT Campus

Barangay Tejeros Convention, Rosario, Cavite, Philippines

Corresponding author:

*bhrendelyn.navales@cvsu.edu.ph

Abstract

Social identities are significant in many facets of life since they aid in self-definition and influence how people interact with one another. Today's workforce needs more diversity and complete inclusion, despite apparent corporate backing and indications of advancement. Similarly, despite a rising commercial case for inclusiveness, the LGBTQ+ group has not seen significant advancements in the workplace. Therefore, this study aimed to ascertain whether LGBTQ employees in Cavite now work in an inclusive atmosphere. In order to investigate and comprehend the workplace acceptance of LGBTQ employees, the study used a mixed research approach. Most of the volunteers were between the ages of 25 and 34, single, recent graduates of a trade school, and served for two to three years at work. This suggested that older millennials made up the majority of the participants. The majority of participants agreed that they felt an inclusive work environment facilitated their professional development. The majority of the literature emphasizes management's dominance and commitment to advancement as key reasons why LGBTQ employees stay at their place of employment. In addition, the multilevel analysis with parallel segments for understanding the working environment among LGBTQ members serves as a framework for developing strategies for the inclusion and diversity of LGBTQ employees in the workplace. It was revealed that the inclusion of LGBTQ members in the workplace had no discernible dynamic effect on their profile. Hence, the study recommends strategies to further foster workplace inclusion.

Keywords: gender, LGBT, inclusivity, social identity, workplace, mixed design

1. Introduction

Social identities are important in all aspects of life because they help individuals in defining themselves and shape their daily social interactions. When inclusiveness is present, employees are considered a part of crucial organizational processes (Lee et al., 2021), which implies that they have access to information, a connection to coworkers, and the capacity to participate in and influence decision-making. However, gender preferences among employees have been a problem for organizations up to this day.

LGBTQ employees make up a significant percentage of the global workforce (Tang & Yu, 2021). LGBTQ+ stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, and queer. The plus sign represents people who identify differently based on their sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics. Although members LGBT community have gained greater acceptance and access to society in recent years, there has been little progress toward creating

inclusive workplace environments, decreasing LGBTQ employee retention. Transgender people, whether straight or LGBQ+, are more likely to see their gender or sexual orientation as a hindrance to future advancement. In fact, many LGBTQ employees hide their sexual orientation out of fear of discrimination and violence. LGBTQ employees have left their jobs because of how their employers treated them based on their sexual orientation or gender identity. Similarly, according to an international report by Sears et al. (2021), 46 percent of LGBTQ workers have experienced unfair treatment at work, including job discrimination, negative performance evaluations, verbal abuse, and even physical assault.

Previous studies have shown that LGBTQ employees are more likely to benefit from working in companies with LGBTQ-inclusive policies and practices. Establishing and maintaining an inclusive work environment will enable all team members to thrive and grow. A diverse workforce is an important first step toward inclusion (Jones & Lim, 2020). This is supported by the data presented by Marco et al. (2021), showing that making stigmatized identities visible, giving LGBTQ employees a voice, and increasing knowledge about LGBTQ concerns are all crucial steps toward challenging belief systems and the various expressions that perpetuate and promote heteronormativity in the workplace. As stated by Melson et al. (2020), organizations have a greater need to comprehend the underlying mechanisms and origins of workplace discrimination against LGBTQ targets as well as how discrimination of LGBTQ applicants may manifest itself in the employment context as a result of recent legal and societal changes regarding LGBTQ worker rights. Rand et al. (2021) suggested that the need for more visible and out LGBTQ+ youth and adults will provide mutual support and promote visibility and inclusive programs and policies. Employee exclusion has been linked to job dissatisfaction, increased turnover intention, lower trust, low employee morale, and poor performance at work (Moon, 2018). Thus, it is critical to understand their coping strategies so that policymakers, organizations, businesses, and the LGBTQ community are aware of the resources that can potentially mitigate or eliminate workplace discrimination. This will create an opportunity for an equal workplace climate that will better protect the welfare of every employee.

Despite visible corporate support and signs of progress, today's workforce falls short of diversity and full inclusion. Likewise, a growing business case for inclusion has not translated into solid gains for the LGBTQ+ community within the workplace itself. Members of the LGBTQ community still face discrimination in the workplace. Hence, this study sought to investigate the current working environment inclusivity of LGBTQ employees in the Philippine context, where employment discrimination persists and the LGBTQ community is underrepresented (Aguilar et al., 2022).

The study's general objective was to analyze and understand the working environment inclusivity of LGBTQ employees in selected areas of Cavite.

1. Determine the socio-demographic profile of respondents in terms of:
 - a. age;
 - b. civil status;
 - c. educational attainment; and
 - d. length of service;
2. Determine the perceived working environment inclusivity in terms of:
 - a. professional growth;
 - b. training and capacitating;
 - c. leadership and management;
 - d. stereotyping culture; and

- e. organizational policy;
3. Analyze selected studies relevant to the variables used through a summarized systematic literature review matrix.
4. Describe the dynamism effect of the perceived working environment inclusivity on the participants' profile.
5. Provide a basis for crafting strategies for the inclusion and diversity of LGBTQ employees in the workplace.

2. Review of Related Literature

Workplace diversity

Diversity is a process designed to develop and maintain a pleasant work environment where the similarities and differences of individuals are recognized. Moreover, diversity may include gender, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, place of practice, and practice type. (Pareek, 2020). In addition, it is how people are different yet the same at the individual and group levels (Tan, 2019). Organizational diversity requires examining the makeup of a group to ensure that multiple perspectives are represented. The study by Clark et al. (2021) showed that male workers favor gender diversity in the workplace because they receive the best job reviews from coworkers who are equally split between the sexes. Women report lower employment quality in jobs where women predominate but not in jobs where men do. Because of this, it does not seem like the separation of men and women into businesses with a female or male predominance reflects the desires of the majority of workers. In Europe, there is no evidence to support a link between the gender of the immediate supervisor and the perceived quality of the job among male or female employees.

