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Two advancements in the study of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) individuals' workplace sexual identity management, the Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure (WSIMM) and the Workplace Sexual Identity Management (WSIM) social cognitive model of identity management are incorporated in the current study of LGB K-12 teachers' workplace sexual identity management strategies. The purpose of this study was to assess the psychometric properties of a revised version the WSIMM, investigate the workplace sexual identity management strategies of LGB teachers, and gain further understanding of the complex process LGB individuals navigate related to managing their sexual identity at work by exploring the role of perceived barriers and coping-efficacy in their decision-making process.

The results indicated that the WSIMM-R is useful in assessing identity management strategies and identified problematic items and scales. In examining the relation between various personal and career variables and the identity management strategies used, the school district type (i.e., rural, suburban, urban) in which participants taught was related to differences in the sexual identity management strategies they reported using. A difference in participants' perception of barriers was
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found related to whether the other LGB teachers they knew taught within their same building or other school districts. Also, participants who reported primarily using covering strategies endorsed lower levels of coping efficacy, while those who reported primarily using explicitly out strategies endorsed higher level of coping efficacy. A full discussion of the results is presented, as well as implications and directions for future research.
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CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sexual identity management refers to the process by which individuals who identify as lesbian, gay, or bisexual (LGB) manage information related to their sexual identities (i.e., what they reveal or conceal and how and with whom). The workplace is one milieu in which LGB individuals are continually faced with making such decisions. Croteau (1996) highlighted that prior research has shown that for LGB workers the degree of openness regarding their sexual identity has been largely related to their attempts to manage potential discrimination and hostility in the workplace.

Though this process of workplace sexual identity management has been identified as one of the broad themes addressed in the literature on LGB career issues, there is a clear need for further research to build upon the theoretical and empirical study of the concept (Chung, 2001; Croteau, 1996; Croteau, Anderson, DiStefano, & Kampa-Kokesch, 2000). Thus far, the research on workplace sexual identity management has been limited in that it has lacked an adequate theoretical basis and contains methodological problems. However, there have been two advancements in the study of workplace sexual identity management that serve as the basis of the current study. The first advancement is Anderson, Croteau, Chung, and DiStefano’s (2001) Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure (WSIMM). The WSIMM was developed as a quantitative measure to assess workplace sexual identity management strategies of lesbian women and gay men and was administered to a
sample of Student Affairs professionals in its initial evaluation. Another advancement in the study of workplace sexual identity management is Lidderdale, Croteau, Anderson, Murray, and Davis’ (in press) Workplace Sexual Identity Management (WSIM) model. The WSIM model parallels Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) and provides a theoretical framework to describe what influences individuals in their navigation of workplace sexual identity management. Incorporating the WSIMM and WSIM model to understand and assess workplace sexual identity management might be particularly useful in conducting research to further expand the study of the multifaceted process of managing an LGB sexual identity. Both the WSIMM and the WSIM model are further explicated later in this chapter.

The current study was designed to incorporate the two aforementioned recent contributions to the LGB vocational literature (WSIMM and WSIM model) in an attempt to strengthen both theoretical and operational aspects of the study of workplace sexual identity management, and to apply these advancements to the study of LGB teachers’ identity management experiences. One of the primary purposes of the study was to further assess the psychometric properties of the WSIMM, particularly in the use of the measure with a different population than that of the original evaluation. Another primary purpose of the current study was to expand the existing body of literature addressing workplace sexual identity management of LGB teachers. Gaining additional information about the workplace sexual identity management of LGB teachers can add to the general study of sexual identity management, as well as to those issues specific to LGB teachers. A secondary purpose
of the current study was to further explore aspects of Lidderdale, Croteau, Anderson, Murray, and Davis's (in press) theoretical explanation of how individuals make decisions regarding workplace identity management using a social cognitive model.

The review of literature presented in this chapter contains seven sections. The first section describes how workplace sexual identity management has been studied in the LGB vocational research and significant findings of this body of research. The second section summarizes the research on LGB teachers. The third section explicates Griffin's (1992) model of sexual identity management, which was integral in the development of the WSIMM measure at the center of the current study. The fourth section describes the construction of the WSIMM, its initial psychometric evaluation, and why this measure was selected for use in the current study. The fifth section presents the theoretical WSIM model and its usefulness in understanding the complexity of the decision-making process involved in identifying, selecting, and implementing workplace sexual identity management strategies. The sixth section discusses two additional components of the Social Cognitive Learning Theory (i.e., perceived barriers and coping efficacy) that should be addressed in the WSIM model to further explain influences on workplace sexual identity management. The seventh section describes how these potential barriers were identified for LGB teachers based on previous research. This section then explains how these potential perceived barriers and coping efficacy were assessed in the current study. The final section of this chapter contains the research hypotheses for the current study.
Workplace Sexual Identity Management

In the LGB vocational literature the discussion and study of the process by which LGB individuals navigate revealing or concealing information related to their sexual identities has varied in definition as well as measurement. Some authors and researchers define the process simply as a measure of the degree of disclosure or openness of individuals’ sexual identity at work (i.e., to how many others have the individuals disclosed their sexual identity or how open they are about their sexual identity). Individuals described as being more out are those who report having disclosed or revealed their sexual identity to most people or who identify as being “very open.” Those who are described as less out or “closeted” report having disclosed their sexual identity to few individuals or identify themselves as “not open.” Assessing workplace sexual identity management simply as a measure of how many others to whom the LGB workers have disclosed their sexual identity or how “open” the workers describe themselves, does not address the more complex process of managing one’s sexual identity in the workplace. I use the term *workplace sexual identity management* to refer to the process by which LGB individuals engage in behaviors that determine how much information related to their sexual identity is revealed or concealed. The concept of workplace sexual identity management includes awareness that LGB individuals make many decisions regarding how to manage their sexual identity, and that it cannot be measured or understood simply as the number of people at work who know the individual’s sexual identity. Also, the concept of sexual identity management takes into account that LGB individuals may
make different decisions regarding how much information about their sexual identities they reveal or conceal based on various factors, such as the setting, the individuals involved, and the LGB individuals' personal background among other factors.

The following section of this chapter is divided into three subsections. The first subsection recaps Croteau's (1996) review of the LGB vocational research and findings related to workplace sexual identity management dating to that year. The second subsection briefly describes twelve additional studies addressing workplace sexual identity management added to the literature since Croteau's review. The third subsection then summarizes the workplace sexual identity management research findings and explains how these findings relate to the current study.

Croteau's Review of the LGB Vocational Research

In his review of the empirical research focused on vocational behavior of LGB workers, Croteau (1996) reviewed nine studies that all addressed workplace identity management to some degree (Hall, 1986; Griffin, 1992; Woods & Harbeck, 1992; Olson, 1987; Croteau & Lark, 1995; Croteau & von Destinon, 1994; Levine & Leonard, 1984; Schachar & Gilbert, 1983; Schneider, 1986). Specific to the current study, Croteau (1996) examined the nine identified studies related to the variability in openness about sexual identity in the workplace and correlates of the degree of openness versus concealment. These findings will be highlighted in the following paragraphs.

Croteau (1996) identified that the studies reported variability in the degree of
openness regarding a lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity in the workplace. For example, Croteau and Lark's (1995) study of student affairs professionals revealed that 47% of the participants reported that all or most people in their workplace knew the participants' sexual orientation; while Levine and Leonard's (1984) study involving 203 lesbians who represented various occupations in New York City revealed that 23% of the participants reported that all or most in their workplace knew the participants' sexual orientation. Likewise, Lark and Croteau (1995) reported that only 6% of the student affairs professionals in their study indicated that no one at work knew the participants' sexual orientation; while Schneider's (1986) sample of 228 lesbians who represent a range of occupations revealed that 29% of the participants reported not being open at all in the workplace. Croteau (1996) highlighted that the three qualitative studies (Griffin, 1992; Hall, 1986; Woods & Harbeck, 1992) included in his review also demonstrate variability in how LGB participants managed their sexual identity.

Croteau (1996) stated that the descriptive information regarding identity management strategies discussed in the three qualitative studies was grounded in the experiences of workers and suggested that this serve as the foundation for the development of a quantitative measure of workplace identity management strategies. Croteau identified Griffin's (1992) qualitative study as providing the most comprehensive and systematic model of identity management strategies. He claimed that her explanation of the continuum of openness versus concealment and description of the four categories of identity management strategies (passing, covering, implicitly
out, and explicitly out) were consistent with the experiences reported by participants in the other qualitative studies (Hall, 1986; Woods & Harbeck, 1992) as well. Further explanation of Griffin's model of sexual identity management appears later in this chapter.

Croteau (1996) also summarized the findings he saw as consistent across multiple of the nine studies regarding correlates of the degree of openness versus concealment of a minority sexual identity. His summary of findings indicated that several of the studies found a relationship between openness regarding sexual identity and increased experiences of discrimination (see Croteau & Lark, 1995; Croteau & von Destinon, 1994; Levine & Leonard, 1984). He also reported that two of the studies indicated that those who were more open regarding their sexual identity were more satisfied with their degree of openness versus those who were less open (see Levine & Leonard, 1984; Croteau & Lark, 1995).

Identity Management Studies Since 1996

I have identified twelve additional studies that address workplace sexual identity management for review in this section. Eleven of these studies were published after Croteau's (1996) review, and one study was published in 1993 but was not included in Croteau's review. The descriptions of the twelve studies included here describe only the definitions of sexual identity management used in the study, information about the purpose and sample of each study, and the means of measuring identity management utilized in each study. The descriptions are limited to these three areas of information because they highlight the limitations of prior research and
provide enough context to understand the studies. After all twelve studies have been described in chronological order, the results of these studies will be integrated with the findings previously reviewed by Croteau.

In a qualitative study of gay men, Woods (1993) explored strategies that gay men employed in managing their sexual identities in corporate professions. Woods conducted interviews with 70 gay men who worked in various corporate setting in five major cities in the U.S. Participants were recruited primarily via personal contacts he had in the five cities. First he conducted group interviews to gather data about how the gay men conceptualized the process of coming out at work and the language they used around this process. Woods classified the participants’ explanation of how they manage their sexual identities into three categories of strategies (counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating).

Ellis and Riggle (1995) studied identity management in terms of the degree of “openness” lesbian and gay workers utilize regarding their sexual identity at work. The purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between openness, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction. The sample was comprised of 164 participants who identified as either lesbian or gay and were active in an LGB chorus group, social group, or discussion group in either San Francisco or Indianapolis. Participants’ degree of openness in the workplace was measured by asking participants to complete several questions asking about how many others at work knew about the participants’ sexual identity, such as “At work _____ are aware of my sexual orientation” (Ellis & Riggle, 1995, p. 79). Participants completed the question with possible responses that
ranged from “all of my co-workers” to “none of my co-workers.” The authors of the study did not further describe how they derived the index of how open individuals were in the workplace, or “Openness” as it was termed in their analysis.

Driscoll, Kelley, and Fassinger (1996), conducted a quantitative study that addressed “disclosure” in the workplace. The purpose of the study was an empirical examination of the relationships among the disclosure of lesbian identity, perceived workplace climate, occupational stress and coping, and work satisfaction for lesbian workers. The sample was comprised of 123 lesbian women from across the United States who were recruited by word of mouth and through classified ads in local gay and lesbian newspapers. The researchers assessed the variable of disclosure using a five-item measure that was developed for the study and referred to this measure as the Disclosure Questionnaire. The first item of the Disclosure Questionnaire asked participants to indicate how “out at work” they were or to what degree they had disclosed her lesbian identity at work using a Likert-type scale: 0 (out to nobody at work), 1 (out to one), 2 (out to two), 3 (out to three), 4 (out to five coworkers), 4 (out to immediate supervisor), and 5 (to all). The other four items asked participants about: their sense of their workplace being a place where they are comfortable being themselves, their involvement in lesbian or gay-related activities at work, whether they bring a same-sex partner or date to work-sponsored events, and whether they bring a same-sex partner or date to parties or events hosted by personnel from work that occur outside of work. The participants were asked to respond using a 3-point Likert-type scale: 1 (never), 2 (sometimes), and 3 (always),
Day and Schoenrade (1997) conducted a quantitative study in which they examined identity management in terms of workers' extent of communication about sexual orientation. The purpose of the study was to explore how different degrees of disclosure related to gay and lesbian workers' job satisfaction. The study's sample involved 900 lesbian, gay, and heterosexual workers whose names were on a mailing list of a civil rights organization that focused on gay and lesbian rights. The researchers asked participants to respond to items pertaining to the degree to which they were open about their sexual orientation. This one item asked participants, "In general, how hard do you try to keep your sexual orientation secret from these people at work?" (p. 155). The question was followed by a list including coworkers, immediate supervisor, other supervisors, subordinates, middle management, and top management. The participants were asked to indicate a response for each person/role in workplace on a scale of one to four: 1 (I try very hard to keep it secret); 2 (I try somewhat hard to keep it secret); 3 (I don't try to keep it secret); or 4 (I actively talk about it to others at work). Participants' scores on these items were summed to create an index that was used to indicate the extent to which they communicated to coworkers about their sexual orientation.

A study utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methodologies conducted by Bliss and Harris (1998) explored lesbian and gay teachers' experiences related to the disclosure of their sexual orientation at school. The purpose of the study was to explore the reasons the lesbian and gay teachers gave for disclosing or not disclosing their sexual identities in the school setting, as well as to examine gender differences.
greater detail in the second section of this chapter, which addresses research on LGB teachers' workplace sexual identity management.

Anderson et al.'s (2001) quantitative study of identity management of lesbian and gay student affairs professionals was instrumental in evaluating their newly created measure of workplace sexual identity management, the WSIMM. The purpose of their study was to examine the psychometric properties of the WSIMM. The 172 participants in the study were recruited through their membership in the Network for Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Concerns (NGLBC) of the National Association of Student Affairs Professionals (NASPA). To measure identity management the researchers designed the WSIMM by creating 31 items that describe behaviors related to the four general identity management strategies of passing, covering, implicitly out, and explicitly out. These strategies are described in greater detail in the next section of this chapter, which explicates Griffin’s (1992) model of identity management. The participants responded to the 31 items of the WSIMM by indicating how frequently they engage in the behavior in each item on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (never/seldom) to 4 (almost always/always). Respondents' scores for each of the four general strategies were derived by averaging relevant items. The WSIMM and details about the initial psychometric evaluation of the measure will be further discussed in the fourth section of this chapter.

In a study of organizational efforts to affirm sexual diversity, Button (2001) addressed sexual identity management in terms of strategies, which he grouped based on Woods' (1993) tripartite categorization of strategies: counterfeiting, avoiding, and
integrating strategies. The purpose of this quantitative study was to explore the relations among lesbian and gay workers' identity management strategies, lesbian and gay group identity attitudes, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, prevalence of treatment discrimination in the workplace, and presence of affirming organizational policies. The 537 lesbians and gay men who participated in this study were recruited through snowball sampling by contacting designated LGB individuals who served as contact people for various organizations and asking them to invite participants. To assess sexual identity management, the researcher used the scales (i.e., counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating) that he developed in his dissertation (Button, 1996).

Button's (1996) Sexual Identity Management (IMS) measure contains 23 items that assess participants' use of the three identity management strategies: (a) counterfeiting a false heterosexual identity, (b) avoiding the issue of sexuality, and (c) integrating a lesbian or gay identity into the workplace context. Respondents indicated to what degree each workplace behavior described fit them, using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).

Chrobot-Mason, Button, DiClementi (2001) conducted a quantitative study of identity management of gay and lesbian workers. The purpose of the study was to explore antecedents and consequences of three generalized sexual identity management strategies for lesbian and gay workers. The study's sample was comprised of 255 gay and lesbian workers who were invited to participate: (a) while attending a national conference on gay and lesbian workplace issues, (b) through their corporate gay and lesbian employee groups, or (c) via an Internet invitation sent to
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gay and lesbian distribution lists. In their study, the authors used Woods' (1993) tripartite categorization of behaviors intended to either conceal or reveal individuals' sexual identity (i.e., counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating strategies). The authors considered perceived climate and sexual identity development as antecedents of the three strategies and open group process (degree of group members' expression of views and inclusion of all members in decision-making) as a consequence of the various strategies. Identity management strategies were assessed using Button’s (1996) previously mentioned multiple-item scales, for the three general identity management strategies of counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating. The items describe various workplace behaviors and participants responded using a 5-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree).

In their quantitative study of lesbian and gay workers, Rostosky and Riggle (2002) explored identity management in terms of “disclosure at work” and several possible external correlates. The purpose of the study was to explore the relationships between participants’ disclosure status at work and their workplaces’ policies regarding discrimination based on sexual identity and participants’ internalized homophobia. The study was conducted using data collected in a larger study of lesbian and gay couples that were invited to participate via e-mail lists directing them to a website address. A total of 261 participants responded to the invitation to participate, including 118 couples. This sample also allowed the researchers to examine the relationship between the individuals’ disclosure at work and their partner’s internalized homophobia and workplace policies. The researchers measured
"disclosure at work" by asking participants to indicate the number of people at work who are aware of the participants' sexual identity. To accomplish this goal, the authors derived a continuous variable of disclosure at work from the scaled responses of three items regarding the degree to which coworkers, supervisors, and clients were aware of the lesbian or gay workers' sexual identity. Two of the three items asked participants to complete the statement regarding how many coworkers or clients were aware of their sexual identity, using the responses options of all, most, about half, a few, or none. The responses were mapped onto a 100-point scale (none = 0, a few = 25, about half = 50, most = 75, and all = 100). The third question asked participants to indicate whether all, some, or none of their supervisors were aware of their sexual identity (none = 0, some = 50, and all = 100). Participants were also given a does not apply response option in case they do not work with coworkers, clients, or supervisors. The researchers summed the scaled scores across the questions and divided by the number of questions contributing to this sum.

Schope (2002) conducted a quantitative study that focused on identity management in terms of how open participants' were regarding their sexual identity. The researchers examined gay men's decisions to disclose their sexual identity to others within various relationships or environments (i.e., parents, siblings, school, current workplace, previous workplace, and neighborhood). The purpose of the study was to examine where and to whom gay men chose to disclose their sexual identity, and to explore several factors that might influence these decisions (i.e., current occupation, income level, religious affiliation, parents' religious affiliation). The
sample was comprised of 443 gay men recruited through a number of gay organizations in the Midwest. The gay male participants were asked to indicate their level of disclosure on a 3-point scale describing how open they were about their sexual identity (not open, somewhat open, very open) related to each of the aforementioned relationships/settings.

In their quantitative study addressing workplace identity management, Griffith and Hebl (2002) considered relations among aspects of one’s personal and professional lives. The purpose of this study was to empirically examine relations among workplace disclosure of sexual identity; individual differences (i.e., centrality of sexual identity to one’s self-concept, degree of self-acceptance, and extent to which one has disclosed sexual identity to others); organizational support; work attitudes; formal organizational policies; and co-workers’ reactions. The study’s participants were 379 gay men and lesbians from Houston, Texas. They were recruited through invitations to nonprofit clubs, businesses, and establishments self-identified as gay/lesbian-related or friendly. Participants were also recruited via a citywide gay/lesbian monthly publication and a similar email listserv. A third recruitment strategy involved approaching attendees at a two-day, gay/lesbian business exposition. It appears that the researchers also used Button’s (1996) measure, though this was incorrectly cited in their article.

Summary of Identity Management Research Findings

An integration of the findings of the twelve studies just described and the nine studies previously reviewed by Croteau (1996) will be discussed in this subsection.
The twelve studies regarding workplace sexual identity management described in the previous subsection expand the previous findings summarized in Croteau's (1996) review. These findings are related to: (a) variability regarding concealment or openness of one's sexual identity, (b) information related to correlates of identity management, (c) the relationship between identity management and participants' satisfaction with their degree of disclosure, and (d) the relationship between identity management and work satisfaction or satisfaction with co-workers.

Croteau (1996) identified Griffin's (1992) model of sexual identity management as being the most comprehensive and systematic, as well as successfully capturing the experiences of LGB individuals that had been reported in other qualitative studies. Wood's (1993) qualitative study of gay men also produced a fairly comprehensive model of workplace sexual identity management strategies. His model proposes that the gay men utilized three primary types of categories to manage their sexual identities at work (counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating). Counterfeiting strategies are those the gay men used to conceal their sexual identities by creating an image of being heterosexual. Counterfeiting strategies include behaviors in which the men either fabricated heterosexual romantic relationships or played against the stereotype by acting in stereotypically masculine manners and distancing from any behaviors seen as stereotypically feminine. Avoiding strategies are those the gay men used to create distance between their private and professional lives (i.e., participating in gay community in one city but living as "straight" men the city in which they work), or avoiding situations in which they might be asked to share personal
information related to their sexual identities (i.e., avoiding lunches with colleagues, or creating the image that they consider personal questions inappropriate to avoid talk of sexual behavior or romantic relationships, etc.). Integrating strategies are those the gay men used to integrate their personal lives (including sexual identity) and their professional lives. Woods described integrating behaviors as being either direct (i.e., disclosing sexual identity to supervisor or colleagues) or indirect (i.e., making a supportive comment related to a LGB identified organization, or displaying photos of same-sex romantic partner, etc.). These three strategies of workplace sexual identity management are similar to Griffin’s strategies that will be explained in detail in the third section of this chapter. Important differences between these two models of workplace identity management strategies will be explained in the fourth section of this chapter.

Similar to the studies reviewed by Croteau (1996), there is a degree of variability related to participants’ reported openness about their sexual identity. Schope (2002) reported that in his study 44% of the gay men were not open and 35% were very open about their sexual identity in their current workplace. Rostosky and Riggle (2002) reported that participants in their study earned scores of 64.1 (male) and 58.9 (female) related to how many people at work to whom they have disclosed their sexual identity (50 = about half the people at work, 75 = most people at work, and 100 = everyone at work). In their study involving student affairs professionals, Anderson et al. (2001) found that 56% of the respondents identified the description of using Explicitly Out strategies to be most self-descriptive; 38% identified the
description of using Implicitly Out strategies to be most self-descriptive; the other 6% identified the description of using Covering strategies to be most self-descriptive; and no participants identified the description of using Passing strategies to be most self-descriptive. In their study of lesbian and gay teachers, Bliss and Harris (1998) found that 65% of them had disclosed their sexual identity to at least one colleague, and that 50% of the men and 17% of the women had disclosed their sexual identity to their principal. In their study of lesbians Driscoll et al. (1996) found that 24% of the participants reported being out to all co-workers; while 16% reported being out to no one at work.

The studies reviewed here indicate that lesbian and gay workers' identity management is influenced by external and internal variables. Several external factors specific to the workplace environment were found to relate to the degree of openness participants reported. LGB workers in these studies who perceived affirmation in the workplace climate tended to manage the sexual identities more openly (Chrobot-Mason et al. 2001; Griffith & Hebl, 2002). The LGB workers also managed their sexual identities more openly when they worked in environments in which workplace non-discrimination policies including sexual orientation were in place (Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Rostosky and Riggle 2002). Another external factor that seemed to influence LGB workers' sexual identity management was their perception of co-workers' reactions to their disclosure, in that participants who reported positive reactions from co-workers tended to manage their identities more openly (Button, 1996; Ellis & Riggle, 1995). Several internal or personal variables (not related to
workplace environment) were also found to relate to the degree of openness participants reported. Participants who reported lower degrees of internalized homophobia, or greater self-acceptance of their sexual identity, reported managing their sexual identity more openly than those who reported a higher degree of internalized homophobia or lower degrees of self-acceptance of their sexual identity (Button, 2001; Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002).

LGB workers' sexual identity management was shown to vary related to aspects of their romantic/partner relationships. In their study of lesbian couples, Rostosky and Riggle (2002) found that participants whose partners’ workplaces had nondiscrimination policies that include sexual identity managed their sexual identity more openly than those whose did not. The researchers also found that participants whose partners’ reported lower degrees of internalized homophobia managed their sexual identity more openly than those whose partners reported higher degrees of internalized homophobia. Driscoll et al. (1996) reported finding a significant correlation between lesbian participants’ disclosure of their identity at work and the duration of their lesbian relationship in that the longer they were in the relationship, the more open they were about their sexual identity at work.

In Croteau’s (1996) review, he identified two studies (Levine & Leonard, 1984; Croteau & Lark, 1995) that indicated that participants who were more open regarding their sexual identity at work were more satisfied with this degree of openness than those participants who reported being less open. Similarly, Anderson et al. (2001) found a positive relationship between more open sexual identity
management strategies and participants' satisfaction with their degree of disclosure.

Several of the studies reviewed here report findings related to the relation between LGB workers' sexual identity management and their reported job satisfaction, satisfaction with co-workers, and life satisfaction. Three studies found that workers who were more open regarding their sexual identities reported higher job satisfaction than those who were less open (Day & Schoenrade, 1998; Ellis & Riggle, 1995; Griffith & Hebl, 2002), while two other studies did not find a significant correlation between more open sexual identity management strategies and job satisfaction (Driscoll et al., 1996; Anderson et al., 2001). Ellis and Riggle (1995) also found that participants who reported a higher degree of openness were more satisfied with their co-workers than participants who reported being less open about their sexual identities. Ellis and Riggle (1995) found that the relationship between openness and life satisfaction might be mediated by other factors, such as the geographic location of the participants. In their study, more open participants who lived in San Francisco (i.e., an urban region with a significant visible LGB community) reported a greater degree of life satisfaction than their counterparts in San Francisco who were less open. In contrast, more open participants who lived in Indianapolis (i.e., a region with a smaller or less visible gay community) reported less life satisfaction than their less open counterparts who also lived in Indianapolis. Interestingly, less open participants who lived in Indianapolis reported being equally satisfied with their lives as the men in San Francisco who were more open. This finding speaks to the complexity of identity management and the influences that
contextual factors might have on LGB individuals as they navigate this process.

Because the current study sought to further explore contextual factors that influence the workplace sexual identity management decisions of LGB teachers rather than workers in general, the next section focuses on six studies of LGB teachers. This review of the literature on LGB teachers related to sexual identity management underscores some contextual factors that might influence this process for these individuals.

LGB Teachers’ Workplace Sexual Identity Management

The body of literature focusing on the experiences of LGB teachers highlights the fears these teachers have regarding the disclosure or others’ speculation of their minority sexual identity, and describes how LGB teachers protect themselves from the risks of being seen as LGB (Bliss & Harris, 1998; Griffin, 1992; Harbeck, 1992, 1997; Jennings, 1994; Khayatt, 1992; Kissen, 1996; Litton, 2001; Olson, 1987; Woods & Harbeck, 1992). Within this body of literature, six studies published since the late 1980’s provide significant information regarding how LGB teachers experience the difficult task of navigating their professional roles and personal identities (Bliss & Harris, 1998; Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Litton, 2001; Olson, 1987; Woods & Harbeck, 1992). Five of the studies in this section (Bliss & Harris, 1998; Griffin, 1992; Litton, 2001; Olson, 1987; Woods & Harbeck, 1992) were discussed previously in this chapter in the general discussion of LGB workplace sexual identity management. Here these studies are discussed in further detail to highlight findings that are specific to LGB teachers and what influences their
workplace sexual identity management decisions. Another study of lesbian teachers (Khayatt, 1992) that was not reviewed in Croteau's (1996) review, nor in the current review of literature, is included in this section. The six studies are each described here, including a brief description of the purpose of the study, the recruitment of participants, and a detailed account of the findings. Griffin's (1992) study is discussed in this section with a focus on findings specific to the workplace sexual identity management of LGB teachers, not her overall model of identity management strategies. Further explication of her model of identity management strategies appears in the next section of this chapter. The overview of these six studies of LGB teachers' workplace sexual identity management was used to identify the potential barriers to be assessed in the portion of the current study that explores perceived barriers and coping efficacy related to using implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies.

In her qualitative study of 97 gay and lesbian teachers, Olson (1987) explored the experiences and perceptions the participants related to their sexual orientation and their careers as teachers. Participants were recruited through social/political/educational associations listed in the National Gay Yellow Pages, through the National Gay Teachers Association, and through personal contacts in several regions of the United States. The survey participants completed consisted of 8 open-ended questions asking: (a) what aspects of teaching they found fulfilling, (b) what kept them from being open about their sexual orientation, (c) what stereotypes of gay and lesbian people had been conveyed to them throughout the school community, (d) how
these stereotypes affected them personally and (e) professionally, (f) what they uniquely had to offer education as lesbian or gay person, (g) how they survived prejudice against them as gay and lesbian teachers, and (h) what can be done to make educators more sensitive to gay and lesbian issues. Olson summarized their narrative responses. The teachers’ responses to the seven questions that are specific to their identity management (i.e., the first question is excluded because it does not apply to the content of this study) are described in the following paragraphs.

The lesbian and gay teachers in Olson’s (1987) study reported that they sought acceptance from their peers and their administrators and that they feared that being open about their sexual orientation would decrease others’ acceptance of them. They also reported that their fears related to job loss or denial of tenure if they disclosed their lesbian/gay identity prevented them from being more open about their sexual orientation. The respondents described their awareness of community stereotypes about the promiscuity of gay people, gay and lesbian teachers teaching students to be gay, and gay and lesbian people as being sick or diseased. They also reported numerous other negative words such as perverted and immoral being used to describe gay and lesbian people within their communities. In describing how these stereotypes affected them personally and professionally, respondents stated that some of the stereotyping caused them to fear disclosure of their sexual orientation and forced them to lead double lives. Others described that the stereotyping caused them to take action against the homophobia and to come out in the school setting. Some reported that they used the stereotypes as lessons in teaching about oppression and how to be...
less judgmental. Other teachers reported that these stereotypes made them more cautious in approaching administrators when being harassed by students because they feared drawing attention to their sexual orientation. Yet others described that the stereotypes made them feel less comfortable in their interactions with students. Only six of the 97 respondents claimed that they had not experienced any such stereotyping. Almost half of the respondents in Olson’s study felt that their minority sexual orientation made them more sensitive to differences, while other participants felt that they were more tolerant of people in general. Several respondents positively described feeling that they had served as role models for gay and lesbian students. Most respondents reported that they sought the support of another gay or lesbian teacher as part of how they survived the prejudice against them. Respondents also reported using the following survival strategies: excluding themselves, maintaining friendships outside of the school setting, remaining closeted, resigning from teaching, and disclosing their sexual orientation. About one third of the respondents felt that more gay and lesbian teachers being open about their sexual orientation would help to make other teachers more sensitive to LGB issues. Another common response was the suggestion of providing in-service training on LGB issues, and several respondents suggested that schools should provide more education on sexuality.

Woods and Harbeck’s (1992) qualitative study of 12 physical education teachers who identify as lesbian highlighted behaviors these teachers engaged in to manage their sexual identities at work. The participants were identified and invited to participate via researcher contacts and from referrals given by other participants. The
purpose of this phenomenological study was to have lesbian physical education teachers describe and make meaning of their work experiences. The methodology included three open-ended individual interviews with each participant to: (a) provide personal and professional background relevant to describing their experience as lesbian physical education teachers, (b) describe in detail the day-to-day work experiences, and (c) reflect on the meaning they make of their experiences. The findings of the study most relevant to the current study fall into two broad topic areas: (a) how the teachers concealed their identities as lesbians and (b) the risks they took that could reveal their sexual orientation.

Woods and Harbeck (1992) categorized the teachers' descriptions of concealing behaviors into three groups: passing as heterosexual, self-distancing from others, and self-distancing from lesbian and gay issues. For these lesbian teachers, passing as heterosexual included such behaviors as changing pronouns or specific references when speaking about same-sex relationships, falsifying details about themselves and their social activities, talking about past relationships with men, and taking male companions to school-related events or social activities. The self-distancing activities the lesbian teachers described were attempts to avoid interacting with their colleagues, administrators, or students in ways that would require sharing of personal information. The teachers recognized how this distancing harmed relationships that were important to them professionally and personally. They also described feeling misunderstood, dishonest, and isolated as a result of their self-distancing behaviors. Despite these feelings and the costs they incurred in their
interpersonal relationships, the teachers chose to conceal their identities through remaining distant from others in order to protect themselves against their perceived threat of losing their jobs if others knew their sexual orientation. The third category of behaviors the lesbian teachers utilized in concealing their sexual orientation was self-distancing from lesbian and gay issues. These behaviors included such activities as ignoring homophobic remarks made in the school setting, not participating in AIDS education, and avoiding or using extreme caution when interacting with student whom they perceived to be gay or lesbian. The teachers reported feeling upset by their failure to intervene in anti-gay situations and by their perceived betrayal of potentially gay and lesbian students. They acknowledged feeling that by distancing themselves from lesbian and gay issues they were failing to provide accurate information regarding minority sexual orientations and to serve as role models.

Woods and Harbeck (1992) also divided the broad topic of risk-taking behaviors the women described into three categories: (a) obliquely overlapping personal with professional, (b) actively confronting and supporting, and (c) overtly overlapping personal with professional. Examples of obliquely overlapping personal and professional were sharing information about a "roommate", or bringing a partner to a school event and introducing her as a "friend", or associating with another lesbian or gay teacher. Many participants saw these behaviors as being low-risk and potentially beneficial to their self-esteem because they allowed the women to share more of who they were, while avoiding feeling deceitful or dishonest as when concealing details about themselves. The teachers also reported taking risks by
confronting homophobia and being supportive of lesbian and gay students. Finally, the teachers discussed the behavior that involved the greatest risk for them, overtly overlapping personal with professional, in that each participant had disclosed or acknowledged her sexual orientation to at least one person in the school community.

Griffin's (1992) qualitative study of gay and lesbian teachers was conducted through interviews with 13 lesbian and gay teachers, as well as the two lesbian co-researchers. Nine of the teachers were identified and recruited for participation in the study through their involvement in a weekend program for gay and lesbian teachers. The other participants were identified through personal contact with the original group of individuals. The focus of the study was to explore lesbian and gay teachers' experiences and then to empower these teachers through group reflection and action. Through analyzing the interview data, Griffin and her co-researcher noted themes in the teachers' responses. The three themes include: (1) the tension between fear and self-integrity the teachers experienced related to their sexual identities being known at school; (2) the protection strategies they used to either keep from being known as lesbian/gay or to minimize the effects if their identity were known; and (3) options of using safety-making versus risk-taking strategies and the resulting feelings associated with each. Griffin also used this data to create a model of identity management strategies (passing, covering, implicitly out, and explicitly out) that will be explicated in the next section of this chapter.

The first theme Griffin (1992) described was that in making decisions about managing their identities the teachers were faced with the "tension between fear of
public accusation and the wish for self-integrity and integration of their lesbian/gay
and educator identities” (p. 173). The teachers described fearing negative
consequences (i.e., loss of job or loss of credibility) of public accusations of being
lesbian or gay. They believed that public accusations would result from one of three
incidents: being accused of child molestation or making sexual advances toward
students, being accused of recruiting students to live lesbian or gay lifestyles, or being
accused of being lesbian or gay due to their presence at a lesbian/gay-identified event
or establishment (e.g., a lesbian bar, gay pride march, etc.) Fear of public accusation
led these teachers to be conscious of their physical contact with students, as contact
with same-sex students might raise suspicion or be misinterpreted. The teachers
feared talking with lesbian or gay students who sought them out as someone who
would be sympathetic and supportive. Some participants described feeling
uncomfortable with the secrecy or dishonesty they believed to be necessary to protect
themselves from being identified as lesbian or gay. Some also felt ashamed for not
speaking out about gay and lesbian issues in light of the stereotypes and negative
attitudes students and faculty hold toward lesbian and gay people. Participants
described feeling divided between their identities as gay or lesbian and their lives as
teachers.

Another theme Griffin summarized is how the participants described general
strategies they used to protect themselves from being seen as lesbian or gay by other
teachers or students or to minimize the damage if their sexual orientation were to be
revealed. One protection strategy the teachers used was developing reputations as
extremely competent teachers who were above reproach, teachers who were well liked, or teachers who would fight back if challenged. The next protection strategy was to be thoroughly prepared as to how to respond if confronted directly about their sexual orientation or when homophobic remarks are made. For participants who chose to disclose their sexual orientation or discuss homophobia with someone at school, this strategy included carefully preparing for possible ramifications (i.e., rehearsing responses to accusations about being lesbian or gay, developing an ability to maintain a calm external appearance despite internal fear, etc.). A third protection strategy participants described was careful regulation of the information about themselves they allowed others to know. Regulating personal information that might reveal their sexual orientation included decisions about their clothing, reactions to homophobic remarks, sharing stories about themselves, etc. The fourth protection strategy participants described was maintaining a strict separation between their identities as teachers and their lesbian/gay identities. This separation involved psychologically and socially distancing their personal and professional lives, and for some even included physically separating the two by living outside of the school districts in which they taught.

Another theme that emerged from Griffin’s interviews with the lesbian and gay teachers was that they continually faced a choice between maintaining secrecy and revealing their sexual orientation. Griffin termed these options “safety-making and risk-taking” (p. 175) and identified that the choice between the two involved balancing potential benefits of disclosing one’s sexual identity and the potential
consequences of doing so. Participants identified that safety-making decisions often
involved feelings of self-betrayal and that risk-taking decisions always involved fear.
The four general sexual identity management strategies that Griffin defined fall along
the continuum from safety-making to risk-taking, with passing being furthest on the
safety-making end and explicitly out being furthest on the risk-taking end.

Khayatt’s (1992) qualitative study of lesbian teachers’ experiences related to
their sexual orientation and professional roles revealed similar findings to that of
Griffin (1992) and Woods and Harbeck (1992). The study involved a series of open-
ended interviews with 18 lesbian teachers in Canada. The teachers were invited to
participate through contact with the researcher, which proved problematic in that in
order to even be identified as potential participants these teachers were risking
revealing their sexual identity. The interviews were conducted over several different
time settings. The data gathered through the researcher’s interviews with the lesbian
teachers provided personal glimpses of what it was like for them to maintain their
lives as lesbians while also teaching in public schools. The majority of the
participants endorsed fear of losing their jobs or their professional credibility if others
within the school settings were to know of their sexual orientation. At some time after
the initial interviews, the Canadian legislature passed a measure that included sexual
orientation as a protected category regarding hiring or firing discrimination. Khayatt
again spoke with the participants regarding their fear of job loss now that this
legislation had been adopted. Despite the legislative protection, the majority of the
women stated that it did not relieve their fear of revealing their identity or having
others speculate about their sexual identity. The participants stated that even though this measure could prevent them from losing their jobs due to their sexual identity, they still feared the loss of credibility they would suffer.

The participants in Khayatt’s study also talked about how the fear of their sexual orientation being known to others forced them to live double lives. Within their descriptions of the double lives they led, the participants gave examples of how they kept personal information private from others, including administrators, colleagues, and students. Some described how they were cautious about attending gay/lesbian-identified establishments or events, while others discussed times when they ran into students or former students in lesbian bars, etc. Fearing disclosure, many of the participants struggled with what to say or how to act around students who had crushes on them. Likewise, students who identified as lesbian to the teachers, either while in their class or years later, also increased the fear these teachers experienced. In their discussions of the difficulty these students posed for them, the participants talked about fearing that others would perceive that they were encouraging these students to adopt a lesbian lifestyle. The participants’ responses also included descriptions of their struggles with wanting to be able to be supportive of these students and to serve as role models, but not feeling safe in doing so. Several described conversations in which they remained vague about their personal experience instead of sharing with these students who were struggling with their own sexual orientation. Other participants described incidents in which they did acknowledge their sexual orientation to former students yet remained uncertain as to
Khayatt noted that participants perceived several environmental factors as contributing to their sense of safety or fear. Some stated that the location of their schools could influence their behaviors in managing their identities. Several were able to confront homophobic actions or remarks, talk about sexuality and include lesbian issues in class content, or attend lesbian-identified events without as much fear of repercussions because they taught in urban schools but felt that they would be unable to do so if they taught in smaller town or villages. The school climate was another environmental factor addressed in participants' description of what influenced their sense of fear. Several participants described negative treatment they received in their schools either because their sexual orientation was revealed or because others speculated they were lesbians. For example, one participant described anti-lesbian writings on bathroom walls and the administration's lack of support in response to this as an example of a school climate that added to her sense of fear.

A study utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methodology conducted by Bliss and Harris (1998) explored lesbian and gay teachers' experiences related to the disclosure of their sexual orientation at school. The participants were 34 teachers who were approached by the researcher at two resort areas frequented primarily by gay men and lesbians. The purpose of the study addressing lesbian and gay teachers was to learn more about their experiences, particularly their experiences relevant to the disclosure of their sexual orientation at school. The lesbian and gay teachers in the study responded to a questionnaire containing demographic information and questions...
about their teaching positions, their degree of disclosure to principals and other
teachers, others' reactions to their disclosure, their social relationships with
colleagues, and their advice to others regarding disclosing a minority sexual
orientation to others. Bliss and Harris (1998) did not explicate the format of these
questions (i.e., open-ended or multiple choice, etc.). The final portion of the
questionnaire was an open-ended question about how the teachers perceived that
being gay or lesbian affected their performance or experience as a teacher, both
positively and negatively. Their responses to the items listed above are described in
order in the following paragraphs.

In response to Bliss and Harris' (1998) questions about whether the
participants had disclosed their sexual orientation at work, a quarter of respondents
had disclosed to a current or former principal, and the men were more likely (50% had
disclosed) than the women (17% had disclosed) to come out to their principals. Of the
five respondents who described their principals' reactions to the disclosure, most
reported positive or at least neutral reactions. Fear of the loss of their job and fear of
exposure were reported as greatest concerns for respondents who rated their reasons
for not disclosing their identity to their principals. Sixty-five percent of the
respondents had disclosed their sexual orientation to one or more fellow teachers
(with a mean of 3.86 teachers to whom they had disclosed) and reported generally
positive reactions from them. Analysis showed a gender difference in those to whom
they disclosed. Nearly two thirds of the male respondents who disclosed their
identities to colleagues disclosed to both males and females (63%) and slightly over a
third of these men disclosed to females only (38%); while two-thirds of the women disclosed to females only (67%), less than a third of the women disclosed to both male and female (27%), and few women disclosed to males only (7%). The teachers also differed significantly along gender regarding whether they would advise others to disclose their sexual identity. Both women and men indicated that they would advise other teachers to come out to counselors and friends, though the women were significantly less likely than the men to advise other teachers to disclose to the principal or other teachers.

In response to the open-ended question regarding whether their sexual identity has had positive and/or negative effects on their teaching, 41 responded. Twenty-five of the participants reported positive effects of their sexual identity on their teaching. Those who reported positive effects described these effects as a general sense of increased awareness of diversity, the problems associated with adolescence, and their responsibility toward their students. Sixteen participants reported experiencing or perceiving negative effects of their identity on their teaching. They identified limitations of their behaviors for fear that others would know their sexual identity (i.e., limitations in how interactive they were with others), and a fear of being accused of improprieties with students as ways they were negatively affected as lesbian or gay teachers.

Litton (2001) conducted a qualitative study that focused on the experiences of lesbian and gay teachers who teach in Catholic elementary schools. His study involved individual structured interviews with five lesbian and gay teachers who had
only taught in Catholic schools. Additional data was gathered through dialogues the participants had with each other at quarterly social gatherings over two years. No information was provided regarding how the participants were invited to participate in the study. The results emphasized the lesbian and gay teachers’ reluctance to reveal their sexual identity to students, parents, and co-workers. They described their fear that being employed by the church was in direct conflict with managing their identity in more open ways, as their contracts direct them to live according to the moral teachings of the Church. They feared the loss of their job if their identity were known. They acknowledged that their principals all have some knowledge of the participants’ sexual identity and that the principals were tolerant of these identities as long as they were not explicitly out. The participants shared that they felt like they had to compromise in order to continue teaching in Catholic elementary schools in that they have to hide their sexual identity. They also expressed a sense that they served a particular purpose for teaching in Catholic schools in that they provide a window into minority sexual identities that these students might not otherwise have. The teachers also discussed survival strategies they employed. They acknowledged that they felt they had to work harder than other teachers so that their work was beyond reproach, protecting them from possible dismissal. They also reported that creating a supportive community was essential in surviving the ongoing compromise between their personal identities and their professional work.

The six studies of lesbian and gay teachers described here highlight findings that are specific to the workplace sexual identity management process for lesbian and
gay teachers. All of the studies found that the lesbian and gay teachers involved expressed fear or reluctance to revealing their sexual identity or to having it suspected by others connected to the school setting (i.e., administrators, teachers, students, parents), and that much of this fear or reluctance was reportedly linked to the teachers’ concerns that revealing their sexual identity could lead to job loss (Bliss & Harris, 1998; Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Litton, 2001; Olson, 1987; Woods & Harbeck, 1992) or to them losing their professional credibility (Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992). Several studies reported strategies (i.e., distancing from colleagues or concealing personal information that might reveal their sexual identity, passing as heterosexual, avoiding known LGB establishments or issues) the teachers utilized to avoid being seen or known to be lesbian or gay (Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Woods & Harbeck, 1992), and that the lesbian and gay teachers described feeling like they had to lead double lives (Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Litton, 2001). Two of studies identified specific strategies the teachers utilized to either protect their professional image or to make them appear above reproach if their identity were to be known, such as working harder to develop a reputation as a competent teacher (Griffin, 1992; Litton, 2001). In the studies that asked the teachers who had revealed their sexual identity to others at work to address how these people responded, they reported that colleagues had typically responded positively (Bliss & Harris, 1998) and that administrators mostly had been somewhat supportive, neutral, or at least tolerant (Bliss & Harris, 1998; Litton, 2001). In several studies, the teachers reported that they believed that their being lesbian or gay had positive effects in that they were more
sensitive to diversity and other issues (Bliss & Harris, 1998; Olson, 1987) or that they could serve as students’ exposure to diversity related to minority sexual identities (Litton, 2001). In contrast, several studies discussed a negative consequence of not being more open about their sexual identity in that the teachers felt unable to be more supportive of LGB students or to feel comfortable and safe enough to address homophobic remarks or issues in school (Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Woods & Harbeck, 1992).

The findings of these teacher studies are important not only in shedding light on how LGB teachers manage their identities, but also in helping to identify contextual factors that might influence LGB teachers’ sexual identity management decisions. These specific factors are discussed in further detail in the seventh section of this chapter that explains how the current study explores perceived barriers and coping strategies related to LGB teachers’ use of implicitly and explicitly out identity management strategies. Another important contribution of this body of literature on LGB teachers is Griffin’s (1992) model of identity management, which served as a foundation for the development of Anderson et al.’s WSIMM measure. Griffin’s model is explained in the next section of this chapter.

Griffin’s Model of Identity Management Strategies

As identified in Croteau’s (1996) review of LGB research addressing workplace sexual identity management, Griffin’s (1992) model of workplace identity management strategies may be the most systematic and comprehensive created thus far. The focus of this section is on Griffin’s categorization of four general identity
Griffin (1992) developed a categorization of the array of reported behaviors lesbian and gay teachers employed as they navigated the safety-making/risk-taking continuum related to managing their sexual identities at work. The categorization of these safety-making/risk-taking behaviors can be explained as four points along a continuum of identity management strategies. According to Griffin's model, participants' decisions regarding identity management were in response to the tension between fear of negative consequences and a desire for self-integrity. The continuum of strategies ranges from the safest strategies to those involving the most risk for the lesbian and gay teachers (i.e., passing, covering, implicitly out, explicitly out). Griffin described behaviors on the safety-making end of the continuum as reflexive reactions to feelings of fear about being perceived as lesbian or gay, and the potential negative consequences involved. Participants acknowledged that using strategies toward the safety-making end of the continuum often led to feelings of self-betrayal. Griffin described behaviors at the risk-taking end of the continuum as efforts to "balance potential benefits and importance to themselves and others against the potential negative consequences" (p. 175), often leading to feelings of self-integrity.

Griffin (1992) labeled the identity management strategy at the greatest safety-making end of the continuum, and least producing of feelings of self-integrity, as passing. Passing behaviors were intended to make others believe that one was heterosexual rather than lesbian or gay. Participant examples of passing strategies
include both passive strategies (e.g., allowing others to assume participant’s heterosexual identity from a past marriage) and active strategies (e.g., making up stories about dating an opposite-sex partner, or changing the name or pronoun to refer to a same-sex partner in describing their weekend activities).

The next category of identity management behaviors along the continuum is covering, which involved the censoring of information to avoid being seen as lesbian or gay (e.g., omitting gendered pronouns when describing romantic relationships, or attending work-related events without their partner or date). Covering behaviors were intended to prevent others from knowing that participants were lesbian or gay but did not include attempts to be seen as heterosexual.