Blanck et al. (2020) examined the workplace accommodation of lawyers with disabilities and those who belong to the LGBTQ community. The results showed that the likelihood of requesting accommodations is associated with an individual's sexual orientation. It indicated that straight/heterosexuals were reported to have requested accommodations, as compared to gays/lesbians who were identified as bisexual, those who were identified as queer, and other sexual orientations. Concerning gender, women and transgender lawyers are significantly more likely to request accommodations as compared to men. Donaghy and Perales (2022) performed various theoretical expectations to explore the differences in workplace well-being across nuanced gender- and sexual-identity groups. The bisexual and pansexual employees reported significantly lower levels of workplace well-being than gay/lesbian individuals. Out of all unisexual identity groups, pansexual people reported the lowest workplace well-being. The second theoretical expectation revealed that workplace well-being would be lower for individuals who identified as gender non-conforming (non-binary and agender) compared to cisgender-identifying individuals. Additionally, Ahmad and Rahman (2019) studied how Allama Iqbal Open University personnel might be affected by workplace diversity. The findings showed a negative relationship between age diversity, gender diversity, ethnic diversity, and employee performance. The performance of employees benefits from experience diversity.

Job satisfaction and performance of LGBTQ employees

A study conducted by Hur (2019) reported that organizations promoting inclusive work climates, such as initiatives to improve justice, support, openness, and empowerment, contribute to good opinions of inclusive work organizational culture. It also increases LGBT employees' job

happiness, satisfaction, and affective loyalty to the organization since inclusive policies foster an open environment. Furthermore, according to Sean (2020), inclusive and tolerant workplaces can benefit both employees and employers. Being inclusive and respected at work can boost job satisfaction and productivity as companies implement LGBTQ-related policies after recognizing the financial benefits of embracing diversity and LGBTQ workplace inclusion. Bayrakdar and King (2022) provided descriptive statistics regarding job satisfaction, and factors associated with it differ by gender and sexual orientation. Overall, heterosexual women reported better job satisfaction than heterosexual men. Lesbians showed lower job satisfaction compared to heterosexual women, whereas gay men reported having greater satisfaction with their jobs than heterosexual men. Bisexual individuals seemed to have the lowest job satisfaction level between men and women. Lesbian employees were more likely to be classified into the "high earners" group among women, although bisexual men and women were less likely to be in this category. Compared to their heterosexual and gay counterparts, bisexual males appeared to be at a distinct disadvantage since they were more likely to obtain a degree but less likely to hold a leadership position, which may indicate that they have fewer opportunities for career advancement. Transgender or cisgender women are more likely to be LGBTQ employees who report having poorer mental health. Additionally, they are more likely to work in non-standard employment relationships and frequently or always be unable to schedule time with friends due to work schedules. They are also more likely to rate their work environment as unfavorable for LGBTQ employees or to be unsure about it. Because they are more prone to turn to drugs and alcohol to cope with their jobs, LGBTQ employees who report having poor mental health are also more likely to lack adequate coping mechanisms (Mills et al., 2021). All of these were confirmed by a study conducted by Jayawardana and Priyashantha (2019) in Sri Lanka, who noted that the more diverse an organization's workforce is in terms of age, gender, educational level, job experience, and attitude, the better its employees' performance.

Importance of LGBTQ+ inclusive policies

Webster (2018) found that employers who want to be LGBTQ-inclusive need more than just policies and practices; they need cultures of support for LGBTQ employees based on friendly colleague interactions. Because this study found that supportive behaviors improve workplace outcomes for LGBT employees, empowering allies may aid in the implementation of actual organizational change. Developing and engaging partners at work may thus be a helpful approach for boosting LGBTQ inclusion. According to Di Marco et al. (2021), developing and implementing policies and standards of conduct that value people and protect their dignity throughout the employment cycle may aid in embedding diversity and inclusion throughout the organization, recognizing and appreciating them. Giving LGBTQ workers a voice and raising knowledge about LGBT problems is critical for challenging belief systems and the various expressions perpetuating and promoting heteronormativity within the business environment. Inclusive policies enable companies to obtain outstanding talents from diverse cultural backgrounds, religious convictions, ethnicities, gender orientations, and races. Tang & Yu (2021) believed that healthy LGBTQ-friendly policies and practices could establish a work environment that values the viewpoints, capabilities, and problem-solving abilities that LGBTQ people can bring to a company. However, those LGBTQ-friendly policies could result in several less-than-optimal outcomes, such as poor levels of job satisfaction, work-related stress, and a greater employee turnover rate.

The study conducted by Perales et al. (2021) highlighted the relevance of company policies and practices that foster an inclusive work environment for trans individuals. Some beneficial policies include non-binary alternatives when requesting information about the gender of the

employee, allowing them to choose personal pronouns inside the human resource systems, and ensuring consistency in the salutation sections on documents. Utilizing suitable language toward people of different genders and sexual orientations is a crucial first step to their inclusivity in the workplace. Johnson & Otto (2019) suggested that organizations may utilize their resources to oppose gender injustice against women and members of the LGBTQ group, helping create safe spaces for both groups. It involved defining gender and sexuality in inclusive ways and incorporating feminist and queer viewpoints with an intersectional strategy to address discrimination. It helped to ensure that all genders, people with disabilities, people with diverse body shapes, and people from all cultural backgrounds are made visible and addressed, creating an inclusive and respectful workplace environment. Brahma et al. (2023) asserted that despite recent rulings and workplace diversity measures that have increased the number of LGBTQ employees in businesses, job discrimination against LGBTQ people is still prevalent. Importantly, LGBTQ law promotes hiring LGBTQ persons, providing businesses with access to a pool of skilled workers. LGBTQ policies help to break down the glass ceiling that inhibits LGBTQ persons from reaching top management positions.