The third category of identity management strategy behaviors along the continuum is being implicitly out. This collection of behaviors involved being honest about one’s life without actually acknowledging a lesbian or gay identity (e.g., talking about a same-sex partner using a correct gendered pronoun but without identifying the individual as partner, or inviting colleagues to dinner in their home shared with a same-sex partner). Participants described that while using implicitly out strategies they assumed that their sexual identity was known, though they did not use labels or confirm their identity to others. Instead, they allowed others to make whatever sense of the information as they chose. While not lying or censoring information about themselves, the participants who used implicitly out strategies were still able to have a sense of safety by not directly disclosing their lesbian or gay identity while also maintaining a greater sense of self-integrity because they were not lying or censoring
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information. The lack of explicitly labeling themselves as lesbian or gay also allowed
them to utilize covering or passing strategies if they felt the need.

The final category along the continuum of identity management behaviors is
being explicitly out. Behaviors in this category were those that explicitly identify
oneself as lesbian or gay (e.g., openly labeling self as lesbian or gay to a colleague, or
bringing a same-sex partner to a work-related social function and introducing the
person as their partner). Participants described this strategy as posing the greatest risk
of the four, yet also as the one offering the most self-integrity. Being explicitly out
prevented participants from returning to covering or passing behaviors when doing so
felt necessary; however, the strategy also allowed them to integrate their personal and
professional identities without being dishonest or omitting personal details.

These four identity management strategies serve as the conceptual model of
workplace identity management strategies operationalized in Anderson et al.'s (2001)
development of scale items that could be used as a quantitative measure of sexual
identity management for lesbian and gay workers. Their measure, the WSIMM, its
creation, and its selection for use in the current study are described in greater detail in
the next section of this chapter.

Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure

Using prior qualitative research and Griffin’s (1992) model of identity
management strategies, Anderson et al. (2001) developed the Workplace Sexual
Identity Management Measure (WSIMM), a 31-item measure that assesses the
frequency with which individuals engage in passing, covering, implicitly out, and
explicitly out behaviors. The researchers utilized a sample of lesbian and gay student affairs professionals to conduct a psychometric evaluation of the WSIMM, including an examination of the relationship between the WSIMM and several external correlates.

In Anderson et al.'s (2001) study, the 172 participants were recruited through their membership in the Network for Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Concerns (NGLBC) of the National Association of Student Affairs Professionals (NASPA). The participants ranged in age, ethnicity, gender, level of education, professional roles within student affairs, number of years in the profession, geographic location, and type of institution. The participants completed the WSIMM, demographic items, the Disclosure Questionnaire (Driscoll et al., 1996), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weis, Dawes, Entland, & Lofquist, 1967) and three additional LGB workplace experience items (Anderson et al., 2001). The Disclosure Questionnaire, the MSQ, a single item about participants’ level of disclosure of their sexual identity, a single item about participants’ satisfaction with this level of disclosure, and a ranking of the four identity management strategies as self-descriptive all served as external correlates for the WSIMM.

As administered in the study of student affairs professionals, the WSIMM contained eight items that fit the definition of passing behaviors, eight covering behavior items, seven implicitly out behavior items, and eight explicitly out behavior items. Respondents indicated how frequently they engage in each behavior on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (never/seldom) to 4 (almost always/always). Respondents’
scores on each of the four strategies were derived by averaging relevant item responses. Separate from the WSIMM, respondents were also asked to complete a single item to indicate which of the descriptions of the four identity management strategies was most self-descriptive. Nearly 56% percent of the respondents described themselves as Explicitly Out; 38% described themselves as Implicitly Out; the other 6% described themselves as Covering; and no participants described themselves as Passing.

Anderson et al. (2001) conducted an exploratory factor analysis in which they determined that a three-factor solution was the best fit for the data. The three factors were Explicitly Out (EO), a combination of Covering and Passing (PC), and Implicitly Out (IO) strategies. A second factor analysis was conducted due to the limited item response variance and the fact that none of the participants identified Passing as the most self-descriptive identity management strategy. In the second factor analysis the researchers excluded the Passing items and again found that a three-factor solution was the best fit. The three factors in this analysis were Explicitly Out, Covering, and Implicitly Out strategies.

The WSIMM was also examined in relation to external correlates. The four theoretically derived scales were correlated with a measure of disclosure of sexual orientation (Disclosure Questionnaire, Driscoll et al., 1996), a single item about disclosure (Anderson et al., 1996), job satisfaction (MSQ, Dawes et al., 1967), and a single item about satisfaction with level of disclosure of sexual orientation. The observed correlations for Explicitly Out and Covering were as expected. The
Explicitly Out scale was positively correlated with the disclosure measure and the satisfaction with disclosure measure and not statistically significantly correlated with job satisfaction. The Covering scale was negatively correlated with the disclosure measure and the satisfaction with disclosure measure and not statistically significantly correlated with job satisfaction. The observed patterns of correlations of the Passing scale paralleled those of the Covering scale but with smaller values. However, the Implicitly Out scale did not yield the expected correlational pattern in that it was not correlated statistically significantly with the disclosure measure or the satisfaction with disclosure measure. The Implicitly Out scale did yield the expected lack of statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction.

The validity of the WSIMM was also considered by examining the responses to the single item regarding respondents' ranking of the four identity management strategies (Explicitly Out, Implicitly Out, Covering, Passing) as being self-descriptive. Participants who identified either Explicitly Out or Implicitly Out as the most self-descriptive strategy reported employing the relevant behaviors for that strategy more often than those relevant to the other three. Participants who identified Covering as the most self-descriptive strategy reported employing both Covering and Implicitly Out behaviors more than either Passing or Explicitly Out behaviors. Again, no participants ranked Passing as most self-descriptive.

According to Anderson and her colleagues (2001), the psychometric evaluation of the WSIMM indicates that the measure does assess a continuum of workplace sexual identity management strategies. The researchers noted that this
seems particularly true of the Explicitly Out and the Covering strategies, though they found the measure to be less effective in assessing the Implicitly Out and Passing strategies. To address the WSIMM’s current ineffectiveness in assessing Implicitly Out strategies, Anderson et al. proposed revising the wording of several Implicitly Out items (items 8, 11, and 30) to make the items less ambiguous, thus improving the scale. The researchers attributed difficulties of the Passing scale to poor item variance, which they believed to be due to the nature of the study’s sample (i.e., sample who were predominately open regarding their sexual identity) rather than the items themselves. They proposed that the Passing items might perform differently with a sample whose members’ sexual identity management strategies span the continuum more fully.

In the current study, I incorporated Anderson et al.’s (2001) proposed suggestion regarding the Implicitly Out scale of the WSIMM. To eliminate the ambiguity of wording in three items in the Implicitly Out scale, items 8, 11, and 30 were reworded for use in the current study. The revised items are described in further detail in the next chapter. These revised items allowed for further psychometric examination of the effectiveness of the Implicitly Out scale. I also incorporated Anderson et al.’s (2001) recommendation that the WSIMM should be administered to a sample that might represent more of a range of identity management strategies than the student affairs professionals in their study. Therefore, in the current study the WSIMM was used to examine identity management strategies of LGB teachers. It was anticipated that administering the measure to this sample might provide important
psychometric information for the Passing scale, as this population would likely report more frequent use of the passing strategies than the sample of student affairs professional assessed in the initial study.

The WSIMM was selected to assess workplace sexual identity management in the current study in that it operationalizes Griffin's (1992) categorization of workplace sexual identity management strategies. Though Button's (1996) IMS measure is similar to the WSIMM in that both assess workplace sexual identity management strategies rather than merely measuring openness or degree of disclosure (as in Day & Schoenrade, 1997; Ellis & Riggle, 1995; Rostosky & Riggle, 2002), the IMS tripartite measure poses a limitation in that it ignores important distinctions among behaviors that might fall between what he labels as the avoiding and integrating strategies of sexual identity management. This measure does not include items to assess some behaviors that would fall into the covering category of Griffin's model (i.e., talking about spending time with a same-sex partner and omitting pronouns). Button's IMS measure also does not distinguish between behaviors that Griffin categorized as implicitly out (i.e., discussing lesbian and gay issues without disclosing one's own sexual identity) verses explicitly out strategies (i.e., introducing same-sex partner as such). Therefore, the WSIMM was selected for use in the current study because of its potential ability to measure a broader range of identity management strategies than other measures available.

Social Cognitive Model of Workplace Sexual Identity Management

Anderson et al.'s (2001) efforts to develop a measure of workplace sexual
identity management strategies that is grounded in a conceptual model of identity management serves as a major advancement in the study of workplace identity management for LGB workers. However, the body of research focused on the identity management strategies of LGB individuals has lacked an adequate theoretical framework that explains the process by which individuals make decisions regarding their workplace sexual identity management. Another recent advancement in this area is Lidderdale et al.'s (in press) Workplace Sexual Identity Management (WSIM) model that employs the framework of Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) as developed by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1996). Lidderdale et al.'s (in press) social cognitive model of workplace sexual identity management provides a conceptual framework for understanding the influence of personal, cultural, and other environmental factors on how LGB individuals make decisions regarding their workplace sexual identity management. It is important to note that within the WSIM model key concepts from SCCT are applied to the identity management process. So, this model incorporates the cognitive-person variables, as well as the contextual variables, described by Lent et al. (1996) in their application of Bandura's social cognitive learning theory to the career development process. In considering individuals' career development, SCCT explains that person and context variables influence individuals' career interests, career goals, and career behaviors. The WSIM model explains the role of person and context variables related to LGB individuals' learning about identity management, developing a range of personally acceptable identity management strategies, and selecting which identity management intentions
to implement through workplace behaviors.

This section describes the Workplace Sexual Identity Management (WSIM) model as proposed by Lidderdale et al. (in press). The following overview of the WSIM model describes the four segments of the model and examples of how each segment might apply to LGB workers. I then identify the possible role of perceived barriers and coping efficacy in the WSIM model that Lidderdale et al. do not specifically address in their explanation of proximal contextual influences. I explain how the current study explored these two additional concepts and how they might affect LGB individuals' choices regarding workplace sexual identity management strategies.

The four segments of the WSIM model are: (a) the shaping of learning experiences about identity management through the interaction of personal and distal contextual variables with sexual orientation and other social group identities; (b) the self-efficacy and outcome expectations related to identity management that result from learning experiences and determine which identity management strategies are personally acceptable; (c) the effect of proximal contextual influences on the translation of this range of personally acceptable identity management strategies to specific intentions and behaviors involving workplace identity management; and (d) using feedback from the outcome of identity management behaviors to further inform future learning, choices, and behaviors. Each segment of the WSIM model is explained in further detail in the following subsections.
**Segment One: Learning Experiences Related to Sexual Identity Management**

In the first segment of the WSIM model, person inputs and distal contextual affordances influence what and how individuals learn about identity management, as well as about sexual identity and other social group identities. Person inputs are the individuals’ various predispositions such as race/ethnicity, gender, disability/health status, and particular sexual identity. Distal contextual affordances include a range of influential environmental factors such as cultural and familial messages related to understanding sexual identity, education about and exposure to LGB people and issues, and community norms related to affirmation or intolerance of diversity. For example, a man who lived much of his childhood and teen years in an urban area nearby his aunt who raised children within a same-sex relationship might have a fair amount of direct learning about sexual orientation and how LGB individuals manage their identity. Likewise, a woman who grew up in a conservative rural setting in the Southwest might have had little to no exposure to LGB people and direct learning regarding sexual identity and how LGB individuals manage this identity.

Lidderdale et al. (in press) described sexual identity itself as a cognitive personal variable that influences LGB individuals’ learning experiences that shape their self-efficacy and outcome expectations related to sexual identity management. The authors explained that “how an individual cognitively constructs her or his sexual identity helps shape the learning of self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations in regard to identity management” (p.12). For example, a woman who acknowledges a lesbian sexual identity, and believes this to be a positive aspect of herself, will be
more likely to interact with other openly lesbian women successfully navigating a
heterosexist and/or homophobic environment. However, a woman who acknowledges
a lesbian sexual identity yet holds negative beliefs about this identity is less likely to
associate with openly lesbian women. Thus the second lesbian woman will have
fewer learning experiences that exemplify ways of openly managing one’s sexual
identity than the first lesbian woman described. In this way, individuals’ sexual
identity influences what they might learn about sexual identity management. The two
lesbian women discussed in the example will have different learning experiences
related to sexual identity management, which then influence their self-efficacy and
outcome expectations related to identity management, as will be discussed in the
second segment of the WSIM model.

The WSIM model also emphasizes the integration of individuals’ other social
group identities and how these identities interact with individuals’ sexual identity.
Lidderdale et al. (in press) provided an example that demonstrates the complexity of
how individuals’ multiple identities influence the learning process they experience
related to the management of a minority sexual identity:

For instance, a gay man may identify with his Latino cultural norms involving
collectivism and centrality of the family. His future learning experiences
about identity management, as well as his cognitive interpretations of learning
experiences, will be shaped not only by his personal interpretations but also
by the possible meanings relevant to his family and community. (p. 12)
Segment Two: Developing a Range of Personally Acceptable Identity Management Strategies

The learning experiences described in the first segment of the WSIM model shape the self-efficacy and outcome expectations related to identity management, thus allowing individuals to develop an array of personally acceptable identity management strategies.

Within the WSIM model, self-efficacy related to sexual identity management refers to the degree to which individuals' believe they are able to perform specific identity management behaviors. Lidderdale et al. (in press) utilized Griffin's (1992) description of the continuum of identity management strategies that ranges from strategies that conceal one's identity to those that reveal one's identity. So on the concealment end of this continuum would be passing and covering identity management strategies, and on the revealing end of the continuum would be implicitly and explicitly out strategies. An example to illustrate self-efficacy related to sexual identity management would be a gay man who has watched several of his gay friends introduce their same-sex partners to heterosexual colleagues as such, believes that he can acknowledge his partner as such to several heterosexual colleagues. His belief regarding his ability to utilize this explicitly out strategy stems from the vicarious learning he experienced seeing his friends utilizing such a strategy. He can be described as having positive self-efficacy related to being open about his sexual identity with selected heterosexual colleagues. Another example of self-efficacy related to sexual identity management would be a lesbian woman who has been assumed to be heterosexual when she mentioned a man she once dated. She believes
that she can be perceived as heterosexual by implementing this passing identity management strategy based on her past experience. She can be described as having positive self-efficacy related to concealing her sexual identity.

Outcome expectations related to sexual identity management refers to the possible outcomes the individuals believe might result from performing particular identity management behaviors. Outcome expectations contain two basic components, instrumentality and valence. The instrumentality refers to the consequences individuals anticipate will result from performing specific behaviors. Valence refers to the relative value of the consequences as being positive, negative, or neutral for the individual. As within the SCCT model, outcome expectations related to identity management can be intrinsic, extrinsic, or process-related. An example that might illustrate how outcome expectations might influence an individual’s choices regarding identity management strategies would be a lesbian woman who has experienced feelings of isolation and disconnection from important others when she has withheld information related to her sexual identity. She experiences this isolation and disconnectedness negatively and feels bad about herself. Through passing and covering identity management behaviors she anticipates intrinsic and process oriented consequences of increased isolation and disconnection from important others. These consequences have a negative valence for the lesbian woman. Another example of how the valence of outcomes expectations could influence an individual’s choices regarding which strategies to implement would be a gay man who has experienced feelings of safety and acceptance when fabricating stories about dating women while
speaking with his work colleagues. He experiences this safety and connectedness positively. Through using passing identity management behaviors he anticipates intrinsic and process oriented consequences of safety and connection to others. These consequences have a positive valence for the gay man. Despite the fact that both of these examples involve similar identity management behaviors (passing/covering strategies), the two individuals have very different outcome expectations related to their use of the behaviors and experience different valence of these outcome expectations.

Within the WSIM model, self-efficacy and outcome expectations related to identity management combine to create LGB individuals' personal range of sexual identity management strategies that they conceive as fitting for themselves. The identity management strategies individuals might consider as possible choices are those that seem to fit their sense of efficacy in performing the behaviors, as well as the instrumentality and valence of the expected outcomes of such behaviors. Though LGB individuals might consider utilizing multiple identity management strategies, their range of conceivable strategies should cluster around a particular point along the continuum of sexual identity management strategies. This personal range of sexual identity management strategies is determined through a complex process involving the evaluation of learning experiences that are translated into self-efficacy and outcome expectations related to identity management.

*Segment Three: Selection and Implementation of Sexual Identity Management Strategies*

The third segment of the WSIM model involves the process by which
individuals move from their range of personally acceptable identity management strategies to selecting and implementing workplace specific identity management behaviors. From the range of identity management strategies that are personally acceptable to the individuals, they then develop identity management intentions. These intentions are the individuals' plans to implement given strategies from within their personal range of identity management strategies. For example, a bisexual woman who plans to discuss her same-sex partner using her name and correct gender pronouns without identifying the woman as her partner has the intention to use implicitly out strategies at work. From within the framework of the workplace sexual identity management intentions, individuals then engage in specific behaviors or actions related to managing their sexual identities within the work environment. Thus, the bisexual woman just discussed shares an account of her weekend at home with her same-sex partner, using the partner's name when referring to their weekend activities without acknowledging the nature of their relationship.

The process described in the WSIM model, involving moving from a range of personally acceptable sexual identity management strategies to workplace sexual identity management intentions to workplace sexual identity management behaviors, parallels the process of moving from career interests to career choice goals to career choice actions in SCCT. As in SCCT, the WSIM model incorporates the concept of proximal contextual influences in explaining how individuals navigate this complex process.

Workplace identity management intentions and behaviors are then mediated or
moderated by proximal contextual influences, which are social and environmental factors that directly and indirectly affect one’s identity management intentions and behaviors. Specific to identity management within the work environment, Lidderdale et al. (in press) identified five broad categories of proximal contextual influences that likely have salient impact on workplace sexual identity management: “context of immediate work situation, work climate, nature of work role, interpersonal factors, and community context” (p. 16). These proximal contextual factors might moderate how individuals translate their personal range of identity management strategies into workplace identity management strategy intentions and these into workplace identity management behaviors. For example, a gay man might include strategies from covering to explicitly out in his personal range of acceptable strategies, and intend to use implicitly out strategies in general at work. Despite this intention, he might choose his less preferred strategy of covering when a new colleague at work introduces himself as being very active in the local conservative church group (i.e., community context and interpersonal factors as a proximal contextual influence). The gay man might implement covering identity management strategies until he more thoroughly assesses the colleague’s ability to be affirming of his gay identity.

Similarly, a lesbian woman might include strategies from passing to implicitly out in her personal range of acceptable strategies, and intend to use covering strategies in general at work. Despite this intention, she might choose her less preferred strategy of being implicitly out when she is discussing an issue of discrimination with one of her supervisees. The lesbian supervisor might implement implicitly out strategies in order
to offer support for her supervisee (i.e., work role as a proximal contextual influence).

*Fourth Segment: Incorporation of Feedback Based on Outcome of Identity Management Behaviors*

The fourth and final segment of the WSIM model is a feedback loop that underscores the importance of individuals assessing the outcomes of the workplace identity management behaviors they have chosen and implemented. The actual outcomes of identity management strategies that have been executed provide valuable information that can be fed back into the model as learning experiences that influence self-efficacy and outcome expectations concerning future decisions regarding identity management. For example, a bisexual woman who prefers to be fairly open about her sexual identity with her work peers goes to lunch with a new female client. During their discussion the client makes several comments that imply that the bisexual woman is heterosexual. Feeling uncomfortable sharing personal information with a new client, the bisexual woman does not correct the client and disclose that she is bisexual and currently dating a woman (covering strategy). By the end of the lunch, the bisexual woman noted that the client seemed to feel connected to her in referring to what they go through as women trying to find suitable men. She is glad that the new client seems favorable toward her. However, she also feels uncomfortable with her nondisclosure and what feels like assuming a heterosexual image for professional gains. These outcomes and how she assesses them will now feed back into the loop related to her workplace sexual identity management in the future. This lunch incident can serve as new learning experiences that will affect her self-efficacy and outcome expectations for future workplace sexual identity management behaviors. She now
knows that she is able to cover her sexual identity in a work setting with those she does not previously know (self-efficacy), and she has experienced outcomes that may be perceived as both positive (connecting with heterosexual work associate) and negative (feeling dishonest, decreased sense of self-integrity) related to this sexual identity management strategy. The relative value this woman places on these outcomes, combined with her past learning experiences related to other identity management strategies, will influence her future choices related to workplace sexual identity management. The feedback loop described in this segment of the WSIM model is vital in the ongoing learning process of identity management.

Additional Aspects of the WSIM Model

Though the WSIM model provides an important theoretical basis for understanding the complexity of LGB workers’ sexual identity management, it does not specifically address two key components that researchers in vocational psychology have predicted to affect the social learning process related to career development (Albert & Luzzo, 1999; Hackett & Byars, 1996; Lent et al. 1996, 2000; Lent et al., 2002; Lent et al. 2003; Luzzo, & McWhirter, 2001). The WSIM model does not identify the concepts of perceived barriers and coping efficacy as part of the complexity of how proximal contextual influences relate to individuals’ self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and resulting identity management strategy intentions and behaviors.

In the vocational literature, perceived barriers and coping efficacy have been the focus of several studies that further explore the complexity of SCCT (Albert &
Luzzo, 1999; Lent et al., 2002; Luzzo, & McWhirter, 2001) and are included here in this exploration of the WSIM model. Several researchers have explored the effects of perceived barriers on individuals’ career exploration and planning (Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001; McWhirter, 1997; Swanson, Daniels, & Tokar, 1996; Swanson & Tokar, 1991; Swanson & Woitke, 1997). The literature suggests that perceived career-related barriers serve to inhibit individuals’ translation of interests into goals and goals into actions (Brown & Lent, 1996).

Though Swanson et al. (1996) argued that SCCT is unclear regarding whether the concept of barriers actually differs from outcome expectations, Lent et al. (2000) propose that these two concepts do differ and are worthy of further theoretical and empirical exploration. They propose that barriers might actually be “conceived and operationalized as a particular form of outcome expectation related to one’s perception of the environment” (p.41). Lent and his colleagues explained that individuals hold beliefs about proximal outcomes of their career choices or pursuing these choices, or what they termed “process expectations” (p.44). These process expectations include both supports and barriers individuals believe they might encounter while in the process of pursuing a particular course of action. Lent and his colleagues explain that these process expectations are related to but distinct from the larger consequence or pay-off (i.e., distal outcome expectations) that encourages the individual toward a specific goal. For example, a young woman might be interested in pursuing a career in mechanical engineering. She might perceive the ultimate pay-offs of this career choice in that she will be able to secure a good paying job and enjoy
fulfilling her desire to work in the field of automotive design (distal outcome expectations). However, she is also likely to perceive the conditions she will experience while pursuing this career option. She might believe that she will experience discrimination or isolation within a graduate program dominated by men and that she will be faced with financial hardships while in school (proximal process expectations). Lent and his colleagues added that different individuals might hold similar distal outcome expectations about pursuing a career choice, yet hold rather different process expectations about proximal barriers they would encounter in the pursuit of this goal.

The following example of a gay teacher helps to explicate how perceived barriers related to using implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies might affect LGB workers’ decisions about which strategies to implement. The gay male teacher might see a potential larger pay-off of using implicitly and even explicitly out strategies as the possibility that he will experience a greater sense of self-integration and will not have to expend so much energy keeping his professional and personal lives separate (distal outcome expectations). However, he might also consider the homophobic or anti-gay comments he anticipates hearing from colleagues, students, and community members (proximal process expectations) if he chooses to implement implicitly or explicitly out strategies.

The influence of perceived barriers might be mitigated by what Bandura (1997) termed “coping efficacy.” He described coping efficacy as the degree to which individuals are confident that they have the ability to cope with or manage difficult or
complex situations. Lent et al. (2000) explained that coping efficacy might play a role in moderating the effects of perceived barriers, suggesting that a negative relationship between coping efficacy and perceived barriers (i.e., those with higher coping efficacy would perceive fewer barriers and report less impact of perceived barriers on career choice and behavior). Hackett and Byars (1996) explained that strong coping efficacy might result in individuals performing successfully, despite expected barriers such as racism and discrimination. For example, although the gay teacher described in the last paragraph might perceive that he will hear anti-gay comments from his colleagues, he might also have confidence in his ability to cope with these discriminatory comments and decide to implement an implicitly or explicitly out sexual identity management strategy. Thus, in considering the role that perceived barriers might play in LGB individuals’ sexual identity management process, it is also important to look at the individuals’ sense of coping efficacy.