Discrimination experiences of LGBTQ employees at work

Lina et al. (2020), gay men are more likely than heterosexual men to be extremely satisfied with their jobs—overall and in certain job-related elements. Lesbians, in contrast to heterosexual women, seem less content with their jobs and chances for promotion. They observe no differences in the likelihood of being extremely satisfied with one's job among women based on sexual orientation. However, the issue of sexual orientation and job satisfaction is complex since gay men, despite that they more often are very satisfied with their job, like lesbians, find their job more mentally straining than heterosexuals. The researcher concludes that gay men and lesbians face other stressors at work than heterosexuals do. And also conclude that the worker's expectations about the job and possibilities to fulfill career plans may be possible driving forces to the results. Previous research has documented discrimination against gay males and lesbians in hiring. According to Sears et al. (2021), LGBTQ employees reported experiencing verbal, physical, or sexual harassment due to their sexual orientation or gender identity and being fired or not hired. The study by Bhankaraully et al. (2022) stated that LGBTQ employees face many adverse outcomes associated with workplace discrimination, including harassment and ostracism: being viewed as an embarrassment to the company, feeling inferior and devalued, and being perceived as challenging to manage. These negative consequences are primarily the result of widespread workplace humiliation, harassment, and ostracism. Stephens (2018) studied the experiences and perceptions of LGBTQ employees in the workplace. LGBTQ employees expressed having to lead a double life at work and concealing their sexual orientation, and they found it challenging to show up to work and perform at their best levels when they could not be true to themselves and their coworkers.

As stated by Cech and Waidzunus (2021), LGBTQ people reported having fewer employment possibilities and having their professional competence undervalued by their peers, making them more likely than their non-LGBTQ counterparts to endure social marginalization and harassment in the workplace. More LGBTQ respondents than their counterparts reported having health issues, and these issues were partially brought on by the increased social exclusion, career restrictions, and professional undervaluation they encountered at work. Many Americans believe that LGBTQ individuals face prejudice both in their neighborhoods and across the nation. Most people encounter anti-LGBTQ slurs at work and in the classroom. Americans are more inclined to

believe that law enforcement and the educational system unfairly treat Gay persons than the healthcare system or the workplace. By employer type, there was no discernible difference in the percentages of people expressing perceptions of unfair treatment in areas including employment, services, and public accommodations for any measure (Sears et al., 2021).

Organizational challenges in implementing inclusion policies

Azmat and Boring (2020) examined heterogeneity across countries and sectors in characteristics that may limit firms in terms of their potential adoption in order to comprehend why some businesses may not be embracing diversity policies. Because of major pre-market characteristics that still exist and preference disparities, such as women's reluctance to work in industries with a male preponderance, progress may have been delayed despite the rules that corporations employed. Fewer women may obtain the information and skills needed in fields where they are a minority if women make up a smaller portion of the workforce. Suarez et al. (2022) stated that in terms of the experience of discrimination for trans workers, the presence of LGBTQ anti-discrimination regulations provides a mixed record. State laws offer varying degrees of protection. The study's findings revealed that while laws may be insufficient to solve anti-trans discrimination, workers with both workplace and state-level rights perform better than others. Rand et al. (2021) noted a severe lack of training and resources that will assist them in supporting LGBTQ+ youth. Specifically, it was found that they lacked guidance on LGBTQ+-related language, how to create safe and affirming environments, and how to respond to criticism and resistance.

In the school setting, Meyer et al. (2019) outlined the challenges that prohibited elementary educators from bringing up LGBTQ concerns in the classroom. These challenges include the age of the students, religion, instructors' knowledge of the laws and procedures governing LGBTQ matters in the classroom, the school administration, concerns from the local community, lack of teaching expertise, and the inappropriateness of these issues in schools. Five main areas were recommended to improve practices and extend the implementation of LGBTQ-inclusive policies in elementary schools: Challenging the age-appropriate question, going beyond posters, stickers, and pink shirts, developing confidence in the subject, being aware of your state's or province's laws, and not letting fear stand in your way. Likewise, Mokaleng and Mowes (2020) indicated that many problems, including improper policy development issues, teacher attitudes, a lack of teacher training, inadequate support and resources, as well as curriculum concerns, hindered the implementation of inclusive education.

3. Methodology

Research Design

The study used a mixed research design to explore and understand the working environment inclusivity of LGBTQ workers in manufacturing companies in Cavite. Considerably, descriptive design was used to highlight and describe data of profile and the agreement level towards professional growth, training and capacitating of workers, leadership and management,

stereotyping culture, and organizational policy. Regression analysis was used to understand the behavioral effect of the mentioned variables on the length of stay of LGBTQ members. Modified systematic literature design was also used to triangulate the quantitative findings with existing and latest studies related to the working environment of LGBTQ members using Google Scholar as key source data, and a purposive journal variable-relevant filtering method was used to identify appropriate studies that will form part of the review. Finally, partial meta-analysis was utilized to provide a multiple-mix analysis that compresses all secondary and primary data and augments a proposition that aided the conclusion and recommendation of this study.

Research Instrument

The researchers used a researcher-made questionnaire encompassing several parts of the profile and perceived agreement level. The instruments as subjected to validity and reliability and have proven valid and usable.

Sampling Design

The researchers have used purposive sampling among the LGBTQ members in the manufacturing enterprises in Cavite. Seventy-five participants were selected and given personal questionnaires, which were later processed, arranged, and tabulated.

4. Results and Discussion

Socio-demographic Profile

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic profile of the respondents regarding age. It presents that most respondents were ages 25 to 34, with 57.33 percent of total responses. In contrast, the least percentage, with 8 percent, belongs to the respondents with 45 and above, having 6 total responses. Thus, the table implies that older millennials dominate the total study population. Likewise, Dupreelle et al. (2020) showed that aged 25 to 34 comprise 71 percent of the LGBTQ population, accounting for a higher share of the entire workforce. However, in another related study, out of the 253 total samples, 46 percent pertained to the age group of 31-40 years, while 11.4 percent were from the age group 51 and above (Ahmad & Rhaman, 2019).

Table 1. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age

CATEGORIES	CATEGORIES	CATEGORIES
18 – 24	14	18.67
25 – 34	43	57.33
35 – 44	12	16.00
45 and above	6	8.00
TOTAL	75	100.00

Table 2 showcases the respondents' socio-demographic profile regarding civil status. It reveals that 65.33 percent were single, with a higher frequency of 49 responses. However, the least responses belong to respondents with a married civil status, which has a percentage of 6.67 percent. It suggests that the majority of the total response belongs to single respondents. Additionally, Soto-

Sanfiel and Sanchez-Soriano (2023) revealed that 66.66 percent of the sample were single, 16.66 percent were married, and 16.66 percent were divorced. However, Bayrakdar and King (2021) discovered that gays and bisexuals with a marital status of living with a partner dominate the study's population, with a total response percentage of 78.01 and 72.