Exploration of Perceived Barriers and Copy Efficacy

As stated in the introduction, a secondary purpose of this study was to explore the role of perceived barriers and coping-efficacy in the workplace sexual identity management process. By including the concepts of perceived barriers and coping efficacy in the WSIM model, we might better understand the complexities of the relationships that exist between the key components of the WSIM model of self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and proximal contextual influences and how they might factor into individuals’ workplace sexual identity management decisions. In the current study, I explored the relationship between LGB teachers’ perceived barriers to
implementing implicitly and explicitly out strategies and their beliefs regarding their coping efficacy related to these barriers. Specifically, I explored whether there were correlations between which identity management strategies participants use and their perceived barriers and coping efficacy. I also explored whether specific person inputs and proximal contextual influences were related to participants' perception of barriers and coping efficacy.

In order to explore the perceived barriers and coping efficacy of the participants in the current study, it was necessary to identify potential barriers that LGB teachers might perceive related to the process involved in choosing and implementing implicitly and explicitly out identity management strategies. The findings of the LGB teacher studies summarized earlier in this chapter provided important information regarding the barriers participants perceived as they made decisions about how to manage their sexual identities. Specifically, fears related to the consequences of revealing their sexual identities or having them known to others in the school setting were identified. The current study explored these fears related to implementing implicitly and explicitly out identity management strategies as the perceived barriers. Therefore, the perceived barriers to implicitly and explicitly out identity management strategies that were examined for LGB teachers in the current study included: (a) loss of job, (b) non-promotion in career, (c) loss of credibility, (d) being stereotyped as a sexual predator, (e) being stereotyped as recruiting students to LGB lifestyle, (f) negative comments regarding identity, (g) negative teacher evaluation, (h) lack of support from administration, (i) lack of support from
colleagues, and (j) non acceptance by colleagues.

The teachers’ perceptions regarding the degree to which the identified potential barriers exist for them was explored using an adaptation of Luzzo and McWhirter's (2001) Perception of Barriers Scale (POB), substituting barriers related to managing one’s sexual identity in the workplace for the original scale’s career-related barriers. The LGB teachers who participated in the current study were asked to rate the degree to which they believe that they are able to cope with the barriers related to implicitly and explicitly out identity management strategies, by responding to items similar to Luzzo and McWhirter’s (2001) Coping With Barriers Scale (CWB). The adaptations of both the POB and CWB instruments used in current study are discussed in greater detail in the instruments section of the methods chapter.

Research Hypotheses

In the current study, I expected the psychometric assessment of the WSIMM-R to provide confirmation of the theorized four-factor structure. In assessing the validity of the WSIMM-R Scales by assessing how they correlate with the three scales of the IMS-R, I expected to find the following correlations. Scores on the Explicitly Out Scale of the WSIMM-R would be positively correlated to the Integrating Scale of the IMS-R because these two scales were developed to measure identity management strategies that involve explicitly out behaviors. I expected that scores on the Explicitly Out Scale of the WSIMM-R would be negatively correlated to the IMS-R Avoiding Scale scores and even more strongly negatively correlated with scores on the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale. I expected that scores on the Implicitly Out Scale of the
WSIMM-R would be positively correlated to scores on the Integrating Scale of the IMS-R because both scales were designed to measure identity management strategies toward the more open end of the identity management strategy continuum. I expected this correlation to be moderate in that the IMS-R Integrating scale includes implicitly out strategies but also includes explicitly out strategies which are not similar to the strategies in the Implicitly Out scale of the WSIMM-R. I also expected that scores on the Implicitly Out Scale would be negatively correlated with the IMS-R Avoiding Scale and even more strongly negatively associated with the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale. I expected to find that scores on the Covering Scale of the WSIMM-R would be positively correlated to scores on the Avoiding Scale of the IMS-R, somewhat negatively correlated to scores on the Counterfeiting Scale of the IMS-R because the Covering scale does not include behaviors in which individuals intentionally present as heterosexual as in the Counterfeiting Scale, and strongly negatively correlated with the IMS-Integrating Scale. I expected scores on the Passing Scale of the WSIMM-R to be positively correlated to scores on the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale because these two scales were written to measure identity management strategies in which individuals intentionally present themselves as heterosexual to conceal their sexual identity. I expected that scores on the Passing Scale would be negatively correlated to scores on the Integrating Scales of the IMS-R, and somewhat less negatively correlated with on the IMS-R Avoiding Scale.

An additional estimate of validity of the WSIMM-R was the expected positive relationship between participants' scores on the four scales and their response to the
single item regarding how “out” they are at work and their degree of satisfaction with this degree of outness. I expected to find that higher scores on the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales were positively associated with the item assessing participants’ degree of outness. Regarding participants’ individual rankings of the sexual identity management strategy descriptions as self-descriptive, I expected that participants who identified the general strategy of being Explicitly Out as most self-descriptive would report using Explicitly Out strategies more often than Implicitly Out, Covering, or Passing strategies and in decreasing magnitude. I expected that participants who identified the general strategy of being Implicitly Out as most self-descriptive would report using Implicitly Out strategies more often than Explicitly Out, Covering, or Passing strategies. I expected that participants who identified the general strategy of Covering as most self-descriptive would report using Covering strategies more often than Explicitly Out, Implicitly Out, or Passing strategies. I expected that participants who identified the general strategy of Passing as most self-descriptive would report using Passing strategies more often than Explicitly Out, Implicitly Out, or Covering strategies.

An exploratory portion of the current study was intended to explore the possible effects of person inputs and proximal contextual influences on which identity management strategies participants implement. Though I did not have specific hypotheses regarding the degree or direction of these relations, I did expect to find differences in identity management scale score means related to the various factors examined. Similarly, I expected that these person inputs and proximal contextual
influences would also be associated with differences in PBOSIMS and CBOSIMS score means, though did not have specific hypotheses as to the nature of these relations.

Another exploratory portion of the study was designed to investigate the possible associations between participants' scores on the WSIMM-R scales, their perceived barriers to implementing implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies, and as well as their perceived ability to cope with these barriers. I hypothesized that participants who implement Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out strategies would report perceiving fewer barriers. Thus, scores on the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales of the WSIMM-R would be negatively associated with scores on the PBOSIMS. In contrast, scores on the Passing and Covering Scales would be positively associated with PBOSIMS scores.

My hypothesis regarding the possible relation between participants' use of the identity management strategies and their coping efficacy was that participants who implement Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out strategies possess greater coping efficacy. Therefore, scores on the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales of the WSIMM-R would be positively associated with scores on the CBOSIMS. In contrast, scores on the Passing and Covering Scales would be negatively associated with CBOSIMS scores.

Another hypothesis regarding the relations between identity management strategies, perceived barriers to implicitly and explicitly out identity management strategies, and coping efficacy was that coping efficacy would mediate the degree to
which perceived barriers affect LGB individuals’ choices regarding which identity management strategies they implement. Thus, if PBOSIMS scores were positively associated with scores on the WSIMM-R Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales, CBOSIMS scores would also be positively correlated with the identity management strategy scales.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

The current study was designed to assess the psychometric properties of a revised version of Anderson et al.'s WSIMM (2001), gain further understanding of the complex process LGB individuals navigate related to managing their sexual identity at work, and to add to the current literature on lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) teachers. LGB teachers were asked to respond to survey questions related to their workplace sexual identity management strategies, the degree to which they perceive barriers related to using implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies, and their degree of confidence that they can cope with such barriers. This chapter explicates the methods of conducting the study and the research hypotheses that were examined. The chapter is divided into four subsections. First, the characteristics of the participants are described. Second, the instruments and psychometric properties of each are described. Third, procedures for how data was collected are described. Finally, the data analysis procedures are reported.

Participants

Participants \( n = 64 \) in this study were LGB K-12 teachers currently working in educational settings, either public or private. Fifty-nine percent of participants were female \( (n = 37) \), and 42% were male \( (n = 27) \). They ranged in age from 25 to 62 \( (M = 43.8) \) and were predominantly Caucasian \( (n = 56, 87.5\%) \). Three participants identified as biracial \( (4.7\%) \), two identified as African American \( (3.1\%) \), two identified as Latino \( (3.1\%) \), and one indicated other \( (1.6\%) \) without providing further
explanation. Thirty-four participants identified as lesbian (53.1%), 26 identified as gay (40.6%), and 4 identified as bisexual (6.3%). Over half (n = 36, 56.3%) of the participants described themselves as currently living with a same-sex partner, 7 described themselves as being in a same-sex relationship but not living together (10.9%), 17 described themselves as not currently involved in dating or a romantic relationship (26.6%), and no one described themselves as being involved in an opposite-sex relationship. Five percent of participants had identified with their current sexual orientation for 1-5 years (n = 3), 20.3% identified with their current sexual orientation for 6-10 years (n = 13), 22% identified with their current sexual orientation for 11-20 years (n = 14), and 48.4% identified with their current sexual orientation for 21 years or more (n = 31).

Most participants identified Implicitly Out strategies (n = 29, 45.3%) or Explicitly Out strategies (n = 20, 31.3%) as being most self-descriptive. The majority of the remaining participants identified Covering (n = 11, 17%) as the strategy that best described how they manage their identity and very few participants identified Passing (n = 3, 5%) as the most self-descriptive strategy. Due to the extremely low number of participants identifying Passing as most self-descriptive, the Passing and Covering groups were collapsed for analyses (n = 14, 21.9%).

Participants included teachers across the grade levels. They taught in elementary schools (n = 15, 23.4%), secondary (n = 43, 67.2%), and both elementary and secondary (n = 4, 6.3%). Fifty-four participants reported teaching in public schools (84.4%), 5 reported teaching in private schools (7.8%), and one reported
teaching in a parochial school (1.6%). Thirty-nine percent reported teaching in urban school districts \((n = 25)\), 28% reported teaching in suburban school districts \((n = 18)\), 14% reported teaching in rural school districts \((n = 9)\), and 19% did not indicate their school district type \((n = 12)\). Participants were drawn from across the United States, with the majority from the Midwest and Northeast (Midwest, \(n = 40, 62.5\%\); Northeast, \(n = 16, 25\%\); Southwest, \(n = 4, 6.3\%\); Northwest, \(n = 2, 3.1\%\); Southeast, \(n = 2, 3.1\%\)).

Forty-six participants reported that they had been teaching for 11 or more years (71.9%), 8 had been teaching for 6-10 years (12.5%), and 9 had been teaching for 1-5 years (14.1%). Twenty-nine of them had been in their current teaching position for 11 or more years (45.3%), 13 had been in their current position for 6-10 years (20.3%), and 21 had been in their current position for 1-5 years (32.8%). Sixty-one percent of participants said that they knew other LGB teachers in their building \((n = 39)\), 28% percent knew other LGB teachers in their district but not in their building \((n = 18)\), and 11% knew other LGB teachers but not in their district \((n = 7)\).

**Instruments**

*Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised (Appendix A)*

The Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised (WSIMM-R) is a 31-item measure that assesses the frequency of respondents’ sexual identity management behaviors that are categorized into four scales, corresponding to the four theoretical sexual identity management strategies (passing, covering, implicitly out, and explicitly out). Revisions of the measure for use in this study included rewording...
three items to clarify wording that Anderson et al. (2001) identified as ambiguous after analyzing the results of their study. Another revision to the WSIMM for use in the current study was that the wording *lesbian or gay* was changed to read *lesbian/gay/bisexual*. This wording allowed for the inclusion of participants who identify as bisexual.

Each scale of the WSIMM-R and corresponding sexual identity management strategy is described here, followed by a sample item from the WSIMM-R. The Passing Scale contains 8 items and assesses the sexual identity management strategy of passing, which entails behaviors that are intended to make others believe that the lesbian or gay person is heterosexual (e.g., Bring someone of the other gender to a work-related social function and introduce that person as my date or partner). The Covering Scale contains 8 items and assesses the sexual identity management strategy of covering, which entails behaviors that are intended to prevent others from knowing that participants are LGB but do not include attempts to be seen as heterosexual (e.g., Attend work-related social events without a date or partner so that I do not reveal my sexual orientation). The Implicitly Out scale contains 7 items and assesses the sexual identity management strategy of being implicitly out, which entails being honest about one’s life without actually acknowledging a LGB sexual identity and allowing others to make whatever sense of this information (e.g., Use the appropriate gender pronoun or names to refer to my partner or date without labeling them as a partner or date. That way, if others are savvy, they can figure out that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual). The Explicitly Out scale contains 8 items and assesses the sexual identity
management strategy of being explicitly out, which entails being explicitly open about one’s LGB sexual identity (e.g., Tell most or all of my coworkers that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual). Respondents indicated how often they engage in each behavior using a 4-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (never/almost never) to 4 (almost always/always).

In Anderson et al.’s (2001) evaluation of the WSIMM, an examination of temporal stability yielded test-retest reliability estimates for the four scales during a two-week interval were: Explicitly Out ($r = .87$), Implicitly Out ($r = .59$), Covering ($r = .77$), and Passing ($r = .66$). The internal consistency estimates for the four scales were: Explicitly Out ($\alpha = .91$), Implicitly Out ($\alpha = .53$), Covering ($\alpha = .73$), and Passing ($\alpha = .37$). Though the Passing Scale’s estimate of internal consistency was quite low, the authors of the measure acknowledged that this reliability measure likely reflects limited variation in the ways participants responded to passing items (Anderson et al.). Internal consistency estimates for the WSIMM-R scales in the current study were as follows: Explicitly Out Scale ($\alpha = .95$), Implicitly Out Scale ($\alpha = .75$), Covering Scale ($\alpha = .79$), and Passing Scale ($\alpha = .59$).

Anderson et al. (2001) also conducted an exploratory factor analysis in which they found a three-factor solution was the best fit for the data. The three-factor solution accounted for 39.3% of the variance. The first factor appeared to measure an Explicitly Out (EO) identity management strategy. This factor loaded all 8 of the Explicitly Out items and one of the Covering items. The second factor appeared to measure a combination of the Passing and Covering items (PC) strategies. This
second factor loaded 5 of the Covering items and 3 of the Passing items. The third factor appeared to measure an Implicitly Out (IO) strategy. The third factor loaded 3 of the Implicitly Out items. The three factors in this solution yielded the following correlations: EO with PC, $r = -0.39$; EO with IO, $r = -0.04$; and PC with IO, $r = -0.18$.

Anderson et al. (2001) then conducted a second factor analysis of the WSIMM in which they first excluded the potentially problematic items (the 8 Passing items) and again found the three-factor solution to be the best fit of the data. The three-factor solution for the remaining WSIMM items accounted for 44.9% of the variance. The first factor (Explicitly Out) loaded all 8 of the Explicitly Out items. The second factor (Covering) loaded 6 of the Covering items. The third factor (Implicitly Out) loaded 4 of the Implicitly Out items. The three factors yielded the following correlations: Explicitly Out with Covering, $r = -0.49$; Explicitly Out with Implicitly Out, $r = -0.21$; and Covering with Implicitly Out, $r = 0.16$.

Construct validity of the WSIMM was assessed through the examination of the relation between the four scales with theoretically related constructs. The four theoretically derived scales of the WSIMM were correlated with a measure of disclosure of sexual orientation (Disclosure Questionnaire, Driscoll, Kelley, & Fassinger, 1996) and a single item about disclosure (Anderson et al., 2001), job satisfaction (Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Weis, Dawes, Entland, & Lofquist, 1967), and a single item about satisfaction with level of disclosure of sexual orientation (Anderson et al., 2001). The observed correlations for Explicitly Out and Covering were as expected. The Explicitly Out scale was positively correlated with
the disclosure measure and the satisfaction with disclosure measure and not statistically significantly correlated with job satisfaction. The Covering scale was negatively correlated with the disclosure measure and the satisfaction with disclosure measure and not statistically significantly correlated with job satisfaction. The observed patterns of correlations of the Passing scale paralleled those of the Covering scale but with smaller values. However, the Implicitly Out scale did not yield the expected correlational pattern in that it did not correlate statistically significantly with the disclosure measure or the satisfaction with disclosure measure. The Implicitly Out scale did yield the expected lack of a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction.

The validity estimates of the WSIMM were also assessed by examining the responses to the single item regarding respondents’ ranking of the four sexual identity management strategies (Explicitly Out, Implicitly Out, Covering, Passing) as being self-descriptive. Participants who identified Explicitly Out as the most self-descriptive strategy reported employing Explicitly Out behaviors more often than those behaviors relevant to the other three strategies. Participants who identified Implicitly Out as the most self-descriptive strategy reported employing Implicitly Out behaviors more often than Explicitly Out, Covering, or Passing behaviors. Participants who identified Covering as the most self-descriptive strategy reported employing both Covering and Implicitly Out behaviors more than either Passing or Explicitly Out behaviors. Again, no participants ranked Passing as most self-descriptive.

In a series of post hoc analyses, Anderson et al. (2001) evaluated a Revised
Implicitly Out scale in an effort to improve the measurement of an implicitly out strategy. Their Revised Implicitly Out scale contained items 1, 3, 20, 25 of the original scale and eliminated items 8, 11, 30. The researchers identified the three eliminated items as containing ambiguous wording (i.e., without explicitly identifying myself as gay or lesbian, or without indicating to others what my sexual orientation is), while the other items contained language that acknowledged that others could ascertain the individual’s sexual identity. In the initial evaluation of the revised scale, Anderson et al. found that excluding the three items from the initial Implicitly Out scale improved the scales’ estimate of reliability and reported plans to develop new items to add to the remaining Revised Implicitly Out scale items. In the current study, instead of deleting items 8, 11, and 30 as in Anderson et al.’s Revised Implicitly Out scale, I retained these items but revised what the authors identified as ambiguous wording. Wording that is consistent with the other four Implicitly Out items (Items 1, 3, 20, and 25) was substituted for the ambiguous wording originally used in items 8, 11, and 30. For example, item 8 originally read *Speak out against anti-gay and lesbian discrimination by saying that all people should be treated equally without explicitly identifying myself as lesbian or gay.* Anderson et al. proposed that this wording is unclear in that it can be interpreted as either actively concealing or as an absence of explicitness. In the current revision, item 8 read *Speak out against anti-lesbian/gay/bisexual discrimination by saying that all people should be treated equally, allowing others to assume whatever they want regarding my sexual orientation.* This wording change seemed more consistent with the definition of
implicitly out in that it suggests that others can ascertain the individual’s sexual identity.

*Identity Management Strategies-Revised (Appendix B)*

The Identity Management Strategies-Revised (ISM-R) is Button’s (1996) 23-item instrument used in the current study to assess identity management strategies of participants as an external correlate in the psychometric evaluation of the WSIMM-R. I made a minor modification to the IMS-R for use in the current study by including the term bisexual where the measure referred only to lesbian and gay. Thus, all uses of the words “lesbians and gay males” were changed to read “lesbian/gay/bisexual individuals.” Similarly, uses of “lesbian/gay” or “gay/lesbian” were replaced with “lesbian/gay/bisexual.”

The IMS-R contains three scales based on the three strategies that Woods (1993) identified in his qualitative study of how gay men manage their sexual identities within organizational settings. The three scales and the corresponding strategies are counterfeiting, avoidance, and integrating. The Counterfeiting Scale contains 6 items that describe behaviors in which LGB individuals construct a false heterosexual identity (e.g., To appear heterosexual, I sometimes talk about fictional dates with members of the opposite sex), or avoid appearing in ways that are stereotypically associated with being lesbian or gay (e.g., I make sure that I don’t behave the way people expect gays or lesbians to behave). The Avoiding Scale contains 7 items that describe behaviors in which LGB individuals avoid revealing information about their sexual identity (e.g., I avoid personal questions by never
asking others about their personal lives), or avoid situations where questions about their sexuality are commonly asked (e.g., I avoid situations [i.e., long lunches, parties] where heterosexual co-workers are likely to ask me personal questions). The Integrating Scale contains 10 items that describe behaviors in which LGB individuals reveal their sexual identity directly (e.g., I look for opportunities to tell my co-workers that I am gay/lesbian) or indirectly (e.g., I display objects [e.g., photographs, magazines, symbols] which suggest that I am gay/lesbian). Respondents indicate to what degree they agree that these statements describe their behavior by responding on a 7-point Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Respondents’ scores on the three scales are obtained by summing their responses on the items that comprise each scale, with higher scores indicating the individuals’ greater use of that particular strategy.

Button (1996; 2001) also conducted a set of confirmatory factor analyses on all of the items in his measure of sexual identity management strategies. The results of both studies indicated that the three-factor model fit the data significantly better than either a two-factor or one-factor model, demonstrating that the counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating scales were indeed assessing different constructs. Although in a related study, Button (2004) found a four-factor model (counterfeiting, avoiding, acknowledging, and advocating) to be a better fit of the data, he decided against using such a model because two of the factors (acknowledging and advocating) were highly correlated.

Button (1996) reported that the counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating scales
in his measure exhibited acceptable levels of internal consistency with alphas of .77, .86, and .90, respectively. Button (2001) conducted another assessment of the psychometric properties of his measure and reported that the counterfeiting, avoiding, and integrating scales exhibited alphas of .80, .87, and .90, respectively. Consistent with earlier studies, reliability estimates for the three scales of the IMS-R in the current study were as follows: Counterfeiting Scale (α = .77), Avoiding Scale (α = .89), and the Integrating Scale (α = .93).

Perceived Barriers to Out Sexual Identity Management Strategies (Appendix C)

The Perceived Barriers to Out Sexual Identity Management Strategies (PBOSIMS) is a 16-item measure designed for use in the current study as an exploratory method to assess perceived barriers related to greater levels of outness and is yet untested psychometrically. The PBOSIMS was modeled after McWhirter’s (1997) Perception of Barriers Scale (POB), which was created to assess career and educational barriers for high school students. Luzzo and McWhirter’s (2001) revised the POB in their study of gender and ethnic differences in perceived educational and career-related barriers and coping efficacy for overcoming these barriers. The items in Luzzo and McWhirter’s version of the POB scale listed anticipated barriers and respondents were asked to what degree they perceive the barrier in their career or educational pursuits. Items in the POB began with the stem, “In my future career, I will probably . . .” which was completed by various barriers, “experience discrimination because of my gender,” or “be treated differently because of my ethnic/racial background” (p. 130). Responses were indicated using a 5-point Likert-
type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The higher the score on the POB, the more individuals perceive barriers to using identity management strategies toward the more revealing end of the continuum.

The PBOSIMS uses the same format as the POB to assess the perceived barriers to implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies of LGB teachers. The stem In my career, I probably will or have ... is followed by a list of 16 descriptions of barriers (i.e., lose/lost my job because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual; be/been perceived as trying to recruit students to a lesbian/gay/bisexual lifestyle. Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they perceive each barrier to be true for them, using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Participants’ perception of barriers scores were derived by averaging their responses to the 16 items, with higher scores indicating more perceived barriers to implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies.

I developed the PBOSIMS items in an attempt to capture the potential barriers that LGB teachers might perceive related to using implicit and explicit sexual identity management strategies. These barriers were identified through the research addressing LGB teachers’ experiences related to their workplace sexual identity management reviewed in the previous chapter of this dissertation. From the six studies of lesbian and gay teachers reviewed (Bliss & Harris, 1998; Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Litton, 2001; Olson, 1987; Woods & Harbeck, 1992), I identified barriers that the teachers indicated related to using implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity
management strategies. The barriers emerged particularly in the qualitative data gathered in the studies. Though the teachers also noted positive aspects of being lesbian or gay and a teacher, only the consequences or anticipated consequences that were reported as negative or identified as fears were used in the PBOSIMS as perceived barriers to using implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies. The coefficient alpha for the PBOSIMS in the current investigation was .89.

Coping with Barriers to Out Sexual Identity Management Strategies (Appendix D)

The Coping with Barriers to Out Sexual Identity Management Strategies (CBOSIMS) is a 16-item measure designed for use in the current study as an exploratory method to assess LGB teachers' perception of their ability to cope with barriers to using implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies and is yet untested psychometrically. The CBOSIMS was modeled after the Coping With Barriers scale (CWB), which McWhirter developed for use in Luzzo and McWhirter's (2001) study of sex and ethnic differences in perceptions of educational and career-related barriers and coping efficacy. The CWB scale assessed coping efficacy by asking respondents to rate their degree of confidence that they could overcome each potential educational and career-related barrier contained in the POB. Responses were indicated using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all confident) to 5 (highly confident).

The CBOSIMS uses the same format as the CWB to assess LGB teachers' perceived coping efficacy related to barriers to using implicitly and explicitly out
sexual identity management strategies. Participants were asked to rate their degree of confidence that they could cope with each of the potential barriers listed in the PBOSIMS (i.e., losing my job because I am gay lesbian/gay/bisexual; lack of support from administration because I am lesbian/gay/bisexual; experience negative comments about my lesbian/gay/bisexual sexual orientation). Participants were asked to indicate their degree of confidence that they could cope with each of the potential barriers using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all confident) to 5 (highly confident). Participants’ scores were derived by averaging their responses to all 16 items, with higher scores indicating greater coping efficacy (i.e., more confidence that they can cope with the potential barriers to open sexual identity management strategies). The coefficient alpha for the CBOSIMS in the current investigation was .93.

Demographic/Career Questionnaire (Appendix E)

This demographic/career questionnaire asked participants to indicate relevant personal data (e.g., race/ethnicity, age, gender, sexual identity, how long they’ve identified their sexual identity this way, whether they are currently partnered or dating same sex individuals, and whether they currently live with a same-sex partner). Participants were also asked to complete several items related to their career and work-setting (e.g., grade level and subject taught, years in teaching, years in current teaching position, type of school district, their geographic location, and whether they know other lesbian or gay teachers). The demographic information, as well as information regarding the participants’ teaching career, was asked using fill in the
blank and multiple choice questions (Appendix E). The specific personal
demographics and career questions identified for this study were chosen based on the
likelihood that they might represent influence on LGB teachers’ sexual identity
management (i.e., relevant distal and proximal affordances in WSIM model).

Degree of Outness and Satisfaction with Degree of Outness Items (Appendix E)

As in Anderson et al.’s (2001) initial study which examined the psychometric
properties of the WSIMM, an additional estimate of validity of the WSIMM-R was
assessed using several additional items related to participants’ workplace experience.
The items were the same as used by Anderson et al. and referred to: (a) degree to
which participants were out at work, and (b) participants’ satisfaction with this degree
of outness.

Identification of Self-descriptive Identity Management Strategies (Appendix F)

The final items presented descriptions of each of the four sexual identity
management strategies as defined in Griffin’s (1992) model and the three sexual
identity management strategies defined in Button’s (1996) model and asked
participants to rank order the strategies based on how self-descriptive the descriptions
were.

Procedures

Once Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) approval
(Appendix G) was obtained to recruit participants for the current investigation,
potential participants were invited to participate. Because data were collected via both
paper/pencil surveys and an online survey, two general approaches were used to invite
potential participants and make research surveys available to those interested in participation.

One method of recruiting potential participants was by enlisting the help of personal and professional contacts (i.e., personal friends, counseling professionals, and faculty members in education or counselor training programs) who were LGB affirmative individuals with connections to the LGB community. I sent these contact individuals an initial e-mail message (see Appendix H) that included a brief description of the purpose of the study, an explanation of eligibility for participation, and an invitation to distribute research surveys to LGB teachers who had self-identified as LGB to the contact person.

If willing to help recruit potential participants, the contact persons were asked to e-mail me to indicate how many research surveys they were able to distribute. I then sent the requested number of research surveys to the contact persons in individual packets. These packets were accompanied by a letter to the contact individuals (Appendix I) explaining the procedures for distributing the research surveys and a reminder page (Appendix J) that highlighted distribution guidelines.

Each packet contained an invitation to potential participants that introduced the study and provided consent information (Appendix K), the research survey (Appendices A-F), and a stamped addressed envelope. Potential participants were instructed that if they did not wish to participate, they should return the blank research survey via the enclosed stamped addressed envelope. They were instructed that if they did choose to participate they should return the research survey with their responses.
Another method of recruiting potential participants was via online resources. Similar to the previous strategy of enlisting the assistance of personal and professional contacts to distribute paper/pencil surveys, I contacted various organizations that focus on LGB issues within education such as the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Educators Network (GLSEN) and LGB community centers, asking if they would assist in recruiting potential participants by introducing the study to their members. Once the organizations (GLSEN chapter or LGB community center) expressed willingness to assist in distributing information, I sent them an e-mail to confirm this commitment and to provide instructions regarding how to introduce the study to their members (Appendix L, M, N) via an e-mail invitation (Appendix O) they could distribute to their membership listserv, a website posting (Appendix P), or an online newsletter blurb (Appendix Q). Each of these introductions to the study invited recipients who were eligible to participate in the study to access further information about the study via a hyperlink. The introductions also provided interested recipients a log-in and password required to access the online survey if they decided to participate. The webpage to which recipients were directed via the hyperlink contained a brief explanation of the study and consent information (Appendix R).

Potential participants who remained interested in participating in the study then entered the log-in and password provided to access the online survey. They were instructed that they could submit their responses to the online survey by clicking
“Click Here to Send Information” at the end of the survey. If they decided to discontinue participation, they could close the survey window and no responses would be saved. The online data was collected via the webpage hosted by Western Michigan University’s homepages.

All recipients of recruitment information were asked to complete the research survey only once if choosing to participate. They were also asked to consider further assisting with the study by distributing paper/pencil surveys to other LGB teachers who had self-identified as LGB to the recipient of recruitment information. In an attempt to increase the overall diversity of the sample (i.e., race/ethnicity, school settings, and degree of outness), all recipients of recruitment information and invitations to participate were encouraged to consider distributing research packets to LGB teachers who are people of color, teach in various settings, or might be less open at school regarding their sexual orientation. None of the recipients of recruitment information contacted me regarding wanting to assist in distributing research surveys.

If I did not hear back from the contact individuals to whom I had sent the initial e-mail asking for their assistance in distributing research surveys, I sent them a follow-up e-mail (Appendix S). I also sent a follow-up e-mail (Appendix T) to contact individuals to thank them for their willingness to help distribute surveys, confirm that I had sent the requested number of research surveys, and remind them to distribute the surveys if they had not already done so.

In total, 24 of the 47 contact individuals to whom I sent the initial e-mail asking for assistance in distributing research packets agreed to distribute surveys. I
sent out 150 surveys to contact individuals and received 55 completed surveys and one blank survey. This resulted in a return rate of 37% for the paper/pencil surveys.

It is impossible to track how many online introductions to the study were distributed. Five regional GLSEN chapters and one LGB community center agreed to send out the e-mail invitation to participate to the membership listserv; three regional GLSEN chapters, one community center, and the national chapter of GLSEN agreed to include the newsletter introduction of the study in their e-mail newsletter; and 5 regional GLSEN chapters and one LGB community center agreed to post the introduction to the study on their website. Only 13 online responses were received.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter describes the statistical analyses used to examine the research questions and hypotheses established in the first two chapters and the results obtained. This chapter begins by describing the data screening process I used before conducting the main analyses. The remainder of the chapter reports: (a) the descriptive data for relevant variables; (b) psychometric data for the WSIMM-R; (c) findings related to the association between demographic variables and identity management strategies; (d) and the exploration of relations among perceived barriers, coping efficacy, and identity management strategies.

Data Screening

Prior to the main analysis of the data, I examined the variables using SPSS 14.0 to address missing values, normality of distributions, and outliers. Three cases with excessive missing data (i.e., greater than 20% of the items were missing) on the WSIMM-R or the IMS-R were excluded from further analyses. When less than 20% of the items were missing, these missing values on the WSIMM-R, IMS-R, PBOSIMS, or CBOSIMS items were accounted for in computing participants’ mean scale scores. Thus, in cases where participants responded to at least 80% of the items in a particular scale, their mean score was computed using their total score divided by the total number of responses rather than the total number of items in the scale. While assessing the assumption of normality, I computed the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of variability and examined values for skewness and kurtosis. If the Kolmogorov-
Smirnov test was significant and skewness or kurtosis values were beyond the appropriate range (i.e., above the absolute value of 2), I transformed the variable. This was the case for one of the WSIMM-R scales (i.e., Passing) and one of the IMS-R scales (i.e., Counterfeiting), which both exhibited severe positive skewness. The inverse method of transformation was used. For each analysis involving the WSIMM-R or IMS-R, the transformed scales were included in the analysis. The results for the original scales and the transformed scales were compared to see if they varied. Due to the difficulty of interpreting the transformed data and the fact that the original and transformed scales yielded similar results, only the original scale results are reported.

I examined the results for multivariate outliers, through Mahalanobis distance statistics (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996) with \( p < .001 \), and found one case to be a multivariate outlier. This case was excluded from further analyses. I also examined the homogeneity of covariance assumption for the MANOVAs conducted. Although the assumption was not always satisfied, I used Pillai’s Trace as the test of significance to accommodate this concern since Pillai’s criteria is the most robust to violations of assumptions concerning homogeneity of the covariance matrix (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

**Descriptive Statistics for WSIMM-R, IMS-R, PBOSIMS, and CBOSIMS**

Prior to examining the reliability and validity of the WSIMM-R scales, I reviewed descriptive data for WSIMM-R scales and items. WSIMM-R scale score means for the present sample were based on participants’ endorsement of how often they used respective strategies (1 = *never* to 6 = *always*) and the overall mean for each
scale was as follows: Passing Scale, 1.30 (SD = .41), Covering Scale, 2.06 (SD = .87), Implicitly Out Scale, 3.81 (SD = 1.04), and Explicitly Out Scale, 2.69 (SD = 1.60).

I also reviewed descriptive data for the other three measures utilized in the study—the IMS-R, the PBOSIMS, and the CBOSIMS. Means for the IMS-R scale scores for the present sample were based on participants’ endorsement of using respective strategies (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) and the overall mean for each scale was as follows: Counterfeiting Scale, 1.70 (SD = .94), Avoiding Scale, 2.47 (SD = 1.46), and Integrating Scale, 4.38 (SD = 1.69). PBOSIMS mean scores were based on participants’ endorsement that they perceived that the barriers listed exist for them (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) and the overall mean and standard deviation for the current sample was 2.76 (SD = .77). CBOSIMS mean scores were based on participants’ endorsement of their degree of confidence that they could overcome the barriers listed (1 = not at all confident to 5 = highly confident) and the overall mean and standard deviation for the current sample was 3.74 (SD = .86). The mean and standard deviation for each of the scales presented here are included in Table 1.

Psychometric Data for the WSIMM-R

Although one of the primary purposes of this study was to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis on the WSIMM-R, to provide further validation of the measure among a sample of teachers, I was unable to conduct this analysis due to the small sample size. Despite being unable to further assess the factor structure of the WSIMM-R, I did obtain estimates of reliability and assessed construct validity of the
Reliability Estimates

Internal consistency estimates for the Passing, Covering, Implicitly Out, and Explicitly Out Scales were .59, .79, .75, and .95, respectively. Similar to findings in Anderson et al. (2001), the internal consistency for the Passing Scale with the current sample was low, though slightly improved. The internal consistency for the Implicitly Out Scale was improved in the current study compared to Anderson, et al.'s findings. Other than the Passing Scale, coefficient alphas were considered to be adequate.

To further examine how items within each scale worked together as a scale, I also calculated inter-item correlations for each of the four WSIMM-R scales. For the Passing Scale (8 items), the inter-item correlations ranged from .00 to .85 (mean inter-item correlation = .34), with one item (Item 15) yielding inter-item correlations that were all less than .30. If this item were deleted from the scale, the Coefficient alpha would have been .68. Inter-item correlations for the Covering Scale (8 items) ranged from -.10 to .67 (mean inter-item correlation = .34), with all items yielding at least one inter-item correlation greater than .30. For the Implicitly Out Scale, inter-item correlations ranged from .02 to .63 (mean inter-item correlation = .28), with one item (Items 3) yielding inter-item correlations that are all less than .30 and two that are negative. Removing item 3 from the scale would change the Coefficient alpha to .80. The inter-item correlations for the Explicitly Out Scale ranged from .46 to .88 (mean inter-item correlation = .70), with all inter-item correlations greater than .30.
Validity Estimates

To assess construct validity of the WSIMM-R scales, I examined two-tailed Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients among the four WSIMM-R scales and then between these scales and the three IMS-R scales. The correlation coefficients are included in Table 1. In examining correlations among the WSIMM-R scales, the results were as expected for the most part. A moderate positive correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Passing and Covering Scales ($r = .43$, $p = .00$). The analysis showed a moderate negative correlation between the Passing Scale and the Implicitly Out Scale ($r = -.47$, $p = .00$), and the Explicitly Out Scale ($r = -.29$, $p = .02$). Similarly, large negative correlations existed between the Covering Scale and Implicitly Out Scale ($r = -.60$, $p = .00$) and Explicitly Out Scale ($r = -.78$, $p = .00$). Though I expected that both the Passing and Covering Scales would be negatively correlated with both the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales, I hypothesized that the correlations between the Passing Scale and both the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales would be stronger than the correlations between the Covering Scale and both the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales. Instead, the results indicate that the Covering Scale was more negatively correlated to both the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales than was the Passing Scale. I also hypothesized that the Passing Scale would be more negatively correlated to the Explicitly Out Scale than it to the Implicitly Out Scale, as the Explicitly Out Scale is furthest from the Passing Scale on the continuum of strategies. Contrary to this expected result, the negative correlation between the Passing Scale and the Implicitly
Out Scale was stronger than the correlation between the Passing Scale and the Explicitly Out Scale. As expected, the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out scales had a moderate positive correlation ($r = .48, p = .00$).

In examining correlations between the four WSIMM-R scales and the three IMS-R scales, the results were as expected for the most part. As expected, large positive correlations were found between the WSIMM-R Passing Scale and the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale ($r = .71, p = .00$), and the WSIMM-R Covering Scale and Counterfeiting Scale ($r = .64, p = .00$). Also as expected, a moderate positive correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Passing Scale and the IMS-R Avoiding Scale ($r = .39, p = .00$), while a large positive correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Covering Scale and the IMS-R Avoiding Scale ($r = .60, p = .00$). As expected theoretically, a moderate negative correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Passing Scale and the IMS-R Integrating Scale ($r = -.42, p = .00$). Contrary to the hypotheses, a larger negative correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Covering Scale and IMS-R Integrating Scale ($r = -.86, p = .00$) than between the WSIMM-R Passing Scale and the IMS-R Integrating Scale. As theoretically expected, a large negative correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Implicitly Out Scale and the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale ($r = -.57, p = .00$), and a moderate negative correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Explicitly Out Scale and IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale ($r = -.44, p = .00$). A moderate negative correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Implicitly Out Scale and the IMS-R
Avoiding Scale \((r = -.44 \ p = .00)\), while a large negative correlation was found between the WSIMM-R Explicitly Out Scale and the IMS-R Avoiding Scale \((r = -.56, p = .00)\). As expected, large positive correlations were found between the WSIMM-R Implicitly Out Scale and the IMS-R Integrating Scale \((r = .66, p = .00)\) and the WSIMM-R Explicitly Out Scale and the IMS-R Integrating Scale \((r = .89, p = .00)\).

I also correlated WSIMM-R scores with the single items assessing: a) level of disclosure of sexual orientation at work, and b) satisfaction with degree of disclosure. These correlation coefficients are included in Table 1. I found statistically significant correlations between participants' responses to the single item regarding level of disclosure at work and their scores on the WSIMM-R scales. Higher scores on the disclosure at work item indicated a greater degree of “outness” to others at work. The disclosure at work item was moderately, negatively correlated with the Passing Scale \((r = -.25, p = .04)\), and highly negatively correlated with the Covering Scale \((r = -.77, p = .00)\). The disclosure at work item was moderately, positively correlated with the Implicitly Out Scale \((r = .46, p = .00)\), and highly positively correlated to the Explicitly Out Scale, \((r = .82, p = .00)\). I also found statistically significant correlations between participants' responses to the single item regarding their satisfaction with this degree of disclosure of their sexual identity and their scores on the WSIMM-R scales. Satisfaction with degree of disclosure was highly negatively correlated with the Covering Scale \((r = -.58, p = .00)\), and moderately positively correlated with the Implicitly Out Scale \((r = .28, p = .03)\), and highly positively
correlated with the Explicitly Out Scale ($r = .56, p = .00$). Examining the association between satisfaction with degree of disclosure and the Passing Scale yielded a nonsignificant result.

Another assessment of validity for the WSIMM-R was the examination of participants' ranking of the descriptions of the four identity management strategies (Passing, Covering, Implicitly Out, and Explicitly Out) related to which strategy is most self-descriptive. Participants' ranking of the four identity management strategies was recoded into a categorical variable (i.e., GroupID) with three categories (i.e., Passing/Covering, Implicitly Out, and Explicitly Out). Using WSIMM-R scale mean scores as the dependent variables and GroupID as the independent variable, I conducted a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to assess whether there were differences between group means of participants who identified Passing/Covering, Implicitly Out, or Explicitly Out as the identity management strategy that was most self-descriptive. The MANOVA yielded a statistically significant main effect ($Pillai's \text{ Trace} (10, 114) = 12.40, p = .00, \eta^2_p = .52$). The mean and standard deviation for each group in these analyses are listed in Table 2.

The follow-up ANOVAs results are listed in Table 3. These follow-up ANOVAs indicate that statistically significant group mean differences existed for the Passing Scale, $F(2, 61) = 4.37, p = .0, \eta^2_p = .13$; the Covering Scale, $F(2, 61) = 38.83, p = .0, \eta^2_p = .56$; the Implicitly Out Scale, $F(2, 61) = 17.72, p = .0, \eta^2_p = .37$; and the Explicitly Out Scale, $F(2, 61) = 94.52, p = .0, \eta^2_p = .76$.

The post hoc comparisons using Bonferroni's statistics are listed in Table 4.
and are consistent with the expected direction of relation. These post hoc comparisons indicate that statistically significant differences existed for the Passing Scale between the passing/covering group \((M = 1.54, SD = .61)\) and the explicitly out group \((M = 1.14, SD = .20)\). Statistically significant differences were also founds for the Covering Scale between the passing/covering group \((M = 3.07, SD = .75)\) and the implicitly out group \((M = 2.11, SD = .66)\) and the explicitly out group \((M = 1.28, SD = .26)\). Statistically significant differences were also founds for the Implicitly Out Scale between the passing/covering group \((M = 2.64, SD = 1.06)\) and the implicitly out group \((M = 4.09, SD = .81)\), and between the passing/covering group and the explicitly out group \((M = 4.26, SD = .72)\). Statistically significant differences on the Explicitly Out Scale were found between the passing/covering group \((M = 1.05, SD = .08)\) and the implicitly out group \((M = 2.16, SD = .96)\) and the passing/covering group \((M = 4.65, SD = .82)\).

Demographic Variables and Identity Management Strategies

Because I predicted that participants' WSIMM-R scale scores would differ related to a number of personal and career demographic variables, I conducted MANOVAs to test for these differences. I conducted eleven separate MANOVAs using WSIMM-R scale mean scores as the dependent variables and one of the following demographic variables as the independent variable in each MANOVA: sexual orientation, how long participants have identified with their minority sexual identity, race/ethnicity, relationship status, geographic region, level taught, school type, district type, how many other LGB teachers participants knew, how long
participants have been teaching, and how long participants have been in their current teaching position. These MANOVA results are listed in Table 5. Only one statistically significant main effect was found. A statistically significant main effect was found for district type (i.e., rural, suburban, urban) Pillai's Trace $(8, 94) = 2.14, p = .04, \eta_p^2 = .15$. Follow-up ANOVAs were conducted, as well as post hoc comparisons. The follow-up ANOVA results are listed in Table 6 and indicate statistically significant group mean differences existed for the Covering Scale, $F(2, 61) = 5.87, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .19$; the Implicitly Out Scale, $F(2, 61) = 4.00, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .14$; and the Explicitly Out Scale, $F(2, 61) = 3.75, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .13$. The means and standard deviations for each group in this analysis are included in Table 7, and post hoc comparisons with Bonferroni's statistics are listed in Table 8. These post hoc comparisons indicate that statistically significant differences existed for the Covering Scale between those who taught in suburban districts ($M = 2.69, SD = .94$) those who taught in rural districts ($M = 1.88, SD = .66$) and urban districts ($M = 1.9, SD = .73$). Thus, participants who taught in suburban school districts reported using covering strategies more than those who taught in rural school districts. The post hoc comparisons also indicate that statistically significant differences existed for the Implicitly Out Scale between those who taught in rural districts ($M = 4.41, SD = .70$) and those who taught in suburban districts ($M = 3.24, SD = 1.14$). Thus, participants who taught in rural school districts reported using Implicitly Out strategies more than those who taught in suburban school districts. Finally, the post hoc comparisons indicate that statistically significant differences existed for the Explicitly Out Scale between participants who taught in
urban districts ($M = 4.41, SD = .70$) and those who taught in suburban districts ($M = 1.73, SD = 1.21$). Thus, participants who taught in urban school districts reported using explicitly out strategies more than those who taught in suburban school districts.

Perception of Barriers, Coping Efficacy, and Identity Management

A secondary purpose of the current study was to explore the association among participants' perceptions of barriers (as measured by the PBOSIMS) related to using identity strategies toward the more disclosive end of the continuum, their coping efficacy (CBOSIMS) related to these barriers, and which identity management strategy they utilize most often at work (WSIMM-R and IMS-R scale scores). To examine relations between the PBOSIMS and CBOISMS, and between each of these measures and the WSIMM-R scales, I examined two-tailed Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients. The results of these correlations are included in Table 1. Despite finding no significant association between the PBOSIMS and WSIMM-R scales or the IMS-R measure scores, significant associations were found between the CBOSIMS and two of the WSIMM-R scales and two of the IMS-R scales. The CBOSIMS was moderately negatively correlated with the WSIMM-R Covering Scale ($r = -.43, p = .001$) and moderately positively correlated with the Explicitly Out Scale ($r = .49, p = .000$). Similarly, a moderate negative correlation was found between the CBOSIMS and the IMS-R Avoiding Scale ($r = -.28, p = .05$), and a moderate positive correlation was found between the CBOSIMS and the IMS-R Integrating Scale ($r = .47, p = .00$). As predicted, participants who implement less out identity
management strategies (i.e., higher scores on the WSIMM-R Covering or IMS-R Avoiding scales) reported lower levels of coping efficacy (i.e., lower scores on the CBOSIMS), and participants who implement more out identity management strategies (i.e., higher scores on the WSIMM-R Explicitly Out and IMS-R Integrating scales) reported higher levels of coping efficacy (i.e., higher scores on the CBOSIMS).

I also examined whether participants' PBOSIMS scores differed related to personal and career demographic variables, and whether their CBOSIMS scores differed related on these variables. I conducted individual ANOVA's using the PBOSIMS as the dependent variable and the demographic items as independent variables in each ANOVA, and then did the same for the CBOSIMS. The results of the ANOVAs for the PBOSIMS are listed in Table 9. Only one statistically significant result was found in the ANOVAs conducted to examine the scores on the PBOSIMS and the personal and career demographic variables. Statistically significant differences in PBOSIMS scores and the variable of participants' knowing other LGB teachers, \( F(2, 64) = 4.55, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .13 \). Post hoc comparisons with Bonferroni's statistics are listed in Table 10. These post hoc comparisons indicate that statistically significant differences existed between those who knew other LGB teachers in their buildings (\( M = 2.61, SD = .78 \)) and those who knew other LGB teachers but not in their district (\( M = 3.51, SD = .58 \)). Thus, participants who knew other LGB teachers in their building reported that they perceived fewer barriers to using implicitly out or explicitly out identity management strategies than those who only knew other LGB
teachers who did not teach in the same school district as the participants. No statistically significant differences were found between those who knew other LGB teachers in their district ($M = 2.78$, $SD = .68$) and those who knew others in their building or others who knew others not in the same district.

The results of the ANOVAs for the CBOSIMS are listed in Table 11. No statistically significant differences were found for CBOSIMS scores across any of the personal and career demographic variables examined.