Table 2. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of civil status

CATEGORIES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Married	2	2.67
Separated	5	6.67
Single	49	65.33
Cohabiting	19	25.33
TOTAL	75	100.00

Table 3 displays the respondents' socio-demographic profile regarding educational attainment. It shows that most of the responses come from respondents with a vocational graduate educational attainment, with 31 total responses. Nevertheless, the least responses belonged to respondents that were college graduates, with a total frequency of 2 responses. Generally, it depicts that the majority of the respondents were alumni. However, a study conducted in the province of Pampanga found that more than half of the respondents were college graduates, with a total percentage of 66.67 percent (Fabillar & Felizar, 2019). Moreover, Sahin et al. (2019) found that the participants were relatively highly educated, with 41.66 percent completing university education and 2.76 percent completing secondary education.

Table 3. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of educational attainment

CATEGORIES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
High school graduate	15	20.00
Senior high school graduate	9	12.00
Vocational graduate	31	41.33
College undergraduate	18	24.00
College graduate	2	2.67
TOTAL	75	100.00

Table 4 presents the respondents' socio-demographic profile regarding the length of service. It showcases that 25 out of 75 responses belong to respondents with 2 years to 3 years of length of service. However, 6.67 percent belong to the respondents with a service length of 6 years and above. Generally, it suggests that most respondents have entry-level experience. Likewise, the results of a demographic study by McNamara et al. (2021) showed that out of 510 valid responses, 48 percent had 0-4 years length of service, while 31.6 percent of respondents had a 5-9 years length of service, followed by 17.8 percent had 10 years and above length of service.

Table 4. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of length of service

CATEGORIES	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
1 - 3 months	3	4.00
4 - 6 months	24	32.00
7 months - 1 year	7	9.33

2 years - 3 years	25	33.33
4 - 5 years	11	14.67
6 years above	5	6.67
TOTAL	75	100.00

Table 5 showcases the perceived working environment inclusivity of the respondents. It depicts the perceived working environment inclusivity in terms of professional growth had the highest total mean value of 4.07, interpreted as agree. Moreover, the table shows that leadership and management had a mean value of 3.87, identified as agree. Furthermore, the perceived working environment inclusivity of the respondents in terms of stereotyping culture had a descriptive value of agree, with a total mean value of 3.83. Additionally, the organizational policy had the least total mean value of 3.69, with an agreed descriptive value. In general, the result showcases that the agreement scale of the respondents regarding perceived working environment inclusivity was agree.

Table 5. Perceived working environment inclusivity of the respondents

CATEGORIES	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE VALUE
Professional growth	4.07	Agree
Trainings and capacitating	3.83	Agree
Leadership and management	3.87	Agree
Stereotyping culture	3.86	Agree
Organizational policy	3.69	Agree

Table 6 shows the summary of the systematic literature review on reference from 2020 to the present related to LGBTQ in the workplace. Delimited from the initial 17 studies, segment screening is summarized to nine references for review and references related to the variables used in this study. It revealed that most of the literature points to the dominant prevalence of management and provision for growth as key factors why LGBTQ members stay in the workplace. The workplace encompasses businesses, companies, stores, and alike where they tend to belong to work.

Table 6. Systematic Literature Review Matrix

Author/s	Year	Relevant Results	Variable Relevance	Methodology Notes
Hossain et al.	2020	Prohibition of discrimination and provision of opportunity for growth spur innovations and increased performance level among LGBTQ members.	Personal Growth, Leadership, and Management	Regression Analysis
Cech and Rothwell	2020	Good management and provision of an appropriate environment enrich LGBTQ members in their respective workplaces. Equipped with relevant strategies to include them being part of the organization.	Personal Growth, Leadership, and Management	Qualitative Design

Patel et al.	2021	An organization's commitment to workplace equality and diversity can be signaled and strengthened with the help of a lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender workplace equality policy (LGBTQ-WEP). Previous research indicates that LGBTQ-WEP is positively perceived by stakeholders (clients, staff, and channel partners) and has an impact on business performance. The authors investigate if LGBTQ-WEP improves customer happiness through marketing capabilities and whether demand instability dampens these correlations. They do this by drawing on stakeholder theory and the resource-based view of the firm. They take advantage of the plausible exogenous state-to-state variances in workplace equality policies established by statewide laws on nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation in order to allay the endogeneity concerns of LGBTQ-WEP. According to empirical findings, LGBTQ-WEP positively impacts customer satisfaction both directly and indirectly through improved marketing capabilities.	Management	Descriptive-Correlation
Mara et al.	2021	The concept places the LGBTQ community's members at the center of the fight against prejudice and its impact on public policy. We discovered that not all contexts lend themselves to the use of these tactics. Therefore, businesses, society, and the political system need to get involved and enhance freedoms and labor rights for the LGBTQ population in addition to LGBTQ individual agencies.	Strategy and Management	Descriptive Survey
Cunningham and Hussain	2020	According to the authors' research, multilayer initiatives are required, with an emphasis on leader behaviors, organizational policies, and interactions with the surrounding environment where the sports organization is located. Together, the authors provide a case for LGBTQ diversity and inclusion by demonstrating to sports and entertainment managers both the advantages of such policies and the steps they can take to establish and maintain inclusivity in their workplaces.	Policy and Management	Mixed Design
Steiger and Henry	2020	According to the authors' research, multilayer initiatives are required, emphasizing leader behaviors, organizational policies, and interactions with the surrounding environment of the sports organization. Together, the authors provide a making a case for LGBTQ diversity and inclusion by demonstrating to sports and entertainment managers both the advantages of such policies and the steps they can take to establish and maintain inclusivity in their workplaces.	Policy and Inclusivity	Mixed Design

Magrath	2020	Results obtained using the inclusive masculinity theory (IMT) show that, despite the persistence of heterosexism, every participant was "out" to their coworkers and that practically everyone who did so was unconditionally embraced. Findings also point to a nuanced viewpoint that contrasts with the sports media's frequently sensationalistic reportage on LGBT matters. As a result, this article adds to the growing body of IMT research on changing perceptions of sexual minorities in sports media.	Inclusivity	Qualitative Design
Sabharwal et al.	2019	Based on Lowi's agency classification type, we also investigate the effect of agency type on LGBTQ turnover rates. Key findings indicate that LGBTQ workers intend to leave their jobs more frequently than those who identify as heterosexual or straight and that they are less inclined to do so if they believe their employers value communality or redistribution within their organizations. To implement effective structural change in an organization's culture of inclusion, public sector managers must do more than merely "talk the talk." This finding is also suggestive of LGBTQ employees' desire to avoid the stigma of being LGBT and hide their identities. However, an open and supportive workplace environment positively impacted turnover.	Culture	Mixed Design
Garg and Sangwan	2021	A literature review analysis aimed to focus on workplace diversity and inclusion and research trends from 2010 to 2017. The term "diversity and inclusion" has many different meanings and applications. Hence it is appropriate to review the literature on inclusion and diversity to provide a more in-depth and complex grasp of their meanings and conceptualizations. The analysis provided a substantial amount of literature on variety and the results it has on outcomes. Given that inclusiveness has become a need in the domain of inclusion and its results, a relatively new area of study.	Diversity and Inclusivity	Systematic Literature Review

Regression Analysis

Table 7 shows the initial regression model of the variable dynamism of professional growth (PG), training and capacitating (TC), leadership and management (LM), stereotyping culture (SC), and organization policy (OP). It reveals that the intercept and the dependent variables were insignificant, and their respective p-values exceeded the critical value of acceptability. Considerably, autocorrelation was detected in running the model at the first level, as signified by the ADF test. The initial regression model was subjected to model correction sensitive to compliance to regression classical assumptions.

Table 7. Initial OLS Model

LS = 0.806 + 0.409PG + 0.527TC + 0.139LM – 0.066SC – 0.242OP + μ						
<i>t – Statistic</i>	2.465	1.175	1.317	0.407	-0.355	-0.864
<i>p-value</i>	0.643	0.244	0.192	0.685	0.724	0.391
R² = 0.912						
Adj R² = 0.892						
F(4,100) = 12.092						
DW = 1.42						
Critical Values						
F(4,100) = 12.32						
t-ratio (0.05) = 0.072						
(two-tail test)						

Table 8 shows the corrected regression model. The corrected model was subjected to the JB test, DW test, VIF, BP test, and ADF to be the best, linear, unbiased estimates upon compliance with the assumptions of classical regression conditions. The corrected regression model has an adjusted R-squared value of 0.650 which purports that 65 percent of the variability of the length of service of LGBTQ employees can be explained by the identified dependent variables, and the other 35 percent can be attributed to the other factors or determinants that may not have been included in the model. The coefficient value of the F-stat was found to be significant. Specifically, professional growth, training and capacitating, and leadership and management positively influence the length of stay among LGBT members having p-values below 0.05 critical level. Considerably, stereotyping culture and organizational policy do not affect the length of stay of LGBT members in the workplace, with a p-value corresponding to a t-stat exceeding the 0.05 level of acceptability. Noting that stereotyping culture and organization policy were insignificant whose values exceeded the critical values of acceptability hence, not rejecting the null hypothesis.

The significant values of professional growth, training, and capacitating and leadership and management lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant dynamic effect of professional growth, training and capacitating, and leadership and management on the length of stay among LGBT members in their respective working place. The corresponding t-stat values of professional growth, training and capacitating, and leadership and management, on theoretical notes, increase the length of stay of LGBTQ members for almost a year. The study conducted by De Jesus et al. (2023), whose findings focus on the analysis of BPO non-voiced employees that professional growth and training create a sense of belongingness and make employees stay in the workplace. Congruently, good management in the workplace based on sexual orientation yields growth and higher performance of people, particularly LGBTQ members in the organization (Hossain et al., 2020). Parallel with the results of this study, a study conducted by Badgett et al. (2013) explained that good management, provision of enrichment of skills among employees, and

provision of opportunity to grow allow LGBTQ employees to be productive and is often linked to increased job commitment, satisfaction and health outcomes of employees. Hence, it proves that when it comes to providing professional growth, training and capacitating, leadership, and management, it positively affects the length of stay among LGBT members.

Table 8. Corrected OLS Model

LS = 0.316 + 1.392PG + 2.372TC + 2.201LM – 1.031SC – 0.532OP + μ							
<i>t – Statistic</i>	(3.312)	(4.215)	(2.323)	(3.407)	(0.201)	(0.327)	
<i>p-value</i>	0.016	0.002	0.022	0.04	0.47	0.39	
	R²	=	0.712		Adj R²	=	0.650
	F(4,100)	=	23.902		DW	=	1.83
	p-value	=	0.032				

4. Multilevel Analysis and Discussion

This analysis provides different but parallel segments of understanding the inclusivity of the working environment among LGBTQ members. Considerably, partial meta-analysis was employed to understand the behavioral influence of professional growth, training, capacitating, leadership and management, stereotyping culture, and organizational policy on the length of stay of LGBTQ members in their workplace.

LGBTQ Members as Working Class and Demographic Relevance: A generation of change

The LGBTQ members work regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity; they all have similar incentives for working. Like everyone else, LGBTQ people have needs for money, aspirations for their careers, and other personal objectives that motivate them to look for work and try to make a living. Like everyone else, LGBTQ individuals must financially provide for their families and themselves. Through work, they can generate an income to pay for necessities like housing, food, and other living expenditures. LGBTQ people, like their heterosexual and cisgender peers, also look for personal fulfillment in their employment. They could desire to explore and grow their passions, talents, and interests. They might also have professional ambitions and goals, such as moving up the corporate ladder or significantly impacting their industry. They might select professions that let them follow their passions, support causes they care about, or aid those in need. Additionally, workplaces can offer LGBTQ people social connections, support systems, and a feeling of community. LGBTQ people can interact with coworkers who might have similar experiences or offer support through trying times by developing professional ties. Finally, like