The data do not support the hypothesized mediated relationship between perception of barriers, coping efficacy, and identity management strategies because the relationship between PBOSIMS and WSIMM-R scales is nonsignificant (see Table 1).
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the implications of the results of the primary and secondary analyses presented in the previous chapter and suggestions for future research. The first section discusses the limitations to the current study. The second section discusses the implications of the psychometric evaluation of the WSIMM-R, including suggestions for revising the measure. The third section highlights participants' feedback regarding various aspects of their sexual identity management. The fourth section compares two aspects of the current findings from those reported in past research of LGB teachers. The next section discusses the exploration of a portion of the WSIM model through examining potential person input and proximal contextual factors that might influence the identity management process for the LGB teachers in this study. The sixth section discusses another exploratory portion of the study that looked at perceived barriers and coping efficacy related to using implicitly out and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies.

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation of the present study was the small sample size of only 64 participants. Due to the difficulty accessing LGB teachers and the minimal response rate to the online survey, I was unable to conduct the intended factor analysis of the WSIMM-R. The small sample size and nature of the sample also led to small cell sizes in conducting some of the analyses comparing group means based on particular variables. The difficulty accessing a wider range of teachers also limited the
diversity of the sample (i.e., almost 87% of participants were Caucasian) and proximal contextual influences (i.e., only 5 participants taught in private schools and only 1 taught in a parochial school).

Another limitation related to the difficulty accessing LGB teachers was that in order to be invited to participate in the study, the teachers either needed to have self-disclosed their sexual identity to the initial contact individuals or had to have some association to an LGB identified teacher organization or community center. This limitation may have contributed to the nature of this sample being fairly open regarding their sexual identity and may have limited the generalizability of the results to LGB teachers. The nature of the sample representing use of identity management strategies toward the revealing end of the continuum more so than the concealing end of the continuum, might have affected many aspects of the current study, such as: the low variance on the WSIMM-R Passing Scale, how the WSIMM-R scales performed overall, findings related to person inputs and proximal contextual influences, and how the PBOSIMS and CBOSIMS performed in this initial examination.

Another limitation of the current study was that the WSIMM-R, IMS-R, PBOSIMS, and CBOSIMS are all self-report measures. Though the self-report format allows researchers to assess phenomena that might be rather difficult to measure (i.e., one’s perception of barriers or degree of coping efficacy), the format also has several disadvantages that might have affected the findings in the current study. For example, self-report measures are vulnerable to distortions by respondents, such as (a) responding in a manner that attempts to confirm or disconfirm what they assume the
hypothesis to be, or that makes their behavior or thinking appear more socially
desirable (Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 1999); (b) respondents’ tendencies to
respond to items in similar ways, toward the same end of the response continuum; (c)
individual interpretation of the described concept or behavior; and (d) assessment of
past behaviors or cognitions or attitudes. Another limitation of self-report measures
that could affect the interpretation of the current results is that self-report of behavior
is limited to the perception of the respondent and does not account for whether this
behavior is perceivable by others and how it might be understood. Thus, participants
in this study could have reported using particular sexual identity management
strategies and made sense of how they believed others interpreted this information;
however, their colleagues might not have noticed the behavior or made sense of it in
the way the participants’ expected. For example, a lesbian teacher might have
reported using the explicitly out strategy of displaying a triangular rainbow bumper
sticker, believing that this is a clear symbol of her lesbian identity. Her work
colleagues might not be aware of the nature of this symbol, and, therefore, do not
interpret the bumper sticker in any way as a statement of her sexual orientation.

Evaluation of WSIMM-R and Suggestions for Revisions

As stated in the first chapter, workplace sexual identity management is a
complex process that warrants further consideration. Much of the literature on LGB
vocational research has lacked a clear conceptualization of the process of workplace
sexual identity management for LGB workers and has lacked adequate tools to assess
the various aspects of this process. The WSIMM-R provides significant
advancements in this field of study and should be considered for use in future research. The measure has a theoretical basis that stems from past qualitative research and operationalizes Griffin's (1992) categorization of identity management strategies. Anderson et al.'s (2001) examination of the measure indicated problematic scales and items and emphasized the need for further psychometric evaluation of the measure.

Though one of the primary purposes of this study was to obtain further validation for the WSIMM-R, this goal was adversely affected by the sample size. I was unable to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis to validate the theoretical four factor model that Anderson et al. (2001) were unable to adequately examine in their initial evaluation of the measure with their sample of predominantly implicitly and explicitly out student affairs professional. I was able to conduct some further assessment of the measure. This assessment indicates that the Passing Scale and Implicitly Out Scale are still problematic and that various aspects of the measure might be improved through revision. The remainder of this section provides details related to problems with the WSIMM-R measure and suggestions for improving the measure. Specifically, the subsection discuss the Passing Scale, the Implicitly Out Scale, the fit between the WSIMM-R scales and the proposed strategies, ways to improve the administration of the WSIMM-R, and a limitation of the current measure related to use with bisexual individuals.

Passing Scale

The current assessment of reliability of the WSIMM-R scale indicates that at least three of the proposed scales (Covering, Implicitly Out, and Explicitly Out) have
acceptable reliability estimates; however, the Passing Scale remains problematic with a coefficient alpha of .59. Despite the nearly acceptable coefficient alpha, the inter-item correlations indicate that the items in the Passing Scale did not perform well together in assessing a construct of a passing identity management strategy in the current study. Though it is not clear exactly why the Passing Scale did not perform well in this study, several factors may underlie the problems associated with this scale. First, the low inter-item correlations indicate that the items in this scale are not related closely enough to assess the proposed construct. Second, similar to findings in Anderson et al. (2001), the majority of Passing items yielded extremely minimal response variance in the current study. Furthermore, item distributions for these items revealed that more than 90% of participants responded ‘never’ to 5 of the Passing items (items 6, 7, 12, 26, 29). Though this lack of variance in responses is consistent with the low number of participants who identified the passing strategy as most self-descriptive ($n = 3, 5\%$), it is not clear whether the poor performance of the Passing Scale is fully accounted for by the low variance in participant responses.

One possible way to improve the WSIMM-R is to revise the problematic Passing Scale. This might be achieved through a number of revisions that are explicated in the next few paragraphs. The first suggestion for revising the Passing Scale is rewording several items in the scale. The wording of several items in the WSIMM-R Passing Scale seems problematic in that participants may perceive their connotation to be too negative to endorse. These items are worded in such a way that participants who do actually implement the strategy would have to acknowledge
engaging in behaviors that they may perceive as socially undesirable (i.e., making up stories, saying negative things about LGB individuals or issues, telling demeaning gay jokes, and discussing being attracted to members of the opposite sex though they do not feel such attractions). Future revisions of the WSIMM-R Passing scale items should incorporate wording that is less negative in connotation, thus less likely to be confounded by participants' tendency to avoid endorsing those strategies that may sound socially undesirable. For example, using Button's wording from the IMS-R (i.e., To appear heterosexual, I sometimes talk about fictional dates with members of the opposite sex) rather than wording from the WSIMM-R (i.e., Make up stories about romantic partners of opposite sex).

Improving the WSIMM-R Passing Scale may also be achieved through further consideration of how the items of the measure are scored. The WSIMM-R asks participants to indicate how frequently they engage in each of the identity management strategies, using a Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = frequently, 5 = almost always, 6 = always). In comparison, the IMS-R asks participants to indicate to what extent they agree that they use a particular identity management behavior, using a Likert-type scale (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = uncertain, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). Overall, on the WSIMM-R there were four ways to acknowledge using each identity management behavior, with three choices that indicate using it much of the time (frequently, almost always, always); and there was only one response choice to indicate not using the particular identity management behavior. In
contrast, on the IMS-R, there were three response choices indicating not using a strategy or using it infrequently and an equal number of ways to endorse more frequent use of the strategy. One way that the issue of how items on the WSIMM-R are scored might affect the overall effectiveness of the measure can be seen in a comparison of the Passing Scale and the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale.

In the current study, the WSIMM-R Passing Scale and the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale performed rather differently, though the behaviors described in items of both scales were quite similar. The Passing Scale of the WSIMM-R yielded an estimate of reliability that was only close to acceptable (.59), while the Counterfeiting Scale of the IMS-R yielded an acceptable estimate of reliability (.77). One possible explanation for the difference in how these two scales performed can be associated with the way the items in each scale were scored as previously described. Thus, the restricted range of responses to the WSIMM-R Passing Scale items was likely affected by the fact that participants had only one response choice to indicate that they do not use that particular identity management behavior (i.e., 1 = never). Whereas, with the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale, participants had several response choices to indicate that they don't use that particular identity management behavior (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, and 3 = slightly disagree). Possible suggestions for revising the scoring anchors are discussed later in this chapter.

To obtain further validation of the WSIMM-R, it should be evaluated with another sample. With the current sample and that in Anderson et al.’s (2001) study, it is difficult to completely determine whether the Passing Scale’s poor performance is
primarily due to problematic items or simply due to the nature of the samples. More than 76% of the current sample self-identified as either Implicitly Out or Explicitly Out, while more than 93% of those in Anderson et al.'s sample of student affairs professionals self-identified as either Implicitly Out or Explicitly Out. Thus, it is difficult to determine whether the Passing Scale items might perform differently in assessing a passing identity management strategy if the sample were more diverse, particularly including individuals across various occupations that may be more inclusive of individuals that use identity management strategies on the concealing end of the continuum as well as the revealing end of the continuum. In order to further develop the WSIMM-R as a measure that can assess the full spectrum of identity management strategies, researchers need to carefully consider ways of accessing participants who primarily utilize passing strategies due to the intended invisibility of this group.

Implicitly Out Scale

The revised Implicitly Out Scale performed better with the sample in the current study than the original version did in Anderson et al.'s (2001) initial assessment of the WSIMM. As noted previously, three of the Implicitly Out Scale items (items 8, 11, 30) were revised for use in the current study. Anderson et al. found these three items to be moderately correlated with each other but not correlated with other items in the scale. In the current study, the revised items were each moderately correlated with at least three of the other 6 items in the scale. Changing the wording of these three items seemed to have improved the way the items worked together to
assess an implicitly out strategy. Despite this improvement and the coefficient alpha of .75 for the Implicitly Out Scale with the current sample, the inter-item correlations indicate that the items are not as strongly associated as would be desirable.

Specifically, item 3 (Talk about activities that include a same-sex partner or date, but do not identify the kind of relationship I have with that person. That way, people can assume whatever they want.) is negatively correlated with two of the other items in this scale. This item may be improved by rewording it to make it clearer that it refers to discussing a same-sex partner or date without labeling the relationship as a romantic relationship (i.e., Talk about activities I do with a same-sex partner or date, but do not label the relationship as a romantic one. That way, people can assume whatever they want.).

*The Fit Between WSIMM-R Scales and Theorized Strategies Assessed*

The assessment of the WSIMM-R’s validity with the current sample indicates that the WSIMM-R scales do measure several different identity management strategies. The correlations between WSIMM-R scales and with IMS-R scales were in the expected direction and of the expected magnitude for the most part. There are several observations about these correlations worth noting. First, although both the Passing Scale and Covering Scale were both moderately negatively correlated with the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales, the magnitude of these correlations differed in somewhat unexpected ways. The Covering Scale was more negatively correlated with both the Implicitly and Explicitly Out Scales than was the Passing scale was. This finding is not consistent with the theoretical continuum of identity.
management strategies that would yield stronger negative correlations between the Passing Scale and each of the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales, than between the Covering Scale and each of the Implicitly Out and Explicitly Out Scales. It is important to note that this difference in these correlations is most likely attributed to the restricted variance for the Passing items and the poor performance of the Passing Scale. Second, the WSIMM-R Passing Scale yielded a large positive correlation with the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale, as expected, and a moderate positive correlation with the IMS-R Avoiding Scale. Similarly the WSIMM-R Covering Scale yielded a large positive correlation with the IMS-R Counterfeiting Scale, but also a large positive correlation with the IMS-R Avoiding Scale. This pattern seems to indicate that the Covering Scale does not differentiate between counterfeiting and avoiding strategies.

Anderson et al. (2001) reported that the WSIMM successfully assessed a continuum of identity management strategies, particularly the Covering and Explicitly Out strategies. Similarly, the current study provides further evidence that these two scales seem to perform well and that the Passing and Implicitly Out Scales remain problematic, though improved. It may be more consistent with the findings of the current study and Anderson et al.'s study of student affairs professionals to further explore the idea that there may actually be two general sexual identity management strategies, concealing and revealing, rather than the theorized four strategies. However, without being able to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis, it is important to note that this possible interpretation of the WSIMM-R scales should be considered cautiously.
Future assessment of the WSIMM-R should explore the possibilities of the four factor model (i.e., passing, covering, implicitly out, explicitly out as proposed by Anderson et al., 2001), a three factor model (i.e., passing/covering, implicitly out, explicitly out as found by Anderson et al., 2001), a two factor model as suggested in the current discussion (i.e., concealing and revealing), and a one factor model that incorporates the idea that identity management strategies are all within a single continuum without subcategories.

Suggestions to Improve the Administration of the WSIMM-R

One possible revision of the WSIMM-R would be to rewrite the introduction/instructions. The WSIMM-R instructions ask participants to read descriptions of strategies that LGB individuals might use in the workplace to manage their sexual identities and then rate how often they might use these strategies. It seems that some participants perceived that there was a negative connotation implied by acknowledging that they manage their sexual identities. Several participants commented on their surveys by explaining or defending why they “manage” their sexual identity in the workplace. They stated that they “had” to manage their sexual identity to prevent losing their jobs or being “burned at the stake.” Others commented that they used to use the strategies in the measure to manage their identity but now they do not. These written comments suggest that future researchers might want to consider how participants might interpret the concept of identity management as presented. The instructions were intended to indicate that all LGB individuals manage their sexual identities in the workplace, and not to imply that doing so is considered
negative or wrong or that “managing” your identity only means using passing/covering strategies. It may be helpful to make it more clear in future administrations of the WSIMM-R that the measure does not imply that managing one’s sexual identity is a negative thing, nor that there is a better way to manage one’s sexual identity.

As introduced earlier in this chapter, further development of the WSIMM-R should include an examination of how items are scored. One aspect of this examination might include whether scoring anchors should ask respondents to indicate how often they use particular identity management strategies as the WSIMM-R does, or to indicate how much they agree or disagree with the statement of the strategy, as in the IMS-R. Though the IMS-R scoring anchors allow respondents to imply that they do not use a particular strategy by choosing several different responses, it is important to note that the anchors do not provide clear information related to the respondents’ use of the strategy. For example, a respondent could choose slightly disagree in response to an item, yet according to the instructions this simply indicates the degree to which the respondent agrees with the statement (i.e., In order to keep my personal life private, I refrain from “mixing business with pleasure”) without a clear statement of the respondent’s use of the strategy. If researchers decide to keep the WSIMM-R scoring anchors as indices of how often respondents use particular strategies, they may also want to consider providing clearer descriptions of the anchors (i.e., rarely = 1 to 2 times per year, etc.) to ensure greater consistency in how participants interpret the response choices.
In considering the way the WSIMM-R asks participants to rate how often they use each strategy, it is also important to take into account feedback provided by participants in the current study. Several participants highlighted the difficulty they had identifying the frequency with which they use particular strategies in general, because they might use them with some people or in certain roles but not others. At least one participant commented that s/he used to use particular strategies but no longer does so. This feedback seems important in that the WSIMM-R does not explicitly acknowledge that LGB individuals might use different strategies based on the various roles and relationships the individuals have within their workplace or that the process is ongoing and changing. Perhaps the measure could be revised to allow respondents to indicate their use of particular sexual identity management strategies with various others in their work setting (i.e., with colleagues, with administrators or supervisors, with clients or students, etc.). Also, allowing participants to indicate whether they have used the strategies in the past, currently use the strategies, or anticipate that they might use the strategies in the future might provide important information related to understanding the sexual identity management process.

Another possible revision for the WSIMM-R is to explore other identity management strategies not included in the current version of the measure. Some participants in the current study responded to the open-ended question asking them to list any other behaviors that they would consider ways of managing their sexual identity at work. If the WSIMM-R is revised by adding additional strategies or replacing problematic ones, several of these responses should be considered.
Specifically, flirting with members of opposite sex, participating in or supporting a workplace-related LGB group (i.e., teacher advising GSA), and living in different community from work setting are three suggested strategies that could be added as items.

_Limitation of the WSIMM-R with Bisexual Individuals_

Another suggestion for further development of the WSIMM-R would be to consider its effectiveness in assessing workplace sexual identity management strategies of bisexual individuals. The conceptual model that underlies how sexual identity management strategies are measured by the WSIMM-R focuses on the experiences of lesbian women and gay men, and not bisexual individuals. Thus, the strategies listed in the WSIMM-R may not capture the experiences of bisexual individuals. In the current study, WSIMM items were revised to include bisexual individuals by substituting "lesbian/gay/bisexual" in items where "lesbian or gay" was previously used. Simply altering the wording of items to include bisexual individuals may not be an effective way to obtain an accurate picture of how the sexual identity management process may work for these participants.

The current sample contained only four bisexual participants, thus producing little feedback about how their identity management process might differ or be similar to that of lesbian and gay participants. The open-ended question regarding whether there were items that were difficult to answer for bisexual participants or that did not capture their experiences yielded few responses. Several respondents stated that they had difficulty responding to questions about same-sex date or partners because they
were not currently or had not been in a same-sex relationship since they began teaching. One participant who self-identified as bisexual skipped several WSIMM-R items that contain references to a same-sex partner or date. Future revisions to the WSIMM-R might include additional instructions for bisexual individuals that allow them to respond to items in a way that fits their experience whether they are currently dating or in a same-sex or opposite sex relationship. For example, respondents might be provided multiple sets of anchors for each item, one that relates to their use of the strategy when they are in a same-sex relationship and one that relates to their use of the strategy when they are not in a relationship or dating. This suggestion may prove to be too cumbersome in assessing the sexual identity management process for bisexual individuals. Instead, further research related to the identity management process for bisexual individuals needs to be conducted before the WSIMM-R measure can be revised to capture the experiences of bisexual individuals in meaningful ways.

In summary, the current psychometric evaluation of the WSIMM-R suggests that it does assess different workplace sexual identity management strategies and is need of further evaluation and development. The preceding suggestions might improve the overall effectiveness of the measure and its utility in future research.

Workplace Sexual Identity Management of LGB Teachers

One of the goals of the study was to expand previous research related to the workplace sexual identity management of LGB teachers. Beyond the previously discussed findings about how the LGB teachers in the current study manage their
sexual identities at work, it is important to highlight several results as they relate to previous research. Woods and Harbeck (1992) and Griffin (1992) described how teachers in their studies expressed feeling frustrated or ashamed that in order to protect themselves from being seen as LGB they would not reach out to LGB students or would not respond to anti-gay remarks in school. Several teachers in the current study commented that they feel empowered to confront anti-gay remarks without necessarily giving any indication that it applied to them directly as an LGB person. Similarly, several commented that they serve as the Gay Student Alliance (GSA) advisor or serve on an antidiscrimination committee in their schools, thus openly acknowledge their support of LGB students and issues.

One reason the current study focused on LGB teachers was to hopefully gain important validation of the WSIMM-R by administering the measure with a population that has traditionally been described as using more concealing identity management strategies. Based on how LGB teachers had reported their degree of openness in previous research, it was somewhat surprising that 76% of the current sample identified Implicitly Out or Explicitly Out strategies as most self-descriptive and that a number of participants described being completely open about their identity and that others were fine with this.

Similarly, it was surprising that fear of job loss related to being LGB was not as prevalent for the current sample as in past research with LGB teachers. Past studies (Griffin, 1992; Khayatt, 1992; Litton, 2001; Olson, 1997; Woods & Harbeck, 1992) report a primary fear of LGB teachers is that they will lose their job if their identity is
known. In responding to PBOSIMS items about perceived barriers related to open sexual identity management, nearly 70% of the current sample endorsed that they did not perceive that they would lose their job if they were known to be LGB. This finding indicates that the current sample of LGB teachers report less fear about the potential of losing their teaching job if known to be LGB than that described in the previous studies reviewed. This difference might be related to the length of how time these teachers have been in their careers. Seventy-three percent of the teachers in the present sample reported having been teaching for over 11 years and almost half of them (46%) have been in their current teaching position for 11 or more years. The number of years in their career and/or current teaching position might have affected their perception of whether they would lose their job related to being LGB. It is possible that they may have achieved a sense of job security because they have been tenured or because they have not experienced a threat to their job yet. Perhaps because so many of these teachers identified implicitly out and explicitly out management strategies as being most self-descriptive, they might not perceive a threat of job loss because they already believe many in their work setting know that they are LGB and have not lost their job. Another potential factor that might have influenced the current sample to fear a threat of job loss less than those in previous teacher studies could be actual or perceived changes in school climate related to LGB issues. For example, since many of the previous teacher studies were conducted, GSAs have become more prevalent and diversity issues have become the focus of many teacher inservice trainings throughout schools districts across the nation. However, there is no way to
conclude what this finding related to participants’ perception of the threat of job loss related to being LGB means based on the current data. It is important to note that despite these possible influences, 30% of the current sample still reported that they either were uncertain about whether the threat of job loss related to being known as LGB existed or clear that the threat existed. Thus, the threat of job loss still seems to be an important factor in further exploring the identity management process for LGB teachers.

In addition to the findings previously discussed, participants also provided feedback about the WSIMM-R by commenting in the margins on the paper-pencil surveys and responding to the open-ended questions at the end of the WSIMM-R. Several participants commented that they were more open about their sexual identity with colleagues and administrators than with their students or students’ parents. This supports the conceptualization of the identity management process as defined in the first chapter of this paper and the conceptualized role of proximal contextual influences in Lidderdale et al.’s (in press) WSIM model. It also leads to the need for further exploration of the salience of different perceived barriers (i.e., consequences of being perceived as LGB by students and their parents vs. by colleagues and administrators).

Also in their comments in the margins of the survey and in their response to the open-ended questions at the end of the WSIMM-R, several participants commented that they do not perceive their sexual identity to be a significant enough part of their overall identity to really see how it relates to their work experiences or
workplace relationships. Also, several participants commented that they are quite private and do not share their personal lives, or that they do not care for the people at work enough to share anything with them. These comments raise important issues about the complexity of measuring sexual identity management. For example, the concept of workplace sexual identity management assumes that sexual orientation is an important aspect of one’s identity (Lidderdale et al., in press). The participant comments might indicate that for some individuals, other aspects of identity are prevalent enough for them that sexual orientation and how they manage information related to it are not in the forefront of their daily experiences. It is also possible that some of the participants who do not see their sexual identities as significant enough aspects of themselves to really pay attention to how they manage these identities have become so used to compartmentalizing their lives as a way to prevent potential discrimination that they are not conscious of the daily decisions they make about revealing and concealing their identities. Another issue related to the complexity of measuring sexual identity management is that individuals’ personalities and ways of interacting in the world may also play a role in the identity management process, or even supersede it. It is possible that some LGB individuals have learned to be private about their lives due to the discrimination they anticipate if they openly share aspects of their sexual identity with others. But it is also possible that personality traits, such as being very private, might make sexual identity management decisions almost mute. There are doubtless other ways to make sense of the participant comments and other issues worth exploring related to sexual orientation and identity management.
Unfortunately, the purpose, methodology, and results of the current study cannot address these issues adequately, though they remain important considerations for future research.

The WSIM Model

A secondary purpose of the current study was to explore and expand Lidderdale et al.'s (in press) WSIM model. Specifically, the current study attempted to gain greater understanding of the role of person inputs and proximal contextual factors in LGB individuals' decisions regarding general identity management strategies. According to the WSIM model, person inputs and proximal contextual factors influence LGB individuals' learning experiences about LGB people and issues and how they manage their sexual identities.

The person inputs of participants' sexual orientation, how long they identified as LGB, and race/ethnicity were expected to be related to differences in how these LGB teachers manage their sexual identities in the workplace. Related to the person input of how long participants had identified LGB, no statistically significant differences were found. Similarly, no statistically significant differences were found related to participants' race/ethnicity. Though these findings might indicate that these person inputs examined do not have much effect on which identity management strategies participants in this study choose, the small cell sizes in these comparisons may account for the lack of statistically significant findings. Further exploration of the role of person inputs with another, more diverse sample might provide more evidence of the role these factors play in LGB individuals' workplace sexual identity.
management decisions.