everyone else, LGBTQ people cherish their professional and personal development. Their general growth can be aided by the chances that work can provide for learning new skills, growing their knowledge, and advancing in their jobs. It's crucial to keep in mind that LGBTQ people, like members of any other group, are different, and their reasons for working might range greatly. Their unique motivations for working could be affected by a variety of personal objectives, financial requirements, societal considerations, and individual circumstances (Pareek, 2020; Tan, 2019; Blank et al., 2020; and Donaghy & Perales, 2022). The visibility and portrayal of LGBTQ people can be impacted by how openly and comfortably one discloses their sexual orientation or gender identity at work. According to certain studies, many LGBT people decide against disclosing their sexual orientation or gender identity at work out of concern for discrimination or unfavorable consequences. Noting the diversity of the LGBTQ community, which includes people from different racial, cultural, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds. This variety may be reflected in the proportion of LGBT people in the workforce (Di Marco et al., 2021; Johnson & Otto, 2019; Tan & Yu, 2021; and Brahma et al., 2023). The findings of this study point towards the completion of basic education for the millennial generation, mostly single and working for years in their respective workplace, noting that the study only segmented the manufacturing-working class in Cavite. The findings showcased the diversity, generation composition, and key demographics. This can be attributed to modern perspectives in interaction, decision base, and engagement in their respective working environments, as pointed out by Brahma et al. (2023), where interventions in working place were necessary, and there was an observed shift of acceptance and tolerance that may vary from one's workplace to another.

The LGBTQ and their Current Working Environment: Acting towards inclusivity but not perfect!

It is important to note that there has been improvement in many areas and that the situation for LGBTQ people in the workplace is always changing. LGBTQ-friendly workplace settings are more likely to be established in institutions and communities, encouraging diversity, equity, and inclusion. It is noted that to encourage diversity and LGBTQ inclusivity, numerous organizations have created inclusive policies and practices. This can include anti-discrimination laws, equal benefits for same-sex couples, gender-neutral dress regulations, and access to support for gender change. However, how these regulations are implemented and upheld varies greatly among firms.

Different countries have implemented comprehensive anti-discrimination laws that expressly include sexual orientation and gender identity as protected characteristics, prohibiting discrimination in hiring, promotion, and other employment practices. In contrast, other regions may have limited or no legal protections, leaving LGBTQ people vulnerable to discrimination and harm (Di Marco et al., 2021; Johnson & Otto, 2019; Tan & Yu, 2021; and Brahma et al., 2023). The findings of this study are aligned with the prevailing literature and studies conducted. This manifests that there are changes in the working environment of LGBTQ members compared to the past decades. The agreement responses, on average, towards the presence of professional growth, training, capacity improvement, leadership and management, addressing stereotyping in the workplace, and having an organizational policy in place among the participants depicted an activity towards work inclusivity, working, but not perfect.

The Working Inclusivity of LGBTQ Members: What makes them stay in their workplace?

A welcoming work environment that celebrates diversity and actively supports LGBTQ people can greatly influence employee retention and job satisfaction. LGBTQ employees are more likely to stay if they feel welcomed, respected, and supported at work. This can be encouraged by enacting laws, practices, and programs supporting inclusivity, including anti-discrimination laws, LGBTQ employee resource groups, diversity education, and open allegiance from coworkers and upper management. Strong working connections and support networks significantly influence LGBTQ employees' job happiness and retention. LGBTQ employees may feel more appreciated and connected if their coworkers and managers are accepting, inclusive, and supportive of them. LGBTQ-specific employee resource groups and similar networks can offer important contacts and support. Opportunities for personal and professional growth, including mentoring programs, skill-building efforts, and training programs, can improve job satisfaction and increase the possibility that LGBTQ employees will remain in their positions. Giving people access to tools and opportunities for career advancement encourages investment and dedication. For all workers, including LGBTQ people, job or career stability and financial security are crucial aspects. A steady job with competitive pay and perks may influence someone's decision to remain in their current position. Finally, LGBTQ employees may be more likely to remain with companies that show a strong commitment to their rights and inclusivity. This can include activities that show the organization's commitment to building a diverse and inclusive workplace, participation in LGBTQ advocacy, and public support for LGBTQ causes (Hossain et al., 2020; Cech & Rothwell, 2020; Patel et al., 2021; Mara et al., 2021; Cunningham & Hussain, 2020; Steiger & Henry, 2020; Magrath, 2020; Sabharwal et al., 2019; and Garg & Sangwan, 2021). Regression results of this study validate the prevailing studies that when it comes to what makes LGBTQ stay in the workplace as represented by their length of stay in the organization, variables concerning professional growth, provisions of training and capacity building activities, and leadership and management that inculcate inclusivity, respect and equal opportunity to their respective employees can provide a significant positive motivation factor that influence the LGBTQ workers to stay longer in the workplace.

6. Conclusions

This study concludes the following:

- a. The majority of the participants were aged 25 to 34, single, vocational graduates, and rendered 2 to 3 years of service. This implied that older millennials dominated the total study population. This also suggested that most of the participants could have entry-level experience, which gave them a chance to acquire knowledge and abilities that will help them in future potential employment and foster the growth of responsibility, commitment, and collaboration among individuals.
- b. The majority of the participants concurred that the perception of working environment inclusivity was favorable for their professional growth. This showed that it sought to remove prejudices and restrictions that can disproportionately affect certain groups while promoting fairness in the promotion and recognition procedures.
- c. Most of the literature points to the dominant prevalence of management and provision for growth as crucial factors for LGBTQ members staying at their workplace. This meant that

this might create opportunities for advancement in employment chances, such as promotions. It can improve their existing knowledge and abilities and acquire new ones

- d. It disclosed that the working environment inclusivity among LGBTQ members was found to have no significant dynamic effect on their profile. It meant that LGBTQ employees had equal possibilities to accomplish their jobs at work, perform their leadership, and follow their culture as well the organizational policies with personal fulfillment regardless of their identities.
- e. The multilevel analysis for distinct with parallel segments for comprehending the working environment among LGBTQ members serves as a framework for crafting strategies for the inclusion and diversity of LGBTQ employees in the workplace. This had an impact on their attitudes and actions, which in turn had a bearing on their professional development, training, capacity, leadership, and organizational policy, which in effect had an influence on how long LGBTQ employees stayed at their jobs.