The proximal contextual influences of participants' relationship status, how long teaching, how long in current teaching position, school district type, level taught, type of school, and region of the country were expected to be related to differences in how the LGB teachers manage their sexual identities in the workplace. Only one statistically significant group difference was found in this analysis and was based on the proximal contextual factor of school district type in which participants taught (i.e., rural, suburban, or urban). The finding indicates that the LGB teachers in the current sample who taught in suburban districts are more likely to use covering strategies than those in rural districts, less likely to use implicitly out strategies than those in rural districts, and less likely to use explicitly out strategies than those in urban districts. This finding serves as an example of a proximal contextual influences that falls within Lidderdale et al.'s (in press) identification of community context as one of five broad categories of proximal contextual influences that likely have salient impact on workplace sexual identity management. No statistically significant differences were found in looking at the proximal contextual influences of relationship status, how long participants had been teaching, how long participants were in their current teaching position, the level taught, the type of school, or region of the country. Though this lack of statistically significant differences might indicate that these proximal contextual influences are not associated with which identity management strategies the current sample use, these findings might also be affected by the small cell sizes used in the analyses.
Another exploratory portion of the current study was to examine LGB teachers’ perception of barriers and coping efficacy related to implicitly and explicitly out identity management strategies. Lent et al. (2002) proposed that within the Social Cognitive Career Theory, perceptions of barriers and coping efficacy might interact in various ways and influence how individuals translate their career goals and intentions into actual career related behaviors. Similarly, I expected that LGB teachers’ perception of barriers related to sexual identity management and coping efficacy would influence how they translate their personal range of acceptable identity management strategies into identity management intentions and behaviors. Specifically, I expected that perception of barriers would be negatively correlated with implicitly out and explicitly out identity management strategies, coping efficacy would be positively correlated with implicitly out and explicitly out strategies. I also expected that coping efficacy might serve as a mediator or moderator in the relations between perceived barriers and workplace sexual identity management strategy choices. Therefore, the current study explored possible relations between how participants’ manage their sexual identity at work and their perception of barriers and coping efficacy related to implicitly out and explicitly out strategies, and whether differences in perception of barriers or coping efficacy were related to any of the person inputs or proximal contextual influences previously discussed.

No statistically significant associations between perception of barriers and identity management strategies were found; therefore, no further assessment of a
mediating or moderating effect of coping efficacy on this process was possible. Statistically significant correlations between coping efficacy and identity management were found. Specifically, participants who acknowledged implementing covering strategies endorsed less coping efficacy, while participants who acknowledged implementing explicitly out strategies endorsed more coping efficacy. This may support the theory that increased coping efficacy might influence participants to choose explicitly out identity management strategies, or the opposite in that implementing explicitly out strategies might affect LGB individuals’ perception of their coping efficacy.

Based on the WSIM model, it makes sense that person inputs and proximal contextual factors might influence LGB individuals’ perception of barriers and their coping efficacy. In looking at differences in participants’ perception of barriers and coping efficacy related to their personal and career demographics, only one significant result was found. The LGB teachers in this sample who know other LGB teachers in their building reported fewer perceptions of barriers than those who know other LGB teachers who are not in their school district. This fits with the WSIM model in that having potential role models or sources of vicarious learning within closer proximity, may affect the LGB teachers’ perceptions of barriers related to their sexual identity. They may be more likely to see how other LGB teachers manage their sexual identities at work and also have more direct knowledge of the reality of barriers versus the perception of potential barriers. In other words, these teachers may see that other LGB teachers in their building do not experience negative consequences related
to being known to be or perceived as LGB, thus the participants do not perceive the barrier to exist for themselves.

The lack of other statistically significant results related to perceived barriers and coping efficacy and the person inputs and proximal contextual influences examined might indicate that these factors do not affect participants’ perception of barriers or coping efficacy. Again, it is important to note that these results may be affected by the size and nature of the current sample, thus requiring further exploration in future research.

The PBOSIMS and CBOSIMS may be useful starting points in assessing the concepts of perceived barriers and coping efficacy related to workplace sexual identity management; however, both will require critical conceptual and psychometric examination. As written for the current study, the PBOSIMS and CBOSIMS contain wording specific to work experiences of LGB teachers. One significant revision of these measures may be to develop wording that will apply across various work settings so that they can be administered with LGB workers in general rather than requiring revision to fit each target population. Through continued examination of the PBOSIMS wording, it became clear that it might not effectively capture the intended construct. Specifically, the measure seems problematic as currently written in that items do not seem to directly assess perceived barriers to implicitly and explicitly out sexual identity management strategies as intended. Instead, the wording of PBOSIMS items may be more directly assessing perceived barriers to career advancement or stability related to being known to be LGB. To more effectively assess actual
perceived barriers to using implicitly or explicitly out identity management strategies, wording such as "I fear that if I openly acknowledge my LGB identity, I might lose my job" might be more accurate.

This initial exploration of perception of barriers and coping efficacy related to sexual identity management leads to further questions about the salience of perceived barrier and coping efficacy, whether either of the two concepts has a moderating or mediating effect on sexual identity management decisions, and how proximal contextual factors may relate to LGB individuals' perception of barriers and coping efficacy.

Further exploration of perceived barriers related to sexual identity management should include an explication of how this concept relates to the LGB career literature on workplace discrimination (i.e., Chung, 2001; Croteau, 1996; Levine & Leonard, 1984). For example, Chung's (2001) conceptual model of work discrimination includes three dimensions of discrimination that might be helpful in understanding various aspects of barriers to workplace sexual identity management. These dimensions of work discrimination (i.e., formal vs. informal, potential vs. encountered, and perceived vs. real) could serve as important distinctions in exploring the various roles that barriers might play in the workplace sexual identity management process.

Conclusion

The current study offers several important contributions to the existing literature on LGB workplace sexual identity development. First, the psychometric
evaluation of the WSIMM-R provides useful information regarding aspects of the measure that still appear to be problematic (i.e., the Passing Scale and Implicitly Out Scale). Another significant contribution of the current study is that the revisions made to three Implicitly Out Scale items improved the overall performance of this scale. The study also adds to the body of literature related to the workplace sexual identity management of LGB teachers in general, as well as by providing some initial support regarding workplace factors that might influence how these teachers manage their identities. Though producing little evidence to support the proposed WSIM model, the exploratory components of the study also contribute to the study of LGB workplace sexual identity management by providing further clarification as to just how complex the sexual identity management process is.

The most significant contributions of the current study lie in the questions it raises and the numerous avenues for future research it identifies. The study raises the question of whether the proposed categorization of sexual identity management strategies that underlies the WSIMM-R is really the best way to conceptualize and measure the sexual identity management process. The findings offer some support that instead of the strategies falling along four points on the identity management continuum as proposed by Griffin (1992), they may actually be divided between two general strategies and that there is a continuum within each category. Future research may be able to clarify whether these two general strategies of concealing and revealing and the potential continuum within each are validated by further empirical examination.
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The study also raises the question of the overall effectiveness of quantitative measures to assess the complexity of the workplace sexual identity management process. For example, the study highlights that: (a) the WSIMM-R currently cannot account for the fact that LGB individuals likely implement various strategies depending on the contexts of their work role and others involved; (b) the WSIMM-R may not be using adequate means to assess the frequency or degree to which participants implement particular identity management strategies; (c) the PBOSIMS and CBOSIMS cannot currently assess how the salience of perceived barriers and coping efficacy might interact in how they influence identity management decisions. Any of the proposed revisions of the WSIMM-R could contribute to further develop this measure and improve its effectiveness. Furthermore, researchers could advance the study of LGB workplace sexual identity management by further exploring any aspect of the WSIM model. The study also raises the question of how to assess sexual identity management of bisexual individuals. Researchers could focus attention on how bisexual individuals manage the sexual identity, and then make distinctions between how this process is similar to and varies from that of lesbian and gay individuals. The study also raises questions related to the potential complex relationships between individuals' sexual identity management, their identity development, and self-perception (i.e., pursuing a career in which many perceive that it is unsafe to be known as LGB might influence a gay teacher to perceive that his gay identity is not significant or that his maintenance of rigid personal boundaries might be his unconscious attempts to conceal his identity rather than a result of being a
private person). Researchers could consider using other measures with the WSIMM-R in order to assess identity development and personality to look at ways these constructs might interact.

As underscored throughout this discussion, the WSIMM-R should continue to be used and further developed as it serves as an instrumental tool in advancing the study of LGB workplace issues.
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Appendix A

Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure

Following are a variety of strategies a lesbian, gay, or bisexual person might use in the workplace to manage his or her sexual identity. Please rate how often you use these strategies in your current workplace by circling the appropriate response for each item.

If you identify as bisexual, you might find some items more difficult to apply to yourself because this measure initially focused on gay and lesbian identity management only. The authors of this measure have a special interest in the ways that these questions do or do not fit for people who identify as bisexual. Therefore, there are two open-ended questions at the end of this measure where you can address what is missing in this measure for you or what makes items difficult to answer.

1. Use the appropriate gender pronoun or names to refer to my same-sex partner or date without labeling them as a partner or date. That way, if others are savvy, they can figure out that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.

   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

2. Omit names or pronouns when talking about a same-sex person I am dating or living with so that my sexual orientation is unclear.

   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

3. Talk about activities that include a same-sex partner or date, but do not identify the kind of relationship I have with that person. That way, people can assume whatever they want.

   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

4. Bring someone of the same sex to a work-related social function and introduce that person as my date or partner.

   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

5. Tell co-workers when I'm going to a lesbian/gay/bisexual identified location or event because I am open about my sexual orientation.

   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

6. Say negative things about gay and lesbian content in movies and television shows if I think that such comments will help convince coworkers that I am heterosexual.

   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always
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7. Make up stories about romantic partners of the opposite sex.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

8. Speak out against anti-lesbian/gay/bisexual discrimination by saying that all people should be treated equally, allowing others to assume whatever they want regarding my sexual orientation.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

9. Avoid contact with people known by others to be lesbian/gay/bisexual in order to prevent suspicions that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

10. Wear or display commonly known lesbian/gay/bisexual symbols (e.g., buttons, jewelry, T-shirts, bumper stickers) that reveal my sexual orientation to coworkers.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

11. Raise objections to gay jokes or homophobic slurs by pointing out that I consider such comments to be offensive, allowing others to conclude that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual if they want to.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

12. Bring someone of the other sex to a work-related social function and introduce that person as my date or partner.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

13. Avoid local lesbian/gay/bisexual identified social events or places so I do not risk revealing my sexual orientation to anyone at work.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

14. Am explicit that I am referring to someone of the same sex when I talk about romantic relationships and dating at work.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

15. Use names or pronouns of the other sex to refer to the same-sex person with whom I am dating or living.

Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Frequently  Almost Always  Always

16. Dress or behave in ways that are gender traditional so that others will think I am heterosexual.
17. Tell most or all of my coworkers that I am gay/lesbian/bisexual.

18. Attend work-related social events without a date or partner so that I do not reveal my sexual orientation.

19. Raise objections to gay jokes or homophobic slurs by telling others that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual and find that offensive.

20. Wear or display buttons or symbols known only to those familiar with the gay, lesbian, and bisexual culture.

21. Talk about activities that include a partner or date, labeling that person only as a friend so that I don’t appear lesbian/gay/bisexual.

22. Correct others when they make comments that imply I am heterosexual (e.g., they ask if I have been in a relationship with someone of the other sex) by explaining that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.

23. Wear or display materials with a heterosexual content (e.g., T-shirts, pictures, posters) in order to make me appear heterosexual.

24. Do not correct others when they make comments that imply I am heterosexual.

25. Openly associate with coworkers known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual, and let others think that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual too, if they want to.

26. Join others in telling demeaning gay jokes or saying negative things about lesbian/gay/bisexual individuals so that people will think I am heterosexual.
27. Avoid socializing with coworkers in order to conceal my sexual orientation.

28. Am active in trying to obtain access and treatment for me at my workplace (e.g., asking for insurance coverage for my same-sex partner, trying to get an antidiscrimination statement that is inclusive of sexual orientation, etc.).

29. Join in discussion with members of my own sex about being attracted to members of the other sex when I don't feel such heterosexual attractions.

30. React in positive ways when discussing television shows or movies with lesbian or gay themes (e.g., "Will and Grace", "The L Word", "Kissing Jessica Stein"), and let others think that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual too, if they want to.

31. Avoid associating myself with issues pertaining to sexual orientation in order to prevent suspicions that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.

32. Please describe any other behaviors you use that you would consider ways of managing your sexual identity at work.

33. If you identify as bisexual, were there items in this measure that were difficult to apply to your own experience or difficult to answer? Please identify which items didn't fit your experience or made it challenging to respond in a way that captured your experience and explain why.
Appendix B

Identity Management Strategies

The following items concern how lesbian/gay/bisexual individuals handle information related to their sexual orientation in the workplace. Some people are completely “closeted” (i.e., hide their lesbian/gay/bisexual identity), while others are completely “out” (i.e., have revealed their lesbian/gay/bisexual identity). Still others use a combination of approaches; they are open with some co-workers and closeted with others.

Please take a moment and consider how you currently handle information related to your sexual orientation during your daily work-related activities. Then read the following statements and indicate, using the 7-point scale below, how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Your answers should reflect how you conduct yourself, on average, across all of your co-workers. Finally, references to co-workers should be understood to include your supervisors, peers, and subordinates, as well as customers, clients, and other business associates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To appear heterosexual, I sometimes talk about fictional dates with members of the opposite sex. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I sometimes talk about opposite-sex relationships in my past, while I avoid mentioning more recent same-sex relationships. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I sometimes comment on, or display interest in, members of the opposite sex to give the impression that I am straight. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I have adjusted my level of participation in sports to appear heterosexual. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I make sure that I don’t behave the way people expect lesbian/gay/bisexual individuals to behave. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I sometimes laugh at “fag” or “dyke” jokes to fit in with my straight co-workers. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I avoid co-workers who frequently discuss sexual matters. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I avoid situations (e.g., long lunches, parties) where heterosexual co-workers are likely to ask me personal questions. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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9. I let people know that I find personal questions to be inappropriate so that I am not faced with them.

10. I avoid personal questions by never asking others about their personal lives.

11. In order to keep my personal life private, I refrain from "mixing business with pleasure."

12. I withdraw from conversations when the topic turns to things like dating or interpersonal relationships.

13. I let people think that I am a "loner" so that they won't question my apparent lack of a relationship.

14. In my daily activities, I am open about my sexual orientation whenever it comes up.

15. Most of my co-workers know that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.

16. Whenever I am asked about being lesbian/gay/bisexual, I always answer in an honest and matter-of-fact way.

17. It's okay for my lesbian/gay/bisexual friends to call me at work.

18. My co-workers know of my interest in lesbian/gay/bisexual issues.

19. I look for opportunities to tell my co-workers that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.

20. When a policy or law is discriminatory against lesbian/gay/bisexual individuals, I tell people what I think.

21. I let my coworkers know that I'm proud to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

22. I openly confront others when I hear a homophobic remark or joke.

23. I display objects (e.g., photographs, magazines, symbols) which suggest that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.
Appendix C

Perceived Barriers to Implicitly and Explicitly Out Sexual Identity
Management Strategies

As you read the following list of situations related to your work experiences, please indicate the degree to which you believe the statement to be true for you currently, in the past, or in the future, using the five point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In my career, I probably will be/have been/or am treated differently because of being known or perceived to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

2. In my career, I probably will/have experience (d) negative comments about my lesbian/gay/bisexual sexual orientation (such as insults or rude jokes).

3. In my career, I probably will lose/have lost my job because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

4. In my career, I probably will/have receive(d) negative review by my administrator because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

5. In my career, I probably will/have receive(d) negative teacher evaluations from students because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

6. In my career, I probably will lose/have lost credibility with my students because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

7. In my career, I probably will lose/have lost credibility with colleagues/administrators because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

8. In my career, I probably will lose/have lost credibility with parents/community members because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.

9. In my career, I probably will/have lack(ed) support from administration because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> In my career, I probably will/have lack(ed) support from colleagues because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> In my career, I probably will/have lack(ed) role models or mentors who are lesbian/gay/bisexual teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> In my career, I probably will be/have been perceived as trying to recruit students to a lesbian/gay/bisexual lifestyle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> In my career, I probably will be/have been perceived as a sexual predator because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> In my career, I probably will/have live(d) two separate lives, one as a teacher and one as a lesbian/gay/bisexual person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> In my career, I probably will/have lack(ed) support from my significant other related to others knowing that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Coping With Barriers to Implicitly and Explicitly Out Sexual Identity Management Strategies

As you read the following list of situations related to your work experiences, please rate your degree of confidence that you could overcome each potential barrier to disclosing your sexual identity at work. Please use the five point scale ranging from 1 (not at all confident) to 5 (highly confident).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Highly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Unconfident</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Being treated differently because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
2. Being aware of negative comments about my lesbian/gay/bisexual sexual orientation (such as insults or rude jokes).
3. Losing my job because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
4. Receiving a negative review by my administrator because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
5. Receiving a negative teacher evaluations from students because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
6. Losing credibility with my students because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
7. Losing credibility with colleagues/administrators because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
8. Losing credibility with parents/community members because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
9. Having difficulty fitting in with colleagues because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
10. Lacking support from administration because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
11. Lacking support from colleagues because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.
12. Lacking role models or mentors who are lesbian/gay/bisexual teachers.
13. Being perceived as trying to recruit students to a lesbian/gay/bisexual lifestyle.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Being perceived as a sexual predator because of being known to be lesbian/gay/bisexual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Living two separate lives, one as a teacher and one as a lesbian/gay/bisexual person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lacking support from my significant other related to others knowing that I am lesbian/gay/bisexual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Demographic Questionnaire

Please respond to the following questions about you and your current teaching career by filling in the blank or checking the appropriate responses.

1. Gender: _________________ 2. Age: __________

3. Sexual Orientation: lesbian ___ gay ___ bisexual ___ heterosexual ___ other ___

If you have not checked gay, lesbian, or bisexual, please discontinue participation here.

4. How long have you identified with your current sexual orientation? __________

5. Education:
   - _ Bachelor's Degree
   - _ Master's Degree
   - _ Doctoral degree

6. Your current relationship status:
   - _ not involved in dating or romantic relationship
   - _ in a same-sex relationship (not living together)
   - _ live with a same-sex partner
   - _ involved in opposite-sex romantic relationship

7. Race/Ethnic Background:
   - _ American Indian or Native
   - _ Asian or Asian American or Pacific Islander
   - _ Biracial
   - _ Black or African American
   - _ Caucasian / White American
   - _ Hispanic or Latino
   - _ Multiracial
   - _ Other

8. Grade level of current teaching position (check all that apply):
   - _ elementary
   - _ middle school / junior high / intermediate school
   - _ high school

9. Primary content area for secondary teachers or elementary teachers if applicable:
   - _ Music
   - _ Art
   - _ English/Language Arts
   - _ Special education
   - _ Math
   - _ Science
10. Do you know other lesbian, gay, or bisexual teachers?
   - Yes, in my building
   - Yes, in my district
   - Yes, but not in my district
   - No

11. School district type/setting (check all that apply):
   - Parochial
   - Private
   - Rural
   - Suburban
   - Urban

12. Number of years in current teaching position (in school district) ________

13. Number of years in teaching career ________

14. How satisfied with your current job are you:
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neutral or unsure
   - Dissatisfied

15. To what degree are you “out” to people in your work setting?
   - All or most know
   - Some know
   - Only close friends know
   - No one knows

15. How satisfied are you with your degree of “outness” at work?
   - Very Satisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Neutral or unsure
   - Dissatisfied
   - Very Dissatisfied

16. In which region of the United States do you teach?
   - 1. Northwest
   - 2. Midwest
   - 3. Northeast/Mid-Atlantic
   - 4. South
   - 5. Southwest
Appendix F

Self-Ranking of Identity Management Strategies

Listed below are four general approaches to managing a minority sexual identity at work. Please read the description of each approach carefully and consider which of the approaches are descriptive of ways that you manage your sexual identity at work. Then rate each description. Place a ‘1’ next to the approach that you consider most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘2’ next to the approach that you consider second most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘3’ next to the approach that you consider third most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘4’ next to the approach that you consider least descriptive of yourself.

____ I fabricate information so that others will see me as heterosexual at work. I assume that others at work do not know I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

____ I censor information so that others will not see me as lesbian, gay, or bisexual at work. I assume that others at work do not know that I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

____ I provide true information about myself without using lesbian, gay, or bisexual labels so that others can see me as lesbian, gay, or bisexual if they want to. I assume that others at work know I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual, but do not know for sure.

____ I affirm my lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity so that others will see me as lesbian, gay, or bisexual at work. I know that others at work know that I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

Listed below are three general approaches to managing a minority sexual identity at work. Please read the description of each approach carefully and consider which of the approaches are descriptive of ways that you manage your sexual identity at work. Then rate each description. Place a ‘1’ next to the approach that you consider most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘2’ next to the approach that you consider second most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘3’ next to the approach that you consider least descriptive of yourself.

____ I attempt to portray a heterosexual identity at work and do not express interests and mannerisms that are stereotypically associated with being lesbian, gay, or bisexual.
I do not reveal anything related to my sexual identity at work or with co-workers.

I reveal information related to my sexual identity at work, either directly (i.e., telling a co-worker that I am gay) or indirectly (i.e., displaying photographs of me and a same-sex partner) and attempt to manage the consequences.

Listed below are four general approaches to managing your minority sexual identity with your family members (i.e., parents, siblings, extended family). Please read the description of each approach carefully and consider which of the approaches are descriptive of ways that you manage your sexual identity with family members. Then rate each description. Place a ‘1’ next to the approach that you consider most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘2’ next to the approach that you consider second most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘3’ next to the approach that you consider third most descriptive of yourself. Place a ‘4’ next to the approach that you consider least descriptive of yourself.

I fabricate information so that family members will see me as heterosexual. I assume that my family members do not know I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

I censor information so that family members will not see me as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. I assume that my family members do not know that I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

I provide true information about myself without using lesbian, gay, or bisexual labels so that family members can see me as lesbian, gay, or bisexual if they want to. I assume that my family members know I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual, but do not know for sure.

I affirm my lesbian, gay, or bisexual identity so that family members will see me as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. I know that my family members know that I am lesbian, gay, or bisexual.
Appendix G

Human Subjects Review Board Approval Letters

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Date: April 14, 2005
To: James Croteau, Principal Investigator
    Teresa Lance, Student Investigator for dissertation
From: Mary Lagerwey, Ph.D., Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 05-04-10

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "More than In and Out of the Classroom Closet: A Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Teachers' Workplace Sexual Identity Management Strategies" has been reviewed under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. Before final approval can be given please address each of the following concerns. We expect that you will find the revisions requests to be productive and that you will revise your protocol according to our suggestions or in similar ways. If you think a particular revision is not in the best interest of the human subjects in your study, or you think an entirely different approach to the issue is best, please provide a written explanation and/or call us for consultation.

In a cover letter to the HSIRB, indicate whether you have made the requested change; addressed the issue in a different way than the one the reviewers suggested; are directing the reviewers to the pages in your protocol that address the issue; or are providing a justification for not making the requested change.

1. Application form, page 2, TARGETED PARTICIPANT POOL:
   - Please report "0" for the number of subjects in the control group.
   - An age range is required (e.g., 18-99).

2. Application form, page 2, RESEARCH SITES: Approval letters (or emails) are required from the listserv organizations assuring that you have approved access to their mailing lists.

3. Procedure section of the protocol outline: To emphasize that research subjects are volunteers, please change the word "asked" to "invited" throughout this section.

4. Subject Selection section of the protocol outline: Under D—Personal and professional contacts distributing research surveys: Please add provisions for security (describe how you will assure privacy) for this snowball recruitment procedure. The teachers may not want employers or others to have access to the letter and/or their responses.

5. Protection for Subjects section of the protocol outline: You say the participants will have self-identified as LGB, but the potential participants recruited by the snowball technique may not have identified to employers or colleagues so protection of confidentiality is...
particularly important in email (not listserv) and face-to-face recruitment and communication.

6. Confidentiality of Data section of the protocol outline: Please describe your procedures for protecting the confidentiality of those who are recruited by the snowball technique.

7. Appendix N: Please provide directions (and any script snowball recruiters should use) for distribution of the packets to their acquaintances.