Recommendations

- a. Assess the educational environments and use resources like the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network (GLSEN) educational environment, which can develop bright and optimistic ideas for enhancement.
- b. Encourage gender diversity as it can lead to better decision-making as employees can bring different ideas, perspectives, and approaches for solving problems.
- c. Promote gender diversity as a social responsibility in the workplace as it contributes to the broader goal of achieving gender equality in the organization and society, leading to equitable and fair practices and policies, which can achieve higher levels of commitment and job satisfaction among employees.
- d. Focus on the experience and skills of LGBTQ employees in development programs, which can help them identify who is best suited for specific projects and job roles.
- e. Consider the scholarship program for higher education for LGBTQ, which can be more relevant for certain job roles other than vocational training.
- f. Encourage LGBTQ employees to a growth mindset to emphasize the importance of continuous development and learning to enable them to develop new knowledge and skills, regardless of educational attainment.
- g. Provide LGBTQ employees with long years of service in the organization with opportunities for attendance at workshops, conferences, and training sessions that can make them stay up-to-date with the latest technologies and trends in their field.
- h. Provision of comprehensive training and orientation programs and job-specific training can help LGBTQ employees feel comfortable in their job roles, ensuring that they receive an overview of the company's values, culture, goals, procedures, and policies.
- i. Develop a personalized approach in the design for LGBTQ employee development programs to tailor to the individual goals and needs of employees that consider experience level, job responsibilities, career stage, and learning style, thus, ensuring that employees at all age ranges have the opportunity to grow and learn for the effective performance of job roles.
- j. Cultivate relations with significant local leaders in industry, belief systems, sports, or other organizations who are supportive of diversity and inclusion.
- k. Offer a variety of options for education as LGBTQ employees have different preferences and learning styles, which can include self-paced learning, online courses, and mentorship programs.

- l. Monitor LGBTQ employees' progress in the development program to ensure the program's effectiveness in addressing gaps in employee skills through evaluations to identify improvement areas and make adjustments to the program as needed.
- m. Escalate the number of LGBTQ literature and studies available in the companies and communities. LGBTQ employees will feel more a part of their community, more valuable, and more connected to themselves and convey substantial concepts of support and encouragement.
- n. The government should enhance the judicial and legislative frameworks for the fight against discrimination against LGBT people.
- o. The government should put forth efforts to improve every individual's knowledge and understanding and craft effective strategies in schools, companies, and community networks on sexual and gender identity violence and how it is expressed, including social networks as cutting-edge instruments for communication.

Acknowledgment

We would like to express our appreciation and sincerest thanks to OUR GOD ALMIGHTY for his unending blessings of wisdom, strength, and motivation. Secondly, the authors would like to express their gratitude to the CvSU-CCAT administration for making this publication come into existence. *Per aspera, ad astra!*

References

- Aguilar, M. G., Fonacier, R., Duldulao, A., Pangilinan, S. M., Paz, J. M., Cruz, S., ... & Pecayo, V. (2022). Diversity and employees' challenges in the workplace: The case in selected resorts in Calamba City, Laguna, Philippines. *Journal of Global Awareness, 3*(2), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.24073/jga/3/02/08>
- Azmat, G., & Boring, A. (2020). Gender diversity in firms. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 36*(4), 760–782. <https://academic.oup.com/oxrep/article/36/4/760/6124301>
- Badgett, M., Durso, L. E., Mallory, C., & Kastanis, A. (2013). The Business Impact of LGBT-Supportive Workplace Policies. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3vt6t9zx>
- Bayrakdar, S., & King, A. (2022). Job satisfaction and sexual orientation in Britain. *Work, Employment and Society, 36*(1), 21-39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017020980997>
- Bhankaraully, S., Goyer, M., & Aroles, J. (2022). Workplace discrimination against LGBT employees in Mauritius: A sociological perspective. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 0*(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X221111822>
- Blanck, P., Hyseni, F., & Altunkol Wise, F. (2020). Diversity and inclusion in the American legal profession: workplace accommodations for lawyers with disabilities and lawyers who identify as LGBTQ+. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 30*, 537-564. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10926-020-09938-3>

- Brahma, S., Gavriilidis, K., Kallinterakis, V., Verousis, T., & Zhang, M. (2023). LGBTQ and finance. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 102547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2023.102547>
- Cech, E. A., & Rothwell, W. R. (2020). LGBT workplace inequality in the federal workforce: Intersectional processes, organizational contexts, and turnover considerations. *Ilr Review*, 73(1), 25-60.
- Cech, E. A., & Waidzunus, T. J. (2021). Systemic inequalities for LGBTQ professionals in STEM. *Science advances*, 7(3), eabe0933. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe0933>
- Cunningham, G. B., & Hussain, U. (2020). The case for LGBT diversity and inclusion in sports business. *Sport & Entertainment Review*, 5(1), 1–15.
- De Jesus, E. R. E., Noveno, H. D., Villamor, N. E., Tadeo, J. B., & Mendoza, X. L. D. (2023). The Workplace Environment, Employees' Retention, and Performance: A Focus on Non-Voiced BPO Employees for an Enhance Staff Development Program. *International Journal of Business, Technology and Organizational Behavior (IJBTOB)*, 3(2), 156-168.
- Di Marco, D., Hoel, H., & Lewis, D. (2021). Discrimination and exclusion on grounds of sexual and gender identity: Are LGBT people's voices heard at the workplace?. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 24 (18), <https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2021.16>
- Donaghy, M., & Perales, F. (2022). Workplace well-being among LGBTQ+ Australians: Exploring diversity within diversity. *Journal of Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14407833221118383>
- Dupreelle, P., Novacek, G., Lindquist, J., Micon, N., Pellas, S., & Testone, G. (2020). A new LGBTQ workforce has arrived—Inclusive cultures must follow. *Boston Consulting Group*. <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2020/inclusive-cultures-must-follow-new-lgbtq-workforce>
- Fabillar, C. N. E., & Fellizar, F. M. D. (2019). Social acceptability of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) Community among Local Government Legislators in the City of San Fernando, Pampanga. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 8(1). <https://ovcre.uplb.edu.ph/journals-uplb/index.php/JHE/article/view/430>
- García Johnson, C. P., & Otto, K. (2019). Better together: A model for women and LGBTQ equality in the workplace. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 272. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00272>
- Garg, S., & Sangwan, S. (2021). Literature review on diversity and inclusion at the workplace, 2010–2017. *Vision*, 25(1), 12-22.