8. Appendix P: Please soften the promise of benefits by changing the word "will" to "may" throughout the second paragraph.

Please submit your cover letter and one copy of the revised protocol with the changes highlighted within the document to the HSIRB, 251W Walwood Hall (East Campus). Remember to include the HSIRB project number (above).

Conducting this research without final approval from the HSIRB is a violation of university policy as well as state and federal regulations.

If there is anything you don't understand about these comments, you are welcome to call the research compliance coordinator (387-8293) for consultation.
Date: May 17, 2005

To: James Croteau, Principal Investigator
    Teresa Lance, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Mary Lagerwey, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 05-04-10

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled “More than In and Out of the Classroom Closet: A Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Teachers’ Workplace Sexual Identity Management Strategies” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: May 17, 2006
This letter will serve as confirmation that the change to your research project "More Than In and Out of the Classroom Closet: A Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Teachers" requested in your memo dated 7/6/2005 and later clarified in your memo dated 7/7/2005 (documentation of NEA-GLBTC's willingness to distribute email invitation via listserv) has been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.

The conditions and the duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: May 17, 2006
Appendix H

Email to Personal and Professional Contacts
Asking for Assistance Distributing Research Surveys

Dear (insert name):

As you may know, I am working on my dissertation that focuses on the identity management strategies of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) teachers. I know you as someone who is LGB affirming and am writing to ask if you might be willing to assist me in recruiting participants for my research study. You could help me by distributing research surveys to LGB teachers who have self-identified themselves as LGB to you and who currently teach in a K-12 school setting. I am striving to gather information from as broad and diverse a sample as possible. Therefore, please consider distributing research surveys to LGB teachers who are people of color, teach in various educational settings (i.e., grade level or location), and who might be less open at school regarding their sexual orientation.

If you agree to distribute research surveys, I will send you a packet of surveys. Each survey will be accompanied by a letter inviting the recipient of the survey to participate in the study. This invitation to participate contains the informed consent information for potential participants and contact information so that they may contact me or my advisor if they have questions or concerns regarding the study. My research study has been approved by the Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Review Board. When you distribute the surveys it is important that you hand the survey packets directly to the individuals rather than relying on other methods of distribution that might pose a risk to their confidentiality (i.e., using inter-school mail, leaving packet in their teacher mailbox at school, etc.). In the packets of research surveys, you will also receive further instructions regarding how to introduce the project to those individuals to whom you distribute research surveys.

In order to protect the anonymity of potential participants, I ask that if you agree to distribute research surveys you inform me only of how many surveys you can distribute. Please respond to this email by clicking the reply prompt and writing your postal address and the number of research surveys you plan to distribute. Do not provide me any names or contact information of those to whom you plan to distribute the surveys. It is also extremely important that you simply give the research surveys to the potential participants without discussing the study further with them and that you not do any type of follow-up asking whether they have completed the surveys.

I want to thank you in advance for your willingness to assist me in recruiting potential participants by distributing research surveys. I am excited to begin collecting information regarding how LGB teachers manage their sexual identity at work and appreciate your support.
Sincerely,

Teresa S. Lance, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University
Appendix I

Letter to Contact Individuals
Enclosed with Packets of Research Surveys for Distribution

Department Letterhead

Recipient Name
Street Address
City/State/Zip code

(insert date)

Dear (insert name):

Thank you for your willingness to assist me in my dissertation research by distributing research survey packets. You indicated in your email that you could distribute ___ research surveys to teachers who have identified themselves to you as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. I have enclosed the number of survey packets you requested.

I ask that you distribute the enclosed research survey packets within the next two weeks. Please keep in mind the potential participants’ confidentiality as you distribute the surveys. Please hand the survey packets directly to the individuals rather than relying on other methods of distribution that might pose as a risk to their confidentiality (i.e., using inter-school mail, leaving packet in their teacher mailbox at school, etc.).

When you hand the survey packets to the individuals, please inform them that you found out about a research project about LGB teachers being conducted and wanted to give them the opportunity to participate if they are interested. If they have any questions regarding why you are helping distribute surveys or about the researcher, you might want to tell them how you know me and that I am a former teacher who identifies as lesbian. Please do not discuss the study further with the potential participants at this time. It is important that participation in the study remains anonymous and that potential participants do not feel pressured to participate. Therefore, please do not follow-up with anyone to whom you distribute a research survey packet regarding whether they have completed it. Also, please do not communicate to me the name or any contact information of anyone to whom you distribute a research survey packet.

I truly appreciate your support. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at tlance@insight.rr.com or 614-395-0925.
Sincerely,

Teresa S. Lance, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University
Appendix J

Research Survey Distribution Reminders

*Please distribute these research surveys only to K-12 teachers who have identified themselves to you as lesbian, gay, or bisexual.

*Please do not discuss whether these teachers plan to participate in the study.

*Please do not follow-up with any of the teachers to whom you distribute research surveys regarding whether they complete them.

*Please do not communicate to me any names or contact information of potential participants.

THANK YOU!
Appendix K

Invitation to Participate
Attached to Distributed Research Surveys

Dear Teacher:

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "More Than In and Out of the Classroom Closet: A Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Teachers' Sexual Identity Management Strategies," designed to examine how lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) K-12 teachers navigate their workplace environments related to their sexual orientation. The study is being conducted by Teresa Lance, M.A., under the supervision of James M. Croteau, Ph.D., from Western Michigan University, Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Teresa Lance.

Your participation in this study may make a valuable contribution to the body of research about the experiences of LGB teachers and the general work experiences of LGB individuals. The information gathered about identity management and how to assess identity management effectively may aid in the study of LGB teachers. As researchers gain more understanding of LGB teachers' experiences managing their sexual identity, this information might be instrumental to those working to make schools more affirming and safe for LGB teachers. In turn, greater affirmation for LGB teachers might contribute positively to the process of improving school environments regarding LGB students, families, staff, and issues.

Participation in the study involves completing the enclosed survey containing demographic information and questions related to your workplace and your sexual orientation. Benefits of participating in the study may include the opportunity to reflect on your own experiences and the knowledge that you are contributing to the body of literature intended to improve the environment of K-12 school settings. Your personal reflection on your workplace experiences might remind you of discomfort or concerns you have as a teacher who is LGB. Responding to the survey will take approximately 30 to 35 minutes to complete. The time it takes to complete the survey and the possible discomfort of reflecting on your workplace experiences are the only anticipated inconveniences or risks of participation.

Your responses will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. Responses you provide will be grouped with data of other participants for reporting and presentation. Your decision to participate in this research is voluntary. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose not to participate in this study, please return the blank survey in the enclosed stamped envelope. If you choose to respond to the
survey, please return your survey in the enclosed stamped envelope. Returning the survey with
responses indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

If you have received more than one copy of this survey or have received an email invitation to
participate in this project, please do not respond to the survey more than one time (i.e., do not
complete more than one paper/pencil survey, do not complete this paper/pencil survey and
respond to the email invitation via the Internet, or do not submit more than one survey via the
Internet).

I am also inviting you to distribute research surveys to other teachers who are out to you as
lesbian, gay, or bisexual. I am striving to gather information from as broad and diverse a sample
as possible. Therefore, please consider distributing research surveys to LGB teachers who are
people of color, teach in various educational settings (i.e., grade level or location), and who
might be less open at school regarding their sexual orientation. If you are interested in
distributing research surveys to other LGB teachers, please email me at tlance@insight.rr.com
and indicate your mailing address and how many surveys you can distribute. Please do not
include any information regarding the names or contact information of those to whom you plan
to distribute research surveys. Again, please do not provide your mailing address or any other
identifying information on your survey if you choose to participate.

If you have any questions, you may contact Teresa Lance, M.A. at (614-395-0925) or James M.
Croteau, Ph.D. at (269-387-5111). The participant may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects
Institutional Review (269-387-8293), or the Vice President for Research (269-387-8298) if
questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board
chair in the upper right corner. Do not participate in this study if the stamped date is older than
one year.

Sincerely,

Teresa S. Lance, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University
Appendix L

Email to Organizations for Distributing
Email Invitation to Listserv Members

Dear __________: (Specific GLSEN chapter/State Education Association LGB Caucus/Community Center name will be entered here)

Recently you agreed to assist me in recruiting potential participants for my dissertation research study focusing on identity management strategies of lesbian, gay, and bisexual teachers. At that time I let you know that I would be in touch with you once I received Human Subjects Review Board approval for my study.

My study has been approved by Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Review Board (269-387-8293) and I am ready to begin my recruitment of participants. Your organization expressed that one way you could assist in this process would be to distribute an email to your listserv members. This email invites potential participants to access a webpage that further describes the study and includes a link to the online anonymous research survey.

I have attached the email invitation for you to send to your listserv members. Please open the attachment and send it out as an email message using your listserv address list. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (614-395-0925) or via email.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to assist me in recruiting potential participants for my study.

Sincerely,

Teresa Lance
Doctoral Student
Counselor education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University
Appendix M

Email to Organizations Regarding Organizational Website Introduction to Study

Dear (GLSEN chapter/State Education Association LGB Caucus/Community Center):

Recently you agreed to assist me in recruiting potential participants for my dissertation research study focusing on identity management strategies of lesbian, gay, and bisexual teachers. At that time I let you know that I would be in touch with you once I received Human Subjects Review Board approval for my study.

My study has been approved by Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Review Board (269-387-8293) and I am ready to begin my recruitment of participants. Your organization expressed that one way you could assist in this process would be to include a brief introduction to my study on your website. This website introduction to my study invites potential participants to access a webpage that further describes the study and includes a link to the online anonymous research survey.

I have attached the introduction to my study for you to post on your organization’s webpage. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (614-395-0925) or via email.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to assist me in recruiting potential participants for my study.

Sincerely,

Teresa Lance
Doctoral Student
Counseling education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University
Appendix N

Email to Organizations Regarding 
Organizational Newsletter Introduction to Study

Dear (GLSEN chapter/State Education Association LGB Caucus/Community Center):

Recently you agreed to assist me in recruiting potential participants for my dissertation research study focusing on identity management strategies of lesbian, gay, and bisexual teachers. At that time I let you know that I would be in touch with you once I received Human Subjects Review Board approval for my study.

My study has been approved by Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Review Board (269-387-8293) and I am ready to begin my recruitment of participants. Your organization expressed that one way you could assist in this process would be to include a brief introduction to my study in your organization’s newsletter. This newsletter introduction to my study invites potential participants to access a webpage that further describes the study and includes a link to the online anonymous research survey.

I have attached the introduction to my study for you to include in your organization’s newsletter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (614-395-0925) or via email.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to assist me in recruiting potential participants for my study.

Sincerely,

Teresa Lance
Doctoral Student
Counseling education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University
Appendix O

Email Invitation to Organization Listserv Members

Greetings [Blank] member: (note—in email specific organization name will be inserted in blank)

My name is Teresa Lance and I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology at Western Michigan University. As part of my dissertation research I am conducting a study that focuses on the work experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual (LGB) teachers. As a former middle school teacher who also identifies as lesbian, I am interested in ensuring that school settings are safe and affirming environments for everyone, including LGB students, teachers, administrators, and families. It is my hope that through gaining more information regarding the work experiences of LGB teachers I can add to a knowledge base about LGB teachers that can be helpful in creating more positive school environments for all LGB individuals. I am also interested in adding valuable information to what is known regarding LGB individuals’ work experiences for use in future research and in the vocational literature.

I have asked [correct GLSEN chapter/state education association or community resource centers] to distribute this email to their membership, hoping that I will be able to reach as many LBG teachers as possible from all over the country. If you are a teacher who identifies as lesbian, gay, or bisexual, I would like to take this opportunity to invite you to participate in my research study. To learn more about the study, please click on this webpage link: http://homepages.wmich.edu/~t71ance. If you decide to access this website, you will find further information about the study that might help you decide whether you want to participate. If you decide that you want to participate, you will be asked to enter the username “XXXXX” and password “XXXXX” in the log-in box. You will then be directed to the online survey.

Though I am only inviting LGB teachers to participate in my study, I appreciate everyone who receives this for your involvement in [name of GLSEN chapter] and your efforts to make schools safe and effective for all students!

[NOTE: Education association and community center emails will end with: Though I am only inviting LGB teachers to participate in my study, I appreciate your involvement with (insert name of association or center).]

Sincerely,

Teresa S. Lance, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University

161
Organizational Newsletter Introduction to Study

**Research Opportunity:** If you are a teacher who identifies as lesbian, gay, or bisexual, you are invited to participate in a study via an anonymous online survey. The study is being conducted by Teresa Lance, a doctoral student at Western Michigan University, and focuses on workplace experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) teachers. The study is designed to examine how LGB teachers manage their sexual identity at work. Your participation in the study can make a valuable contribution to the body of literature that focuses on LGB teachers. To learn more about this research study, please go to [http://homepages.wmich.edu/~t7lance](http://homepages.wmich.edu/~t7lance). If you do decide to participate in the online study, you are invited to access the survey by using the log-in name XXXXXXXXXXX and the password XXXXXXXX to enter the survey website. This study has been approved by Western Michigan University's Human Subjects Review Board.
Appendix Q

Organizational Website Introduction to Study

Research Opportunity: If you are a teacher who identifies as lesbian, gay, or bisexual, you are invited to participate in a study via an anonymous online survey. The study is being conducted by Teresa Lance, a doctoral student at Western Michigan University, and focuses on workplace experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) teachers. The study is designed to examine how LGB teachers manage their sexual identity at work. Your participation in the study can make a valuable contribution to the body of literature that focuses on LGB teachers. To learn more about this research study, please go to http://homepages.wmich.edu/~t7lance. If you do decide to participate in the online study, you are invited to access the survey online by using the log-in name XXXXXXXX and the password XXXXXXXX to enter the survey website. This study has been approved by Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Review Board.
Appendix R

Webpage Explanation of Study and Informed Consent Information

Dear Interested LGB Teacher:

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “More Than In and Out of the Classroom Closet: A Study of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Teachers’ Sexual Identity Management Strategies,” designed to examine how lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) K-12 teachers navigate their workplace environments related to their sexual orientation. The study is being conducted by Teresa Lance, M.A., under the supervision of James M. Croteau, Ph.D., from Western Michigan University, Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Teresa Lance.

Your participation in this study may make a valuable contribution to the body of research about the experiences of LGB teachers and the general work experiences of LGB individuals. The information gathered about identity management and how to assess identity management effectively will aid in the study of LGB teachers. As researchers gain more understanding of LGB teachers’ experiences managing their sexual identity, this information might be instrumental to those working to make schools more affirming and safe for LGB teachers and students.

Participation in the study involves completing an anonymous online survey containing demographic information, questions related to your work setting, and questions about how you manage your sexual orientation at work. Benefits of participating in the study may include the opportunity to reflect on your own experiences and the knowledge that you are contributing to the body of literature intended to improve the environment of K-12 school settings. Your personal reflection on your experiences in the workplace might remind you of discomfort or concerns you have as a teacher who is LGB. Responding to the survey will take approximately 30 to 35 minutes to complete. The time it takes to complete the survey and the possible discomfort of reflecting on your workplace experiences are the only anticipated inconveniences or risks of participation.

If you have received more than one invitation to participate in this project or have received a paper/pencil version of the survey, please do not respond to the survey more than one time (i.e., submitting more that one survey via the Internet, completing a survey via the Internet and a paper/pencil survey, or completing more than one paper/pencil survey, etc.). You may choose not to answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose not to participate in this survey, you may close out the webpage without submitting your responses. Submitting the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.
This project has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board on __________. Please do not participate in this study after June 15, 2005. Approval of this project only signifies that the procedures adequately protect the rights and welfare of the participants. Your responses will be stored on a secure portion of Western Michigan University’s server and will be anonymous to the researchers. Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. One potential limitation to confidentiality is the lack of discreteness that you may encounter when submitting responses over the Internet. For instance, if you are using a computer in a public area persons passing by may be able to easily read your responses. Another limitation to confidentiality is that companies often have tracking systems that monitor employees' emails. It is important for you to be aware that your participation may not be entirely confidential if you are receiving and/or submitting responses over a monitored email system.

If you have any questions, you may contact Teresa Lance, M.A., at (614-395-0925). You may also contact James M. Croteau, Ph.D., at (269-387-5111), the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269-387-8293), or the Western Michigan University Vice President for Research (269-387-8298).

Teresa S. Lance, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Counselor Education and Counseling psychology
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

If you choose to participate, please enter the username and password provided in the original email invitation you received. After Login you will be transferred to a secured site, meaning that your information is encrypted so no one but the researcher can read it.
Appendix S

Follow-up Email for Contact Individuals

Dear (insert name):

I hope your summer is off to a good start. About a month ago I sent you the email below, asking if you might be able to assist me in recruiting potential participants for my dissertation by distributing research surveys. I did not hear back regarding this email and know that I sent the message at a busy time for you. I am writing now to ask whether you would be willing to distribute research surveys to lesbian, gay, and bisexual teachers (LGB) who have self-identified themselves to you as LGB. The specifics about distributing research surveys are detailed in the message below.

Please let me know whether you know any LGB teachers to whom you are willing to distribute research surveys or if you are unable to assist me at this time. If you are able to help me in recruiting potential participants, I’ll need your postal address and the number of surveys you can distribute.

Again, I appreciate any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Teresa S. Lance, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University

Dear (insert name):

As you may know, I am working on my dissertation that focuses on the identity management strategies of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) teachers. I know you as someone who is LGB affirming and am writing to ask if you might be willing to assist me in recruiting participants for my research study. You could help me by distributing research surveys to LGB teachers who have self-identified themselves as LGB to you and who currently teach in a K-12 school setting. I am striving to gather information from as broad and diverse a sample as possible. Therefore, please consider distributing research surveys to LGB teachers who are people of color, teach in various educational settings (i.e., grade level or location), and who might be less open at school regarding their sexual orientation.
If you agree to distribute research surveys, I will send you a packet of surveys. Each survey will be accompanied by a letter inviting the recipient of the survey to participate in the study. This invitation to participate contains the informed consent information for potential participants and contact information so that they may contact me or my advisor if they have questions or concerns regarding the study. My research study has been approved by the Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Review Board. When you distribute the surveys it is important that you hand the survey packets directly to the individuals rather than relying on other methods of distribution that might pose as a risk to their confidentiality (i.e., using inter-school mail, leaving packet in their teacher mailbox at school, etc.). In the packets of research surveys, you will also receive further instructions regarding how to introduce the project to those individuals to whom you distribute research surveys.

In order to protect the anonymity of potential participants, I ask that if you agree to distribute research surveys you inform me only of how many surveys you can distribute. Please respond to this email by clicking the reply prompt and writing your postal address and the number of research surveys you plan to distribute. Do not provide me any names or contact information of those to whom you plan to distribute the surveys. It is also extremely important that you simply give the research surveys to the potential participants without discussing the study further with them and that you not do any type of follow-up asking whether they have completed the surveys.

I want to thank you in advance for your willingness to assist me in recruiting potential participants by distributing research surveys. I am excited to begin collecting information regarding how LGB teachers manage their sexual identity at work and appreciate your support.

Sincerely,

Teresa S. Lance, M.A.
Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University
Appendix T

Follow-up Thank You and Reminder
For Contact Individuals

Dear (insert name):

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for your willingness to assist me in my dissertation research by agreeing to distribute research surveys to LGB teachers. I sent you the requested number of surveys and hope they reached you. I appreciate your assistance and have been receiving completed surveys. If you received the surveys I sent but have not yet distributed them, I ask that you do so as soon as possible. If you did not receive the surveys, please notify me and I will resend them.

Thank you again for your willingness to assist me in recruiting potential participants!

Sincerely,

Teresa S. Lance
Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University
Table 1

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between WSIMM-R Scales, IMS-R Scales, PBOSIMS, CBOSIMS, and Disclosure Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Passing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Covering</td>
<td>.43(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Implicitly Out</td>
<td>-.47(**)</td>
<td>-.60(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explicitly Out</td>
<td>-.29(*)</td>
<td>-.78(**)</td>
<td>.48(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counterfeiting</td>
<td>.71(**)</td>
<td>.64(**)</td>
<td>-.57(**)</td>
<td>-.44(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avoiding</td>
<td>.39(**)</td>
<td>.60(**)</td>
<td>-.44(**)</td>
<td>-.56(**)</td>
<td>.56(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Integrating</td>
<td>-.42(**)</td>
<td>-.86(**)</td>
<td>.66(**)</td>
<td>.89 (**)</td>
<td>-.62(**)</td>
<td>-.57(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PBOSIMS</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CBOSIMS</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.43(**)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.49(**)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.28(*)</td>
<td>.47(**)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “out” at work</td>
<td>-.25(*)</td>
<td>-.77(**)</td>
<td>.46(**)</td>
<td>.82(**)</td>
<td>-.47(**)</td>
<td>-.48(**)</td>
<td>.84(**)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.36(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “out” satisfaction</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.58(**)</td>
<td>.28(*)</td>
<td>.56(**)</td>
<td>.31(*)</td>
<td>-.45(**)</td>
<td>.52(**)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.29(*)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.30</th>
<th>2.06</th>
<th>3.81</th>
<th>2.69</th>
<th>1.70</th>
<th>2.47</th>
<th>4.38</th>
<th>2.76</th>
<th>3.74</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>3.45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N varies between 63 and 64 due to missing data. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised. IMS-R is Identity Management Strategies-Revised. PBOSIMS is Perception of Barrier to Implicitly and Explicitly Out Identity Management Strategies. CBOSIMS is Coping with Barrier to Implicitly and Explicitly Out Identity Management Strategies. “Out” at work = single item assessing degree to which participants are out to people in work setting. ‘Outness’ satisfaction = single item assessing participants’ satisfaction with their degree of “outness” at work.
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for WSIMM-R Scales by GroupID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSIMM-R Scale</th>
<th>GroupID</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing Scale</td>
<td>passing/covering</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implicitly out</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicitly out</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering Scale</td>
<td>passing/covering</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implicitly out</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicitly out</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly Out Scale</td>
<td>passing/covering</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implicitly out</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicitly out</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Out Scale</td>
<td>passing/covering</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implicitly out</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explicitly out</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised.
Table 3

Analysis of Variance for WSIMM-R Scales by GroupID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>Observed power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.83</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly Out Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Out Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised.
Table 4

Post Hoc Comparisons for WSIMM-R Scales by GroupID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSIMM-R Scale</th>
<th>GroupID</th>
<th>GroupID</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing Scale</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering Scale</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly Out</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Out</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>P/C</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IO</td>
<td>EO</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised. P/C = passing covering, IO = implicitly out, EO = explicitly out.
### Table 5

Multivariate Analysis of Variance for WSIMM-R Scales by Personal and Career Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta_p^2$</th>
<th>Observed power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Id</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Long ID</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long in career</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long in position</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised. Race/Ethn is Race/Ethnicity. * This statistically significant result was not reported as such in the study due to the extremely unequal and small cell sizes involved in the analyses.
Table 6

Analysis of Variance for WSIMM-R Scales by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta_p^2$</th>
<th>Observed power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly Out Scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Out Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised.*
Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for WSIMM-R Scales by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSIMM-R Scale</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing Scale</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering Scale</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly Out</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Out</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised.
Table 8

Post Hoc Comparisons for WSIMM-R Scales by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSIMM-R Scale</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passing Scale</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covering Scale</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicitly Out</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly Out</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: WSIMM-R is Workplace Sexual Identity Management Measure-Revised.
Table 9

Analysis of Variance for PBOSIMS by Personal and Career Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta_p^2$</th>
<th>Observed power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Id</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Long ID</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long in career</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long in position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PBOSIMS is Perception of Barriers to Implicitly and Explicitly Out Identity Management Strategies. Race/Ethn is Race/Ethnicity.
Table 10

Post Hoc Comparisons for PBOSIMS by Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, in building</td>
<td>Yes, in district</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, not in district</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, in district</td>
<td>Yes, not in district</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* PBOSIMS is Perception of Barriers to Implicitly and Explicitly Out Identity Management Strategies.
Table 11

Analysis of Variance for CBOSIMS by Personal and Career Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>Observed power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex Id</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Long ID</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long in career</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long in position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CBOSIMS is Coping with Barriers to Implicitly and Explicitly Out Identity Management Strategies. Race/Ethn is Race/Ethnicity. * These statistically significant results were not reported as such in the study due to the extremely small cell sizes involved in the analyses.