- Hossain, M., Atif, M., Ahmed, A., & Mia, L. (2020). Do LGBT Workplace Diversity Policies Create Value for Firms? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04158-z>
- Hur, H. (2019). The role of inclusive work environment practices in promoting LGBT employee job satisfaction and commitment. *Public Money & Management*, pp. 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2019.1681640>
- Jayawardana, H. M. A. S., & Priyashantha, K. G. (2019). The impact of workforce diversity on employee performance. <http://ir.lib.ruh.ac.lk/xmlui/handle/iruor/208>
- Jones, P. A., & Lim, F. (2020). Fostering an LGBTQ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer) Inclusive Workplace. <http://hdl.handle.net/10755/21305>
- Lee, D., Johansen, M., & Bae, K. B. (2021). Organizational justice and the inclusion of LGBT federal employees: A quasi-experimental analysis using coarsened exact matching. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 41(4), 700-722. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X20929731>
- Magrath, R. (2020). "Progress... slowly, but surely": The sports media workplace, gay sports journalists, and LGBT media representation in a sport. *Journalism Studies*, 21(2), 254–270.
- Mara, L., Ginieis, M. & Brunet-Icart, I. Strategies for Coping with LGBT Discrimination at Work: a Systematic Literature Review. *Sex Res Soc Policy* 18, 339–354 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-020-00462-w>
- McNamara, K. A., Gribble, R., Sharp, M. L., Alday, E., Corletto, G., Lucas, C. L., ... & Holloway, I. W. (2021). Acceptance matters: Disengagement and attrition among LGBT personnel in the US military. *Journal of Military, Veteran and Family Health*, 7(S1), 76–89. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jmvfh-2021-0017>
- Melson-Silimon, A., Salter, N. P., & Carter, N. T. (2020). A historical review of the study of us LGBTQ employees' workplace experiences. In *Historical perspectives in industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 161–183). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429052644-9>
- Meyer, E. J., Quantz, M., Taylor, C., & Peter, T. (2019). Elementary teachers' experiences with LGBTQ-inclusive education: Addressing fears with knowledge to improve confidence and practices. *Theory Into Practice*, 58(1), 6-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2018.1536922>
- Mills, S., Lewis, N., Owens, B., & Guta, A. (2021). Work-related stressors and mental health among LGBTQ workers: Results from a cross-sectional survey. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-699508/v1>

- Mokaleng, M., & Möwes, A. D. (2020). Issues affecting the implementation of inclusive education practices in selected secondary schools in the Omaheke Region of Namibia. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 9(2), 78-90. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v9n2p78>
- Moon, K. (2018). Fairness at the organizational level: Examining the effect of organizational justice climate on collective turnover rates and organizational performance. *Public Personnel Management*, 46(2), 118–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026017702610>
- Morrison, K. (2022). Inclusion of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer (LGBTIQ+) persons in the world of work: a learning guide.
- Patel, P. C., & Feng, C. (2021). LGBT workplace equality policy and customer satisfaction: The roles of marketing capability and demand instability. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 40(1), 7–26.
- Perales, F., Ablaza, C., Tomaszewski, W., & Emsen-Hough, D. (2022). You, me, and them: understanding employees' use of trans-affirming language within the workplace. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 19(2), 760-776. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-021-00592-9>
- Rand, J. J., Paceley, M. S., Fish, J. N., & Anderson, S. O. (2021). LGBTQ+ inclusion and support: An analysis of challenges and opportunities within 4-H. *Journal of Youth Development: Bridging Research and Practice*, 16(4), 26–51. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jyd.2021.1072>
- Sabharwal, M., Levine, H., D'Agostino, M., & Nguyen, T. (2019). Inclusive work practices: Turnover intentions among LGBT employees of the US federal government. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 49(4), 482–494.
- Şahin, O., Van der Toorn, J., Jansen, W. S., Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2019). Looking beyond our similarities: How perceived (in) visible dissimilarity relates to feelings of inclusion at work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 575. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00575>
- Sean, W. (2020). Should I stay or should I go? Employment discrimination and workplace harassment against transgender and other minority employees in Canada's Federal Public Service. *Journal of Homosexuality*, (1)27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2020.1712140>
- Sears, B., Mallory, C., & Luhur, W. (2021). Public and private sector employees' perceptions of discrimination against LGBTQ people. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5wg2j0q2>
- Sears, B., Mallory, C., Flores, A. R., & Conron, K. J. (2021). LGBT people's experiences of workplace discrimination and harassment. eScholarship, University of California. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5s95g1pg>
- Soto-Sanfiel, M. T., & Sánchez-Soriano, J. J. (2023). Absence and Distortion in the Self-Representation of LGBTQ+ Narratives. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2022.2161083>

- Stephens, D. D. (2018). *A case study of inclusive environments for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender employees* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University). <https://search.proquest.com/openview/189bfc531b9c1c209c61b7b18e1372c8/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- Steiger, R. L., & Henry, P. J. (2020). LGBT workplace protections as an extension of the protected class framework. *Law and Human Behavior*, 44(4), 251.
- Suárez, M. I., Marquez-Velarde, G., Glass, C., & Miller, G. H. (2022). Cis-normativity at work: Exploring discrimination against US trans workers. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 37(6), 716-731. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-06-2020-0201>
- Tan, T. Q. (2019). Principles of inclusion, diversity, access, and equity. *The Journal of infectious diseases*, 220(Supplement_2), S30-S32. <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiz198>
- Tang, H., & Yu, W. (2021). LGBTQ inclusive workplace climate in China: A case study on the inclusion of LGBTQ groups in the workplace based on the organization's LGBTQ support policy, policy implementation, and employees' understanding. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1561483>
- Webster, J. R., Adams, G. A., Maranto, C. L., Sawyer, K., Thoroughgood, C. (2017). Workplace contextual supports for LGBT employees: A review, meta-analysis, and agenda for future research. *Human Resource Management*, (1), p. 18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21873>